

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Faculty Senate records

Arthur E. Nelson University Archives

3-7-2016

2015 CSUSB Campus Climate Survey, Phase I Report March 7, 2016

CSUSB Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/facultysenate>

Recommended Citation

CSUSB Faculty Senate, "2015 CSUSB Campus Climate Survey, Phase I Report March 7, 2016" (2016).
Faculty Senate records. 52.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/facultysenate/52>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Arthur E. Nelson University Archives at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate records by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

2015 Campus Climate Survey Results: Phase II Report to the Faculty Senate May 10, 2016

Presented by Jan Kottke

Co-authors:

Barbara Sirotnik & Kathie Pelletier

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

What was examined in Phase I?

- Morale
- Leadership
- Shared governance/decision making

Overview of Presentation

- Phase II report of survey results covered:
 - Diversity
 - Trust and mutual respect (psychological safety)
 - Workload and performance evaluation
 - Potential for job growth and career advancement
 - Bullying
- Today's presentation will focus on:
 - Diversity, trust, and bullying
 - Conclusions and suggestions based on these data and the results from Phase I

Review of Background

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

Method

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

Method

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

Who responded?

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

Analysis

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

STARTING WITH DIVERSITY

Diversity: Numeric Results

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

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

Diversity: Comments

Positive themes

- Diversity is valued (27)
- Though progress has been made, more diversity is needed (12)
- 116 respondents left comments; 88 responses were assigned a theme

Negative themes

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

Diversity: Representative Comments

- *“Ethnic diversity is pretty good, but gender diversity is not. There are no female vice presidents.”*
- *“Diversity is championed in every direction one turns, but for a purpose. The purpose is to wield power and loyalty.”*
- *“Unfortunately, I think that recent efforts by the administration to highlight differences between groups of students tends to marginalize some groups.”*
- *“At the department and college level, differences are respected. At the university level, they are not.”*

TURNING TO TRUST

Trust: Numeric Results

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

Feelings of Safety: Numerical Results

% who “agreed” with the following items:

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

TURNING TO BULLYING

Bullying: Definition

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

Bullying: Numeric Results

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

Bullying: Comments

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

102 respondents left comments

Bullying: Comments

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

Bullying: Comments

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

Bullying: Was it reported?

- Only 28.6% reported the bullying they experienced
- Why did people choose not to report?
 - Fear of retaliation (38)
 - Futile to report (26)
 - Conflict avoidance (26)
 - Distrust of HR (20)
 - Power differential (13)
 - The bullying was only “borderline” (11)

Bullying: Representative Comments

- *“In my immediate workplace I have experienced shaming in meetings, condescension, and attacks on my professional abilities and knowledge.”*
- *“People are targeted if they disagree with the central administration.”*
- *“I was treated very rudely/offensively by a VP. His behavior was silencing and intimidating. It was a very nasty side of him I had never seen nor do I want to from him or anyone.”*
- *“HR protects and even encourages bullying by managers.”*

Bullying: Representative Comments

- *“I witnessed the President bullying a VP - horribly. I can't imagine anyone treating another human the way Dr. Morales treated the VP.”*
- *“I have seen several of my good coworkers leave the department due to unfair treatment, bullying, stress and unfair work demands.”*
- *“I have witnessed many managers bully and harass their employees. This is an ongoing problem that many employees refuse to make a stand against for fear of retaliation.”*

Phase I & II: Conclusions and Interpretations

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

Phase I & II: Conclusions and Interpretations

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

Phase I: Recommendations

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

What has been done since Phase I?

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

- Sufficient?

Phase II: Recommendations

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

Phase II: Other Recommendations

- **Number 1:** Read Phases I and II of the Campus Climate Survey Report, and focus on changing *behaviors* to demonstrate a commitment to the campus community
- Invite input BEFORE decisions have been made
- Be willing to change direction if a majority of people affected by a decision are not in favor
- Take steps to improve feelings of psychological safety
- Implement further tracking of campus climate, including 360 degree reviews of senior management
- Hire an executive coach

Why Important?

- Why follow these recommendations?
 - To show leadership's commitment to the core values expressed in the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan
 - Inclusivity, integrity, respect, social justice and equity, transparency, and wellness and safety
 - To ensure everyone feels safe at work, empowered to live up to his or her fullest potential, to serve the mission of the university
 - And, for the students

Questions?

Phase II: Recommendations

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