

**2015 CSUSB CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY, PHASE 2 REPORT**  
**May 10, 2016**

Ad hoc Campus Climate Committee: Jan Kottke (Chair), Dorothy Chen-Maynard, Rob Madrigal, Rich McGee, Kathie Pelletier, and Barbara Sirotnik

Analyses conducted and report written by Janet Kottke, Kathie Pelletier, and Barbara Sirotnik

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Abstract.** This report is the second of two that address results of CSUSB's 2015 Campus Climate survey. This survey was distributed via email invitation to all employees at CSUSB in fall quarter 2015. The purpose of the survey was to measure the organizational climate of CSUSB. Within this paper, we describe employees' perceptions of the performance evaluation process; the potential for job growth and career advancement on the campus; workload; work stress; communication and application of policies and procedures; perceptions of diversity; psychological safety, respect, and trust; and incivility and bullying. Both numerical ratings and themes generated from comments to the open-ended questions, with representative statements by respondents, are presented.

**Background.** At two fora in June 2015, sponsored by the Faculty Senate executive committee, over 200 faculty and staff gathered to express concerns about the campus climate. The faculty senate chair requested that the chancellor sponsor a survey to assess the campus' climate. Chancellor White declined to sponsor the survey, but encouraged the campus community to work together to address the issues. Consequently, an ad hoc committee of faculty and staff formed to conduct the study. These experts in survey design, statistics, measurement, leadership, and industrial-organizational psychology spearheaded the survey development process and ultimately, the analysis of the data collected.

**Results.** Phase 2 results, relying on 756 respondents, indicate that there are significant problems on the CSUSB campus, which likely contribute to (and extend beyond) the low morale cited in the Phase 1 report. In this report, the dimensions that we suggest are particularly concerning are bullying, lack of psychological safety, favoritism (lack of inclusion), and work stress.

**Bullying** appears to be widely practiced on campus – a quarter of the respondents had personally experienced bullying and more than 40 percent had witnessed bullying. Comments show that key perpetrators of the practice tend to be those in powerful positions. Victims of bullying are hesitant to report because they fear retaliation, believe it is futile to report, want to avoid additional conflict, or believe that HR would not properly handle the issue.

Another dimension of concern is that many employees on campus characterize their **work environment as threatening**, or do not feel safe expressing an honest opinion for fear of

inviting retaliation from management. As we noted in our first report, there is a lack of trust on campus, with that perception reinforced in Phase 2 results, with less than a quarter of respondents agreeing that “an atmosphere of trust exists.”

In addition, although there is considerable support for **diversity**, with many respondents indicating that they personally value diversity and that they believe their coworkers and supervisors treat people with respect regardless of cultural background, many believe that senior management does not treat people fairly on this basis. Respondent comments emphasized that diversity is a valued aspect of the campus community but also that preferential treatment is commonplace.

Turning to **workload and work stress**, working more than 50 hours is the norm for faculty and administrators. Although some respondents reported that they didn’t mind working long hours, a prevalent theme was that the amount of work to be done was not reasonable and caused stress. Comments strengthened these concerns by emphasizing a lack of staff to accomplish the work to be done and the notion that top management either contributed to the work overload through its policies, or was tone-deaf to workload issues.

Respondents were asked questions about the **communication and application of policies**, to which many people reported that they believed that policies at the departmental level were usually communicated in a timely manner, were sufficiently explained, and systematically applied. These levels of agreement lessened at each step of the hierarchy with less agreement at the college or divisional level, and even less at the campus level.

Additionally, respondents were asked about the **performance evaluation process**. The faculty, for the most part, agreed that the process was clear and fair, but expressed reservations with regard to the weights given to student evaluations and service, as well as objections to the SOTE instrument. Staff, on the whole, agreed that their evaluations were conducted on a regular basis and done fairly by the person most knowledgeable about their work, and were provided with meaningful feedback; with that said, respondent comments also suggested that there was favoritism in the process and that evaluations are often used to punish or retaliate against employees. Further, less than 40 percent of staff agreed that their positions were properly classified and specific questions addressing the in-range progression (IRP) process were revealing; most telling, the process, which is to take less than 90 days, typically takes at least that long or longer.

Finally, questions on the survey asked employees for their perceptions of **job growth and career advancement opportunities** on the campus. Both faculty and staff were positive with regard to training and educational opportunities needed for job growth, with the notable exception that less than half of faculty, staff, and administrators agreed that they were “optimistic about the future of my career at CSUSB.”

**Conclusion.** As with the Phase 1 report, there are significant issues at CSUSB that must be addressed by leadership. The results detailed in this Phase 2 report reinforce the themes that were present in the first phase report: faculty and staff value the campus and the students they serve. Faculty and staff value diversity, are satisfied with their jobs, and want to do good work in the service of the primary academic mission. At the departmental level, faculty and staff respect each other's cultural backgrounds, treat each other with respect, and trust one another. These values, however, do not transcend across the campus, nor are they perceived to be enacted values of the top leadership. As stated in the Phase 1 report, faculty and staff are devoted to the primary mission of the university, but they have lost confidence in leadership. Not only do they feel underappreciated, undervalued, and unheard, many also feel overworked, stressed, and bullied. The sense of community that many believe existed on the campus a few years ago, is largely gone. There are deeply divisive issues at work at CSUSB and without immediate attention, these issues will continue a brain drain and, further, make it hard to attract employees to the university, all at a time when there are more students to be served than can be accommodated. The university can ill afford to lose such engaged and involved employees, but that is a very real possibility, given these data. The source of many of these issues lies with campus leadership.

**Recommendations regarding Phase 2.** As with the recommendations made from Phase 1 results, we recommend that senior management work to restore the trust that has been lost and to reduce the climate of fear and favoritism that large groups of faculty and staff perceive. It will not be easy. The reader is encouraged to read the full text of our recommendations in the concluding section of this report. Some concrete recommendations include:

- Read Phases 1 and 2 of the Campus Climate Survey Report in their entirety with special attention to what employees are saying when they are given an opportunity, as with this survey, to speak freely.
- Create an explicit anti-bullying policy which includes credible enforcement procedures and procedures for handling complaints in a fair and timely fashion.
- Sponsor an audit of HR's practices and policies by an independent party.
- Invite input from campus constituencies BEFORE decisions have been made, and ensure that it is done in a way that people feel "safe" in providing ideas.
- Work more closely with constituents than has been the practice thus far. This is especially important in situations where the majority of the employees who will be affected by a particular decision are not in favor of that decision (as has been the case in the recent past).
- Conduct a workload audit to identify departments for which there are imbalances in work distribution and expectation.
- Commit to an ongoing process of data collection to evaluate campus climate over time.
- Bring in an executive coach who specializes in the area of authentic, ethical, and relational leadership.

As we stated in our first report, it is possible that some faculty and staff do not believe that top leadership can or wants to change. Yet, we believe that faculty and staff are likely to respond positively to attentive, caring, authentic leadership. Improving CSUSB's campus climate and culture will require, first of all, that top leadership acknowledge that a problem exists. Second, it is important that top leadership genuinely listen to employees—all employees—and address their concerns. Third, top leaders need to model integrity consistently to restore employee trust. If there is even *one* instance where trust is breached or leadership reverts to the same behaviors and practices that contributed to decreases in morale, trust is likely not going to be restored, and any gains in this area will be lost. Finally, top leadership must demonstrate that all employees are valued, not just a select number who support the leadership already, and show that active steps are being taken to restore trust.

The authors<sup>1</sup> of this report offer their assistance to guide the recommended culture change. We believe that CSUSB is at a critical stage and that immediate behavior change is necessary if CSUSB is to carry out its stated mission.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix 3 for expert qualifications of the authors.

## 2015 CSUSB CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY, PHASE 2 REPORT

### OVERVIEW

This document is the second report of the major findings of a survey that was distributed to all employees (faculty, staff, administrators, and people for whom we had contact information but are no longer employees) at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) in fall quarter 2015. The purpose of the survey was to measure the organizational climate of CSUSB. Within this paper, we describe results of the dimensions not covered in the first report. These dimensions include the employees' perceptions of the performance evaluation process; the potential for job growth and career advancement on the campus; workload; work stress; communication and application of policies and procedures; perceptions of diversity; psychological safety, respect, and trust; and incivility and bullying. Both numerical ratings and themes generated from comments to the open-ended questions, with representative statements by respondents, are presented.

### BACKGROUND

In brief, the call for a campus climate survey developed from fora that were held in June, 2015, by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. An ad-hoc committee of faculty and staff<sup>2</sup> was formed to spearhead the study of campus climate. The overarching goal of the survey team was to determine whether the perceptions of a negative campus climate expressed at the fora were widespread. The team aimed to collect data that would provide CSUSB leaders with valuable information that could be used to determine the status of the campus climate and, if survey results so indicated, improve it.

For a full treatment of the background, the survey plan, and a resolution from the Faculty Senate requesting a campus climate survey, see the first report, a copy of which may be obtained from:

<http://senate.csusb.edu/reports.htm>

or from:

<https://sites.google.com/site/2015csusbcampusclimate/questions-and-answers-about-the-survey/reports>

For Phase 1, we reported on morale, leadership, communication, and shared governance and decision making. For this report, we report on the performance evaluation process, the potential for job growth and career advancement on the campus, perceptions of equity, diversity, and psychological safety on campus, work load, work stress, and bullying.

---

<sup>2</sup> Three administrators were approached and invited to join the committee; all declined.

## METHODS

**Survey Respondents.** The sample consisted of full-time faculty members (tenured, tenure-track, and FERP), lecturers, administrators, staff, and retirees (including those who left the university). Twenty eight percent of respondents preferred not to state their gender (or chose to leave that question blank). Of those who were willing to specify their gender, 37 percent were male and 62 percent female (less than 1 percent stating “other”). The length of time employed on campus ranged from “recently hired” (0 years) to 21 or more, with 52 percent having more than 10 years of longevity at CSUSB. Ethnic identity (a multiple response variable) was as follows (table produced in statistical software SPSS 22.0):

**Table 1. Self-Reported Ethnicity of Respondents**

	Responses		Percent of Cases
	N	Percent	
American Indian or Alaska Native	12	1.9%	2.1%
Asian	28	4.5%	4.8%
Black or African American	54	8.6%	9.3%
Hispanic or Latino	136	21.7%	23.5%
Middle Eastern	4	0.6%	0.7%
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	8	1.3%	1.4%
White/Caucasian	338	53.8%	58.4%
Other	48	7.6%	8.3%
Total	628	100.0%	108.5%

The following table shows the breakdown of respondents’ current position.

**Table 2. Positions of Respondents**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	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
Missing	Declined to state	1	.1	
Total		756	100.0	

For the remainder of this report, “Faculty” refers to Tenured Faculty (including faculty in the early retirement program [FERP]), Tenure-Track Faculty, and Lecturers. The category of “Staff” includes non-exempt, exempt, and confidential class staff members. The label “Former CSUSB employees” refers to people who once worked for CSUSB, but retired or left for some other reason.

## **Measures and Data Collection**

*Please refer to the Phase 1 report for detail on survey development and deployment. A copy of the final copy of the survey can be found at:*

<https://sites.google.com/site/2015csusbcampusclimate/climate-survey-instrument>

Data were collected in Fall Quarter, 2015, using an on-line Qualtrics survey hosted by an external marketing firm (Global Knowledge) to ensure confidentiality and anonymity of individual survey responses. All faculty, staff, and administrators with a working e-mail address (1567 taken from the CSUSB online directory) were sent individual e-mails with a link to the anonymous survey, as were CSUSB employees who recently separated from the university via a request to a retiree listserv. Ultimately, 756 (48% of the invited) responded, one of whom did not provide his or her position.

## **Analysis**

A mixed method approach was used to provide a thorough examination and explanation of the phenomena studied. We used quantitative analysis to identify the extent of agreement with statements related to climate and we also included open-ended questions to allow respondents to elaborate on their numeric ratings. Please see the Phase 1 report for the method by which the qualitative coding was done; the same procedures were employed with these data. As noted in that first report, we used the case/response level for analysis, i.e., the full response that a survey taker provided, to tally frequency of theme.

## **FINDINGS**

This section of the report includes Phase 2 results of CSUSB’s Campus Climate survey. Results are reported in aggregate form only, cross-tabulated by position (faculty, staff, administrator, or retiree) where appropriate. The results are reported and grouped by conceptual category (although some questionnaire items could fall into more than one category). For a full display of the numeric results, please see Appendix 2.

## Performance Appraisal, Evaluation, and IRP Process

### FACULTY EVALUATION

According to FAM 652.4 (see Preamble, p. 1), “The purpose of evaluation is to develop and maintain faculty who are intellectually and professionally active and who communicate effectively with students. The goal of evaluation is to ensure the protection of faculty, student, and institutional interests....The evaluation process is designed to evaluate teaching effectiveness from multiple perspectives, to assess faculty performance, and to provide constructive guidance to the faculty member in achieving intellectual growth and professional development.” Certainly, the retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT) process is of utmost importance for junior faculty as they navigate the university structure of committees and administrators who review their files. The process may be less salient, personally, for senior faculty who have achieved tenure and full professor status, but given that they are evaluated periodically and they are responsible for reviewing files of junior faculty, their responses are of equal importance to evaluate the perceptions of the fairness of the process.

Do CSUSB faculty (tenured faculty including FERP, tenure-track faculty, and lecturers) feel that the system is clear and administered fairly? Several questions were included in the survey to determine faculty members’ opinions about the performance evaluation system and its process. Tables 3 and 4 display the responses to the numeric items.

As noted in Table 3, in general, the evaluation process is perceived to be clear and fair, with greater percentages of tenured faculty than tenure-track faculty holding that belief. Lecturer ratings were significantly lower than those of faculty in the other two categories, but that may be due to the fact that most lecturers have little experience with the process. As one lecturer said: *“I am not qualified for promotions/tenure as far as I know, so my insight into this topic is pretty limited.”*

**Table 3. Faculty responses regarding the processes of retention, promotion, and tenure**

<b>% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following items:</b>				
	<b>Tenured Faculty (Including FERP)</b>	<b>Tenure Track Faculty</b>	<b>Lecturer</b>	<b>ALL Faculty</b>
<b>“The process for attaining promotion and tenure is clear”</b>	77.9%	63.6%	33.3%	70.9%
<b>“The decisions made by the evaluation committees on this campus are fair”</b>	76.0%	61.3%	38.9%	69.7%
<b>“The process to appeal an evaluation decision is clearly communicated to faculty”</b>	66.7%	61.3%	31.3%	62.5%



Somewhat lower ratings were given regarding the relative weights for teaching, professional activity, and service. The majority of faculty respondents (61.1%) believes that proper weight is given to research, scholarly, or creative contributions in the evaluation process. But less than half of tenured faculty (46.1%) and only about a third of tenure-track faculty members (35.7%) believe that student evaluations are given the proper weight in the personnel evaluation process. Similarly, about half of the tenured faculty (49.6%) and 56.3% of tenure-track faculty agree that service is accorded the proper weight. See Table 4.

**Table 4. Faculty responses regarding the weighting of elements of the RPT process**

**% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following items:**

	<b>Tenured Faculty (Including FERP)</b>	<b>Tenure Track Faculty</b>	<b>Lecturer</b>	<b>ALL Faculty</b>
<b>“Student evaluations are given the proper weight in the personnel evaluation process”</b>	46.1%	35.7%	21.1%	41.7%
<b>“Proper weight is given to research, scholarly, or creative contributions in the evaluation process”</b>	64.1%	63.6%	31.2%	61.1%
<b>“Service is given the proper weight in the evaluation process”</b>	49.6%	56.3%	37.5%	49.7%

**Faculty Performance Evaluation: Themes of Open Ended Comments**

Emergent themes from the open-ended follow-up question provide evidence of the bifurcation of faculty sentiment with regard to the importance given to scholarship and teaching, as well as amplifying the numeric values for the process. Forty-nine faculty members responded to the open-ended question, “Please provide any comments you wish to make regarding the personnel evaluation process.” Of these 49, 46 left a response that was assigned a theme. See Table A1 for the definitions of the themes and Table A2 for representative comments (in Appendix 1). We categorized the faculty responses into comments about the weights accorded to the three elements evaluated (scholarship, teaching, and service) and issues with regard to the fairness of the outcomes. The themes broke out into the following: too much weight on scholarship (3), too much weight placed on SOTES (8), SOTE instrument is of poor quality (13), too little weight on service (3), the process or results are fair (4), the process or results are unfair (10), and there is a lack of clarity in the process (3). Here are a few statements to illustrate the themes, categorized by theme:

**Too much weight on scholarship (3)**

- *"We are a teaching institution, yet we are evaluated as if we were a research 1 university."*

**Too much weight placed on SOTES (8)**

- *"Some departments place too much weight on SOTES as the sole measure of teaching performance rather than evaluating syllabi, assessments, etc. against department/college/GE outcomes goals. Faculty that encourage learning and critical thinking may demand more work of students than faculty relying primarily on multiple choice exams yet the RPT reports don't make that distinction often enough to lead me to believe that there is careful consideration being given to the files."*

**SOTE instrument is of poor quality (13)**

- *"The SOTE system is junk and I think everyone knows it."*
- *"SOTES do not measure what they purport to measure..."*

**Process or results are fair (4)**

- *"The process for tenure and promotion is one of the good things about CSUSB..."*

**Process or results are unfair (10)**

- *"There are serious inconsistencies in the RPT process. I have seen a person have difficulty attaining promotion to associate professor with more publications and stronger teaching evaluations than individuals who were granted full professorship."*

**Lack of clarity in the process (3)**

- *"I find junior faculty confused about what matters."*

**Too little weight on service (3)**

- *"I have seen a decrease in service amongst my junior colleagues. I think that we have never emphasized service as an important aspect of RPT equal in weight to teaching and research but people pulled their weight. It appears as we become even more research oriented, faculty feel supported in their decisions to be less service oriented."*

These results and participant comments suggest that some aspects of the RPT process are viewed as unfair or in need of revision. Over the past several years, departments have been empowered to develop guidelines for teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities, and service. Moreover, a senate subcommittee has been created to develop a more valid instrument to assess students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness. It is hoped that by the time the next climate survey is distributed, perceptions of the evaluation process for faculty will be more positive.

## STAFF EVALUATION

Regularly scheduled performance evaluations and reviews of staff members are an important aspect of employee development. If done well, they provide staff and supervisors an opportunity to give and receive feedback, identify areas for future development, and discuss expectations and accomplishments. Organizations with effective performance management systems define clear performance goals and measures, conduct performance appraisals regularly, and provide ongoing feedback. The level of thought and detail that go into an employee's appraisal, and the manner in which the feedback session is conducted, are related to justice perceptions (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Another factor that influences perceptions of appraisal fairness is the notion that the evaluator be the individual most familiar with the employee's work and accomplishments (Jackson, Schuler, & Werner, 2009). Further, when those providing feedback to their employees do so in a manner that shows they are concerned about employee growth and development, employees will be more likely to take the feedback as intended, be more committed to the process, and be more likely to make positive changes in performance. Conversely, ineffective, poorly executed performance evaluations can lead to decreased employee morale, an inability for the organization to meet its objectives, decreased productivity, increases in turnover, and a negative impact on financial performance (DeNisi & Pritchard, 2006).

Staff members were asked for their level of agreement with several statements about their personnel evaluations. Table 5 shows the percent of staff members who agreed or strongly agreed with the statements. Data are shown for all staff combined, and also for hourly staff and exempt staff separately (although there were very few statistically significant differences in their evaluations – those are denoted using asterisks “\*” in Table 5).

The data appearing in Table 5 show that most staff members (61.2%) are aware of how their performance is measured and believe that the reviews are conducted fairly (63.5%), usually by the person most familiar with their work (65.4%). Unfortunately, only slightly more than half of staff members believe that the evaluations or reviews provide meaningful and timely feedback on performance (50.5% and 55.8%, respectively), and provide an opportunity to work with the supervisor to establish goals for the coming year (54.1%; see highlighted rows below). Perhaps the most troubling data in the table are the figures indicating that only about a third of respondents (36.8%) believe that their position is properly classified and reflects their duties accurately. This misclassification can lead to a significant loss of morale on the part of staff, as well as the ability of the specific department to provide quality service to students and other employees within the university.

**Table 5. Staff employee responses to items asking about performance evaluations**

**% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following items:**

	<b>Hourly</b>	<b>Exempt</b>	<b>ALL Staff</b>
<b>“I know how my performance is measured”</b>	64.5%	57.8%	61.2%
<b>“My performance reviews are conducted on a regular basis”</b>	67.1%	67.3%	67.2%
<b>“Performance evaluations/reviews are conducted fairly”</b>	69.5% *	57.2% *	63.5%
<b>“Performance evaluations/reviews provide meaningful feedback”</b>	54.2%	46.6%	50.5%
<b>“My position is properly classified and reflects my duties accurately”</b>	<b>39.0%</b>	<b>34.6%</b>	<b>36.8%</b>
<b>“My supervisor and I work together to establish my goals for the next year”</b>	59.4% *	48.5% *	54.1%
<b>“I receive timely feedback on my performance”</b>	58.2%	53.3%	55.8%
<b>“I actively participate in the evaluation of my performance objectives”</b>	63.5%	55.6%	59.7%
<b>“My performance evaluation is conducted by the person most familiar with my work”</b>	66.5%	64.2%	65.4%

**Staff Performance Evaluation: Themes of Open Ended Comments**

Responses from staff employees to the open-ended item, “Please provide any comments you wish to make regarding the personnel evaluation” were reviewed and coded for common themes. One hundred forty-eight staff employees left comments and of these, 105 were assigned at least one theme. See Table A3 for those themes and Table A4 for more representative statements illustrating the themes; both tables are in Appendix 1.

