



**2009
Texas A&M University
Staff and Management Survey Results**

Human Resources and the Mays Business School collaborated to conduct staff and management surveys in December 2009 in follow up to similar surveys conducted through this partnership in 2007.

The purpose of the surveys was to:

- increase the understanding of employee work attitudes and perceptions;
- collect data that allows us to identify ways the university might improve quality of life for staff;
- support the university's efforts to be the employer of choice; and
- collect longitudinal data to track turnover and evaluate factors that affect retention.

The 2009 survey results will be used to provide insight on potential new policies, programs, and services and to keep informed on the pulse of the university climate. T

he survey report was prepared by Dr. Wendy Boswell, Associate Professor, Management Department, Mays Business School.

Survey results have been presented at a Presidential Briefing to President Bowen Loftin and distributed to the Office of the Vice President for Diversity, the University Staff Council, and the University Work Life Committee.

Contact Dr. Wendy Boswell at wboswell@tamu.edu if you have questions regarding this survey report.

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

TO: KATHY SYMANK, ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND HUMAN RESOURCES SERVICES

FROM: DR. WENDY BOSWELL, DR. RYAN ZIMMERMAN, AND RICHARD GARDNER

SUBJECT: RESULTS FOR TAMU STAFF AND MANAGER SURVEYS

DATE: FEBRUARY 25TH, 2010

Executive Summary

The Texas A&M University climate survey was administered between December 9th, 2009 and January 8th, 2010. E-mails inviting participation in the survey were sent to approximately 4,400 staff employees and 580 manager-level employees, with a very small portion (approximately 20) being of the emails returned as undeliverable and/or the employee no longer employed. In addition, paper surveys were distributed to employees in areas unlikely to have computer access, including Physical Plant, Residence Life, and Dining Services. In total, 1,543 staff surveys were returned representing a 34% response rate, and 288 manager surveys were returned representing a 50% response rate.

Demographic composition of staff respondents was 70% female, an average of 44 years old, and 79% Caucasian, 12% Hispanic, 6% African-American, and 3% other races. 70% of the responders were in nonclassified positions. 92% of those completing the survey did so online.

Demographic composition of manager respondents was 54% female, an average of 48 years old, and 84% Caucasian, 8% Hispanic, 6% African-American, and 2% other races.

Results of the survey revealed fairly few differences across the demographic groups for staff-level employees. There is some indication that black respondents have somewhat lower job attitudes (e.g., career satisfaction, organizational commitment). Yet there are few gender or age differences. This is also supported by the fairly positive work climate reported where respondents do not tend to indicate concerns regarding racism, intolerance, disrespect, or feeling the university culture is not accepting.

On the other hand, there are quite a few differences across racial groups for the manager-level respondents. In particular, black managers and those from “other” racial groups (non-Hispanic) reported significantly more negative job/organizational attitudes. The attitudes for the latter group seem particularly low. This is also supported by the managerial group, in general, reporting greater concerns with the organizational climate and diversity/discrimination of the various groups (e.g., student body, faculty, staff) relative to the staff-level respondents.

In this survey, we focused on perceived discrimination and sexual harassment in the past year. Less than 3% of staff and managerial respondents perceive they have been discriminated against based on race or gender in the past year, and less than 2% perceived another basis of discrimination (e.g., age, religion, disability, sexual orientation). For staff respondents, Hispanics were most likely to perceive race discrimination, and whites were somewhat more likely than blacks to perceive discrimination. Females were much more likely than male respondents to perceive gender discrimination. For the managerial respondents, Hispanics and blacks were much more likely to perceive discrimination than white respondents. And, consistent with the staff, females were much more likely than males to perceive gender discrimination. In addition, 2% of staff respondents and 5% of managerial respondents indicated they had received unwanted sexual attention in the past year, with the majority of those respondents being female. These findings are comparable to the findings in the 2006 and 2007 surveys.

In terms of opportunities for learning, respondents indicated a preference for conferences with those from other universities, programs with participants at various organizational levels, and on-line courses and articles appear to be the preferred method for learning among both staff and managerial employees. In regards to services provided by the university, there appears to be greatest interest in job flexibility, parking, tuition assistance, career ladders, training, and policies aimed at work-family balance.

We note that while the response rate for this survey is quite comparable to the response rates of other surveys we have done (including the 2006 survey), results reported here are based on a limited number of employees at Texas A&M. Attempts should be made to understand why employees in some areas choose not to participate in the survey. For example, there were no surveys returned from the Dining Services paper and pencil survey suggesting the survey may not have been distributed. This is consistent with the 2006 survey.

All results are reported below separately for staff- and manager-level employees. The surveys were similar across the two respondent groups with a few additional items included on the manager-level survey (as indicated below).

We believe the results reported below, and in comparison to the results from the prior surveys (administered 2006 for staff, 2007 for managers) are informative in keeping a pulse on the university climate and providing insight on potential new programs and initiatives.

