



2017 Campus Climate/Work-life Survey

Final Report - 2018

Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Equity

Survey and Report Developed By:

Emily Berg, Director, Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Kara Gravley-Stack, Deputy Title IX Coordinator – Campus Diversity Initiatives

Table of Contents

Campus Climate/Work-life Survey.....	3
Executive Summary	4
Historical Context	5
2017 Survey Administration	6
Survey Participants.....	6
Summary of Results	8
Campus Climate	8
Treatment by Others.....	12
Departmental Support for Employees	17
Sexual Harassment	17
Hostile or Intimidating Behavior.....	18
Experiencing Sexual Harassment and/or Hostile or Intimidating Behavior	20
Reporting Sexual Harassment and/or Hostile or Intimidating Behavior.....	23
Job Satisfaction	23
Work-life Balance	28
NDSU Programs to Address Climate and Work-life Balance	30
Employee Morale	32
Summary of Findings.....	33
Areas of Strength.....	33
Areas for Improvement	33
Next Steps	34
NDSU Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan	35
Provocative Proposition	35
Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan	35

List of Tables

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents	6
Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Staff Respondents by Position Type	7
Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of Faculty Respondents by Rank, Tenure Status, and Administrative Appointment	8
Table 4. The climate at NDSU is... ..	9
Table 5. Perceptions of climate from traditionally underrepresented perspectives. (Extremely Good and Moderately Good)	11
Table 6. 1 Interactions with others at the university. (Strongly Agree and Agree)	12
Table 7. 1 Interactions with Colleagues by Underrepresented Identity Group. (Strongly Agree and Agree).....	13
Table 8. 1 Interactions with Colleagues by Position Type. (Strongly Agree and Agree).....	15
Table 9. 1 Departmental Support for Diverse Employees* (Strongly Agree and Agree)	16
Table 10. 1 Sexual Harassment / Hostile or Intimidating Behavior is Taken Seriously. (Strongly Agree and Agree).....	19
Table 11. 1 Frequency of Experiencing Sexual Harassment or Hostile/Intimidating Behavior... ..	21
Table 12. 1 I know the steps to take when... (Strongly Agree and Agree)	23
Table 13. 1 Who has Considered Leaving NDSU	24
Table 14. 1 Top 10 Reasons for Leaving.....	25
Table 15. 1 Top 10 Reasons for Staying.....	27
Table 16. 1 Work-life Balance. (Strongly Agree or Agree)	29
Table 17. 1 University Programs and Resources to Improve the Working Environment.	30
Table 18. 1 Coded Responses to Additional Career Support Measures	31

Campus Climate/Work-life Survey

Executive Summary

North Dakota State University is a student-focused, land-grant, Research University. One of the seven core values of NDSU is its people. This core value is expressed by the university as such,

“We derive strength and vitality from each other and from the diverse communities we serve. We envision an academic and social environment that is conducive to intellectual and personal development by promoting the safety and welfare of all members of the university community. We promote excellence through individuals participating in decisions and value cooperation for the common good.”

In order to sustain this core value throughout the campus, an action plan was created in 2017 focusing on NDSU Campus wide Diversity and Inclusion. The 2017 Campus Climate/Work-life Survey was included as a part of this action plan. The results of this survey were intended to provide an understanding of the current campus climate and work-life balance according to university staff and faculty.

Prior to the current survey three previous campus climate assessments for diversity were conducted, the results of which were used to measure the campus climate over the years. Responses were disaggregated based on respondents' identities as staff or faculty as well as their identities in relation to underrepresented groups, including: people of color; sexual orientation minorities; women; international people; and those with disabilities/chronic health conditions

Participants responded to a series of questions pertaining to their identities and experiences on campus and their perceptions of the experiences of members of each of these underrepresented groups. They were also asked if they have ever witnessed or personally experienced sexual harassment or hostile behavior, and if they know how to report it.

The results from this survey, having been consistent with results from the previous surveys, pointed out areas in which the university may require additional attention to ensure the core values were met. Though a majority of staff and faculty indicated that the climate was either extremely or moderately good, throughout the survey a higher percentage of underrepresented individuals reported feelings of isolation and exclusion. Additionally, respondents across all survey demographics reported feeling under-appreciated for their contributions.

The survey results indicated that more staff and faculty knew the steps to report sexual harassment than to report hostile or intimidating behaviors. Results showed that a vast majority of underrepresented respondents reported having never experienced sexual harassment. However, a smaller percentage of underrepresented respondents reported having never experienced hostile or intimidating behaviors.