A review of themes that emerged from the qualitative analysis indicates marked correspondence to the lowest numeric ratings (See Table A3 in Appendix 1). Although some respondents indicated with their comments that they believe the evaluation process is done well and is fair, by far the most commonly referenced main theme was that there are problems with it. The problems that were enumerated by staff included that the process is biased, is pro-forma – simply a “cut and paste” version of the previous year’s evaluation rather than a true reflection of the staff member’s performance, not tied to salary decisions, used as a means to retaliate toward or punish employees, that there are arbitrary limits placed on the ratings possible, standards are inconsistently applied, and that HR is a key source of the problems with the process. Additional themes that emerged indicated that staff employees thought evaluators needed more training, that there are issues with timeliness, and that there were issues with the

reclassification process. Here are a few that represent common sentiments from among the staff; see Table A4 in Appendix 1 for additional comments.

#### **Issues with timeliness and deadlines (21)**

- *"I would like to say that when I started, my direct supervisor did conduct evaluations on a timely basis and with adequate input opportunities. I have not had an evaluation in three years."*
- *"It was a joke. My evaluations were usually more than a year late in coming."*

#### **Process seen as biased (20)**

- *"'Favorites' and/or 'friends' that have special relationships with higher ups are listened to more than others and influence reviews in an unacceptable way."*
- *"If someone is not qualified for a job, they just need Morales to call on their behalf to make it happen. Management is famous for saying 'this comes from above' or 'I can't tell you who needs this but it is important to our growth as a division.'"*

#### **Evaluators need more training (14)**

- *"My evaluations are done by temporary supervisors. My last one was unfair and done by someone that was only in the position for three months."*
- *"Evaluations are confusing at this point. Since all my directors have left over the course of the past 3 years, my evaluations are being done by interims. This has been the case since Morales came. There is no stability in this regard due to the high turnover rate."*

#### **Not tied to salary decisions (11)**

- *"While I do appreciate the personnel evaluation process, I do think it has less impact on the employee without the added benefit of a salary increase. Having to apply for a raise is something that boggles my mind and I'm still trying to identify the benefit that this process has over using someone's evaluation to promote morale and incentive within the evaluation structure itself."*

#### **Used as a means to retaliate toward or punish employees (10)**

- *"The evaluation process on this campus is used specifically for retaliation and punishment against the subordinates. The positive improvements and accomplishments are not noted on the evaluations! It is a joke on this campus."*
- *"The fairness of the process all depends on the ethics of the person doing the evaluation. In my office, it is used to reward and punish."*

#### **Issue with the reclassification process (9)**

- *"I want to submit an IRP but have been told by my dean that HR will block it for months."*

### **Performance evaluations are seen as an administrative chore (8)**

- *“It feels like an exercise; not a genuine reflection of job duties or genuine evaluation of performance.”*

### **Standards are inconsistently applied (7)**

- *“The expectations are always fuzzy. If you can't tell me what you expect then I am constantly trying to guess. I have a very high bar for myself. It's just tough to tell if my bar of expectations aligns with my administrators. “*

### **Problems with HR (7)**

- *“Between the switch in department chairs (2014), I did not receive an evaluation or if one was completed for me I was not provided with a copy or with any opportunity to look it over. When I contacted HR I was told I did not receive a call back and when I was able to get a hold of somebody I was told they would get back to me and I have yet to hear anything about it.”*
- *“IRP and reclassifications are always denied by HR for my peers regardless of how much work a staff does.”*

In summary, the majority of staff report that they know how their performance is determined, with the review conducted by the person most familiar with their work and are able to participate in their performance review. The comments—though representative of a fairly small number of respondents—suggest some troubling trends: bias in the process, lack of timeliness in providing a review or feedback, lack of training of evaluations, problems with HR, and most disconcerting, the perception that some superiors use the evaluation process as a way to punish subordinates. This use of the evaluation process for punishment and retaliation no doubt contributes to the climate of fear on campus.

### **In-Range Progression**

Several specific questions focused on IRP (in-range progression), a procedure for staff employees to move through the salary ranges as they assume additional and/or enhanced responsibilities and skills. A total of 65 individuals (21.0% of staff members) indicated that they had applied for an IRP, in writing, within the past three years. Nearly half (47.5%) said that their IRP had been approved, however only 20.7% of those individuals felt that the amount of increase was fair. Further, many appeared to be concerned about the time it took to process the IRP request:

- 21.1% said it had taken under 90 days to process
- 45.6% said it took between 90 days and 6 months
- 26.3% said it took between 6 months and a year
- The remainder of respondents indicated that they are “still in the process” thus it was impossible to determine the length of time the process has taken thus far.

These data are of concern since the process is supposed to take 90 days or less, yet the vast majority of individuals experienced waits much longer than the expected time frame.

As in other areas of the survey, respondents were asked to make comments, and in this question, were asked if they had any recommendations regarding the IRP process; 37 people left comments; 32 were assigned a theme. There were three broad themes that emerged: **communication and feedback, IRP process, and recommended solutions.** With regard to communication and feedback, there were three subthemes indicating that IRP communication or feedback is not timely (5), doesn't provide meaningful feedback (4), and that there are issues with how to complete the forms (3). Several subthemes emerged from the comments regarding process: that there is favoritism in how the process is conducted (6), that no notification is given of a decision or the decision is not provided within a reasonable timeframe (6), that there is favoritism in the final outcome of who is awarded or denied an IRP (6), that IRP paper work is held back, sitting on administrators' desks (5), that HR can't be trusted to handle the process fairly or well, e.g., losing the paperwork associated with the application for an IRP (5), and finally that there are no clear standards for an IRP (4). Staff comments provided clear recommendations for fixing the process: Use objective standards (9), institute time limits (6), and provide meaningful feedback (5).

Following are some representative specific recommendations offered for ways to improve the IRP process, as suggested by key themes from above:

- *"It took 2 years (there wasn't a category for that above)! VPs should have a limited time (30 - 60 days max) to respond, and after VP approved HR must respond within 2 - 3 weeks."*
- *"I never received notification from HR that it was denied and why. Employees should know why they were denied IRP."*
- *"The evaluation for the salary increase should be more objective accordingly to the responsibilities, task assigned, and comparison with all of the people in the same position."*

Considering these data on IRPs, taken together with the data on performance evaluation – specifically, the fact that a majority of staff felt that they were misclassified, that there is a perceived problem with the reclassification process itself, and that the IRP process appears to be a hurdle rather than an avenue for pay increases – it is not surprising that nearly 89% of the staff employees who responded to the survey reported that morale had gotten worse over time.

### **Job Satisfaction and Job Growth/Career Advancement**

In our earlier report ("Phase 1 results") we noted that job satisfaction is one component of morale. Specifically, we found that:

- 77.8% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they are “proud to say” they work at CSUSB
- 83.0% said that their work gives them a sense of personal accomplishment
- 79.9% said that the work they do is satisfying
- 81.5% said that they like their job

We concluded that most CSUSB employees are satisfied with their jobs and want to do good work in the service of the primary academic mission. There is a core of employees who genuinely care about the university and its students—as well as each other. Yet we also noted that less than one quarter of employees (22.4%) said that employee morale is good on campus. The questionnaire included some additional items regarding job satisfaction which did not appear in the Phase 1 report, items which focused on job growth and career advancement rather than on overall morale. The results in Table 6 show that administrators are more satisfied than either faculty or staff with the way their careers have progressed at CSUSB, and they apparently are allotted more time to attend important campus events during work hours. Further, the data below show that less than half of faculty and staff are optimistic about the future of their careers at CSUSB. Administrators are more optimistic than individuals in those subgroups, yet it is worth noting that only 59.4% of administrators feel that optimism.

**Table 6. Employee responses regarding their career advancement at CSUSB**

**% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following items:**

	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Not at CSUSB</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>“I am satisfied with the way my career has progressed on this campus”</b>	60.3%	45.5%	75.4%	64.3%	54.0%
<b>“I am allowed to use work time to attend important campus events”</b>	73.1%	71.9%	94.2%	81.6%	75.0%
<b>“I am optimistic about the future of my career at CSUSB”</b>	49.0%	47.3%	59.4%	31.3%	48.3%

A related question is whether respondents believe that there is opportunity for career advancement at CSUSB. Table 7 shows that relatively few staff believe that they can advance at either the Department or College/Division level, and only half believe there is opportunity at the Campus/University level. This may be a serious issue considering that a key reason for leaving a job is the lack of growth opportunities (Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007). Good, high performing employees remain in an organization if they are in jobs that challenge them and utilize their expertise (cf. Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2013).



**Table 7. Employee responses regarding their career advancement at CSUSB by department, college/division, and campus**

**% who “agreed” with the following items:**

	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Former Employees</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>“There is opportunity for career advancement” at the Department level</b>	67.0%	36.7%	71.7%	54.5%	49.6%
<b>“There is opportunity for career advancement” at the College/ Division level</b>	60.7%	40.8%	58.6%	43.8%	48.5%
<b>“There is opportunity for career advancement” at the Campus/ University level</b>	41.5%	50.0%	54.4%	41.2%	47.4%

Respondents were also asked whether they feel there is recognition for their contributions at the Department, College/Division, and Campus/University levels. Again, administrators have more of a feeling of recognition than do faculty and staff. And there is more recognition at the Department level than at the College/Division or Campus/University levels.

**Table 8. Employee agreement regarding their recognition for their contributions at the department, college/division, and campus level**

**% who “agreed” with the following items:**

	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Former Employees</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>“I feel recognized for my contributions” at the Department level</b>	79.1%	65.3%	85.5%	73.0%	71.7%
<b>“I feel recognized for my contributions” at the College/ Division level</b>	68.4%	43.2%	69.4%	62.2%	53.8%
<b>“I feel recognized for my contributions” at the Campus/ University level</b>	41.0%	31.2%	48.4%	47.2%	36.7%

Three other questions were included to elicit respondents’ views on the potential for job growth on the campus. Overall, about two-thirds of respondents feel that they have the tools and resources necessary to perform their jobs, and believe that the campus provides the workforce training they need to improve their work performance. Over half of the respondents (55.9%) believe that they have opportunities for professional growth and development at CSUSB.

**Table 9. Employee agreement with statements regarding opportunities and resources for career advancement**

**% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following items:**

	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>“I have the tools and resources necessary to perform my job well”</b>	54.6%	75.1%	61.3%	67.4%
<b>“I have opportunities for professional growth and development at this campus”</b>	59.9%	52.6%	62.9%	55.9%
<b>“This campus provides training and education so that employees have an opportunity to improve their work performance”</b>	62.6%	65.3%	62.9%	64.2%

**Job Satisfaction and Job Growth/Career Advancement: Themes of Open Ended Comments**

Although an initial review of the comments suggested that there was agreement between staff and faculty comments, there were sufficient differences qualitatively that we coded the two groups separately. We grouped the themes that emerged into individual (personal) and institutional resources with a few general themes that emerged.

**Faculty Themes**

The number of faculty who left a comment was 64, of which 51 were assigned at least one theme.

**Individual Resources: Lack of time (10) or heavy workload (11)**

For the faculty, there were many references to a lack of time and a heavy workload. Representative comments with regard to these individual themes are as follows:

- *“Time is a huge problem. I work between 55 and 60 hours a week. This does not often allow me to take advantage of the educational opportunities that the campus DOES offer and this is very disappointing.”(Time)*
- *“Our workload shows no signs of making any true development possible.” (Workload)*

Other comments by faculty referenced institutional resources (or lack of). These included a lack of relevant personnel (staff or faculty) to do all work perceived to be needed to be done (6), a lack of funding for either scholarship (14) or teaching (9) infrastructure, the perception that administrative requirements are making job growth opportunities more difficult to acquire (5), and that resources are just generally lacking (3). Following are representative comments for these subthemes, listed in order of frequency of responses:

**Institutional Resources: Lack of funding, infrastructure for scholarship (14)**

- *"I do not have time or resources to support my professional development -- there is a lack of funds, supports and making things overly complicated, like the new travel system."*

**Institutional Resources: Lack of funding, infrastructure for teaching (9)**

- *"...There used to be adequate support for teaching, but I've noticed a drastic cut in teaching resources for new faculty. This is highly problematic!"*
- *"When 1 of my 3 classes has 135 students and I have no TAs or assistance grading and evaluating student work, No, I am not being supplied with the resources necessary to perform my job well. These large lectures without TAs are a disgrace, especially as students pay more tuition -- they deserve more attention and a higher quality education."*

**Institutional Resources: Lack of staff/faculty to do work (6)**

- *"It's a mixed bag. There are tools and resources, but not in key areas. Resources are being placed in places that solve little problems, but insufficient resources are being devoted to the real and substantive problems - there are too many students, and not enough facilities and faculty..."*

**Institutional Resources: Administration making it harder to obtain growth opportunities (5)**

- *"Many times training takes place when faculty are in class. This sends a message to faculty that they are not important, or not important enough to inconvenience staff by having multiple dates for training or other events that faculty might wish to attend"*

**Institutional Resources: General lack of resources (3)**

- *"The budget is laughable. We've been slashed to the bone, and I don't have hope that those cuts will ever be restored. We can't fulfill our basic mission with our resources."*

**Positive theme—adequate resources are available.**

On the plus side, there was some sentiment (9 respondents) expressed that there were adequate resources for faculty, with representative statements of this idea including:

- *"TRC is great! Department is very supportive. College less so. University as a whole, even less so. Leadership positions seem to be given from nepotism."*
- *"I have enjoyed a tremendous amount of support as a new faculty member."*

## **Staff Themes**

The number of staff who left a comment was 108, of which 78 were assigned at least one theme. For staff, there were some comparable themes with regard to individual and institutional resources but some notable differences. Two staff themes that echoed the faculty themes were a lack of time and personnel.

### **Individual Resources: Lack of time (5)**

- *"The campus provides the resources but not the time"*
- *"There are trainings available on-line, but no time is given to complete training."*

### **Institutional Resources: Lack of staff to do work (6)**

- *"...my department is denied growth opportunities by our supervisor due to "coverage" issues."*
- *"Due to staffing constraints in our office, it has been difficult to attend trainings."*

In addition to the institutional subtheme of lack of staff, other subthemes included a lack of management support for taking the initiative to train or promote, that the training that is offered is of insufficient quality or focus for staff positions, a lack of funding for training, and a lack of funding for needed tools. Representative statements for each of these institutional subthemes are listed next, in order of frequency of responses:

### **Institutional Resources: Lack of management support (17)**

- *"...We are asked to take initiative to improve processes/the department, but often get shot down before we can put ideas into practice."*

### **Institutional Resources: Training is perceived to be either of insufficient quality, focus, or relevance (10)**

- *"Training provided have not always been beneficial e.g. Diversity training and Civility in the Workplace."*
- *"There are staff on this campus that really need courses related to the use of Microsoft Excel but there doesn't appear to be someone on campus that offers that training."*
- *"While some of the training provided is very helpful, other training makes little sense and is not of much assistance."*

### **Institutional Resources: Lack of funding for training (8)**

- *"While I am told that we should seek opportunities for professional growth and development, when opportunities are found we are usually told "no" due to funding issues or told to find another option. I've basically given up on finding opportunities as I see it a waste of my time."*

### **Institutional Resources: Lack of funding for necessary equipment, tools (7)**

- *"...We also lack adequate space and equipment to perform our job to the best of our abilities. Like many offices are asked to do more with less."*

### **General Lack of Institutional Resources (10)**

For both staff and faculty, there was some sentiment that there are few or no opportunities for growth on the campus. These comments were general in tone, not pinpointing a specific lack of resources but rather a general sentiment that resources had declined or were at low levels, insufficient for doing their jobs:

- *"The tools/resources given to me are from my direct supervisor(s), not necessarily from the campus. There is a lack of professional growth opportunities in my department." (staff)*
- *"I believe I have no opportunities for professional growth and development at this campus." (faculty)*

A theme that did not emerge for the faculty but did for staff, was that there is perceived favoritism in who is offered or permitted to take training on campus.

### **Favoritism (training is offered to a "select few") (13)**

Comments reflected the perception that job growth and promotion opportunities were not available to all but to a select few who were the favorites of administration. Representative comments here include:

- *"This campus offers so many resources -- from tuition assistance to trainings -- I love that about this campus. The sad part is that there are no career advancement opportunities because those who are hiring only hire their friends; there is no more hiring from within."*
- *"Career path is zero unless you are among a favored few that are willing to toe the line."*
- *"Training assignments are given out on a biased basis. If the administrator likes you then you get to go to training. If the administrator does not like you then you don't get to go even when the training directly affects your working environment."*

### **Positive theme—adequate resources are available (17)**

Finally, some staff (17 respondents) did indicate that they believed that there were adequate resources for supporting their job growth on the campus. Representative statements were:

- *"Our college dean allows for professional growth and opportunities. I am so grateful to him for that."*
- *"CSUSB provides many opportunities for growth and development."*

To briefly summarize the respondents' perceptions of opportunities for job growth and career advancement at CSUSB, faculty overall perceive that there are institutional resources available for job growth. That said, only half of the faculty are optimistic about their future on this campus. Staff are less satisfied with the way their careers have progressed at CSUSB and see few opportunities for career advancement. Many respondents commented that they were not

optimistic about their futures on campus, and felt that their job growth opportunities are limited. These latter results taken together the results for the IRP process may very well explain some of the results regarding poor morale among staff.

### Workload and Workload Stress

According to a study of postsecondary faculty published by the Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics in 1999, full-time faculty reported working about 55 hours per week (AAUP, What do Faculty Do?). More recently, surveys (e.g. a 2014 survey at Boise State University in Idaho) have revealed workweeks of 60 or more hours. Unfortunately, the literature shows that although it is possible for people with heavy workloads to perform their tasks well for a certain period of time, eventually their creativity, judgement, productivity, morale, and work quality suffer (THE University Workplace Survey, 2016). In addition, unreasonably heavy workloads lead to fatigue, physical disorders, stress, and burnout, stemming from work-life imbalance.

Table 10 shows that working over 50 hours per week is the norm for half of the respondents who were tenured faculty and over 60% of tenure-track faculty, as they prepare for classes, teach, grade, advise, engage in research, scholarly, and creative professional activities, and provide service to the campus and community. Most hourly staff reported work weeks of 40 hours or less (although 17% report working overtime to some extent). Less than 10% of administrators who responded to this question reported being able to perform their jobs within the timeframe of a 40-hour workweek.

**Table 10. Employee reported hours per work week**

<b>Approximately how many hours is your typical work week?</b>						
	<b>Tenured Faculty (+ FERP)</b>	<b>Tenure Track Faculty</b>	<b>Lecturer</b>	<b>Hourly Staff</b>	<b>Exempt Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>
<b>40 hours or less</b>	16.1%	10.3%	64.7%	78.2%	45.0%	9.3%
<b>41 to 50</b>	33.9%	27.6%	29.4%	17.0%	43.6%	57.4%
<b>51 to 60</b>	39.5%	41.4%	0.0%	4.1%	10.7%	29.6%
<b>Over 60 hours</b>	10.5%	20.7%	5.9%	0.7%	0.7%	3.7%
<b>Mean (hours)</b>	52.7	58.1	38.6	40.3	45.2	51.0
<b>Median (hours)</b>	50.5	60.0	40.0	40.0	45.0	50.0
<b>Standard Deviation (hours)</b>	12.1	12.2	14.29	8.0	6.4	8.2

Some individuals apparently do not mind working long hours. As one person said: *“As long as I enjoy my work, which I do, I’m fine with working extra hours.”* Others, however, have issues with the extra time spent at work: *“It’s VERY discouraging to keep giving this level of service day after day!”*

What are the reasons why many people are spending significantly more than 40 hours a week performing their work tasks? Is it lack of staffing, or unreasonable expectations, or unfair distribution of work within a department/workgroup/division, or some other factor? Respondents were asked four questions to shed light on that issue, and were also offered an opportunity to provide comments. Table 11 shows that adequate staffing is indeed an issue for a great many respondents, since only a third agree that the staffing is sufficient to “get the job done.” This is especially an issue for faculty who are often asked to increase class size during times when there is insufficient budget to hire the part-timers needed to increase the number of sections. Comments from staff include:

- *“Staffing levels are so low that employees are stressed out and demoralized. What's more, management is pitting employee against employee.”*
- *“While higher administration in our division has asked for input on our workload, that input has been discounted in his determination that we can work with fewer staff, even though the workload volume of the areas have increased and new responsibilities added over the years. While I like my job and it normally brings me satisfaction, I feel the quality of my work is suffering as I am getting spread too thin. I would like to make it clear that it is not my director that is having unreasonable expectations, but higher up.”*

**Table 11. Employee agreement regarding workload, work demands, and staffing**

**% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following items:**

	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Not at CSUSB</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>“We have adequate staffing in my workgroup to get the job done in a way that meets our goals and objectives”</b>	27.6%	35.7%	37.7%	28.9%	33.1%
<b>“I am expected to respond to work demands (e.g. e-mails) during non-work hours”</b>	65.4%	30.6%	70.5%	70.3%	47.5%
<b>“The amount of work I am asked to do is reasonable”</b>	<b>36.4%</b>	<b>46.7%</b>	<b>43.5%</b>	52.6%	43.7%
<b>“Overall, my workload is fair compared to others in my workgroup”</b>	44.6%	41.8%	50.8%	52.6%	44.2%

Table 11 also shows that for the most part, staff do not perceive that they are expected to respond to work demands during non-work hours. There appears, however, to be an expectation that faculty and administrators will do so.

Perhaps the most striking figures in Table 11 are those related to reasonableness and equity of employees' workload. Only 36.4% of faculty, 46.7% of staff, and 43.5% of administrators believe that the amount of work they are asked to do is reasonable.

- *"I am currently attempting to juggle the workloads of three vastly different positions and am often scolded for falling behind, despite the impossibility of this task."*
- *I've always had an exceptionally strong work ethic, but my average workload here is way beyond what I expected. Even though I love the work, I'm already burned out after less than a year. I work long, stressful hours at the office, never take a lunch break, and almost always have additional work at home in the evenings and on weekends. Some of the workload is self-imposed due to my personal goals and expectations, but much of it is due to inadequate support staffing."*

Further, fewer than half of faculty and staff, and about half of administrators believe that their workload is fair in comparison to others in their workgroup.