Staff – Overall Results

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Attribute	2006 TAMU Score (1-6)	TAMU Mean Score (1-6)	% Agree	% Neutral	% Disagree
Satisfied with Pay	3.2	3.2	9%	54%	37%
Satisfied with Supervisor	4.7	4.7	57%	34%	9%
Satisfied with Coworkers	4.5	4.4	34%	61%	5%
Satisfied with Work Itself	4.7	4.8	56%	41%	3%
Satisfied with Voice Opportunities	3.8	3.9	52%	36%	12%
Satisfied with Promotion Opportunities	3.3	3.1	7%	52%	41%
Satisfied with Development	4.2	4.2	36%	54%	10%
Career Satisfaction		4.1	21%	67%	12%
Abusive Supervision		1.7	2%	11%	87%
Embeddedness		4.4	20%	77%	3%
Positive Image/Reputation		4.9	89%	8%	3%
Pride in Org		5.1	77%	20%	3%
Perceived Org. Support		4.1	64%	23%	13%
Committed to Organization	4.0	4.1	19%	69%	12%
Engaging in Job Search Behaviors*	2.2	2.1	4%	18%	78%
Perceived Employment Alternatives	3.4	3.5	12%	65%	23%
Job Insecurity		3.3	27%	43%	30%
Intent to Exit		2.8	22%	19%	59%
Voice		3.4	3%	72%	25%
Loyalty		4.0	14%	76%	10%
Neglect		1.9	0%	48%	51%
Org Respects Diversity	4.3	4.0	2%	95%	3%
Work-Life Conflict		2.9	24%	23%	53%

* Higher score indicates employees engaging in more job search behaviors

Notably, the mean-level responses to the recent survey were quite similar to the survey conducted in 2006. Perceptions that there is “respect for diversity” at Texas A&M has slightly decreased.

Manager-Overall Results

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Attribute	2007 TAMU Score (1-6)	TAMU Mean Score (1-6)	% Agree	% Neutral	% Disagree
Satisfied with Pay		3.8	19%	58%	23%
Satisfied with Supervisor		5.0	65%	29%	6%
Satisfied with Coworkers		4.7	52%	44%	4%
Satisfied with Work Itself	5.1	5.0	66%	33%	1%
Satisfied with Voice Opportunities		4.3	19%	75%	6%
Satisfied with Promotion Opportunities	3.7	3.5	14%	59%	27%
Satisfied with Development		4.4	46%	47%	7%
Career Satisfaction	4.7	4.6	79%	16%	5%
Abusive Supervision		1.5	1%	5%	94%
Embeddedness	4.7	4.6	33%	64%	3%
Positive Image/Reputation	5.0	4.8	56%	42%	2%
Pride in Org		5.2	79%	19%	2%
Perceived Org. Support		4.3	32%	61%	7%
Committed to Organization	4.5	4.3	27%	66%	7%
Engaging in Job Search Behaviors*	1.8	1.7	1%	16%	83%
Perceived Employment Alternatives	4.1	3.4	9%	65%	26%
Job Insecurity		3.1	3%	60%	37%
Intent to Exit		2.6	6%	30%	64%
Voice		3.7	6%	82%	12%
Loyalty		4.0	12%	81%	7%
Neglect		1.7	0%	2%	98%
Org Respects Diversity	4.4	4.3	10%	88%	2%
Work-Life Conflict	3.5	3.8	24%	52%	24%

* Higher score indicates employees engaging in more job search behaviors

The mean-level responses to the recent survey were quite similar to the survey conducted in 2007. The most significant change is in perceived employment opportunities – respondents perceive many more external opportunities than in 2007, which is quite interesting given the current economy. Also, reported work-life conflict has slightly increased.

Staff – Results by Executive Level Reporting Structure

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Attribute	Academic Affairs	President*	Facilities	Finance	Operations	Student Affairs
Satisfied with Pay	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.3
Satisfied with Supervisor	4.8	4.5	4.5	5.1	4.8	4.8
Satisfied with Coworkers	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.5
Satisfied with Work Itself	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Satisfied with Voice Opportunities	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.0
Satisfied with Promotion Opportunities	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.1
Satisfied with Development	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.4
Career Satisfaction	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.2
Abusive Supervision	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.5	1.9	1.7
Embeddedness	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.3
Positive Image/Reputation	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.9
Pride in Org	5.1	5.4	5.1	5.2	5.4	5.2
Perceived Org. Support	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.3
Committed to Organization	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.4	4.1
Engaging in Job Search Behaviors**	2.0	1.8	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.2
Perceived Employment Alternatives	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.9	3.6	3.3
Job Insecurity	3.2	3.8	3.3	3.6	3.4	3.2
Intent to Exit	2.7	2.3	2.7	2.7	2.8	3.0
Voice	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.6
Loyalty	4.0	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.1
Neglect	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	2.0	2.0
Org Respects Diversity	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0
Work-Life Conflict	2.9	3.6	2.8	2.6	2.8	3.2

Green Highlight: Meaningfully higher than TAMU overall; Yellow Highlight: Meaningfully lower than TAMU Overall

While there are few differences across the reporting structures, it does appear those serving under the President tend to have greater pride in, are more committed to, and have greater loyalty to the organization. Interestingly, despite these positive attitudes, these individuals also report higher job insecurity, though they are also less likely to be searching for alternative employment and have lower intent to quit. There is also higher work-life conflict among those under the President (as well as those in Student Affairs).

