

2015 Campus Climate Survey  
Results: Preliminary Report to  
Faculty Senate  
March 8, 2016

Presented by Jan Kottke

Co-authors:

Barbara Sirotnik & Kathie Pelletier

Our other members of the Ad hoc Campus Climate Committee are  
Dorothy Chen Maynard, Robie Madrigal, and Rich McGee

# Introduction

- Comment from the 2015 CSUSB Campus Climate Survey:
  - “Who are we kidding here? Do you really need to do a survey to see that the morale is in [the] dumps?”
- Yes, we do. To assess morale, we need more data than comments heard ‘round the water cooler.

# Overview of Presentation

- Phase I report of survey results
  - Will cover the following domains from our report
    - Employee morale
    - Leadership
    - Shared governance and decision making
  - Conclusions and suggestions based on these data
- What's coming later
  - Phase 2 results

# Background

- June 2015, 2 fora sponsored by the FS
  - More than 100 faculty and staff attended each
  - Concern for campus climate
- Faculty senate requested support from CO
  - CO declined; encouraged the campus community to work together to address the issues.
- Ad hoc committee formed
  - Faculty and staff
    - Qualifications include: survey design, statistical analysis, qualitative analysis, measurement, leadership expertise, executive coaching, and knowledge of organizational behavior
  - Administrators asked to join, but declined

# Method

- Committee considered what is known about organizational climate and common ways to assess
- Reviewed other relevant, recent surveys from:
  - 2015 Chico State
  - 2014 UC Berkeley
  - 2010 CSUSB Staff survey
  - 2009 furlough study
- Reviewed issues identified in the FS resolution sent to the CO

# Method

- Developed an online instrument of Likert style scale items and open-ended questions
  - Hosted by external marketing firm
  - Link was sent to all campus employees with a working email address, as well as
  - Retiree association list serv
- Dimensions addressed:
  - job satisfaction, opportunities for job growth, leadership, communication and decision making processes, diversity, inclusion, equity, workload and work stress, collaboration, performance evaluation and feedback, shared governance/decision-making, and in-range progression process

# Who responded?

<b>Position</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Tenured faculty (including FERP)	151	20.0	20.0
Tenure track faculty	40	5.3	5.3
Lecturer	27	3.6	3.6
Non-exempt staff (hourly)	211	27.9	27.9
Exempt staff	203	26.9	26.9
Administrator (MPP)	75	9.9	9.9
Former CSUSB employees	48	6.3	6.4
Total	755	99.9	100.0
No position listed	1	.1	
<b>Total</b>	<b>756</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

# Analysis

- Mixed method
  - Summaries of the rated, numeric variables
  - Analysis of the comments into themes



# Results

- Highlights of summarized data follow
- We begin with the survey items that asked about Morale

# Morale: Numeric Ratings

<b>% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following:</b>				
	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>“I am proud to say I work at CSUSB”</b>	67.8%	82.2%	92.9%	77.8%
<b>“My work gives me a sense of personal accomplishment”</b>	88.0%	78.4%	93.0%	83.0%
<b>“I like my job”</b>	82.4%	82.3%	81.7%	81.5%
<b>“The work that I do is satisfying”</b>	84.6%	76.0%	85.7%	79.9%
<b>“Employee morale is good on campus “</b>	16.6%	22.2%	36.6%	22.4%

# Morale: Numeric Ratings

	% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” ...				
	Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	Overall
“Morale has changed since I was hired”	66.7%	69.3%	62.3%	90.7%	69.2%
<b>[IF RESPONDENT INDICATED A CHANGE].....</b>					
Morale has gotten <i><u>better</u></i>	5.3%	11.2%	22.0%	11.1%	10.4%
Morale has gotten <i><u>worse</u></i>	94.7%	88.8%	78.0%	88.9%	89.6%

# Morale: Comments

- Positive themes
  - Job satisfaction (38)
  - Optimism about future direction of CSUSB (13)
  - Leadership (7)
- 313 respondents' responses assigned at least one theme
- Negative themes
  - Leadership attributions, e.g., not valuing employees (287)
  - Loss of institutional values, e.g., loss of family/talent (188)
  - Work and workload (147)
  - Environment, e.g., fear (102)
  - Lack of authenticity and accountability (53)

# Morale: Representative Comments

- *“The campus climate has changed from a friendly and open communication, where one could disagree without fear of retaliation to an environment where staff and faculty are worried about speaking up.”*
- *“I am very optimistic about the future of CSUSB.”*
- *“A few years ago, I would have said I was proud to work here. That has changed, as the heart and soul of this university has changed—for the worse.”*

# **TURNING TO LEADERSHIP**

# Leadership: Numeric Ratings

	<b>% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” ...</b>				
	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Former employees</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>“I have confidence that senior management of this campus is capable of addressing the challenges that we face”</b>	18.3%	28.9%	50.0%	34.1%	28.2%
<b>“Senior management is open to receiving feedback”</b>	18.0%	26.3%	41.9%	28.6%	25.6%

# Leadership: Numeric Ratings

	% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” ...				
	Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former employees	Overall
<b>“Senior management inspires confidence in the future successes of this university”</b>	16.6%	26.5%	50.0%	31.0%	26.2%
<b>“Senior management acts with honesty and integrity”</b>	16.1%	22.6%	48.4%	26.2%	23.4%



# Leadership: Comments

- Positive themes
  - Confidence in direction (4)
  - Collaborative and consults (3)
  - Transparent (3)
  - Diversity focus (3)
  - Leadership has good intentions and the best interests of students and campus at heart (3)
- 170 respondents' responses assigned at least one theme
- Negative themes
  - Favoritism (47)
  - Authoritarian (26)
  - Lack of respect (25)
  - Fear (16)
  - Ineffective (14)
  - Lack of authenticity and accountability(15)
  - Hypocrisy/lip service (10)
  - Abusive (9)
  - No confidence (9)
  - Loyalty/compliance expected (8)
  - Self interested (7)