- *"Due to a marked decline in tenured faculty members in my department, the service load for the few tenured faculty remaining has become excessive. Also, most key committees require members from outside of the department. We once had ample faculty resources for such. Now, committee assignments siphon time from teaching and research. It is truly sad to be experiencing the decline in tenure-track faculty resources."*
- *"We are expected to do the same amount of work as similar departments that have twice the staff as our dept."*

### **Workload: Themes of Open-ended Comments**

Responses to the open ended question asking "Please make additional comments regarding workload or hours" echoed the numeric ratings. Of the 194 participants who responded to this question, 121 were assigned a theme. The main themes that emerged from their comments included: shortage of people, issues with workload such as number of emails or texts, lack of resources for the campus mission, and perceived lack of concern from management about workload issues. Some noted that although the workload is heavy, it is reasonable or manageable. Faculty and staff comments about workload are arranged by main theme with subthemes appearing within each theme:

#### **Shortage of people**

##### **1. Not enough staff (33)**

- *"My position requires I am always available. While I spend approx 50 hours a week on site, my phone is always on and I am always available via email. There are not enough staff members to share the burden and create an on call schedule."*



- *"The department could not keep the staff due to the mistreatment. There's always an open position. This means there's more work than the number of current staff. Originally staff were there for 10 years, then it reduced to about four years. Now the average is one or two years. It almost seemed to become a stepping stone instead of a destination."*
2. **Not enough tenure-track faculty (13)**
    - *"We are short of tenure track faculty. I am overloaded."*
    - *"I generally experience what I can only describe as near-despair by the second half of the quarter. My department is understaffed at the t-t level, the service workload is brutal, and there is inadequate course release from our notoriously heavy teaching load."*
  3. **Deadwood, people not pulling their weight (11)**
    - *"60 hours is a light week. For several reasons, my workload is much higher than many of my peers. In part, when faculty withdraw from doing an adequate job of teaching/service/research, it puts an undue burden on the remaining faculty."*

## Issues with workload

1. **Working beyond 40 hour week (38)**
  - *"I have been told by the Divisions MPP that as an exempt employee I will work on the weekends and evening. Exempt means I work 24 hours a day if necessary, this is definitely not what the law had in mind for exempt employees."*
  - *"I work ten hour days and then put in about three hours a day on weekends. It could be more. There is an infinite amount of work to be done-- but this seems to be the nature of professional work these days. There is as much as you are willing to do."*
2. **Number of emails/texts (21)**
  - *"Although I am not "expected to answer emails during non-work hours", I believe that I cannot perform well without checking email every day and after hours at home."*
  - *"My supervisor send me emails during the weekend, and after work hours, asking me to respond."*
3. **Excessive service demands (10)**
  - *"New duties are always being added, like measuring outcomes, but no release time is given."*
  - *"Re-advising students after they have been misinformed by other advisors on campus adds unnecessarily to faculty workloads."*

**4. Class sizes (9)**

- *“Sadly, my work load has NOT lessened as I have climbed the tenure track ladder. Part of this is the continued explosion in class sizes. Classes that were once 45 just a few years ago are now 125.”*

**5. Too many courses (6)**

- *“The teaching loads are so heavy that there is no time left for research, or for even having a life.”*

**Lack of or shortage of resources for campus mission (10)**

- *“I have had to argue and fight for faculty and staff support for our program. We have had some relief, but this continues to be a problem for our program.”*
- *“More in-room classroom resources need to be made available instead of these out-of-classroom initiatives that are a priority of the most senior administration.”*

**Lack of concern from management regarding workload**

**1. Unaware or out of touch management (26)**

- *“...the administration does not generally understand what it takes to do this job, hence they do not equip us with the appropriate resources. In the end, to do our job, we work holidays and summers when we are not paid. This would not be acceptable in any other field...”*
- *“... Meaningful support services are decreasing, although the Central Administrators get more Staff assistants and even new assistant positions, such as a Chief of Staff.”*

**2. Bureaucracy creates more work (4)**

- *“The amount of bureaucracy has dramatically increased in the past few years and we are spending more and more time filling out forms and wasting time on projects.”*
- *“Too many layers of approval required and whenever we think we can remove a barrier, it seems like we’re forced to create two new ones in the place...”*
- *“...I wish my time was better respected and I did not have to waste a lot of it in unnecessary meetings and/or bureaucratic demands - I'd prefer to use my time on my students and research instead.”*

**Workload is workable or reasonable**

**1. Heavy workload, but workable (11)**

- *“Tenure-track faculty positions which include an expectation of research or scholarly activity are never 40-hour-a-week jobs, so this is not out of line with faculty workload at other universities.”*
- *“I work very long hours but, to some extent, this is my own decision”.*

## 2. Workload is fine, reasonable (7)

- *“While I work more than a 40 hour week, it's not excessive. I'm usually in the office between 9-10 hours per day and work (mostly on email) over the weekends and during the evenings. But that's the nature of my position and I feel valued for what I do.”*

In summary, it is apparent that while there are some who feel their workloads are reasonable, or/or enjoy their work so much that they aren't bothered by the heavy workload, there are many employees who believe that they are working more hours than is reasonable. The sources of these workload demands include email overload, too much service, too many students to teach and serve effectively and meaningfully, extra-curricular programs that tap the resources needed for the classroom, and not enough support from management.

## WORK STRESS

Stress is defined as the pattern of emotional states and physiological reactions occurring in response to positive or negative demands (stressors) from within or outside an organization. Occasional workload stress is to be expected in virtually every job. On the other hand, high levels of negative stress have been shown to affect physical health, psychological well-being, and many aspects of task performance (Greenberg, 2011). Exposure to stress for a prolonged period of time can lead to employee burnout, high rates of absenteeism and turnover, and decreased productivity for the organization, as well as increased risk of heart disease and other physical (and mental health) ills for the employee.

Stressors that are common in the work environment are plentiful and can include juggling multiple roles or tasks, role conflict (work-family conflict), role or task ambiguity (too little information about what is required), harassment, poor leadership, decision-making (e.g., too many decisions to make regularly, being required to make decisions that could have serious consequences), boring or repetitive tasks, work overload and underload, working in unpleasant physical conditions, and being responsible for others, to name a few (Burke, 2010; Troup & Dewe, 2002). According to Burke (2010), the manager or supervisor should play a primary role in reducing workplace stress by *continuously* assessing (not micromanaging) the workload of each employee, assigning work that has clear and reasonable timelines, ensuring that staffing is sufficient to meet the requirements of the task or project, providing resources timely to ensure employees can continue to make progress, supporting employees by removing obstacles, and checking in with them regularly to see how they are doing and coping.

Respondents were asked how often their work causes them stress using a scale from very infrequently to very frequently. There were statistically significant differences by job position in the responses to this question, with administrators and faculty showing significantly more stress than staff.

**Table 12. Employee reported frequency of work stress**

How often does your work cause you stress?					
	Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	Overall
<b>Very infrequently</b>	8.2%	10.9%	5.0%	4.9%	9.1%
<b>Infrequently</b>	9.2%	11.2%	10.0%	9.8%	10.4%
<b>Sometimes</b>	29.9%	39.8%	26.7%	24.4%	34.6%
<b>Frequently</b>	34.8%	24.8%	28.3%	39.0%	29.0%
<b>Very frequently</b>	17.9%	13.3%	30.0%	22.0%	16.8%

### Work Stress: Themes of Open-ended Comments

Respondents were invited to comment about the workplace stress they have experienced or witnessed. Of the 111 participants who responded to this question, 97 included responses that were assigned a theme. The themes that emerged from their comments included: Work overload, poor leadership/management, stressful work environment/climate, unreasonable time demands, self-induced stress, inequitable compensation for the amount of work, lack of respect for amount of work assigned, bureaucracy, and staff shortages. Eleven participants indicated that stress was to be expected in their jobs. Below are faculty and staff comments about workload stress, in order of number of responses:

#### 1. Excessive Workload (36)

- *“I regularly experience stress and near-despair due to my workload. I don't think this will be resolved: the department can't fix it, and higher levels of administrators on this campus and in the system simply do not care, and/or have no real concept of what our day-to-day lives are like.”*
- *“The only real stress I experience in my job is wishing I had more time to get everything done!”*
- *“We need to look at the change in workload as a result of new programs, administrators, etc. Workload has increased significantly.”*
- *“There are too many new initiatives and not enough staffing to support the initiatives. Everything is a priority. It feels very much that we are being tasked with a lot of initiatives that don't allow us to do the essential job at hand.”*

#### 2. Poor Leadership/Management (26)

Comments indicate the perception that managers lack awareness of their employees' workload, are ineffective in managing their employees, and are not trained in project/people management.

- *“Managers have never once asked us about our stress levels. I can work 60 hours (or more!) in a week, yet if I ask to take an afternoon off, I am accused of “leaving early.”*

- *"It is not the work that causes stress, it is higher management's negative comments, unclear communications, and lack of consideration for workload."*
- *"Sometimes it is hard because the group I am works so well together that when upper management stresses out our supervisor we all kind of feel it. It is like a cycle."*
- *"We do not have the support we need to cut a lot of the stress that we could easily take away (this has been brought to our AVP, but we are brushed off)."*

### 3. **Stressful Work Environment/Climate (13)**

- *"I feel extremely stressed all the time now. This is due to unreasonable workloads, unreasonable time demands, and the lack of a stable supervisor. I used to feel a sense of pride and accomplishment in my work, and that I was a valued, respected member of a team. Now, I am under constant pressure to crank things out, factory-style, knowing that what I produce will not be acceptable to, or fast enough for, senior management – in spite of many years of excellent reviews. This is stressful, and demoralizing."*
- *"Secondly, the environment I work in is very stressful. The manager is always yelling or venting about comments that really should be kept to herself. If she is having a bad day, we all have a bad day because her negative energy fills the space."*
- *"I like my job very much, but the stress associated with the feelings of unease on our campus, are causing me to question just how much more I can take before it begins to affect my health."*

### 4. **Unreasonable Time Demands/Pressures (12)**

- *"The volume of work that is expected with unrealistic deadlines when we clearly need to hire additional staff."*
- *"Too many assignments with vague due dates that become due immediately at the drop of a hat."*
- *"Time sensitive programs and high work load create stress for everyone."*

### 5. **Stress is Self-induced (8)**

- *"Stress in a high paced work environment is normal. It is something I put upon myself on occasion due to my perfectionist personality."*
- *"Work by its nature is stressful. I expect a lot from myself."*
- *"My stress is more self-induced."*

### 6. **Inequitable Compensation for Work (6)**

- *"Highly stressful position that is over worked and under paid without any support from higher ups."*
- *"I am overworked and underpaid, which leads to stress."*

### 7. **Lack of Respect or Consideration for Amount or Type of Work (6)**

- *"I often feel that demands are too high and there is no respect offered to me for the work that I do outside of the university."*

- *“The stress is brought on by the lack of respect directed towards employees. Management doesn't seem to care and often contributes to the problem.”*

#### **8. Bureaucracy Increasing-Adding to Work Load (5)**

- *“When we have gotten approval for a position to help relieve backlog, it sits either in the process or in HR and we get further behind. Too many layers of approval required and when it's in our area, whenever we think we can remove a barrier, it seems like we're forced to create two new ones in their place and what we've tried to make easier has become that much harder.”*
- *“The amount of bureaucracy has dramatically increased in the past few years and we are spending more and more time filling out forms and wasting time on projects. Many of the committees that I've sat on may make recommendations, only to hear nothing thereafter.”*

#### **9. Shortage of Staff or Faculty (3)**

- *“We are grossly understaffed and over worked...”*
- *“The stress I have experienced related to feeling like 40-45 hours per week was not enough time to complete the work that was expected of me. The stress level has reduced in the past year or two, as improving budgets have allowed us to begin searching for an additional faculty member in our department.”*

#### **10. Stress is Normal (11)**

- *“Stress is just part of a busy office.”*
- *“Being faculty is stressful anywhere. If you are doing your job and doing research, writing papers, working with students you are going to be stressed.”*
- *“The stress we experience here is very common among MPP's in higher education.”*

Finally, to reiterate a point made above, some stress is expected in any organization; however, when the employee perceives workplace stressors as excessive or threatening, or beyond his or her control, productivity and effectiveness will suffer, along with employee morale and physical and emotional well-being. To improve campus climate, it will be important to investigate the magnitude of the feelings expressed above, to determine the root cause of the stresses, and to implement strategies to mitigate stress. The themes and comments in this section provide an excellent starting point for university administrators, managers, and supervisors.

### **Communication and Application of Policies and Procedures**

Several questions related to communication were included on CSUSB's campus climate survey, some of which were asked relative to each of the three different levels of the university: department, college/division/ and campus/university as a whole. Table 13 shows the percentage who agreed with two statements relative to communication regarding policy

matters: (1) “New policies and procedures are communicated in a timely manner,” and (2) “The rationales for new policies and procedures are clearly explained.”

As has already been discussed in this report, respondents tend to have more positive impressions of the work environment at the Department level than at the college/division or campus/university level. That same trend holds relative to communication about policies and procedures. Whereas 80.7% of faculty indicated that there is timely communication about new policies and procedures at the **department** level, only about a third (36.6%) of faculty feel that way about communication at the **campus/university level**. Approximately six out of 10 administrators (60.3%) – people who perhaps have more access to top leadership than do faculty and staff – feel that timely communication *does* occur at the campus/university level.

**Table 13. Employee responses regarding communication of new policies**

% who “agreed” with the following items:					
	Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	Overall
<b>Department level: “New policies and procedures are communicated in a timely manner”</b>	<b>80.7%</b>	56.8%	75.0%	65.7%	66.1%
<b>College/division level: “New policies and procedures are communicated in a timely manner”</b>	68.6%	50.0%	66.1%	55.6%	57.4%
<b>Campus/university as a whole: “New policies and procedures are communicated in a timely manner”</b>	<b>36.6%</b>	47.9%	<b>60.3%</b>	38.9%	45.2%

Leaders who are high on emotional intelligence and empathy understand that changes to policy or the introduction of new policies can sometimes be stressful to employees, especially when the employees are not aware that changes are being made, or have not had an opportunity to weigh in on policy changes that directly affect them. Moreover, when considering the importance of adherence to policies and procedures, clear and timely communication is vital for ensuring employees understand the policies and are implementing new procedures correctly. Unfortunately, only a third (34.3%) of those sampled agreed that the rationales for new policies and procedures at the campus/university level are clearly explained. That figure ranges from a low of 18.6% for faculty to a high of 56.9% for administrators (see Table 14). Given these low figures, it makes sense for campus leadership to ensure that the existence and rationale of new (and changing) campus policies and procedures are communicated widely and clearly. And, as other portions of the Phase 1 report indicated, the importance of inviting input before policies are implement cannot be overstated.

**Table 14. Employee responses regarding clarity of explanations for policies and procedures**

**% who “agreed” with the following items:**

<b>Department level: “The rationales for new policies and procedures are clearly explained”</b>	76.0%	50.6%	75.0%	58.3%	60.9%
<b>College/division level: “The rationales for new policies and procedures are clearly explained”</b>	59.1%	39.4%	63.8%	44.4%	47.9%
<b>Campus/university as a whole: “The rationales for new policies and procedures are clearly explained”</b>	18.6%	38.9%	56.9%	34.2%	<b>34.3%</b>

The following comments are representative of people’s feelings about the lack of meaningful consultation, communication, and explanation about new policies and procedures:

- *“The President's idea of shared governance is to announce a radical policy change that harms our students - then it is up to the staff and faculty to make it happen with little opportunity for input, or discussion. If you disagree with the President you will be punished.”*
- *“Administrative departments across campus do not communicate change in policies/forms well. I would suggest changing forms on their websites when there are changes, not way after.”*
- *“During the 2014-2015 academic year, it became very clear that directors, coordinators, and staff members' voice and opinions were not welcomed among AVPs and VPs. The origins of new policies were not explained, but were expected to be disseminated to staff members. This put managers in very awkward positions.”*
- *“I think when the division asks for input regarding a decision or policy the answer has already been figured out, the asking is just for the sake of asking. I don't know what the rationale is for new policies or procedures because that is not communicated nor are the new policies or procedures clearly communicated to the campus as a whole.”*
- *“The President and his central administrators accept no criticism and will not engage in meaningful academic and scholarly discussion either before or after a decision is made or new activity, facility, or direction is announced.”*

An additional question was asked about whether policies are systematically applied, and respondents were instructed to respond relative to the issue at the Department, College/Division, and Campus/University levels (see Table 15). The figures below reflect the perception that policies are applied more systematically at the Department level (62.7%) than at the Campus/University level (41.6%). Overall, staff seem to feel more inequity in the application of policies than did faculty or administrators. It is noteworthy that only about half of administrators who responded (50.9%) believe that policies are systematically applied at the Campus/University level.



**Table 15. Employee responses regarding systematic application of policies and procedures**

**% who “agreed” with the following items:**

	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Former Employees</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>“Policies are systematically applied” at the Department level</b>	71.2%	56.4%	79.7%	51.4%	62.7%
<b>“Policies are systematically applied” at the College/ Division level</b>	56.7%	47.7%	62.1%	41.7%	51.4%
<b>“Policies are systematically applied” at the Campus/ University level</b>	32.0%	46.2%	50.9%	31.4%	41.6%

These results are consistent with earlier findings that employees, on the whole, felt the most comfortable with their departments’ actions and decisions. Some comments regarding consistent application of policies included:

- *“I think my chair is so overwhelmed with new policies and directives from the President's Office that the chair seems to have given up and has stopped regulating faculty within the Department... At the University level, there have been too many changes initiated seemingly without any feedback from faculty/staff, which has led to confusion, redundancy, and frustration.”*
- *“I attempt to discuss our policies and procedures based on ethics and best practices, however I and others are frowned upon because of our critical thinking processes. We have been told we are trouble makers if we question or trying to understand processes.”*

### **Diversity**

CSUSB’s website for the University Diversity Committee includes the following statement:

California State University, San Bernardino seeks a campus climate that welcomes, celebrates, and promotes respect for the entire variety of human experience. In our commitment to diversity, we welcome people from all backgrounds and we seek to include knowledge and values from many cultures in the curriculum and extra-curricular life of the campus community. Our commitment to work toward an environment that values diversity requires that we create, promote, and maintain activities and programs which further our understanding of individual and group diversity. We will also develop and communicate policies and promote values which discourage intolerance and discrimination. (From <http://diversity.csusb.edu/about/commitment.html>)

A workforce that embraces diversity and inclusion ensures that a wide variety of ideas and perspectives can be exchanged, with people feeling as though they can be themselves, that they belong, and that they are valued for their contributions (Dwertmann, Nishii, & van

Knippenberg (online, 2016). Research indicates that managing diversity well by creating inclusive workplaces can lead to many meaningful organizational outcomes, such as work engagement (Choi, Tran, & Park, 2015), increased creativity (Carmeli, Reiter-Palmon, & Ziv, 2010), and ultimately, increased organizational effectiveness. Among the many benefits of diversity and inclusion would be that employees understand the needs of our students and their families, and our local community. Recognizing the value of fair treatment of all employees provides an environment in which current employees have equal access to opportunities for growth, an environment that attracts new talent, and encourages employee engagement and retention (Barrick, Thurgood, Smith, & Courtright, 2015).

Inclusion means that everyone feels fully comfortable at work, is heard, and is able to contribute ideas that are welcomed. Diversity without inclusion does not bring the promised benefits. More directly stated, diversity arguably could be said to be about “counting heads, whereas inclusion is about making those heads count” (Winters, 2014, p. 205). If organizational leaders merely pay lip service to diversity, but fail to provide a proactive strategy and commitment to achieving those goals, those benefits will not materialize, and in all likelihood, there will be considerable discontent, and dysfunctional turnover (Gilbert & Ivancevich, 2000).

Questions were included on the survey to measure respondents’ perceptions of diversity and equity on campus. Overall, approximately three-quarters of all respondents reported that their co-workers and supervisors respect individual and cultural differences (see Table 16).

In contrast to those positive sentiments, only about half of the respondents answered in the affirmative when asked whether all people are valued at CSUSB, and only about a third believes that senior management (defined in the survey as individuals at the Vice-President level and above) treats all people fairly.

**Table 16. CSUSB employee agreement with statements regarding diversity**

**% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following items:**

	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Not at CSUSB</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>“My co-workers respect individual and cultural differences”</b>	77.1%	74.7%	88.7%	84.2%	77.4%
<b>“My supervisors respect individual and cultural differences”</b>	72.8%	70.4%	88.5%	64.9%	72.5%
<b>“I feel all people, regardless of differences, are valued at CSUSB”</b>	46.6%	49.1%	67.2%	42.9%	49.7%
<b>“Senior management treats all people, regardless of individual and cultural differences, fairly”</b>	25.5%	31.1%	59.7%	31.0%	32.3%

**Diversity: Themes of Open-ended Comments**

Analysis of the comments to the open-ended item, “Please comment on your experience with diversity and equity at CSUSB,” provided considerable clarity to the numeric results. Of the 116 respondents who left a comment, 88 responses were assigned themes. See Tables A11 and A12 in Appendix 1 for full description of the themes and additional representative statements.

Here we present the themes and subthemes with representative statements, beginning with the positive theme, **diversity is valued at CSUSB**. Consistent with the high percentages of employees who felt that their coworkers and supervisors respect individual and cultural differences, the greatest number of coded responses made reference to the idea that such differences are valued at CSUSB.

**1. Diversity is valued at CSUSB (27 respondents)**

- *“My experiences have been that this is a welcoming campus and one of few unique places in the Inland Empire where one can interact with and learn from individuals of varying backgrounds/differences.”*

**2. Though progress has been made, more diversity is needed (12)**

- *“Gender and racial equity is still lacking on this campus.”*

The remainder of the comments that could be assigned themes expressed the antithesis of diversity and inclusion. These themes were: preferential treatment is practiced at CSUSB (31); there is gender (17) and racial bias (15); there is purposeful, political use of diversity (13); marginalization takes place (12); and diversity is practiced differentially across the university (6). Next, we present these themes in order of their number of references with representative statements.