Those serving under Operations also reported somewhat higher attitudes (e.g., pride, commitment) but were also less satisfied with opportunities for promotion and may be searching for alternative employment with greater frequency. Those in Finance indicated higher supervisor satisfaction, greater alternative employment opportunities, and somewhat higher job insecurity.

*VP-Communications and VP-Development included under President due to small group size; ** Higher score indicates employees engaging in more job search behaviors

Manager – Results by Executive Level Reporting Structure

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Attribute	Academic Affairs	President*	Facilities	Finance	Operations	Student Affairs
Satisfied with Pay	3.6	3.2	3.3	4.3	4.2	4.2
Satisfied with Supervisor	5.0	4.9	4.5	5.3	5.3	5.1
Satisfied with Coworkers	4.7	5.0	5.2	4.8	5.1	4.6
Satisfied with Work Itself	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.1	5.0	5.0
Satisfied with Voice Opportunities	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.6	4.6	4.3
Satisfied with Promotion Opportunities	3.6	3.3	3.2	4.2	3.7	3.5
Satisfied with Development	4.4	4.0	4.1	4.9	4.3	4.4
Career Satisfaction	4.7	4.3	4.3	5.0	4.7	4.4
Abusive Supervision	1.5	1.3	1.8	1.4	1.3	1.4
Embeddedness	4.6	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.4
Positive Image/Reputation	4.9	5.4	4.3	5.1	5.3	4.5
Pride in Org	5.2	5.7	5.1	5.6	5.4	5.0
Perceived Org. Support	4.3	4.4	3.7	4.5	4.9	4.3
Committed to Organization	4.3	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.1
Engaging in Job Search Behaviors**	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.9
Perceived Employment Alternatives	3.3	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.2	3.3
Job Insecurity	3.0	3.6	3.4	3.1	3.5	2.8
Intent to Exit	2.6	3.0	2.2	2.0	2.3	3.1
Voice	3.7	4.2	4.5	3.7	3.9	3.7
Loyalty	4.1	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4	3.7
Neglect	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.8
Org Respects Diversity	4.4	4.1	4.0	4.4	4.4	4.3
Work-Life Conflict	4.0	3.6	3.3	3.5	4.5	3.8

Green Highlight: Meaningfully higher than TAMU overall; Yellow Highlight: Meaningfully lower than TAMU Overall

There is actually quite a bit of variance across the groups. In general, managers in Finance and in Operation report higher attitudes toward their job/organization (though Operation also reports high work-life conflict). Those under the President’s office, tend to report particularly positive attitudes directed toward the University (e.g., commitment, pride), but along with Student Affairs, report higher intent to quit. Those managers in Facilities reported somewhat more negative work attitudes (e.g., lower satisfaction with supervisor, voice opp, career, org support, perceived support for diversity), yet also low intent to quit, low work-life conflict, and high overall commitment to the organization than the overall group.

*VP-Communications and VP-Development included under President due to small group size; ** Higher score indicates employees engaging in more job search behaviors

Staff – Organizational Climate

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

How would you characterize the university climate for each of the following:	TAMU Mean Score (1-6)	% Agree	% Neutral	% Disagree
Racist	2.8	3%	49%	48%
Accepting	4.2	19%	68%	13%
Disrespectful	2.4	2%	35%	63%
Collegial	4.1	14%	73%	13%
Sexist	2.8	3%	48%	49%
Collaborative	4.0	13%	74%	13%
Competitive	3.2	6%	58%	36%
Not Supportive	2.6	3%	43%	54%
Non-xenophobic	4.3	24%	62%	14%
Non-tolerant	2.8	3%	49%	48%
Non-cliquish	3.1	7%	56%	37%
Narrow-minded	3.2	5%	59%	36%
Diverse	3.9	12%	70%	18%
Conservative	4.2	20%	65%	15%
Isolated	2.8	3%	51%	46%
Judgmental	3.4	7%	66%	27%
Not Respectful of different sexual orientations	3.4	11%	57%	32%
Respectful of different spiritual beliefs	4.0	16%	65%	19%

In general, staff employees see the university as fairly accepting and collegial, non-xenophobic, respectful of different spiritual beliefs, and conservative. The university is not seen as particularly racist, disrespectful, sexist, unsupportive, intolerant, or isolated.

Overall, based on your experiences, how would you rate the climate of your department/unit?		
Hostile	Neutral	Friendly
10%	26%	64%

The vast majority of staff respondents feel their department climate is neutral or friendly.