The next steps to improve the campus climate and work-life balance will need to focus on using the data collected from this survey as a basis of understanding to help direct which areas require the most focus. For example, efforts to educate about the steps to take to report hostile and intimidating behaviors, as well as steps to lowering the frequency of this occurrence, are critical. Additionally, action should be taken to address the feelings of under-appreciation for contributions within departments/units across the entire campus. Ultimately, the survey responses affirm how beneficial the implementation of the strategies discussed within the action plan will be to improve the campus climate and work-life balance experience at NDSU.

Historical Context

College campuses provide a unique and complex social setting in which organizational culture impacts the learning and working environment for all community members – faculty, staff, and students. Kuh and Whitt (1988) defined culture as “persistent patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that shape the behavior of individuals and groups in a college or university and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off the campus” (p. 6). A campus culture that supports and welcomes diversity is increasingly important in creating a climate that supports and enhances diversity for faculty, staff, and students. This importance is underscored as we become a more diverse and global society.

A significant body of educational research (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000; Harper, 2013; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998; Swarz, 2009) has focused on the specific impact that campus climate for diversity has on underrepresented, diverse individuals. Campuses that are perceived as being welcoming and supportive of diversity are valued and sought after by both students and employees.

North Dakota State University has conducted three prior campus climate assessments for diversity. In 2003 and 2009, the President’s Diversity Council contracted with Rankin &

Associates Consulting to assess the campus climate and to offer recommendations that lead to the development of the 2005-2010 *Strategic Plan for Diversity, Equity, and Community*. In 2014, a third campus climate assessment was conducted utilizing an internal team of faculty and staff to develop, implement, and analyze the survey results. Parallel efforts by NDSU FORWARD were focused on assessing the campus climate for women faculty through Work Life surveys implemented in 2008-2009 and in 2013.

2017 Survey Administration

In September and October 2017, the Equity Office and the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis launched a Campus Climate/Work-life Survey for faculty and staff. This instrument combined some items from each of the previous surveys to assess work-life balance and experiences with campus climate at NDSU. Key considerations in evaluating the instrument included survey length, response rates, and the need to provide results to inform institutional efforts for diversity and inclusion. The resulting two instruments, one each for faculty and staff, were administered utilizing Qualtrics software. The survey launched on September 11 and closed on October 31.

Survey Participants

Survey participants were identified as those staff and faculty who completed the first block of questions; those who did not complete the first block of questions were removed from the data set. The resulting survey response rate was 30% (508 actual respondents) for staff and 40% (274 actual respondents) for faculty. Participant demographics were summarized in Table 1. While it was unclear as to why some respondents chose not to answer demographic questions, two potential reasons were (1) demographic questions were asked at the end of the survey so respondents may have quit before reaching that section and (2) some respondents may have been concerned that answering demographic questions would leave them identifiable by the survey team. In order to protect identities of survey respondents, results were not reported on any survey items with fewer than five respondents. Whatever the reason for the missing demographic information, that factor should be taken into consideration when reviewing the survey results.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

	Staff		Faculty	
	Number	% of Respondents	Number	% of Respondents
People of color	31	6.1%	15	5.5%
White people	374	73.6%	190	69.3%
Sexual orientation minority	11	2.2%	6	2.2%
Heterosexual	393	77.4%	198	72.3%
Women	307	60.4%	124	45.3%
Men	109	21.5%	88	32.2%
Transgender	0		0	
U.S. born citizen	418	82.3%	192	70.1%
Naturalized citizen	11	2.2%	23	8.4%
Not a U.S. citizen	8	1.6%	18	6.6%
Providing care/managing affairs for aging/ill parent/relative	94	18.5%	47	17.2%
Caring for dependent child(ren)	193	38.0%	126	46.0%
Disability/chronic health condition	84	16.5%	35	12.8%

Staff respondents, based on position type, are noted in Table 2 below. In later analyses, these categories will be combined into three groups: 0000-3000 bands; 4000-5000 bands; and, 6000-7000 bands. Similarly, Table 3 illustrates faculty respondents based on the demographics of rank, tenure status, and whether they hold an administrative position.