### **3. Preferential treatment is practiced at CSUSB (31)**

- *"If you are a friend of Morales, you will always have a job"*
- *"I would argue that the university is heading toward a reverse discrimination lawsuit. Minorities (both students and job applicants) are getting preferential treatment. Minority students are given second or third chances. White students are not."*
- *"The perception on campus is that people who are long term employees are less valuable than people from the outside in terms of promotional opportunities."*

In addition to perceptions of preferential treatment are strong perceptions that there are gender and racial bias in employment decisions and the treatment of employees.

### **4. Gender bias (17)**

- *"The President does not have much respect for women. It became clear when his "inbred" list was divulged by members of his cabinet. The list of "inbreds" were all women whom, he believed, were not worthy of internal promotions..."*
- *"Ethnic diversity is pretty good, but gender diversity is not. There are no female vice presidents."*
- *"Within the past three years I know of at least a dozen female MPPs that were either "non-retained" or left the university due to the bias against women in leadership at CSUSB. At one-time there was serious discussion about filing a class-action lawsuit due to the unfair treatment against women. Instead, they and their expertise left CSUSB."*

### **5. Racial bias (15)**

- *"... in my opinion (I) believe he [the President] is racist against whites and African Americans."*
- *"I do not think we have an issue with diversity and cultural differences. There is an issue of equity for promotion of faculty who are black and Latino though."*

### **6. Purposeful political use of diversity (13)**

There is a perception that diversity is being used as a shield by top administration to deflect criticism of administrator decisions with statements such as these:

- *"The President has tried, apparently without success, to convince various affinity groups on campus to sign on to a resolution of diversity which has an embedded statement that in essence said that if you didn't support the president, it would be because you were a racist. ... I shudder at how the president has actually set back race relationships on our campus by his brand of diversity which divides us rather than raises us up."*
- *"Diversity is championed in every direction one turns, but for a purpose. That purpose is to wield power and loyalty. Behind the facade of diversity and inclusion is a motive that has become painfully obvious."*

## 7. Marginalization (12)

- *“Unfortunately, I think that recent efforts by the administration to highlight differences between groups of students tends to marginalize some groups and throws cold water on the rewarding mix that this campus has historically enjoyed.”*
- *“This campus is comparatively great at tolerating people who hold unpopular opinions, but it would be a mistake to assume that this signifies any kind of real openness to these points of view. I keep my opinions to myself as much as possible, whether I’m in the classroom or collaborating with my colleagues on a given project.”*

## 8. Differential practice; diversity and inclusion is valued and practiced in some areas, not others (6)

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

In sum, the narratives of the predominant themes are troubling, suggesting that many people do not feel included or valued at work. These are very disconcerting results.

**Summary.** When the numeric ratings and qualitative themes are taken together, it is evident that more than half of respondents do not perceive of CSUSB as having an inclusive work environment. With regard to diversity, there are perceptions that the concept has been used prominently at CSUSB by senior management without the underlying understanding nor enactment of what diversity and inclusion really means. As noted by Plácida Gallegos (2014, pp. 196-197), lip service without commitment can have serious consequences for the organization:

Inclusive leadership must be reflected in behavior rather than platitudes. Unfortunately, many organizations today have gotten on the bandwagon of celebrating diversity and including language to that effect in their mission statement without doing the deeper work to make their organizational reality align with their aspirations. They—and particularly their leaders—need to pay attention to consistency between espoused values and demonstrable behavior in organizations. Words alone, unaccompanied by authentic and consistent behavior, cause more harm than good, and have a demotivating impact on the work force. Inclusion must be embedded in the fundamental culture of the organization and related to its day-to-day operations.

## **Psychological Safety, Respect, and Trust**

Psychological safety is the idea that at work, an individual can speak and act without fear of interpersonal consequences. This concept has been linked to a wide variety of outcomes in the work setting. For example, employees who feel safe are more likely to be fully engaged at work

and make significant contributions to their organizations’ effectiveness (Edmondson & Lei, 2014). Psychological safety is grounded in trust and respect, which is clearly consistent with one of the university’s core values in its recently revised Strategic Plan: “respect.”

To investigate people’s perceptions of whether respect exists among CSUSB employees, the question was asked of people at all three levels of the university: “CSUSB employees have mutual respect for each other.” Table 17 shows that overall, about two-thirds (68.2%) of the campus community perceives that there is mutual respect at the department level. Less than half (49.7%) believe that mutual respect exists at the campus/university level. Considering that campus operations require people to work together in teams, the lack of mutual respect perceived by many employees is troubling.

**Table 17. Employee responses about mutual respect of one another**

	<b>% who “agreed” with the following items:</b>				
	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Former Employees</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Department level: “CSUSB employees have mutual respect for each other”</b>	76.8%	61.6%	81.7%	64.7%	<b>68.2%</b>
<b>College/division level: “CSUSB employees have mutual respect for each other”</b>	66.3%	57.0%	66.1%	58.3%	60.7%
<b>Campus/university as a whole: “CSUSB employees have mutual respect for each other”</b>	39.1%	56.2%	47.5%	44.7%	<b>49.7%</b>

The following comments reflect respondents’ concerns about the lack of mutual respect at some levels of the university:

- *“I feel that our department has strong, effective leadership, but our division (and the campus as a whole) suffers from a lack of visionary leadership that is truly student-centered. I also feel that there is mutual respect among the staff and the MPPs in our department and our division, but that respect erodes at the level of the VPs and the president.”*
- *“I believe there is respect among CSUSB employees, but I do not believe that AVPs and above have respect for those below them. I know for a fact that at least in my division they do not listen to us on the bottom. They do not care about how their decisions are affecting us or what we think about an idea; they just make the decision and we have to deal with the consequences and make it work.”*
- *“The current administration does not value or respect the expertise and accomplishments of the staff, and do not include them in the decision-making process.”*

As noted, psychological safety is rooted in respect and trust. In a related question, respondents were asked whether they agree that an atmosphere of trust exists at the department, college/division, and campus/university levels. Only about a quarter of administrators (25.4%) and staff (28.5%), and relatively few faculty (13.7%) feel that an atmosphere of trust exists at the campus/university level. Those numbers are much higher at the department and college/division levels.

**Table 18. Employee responses regarding trust at different levels**

**% who “agreed” with the following items:**

	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Former Employees</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Department level: “An atmosphere of trust exists”</b>	73.4%	50.8%	67.8%	58.3%	59.4%
<b>College/division level: “An atmosphere of trust exists”</b>	54.9%	32.0%	47.5%	44.4%	41.0%
<b>Campus/university as a whole: “An atmosphere of trust exists”</b>	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>28.5%</b>	<b>25.4%</b>	28.9%	23.9%

The next questions focused on whether people feel safe when expressing their opinions at the department, college/division, and campus/university levels. The results in the Table 19 are discouraging. Whereas most people (65.0%) feel safe expressing their opinion at the department level, that is clearly not the case relative to the campus/university level, where less than a third of respondents (30.3%) feel safe. The feeling of safety is highest among administrators, yet even for that group only 37.3% feel safe expressing their opinion without fear of consequences or retribution.

**Table 19. Employee responses regarding their feeling of safety to express opinions freely**

**% who “agreed” with the following items:**

	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Former Employees</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Department level: “I feel safe expressing my opinion without fear of consequences or retribution”</b>	77.6%	56.6%	73.8%	66.7%	<b>65.0%</b>
<b>College/division level: “I feel safe expressing my opinion without fear of consequences or retribution”</b>	59.9%	37.7%	47.5%	48.6%	45.9%
<b>Campus/university as a whole: “I feel safe expressing my opinion without fear of consequences or retribution”</b>	23.8%	32.4%	<b>37.3%</b>	31.6%	<b>30.3%</b>

Finally, there were several questions that asked specifically about perceptions of psychological safety. As Table 20 shows, 30.6% of respondents perceive that a mistake made at work would be held against them. Some would argue that this is an acceptable response to a mistake, particularly if that mistake has serious repercussions for the university. But when one combines this with the 24.5% of respondents characterizing their work environment as “threatening,” there is an issue which needs to be addressed.

**Table 20. Employee responses regarding the psychological safety of their work environment**

<b>% who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following items:</b>					
	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Admin</b>	<b>Not at CSUSB</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>“If I were to make a mistake at work, it would be held against me”</b>	33.5%	27.9%	28.3%	43.6%	<b>30.6%</b>
<b>“My work environment can be characterized as ‘threatening’”</b>	31.7%	19.1%	18.3%	47.5%	<b>24.5%</b>
<b>“There are adverse consequences for those who openly disagree with management”</b>	<b>55.2%</b>	<b>34.0%</b>	<b>35.6%</b>	54.8%	41.8%

Further, a large group of respondents (55.2% of faculty, 34.0% of staff, and 35.6% of administrators) apparently don’t perceive an environment of psychological safety exists since they agree that “there are adverse consequences for those who openly disagree with management.” Whether this perception is true or imagined, the statistic warrants further investigation.

### **Incivility and Bullying**

The results of this section may be the most concerning of the entire report, as many of the negative themes that emerged from the comments about decreases in morale are the consequences of an environment of incivility, and where bullying is prevalent. Cassell (2011, p. 33) examined the prevalence and significance of bullying in higher education. The author noted that “the failure of administrations of institutions of higher education to acknowledge the prevalence and significance of bullying and mobbing of members of the professoriate will further contribute to the incessancy of these behaviors and actions.” The hierarchical structure of institutions, including higher education, is important to examine in the context of bullying, since 56% of workplace bullying incidences involved a harasser that was ranked higher than his or her targets (Workplace Bullying Institute, 2014). Results from the 2014 U.S. Workplace Bullying Survey found that 27% of employees have experienced bullying in the workplace, with an additional 21% witnessing bullying. Bullying behaviors identified in the literature (and in the



responses of CSUSB employees) include: interpersonal mistreatment, psychosocial harassment (e.g., social exclusion), psychological violence (threats and intimidation), abusive conduct, escalated incivility, and psychological and physical aggression (Von Bergen, Zavaletta, Jr., & Soper, 2006).

Although the literature has not identified a universally accepted definition of bullying, there are common themes that have characterized the nature of the abusive conduct. Perhaps the most comprehensive definition of workplace bullying is that proposed by Von Bergen et al. (2006, p. 16): “harassment that inflicts a hostile work environment upon an employee by a coworker or coworkers, typically through a combination of repeated, inappropriate, and unwelcome verbal, nonverbal, and/or low-level physical behaviors that a reasonable person would find threatening, intimidating, harassing, humiliating, degrading, or offensive.” In contrast, workplace incivility consists of “low-intensity” deviant behaviors which may be rude and offensive, but with an ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect. Uncivil behaviors are characterized as being rude or discourteous, displaying a lack of respect for others, and may escalate to the point that the behavior becomes a precursor to petty tyranny or interpersonal torment. Although incivility does not rise to the same level of concern as bullying, incivility in the workplace represents a hostile work environment that should not be ignored. We did not explicitly ask about incivility in the survey, but a theme of incivility emerged from respondent comments.

According to the Workplace Bullying Institute (2014), bullying often has deleterious effects on the target’s health, including burnout, cardiovascular disease, clinical depression, and a host of related physical and psychological factors. The impact of bullying on the target can include stress, depression, and symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (Cassell, 2011). Effects of bullying can include an inability to attract new hires, dysfunctional work environment, increases in medical and worker’s comp claims, decreased productivity and morale, decreased loyalty, increased absenteeism and increased lawsuits.

The survey contained four questions about people’s experiences with abusive conduct and bullying which was defined on the survey to be *verbal or physical conduct that a “reasonable person” would find threatening, intimidating, or humiliating.*

The results are relatively consistent with the national statistics quoted above. Specifically, a quarter of respondents (25.6%) indicate that they have been bullied in the workplace this past year (as compared with the 27% nationally who have current or past experience with abusive conduct at work – a longer time frame which might be expected to inflate the figures). And a larger group of respondents (41.4%) indicated that they had witnessed bullying (see Table 21). We must note that the actual figures may have been even higher than those appearing in the table: Anecdotal evidence indicates that some respondents were fearful of retaliation and may have elected to skip this item, even though confidentiality had been assured.

**Table 21. Employee responses regarding bullying and unethical behavior**

	% 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?"	<b>48.6%</b>	<b>38.9%</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>41.4%</b>
"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: Themes of Open-ended Comments (See Appendix 1, Table A13 for construct definitions)**

There were three primary dimensions that emerged from the question asking respondents to comment about bullying they had experienced or witnessed. A total of 102 respondents answered the open-ended question, "Please feel free to make comments about workplace stress or bullying you have witnessed or experienced" with references to bullying. From the comments, we noted statements regarding the nature of the bullying, who was perpetrating the bullying, and the level at which the bullying occurred (e.g., university, department, or division).

**Nature of the bullying:** Subthemes that emerged in the employee statements included employees being targeted or singled out, pressuring employees to do something they felt uncomfortable doing, gender harassment and exclusion, infliction of emotional abuse/intimidation, verbal abuse/yelling, and incivility. Next we list the bullying themes in order of number of respondents who referenced the theme:

1. **Emotional Abuse and Intimidation (28)** – references to behaviors or statements that demean, marginalize, threaten, or diminish an employee’s sense of security and self-worth.
  - *"I had a director mock me about my work."*
  - *"In a meeting I attended, a senior management individual stated, 'If this group doesn't straighten up, I'm going to fire you all. I can make you work more if necessary.'"*
  - *"I am always fearful of losing my job, even though I am a good employee. I do not want retaliation as I cannot afford to lose this job."*
  - *"In my immediate workplace I have experienced shaming in meetings, condescension, and attacks on my professional abilities and knowledge."*

2. **Incivility (16)** – References to employees being treated with disrespect.
  - *“At the staff recognition luncheon, Tomas Morales commented during his remarks that he was a “slave driver.” My African American colleagues were offended by his statement, as was I. It shows his mentality toward employees. This, in part, explains why there is so much tension between management and rank-and-file employees.”*
  - *“When our upper manager laughs and talks to others about your group it is hard not be stressed.”*
  - *“New leadership constantly bad-mouths old leadership, and treats people with disrespect. Individuals don't feel valued.”*
  
3. **Verbal Abuse/Yelling (13)**
  - *“I have been glared at, intimidated, and yelled at by a senior faculty member.”*
  - *“The President flared up at an employee who dared mention the name of Al Karnig.”*
  - *“My chair interrupts women when they speak and swears at them.”*
  - *“Several administrators have white noise machines, probably because they raise their voices when reprimanding an employee and don't want others to hear. The “zero tolerance” talk at workshops is not adhered to.”*
  
4. **Gender Harassment (7)** – References reflecting aggression toward or devaluation of women.
  - *“There are male colleagues in my department that are intimidating, threatening, and display soft aggression toward the women faculty.”*
  - *“Male threats of physical violence to women.”*
  - *“In the adjoining workplace/department I have experienced bullying, sexism....”*
  - *“My dept chair runs over the rights of female faculty.”*
  - *“Inappropriate male-to-female comments.”*
  
5. **Pressuring Employees (6)**
  - *“The President did the bullying. I have personally witnessed him bully a staff member... (i.e., to do something unethical to make himself or the university look better).”<sup>3</sup>*
  - *“Basically if you didn't do what you were told to do... no matter how it went against policy, was unethical, or unsafe, you were removed from the roles of your position and then judged on not being involved. The system was extremely toxic. There were times in meetings where I would say... my job title and my professional opinion says to do X and I would be flatly told by a higher ranking administrator “Don't do X” and when I challenged them on their decision making process I would be forcibly told to “follow their directive.””*

---

<sup>3</sup> This comment was edited to remove the context of the unethical behavior so as to preserve the confidentiality and anonymity of the respondent.

## 6. Targeting Employees (3)

- *“People are targeted if they disagree with the central administration. Evidence is fabricated, and senior management is willing to lie to make their case. Many people have left the university because of this. Faculty are immune to some extent, but even they are targeted for discipline if they speak up too much.”*

**The Perpetrators of Bullying:** As mentioned earlier in this report, a national survey found that 56% of workplace bullying incidents involved a harasser who was ranked higher in the organization than his or her targets (WBI, 2014). The data in our study support the notion that bullying at CSUSB is primarily a top-down phenomenon. Below we list the rank of the perpetrator in order of number of respondents who referenced that rank:

### 1. Top Leadership (8)

- *“Many VP's quietly and without much notice retaliate against their employees. Many departments on campus are suffering from this abuse and it goes unchecked by HR and top administrators.”*
- *“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. HR is aware of a number of managers who are abusive but they do not take any action to stop the behavior.”*

### 2. Department Chairs (6)

- *“My chair bangs his fist on the table when women say something he disagrees with.”*
- *“The Chair's bullying tactics have caused faculty to leave the department... In spite of the problems, the Chair remains, largely because at this point all potential replacements within the department have left. This situation was created by the previous Dean, who had a policy of ignoring all problems.”*

### 3. Senior Faculty (6)

- *“The pattern of senior faculty bullying the junior faculty in their field is a chronic problem in my department.”*
- *“The first 20 years, I have experienced bullying behavior from faculty, students, and a couple of mean comments made by two previous deans.”*

### 4. President (5)

- *“I witnessed the President bullying a VP - horribly. I can't imagine anyone treating another human the way Dr. Morales treated the VP. Morales has serious anger management problems.”*
- *“The President did the bullying. He can't do much to me as a faculty member, but I have personally witnessed him bullying a staff member. That is simply unacceptable. Many staff members I've spoken to don't even want to fill out this survey because they are scared that somehow they will be identified and punished.”*

- *“I experienced bullying directly from the president's office when I followed through on administrative policies.”*

#### 5. Supervisor (5)

- *“I have seen several of my good coworkers leave the department due to unfair treatment, bullying, stress and unfair work demands. Even while these employees have left the department (either to different departments or off campus) they are still mentioned as being traitors and conspiring against management...I am constantly feeling stressed and now have high blood pressure....No help was received from HR.”*
- *“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.”*

#### 6. Coworkers (5)

- *“Staff to staff bullying is present in the office, the administrators are aware of it, but nothing is done. They say it's out of their hands and cannot really do anything unless the bullied staff members are willing to speak to Human Resources. It is really sad and disappointing to see that our administrators choose not to do anything.”*
- *“Faculty/Staff feel that they are entitled to a certain kind of treatment and when we do not comply they harass and bully other staff to get the result they want. If you speak up and challenge them they try to make your life miserable.”*

**Level of Bullying:** Comments from participants who reported that they had experienced bullying directly or witnessed someone being bullied, and who also disclosed the level at which the bullying occurred, were also coded. Below are the three most commonly referenced levels of bullying at CSUSB, in order of number of respondents who referenced that level. Levels referenced by less than 3 respondents were not included in the results:

#### 1. Department/Division (19)

- *“The workplace stress and bullying is absolutely present in all sub-departments that comprise the division.”*
- *“I have been personally threatened multiple times by the past and current department chair.”*

## 2. University (18)

- *“This list of people that Morales has bullied is long. People in HR. People in facilities. The Palm Desert dean. His constant companion bullies people in his department to the extent of hostile aggression.”*
- *“Many VP's quietly and without much notice retaliate against their employees.”*
- *“There is virtually no bullying at the college and department levels, its all from the university level where all of the new managers have been hired.”*
- *“I have experienced the bullying behavior directly from Dr. Morales...he yelled at me. Some other committee members told him that his behavior was inappropriate.”*

## 3. Human Resources (3)

- *“HR protects and even encourages bullying by managers. HR is aware of a number of managers who are abusive but they do not take any action to stop the behavior.”*
- *“HR turns a blind eye when complaints are made, and issues are ignored. Instead what they do is turn it on you and make you feel as though you are the problem, so you learn to keep your mouth shut so you can to continue work, and not be harassed.”*

## Reactions to Bullying—Why Not Reported

Those who had answered “yes” to any of the four questions in Table 21 were then asked if they had reported the bullying incident to HR or another campus representative. Only 28.6% indicated that they had reported the conduct, and of those who chose to report the conduct, 26.7% said that the situation was resolved to their satisfaction.