Manager – Organizational Climate

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

How would you characterize the university climate for each of the following:	Score (1-6)	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Racist	3.0	16%	42%	42%
Accepting	3.9	42%	38%	20%
Disrespectful	2.4	7%	33%	60%
Collegial	4.4	55%	37%	8%
Sexist	3.0	18%	37%	45%
Collaborative	3.9	39%	45%	16%
Competitive	3.4	22%	48%	30%
Not Supportive	2.7	6%	42%	52%
Non-xenophobic	4.1	44%	41%	15%
Non-tolerant	3.0	14%	47%	39%
Non-cliquish	3.1	19%	45%	36%
Narrow-minded	3.4	21%	63%	26%
Diverse	3.2	16%	64%	30%
Conservative	4.8	66%	29%	5%
Isolated	2.9	9%	50%	41%
Judgmental	3.8	29%	54%	17%
Not Respectful of different sexual orientations	3.8	62%	14%	24%
Respectful of different spiritual beliefs	3.9	38%	43%	19%

In general, managers view the university climate fairly positively, but do report somewhat greater concerns with the climate than the staff respondents (e.g., more racist, less accepting, sexist, less diverse, particularly conservative, judgmental, not respectful of different sexual orientations). This may be due to the managerial group being more likely to be from outside the area (TX) and thus have experienced other (more diverse) organizational environments.

Overall, based on your experiences, how would you rate the climate of your department/unit?		
Hostile	Neutral	Friendly
3%	17%	80%

Yet, manager respondents view the climate in their department much more positively than staff – managers overwhelmingly see the climate as friendly. This might suggest a disconnect between the managers’ views of their departments’ climates and the staffs’ experiences.

Staff – Learning Methods

My preferred learning methods are:	% Most Preferred	% Somewhat Preferred	% Least Preferred
Conference with participants from other universities	38%	44%	18%
Conference with participants from other types of employers	23%	48%	29%
University programs with participants at my organizational level only	23%	53%	24%
University programs with participants at various organizational levels	37%	50%	13%
Print journal articles	17%	44%	39%
Lectures	23%	48%	29%
Briefings	22%	54%	24%
Online courses	40%	40%	20%
Online articles	38%	43%	20%
Program or conference with online pre-work	21%	45%	34%
University reports	12%	48%	40%
Professional association reports	20%	49%	31%
Other	31%	34%	35%

Conferences with those from other universities, programs with participants at various organizational levels, and on-line courses and articles appear to be the preferred method for learning among staff employees.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Learning Opportunities	
Item	Mean (1-6)
I know how to access learning opportunities for my professional development.	4.7
Co-workers in my department or unit have the skills and abilities necessary to effectively perform their work duties.	4.6
I have the skills and abilities to effectively perform my work duties	5.2
My supervisor encourages me to attend university offered training courses	
Yes	73%
No	27%

In general, staff employees perceive they have the KSAs to perform their work duties, though they feel they are slightly more prepared than their coworkers. The vast majority of employees also feel their supervisor supports the training offered by the university.

Manager – Learning Methods

My preferred learning methods are:	% Most Preferred	% Somewhat Preferred	% Least Preferred
Conference with participants from other universities	61%	33%	6%
Conference with participants from other types of employers	19%	47%	34%
University programs with participants at my organizational level only	20%	56%	24%
University programs with participants at various organizational levels	33%	54%	13%
Print journal articles	18%	48%	34%
Lectures	18%	52%	30%
Briefings	30%	57%	15%
Online courses	22%	45%	33%
Online articles	30%	50%	20%
Program or conference with online pre-work	19%	50%	31%
University reports	13%	50%	37%
Professional association reports	33%	46%	21%
Other	73%	20%	7%

Again, conferences with those from other universities, programs with participants at various organizational levels, and on-line articles appear to be preferred method for learning among managers. These respondents also indicated a preference for briefings and professional association reports.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Learning Opportunities	
Item	Mean (1-6)
I know how to access learning opportunities for my professional development.	5.0
Co-workers in my department or unit have the skills and abilities necessary to effectively perform their work duties.	4.8
I have the skills and abilities to effectively perform my work duties	5.3
My supervisor encourages me to attend university offered training courses	
Yes	68%
No	32%

In general, managers perceive they have the KSAs to perform their work duties, though like the staff respondents they feel they are more prepared than their coworkers. The majority also feel their supervisors support the training offered by the university, though the number is slightly lower than staff, suggesting such support may be missing at the highest levels of the reporting structure.

Manager – Learning Opportunities Reported for Their Employees

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Learning Opportunities for employees.	Mean (1-6)
Staff in my department or unit have the skills necessary to support the mission of Texas A M.	4.9
The course selections in university-offered training help staff in my department or unit to do their jobs	4.1
The course selections in university-offered training help staff in my department or unit to advance in their careers	3.9
I utilize succession planning in my department or unit to develop employees for management positions.	3.9

Managers also believe their staff have the KSAs to complete the job, which is consistent with the staffs’ own reports. Managers were less positive about the training offered to help employees to do their jobs or, in particular, to advance their careers. There is also moderate use of succession planning as reported by the managers.

What type of learning opportunities do your employees need to do their jobs?	
Face-to-face workshops	70%
Local/state/national conference with participants from other universities	56%
Personal coaching/mentoring	56%
Local/state/national conference with participants from other universities	56%
On-the-job training	56%
Cross-training	52%
Online courses	45%
Certification programs	44%
University programs with participants at various organizational levels	39%
Job shadowing (i.e., following experiences person to learn the job)	37%
Committee leadership	33%
Online articles	24%
Professional association reports	23%
Program or conference with online pre-work	18%
University reports	15%
Reading assignments	9%
Other	2%

The managers view face-to-face workshops, conferences, coaching/mentoring, on-the-job training, and cross-training as particularly useful for their employees. Less participative/active programs such as online articles, reports, and reading reports were seen as less effective.