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Staff Respondents by Position Type

Job Band (Number)	Staff	
	Number	% of Respondents
Executive (0000)	8	1.8%
Administrative/Managerial (1000)	32	7.4%
Academic (2000)	17	3.9%
Professional (3000)	194	44.6%
Technical/Paraprofessional (4000)	71	16.3%
Office Support (5000)	75	17.2%
Crafts/Trades (6000)	6	1.4%
Services (7000)	20	4.6%

Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of Faculty Respondents by Rank, Tenure Status, and Administrative Appointment

	Faculty	
	Number	% of Respondents
Full Professor	64	28.3%
Associate Professor	69	29.1%
Assistant Professor	46	19.4%
Assistant/Associate/Full Professor of Practice	19	8.0%
Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Instructor	26	11.0%
Tenured	134	55.8%
Tenure-track	47	19.6%
Non-tenure Track	55	22.9%
Full-time Administrative Position	11	4.6%
Part-time Administrative Position	38	16.0%
No Administrative Position	189	79.4%

Summary of Results

Campus Climate

The survey defined campus climate as “behaviors within a workplace or learning environment, ranging from subtle to cumulative to dramatic, that can influence whether an individual feels personally safe, listened to, valued, and treated fairly and with respect.” Based upon this definition, survey respondents answer items related to their perceptions of the overall climate, as well as the climate for specifically identified underrepresented populations, including women, people of color, LGBT people, international people, and people with disabilities.

Survey respondents appeared to agree with the overall campus climate, as well as the climate for specific underrepresented identity groups at the university, though staff tended to provide more positive responses than faculty (Table 4). In terms of the overall climate, a majority of staff (63.5%) and faculty (52.2%) rated the overall climate as extremely or moderately good while a significantly smaller group of staff (13.2%) and faculty (17.9%) indicated that the climate was extremely or moderately bad. Similarly, a majority of staff

(60.9%) and faculty (51.3%) also viewed the climate as extremely or moderately good for women. When asked about other traditionally underrepresented groups, the responses were less positive and, in some cases, considerable variation between staff and faculty responses were found. Additionally, a large percentage of both faculty and staff reported “I don’t know” about the climate for people of color, LGBT people, international people, and people with disabilities.

Table 4. The climate at NDSU is...

	“Extremely or moderately good”		“Extremely or moderately bad”		“I don’t know”	
	All Staff*	All Faculty*	All Staff*	All Faculty*	All Staff*	All Faculty*
Overall	63.5%	52.2%	13.2%	17.9%	2.1%	0.0%
Women	60.9%	51.3%	7.2%	15.6%	10.1%	14.1%
People of color	38.9%	23.1%	2.9%	8.6%	47.3%	53.5%
LGBT people	33.4%	20.8%	4.3%	6.3%	54.2%	62.5%
International people	41.3%	35.6%	3.3%	9.6%	46.0%	40.0%
People with disabilities	34.8%	16.8%	3.1%	5.2%	53.5%	68.7%

**Staff were asked to respond with regard to staff; faculty were asked to respond with regard to faculty.*

Survey responses were disaggregated to allow for analysis of how staff and faculty who identified within one or more traditionally underrepresented group (i.e., people of color, LGB people, international people, people with disabilities) responded to questions about campus climate (Table 5). Some differences in response trends emerged from this analysis. For example, with the exception of staff of color, staff who identified as a specific underrepresented group were less likely to report that the climate for their group was extremely or moderately good when compared to peers who did not identify as part of those population groups. In contrast, faculty who identified as LGB, international, or having a disability/chronic health condition were more likely to report that the climate for their respective groups was extremely or moderately good when compared to peers who did not identify with those population groups.

When comparing staff and faculty responses to these survey items, staff who identified as either women or as having a disability/chronic health condition were more likely than their faculty peers to report that overall climate, as well as climate for each underrepresented population, was extremely or moderately good. Similar comparisons between faculty and staff in

other underrepresented populations were more difficult to make, based on our inability to report data for groups with fewer than five survey respondents. However, it appeared that in general, staff had a more positive perception of the campus climate than faculty, relative to both overall climate and the climate for each underrepresented group.