# Leadership: Representative Comments

- *“With new administration, change is expected. However the current administration states they are transparent, that they want campus input. This has not been found to be true. There is a standard for the president and his VP's and their selected soldiers and then there is another standard for everyone else.”*
- *“Since my arrival on campus I think employee morale has gotten better with the direction of our president and senior leadership.”*
- *“In the aftermath of these ongoing administrative decisions, trust, confidence, morale and most importantly belief in CSUSB's integrity and hope for it's continuing success has been sacrificed.”*

# **TURNING TO SHARED GOVERNANCE AND DECISION-MAKING**

# Shared Governance/Decision-Making: Numeric Ratings

	% who “agreed” they “have confidence in the decision-making process .....				
	Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	Overall
In their department	74.0%	54.4%	83.6%	66.7%	63.7%
In their college/division	55.3%	41.3%	63.9%	48.6%	48.2%
For the university as a whole	19.1%	37.1%	51.7%	35.9%	33.0%

# Shared Governance/Decision-Making: Numeric Ratings

**% who “agreed” they are “able to provide input before decisions are made about work issues that affect” them at the.....**

	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Former Employees</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Department level</b>	83.3%	61.3%	83.6%	61.1%	70.0%
<b>College/division level</b>	58.0%	36.0%	66.1%	45.9%	46.0%
<b>Campus/university as a whole</b>	24.9%	33.1%	47.4%	31.4%	31.9%

# Shared Governance/Decision-Making: Numeric Ratings

% who “agreed” that their “input helps shape decisions regarding work issues”					
	Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	Overall
<b>Department level</b>	79.5%	56.8%	84.7%	61.1%	66.4%
<b>College/division level</b>	52.7%	34.9%	63.2%	47.2%	43.7%
<b>Campus/university as a whole</b>	19.6%	30.4%	43.9%	29.4%	28.4%

# Shared Governance/Decision-Making: Numeric Ratings from Staff

<b>% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” .....</b>	
	<b>Staff</b>
<b>“My suggestions are used to improve processes, programs, or services”</b>	50.6%
<b>“My opinions are valued in my workgroup”</b>	59.2%
<b>In my workgroup, I am asked for my opinion about how work is done before changes are made”</b>	50.1%

# Shared Governance/Decision-Making: Numeric Ratings from Faculty and Administrators

% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” .....		
	Faculty	Admin
“Senior management consults relevant constituents when making campus decisions that affect faculty”	16.0%	57.1%
“My suggestions are used to improve processes, programs, or services”	20.7%	60.8%
“Senior management readily shares information needed for faculty to make important decisions”	16.2%	45.5%



# Shared Governance/Decision-Making: Numeric Ratings from Faculty and Administrators

% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” .....		
	Faculty	Admin
“When asked for information, senior management provides information in a timely manner”	20.8%	45.3%
“Decisions about academic requirements for students are made after meaningful consultation with faculty”	22.2%	54.1%
“Shared governance is practiced at CSUSB”	19.3%	51.0%

# Shared Governance/DM: Comments

## Faculty emergent themes (56)

- Had SG once (10)
- Lip service (12)
- Input not sought or valued (17)
- DM is top down (20)
- SG is not SDM (4)
- Selective consultation takes place (7)
- SM is collaborative (4)

- For staff (59)
  - Lip service (3)
  - Input is not valued (17)
  - Selective consultation takes place (16)
  - SM is collaborative (7)
- Admin (8)
  - SG is not SDM (4)

# Shared Governance-Decision-making: Representative Comments

- *“In recent years, senior management has pushed through major changes while paying lip service to shared governance.”*
- *“I think that some faculty think that they have been left out of the decision making process. It's not true.”*
- *“Senior management has been making major decisions about the future of the university and the development of new programs (Coyote First Step, residency requirement for first 2 years for students beyond 25 miles from campus) that affect students and will affect their participation in academic elements of their schooling and it has been doing this without ANY consultation with faculty.”*

# Conclusions and Interpretations

- The good news?
  - faculty and staff value the campus and the students they serve
  - many people are satisfied with their jobs, and find meaning in the work that they do

# Conclusions and Interpretations

- Bad news?
  - faculty and staff (and some administrators)
    - have lost confidence in leadership
    - feel underappreciated, undervalued, and unheard
  - The sense of community that many believe existed on the campus a few short years ago, is largely gone
  - There has been a breach of trust between senior management and the faculty and staff

# Recommendations

- Restore trust
  - It will not be easy
- To restore trust requires top leadership to
  - Acknowledge that a problem exists
  - Genuinely listen to employees—all employees—and hear them out
  - Demonstrate
    - all employees are valued
    - active steps are being taken to restore trust

# Recommendations

- Why this will not be easy
  - It is possible that some faculty and staff do not believe top leadership can or wants to change
- Why it can be done
  - As noted earlier, there is a core of employees who genuinely care about the university and its students—as well as each other
  - That so many employees responded and made strong comments on the survey is an indication that most employees care

# Recommendations

- Why it should be done
  - To show leadership's commitment to the core values expressed in the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan
  - To ensure everyone feels safe at work and empowered to live up to his or her fullest potential
  - For the students



# Looking ahead: Next report

- Our next report will include data on
  - Perceived job opportunities
  - More differences by department, college/division, campus
  - Communication
  - Diversity and inclusion
  - Workload, work stress
  - Personnel evaluation process
  - Intra range progression
  - Abusive conduct and bullying

# Questions?