Staff – University Services

Not important at all 1 Very unimportant 2 Neither Important or unimportant 3 Very Important 4 Extremely Important 5

	Mean (1-5)	Important	Neutral	Unimportant
How important is it to you that your department understands your needs when it comes to:				
Programs and services to help employees balance work and family responsibilities	3.7	64%	28%	8%
Policies that help employees balance work and family responsibilities	3.9	72%	21%	7%
Training	4.1	87%	9%	4%
Career ladders	4.1	79%	15%	6%
Job Flexibility	4.2	86%	10%	4%
Tuition assistance/discounts	3.8	63%	26%	11%
Expanded health insurance benefits coverage	3.6	58%	25%	17%
Child care	3.3	45%	32%	23%
Back up child care	3.2	41%	35%	24%
Financial support for adoption	2.8	25%	41%	34%
Infant care	3.1	40%	34%	26%
Elder care	3.4	50%	30%	20%
Family friendly spaces on campus	3.4	51%	31%	18%
Parking	4.2	82%	12%	6%

Which of these services do you believe the university should explore to help employees manage work-family concerns	
Job Flexibility	56%
Parking	50%
Tuition assistance/discounts	44%
Career ladders	43%
Training	42%
Policies that help employees balance work and family responsibilities	41%
Programs and services to help employees balance work and family responsibilities	37%
Expanded health insurance benefits coverage	30%
Child care	29%
Elder care	25%
Back up child care	20%
Family friendly spaces on campus	24%
Infant care	22%
Financial support for adoption	10%

There appears to be greatest interest in the university offering job flexibility, parking, tuition assistance, career ladders, training, and policies aimed at work-family balance. Adoption support and infant care received the least amount of support, but this likely reflects that such programs would be of value to a smaller proportion of employees.

Manager – University Services

Not important at all 1 Very unimportant 2 Neither Important or unimportant 3 Very Important 4 Extremely Important 5

	Mean (1-5)	Important	Neutral	Unimportant
How important is it to you that your department understands your needs when it comes to:				
Programs and services to help employees balance work and family responsibilities	3.8	69%	25%	6%
Policies that help employees balance work and family responsibilities	4.0	78%	16%	6%
Training	4.1	83%	14%	3%
Career ladders	3.8	70%	23%	7%
Job Flexibility	4.2	87%	12%	1%
Tuition assistance/discounts	3.6	59%	27%	14%
Expanded health insurance benefits coverage	3.1	43%	25%	32%
Child care	2.9	40%	25%	35%
Back up child care	2.8	35%	29%	36%
Financial support for adoption	2.3	17%	30%	53%
Infant care	2.7	31%	29%	40%
Elder care	3.1	41%	32%	27%
Family friendly spaces on campus	3.0	37%	37%	26%
Parking	4.1	78%	16%	6%

Which of these services do you believe the university should explore to help employees manage work-family concerns	
Job flexibility	55%
Policies that help employees balance work and family responsibilities	49%
Tuition assistance /discounts	46%
Parking	44%
Programs and services to help employees balance work and family responsibilities	40%
Training	33%
Career ladders	32%
Child care	25%
Expanded health insurance benefits coverage (Domestic Partner or Plus One, meaning insurance coverage for other than immediate family members as defined by State law)	23%
Family friendly spaces on campus	19%
Elder care	19%
Back up child care	18%
Infant care	17%
Financial Support for Adoption	6%

There appears to be greatest interest in the university offering job flexibility, tuition assistance, parking, training, and policies aimed at work-family balance. Adoption support and infant care (and child care generally) again received the least amount of support, but this again likely reflects that such programs would be of value to a smaller proportion of employees.

Staff – Diversity/Discrimination Concerns

Very Dissatisfied 1 Dissatisfied 2 Neutral 3 Satisfied 4 Very Satisfied 5

Satisfaction with Campus	Mean (1-5)
Overall sense of community	3.9
Racial/ethnic diversity of the student body	3.4
Racial/ethnic diversity of the staff	3.4
Racial/ethnic diversity of the faculty	3.4
Interactions among different racial/ethnic groups	3.4
Atmosphere for political differences	3.1
Atmosphere for religious differences	3.2
Administrative response to incidents of discrimination	3.3
Campus-wide respect for the expression of diverse beliefs and experiences	3.3

Respondents appear to be neutral/to somewhat satisfied with racial/ethnic diversity on campus and particularly satisfied with the overall sense of community. Political and religious acceptance is somewhat lower.