Table 5. Perceptions of climate from traditionally underrepresented perspectives. (Extremely Good and Moderately Good)

	Women		People of Color		LGB People		Not U.S. Citizen		Disability/Chronic Condition	
	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty
Overall climate	66.8% n = 283	51.8% n = 110	48.1% n = 28	50.0% n = 14	72.7% n = 11	53.0% n = 6	50.0% n = 8	66.7% n = 18	64.9% n = 74	46.7% n = 31
Climate for women	65.5% n = 293	50.5% n = 122	83.3% n = 25	50.0% n = 11	72.7% n = 11	51.5% n = 6	83.3% n = 6	38.9% n = 11	67.1% n = 73	42.4% n = 30
Climate for people of color	76.0% n = 154	11.4% n = 45	60.9% n = 24	40.0% n = 13	50.0% n = 6	**	50.0% n = 6	44.4% n = 11	69.0% n = 42	20.6% n = 17
Climate for LGBT people	75.3% n = 132	15.3% n = 46	66.7% n = 16	**	50.0% n = 8	20.4% n = 5	**	**	68.2% n = 44	17.6% n = 12
Climate for international people	76.2% n = 164	23.4% n = 54	59.1% n = 23	46.7% n = 14	33.3% n = 6	**	25.0% n = 8	61.1% n = 18	76.2% n = 42	38.2% n = 22
Climate for people with disabilities	73.3% n = 131	12.1% n = 35	73.3% n = 16	**	66.7% n = 6	**	**	**	65.2% n = 46	20.6% n = 15

*Staff were asked to respond with regard to staff; faculty were asked to respond with regard to faculty.

**Data exist, however were not reported, for fewer than 5 respondents.

“The climate within the department has been first rate; however, it is shifting as morale flags with the deep losses [in] personnel.” - Faculty

Treatment by Others

Staff and faculty responded to survey items related to their personal treatment at the university, primarily in terms of interpersonal interactions with others. As noted in Table 6, the majority of staff and faculty agreed or strongly agreed with positively worded items related to “I am treated with respect” by others. In response to negatively worded items related to feelings of exclusion from informal networks and isolation within their departments, a small percentage of staff and faculty reported agreement or strong agreement. However, a higher percentage, though still less than a majority, of staff and faculty agreed or strongly agreed that they encountered unwritten rules (29.1% staff; 27.3% faculty) and that they believed their work was not recognized within their department/unit (33.8% staff; 43.7% faculty).

Table 6. Interactions with others at the university. (Strongly Agree and Agree)

	All Staff*	All Faculty*
I am treated with respect by the colleagues in my unit	82.3%	74.9%
I am treated with respect by my supervisor	81.3%	79.6%
I am treated with respect by faculty/staff*	67.3%	89.6%
I am treated with respect by students	84.2%	85.8%
I am treated with respect by administrators (other than my supervisor)	73.1%	69.2%
I feel excluded from the informal networks in my department/unit	17.7%	19.4%
I encounter unwritten rules within my department/unit	29.1%	27.3%
I do a great deal of work that is not formally recognized by my department/unit	33.8%	43.7%
I feel isolated in my department/unit	15.0%	18.3%

*Staff were asked this item with relation to faculty; faculty were asked with relation to staff.

When disaggregating this data, higher percentages of underrepresented individuals at the university reported feelings of isolation and exclusion, that they experienced unwritten rules, and that they did not receive recognition for their work within their departments (Table 7). Most underrepresented staff and faculty groups reported at higher rates than their overall peer groups that they felt their work was not formally recognized within their departments. Further, both staff and faculty with a disability/chronic health condition, women faculty, and LGB staff all reported at higher rates than their peer groups on all of these negatively worded survey items.

Table 7. Interactions with Colleagues by Underrepresented Identity Group. (Strongly Agree and Agree)

