2015 Campus Climate Survey Results: Phase II Report to the Faculty Senate May 10, 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

What was examined in Phase I?

- Morale
- Leadership
- Shared governance/decision making

Overview of Presentation

- Phase II report of survey results covered:
  - Diversity
  - Trust and mutual respect (psychological safety)
  - Workload and performance evaluation
  - Potential for job growth and career advancement
  - Bullying

- Today's presentation will focus on:
  - Diversity, trust, and bullying
  - Conclusions and suggestions based on these data and the results from Phase I

Review of 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 (sponsored by the CO)
  - 2009 furlough study
- Reviewed issues identified in the FS resolution sent to the CO (i.e., bullying, shared governance)

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?

Position	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	
Total	**756**	**100.0**	

Analysis

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

STARTING WITH DIVERSITY

Diversity: Numeric Results

% who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following items:					
	Faculty	**Staff**	**Admin**	**Former Empl.**	**Overall**
"My co-workers respect individual and cultural differences"	77.1%	74.7%	88.7%	84.2%	**77.4%**
"My supervisors respect individual and cultural differences"	72.8%	70.4%	88.5%	64.9%	**72.5%**
"I feel all people, regardless of differences, are valued at CSUSB"	46.6%	49.1%	67.2%	42.9%	**49.7%**
"Senior management treats all people, regardless of individual and cultural differences, fairly"	25.5%	31.1%	59.7%	31.0%	**32.3%**

Diversity: Comments

Positive themes

- Diversity is valued (27)
- Though progress has been made, more diversity is needed (12)

- 116 respondents left comments; 88 responses were assigned a theme

Negative themes

- Preferential treatment (31)
- Gender bias (17)
- Racial bias (15)
- Purposeful, political use of diversity (13)
- Marginalization (12)
- Differential practice across university (6)

Diversity: Representative Comments

- *"Ethnic diversity is pretty good, but gender diversity is not. There are no female vice presidents."*

- *"Diversity is championed in every direction one turns, but for a purpose. The purpose is to wield power and loyalty."*

- *"Unfortunately, I think that recent efforts by the administration to highlight differences between groups of students tends to marginalize some groups."*

- *"At the department and college level, differences are respected. At the university level, they are not."*

TURNING TO TRUST

Trust: Numeric Results

% who "agreed" with the following items:					
	Faculty	**Staff**	**Admin**	**Former Empl.**	**Overall**
Department level: "An atmosphere of trust exists"	73.4%	50.8%	67.8%	58.3%	**59.4%**
College/division level: "An atmosphere of trust exists"	54.9%	32.0%	47.5%	44.4%	**41.0%**
Campus/university as a whole: "An atmosphere of trust exists"	13.7%	28.5%	25.4%	28.9%	**23.9%**

Feelings of Safety: Numerical Results

% who "agreed" with the following items:					
	Faculty	**Staff**	**Admin**	**Former Empl.**	**Overall**
Department : "I feel safe expressing my opinion without fear of consequences or retribution"	77.6%	56.6%	73.8%	66.7%	**65.0%**
College/division: "I feel safe expressing my opinion without fear of consequences or retribution"	59.9%	37.7%	47.5%	48.6%	**45.9%**
Campus/university : "I feel safe expressing my opinion without fear of consequences or retribution"	23.8%	32.4%	37.3%	31.6%	**30.3%**

TURNING TO BULLYING

Bullying: Definition

- Defined on the survey as:
  - verbal or physical conduct that a "reasonable person" would find threatening, intimidating, or humiliating

Bullying: Numeric Results

% who said "yes"				
	Faculty	**Staff**	**Admin**	**Overall**
"Have you been bullied in the workplace this past year?"	28.3%	25.4%	18.3%	**25.6%**
"Have you witnessed bullying in the workplace this past year?"	48.6%	38.9%	33.3%	**41.4%**
"Have you been pressured to do something that isn't part of your job?"	25.1%	32.5%	23.0%	**29.2%**
"Have you been pressured to do something that you believe is wrong or unethical?"	21.7%	20.4%	11.9%	**19.9%**