Why is it that the majority of those who experienced or witnessed bullying did not report the misconduct? Prevalent themes that emerged related to reactions to bullying included: Fear of retaliation, feeling that nothing would be done about it (futility), conflict avoidance, beliefs that Human Resources (HR) cannot be trusted, power differential between perpetrator and victim, and borderline behavior approaching bullying. We also coded themes related to proper handling of reported bullying. See Tables A14 for construct definitions. Below are the most commonly referenced reactions to bullying, in order of number of respondents who referenced the theme:

### Did Not Report

#### 1. Fear of retaliation (38)

- *“Reporting such conduct or answering back to such conduct only gets one into deeper trouble. One rather is chastised for any action that may seem to disagree with the current central CSUSB Administration or for attempting to gain any*

*independent facts or observations other than those officially presented by the CSUSB central Administration."*

- *"All a report to a campus administrator would get is further retribution from the Central Administration."*
- *"I've seen other co-workers, who reported misconduct, unfair treatment, etc., treated even more unfairly after filing a report."*

## **2. Futile to report (26)**

- *"Because I didn't feel that anything would be done about it."*
- *"I have done nothing about it because I believed nothing would likely be done and did not want to create a situation where I was tagged on campus as "one of those."*
- *"I had reported the conduct in the past, and no action was taken. Reporting it again seems like a waste of time."*

## **3. Conflict Avoidance (26)**

- *"I didn't want any problems."*
- *"It feels as if there would be more harm done than good in reporting."*
- *"The consequences of reporting and dealing with HR are more overwhelming than just moving on and working. HR does not seem to be very easy to work with only because they have so many guidelines to deal with."*

## **4. Distrust of HR (20)**

- *"Don't feel that it would have made a difference since HR favors management and finds a way to make the employee look like a complainer or that he or she just doesn't want to do their job."*
- *"HR is not independent of Morales. He replaced wonderful people in HR with people who will do what he wants."*
- *"HR does not address bullying, I was told harassments is only for protected classes, disabled. CSUSB does not have a bullying policy although I quoted the Zero Tolerance policy and I was still told CSUSB does not have a bullying policy."*
- *"The first thing HR will do is call your manager. There is no protection in reporting anything to them, as HR has repeatedly demonstrated they cannot be trusted to maintain employee confidentiality."*
- *"Human Resources is part of the problem, employees in that department are some of the worst offenders in terms of bullying and unethical behavior."*

## **5. Power Differential (13)**

- *"I did not report the conduct because the individual is the associate chair of my department and has power/history of abusive retaliation against faculty members."*
- *"The bullying came from a senior member in HR."*
- *"The conduct was by a high-level administrator."*

## 6. Borderline bullying (11)

- *"I would like to keep my job and it was borderline."*
- *"Just because I had moral issues related to the request does not mean that it was legally unethical."*

### **Did Report and/or Incident Was Handled**

Five respondents indicated that they had reported an incident of bullying. Below are representative comments:

- *"It was handled in that moment by supervisor."*
- *"I thought it was dealt with appropriately by senior management."*

In conclusion, lack of trust, poor communication, and the presence of workplace incivility and bullying, all contribute to employee stress and decreased morale/well-being. These factors often lead to problems with employee retention and performance, thus they should be of great concern to CSUSB leadership. It behooves senior management to help create a culture of openness, civility, and respect by modeling civil behavior themselves, and by demanding that everyone in their reporting structure does the same.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

As stated at the outset, our goal was to assess the issues that were identified by the faculty and staff as of June 2015. Were the issues that brought the faculty and staff together in June, 2015, restricted to a small group of individuals with narrow perceptions? No. Our results indicate that several key issues addressed at those fora are widespread beliefs, across faculty and staff (and some administrators), not merely attitudes of a few vocal employees. There are persistent themes that cut across all of the open-ended responses and quantitative data: issues with leadership, a climate of fear, and lack of respect for employee voice.

The results of Phase 2 reinforce the themes that were present in the first phase report: faculty and staff value the campus and the students they serve. Faculty and staff value diversity, are satisfied with their jobs and want to do good work in the service of the primary academic mission. At the departmental level, faculty and staff respect each other's cultural backgrounds, treat each other with respect, and trust one another. These values, however, do not transcend across the campus, nor are they perceived to be enacted values of the top leadership. As stated in the Phase 1 report, though faculty and staff are devoted to the primary mission of the university, they have lost confidence in leadership. Not only do they feel underappreciated, undervalued, and unheard, many feel overworked, stressed, and bullied. The sense of community that many believe existed on the campus a few short years ago, is largely gone. There are deeply divisive issues at work at CSUSB and without immediate attention, these issues will continue a brain drain and, further, make it hard to attract employees to the



university, all at a time that there are more students to be served than can be accommodated. The university can ill afford to lose such engaged and involved employees, but that is a very real possibility, given these data. The source of many of these issues lies with campus leadership.

### **Recommendations from Part I**

In our first report, we suggested that there had been a breach of trust between administration and the faculty and staff. We had proposed the following general recommendations:

- First, it will require that top leadership acknowledge that a problem exists.
- Second, it is important that top leadership genuinely listen to employees—**all employees**—and address their concerns.
- Finally, top leadership must demonstrate that all employees are valued, not just a select number who support the leadership already, and show that active steps are being taken to restore trust.

We also proposed that the values of inclusivity, integrity, respect, social justice and equity, transparency, and wellness and safety from the CSUSB 2015-2020 Strategic Plan should be enacted as the results reported in the first phase strongly suggested that the university is falling short of enacting these core values. The results from the second phase of data provide additional support for heeding the recommendations from the first report. Here, we will provide additional, and more specific, recommendations to the CSUSB leadership, as well as to the senate.

### **What has Campus Leadership Done Since the Phase 1 Report?**

We, the authors of this climate report, note that since our first report and subsequent meeting with the President on March 17, 2016, the only visible actions of which we are aware that have been taken by the administration are: two e-mails from the President to the campus community (the first to express his disappointment in the survey results and his willingness to take responsibility for the state of the climate, and the second, to inform the senate that he had met with the Executive Committee (EC) of the Senate and that discussions were taking place that he felt were positive), and a series of meetings with EC, deans, and department chairs. The President is encouraged to broaden the list of people with whom he confers, both on this issue and other issues. Although seeking honest feedback is necessary to rebuild organizational culture, the feedback must come from those who can challenge the President and his administration's actions without fear of retribution. Deans, vice presidents, and department chairs are not likely to give this administration the level of feedback needed to rebuild trust. We know that restoring trust will not be easy. Once trust has been lost, renewing trust becomes much more difficult. Renewing trust is not simply a decision and it is not achieved simply with words...rather, it requires a host of behavioral changes that will take a great deal of work and effort on the part of senior leadership. It must be noted that being defensive or casual about the problem will not work. Rather, there must be a sincere willingness to take

responsibility for the breakdown in trust and an all-out effort to address the problems. Rebuilding trust will take time, patience, and perseverance, but it can be done.

## **Rationale for Our Recommendations from Part 2**

To provide a meaningful framework for our recommendations relative to the issues raised in this Phase 2 report, we turn to the most pervasive themes from the results:

### ***Issue #1. Climate of Fear***

A climate of fear exists on the CSUSB campus. From the perspective of the faculty, staff, and some administrators, the climate of good will and community that was present three years ago is gone. People no longer feel comfortable expressing their opinions or providing honest input. Thus, restoring a climate of trust begins with eliminating the culture of fear and mistrust that has taken hold of the campus. To eliminate a climate of fear, we have to understand how such a climate developed.

Taking the results from Phase 1 and 2 together, it is clear that employees believe that senior management has bullied employees and fired long standing administrators, at a level not seen in recent memory. It is believed that many employees have been summarily dismissed without apparent cause or bullied, and left under duress. This perception is pervasive enough that one respondent on the survey noted that some in senior management feel comfortable threatening any still-questioning employee if the employee does not comply with the administrator's demands, by stating, "You're next" (to be fired.) It is important to note here that the reality of organizational charts or even the perceptions of top leadership may be different than this collective employee perception, but it is the collective perception that counts when it comes to organizational culture.

*A word about turnover.* To be sure, many employees are willing to accept that when a new administration arrives, there will be changes, including turnover. In fact, several survey respondents addressed this very issue. The turnover that has been ushered in with this administration appears, however, to be particularly noteworthy. Moreover, the fact that there are no administrators from the former president's cabinet in top administrative positions presently (many of whom were perceived to be highly competent in their jobs) is also disconcerting, with a number of respondents remarking about a substantial loss of institutional history and knowledge. That is, the low morale on campus is not a consequence of the turnover itself, but rather how the threats of job loss are being used to bully and cow employees, or to encourage some employees to leave.

The survey results show that turnover of the past three years is perceived as a symptom of poor leadership and unfairly applied policies, rather than the expected establishment of a new administration. During meetings after the release of the Phase 1 report, senior leadership has suggested that campus morale has declined simply as a result of turnover. This narrative may

be effective with the external community, the board of trustees, or the chancellor, but it is not believable to the majority of those who responded to the survey. When turnover is accomplished using authoritarian methods, the message to employees is clear: Toe the line. Such methods establish a climate of fear.

### ***Issue #2. Favoritism***

In addition to the climate of fear, there are strong charges of favoritism lodged against senior management. Thus, along with the perceived high turnover rate, there is the sense that the top leadership has played favorites at an unprecedented level at CSUSB. Specifically, there is a wide scale perception that replacements for many terminated employees have been cronies who will do whatever is demanded of them by senior leadership. If a job does not exist for a friend, one will be created. What is especially troubling about the perceived favoritism is that the top leadership appears to raise the shield of diversity to stifle meaningful discussion about the issue of holding some employees to account, but others not. The responses from the survey were quite clear: Diversity is, on the whole, welcomed on campus. Sadly, inclusion is another matter. Resolutions supporting diversity are fine, but **actions** are more important for establishing an inclusive culture. For example, there is a widely held belief that women are not welcome to the top leadership ranks, and there is credence to this belief, given that the most senior women are deans, the lowest level of the administrative ranks.

When one combines a culture of fear and favoritism with the pessimism about career advancement possible on campus expressed by staff, and the pervasive belief among faculty that top leadership is unwilling to listen, it is not surprising that morale is at low ebb at CSUSB.

### **Specific Recommendations**

We start with the recommendations that are most germane to the climate of fear—the perception that bullying is pervasive on campus, and that it is coming from senior management, and is supported by the office of human resources.

#### **Recommendations to Combat Bullying**

The recommendations in this section are from experts who are recognized in the field of bullying and aggression in the workplace (Namie, 2007) and in higher education (Cassell, 2011). To be successful in embedding a healthy and “safe” culture, CSUSB’s top administrators must show a genuine desire to change the culture of aggression, and this authenticity will not be exhibited if the leader is identified as a perpetrator of aggression.

1. Create an explicit anti-bullying policy that clearly defines bullying conduct and the consequences for bullying behavior (the consequences should also apply to every employee who is found to have bullied, from the President on down). Rationale: Policies obligate employers--mission statements do not.

We suggest that the president and his cabinet go on record as endorsing the policy and pledge to follow it themselves. (Also, see item 5 below)

2. Develop credible enforcement procedures (failing to enforce the policy will likely lead to employee cynicism).
3. Treat the bullied target or complainant as credible unless proven otherwise. Believe the targets as readily as you accept supervisors' complaints about "difficult" employees.
4. Ensure all complaints are handled fairly, promptly, and objectively, by appointing a trustworthy ombudsman or forming a committee (trained in bullying investigations and also representative of all employee units) to investigate thoroughly and handle any complaints.
5. Require all employees in leadership positions, from the President on down, and including the HR Director, to attend training on bullying. Similar to Executive Order 1096 on sexual assault/harassment training, training on bullying should be offered regularly. Since this climate survey revealed that the majority of bullying is perpetrated by individuals in positions of higher rank than the target, it is imperative that **all** University, College, Division, and Department leaders understand what constitutes bullying, the effects of aggression on the target, and the penalties for bullying.
6. Provide ongoing training to any staff responsible for investigating allegations of bullying and to professionals who counsel those who have experienced or witnessed bullying. In short, if we are to rebuild a culture of safety and well-being, training on bullying should be on the top of the list of annual training workshops.
7. Ensure a safe environment for the bullied target throughout the process. Special attention should be paid to the supervisor or person above the complainant to ensure there are no adverse consequences to the target for reporting bullying.

### **Recommendations to Resolve Charges of Favoritism**

1. Immediately sponsor an audit of HR's practices and policies by an independent party, who will make the report directly to top leadership, the faculty senate, and representatives of the staff employees. This action would demonstrate that top leadership has taken the input of staff employees seriously.
2. Follow the policies already in place with regard to fair employment practices. And, be consistent in applying policies regarding employment procedures. It is clear that many staff employees especially do not believe they are treated fairly; in particular, many believe that their jobs are improperly classified, that their requests for help, whether with regard to bullying or reclassification are not being taken seriously. Further, employees need to believe that all are being treated fairly, and that requires that the

policies be applied systematically to all. With regard to recommendations specific to staff concerns, we strongly suggest that the Vice-President of Administration and Finance evaluate IRP practices in HR to improve the speed of the process, assess any perceptions of favoritism in the decision-making process, and ensure employees receive timely and adequate feedback on their proposals.

3. Permit the committees and other established mechanisms for making employment decisions to operate without interference from superiors. To re-establish trust means trusting employees with the autonomy to do their jobs.

### **Other Recommendations for Top Leadership, based on Phase 1 and 2 Results**

We have additional recommendations for President Morales and his cabinet with an eye toward restoring trust with the faculty and staff.

1. Read Phases 1 and 2 of the Campus Climate Survey Report in their entirety with special attention to what employees are saying when they are given an opportunity, as with this survey, to speak freely (see appendices in addition to comments within the body of the report), as their comments provide the roadmap for the actions that will be necessary to restore trust and improve morale. Holding meetings with a selected few is not an efficient use of time in this cause. Consider the survey results as the feedback, and focus your efforts on changing behaviors that will demonstrate a commitment to the campus community and its people.

Here are some very specific actions that could help the faculty and staff to trust the administration:

- a. Invite input BEFORE decisions have been made. For staff especially, ask for this input in ways that do not identify the contributors so people feel safe in providing ideas. This may take the form of having people offer input via an anonymous survey sponsored by an independent party or writing cards that are given an independent party to read at a town hall meeting. Send administrators to the faculty to invite input; town halls on a Friday afternoon are NOT an effective mechanism to invite input, for example; go to where the faculty are already gathering, such as college and department meetings.
- b. Based on the issues raised with shared governance and shared decision making in Phase 1, we recommend that top leadership work more closely with constituents than has been the practice thus far with this administration. For example, if the majority of the employees who will be affected by a particular decision are not in favor of the decision, there is likely a good reason for their disapproval. If administration believes that it is in the best interest of the campus to push forward with a disliked initiative, top leadership needs to provide sound rationale for why the initiative is in the best interest of the campus, despite the

lack of employee support. Severely lacking with this administration has been authentic collaborative behavior, which in itself can lead to employee resistance.

- c. To remove a climate of fear requires not only reducing the bullying on campus, but also removing the fear that some respondents have that there is considerable monitoring being conducted. From the Phase 1 report, one respondent stated: *"I am fearful of even typing on my computer as I know this administration has keystroke recognition technology. I don't want to talk on the telephone, as that is also being surveilled."* This response echoes the key theme regarding the lack of safety on the campus; if one believes he or she is being surveilled and that no conversation or email is private, it will be difficult to re-establish a sense of psychological safety and eradicate fear. Therefore, we recommend that the administration clarify what surveillance and monitoring is taking place on the campus and provide the rationale for such monitoring. In addition to providing evidence that administration is striving to eradicate the climate of fear, supporting the faculty senate's electronic use policy would also evidence support for collaborative decision making with the key constituency, faculty.
  - d. Similarly, in the Phase 1 report, there were concerns expressed that top administration operates without transparency, which violates a core value in the strategic plan. A lack of transparency inculcates and perpetuates a climate of fear and favoritism. One step that would provide evidence that top leadership wants to be truly open and inclusive would be to make the budget process more transparent. Several comments in the survey pertained to requests for budget data from the Division of Administration and Finance that were either ignored or the data offered were grossly incomplete. If communication and transparency are our stated values, budget information should be readily available and provided (within reason) readily when requested. Not doing so perpetuates a climate of divisiveness.
  - e. Once a climate of fear and favoritism has been lessened, the odds are that some sources of work stress will be alleviated. That said, we also recommend that workload audits be considered to identify the departments for which there are imbalances in work distribution and expectation. This audit should be conducted by an external, independent party (i.e., not by HR, which is not widely trusted).
2. Commit to an ongoing process of data collection to track campus climate over time. The process might include repeating this campus climate survey in a year or two to determine if positive changes have been made relative to the issues raised in the Phase 1 and 2 reports. It may also be beneficial to implement 360 degree feedback reviews for all administrative staff to diminish the probability that issues such as those which came to light in this survey would not stay hidden in the future.

3. Finally, we suggest an executive coach be hired who specializes in the area of authentic, ethical, and relational leadership. A good executive coach should be impartial and objective (i.e., has had no prior relationship with the client), and have a record of successful interventions in similar contexts. Further, this coach must be permitted to talk freely with employees about their experiences with members of senior management. CSUSB has employed consultants recently on a number of initiatives that are unrelated to developing a healthy culture of trust and respect; if leadership is interested in improving campus culture, an executive coach for the top University leader would be money well spent.

**For senate leadership:**

- Support the President when he is authentic, and when his behaviors model our core values as a university.
- Communicate to the President and to the VPs what they are doing well, and continue to be forthcoming in advising what the President should do to enact shared governance, transparency, and collegiality. Model the same.

## FINAL THOUGHTS

The authors of this report offer their assistance to guide the recommended culture change. We believe that CSUSB is at a critical stage and that immediate behavior change is necessary if CSUSB is to carry out its stated mission.

As noted above, we recommend that an annual or biennial climate survey be conducted. We feel strongly that the climate needs to be re-assessed soon to measure any changes in perceptions of morale based on actions that administration makes in response to the survey results. To be clear, the next survey need not include all of the dimensions that were surveyed in 2015. We would suggest the areas that were of most concern from the 2015 results—overall morale, shared governance/decision making, work stress, diversity, and bullying—be re-assessed in the next survey, which we would propose be conducted in winter 2017. We further propose that this survey be sponsored jointly by the administration, the faculty senate, and representatives for the staff employees. Such a joint effort would provide concrete evidence that the administration is willing to make changes and to work collaboratively with the constituents of the campus. The authors of this report are willing to provide guidance and support for this effort and we believe there would be willing volunteers who possess the knowledge and skills necessary to conduct the survey.

## Sources/References

- AAUP. What do faculty do? Retrieved from: <http://www.aaup.org/issues/faculty-work-workload/what-do-faculty-do>
- Barrick, M. R., Thurgood, G. R., Smith, T. A., & Courtright, S. H. (2015). Collective organizational engagement: Linking motivational antecedents, strategic implementation, and firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(1), 111-135.
- Burke, R. J. (2010). Workplace stress and well-being across cultures: Research and practice. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 17(1), 5-9.
- Carmeli, A., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Ziv, E. (2010). Inclusive leadership and employee involvement in creative tasks in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological safety. *Creativity Research Journal*, 22(3), 250-260.
- Cassell, M. A. (2011). Bullying in academe: Prevalent, significant, and incessant. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 4(5), 33-44.
- Choi, S. B., Tran, T. B. H., & Park, B. I. (2015). Inclusive leadership and work engagement: mediating roles of affective organizational commitment and creativity. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 43(6), 931-943.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445.
- DeNisi, A. S. & Pritchard, R. D. (2006). Performance appraisal, performance management and improving individual performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 2, 253-277.
- Dwertmann, D.J.G., Nishii, L.H., & van Knippenberg, D. (In press, 2016). Disentangling the fairness & discrimination and synergy perspectives on diversity climate: Moving the field forward *Journal of Management*. doi:10.1177/0149206316630380
- Edmondson, A.C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 23-43.
- Gallegos, P.V. (2014). The work of inclusive leadership: fostering authentic relationships, modeling courage and humility. In B.M. Ferdman, & B. R. Deane (Eds.) *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 177-202.
- Greenberg, J. (2011). *Behavior in organizations*, (10<sup>th</sup> ed.). NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gilbert, J. A., & Ivancevich, J. M. (2000). Valuing diversity: A tale of two organizations. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 14(1), 93-105.
- Jackson, S., Schuler, R., & Werner, S. (2011). *Managing human resources*. Mason, Ohio: Southwestern Publishing.
- Namie, G. (2007). The challenge of workplace bullying. *Employment Relations Today*, 34(2), 43-51.
- Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 438-454.
- Times Higher Education University (THE) Workplace Survey 2016: Results and Analysis. Retrieved from: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/university-workplace-survey-2016-results-and-analysis>.



- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2013). The impact of job crafting on job demands, job resources, and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 18*(2), 230-240.
- Troup, C., & Dewe, P. (2002). Exploring the nature of control and its role in the appraisal of workplace stress. *Work & Stress, 16*(4), 335-355.
- Von Bergen, C. W., Zavaletta, J. A., & Soper, B. (2006). Legal remedies for workplace bullying: Grabbing the bully by the horns. *Employee Relations Law Journal, 32*(3), 14-40.
- Winters, M. F. (2014). From diversity to inclusion: An inclusion equation. In B.M. Ferdman, & B. R. Deane (Eds.) *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 205-228.
- Workplace Bullying Institute (2014). Retrieved from <http://www.workplacebullying.org/wbiresearch/wbi-2014-us-survey/>.

**APPENDIX 1**  
**Construct Definitions and Representative Statements based on Themes to Responses to the**  
**Open-ended Survey Questions**

**Table A1. Themes and Definitions Used for Coding of Faculty Responses to: “Please provide any comments you wish to make regarding the personnel evaluation process.”**

Dimension	Subthemes	Definition; references to...
<b>Faculty: RPT process</b>	<i>Number of references to a given theme are in parentheses</i>	References to flaws in the process, could be references to the department guidelines v the college v the campus
<i>Research and scholarship</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much weight</li> <li>• Too little weight</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References to scholarship being too heavily weighted in the process, CSUSB is a teaching institution, not R1 school, not enough support for research or scholarship</li> <li>• Scholarship is an important aspect of being a faculty member and thus should carry more weight than it does</li> </ul>
<i>Teaching</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much weight placed on SOTEs</li> <li>• SOTE instrument is of poor quality</li> <li>• Too little weight</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student evaluations are too heavily weighted, regardless of comment about the instrument (or no reference to the instrument), includes the idea that students are not fully capable of addressing teaching</li> <li>• Reference to the instrument being unreliable, invalid, or otherwise a poor tool</li> <li>• Teaching is the most important thing that faculty do and it should have more weight than it does in the RPT process</li> </ul>
<i>Service</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much weight</li> <li>• Too little weight</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given too much weight in the decision making</li> <li>• Given too little weight in the decision making process</li> </ul>
RPT outcomes/process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process or results are fair</li> <li>• Process or results are unfair, doesn't take into account all aspects of the profession, may lead to inequities</li> <li>• Lack of clarity in the process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process or outcomes are equitable, fair, regardless of other comments regarding how slow or complicated it is</li> <li>• Process or outcomes are seen as inequitable, whether on gender, race, or differential inputs to the process on the basis of some other categorization</li> <li>• Confusion on the part of faculty as to how the process works, what should go into the process</li> </ul>

**Table A2. Themes and Representative Statements by Faculty Regarding the Personnel Evaluation Process**

Dimension	Subthemes	Representative statements
<b>Faculty: RPT process</b>	<i>(Number of cases are contained in parentheses)</i>	
<i>Research and scholarship</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much weight (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ...Too much weight is given to research in what is supposed to be a teaching institution.</li> </ul>
<i>Teaching</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Too much weight placed on SOTEs (8)</li> <li>2. SOTE instrument is of poor quality (13)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "SOTEs are given too much weight in the evaluation process... " "Too much weight is given to student SOTE scores. What do students know about "teaching effectiveness"</li> <li>2. "SOTE's are not a valid measure of effective teaching. They are horrible.... " "SOTEs are a joke. On the SOTE, only 2 questions ask about teacher effectiveness and I seriously question whether a student is able to judge this accurately. Comments range from "best professor ever" to "she gives quizzes and I hate quizzes." Neither comment are helpful to me as an instructor."</li> </ol>
<i>Service</i>	Too little weight on service (3)	"Faculty that never serve on a committee outside their department are regularly promoted because it is "just not a big deal"
RPT outcomes/process	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Process or results are fair (4)</li> <li>2. Process or results are unfair, doesn't take into account all aspects of the profession, may lead to inequities (10)</li> <li>3. Lack of clarity in the process (3)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "The process for tenure and promotion is one of the good things about CSUSB..."</li> <li>2. "A different standard is demanded for women than for men. Men are given promotion with fewer qualifications than women. There are serious inconsistencies in the rpt process. I have seen a person have difficulty attaining promotion to associate professor with more publications and stronger teaching evaluations than individuals who were granted full professorship.</li> <li>3. I find junior faculty confused about what matters.</li> </ol>

Note. Only those themes in which three or more references were made are included in this table. Total number of respondents who made a reference to personnel evaluation that could be assigned a theme was 46.