	Women		People of Color		LGB People		Not U.S. Citizen		Disability/Chronic Condition	
	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty
I am treated with respect by my colleagues	82.1% n = 307	72.4% n = 123	70.4% n = 28	60.0% n = 15	63.6% n = 11	75.1% n = 6	75.0% n = 8	83.3% n = 18	74.7% n = 83	64.7% n = 35
I am treated with respect by my supervisor	82.1% n = 307	76.6% n = 124	81.5% n = 28	60.0% n = 15	63.6% n = 11	79.3% n = 6	50.0% n = 8	77.8% n = 18	75.9% n = 83	73.5% n = 35
I am treated with respect by faculty/staff*	71.7% n = 300	92.7% n = 123	63.0% n = 28	80.0% n = 15	54.5% n = 11	91.9% n = 6	62.5% n = 8	72.2% n = 18	70.4% n = 81	97.1% n = 35
I am treated with respect by students	87.5% n = 297	84.7% n = 124	88.0% n = 26	86.7% n = 15	54.5% n = 11	85.9% n = 6	87.5% n = 8	83.3% n = 18	85.2% n = 81	82.4% n = 35
I am treated with respect by administrators	76.1% n = 305	71.8% n = 124	70.4% n = 28	66.7% n = 15	63.6% n = 11	70.6% n = 6	75.0% n = 8	76.5% n = 17	73.2% n = 82	73.5% n = 35
I feel excluded from the informal networks in my department/unit	18.2% n = 307	20.2% n = 124	14.8% n = 28	33.3% n = 15	45.5% n = 11	17.7% n = 6	12.5% n = 8	16.7% n = 18	23.5% n = 83	26.5% n = 35
I encounter unwritten rules within my department/unit	28.1% n = 302	30.6% n = 124	40.7% n = 28	26.7% n = 15	36.4% n = 11	24.9% n = 6	62.5% n = 8	16.7% n = 18	39.0% n = 82	38.2% n = 35
My work is not formally recognized by my department	31.9% n = 307	47.6% n = 124	42.9% n = 29	40.0% n = 15	36.4% n = 11	44.9% n = 6	37.5% n = 8	22.2% n = 18	36.9% n = 84	58.8% n = 35
I feel isolated in my department/ unit	12.7% n = 306	20.2% n = 124	10.7% n = 29	26.7% n = 15	36.4% n = 11	16.7% n = 6	0.0% n = 8	22.2% n = 18	16.9% n = 83	23.5% n = 35

*Staff were asked to respond about treatment by faculty; faculty were asked to respond about treatment by staff.

“No one is outwardly 'hostile' in my department but they do openly exclude time after time in communication and behaviors.” - Staff

Staff and faculty responses about “treatment by others” were further analyzed based upon the type of position held at the university (Table 8). Staff responses were reviewed based upon the broadband categories assigned to their positions. Staff respondents were grouped into three employment bands: 0000-3000 (administrative, managerial, academic, and professional positions), 4000-5000 (technical/ paraprofessional and office support positions), and 6000-7000 (crafts/trades and services positions). Faculty responses were analyzed in two separate groupings, the first based on whether they held an administrative role (full-time, part-time, or no administrative role) and the second analysis was conducted for tenured/tenure-track faculty, based on identified gender.

Staff holding positions in the 0000-3000 bands were more likely to strongly agree or agree that they were treated with respect by others at the university, with the exception of their perceived treatment by students which was slightly lower than the responses from 4000-5000 band employees. However, overall there were not significant differences in responses from each of the three staff categories related to their treatment by others. Staff in the 0000-3000 bands were the least likely to indicate that they felt excluded or isolated from others in their departments. However, respondents in all three employment band categories reported encountering some unwritten rules and feeling that their contributions were not formally recognized by others in their departments.

Some variations were found in the ways that faculty responded to the “treatment by others” survey items, when analyzed based upon their reports of holding a part-time, full-time, or no administrative position. While the disparities in responses were not great, it was noted that all three groups reported lower levels of agreement about being treated with respect by administrators than by any other group of people at the university. Faculty with no administrative position were most likely to report feeling excluded and isolated in their respective departments/units while faculty with full-time administrative positions were the least likely to report this. All faculty, regardless of administrative position, reported at fairly high levels (ranging from 44.4% to 54.5%) that they felt their contributions were not recognized by others in their departments.

In terms of faculty who were in tenured/tenure-track positions compared with those who were not, there appeared to be general agreement about being treated with respect by others. A difference in responses emerged with regard to feeling respected by administrators, with those in tenured/tenure-track positions expressing less agreement on that item.

Table 8. Interactions with Colleagues by Position Type. (Strongly Agree and Agree)