Have you experienced any job-related discrimination at Texas A&M within the past one year	% mentioning
Race (39% hispanic; 29% white; 26% black; 6% asian)	2.6%
Gender (92% female; 8% male)	2.3%
Age (59% 40 and above; 41% below 40)	1.2%
Religion	1.1%
National Origin	0.7%
Color	0.6%
Disability	0.3%
Sexual Orientation	0.3%
Veteran status	0.2%

Race and gender were the two attributes that employees felt most frequently discriminated upon. As can be seen in the table, Caucasians report feeling discriminated against slightly more so than African-Americans. This result may be due to perceptions of how Affirmative Action or EEO programs are administered. Hispanics were most likely to feel racial discrimination. And, clearly, Females were most likely to feel gender discrimination. The results for age are somewhat surprising given that many of those feeling discrimination are below 40, whom would not be covered under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

Manager – Diversity/Discrimination Concerns

Very Dissatisfied 1 Dissatisfied 2 Neutral 3 Satisfied 4 Very Satisfied 5

Satisfaction with Campus	Mean (1-5)
Overall sense of community	3.9
Racial/ethnic diversity of the student body	2.9
Racial/ethnic diversity of the staff	3.1
Racial/ethnic diversity of the faculty	3.0
Interactions among different racial/ethnic groups	3.0
Atmosphere for political differences	2.9
Atmosphere for religious differences	3.0
Administrative response to incidents of discrimination	3.4
Campus-wide respect for the expression of diverse beliefs and experiences	3.0

Manager respondents reported somewhat greater concerns with racial/ethnic diversity on campus but were similarly satisfied with the overall sense of community. Concerns with political and religious acceptance are similar to staff respondents, but managers did report lower overall (i.e., “campus-wide”) respect for expression of diversity compared to staff respondents.

Have you experienced any job-related discrimination at Texas A&M within the past one year	% mentioning
Race (50%Hispanic, 33% black, 17% white)	2.1%
Gender (83% female; 17% male)	2.1%
Age (67% over 40; 33% below 40)	1.0%
Religion	0.3%
National Origin	0.3%
Color	0.3%
Disability	0.3%
Sexual Orientation	0.0%
Veteran status	0.0%

Consistent with the staff, race and gender were the two attributes that employees felt most frequently discriminated upon. And, like the staff, Hispanics were most likely to feel racial discrimination, though white managers were somewhat less likely and black managers somewhat more likely to feel racial discrimination relative to the staff respondents. And, again, Females were most likely to feel gender discrimination

Staff - Sexual Harassment

Within the past <u>one</u> year, have you experienced any unwanted and uninvited sexual attention at Texas A&M?	
Yes (71% female)	2%
No	98%

If you have experienced discrimination or experienced unwanted and uninvited sexual attention at Texas A&M in the past year, did you report it?	
Yes	15%
No	85%

Do you know a Texas A&M University staff member who has experienced one or more of the above situations or behaviors?	
Yes	21%
No	79%

The frequency of potential sexual harassment incidents is consistent with the prior (2006) survey. And, not surprisingly, women are more likely to perceive unwanted sexual attention than men. The vast majority of respondents that perceived unwanted sexual attention did not report it. And, the results suggest that more people know of someone that either experienced potential discrimination and/or unwanted sexual attention than experienced it personally.

Manager - Sexual Harassment

Within the past <u>one</u> year, have you experienced any unwanted and uninvited sexual attention at Texas A&M?	
Yes (80% female)	5%
No	95%

If you have experienced discrimination or experienced unwanted and uninvited sexual attention at Texas A&M in the past year, did you report it?	
Yes	13%
No	87%

Do you know a Texas A&M University staff member who has experienced one or more of the above situations or behaviors?	
Yes	29%
No	71%

The frequency of potential sexual harassment incidents is again quite consistent with the prior (2007) survey. And, not surprisingly, women are more likely to perceive unwanted sexual attention than men (though the percentage of women indicating a potential incident seems to have gone up since the 2007 survey). Like the staff respondents, the vast majority of respondents that perceived unwanted sexual attention did not report it. And, like the staff respondents, the results suggest that more managers know of someone that either experienced potential discrimination and/or unwanted sexual attention than experienced it personally.

Staff – Survey Responses by Demographic Group: Age

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Attribute	< 40	>= 40
Satisfied with Pay	3.3	3.3
Satisfied with Supervisor	4.8	4.7
Satisfied with Coworkers	4.4	4.5
Satisfied with Work Itself	4.8	4.9
Satisfied with Voice Opportunities	4.0	3.9
Satisfied with Promotion Opportunities	3.2	3.0
Satisfied with Development	4.3	4.2
Career Satisfaction	4.3	4.1
Abusive Supervision	1.7	1.7
Embeddedness	4.4	4.5
Positive Image/Reputation	4.9	4.9
Pride in Org	5.2	5.1
Perceived Org. Support	4.2	4.1
Committed to Organization	4.1	4.2
Engaging in Job Search Behaviors*	2.2	2.0
Perceived Employment Alternatives	3.3	3.6
Job Insecurity	3.2	3.4
Intent to Exit	3.0	2.6
Voice	3.4	3.4
Loyalty	4.0	4.0
Neglect	2.1	1.8
Org Respects Diversity	4.0	4.0
Work-Life Conflict	3.0	2.9

Yellow Highlight: Meaningfully lower than other group

Staff employees under 40 perceive somewhat lower alternative employment opportunities, report higher intent to quit, and greater likelihood of letting deleterious working conditions deteriorate (e.g., ignore, withdraw, less effort).