**Table A3. Construct Definitions of Themes of Staff Responses to: “Please provide any comments you wish to make regarding the personnel evaluation process.”**

Dimension	Subthemes	Definition; references to...
Process is done poorly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General process is poor</li> <li>• Used to punish</li> <li>• Problems with HR</li> <li>• PA not used for salary decisions</li>   <li>• Administrative ‘chore’</li>   <li>• Biased process</li> <li>• Arbitrary limits on ratings</li>   <li>• Inconsistency in standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problems with the overall process is noted</li> <li>• Evaluations are used to punish or to retaliate</li> <li>• HR office creates problems for staff in the process</li> <li>• PA being done but not tied to salary</li>   <li>• PA is done but more to ‘check off’ an administrator’s list of to-dos rather than to provide meaningful feedback</li> <li>• Some aspect of the process perceived as unfair</li> <li>• Staff employees finding that previously excellent ratings have been downgraded to good, supervisors stating that there is no such thing as an excellent rating</li> <li>• Standards are not uniformly applied, or are simply unclear</li> </ul>
Other issues	Issues with timeliness and deadlines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluations are not done at all or evaluations are not done in a timely fashion</li> </ul>
	Issues with reclassification process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reclassifications are consistently denied, process of them is poorly done, not supported by administration</li> </ul>
	Evaluators need more training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluators are incompetent, poorly trained, need more training, lack understanding of the process</li> </ul>
System works/is fair		PA system or process is fair, equitable, leads to good results

**Table A4. Themes and Representative Statements of Staff Responses Regarding the Personnel Evaluation Process**

Staff and admin	<i>Number of references to a given theme are in parentheses</i>	
<i>Dimension</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General process is poor (11)</li> </ul>	
Process is done poorly	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Used to punish (10)</li> <li>2. Problems with HR (7)</li> <li>3. PA not used for salary decisions (11)</li> <li>4. Administrative 'chore' (8)</li> <li>5. Biased process (20)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "The evaluation process on this campus is used specifically for retaliation and punishment against the subordinates. The positive improvements and accomplishments are not noted on the evaluations! "This tool is used to criticize and critique subordinates and punish them for whatever the manager considers not to their liking."</li> <li>2. "Yearly evaluations are not consistently done. There is no follow up from Human Resources if a supervisor does not complete the yearly evaluation. " "Between the switch in department chairs (2014), I did not receive an evaluation or if one was completed for me I was not provided with a copy or with any opportunity to look it over. When I contacted HR I was told I did not receive a call back and when I was able to get a hold of somebody I was told they would get back to me and I have yet to hear anything about it."</li> <li>3. "Joke. Is not meaningful, not related to bonus, the only import given is to make sure you are not rated excellent. " "Department ASC's classification needs to be re-evaluated. The knowledge and expertise we have is not being properly compensated for the amount of work we do.</li> <li>4. "I don't think it's a good process at all. My previous boss just cut and pasted the same info every year." "More meaningful thought needs to be paid to the process in advance so that the employee feels valued, and not as though their supervisor is doing the evaluation "just to get it done."</li> <li>5. "If someone is not qualified for a job, they just need Morales to call on their behalf to make it happen. Management is famous for saying "this comes from above..."</li> </ol>

**Table A4, continued. Themes and Representative Statements of Staff Responses Regarding the Personnel Evaluation Process**

Staff and admin	<i>Number of references to a given theme are in parentheses</i>	
	<p>6. Arbitrary limits on ratings (5)</p> <p>7. Inconsistency in standards (7)</p>	<p>6. “The VP has stated multiple times that no one is Excellent, but there are those who have that checked by some supervisors anyway. “  “Campus wide, every staff member I know, except for friends of the evaluating MPP, has dropped at least a full step this year. We were told by our MPP's "We're not allowed to give anyone above a satisfactory grade without taking the evaluation to the VP's office." Isn't this a violation of the contract?</p> <p>7. “The expectations are always fuzzy. If you can't tell me what you expect then I am constantly trying to guess. I have a very high bar for myself. It's just tough to tell if my bar of expectations aligns with my administrators. “  “There was an inconsistency between what I was told to expect during the onboarding process and what I actually received.”</p>
Other issues	Issues with timeliness and deadlines (21)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “It was a joke. My evaluations were usually more than a year late in coming.”</li> <li>• “I have never received a performance evaluation.”</li> </ul>
	Issues with reclassification process (9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “I have heard that it takes three to six months to reclass. Pay is not accurate to people's level of education or job duties and takes too long to change.”</li> <li>• “Initially, I was misclassified and it took two years before the problem was corrected. I feel like I am still not where I need to be classified, but we are asked to wait until approvals are given.”</li> </ul>
	Evaluators need more training (14)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “My supervisor has no clue what I do and rarely communicates with me. He only reacts when any one of the vast (and increasing) number of systems under my area of responsibility is reported to him as having an issue.”</li> <li>• “My evaluations are done by temporary supervisors. My last one was unfair and done by someone that was only in the position for three months.”</li> <li>• “Evaluations are confusing at this point. Since all my directors have left over the course of the past 3 years, my evaluations are being done by interims. This has been the case since Morales came. There is no stability due to the high turnover rate.”</li> </ul>
System works/is fair	(11 respondents)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “The personnel evaluation process is extremely helpful.”</li> <li>• “It is cumbersome but fair.”</li> </ul>

Total number of respondents who made a reference to the personnel evaluation process that could be assigned a theme was 105.

**Table A5. Construct Definitions of Themes for Job Growth and Need for Training and/or Resources**

Dimension	Subthemes	Definition; references to...
Faculty: lack of resources		
Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time</li> <li>• Workload</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of time to attend workshops, conferences, or other venues in which knowledge could be gained for advancement</li> <li>• Too much work to be accomplished, unwilling or unable to take on more work, which more training/education would entail</li> </ul>
Institutional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of staff/faculty to do work</li> <li>• Lack of funding, infrastructure for scholarship</li> <li>• Lack of funding, infrastructure for teaching</li> <li>• Administration making it harder to obtain growth opportunities</li> <li>• General lack of resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough people to do the work, whether it be more faculty or support staff</li> <li>• Not enough funding for resources used or needed in research, including lab equipment, software, tangible material, or course buyouts</li> <li>• Not enough funding for resources used in teaching, including lab equipment, appropriate and well equipped classrooms, teaching assistants (TAs)</li> <li>• Difficult process to apply for funding</li> <li>• Lack of overall funding, no or limited budget (not commensurate to need)</li> </ul>
Faculty: have support		Funding available, no difficulty in acquiring, whether in own department, college
Faculty, staff, admin limited opportunities	Limited or no opportunities for growth	General reference to lack of opportunities, not specific



**Table A5, continued. Construct Definitions of Themes for Job Growth and Need for Training and/or Resources**

Dimension	Subthemes	Definition; references to...
Staff & admin: lack of resources		
Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of time to attend workshops, conferences, or other venues in which training or certification could be used for advancement</li> </ul>
Institutional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of staff to do work</li> <li>• Lack of funding for training</li> <li>• Training quality is poor</li> <li>• Lack of management support</li> <li>• Lack of funding for necessary equipment, tools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough people to do the work</li> <li>• No funding is provided to pay for training or certification; employee told s/he must pay for the training</li> <li>• Training available is of insufficient quality, not useful, not worth attending, doesn't meet need</li> <li>• No encouragement from management to seek or take more training, may include the reference to there being no point in taking more training as it will not lead to advancement</li> <li>• Lack of resources available, including not enough or proper tools, equipment</li> </ul>
Staff: have support		Adequate resources, adequate training, support to attend training
Favoritism		Favoritism in who is permitted to take training

**Table A6. Themes and Representative Statements of Faculty, Staff, and Administrators in Response to: “Please make any comments you wish regarding your potential for job growth and the possible need for training and/or resources.”**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Subthemes</b>	<b>Representative comments</b>
Faculty: lack of resources	<i>Number of references to a given theme are in parentheses</i>	
Individual	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Time (10)</li> <li>2. Workload (11)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Time is a huge problem. I work between 55 and 60 hours a week. This does not often allow me to take advantage of the educational opportunities that the campus DOES offer and this is very disappointing. “We have opportunity for training but are not given time. “</i></li> <li>2. <i>Our workload shows no signs of making any true development possible.</i></li> </ol>
Institutional	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of staff/faculty to do work (6)</li> <li>2. Lack of funding, infrastructure for scholarship (14)</li> <li>3. Lack of funding, infrastructure for teaching (9)</li> <li>4. Administration making it harder to obtain growth opportunities (5)</li> <li>5. General lack of resources (3)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>It's a mixed bag. There are tools and resources, but not in key areas. Resources are being placed in places that solve little problems, but insufficient resources are being devoted to the real and substantive problems - there are too many students, and no enough facilities and faculty...</i></li> <li>2. <i>I do not have time or resources to support my professional development -- there is a lack of funds, supports and making things overly complication, like the new travel system.</i></li> <li>3. <i>...There used to be adequate support for teaching, but I've noticed a drastic cut in teaching resources for new faculty. This is highly problematic! When 1 of my 3 classes has 135 students and I have no TAs or assistance grading and evaluating student work, No, I am not being supplied with the resources necessary to perform my job well. These large lectures without TAs are a disgrace, especially as students pay more tuition -- they deserve more attention and a higher quality education.</i></li> <li>4. <i>Many times training takes place when faculty are in class. This sends a message to faculty that they are not important, or not important enough to inconvenience staff by having multiple dates for training or other events that faculty might wish to attend</i></li> <li>5. <i>The budget is laughable. We've been slashed to the bone, and I don't have hope that those cuts will ever be restored. We can't fulfill our basic mission with our resources. (faculty)</i></li> </ol>

**Table A6, continued. Themes and Representative Statements of Faculty, Staff, and Administrators in Response to: “Please make any comments you wish regarding your potential for job growth and the possible need for training and/or resources.”**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Subthemes</b>	<b>Representative comments</b>
Faculty: lack of resources	<i>Number of references to a given theme are in parentheses</i>	
Faculty: have support	(9 respondents)	<i>TRC is great! Department is very supportive. College less so. University as a whole, even less so. Leadership positions seem to be given from nepotism. “I have enjoyed a tremendous amount of support as a new faculty member.”</i>
Faculty, staff, admin no opps	No opportunities for growth (10)	<i>The tools/resources given to me are from my direct supervisor(s), not necessarily from the campus. There is a lack of professional growth opportunities in my department. (staff)</i>

**Table A6, continued. Themes and Representative Statements of Faculty, Staff, and Administrators in Response to: “Please make any comments you wish regarding your potential for job growth and the possible need for training and/or resources.”**

Dimension	Subthemes	Representative comments
Staff & admin: lack of resources		
Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time (5)</li> </ul>	<p><i>“The campus provides the resources but not the time”</i>  <i>There are training available on-line, but no time is given to complete training.</i></p>
Institutional	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of staff to do work (6)</li> <li>2. Lack of funding for training (8)</li> <li>3. Training quality is poor (10)</li> <li>4. Lack of management support (17)</li> <li>5. Lack of funding for necessary equipment, tools (7)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>....my department is denied growth opportunities by our supervisor due to "coverage" issues. Due to staffing constraints in our office, it has been difficult to attend trainings.</i></li> <li>2. <i>While I am told that we should seek opportunities for professional growth and development, when opportunities are found we are usually told no due to funding issues or told to find another option. I've basically given up on finding opportunities as I see it a waste of my time.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Training provided have not always been beneficial e.g. Diversity training and Civility in the Workplace There are staff on this campus that really need courses related to the use of Microsoft Excel but there doesn't appear to be someone on campus that offers that training. While some of the training provided is very helpful, other training makes little sense and is not of much assistance.</i></li> <li>4. <i>...We are asked to take initiative to improve processes/the department, but often get shot down before we can put ideas into practice.</i></li> <li>5. <i>...We also lack adequate space and equipment to perform our job to the best of our abilities. Like many offices are asked to do more with less.</i></li> </ol>

**Table A6, continued. Themes and Representative Statements of Faculty, Staff, and Administrators in Response to: “Please make any comments you wish regarding your potential for job growth and the possible need for training and/or resources.”**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Subthemes</b>	<b>Representative comments</b>
Staff: have support	(17 respondents)	<p><i>“Our college dean allows for professional growth and opportunities. I am so grateful to him for that.”</i></p> <p><i>“CSUSB provides many opportunities for growth and development.”</i></p>
<i>Favoritism</i>	(13 respondents)	<p><i>“This campus offers so many resources -- from tuition assistance to trainings -- I love that about this campus. The sad part is that there are no career advancement opportunities because those who are hiring only hire their friends; there is no more hiring from within.”</i></p> <p><i>“Career path is zero unless you are among a favored few that are willing to tow the line.”</i></p> <p><i>“Training assignments are given out on a biased basis. If the administrator likes you then you get to go to training. If the administrator does not like you then you don't get to go even when the training directly effects your working environment.”</i></p>

Total number of respondents who made a reference to job growth or career advancement that could be assigned a theme was 129.

**Table A7. Construct Definitions of Themes to Faculty, Staff, and Administrator Responses to the Item: “Please make additional comments regarding workload or hours ....”**

Dimension		
<b>Work Stress</b>	Subthemes	Definition; references to...
<i>Shortage of people</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough tenure-track faculty</li> <li>• Deadwood, people not pulling their weight</li> <li>• Not enough staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needing more tenure-track faculty to accomplish the work load</li> <li>• Employees not working as hard as others, more work to be accomplished by other employees</li> <li>• Not enough staff employees to accomplish required tasks</li> </ul>
<i>Issues with workload</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too many courses</li> <li>• Class sizes</li> <li>• Number of emails/texts</li> <li>• Working beyond 40 hour week</li> <li>• Excessive service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More courses to be taught at once than could be reasonable managed</li> <li>• Class sizes increased, too many students</li> <li>• Emails or texts have increased in number</li> <li>• Working on weekends, 10 hour days to keep up with the work to be done</li> <li>• Service demands have increased</li> </ul>
<i>Insufficient resources or support</i>	Lack of funding for campus mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resources are inadequate or are not provided</li> </ul>
<i>Lack of concern from management regarding workload</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unaware or out of touch management</li> <li>• Bureaucracy creates more work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management not caring about workload, unaware of workload</li> <li>• Various processes or management approaches that add to the workload without adding value</li> </ul>
<i>Workload is workable or reasonable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heavy workload, but workable</li> <li>• Workload is fine, reasonable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workload may be very heavy, but employee is willing to work hard</li> <li>• Workload is reasonable, within traditional bounds of a 40 hour workweek</li> </ul>

**Table A8. Themes and Representative Statements of Faculty, Staff, and Administrators in Response to: “Please make additional comments regarding workload or hours ...”**

Dimension	<i>Number of references to a given theme are in parentheses</i>	
<b>Work Stress</b>	Subthemes	Definition; references to...
<i>Shortage of people</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not enough tenure-track faculty (13)</li> <li>2. Deadwood, people not pulling their weight (11)</li> <li>3. Not enough staff (33)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>“We need more faculty, release time needs to equate with the number of students you have.”</i></li> <li>2. <i>“Because I am efficient at doing my job and manage my time wisely it is perceived that I have time to take on more work. Another has poor time management and gets buried in work, and the supervisor thinks that their volume of work is too much and proceeds to get that worker assistance.”</i></li> <li>3. <i>“In the past, faculty were supported well through the help of our ASCs. Now the ASCs work primarily for upper management.”</i></li> </ol>
<i>Issues with workload</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Too many courses (6)</li> <li>2. Class sizes (9)</li> <li>3. Number of emails/texts (21)</li> <li>4. Working beyond 40 hour week (38)</li> <li>5. Excessive service demands (10)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>“The teaching loads are so heavy that there is no time left for research, or for even having a life.”</i></li> <li>2. <i>“Increasing class size and overall increasing student-faculty-ratios represents a significant and uncompensated increase in faculty workload.”</i></li> <li>3. <i>“I do believe that the volume of emails is too high on campus. I have been forced to opt out of the “campus” list because I simply cannot afford that email, even in digest form, to distract me from other more information that comes to me as email.”</i> <i>“I am an exempt staff member... I receive text messages at 3 am in the morning and am expected to work on weekends or on vacation if there is a big project.”</i></li> <li>4. <i>“In the end, to do our job, we work holidays and summers when we are not paid. This would not be acceptable in any other field...”</i></li> <li>5. <i>“Due to a marked decline in tenured faculty members in my department, the service load for the few tenured faculty remaining has become excessive. Also, most key committees require members from outside of the department.”</i> <i>“We once had ample faculty resources for such. Now, committee assignment siphon time from teaching and research.”</i></li> </ol>

**Table A8, continued. Themes and Representative Statements of Faculty, Staff, and Administrators in Response to: “Please make additional comments regarding workload or hours...”**

Dimension	Number of references to a given theme are in parentheses	
Work Stress	Subthemes	Statements/references to...
<i>Insufficient resources or support</i>	Lack of resources for campus mission (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “We need more faculty to adequately serve students but being faculty means working long hours-- this is not a problem. The problem is being asked to do a job without reasonable resources.”</li> <li>• “I have been given additional duties, but no resources/help to complete the duties, so I often have to work additional hours.”</li> </ul>
<i>Lack of concern from management regarding workload</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unaware or out of touch management (26)</li> <li>2. Bureaucracy creates more work (3)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. “...the administration does not generally understand what it takes to do this job... In the end, to do our job, we work holidays and summers when we are not paid. This would not be acceptable in any other field...”</li> <li>2. “The Central Administration puts new software server systems in place, but without any understanding that most of these actually are slower and more cumbersome than the previous systems. Meaningful support services are decreasing, although the Central Administrators get more Staff assistants and even new assistant positions, such as a Chief of Staff.”</li> </ol>
<i>Workload is workable or reasonable</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Heavy workload, but workable (11)</li> <li>2. Workload is fine, reasonable (7)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. “I work every day of the week and every day during winter break. I don't resent the workload, but I do believe that I am underpaid for my level of education and ability. The amount of work I do is not a demand from management, but is merely the requirement of being a successful professor. It's what the job, itself, demands.” “As an exempt MPP I don't expect to work 9-5 or to only have to work 40 hours per week. I took this job on purpose, and I enjoy working long, hard hours to support the mission of our university.”</li> <li>2. “Hours are day and night but flexibility allows me to stay within 40-45 hours.”</li> </ol>

Total number of respondents who made a reference to workload that could be assigned a theme was 121.



**Table A9. Construct Definitions of Themes Related to Work Stress**

Dimension		
<b>Work Stress</b>	Subthemes	Definition; references to...
<i>Attributions or perceived causes of stress</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work overload</li> <li>• Time pressures</li> <li>• Staff shortage</li> <li>• Inequity or poorly compensated</li> <li>• Lack of respect for employee or work done</li> <li>• Poor leadership or supervision</li> <li>• Bureaucracy</li> <li>• Environment</li>   <li>• Self-induced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much work to be completed</li> <li>• Not enough time to complete work or unrealistic deadlines</li> <li>• Not enough faculty or staff to do all the work that is required</li> <li>• Perceptions that one is working harder than others (but paid the same or less) or simply not being adequately compensated for the work to be done</li> <li>• Lack of respect for the work that one does as displayed by supervisor ignoring employee work effort, expressing a lack of value in the employee</li> <li>• Leadership or supervision that does not support employee work, poor decision-making on the part of leadership that leads to job instability or ambiguity about what work is or should be priority</li> <li>• Perceptions that there are additional layers of paperwork, signatures required, needless projects assigned</li> <li>• Aspects of the work environment itself causes stress, such as poor morale of employees, inability to trust coworkers or superiors</li> <li>• That individual employee has high expectations for self, takes on a large workload, creates his or her work stress</li> </ul>
<i>Stress is normal</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stress is to be expected at work, a normal aspect of work life</li> </ul>

**Table A10. Themes and Representative Statements made by Faculty, Staff, and Administrator Responses to the Item: “Please feel free to make comments about workplace stress ...”**

Dimension	(Number of cases are contained in parentheses)	
Work Stress	Subthemes	Representative statements
<i>Attributions or perceived causes of stress</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Work overload (36)</li> <li>2. Time pressures (12)</li> <li>3. Staff shortage (3)</li> <li>4. Inequity or poorly compensated (6)</li> <li>5. Lack of respect for employee or work done (6)</li> <li>6. Poor leadership or supervision (26)</li> <li>7. Bureaucracy (5)</li> <li>8. Environment (13)</li> <li>9. Self-induced (8)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>“I am stressed by workload -- teaching load and service load together - and the increasing impossibility to do all things well.”</i></li> <li>2. <i>“...timelines for completion of tasks are shorter and shorter, with little apologies or considerations for the assigned tasks already committed to and no effort to change!”</i></li> <li>3. <i>“I am always under stress. Firstly, we are grossly understaffed and over worked.”</i></li> <li>4. <i>“I am overworked and underpaid, which leads to stress.”</i></li> <li>5. <i>“I often feel that demands are too high and there is no respect offered to me for the work that I do outside of the university.”</i></li> <li>6. <i>“It is not the work that causes stress, it is higher management's negative comments, unclear communications, and lack of consideration for workload.”</i></li> <li>7. <i>“The stress comes from sorting through new policies and procedures.”</i></li> <li>8. <i>“Stress has increased due to poor morale, wondering who is safe to be oneself around among administrators...”</i></li> <li>9. <i>“My position is such that stress is a common reaction - to the amount of work, quality of work, reaction of others - but this is not imposed by others.”</i></li> </ol>
<i>Stress is normal</i>	(11 respondents)	<i>“Being faculty is stressful anywhere. If you are doing your job and doing research, writing papers, working with students you are going to be stressed”</i>

Total number of respondents who made a reference to work stress that could be assigned a theme was 78.