Bullying: Comments

- Nature of the bullying:
  - Emotional abuse and intimidation (28)
  - Incivility (16)
  - Verbal abuse/yelling (13)
  - Gender harassment (7)
  - Pressuring employees (6)
  - Targeting employees (3)

  102 respondents left comments

Bullying: Comments

- Perpetrators of the bullying:
  - Top Leadership (8)
  - Department Chairs (6)
  - Senior Faculty (6)
  - President (5)
  - Supervisor (5)
  - Coworkers (5)

Bullying: Comments

- Level of bullying:
  - Department/Division (19)
  - University (18)
  - Human Resources (3)

Bullying: Was it reported?

- Only 28.6% reported the bullying they experienced

- Why did people choose not to report?
  - Fear of retaliation (38)
  - Futile to report (26)
  - Conflict avoidance (26)
  - Distrust of HR (20)
  - Power differential (13)
  - The bullying was only "borderline" (11)

Bullying: Representative Comments

- *"In my immediate workplace I have experienced shaming in meetings, condescension, and attacks on my professional abilities and knowledge."*

- *"People are targeted if they disagree with the central administration."*

- *"I was treated very rudely/offensively by a VP. His behavior was silencing and intimidating. It was a very nasty side of him I had never seen nor do I want to from him or anyone."*

- *"HR protects and even encourages bullying by managers."*

Bullying: Representative Comments

- *"I witnessed the President bullying a VP - horribly. I can't imagine anyone treating another human the way Dr. Morales treated the VP."*

- *"I have seen several of my good coworkers leave the department due to unfair treatment, bullying, stress and unfair work demands."*

- *"I have witnessed many managers bully and harass their employees. This is an ongoing problem that many employees refuse to make a stand against for fear of retaliation."*

Phase I & II: Conclusions and Interpretations

- Our strengths to move forward:
  - faculty and staff value the campus and the diverse students they serve
  - many people are satisfied with their jobs, and find meaning in the work that they do

Phase I & II: Conclusions and Interpretations

- The issues:
  - Many faculty and staff (and some administrators)
    - have lost confidence in leadership
    - feel underappreciated, undervalued, unheard, overworked, stressed, and bullied
  - The sense of community that many believe once existed on campus has been replaced for many by
    - a climate of mistrust and fear

Phase I: Recommendations

- Restore trust
- To restore trust requires top leadership to
  - Acknowledge that a problem exists
  - Genuinely listen to employees—all employees—and address their concerns
  - Demonstrate
    - all employees are valued
    - active steps are being taken to restore trust

What has been done since Phase I?

- Two e-mails from the President
- Meeting with report authors
- Meeting with Senate Executive Committee
- Meetings with Deans
- Meetings with Department Chairs

- Sufficient?

Phase II: Recommendations

- Recommendations regarding bullying:
  - Create an explicit anti-bullying policy which include enforcement procedures
  - Appoint a trustworthy ombudsman or form a committee to investigate complaints
  - Require **all** campus leaders to attend training on bullying
  - Ensure a safe environment for the bullied target throughout the process

Phase II: Other Recommendations

- **Number 1:** Read Phases I and II of the Campus Climate Survey Report, and focus on changing ***behaviors*** to demonstrate a commitment to the campus community

- Invite input BEFORE decisions have been made

- Be willing to change direction if a majority of people affected by a decision are not in favor

- Take steps to improve feelings of psychological safety

- Implement further tracking of campus climate, including 360 degree reviews of senior management

- Hire an executive coach

Why Important?

- Why follow these recommendations?

  - To show leadership's commitment to the core values expressed in the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan
    - Inclusivity, integrity, respect, social justice and equity, transparency, and wellness and safety

  - To ensure everyone feels safe at work, empowered to live up to his or her fullest potential, to serve the mission of the university

  - And, for the students

Questions?

Phase II: Recommendations

- Recommendations regarding favoritism
  - Sponsor an audit of HR's practices and policies by an independent party
  - Follow fair employment practices and policies consistently