Manager – Survey Responses by Demographic Group: Age

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Attribute	< 40	>= 40
Satisfied with Pay	3.6	3.6
Satisfied with Supervisor	5.1	4.9
Satisfied with Coworkers	4.6	4.7
Satisfied with Work Itself	4.9	5.0
Satisfied with Voice Opportunities	4.2	4.2
Satisfied with Promotion Opportunities	3.4	3.4
Satisfied with Development	4.5	4.3
Career Satisfaction	4.4	4.5
Abusive Supervision	1.6	1.5
Embeddedness	4.4	4.5
Positive Image/Reputation	4.6	4.8
Pride in Org	5.2	5.0
Perceived Org. Support	4.2	4.2
Committed to Organization	4.2	4.2
Engaging in Job Search Behaviors*	2.3	1.7
Perceived Employment Alternatives	3.5	3.4
Job Insecurity	3.2	3.1
Intent to Exit	3.1	2.6
Voice	3.7	3.7
Loyalty	3.9	4.0
Neglect	1.8	1.7
Org Respects Diversity	4.4	4.3
Work-Life Conflict	4.1	3.9

Yellow Highlight: Meaningfully lower than other group

Managers over 40 perceived somewhat lower intent to quit and fewer job search behaviors. This is consistent with prior research showing older workers are typically less likely to quit/intend to quit their jobs.

Staff – Survey Responses by Demographic Group: Race

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Attribute	White	Black	Hispanic	Other
Satisfied with Pay	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.5
Satisfied with Supervisor	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.6
Satisfied with Coworkers	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.5
Satisfied with Work Itself	4.8	4.6	4.9	4.9
Satisfied with Voice Opportunities	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0
Satisfied with Promotion Opportunities	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.0
Satisfied with Development	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1
Career Satisfaction	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.1
Abusive Supervision	1.6	2.0	1.8	1.7
Embeddedness	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3
Positive Image/Reputation	4.9	4.7	5.0	4.9
Pride in org	5.2	5.0	5.2	5.2
Perceived Org. Support	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2
Committed to Organization	4.2	3.8	4.2	4.2
Engaging in Job Search Behaviors*	2.0	2.5	2.2	2.1
Perceived Employment Alternatives	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.5
Job Insecurity	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.3
Intent to Exit	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.8
Voice	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.4
Loyalty	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.0
Neglect	1.9	2.1	2.0	1.9
Org Respects Diversity	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.9
Work-Life Conflict	3.0	2.4	2.7	2.8

Green Highlight: Meaningfully higher than whites; Yellow Highlight: Meaningfully lower than whites

Black respondents reported lower career satisfaction, higher abusive supervision, lower commitment to the organization, and lower work-life conflict than white respondents. Hispanics also reported somewhat lower work-life conflict than white respondents.

Manager – Survey Responses by Demographic Group: Race

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Attribute	White	Black	Hispanic	Other
Satisfied with Pay	3.8	3.1	3.7	2.8
Satisfied with Supervisor	5.0	5.3	5.0	4.1
Satisfied with Coworkers	4.8	4.4	4.3	3.7
Satisfied with Work Itself	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.6
Satisfied with Voice Opportunities	4.3	4.2	4.4	3.8
Satisfied with Promotion Opportunities	3.6	3.4	3.2	2.5
Satisfied with Development	4.5	4.4	4.3	3.8
Career Satisfaction	4.7	4.0	4.5	3.8
Abusive Supervision	1.5	1.4	1.5	2.3
Embeddedness	4.7	4.1	4.6	4.1
Positive Image/Reputation	4.9	4.2	4.9	4.6
Pride in org	5.2	4.6	5.2	5.3
Perceived Org. Support	4.4	4.3	4.3	3.6
Committed to Organization	4.4	3.5	4.5	4.3
Engaging in Job Search Behaviors*	1.7	1.8	1.8	2.2
Perceived Employment Alternatives	3.4	3.4	3.6	2.9
Job Insecurity	3.1	3.3	3.2	3.1
Intent to Exit	2.5	3.2	2.5	3.8
Voice	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.9
Loyalty	4.1	3.7	4.1	4.1
Neglect	1.7	1.7	1.6	2.2
Org Respects Diversity	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4
Work-Life Conflict	3.8	4.3	3.6	3.5

Green Highlight: Meaningfully higher than whites; Yellow Highlight: Meaningfully lower than whites

There appears to be a significant difference between white managers and black and “other” managers in their job/organizational attitudes. Black managers and those from “other” racial groups reported significant lower satisfaction with multiple work elements (e.g., pay, coworkers, work itself), lower embeddedness, and higher intent to quit. Managers that are members of the “other” racial group seem particularly unhappy with their work situation, reporting fairly high abusive supervision, very low satisfaction with promotion opportunities and development, low perceived support from the organization, and higher likelihood of letting deleterious working conditions deteriorate (e.g., ignore, withdraw, less effort). These managers are also more actively searching for a new job, yet they perceive fewer opportunities. The racial differences in job/organizational attitudes for this population (i.e., managers) should be a significant concern.