**Table A11. Construct Definitions of Themes Coded for Diversity and Equity at CSUSB.”**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Subthemes</b>	<b>Definition; references to...</b>
Diversity valued at CSUSB	Respect for differences are valued, diversity of students or employees is present & seen as positive	Campus community embraces, respects, appreciates diversity as a positive attribute of the faculty, staff, students
Diversity and inclusion practiced differentially*	Differential practice; diversity and inclusion is practiced in some areas, not others	Diversity is practiced at one level of the university, but not at another (e.g., department, but not college; college, but not university level)
More diversity needed	More diversity and inclusion needs to be practiced	More work is needed for diversity to be practiced in the true sense of inclusivity; may include references to the idea that there has been progress with regard to demographics but more is needed
Purposeful Political Use	Appears to be purposeful, by race, ethnicity, gender, age, class, or campus work experience (e.g., years of experience)	Includes references to diversity being used as a ploy that is used to promote a specific political agenda or shield administration from criticism (e.g., used as a pretext for brushing aside criticism of a specific program)
Exclusion	Not seen as intentional, but seen by some as marginalizing groups of people	Marginalization, may include references to separate graduations, differential treatment by religious affiliation or political affiliation
Preferential treatment is practiced at CSUSB	Favoritism	Favoritism based on demographics is being practiced on campus, may include references to decision makers being racist or sexist; also includes references to behavior that may be based on alternative preferential treatment (e.g., external candidates given preference over current employees in promotions)
Bias	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender bias</li> <li>• Racial bias</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific reference to women being treated differently, being silenced, disciplined more harshly, terminated more readily, or not promoted when qualified</li> <li>• Specific reference to people of color (or whites) being treated differently in a way that disadvantages them (as above, with the subtheme gender bias), use of the word ‘racism’ or ‘racist’; includes occasions when the person of color is given preferential treatment</li> </ul>

Note. An initial theme included “Inclusion is genuinely practiced at CSUSB” but because only one respondent was assigned this theme, the category was eliminated. Another initial theme was “inclusion is NOT practiced at CSUSB” for which 12 respondents were assigned the theme; after a review of the cases to which this theme was assigned, all but three cases were also coded within one of the other remaining themes (i.e., exclusion, preferential treatment, or bias); thus, this theme does not appear in the table.

**Table A12. Themes and Representative Statements made by Faculty, Staff, and Administrator Responses to the Item: “Please comment on your experiences with diversity and equity at CSUSB.”**

Dimension	Subthemes <i>Number of references to a given theme are in parentheses</i>	Representative Statements
Diversity is valued at CSUSB	Respect for differences are valued; diversity of students or employees is present and seen as a positive (27)	<i>“The culture at CSUSB supports diversity and strives for community. I am impressed by the people who work here and who go to school here. I am equally sure that, given the nature of “isms” that we are not immune from these concerns here. But I do routinely see people on our campus practicing genuine inclusivity, engaging in genuine exchanges across “diversity” labels, and promoting respect, understanding, and appreciation for all people here.”</i>
Diversity and inclusion is practiced differentially*	Differential practice; diversity and inclusion is practiced in some areas, not others (6)	<i>“At the department and college level, differences are respected. At the university level, they are not.” “My department and my college are amazing, my department head and the dean of my college are both great. As for the larger campus, I am not confident about diversity and inclusion.”</i>
More diversity needed	More diversity and inclusion needs to be practiced (12)	<i>“More work is needed at CSUSB on diversity.” “Ethnic diversity is pretty good, but gender diversity is not.”</i>
Purposeful political use of diversity	Appears to be purposeful, by race, ethnicity, gender, age, class, or campus work experience (e.g., years of experience) (13)	<i>“Dr. Morales likes to state that he has created a climate of inclusiveness and increased diversity. However, he likes to suggest that people who disagree with him don't like him because he is Latino...”</i>
Exclusion	Not seen as intentional exclusion, but seen by some as marginalizing groups of people (12)	<i>“I feel guilty for being white... Diversity training made me ashamed. I'm not now nor have i ever been privileged...”</i>
Preferential treatment is practiced at CSUSB	(31 respondents)	<i>“Cultural differences are respected by some. However, Hispanic people are favored.” “The perception on campus is that people who are long term employees are less valuable than people from the outside in terms of promotional opportunities.”</i>



**Table A13. Construct Definitions of Themes Coded for Bullying (Witnessed or Experienced)**

Dimension		
<b>Bullying</b>	Subthemes	Definition; references to...
<i>Nature of bullying</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targeting specific employees</li> <li>• Pressuring employees</li> <li>• Gender bias</li> <li>• Emotional abuse/intimidation</li> <li>• Verbal abuse/yelling</li> <li>• Incivility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bullying directed at specific employees</li> <li>• Using undue pressure to make an employee do work, sign a contract without being able to read it fully</li> <li>• Bullying is directed at women or men</li> <li>• Intimidating an employee to quiet or back down or away from an issue under discussion</li> <li>• Shouting at an employee, whether in private or in public</li> <li>• Behavior that is unprofessional, rude, slanderous, falls short of bullying threshold of above definitions</li> </ul>
<i>Bullying done by whom?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• President</li> <li>• Top management</li> <li>• Department chairs</li> <li>• Senior faculty</li> <li>• Supervisor</li> <li>• Co-workers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be assigned to the subtheme, statement must reference the specific position or be readily inferred from context</li> </ul>
<i>Level of bullying</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University</li> <li>• Department</li> <li>• Human resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement must make reference to the specific unit</li> </ul>

Representative statements are included in the body of the report; because some statements might have revealed the respondent, we have not included in tables, nor in the report.

**Table A14. Construct Definitions of Themes Coded for the Item: “If “no (you didn’t report the conduct): OPTIONAL: If you feel comfortable explaining, what was the reason you didn't report the conduct?”**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Subthemes</b>	<b>Definition; references to...</b>
<i>Why report?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Futile to report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing would happen if I did report bullying; nothing did happen when I reported it, nothing would change, the bullying would not stop</li> </ul>
<i>Fear of reporting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There would be retaliation</li> <li>• Do not trust HR</li> <li>• Power differential, person doing the bullying had power</li> <li>• Wanted to avoid conflict</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fear of retribution, retaliation, loss of job, cripple career opportunities, negative consequences</li> <li>• No one in HR can be trusted to tell regarding bullying, HR is the logical place to report but they are the problem, HR will call your supervisor right away if you report</li> <li>• Person doing the bullying is a superior, has more power than employee</li> <li>• Employee or witness wanted to avoid creating trouble, felt the issue was not his or her business, didn’t believe he or she had enough information to act</li> </ul>
<i>Reported and/or handled</i>	Was or is being handled	Employee or witness reported that the bullying was handled appropriately
<i>Borderline bullying</i>	Borderline bullying	Employee suggests that behavior wasn’t at the threshold of bullying, a line between incivility and bullying

Representative statements are included in the body of the report; because some statements might have revealed the respondent, we have not included in tables, nor in the report.

**Appendix 2.**

**Data Display of All Questions Included in Phase 2:  
Tables of All Numeric Data Summarized**



**Appendix 2: Data Display, Phase 2**

**Position at CSUSB**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	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
Missing	Declined to state	1	.1	
Total		756	100.0	

**Ethnicity (Multiple responses were allowed)**

	Responses		Percent of Cases
	N	Percent	
American Indian or Alaska Native	12	1.9%	2.1%
Asian	28	4.5%	4.8%
Black or African American	54	8.6%	9.3%
Hispanic or Latino	136	21.7%	23.5%
Middle Eastern	4	0.6%	0.7%
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	8	1.3%	1.4%
White/Caucasian	338	53.8%	58.4%
Other	48	7.6%	8.3%
Total	628	100.0%	108.5%

**Self-identified gender**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Male	202	26.7	32.7
	Female	339	44.8	54.9
	Other	2	.3	.3
	Prefer not to state	75	9.9	12.1
	Total	618	81.7	100.0
Missing	System	138	18.3	
Total		756	100.0	

The remainder of this data display shows questionnaire items cross-tabulated by position. The label “Faculty” refers to Tenured Faculty (including FERP), Tenure-Track Faculty, and Lecturers. The category of “Staff” includes non-exempt, exempt, and confidential class. “Admin” refers to Administrators, and the label “Former Employees” refers to people who once worked for CSUSB but retired or left.

The vast majority of cross-tabulations showed statistically significant relationships between questionnaire item and position. In other words, there were statistically significant differences in opinions between faculty, staff, administrators, and people no longer at CSUSB.

**Overall job satisfaction: I am optimistic about the future of my career at CSUSB**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	22	44	6	12	84
	Column %	10.7%	11.3%	8.7%	37.5%	12.0%
Disagree	Count	46	76	9	6	137
	Column %	22.3%	19.4%	13.0%	18.8%	19.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	37	86	13	4	140
	Column %	18.0%	22.0%	18.8%	12.5%	20.1%
Agree	Count	62	101	22	4	189
	Column %	30.1%	25.8%	31.9%	12.5%	27.1%
Strongly Agree	Count	39	84	19	6	148
	Column %	18.9%	21.5%	27.5%	18.8%	21.2%
Total	Count	206	391	69	32	698
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Overall job satisfaction: I am satisfied with the way my career has progressed on this campus**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	20	45	2	11	78
	Column %	9.6%	11.8%	2.9%	26.2%	11.1%
Disagree	Count	33	75	9	4	121
	Column %	15.8%	19.6%	13.0%	9.5%	17.2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	30	88	6	0	124
	Column %	14.4%	23.0%	8.7%	0.0%	17.7%
Agree	Count	72	105	26	11	214
	Column %	34.4%	27.5%	37.7%	26.2%	30.5%
Strongly Agree	Count	54	69	26	16	165
	Column %	25.8%	18.1%	37.7%	38.1%	23.5%
Total	Count	209	382	69	42	702
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Overall job satisfaction: I am allowed to use work time to attend important campus events**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	7	13	0	2	22
	Column %	3.6%	3.4%	0.0%	5.3%	3.2%
Disagree	Count	19	35	1	4	59
	Column %	9.8%	9.0%	1.4%	10.5%	8.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	26	61	3	1	91
	Column %	13.5%	15.7%	4.3%	2.6%	13.2%
Agree	Count	71	160	29	10	270
	Column %	36.8%	41.2%	42.0%	26.3%	39.2%
Strongly Agree	Count	70	119	36	21	246
	Column %	36.3%	30.7%	52.2%	55.3%	35.8%
Total	Count	193	388	69	38	688
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Department: I feel recognized for my contributions**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	41	127	9	10	187
	Column %	20.9%	34.7%	14.5%	27.0%	28.3%
Agree	Count	155	239	53	27	474
	Column %	79.1%	65.3%	85.5%	73.0%	71.7%
Total	Count	196	366	62	37	661
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**College/Division: I feel recognized for my contributions**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	60	202	19	14	295
	Column %	31.6%	57.7%	30.6%	37.8%	46.2%
Agree	Count	130	148	43	23	344
	Column %	68.4%	42.3%	69.4%	62.2%	53.8%
Total	Count	190	350	62	37	639
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Campus/University as a whole: I feel recognized for my contributions**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	111	238	32	19	400
	Column %	59.0%	68.8%	51.6%	52.8%	63.3%
Agree	Count	77	108	30	17	232
	Column %	41.0%	31.2%	48.4%	47.2%	36.7%
Total	Count	188	346	62	36	632
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Department: I feel safe expressing my opinion without fear of consequences or retribution**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	43	157	16	12	228
	Column %	22.4%	43.4%	26.2%	33.3%	35.0%
Agree	Count	149	205	45	24	423
	Column %	77.6%	56.6%	73.8%	66.7%	65.0%
Total	Count	192	362	61	36	651
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**College/Division: I feel safe expressing my opinion without fear of consequences or retribution**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	75	213	32	19	339
	Column %	40.1%	62.3%	52.5%	51.4%	54.1%
Agree	Count	112	129	29	18	288
	Column %	59.9%	37.7%	47.5%	48.6%	45.9%
Total	Count	187	342	61	37	627
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Campus/University as a whole: I feel safe expressing my opinion without fear of consequences or retribution**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	138	232	37	26	433
	Column %	76.2%	67.6%	62.7%	68.4%	69.7%
Agree	Count	43	111	22	12	188
	Column %	23.8%	32.4%	37.3%	31.6%	30.3%
Total	Count	181	343	59	38	621
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Department: There is opportunity for career advancement**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	59	226	17	15	317
	Column %	33.0%	63.3%	28.3%	45.5%	50.4%
Agree	Count	120	131	43	18	312
	Column %	67.0%	36.7%	71.7%	54.5%	49.6%
Total	Count	179	357	60	33	629
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**College/Division: There is opportunity for career advancement**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	70	200	24	18	312
	Column %	39.3%	59.2%	41.4%	56.3%	51.5%
Agree	Count	108	138	34	14	294
	Column %	60.7%	40.8%	58.6%	43.8%	48.5%
Total	Count	178	338	58	32	606
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Campus/University as a whole: There is opportunity for career advancement**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	103	170	26	20	319
	Column %	58.5%	50.0%	45.6%	58.8%	52.6%
Agree	Count	73	170	31	14	288
	Column %	41.5%	50.0%	54.4%	41.2%	47.4%
Total	Count	176	340	57	34	607
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Department: An atmosphere of trust exists**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	50	176	19	15	260
	Column %	26.6%	49.2%	32.2%	41.7%	40.6%
Agree	Count	138	182	40	21	381
	Column %	73.4%	50.8%	67.8%	58.3%	59.4%
Total	Count	188	358	59	36	641
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**College/Division: An atmosphere of trust exists**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	82	230	31	20	363
	Column %	45.1%	68.0%	52.5%	55.6%	59.0%
Agree	Count	100	108	28	16	252
	Column %	54.9%	32.0%	47.5%	44.4%	41.0%
Total	Count	182	338	59	36	615
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Campus/University as a whole: An atmosphere of trust exists**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	157	241	44	27	469
	Column %	86.3%	71.5%	74.6%	71.1%	76.1%
Agree	Count	25	96	15	11	147
	Column %	13.7%	28.5%	25.4%	28.9%	23.9%
Total	Count	182	337	59	38	616
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Department: New policies and procedures are communicated in a timely manner**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	37	155	15	12	219
	Column %	19.3%	43.2%	25.0%	34.3%	33.9%
Agree	Count	155	204	45	23	427
	Column %	80.7%	56.8%	75.0%	65.7%	66.1%
Total	Count	192	359	60	35	646
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**College/Division: New policies and procedures are communicated in a timely manner**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	58	169	20	16	263
	Column %	31.4%	50.0%	33.9%	44.4%	42.6%
Agree	Count	127	169	39	20	355
	Column %	68.6%	50.0%	66.1%	55.6%	57.4%
Total	Count	185	338	59	36	618
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Campus/University as a whole: New policies and procedures are communicated in a timely manner**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	116	176	23	22	337
	Column %	63.4%	52.1%	39.7%	61.1%	54.8%
Agree	Count	67	162	35	14	278
	Column %	36.6%	47.9%	60.3%	38.9%	45.2%
Total	Count	183	338	58	36	615
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%



**Department: The rationale for new policies and procedures are clearly explained**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	46	176	15	15	252
	Column %	24.0%	49.4%	25.0%	41.7%	39.1%
Agree	Count	146	180	45	21	392
	Column %	76.0%	50.6%	75.0%	58.3%	60.9%
Total	Count	192	356	60	36	644
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**College/Division: The rationale for new policies and procedures are clearly explained**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	74	203	21	20	318
	Column %	40.9%	60.6%	36.2%	55.6%	52.1%
Agree	Count	107	132	37	16	292
	Column %	59.1%	39.4%	63.8%	44.4%	47.9%
Total	Count	181	335	58	36	610
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Campus/University as a whole: The rationale for new policies and procedures are clearly explained**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	149	206	25	25	405
	Column %	81.4%	61.1%	43.1%	65.8%	65.7%
Agree	Count	34	131	33	13	211
	Column %	18.6%	38.9%	56.9%	34.2%	34.3%
Total	Count	183	337	58	38	616
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Department: Policies are systematically applied**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	55	153	12	17	237
	Column %	28.8%	43.6%	20.3%	48.6%	37.3%
Agree	Count	136	198	47	18	399
	Column %	71.2%	56.4%	79.7%	51.4%	62.7%
Total	Count	191	351	59	35	636
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**College/Division: Policies are systematically applied**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	78	173	22	21	294
	Column %	43.3%	52.3%	37.9%	58.3%	48.6%
Agree	Count	102	158	36	15	311
	Column %	56.7%	47.7%	62.1%	41.7%	51.4%
Total	Count	180	331	58	36	605
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Campus/University as a whole: Policies are systematically applied**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	121	179	28	24	352
	Column %	68.0%	53.8%	49.1%	68.6%	58.4%
Agree	Count	57	154	29	11	251
	Column %	32.0%	46.2%	50.9%	31.4%	41.6%
Total	Count	178	333	57	35	603
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Department: CSUSB employees have mutual respect for one another**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	44	137	11	12	204
	Column %	23.2%	38.4%	18.3%	35.3%	31.8%
Agree	Count	146	220	49	22	437
	Column %	76.8%	61.6%	81.7%	64.7%	68.2%
Total	Count	190	357	60	34	641
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**College/Division: CSUSB employees have mutual respect for one another**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	62	147	20	15	244
	Column %	33.7%	43.0%	33.9%	41.7%	39.3%
Agree	Count	122	195	39	21	377
	Column %	66.3%	57.0%	66.1%	58.3%	60.7%
Total	Count	184	342	59	36	621
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Campus/University as a whole: CSUSB employees have mutual respect for one another**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Disagree	Count	109	149	31	21	310
	Column %	60.9%	43.8%	52.5%	55.3%	50.3%
Agree	Count	70	191	28	17	306
	Column %	39.1%	56.2%	47.5%	44.7%	49.7%
Total	Count	179	340	59	38	616
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Potential for job growth on this campus: I have the tools and resources necessary to perform my job well**

		Current position			Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	
Strongly Disagree	Count	23	17	5	45
	Column %	11.9%	4.6%	8.1%	7.2%
Disagree	Count	33	37	12	82
	Column %	17.0%	10.1%	19.4%	13.2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	32	37	7	76
	Column %	16.5%	10.1%	11.3%	12.2%
Agree	Count	80	172	20	272
	Column %	41.2%	47.0%	32.3%	43.7%
Strongly Agree	Count	26	103	18	147
	Column %	13.4%	28.1%	29.0%	23.6%
Total	Count	194	366	62	622
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Potential for job growth on this campus: I have opportunities for professional growth and development at this campus**

		Current position			Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	
Strongly Disagree	Count	21	38	5	64
	Column %	10.9%	10.4%	8.1%	10.3%
Disagree	Count	29	73	6	108
	Column %	15.1%	20.0%	9.7%	17.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	27	62	12	101
	Column %	14.1%	17.0%	19.4%	16.3%
Agree	Count	84	114	22	220
	Column %	43.8%	31.2%	35.5%	35.5%
Strongly Agree	Count	31	78	17	126
	Column %	16.1%	21.4%	27.4%	20.4%
Total	Count	192	365	62	619
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Potential for job growth on this campus: This campus provides training and education so that employees have an opportunity to improve their work performance**