Staff – Survey Responses by Demographic Group: Gender

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Attribute	Male	Female
Satisfied with Pay	3.2	3.3
Satisfied with Supervisor	4.7	4.8
Satisfied with Coworkers	4.4	4.5
Satisfied with Work Itself	4.8	4.9
Satisfied with Voice Opportunities	4.0	3.9
Satisfied with Promotion Opportunities	3.0	3.1
Satisfied with Development	4.1	4.3
Career Satisfaction	4.0	4.2
Abusive Supervision	1.7	1.7
Embeddedness	4.5	4.4
Positive Image/Reputation	4.8	4.9
Pride in Org	5.1	5.1
Perceived Org. Support	4.1	4.2
Committed to Organization	4.1	4.1
Engaging in Job Search Behaviors*	2.2	2.0
Perceived Employment Alternatives	3.3	3.6
Job Insecurity	3.3	3.3
Intent to Exit	2.9	2.7
Voice	3.5	3.3
Loyalty	3.9	4.0
Neglect	2.0	1.9
Org Respects Diversity	3.9	4.0
Work-Life Conflict	3.1	2.9

Yellow Highlight: Meaningfully lower than other group

The responses across gender groups are quite similar. This is in contrast to the 2006 survey where males indicated somewhat lower job attitudes and greater forces driving them to leave. Interestingly, males do perceive somewhat lower alternative employment opportunities, which may be facilitating more positive attitudes toward their present employer (the university).

Manager – Survey Responses by Demographic Group: Gender

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Attribute	Male	Female
Satisfied with Pay	3.8	3.8
Satisfied with Supervisor	5.0	5.0
Satisfied with Coworkers	4.8	4.7
Satisfied with Work Itself	5.1	4.9
Satisfied with Voice Opportunities	4.3	4.2
Satisfied with Promotion Opportunities	3.7	3.4
Satisfied with Development	4.5	4.4
Career Satisfaction	4.6	4.5
Abusive Supervision	1.4	1.5
Embeddedness	4.6	4.6
Positive Image/Reputation	4.9	4.8
Pride in Org	5.3	5.1
Perceived Org. Support	4.5	4.2
Committed to Organization	4.4	4.3
Engaging in Job Search Behaviors*	1.6	1.8
Perceived Employment Alternatives	3.3	3.5
Job Insecurity	3.0	3.3
Intent to Exit	2.5	2.7
Voice	3.7	3.7
Loyalty	4.1	4.0
Neglect	1.7	1.7
Org Respects Diversity	4.2	4.4
Work-Life Conflict	3.9	3.8

Yellow Highlight: Meaningfully lower than other group

Like the staff respondents, the responses across gender groups are quite similar. This is consistent with the 2007 survey where males and females only differed on empowerment and employment opportunities (females reported less of both). Here, females report somewhat lower satisfaction with promotion opportunities as well as lower support from the organization/university.

Staff – Survey Responses by Demographic Group: Classified vs. Nonclassified

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Attribute	Classified	NonClassified
Satisfied with Pay	3.1	3.3
Satisfied with Supervisor	4.7	4.9
Satisfied with Coworkers	4.4	4.6
Satisfied with Work Itself	4.9	4.9
Satisfied with Voice Opportunities	3.9	4.0
Satisfied with Promotion Opportunities	2.9	3.2
Satisfied with Development	4.1	4.3
Career Satisfaction	3.9	4.3
Abusive Supervision	1.9	1.6
Embeddedness	4.5	4.4
Positive Image/Reputation	5.0	4.8
Pride in Org	5.3	5.1
Perceived Org. Support	4.2	4.2
Committed to Organization	4.3	4.1
Engaging in Job Search Behaviors*	2.1	2.0
Perceived Employment Alternatives	3.7	3.5
Job Insecurity	3.4	3.3
Intent to Exit	2.6	2.8
Voice	3.3	3.4
Loyalty	4.2	4.0
Neglect	1.8	1.9
Org Respects Diversity	4.0	4.0
Work-Life Conflict	2.6	3.1

Yellow Highlight: Meaningfully lower than other group

Classified employees reported somewhat lower satisfaction with promotion opportunities and, relatedly, lower career satisfaction. These employees also reported higher abusive supervisors but lower work-life conflict.

Manager were also asked the following questions (not asked of staff employees)

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Slightly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6

Please indicate the extent to which the following are sufficient and accessible for you to do your job...	Mean (1-6)
Personnel policy information/resources	4.8
Financial policy information	4.5
Budgetary support/resources	4.1
Support from university services departments	4.4
Materials, supplies	5.0
Tools, equipment	5.0
Preparation through training, education, past job experience, etc.	4.9
Availability of time	4.2
Helpful/supportive work environment	4.7
Personnel Resources	
I have the right mix of knowledge, skills, and abilities among my employees to meet my department's goals and objectives.	5.2
I have the right mix of knowledge, skills, and abilities among my employees to meet my department's future goals and objectives.	4.9
My employees have the technology skills and abilities to assess and revise work processes for continuous improvement.	4.7

Budgetary support and availability of time received the lowest ratings in terms of sufficiency to do their job.