		Current position			Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	
Strongly Disagree	Count	16	22	5	43
	Column %	8.4%	6.0%	8.1%	7.0%
Disagree	Count	14	41	5	60
	Column %	7.4%	11.2%	8.1%	9.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	41	64	13	118
	Column %	21.6%	17.5%	21.0%	19.1%
Agree	Count	83	164	22	269
	Column %	43.7%	44.8%	35.5%	43.5%
Strongly Agree	Count	36	75	17	128
	Column %	18.9%	20.5%	27.4%	20.7%
Total	Count	190	366	62	618
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Communication and leadership: Senior management treats all people, regardless of individual and cultural differences, fairly**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	71	78	6	13	168
	Column %	38.6%	23.1%	9.7%	31.0%	26.8%
Disagree	Count	24	46	8	10	88
	Column %	13.0%	13.6%	12.9%	23.8%	14.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	42	109	11	6	168
	Column %	22.8%	32.2%	17.7%	14.3%	26.8%
Agree	Count	28	71	18	8	125
	Column %	15.2%	21.0%	29.0%	19.0%	20.0%
Strongly Agree	Count	19	34	19	5	77
	Column %	10.3%	10.1%	30.6%	11.9%	12.3%
Total	Count	184	338	62	42	626
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Perceptions of diversity and equity: I feel all people, regardless of differences, are valued at CSUSB**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	31	32	4	7	74
	Column %	16.4%	9.2%	6.6%	16.7%	11.6%
Disagree	Count	38	60	8	9	115
	Column %	20.1%	17.3%	13.1%	21.4%	18.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	32	84	8	8	132
	Column %	16.9%	24.3%	13.1%	19.0%	20.7%
Agree	Count	59	110	21	11	201
	Column %	31.2%	31.8%	34.4%	26.2%	31.5%
Strongly Agree	Count	29	60	20	7	116
	Column %	15.3%	17.3%	32.8%	16.7%	18.2%
Total	Count	189	346	61	42	638
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Perceptions of diversity and equity: My co-workers respect individual and cultural differences**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	7	14	1	3	25
	Column %	3.7%	4.0%	1.6%	7.9%	3.9%
Disagree	Count	13	27	2	1	43
	Column %	6.9%	7.8%	3.2%	2.6%	6.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	23	47	4	2	76
	Column %	12.2%	13.5%	6.5%	5.3%	11.9%
Agree	Count	82	152	30	20	284
	Column %	43.6%	43.7%	48.4%	52.6%	44.7%
Strongly Agree	Count	63	108	25	12	208
	Column %	33.5%	31.0%	40.3%	31.6%	32.7%
Total	Count	188	348	62	38	636
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Perceptions of diversity and equity: My supervisors respect individual and cultural differences**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	10	27	1	7	45
	Column %	5.4%	7.8%	1.6%	18.9%	7.1%
Disagree	Count	15	24	2	1	42
	Column %	8.2%	6.9%	3.3%	2.7%	6.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	25	52	4	5	86
	Column %	13.6%	14.9%	6.6%	13.5%	13.7%
Agree	Count	77	138	24	15	254
	Column %	41.8%	39.7%	39.3%	40.5%	40.3%
Strongly Agree	Count	57	107	30	9	203
	Column %	31.0%	30.7%	49.2%	24.3%	32.2%
Total	Count	184	348	61	37	630
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Workload in your workgroup/department/division: We have adequate staffing in my workgroup to get the job done in a way that meets our goals and objectives**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	58	76	14	5	153
	Column %	31.4%	22.0%	23.0%	13.2%	24.3%
Disagree	Count	56	103	19	17	195
	Column %	30.3%	29.9%	31.1%	44.7%	31.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	20	43	5	5	73
	Column %	10.8%	12.5%	8.2%	13.2%	11.6%
Agree	Count	38	92	18	8	156
	Column %	20.5%	26.7%	29.5%	21.1%	24.8%
Strongly Agree	Count	13	31	5	3	52
	Column %	7.0%	9.0%	8.2%	7.9%	8.3%
Total	Count	185	345	61	38	629
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Workload in your workgroup/department/division: The amount of work I am asked to do is reasonable**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	48	44	7	4	103
	Column %	25.7%	12.7%	11.3%	10.5%	16.2%
Disagree	Count	39	76	17	8	140
	Column %	20.9%	21.9%	27.4%	21.1%	22.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	32	65	11	6	114
	Column %	17.1%	18.7%	17.7%	15.8%	18.0%
Agree	Count	52	125	20	14	211
	Column %	27.8%	36.0%	32.3%	36.8%	33.3%
Strongly Agree	Count	16	37	7	6	66
	Column %	8.6%	10.7%	11.3%	15.8%	10.4%
Total	Count	187	347	62	38	634
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Workload in your workgroup/department/division: I am expected to respond to work demands (e.g. emails) during non-work hours**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	10	56	3	1	70
	Column %	5.5%	17.3%	4.9%	2.7%	11.6%
Disagree	Count	29	105	8	6	148
	Column %	15.9%	32.4%	13.1%	16.2%	24.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	24	64	7	4	99
	Column %	13.2%	19.8%	11.5%	10.8%	16.4%
Agree	Count	61	64	27	18	170
	Column %	33.5%	19.8%	44.3%	48.6%	28.1%
Strongly Agree	Count	58	35	16	8	117
	Column %	31.9%	10.8%	26.2%	21.6%	19.4%
Total	Count	182	324	61	37	604
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%



**Workload in your workgroup/department/division: Overall, my workload is fair compared to others in my workgroup**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	25	43	3	3	74
	Column %	13.4%	12.6%	5.1%	7.9%	11.8%
Disagree	Count	25	72	14	7	118
	Column %	13.4%	21.1%	23.7%	18.4%	18.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	53	84	12	8	157
	Column %	28.5%	24.6%	20.3%	21.1%	25.1%
Agree	Count	65	112	18	15	210
	Column %	34.9%	32.7%	30.5%	39.5%	33.6%
Strongly Agree	Count	18	31	12	5	66
	Column %	9.7%	9.1%	20.3%	13.2%	10.6%
Total	Count	186	342	59	38	625
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Approximately how many hours is your typical work week?**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
40 or less	Count	34	180	5	8	227
	Column %	20.0%	62.1%	9.3%	22.9%	41.3%
41 to 50	Count	55	87	31	14	187
	Column %	32.4%	30.0%	57.4%	40.0%	34.1%
51 to 60	Count	61	21	16	9	107
	Column %	35.9%	7.2%	29.6%	25.7%	19.5%
Over 60 hours	Count	20	2	2	4	28
	Column %	11.8%	.7%	3.7%	11.4%	5.1%
Total	Count	170	290	54	35	549
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Statistics – Approximately how many hours is your typical work week?**

	Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	Total
Mean	52.23	42.67	50.96	51.04	46.97
Median	50.00	40.00	50.00	50.00	45.00
Std. Deviation	13.276	7.636	8.242	12.641	11.065
Count	170	290	54	35	550

**Personnel evaluations (STAFF ONLY): I know how my performance is measured**

		Current position	
		Staff	Total
Strongly Disagree	Count	30	30
	Column %	8.9%	8.9%
Disagree	Count	47	47
	Column %	13.9%	13.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	54	54
	Column %	16.0%	16.0%
Agree	Count	153	153
	Column %	45.3%	45.3%
Strongly Agree	Count	54	54
	Column %	16.0%	16.0%
Total	Count	338	338
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Personnel evaluations (STAFF ONLY): My performance reviews are conducted on a regular basis**

		Current position	
		Staff	Total
Strongly Disagree	Count	25	25
	Column %	7.6%	7.6%
Disagree	Count	43	43
	Column %	13.1%	13.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	40	40
	Column %	12.2%	12.2%
Agree	Count	157	157
	Column %	47.7%	47.7%
Strongly Agree	Count	64	64
	Column %	19.5%	19.5%
Total	Count	329	329
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Personnel evaluations (STAFF ONLY): Performance evaluations/reviews are conducted fairly**

		Current position	
		Staff	Total
Strongly Disagree	Count	31	31
	Column %	9.5%	9.5%
Disagree	Count	24	24
	Column %	7.4%	7.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	64	64
	Column %	19.6%	19.6%
Agree	Count	143	143
	Column %	43.9%	43.9%
Strongly Agree	Count	64	64
	Column %	19.6%	19.6%
Total	Count	326	326
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Personnel evaluations (STAFF ONLY): Performance evaluations/ reviews provide meaningful feedback**

		Current position	
		Staff	Total
Strongly Disagree	Count	34	34
	Column %	10.3%	10.3%
Disagree	Count	56	56
	Column %	17.0%	17.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	73	73
	Column %	22.2%	22.2%
Agree	Count	105	105
	Column %	31.9%	31.9%
Strongly Agree	Count	61	61
	Column %	18.5%	18.5%
Total	Count	329	329
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Personnel evaluations (STAFF ONLY): My position is properly classified and reflects my duties accurately**

		Current position	
		Staff	Total
Strongly Disagree	Count	71	71
	Column %	21.3%	21.3%
Disagree	Count	69	69
	Column %	20.7%	20.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	71	71
	Column %	21.3%	21.3%
Agree	Count	92	92
	Column %	27.5%	27.5%
Strongly Agree	Count	31	31
	Column %	9.3%	9.3%
Total	Count	334	334
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Personnel evaluations (STAFF ONLY): My supervisor and I work together to establish my goals for the next year**

		Current position	
		Staff	Total
Strongly Disagree	Count	45	45
	Column %	13.5%	13.5%
Disagree	Count	57	57
	Column %	17.1%	17.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	51	51
	Column %	15.3%	15.3%
Agree	Count	109	109
	Column %	32.7%	32.7%
Strongly Agree	Count	71	71
	Column %	21.3%	21.3%
Total	Count	333	333
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Personnel evaluations (STAFF ONLY): I receive timely feedback on my performance**

		Current position	
		Staff	Total
Strongly Disagree	Count	41	41
	Column %	12.2%	12.2%
Disagree	Count	46	46
	Column %	13.7%	13.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	61	61
	Column %	18.2%	18.2%
Agree	Count	127	127
	Column %	37.9%	37.9%
Strongly Agree	Count	60	60
	Column %	17.9%	17.9%
Total	Count	335	335
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Personnel evaluations (STAFF ONLY): I actively participate in the evaluation of my performance objectives**

		Current position	
		Staff	Total
Strongly Disagree	Count	24	24
	Column %	7.3%	7.3%
Disagree	Count	38	38
	Column %	11.5%	11.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	71	71
	Column %	21.5%	21.5%
Agree	Count	133	133
	Column %	40.3%	40.3%
Strongly Agree	Count	64	64
	Column %	19.4%	19.4%
Total	Count	330	330
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Personnel evaluations (STAFF ONLY): My performance evaluation is conducted by the person most familiar with my work**

		Current position	
		Staff	Total
Strongly Disagree	Count	31	31
	Column %	9.3%	9.3%
Disagree	Count	32	32
	Column %	9.6%	9.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	52	52
	Column %	15.7%	15.7%
Agree	Count	136	136
	Column %	41.0%	41.0%
Strongly Agree	Count	81	81
	Column %	24.4%	24.4%
Total	Count	332	332
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**(HOURLY OR SALARIED STAFF ONLY): Have you applied for an IRP, in writing, within the last three years?**

		Current position	Total
		Staff	
Yes	Count	65	65
	Column %	21.0%	21.0%
No	Count	244	244
	Column %	79.0%	79.0%
Total	Count	309	309
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**(HOURLY OR SALARIED STAFF ONLY WHO APPLIED):  
Was your IRP approved?**

		Current position	Total
		Staff	
Yes	Count	29	29
	Column %	47.5%	47.5%
No	Count	32	32
	Column %	52.5%	52.5%
Total	Count	61	61
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**(HOURLY OR SALARIED STAFF ONLY WHO APPLIED  
AND IRP WAS APPROVED): Do you feel the amount of increase was fair?**

		Current position	Total
		Staff	
Yes	Count	10	10
	Column %	18.2%	18.2%
No	Count	45	45
	Column %	81.8%	81.8%
Total	Count	55	55
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**(HOURLY OR SALARIED STAFF ONLY WHO APPLIED): How long did it take Human Resources to process your IRP?**

		Current position	
		Staff	Total
Under 90 days	Count	12	12
	Column %	21.1%	21.1%
Between 90 days and 6 months	Count	26	26
	Column %	45.6%	45.6%
Between 6 months and a year	Count	15	15
	Column %	26.3%	26.3%
Still under review	Count	4	4
	Column %	7.0%	7.0%
Total	Count	57	57
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Personnel evaluations (FACULTY ONLY): The process for attaining promotion and tenure is clear**

		Current position	
		Faculty	Total
Strongly Disagree	Count	7	7
	Column %	3.8%	3.8%
Disagree	Count	22	22
	Column %	12.1%	12.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	24	24
	Column %	13.2%	13.2%
Agree	Count	92	92
	Column %	50.5%	50.5%
Strongly Agree	Count	37	37
	Column %	20.3%	20.3%
Total	Count	182	182
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%



**Personnel evaluations (FACULTY ONLY): The decisions made by the evaluation committees on this campus are fair**

		Current position	
		Faculty	Total
Strongly Disagree	Count	8	8
	Column %	4.5%	4.5%
Disagree	Count	16	16
	Column %	9.0%	9.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	30	30
	Column %	16.9%	16.9%
Agree	Count	98	98
	Column %	55.1%	55.1%
Strongly Agree	Count	26	26
	Column %	14.6%	14.6%
Total	Count	178	178
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Personnel evaluations (FACULTY ONLY): Student evaluations are given the proper weight in the personnel evaluation process**

		Current position	
		Faculty	Total
Strongly Disagree	Count	19	19
	Column %	10.9%	10.9%
Disagree	Count	39	39
	Column %	22.3%	22.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	44	44
	Column %	25.1%	25.1%
Agree	Count	61	61
	Column %	34.9%	34.9%
Strongly Agree	Count	12	12
	Column %	6.9%	6.9%
Total	Count	175	175
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Personnel evaluations (FACULTY ONLY): Proper weight is given to research, scholarly, or creative contributions in the evaluation process**

		Current position	Total
		Faculty	
Strongly Disagree	Count	18	18
	Column %	10.0%	10.0%
Disagree	Count	24	24
	Column %	13.3%	13.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	28	28
	Column %	15.6%	15.6%
Agree	Count	90	90
	Column %	50.0%	50.0%
Strongly Agree	Count	20	20
	Column %	11.1%	11.1%
Total	Count	180	180
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Personnel evaluations (FACULTY ONLY): Service is given the proper weight in the evaluation process**

		Current position	Total
		Faculty	
Strongly Disagree	Count	23	23
	Column %	12.8%	12.8%
Disagree	Count	36	36
	Column %	20.1%	20.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	31	31
	Column %	17.3%	17.3%
Agree	Count	72	72
	Column %	40.2%	40.2%
Strongly Agree	Count	17	17
	Column %	9.5%	9.5%
Total	Count	179	179
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Personnel evaluations (FACULTY ONLY): The process to appeal an evaluation decision is clearly communicated to faculty**

		Current position	
		Faculty	Total
Strongly Disagree	Count	10	10
	Column %	5.7%	5.7%
Disagree	Count	26	26
	Column %	14.8%	14.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	30	30
	Column %	17.0%	17.0%
Agree	Count	84	84
	Column %	47.7%	47.7%
Strongly Agree	Count	26	26
	Column %	14.8%	14.8%
Total	Count	176	176
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%

**Workplace stress and bullying: If I were to make a mistake at work, it would be held against me**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	20	54	5	3	82
	Column %	11.0%	15.9%	8.3%	7.7%	13.2%
Disagree	Count	50	99	24	11	184
	Column %	27.5%	29.1%	40.0%	28.2%	29.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	51	92	14	8	165
	Column %	28.0%	27.1%	23.3%	20.5%	26.6%
Agree	Count	42	62	12	8	124
	Column %	23.1%	18.2%	20.0%	20.5%	20.0%
Strongly Agree	Count	19	33	5	9	66
	Column %	10.4%	9.7%	8.3%	23.1%	10.6%
Total	Count	182	340	60	39	621
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Workplace stress and bullying: My work environment can be characterized as "threatening"**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	47	101	22	7	177
	Column %	25.7%	29.6%	36.7%	17.5%	28.4%
Disagree	Count	52	112	18	9	191
	Column %	28.4%	32.8%	30.0%	22.5%	30.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	26	63	9	5	103
	Column %	14.2%	18.5%	15.0%	12.5%	16.5%
Agree	Count	38	44	6	11	99
	Column %	20.8%	12.9%	10.0%	27.5%	15.9%
Strongly Agree	Count	20	21	5	8	54
	Column %	10.9%	6.2%	8.3%	20.0%	8.7%
Total	Count	183	341	60	40	624
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Workplace stress and bullying: There are adverse consequences for those who openly disagree with management**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Strongly Disagree	Count	21	64	14	5	104
	Column %	11.6%	18.9%	23.7%	11.9%	16.8%
Disagree	Count	14	79	15	6	114
	Column %	7.7%	23.4%	25.4%	14.3%	18.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	Count	46	80	9	8	143
	Column %	25.4%	23.7%	15.3%	19.0%	23.1%
Agree	Count	54	69	15	6	144
	Column %	29.8%	20.4%	25.4%	14.3%	23.2%
Strongly Agree	Count	46	46	6	17	115
	Column %	25.4%	13.6%	10.2%	40.5%	18.5%
Total	Count	181	338	59	42	620
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Experience with stress and/or bullying: Have you been bullied in the workplace this past year?**

		Current position			Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	
Yes	Count	52	87	11	150
	Column %	28.3%	25.4%	18.3%	25.6%
No	Count	132	256	49	437
	Column %	71.7%	74.6%	81.7%	74.4%
Total	Count	184	343	60	587
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Experience with stress and/or bullying: Have you witnessed bullying in the workplace this past year?**

		Current position			Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	
Yes	Count	89	133	20	242
	Column %	48.6%	38.9%	33.3%	41.4%
No	Count	94	209	40	343
	Column %	51.4%	61.1%	66.7%	58.6%
Total	Count	183	342	60	585
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Experience with stress and/or bullying: Have you been pressured to do something that isn't part of your job?**

		Current position			Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	
Yes	Count	46	111	14	171
	Column %	25.1%	32.5%	23.0%	29.2%
No	Count	137	231	47	415
	Column %	74.9%	67.5%	77.0%	70.8%
Total	Count	183	342	61	586
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Experience with stress and/or bullying: Have you been pressured to do something that you believe is wrong or unethical?**

		Current position			Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	
Yes	Count	40	69	7	116
	Column %	21.7%	20.4%	11.9%	19.9%
No	Count	144	270	52	466
	Column %	78.3%	79.6%	88.1%	80.1%
Total	Count	184	339	59	582
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**(IF ANSWER TO ANY OF THE 4 QUESTIONS ABOVE WAS "YES"):**

**Did you report the conduct to HR or other campus representative?**

		Current position			Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	
Yes	Count	28	57	6	91
	Column %	26.4%	30.8%	22.2%	28.6%
No	Count	78	128	21	227
	Column %	73.6%	69.2%	77.8%	71.4%
Total	Count	106	185	27	318
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**(IF REPORTED CONDUCT TO HR OR OTHER CAMPUS REP): Was the situation resolved to your satisfaction?**

		Current position			Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	
Yes	Count	3	19	2	24
	Column %	10.7%	33.9%	33.3%	26.7%
No	Count	25	37	4	66
	Column %	89.3%	66.1%	66.7%	73.3%
Total	Count	28	56	6	90
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**How often does your work cause you stress?**

		Current position				Total
		Faculty	Staff	Admin	Former Employees	
Very Infrequently	Count	15	37	3	2	57
	Column %	8.2%	10.9%	5.0%	4.9%	9.1%
Infrequently	Count	17	38	6	4	65
	Column %	9.2%	11.2%	10.0%	9.8%	10.4%
Sometimes	Count	55	135	16	10	216
	Column %	29.9%	39.8%	26.7%	24.4%	34.6%
Frequently	Count	64	84	17	16	181
	Column %	34.8%	24.8%	28.3%	39.0%	29.0%
Very Frequently	Count	33	45	18	9	105
	Column %	17.9%	13.3%	30.0%	22.0%	16.8%
Total	Count	184	339	60	41	624
	Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Biographical Statements of the Report Authors**

##### **Jan Kottke, Chair of the Working Committee**

Dr. Jan Kottke is a Professor of Psychology at CSUSB where she founded the master's program in industrial and organizational psychology in 1985. As part of the graduate curriculum, she regularly teaches courses in measurement, ethics, and applied practice. At both the undergraduate and graduate level, she has taught courses in diversity and inclusion. Students under her supervision have conducted applied projects that have, among other things, interpreted data collected by Gallup for a private national firm, developed interview protocols and performance appraisal instruments for public sector, conducted program evaluation for First 5 of San Bernardino and the San Bernardino Unified School District, and interpreted the 2010 survey of CSUSB staff employees that was administered by the Chancellor's Office at the request of former VP Bob Gardner. She herself has conducted data analyses for the state of California and consulted with clients such as the City of Los Angeles, Kaiser Steel, and Mt. San Jacinto Community College. With management colleagues Dr. Kathie Pelletier and Dr. Ernesto Reza, she developed and administered a survey assessing reactions to the furloughs by employees of 18 of the 23 CSU campuses. She is a member of the Society for Industrial Organizational Psychology, Academy of Management, Association for Psychological Science, and the American Psychological Association.

##### **Barbara Sirotnik**

Dr. Barbara Sirotnik has been a Professor of Statistics and Supply Chain Management at California State University, San Bernardino since 1980. She is one of the founding Directors of the university's Institute of Applied Research and Policy Analysis, an organization which has conducted survey research projects for public and private organizations in the Inland Empire, statewide, and nationwide since 1985. Institute projects include: 17 years of Inland Empire Annual Surveys (surveys of up to 2,000 residents of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties); 21 years of surveys resulting in the Inland Empire Report on Business released monthly; community needs assessments for Pomona Valley Hospital Medical Center, San Antonio Hospital, Inland Empire United Way, Mt. Baldy United Way, and Planned Parenthood; and quality of life surveys (telephone and online) for the cities of Hemet and Riverside. Statewide studies include a survey of family caregivers; and a survey of landscape water use efficiency for the California Urban Water Conservation Council. Nationwide experience includes a study of information sharing in the military for the Department of Defense. Dr. Sirotnik is a member of the American Statistical Association and The American Association for Public Opinion Research.

##### **Kathie Pelletier**

Dr. Kathie Pelletier is a Professor in the Department of Management at California State University, San Bernardino. She has expertise in survey development and design, quantitative



and qualitative data analysis. She has developed and administered surveys on topics such as organizational corruption and ethics in the public sector, organizational culture, and reactions to furloughs in the CSU system. In addition to holding leadership positions in several large corporations for 25 years, she also consults in organizations on leadership, motivation, culture change, and has also worked as an executive coach. Her clients have included Roadway Express, Inc., County of San Bernardino's Human Services and Human Resources Departments, and Wells Fargo Bank. She is a member of the Society for Industrial Organizational Psychology, Academy of Management, and American and Western Psychological Associations.