	Staff			Faculty			Faculty		
	0000-3000 Band	4000-5000 Band	6000-7000 Band	No Admin Position	Part-time Admin Position	Full-time Admin Position	Tenured	Tenure Track	Not Tenure Track
I am treated with respect by my colleagues	87.3% n = 251	76.7% n = 146	72.0% n = 25	69.9% n = 186	92.1% n = 38	81.8% n = 11	73.1% n = 134	72.3% n = 47	79.6% n = 54
I am treated with respect by my supervisor	86.1% n = 251	76.7% n = 146	80.0% n = 25	75.8% n = 186	94.6% n = 37	72.7% n = 11	76.5% n = 132	78.7% n = 47	83.6% n = 55
I am treated with respect by faculty/staff*	70.7% n = 246	69.2% n = 143	54.2% n = 24	88.7% n = 186	94.7% n = 38	100.0% n = 11	88.8% n = 134	87.0% n = 46	96.4% n = 55
I am treated with respect by students	85.7% n = 245	87.2% n = 141	75.0% n = 24	83.4% n = 187	92.1% n = 38	90.9% n = 11	85.1% n = 134	80.9% n = 47	90.9% n = 55
I am treated with respect by administrators	76.9% n = 251	69.0% n = 145	72.0% n = 25	69.9% n = 186	65.8% n = 38	63.6% n = 11	63.9% n = 133	70.2% n = 47	81.8% n = 55
I feel excluded from the informal networks in my department/unit	13.3% n = 249	24.7% n = 146	28.0% n = 25	20.9% n = 187	10.5% n = 38	9.1% n = 11	22.4% n = 134	17.0% n = 47	12.7% n = 55
I encounter unwritten rules within my department/unit	28.0% n = 246	26.9% n = 145	30.8% n = 26	29.6% n = 186	13.2% n = 38	18.2% n = 11	23.3% n = 133	40.4% n = 47	20.0% n = 55
My work is not formally recognized by my department	28.7% n = 251	39.0% n = 146	38.5% n = 26	44.4% n = 187	50.0% n = 38	54.5% n = 11	46.3% n = 134	42.6% n = 47	47.3% n = 55
I feel isolated in my department/ unit	10.8% n = 250	21.2% n = 146	19.2% n = 26	21.0% n = 186	7.9% n = 38	9.1% n = 11	20.3% n = 133	20.3% n = 47	12.7% n = 55

*Staff were asked to respond about treatment by faculty; faculty were asked to respond about treatment by staff.

“It is a challenge to work at my full capacity when the faculty in my program do not view me as being a valuable part of our program or as an equal.” - Faculty

Table 9. Departmental Support for Diverse Employees* (Strongly Agree and Agree)

	Women		People of Color		LGB People		Not U.S. Citizen		Disability/Chronic Condition	
	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty
My department has taken steps to enhance the climate for diverse employees*	71.6% n = 208	31.7% n = 97	71.4% n = 22	33.3% n = 10	40.0% n = 10	37.1% n = 5	50.0% n = 6	33.3% n = 15	61.0% n = 59	33.3% n = 31
My department actively supports diverse employees*	78.2% n = 234	40.7% n = 104	62.5% n = 25	40.0% n = 12	62.5% n = 8	49.5% n = 5	66.7% n = 6	50.0% n = 16	66.2% n = 65	54.5% n = 34

**Staff were asked to respond with regard to diverse staff; faculty were asked to respond with regard to diverse faculty.*

Departmental Support for Employees

Respondents were asked about evidence of departmental support for diverse employees and the results were summarized on Table 9. Staff in all identity groups reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that their respective departments/units (a) had taken steps to enhance the climate for diverse staff members and (b) actively supported diverse staff members. Conversely, faculty in all identity groups reported agreement with these statements at a considerably lower level. Notably, although respondents were slightly more positive than their faculty counterparts about department efforts to enhance the climate for diverse staff members, LGB staff reported the lowest level of agreement with that statement when compared to all other staff groups.

Sexual Harassment

The survey provided a definition of sexual harassment as being “unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other unwanted conduct of a sexual nature, whether verbal, written, graphic, physical or otherwise” that was sufficiently severe, pervasive, or persistent so as to interfere with one’s employment. Based upon this definition, survey respondents were asked to answer items related to personal experiences of sexual harassment, their perceptions about how common sexual harassment was on campus, and the degree to which sexual harassment was taken seriously on campus or in their respective departments/units.

Staff and faculty were generally in agreement that sexual harassment was treated seriously on campus, though differences in levels of agreement were notable when looking specifically at the staff and faculty responses disaggregated relative to gender, sexual orientation, and racial identity (Table 10). With the exception of LGB staff, all other groups of staff were more likely to agree or strongly agree about sexual harassment being taken seriously on campus and within their departments. Faculty of color were the least likely to indicate that sexual harassment was taken seriously, either on campus or in their departments, followed by women faculty.

With the exception of LGB staff, all other staff and faculty group responses indicated the belief that sexual harassment was treated more seriously in their respective departments/units than in the overall campus. Interestingly, all staff groups were also more likely than their faculty

counterparts to indicate that sexual harassment was common in their departments; in some cases (i.e., staff of color vs. faculty of color) the response gaps were quite large.

Hostile or Intimidating Behavior

The survey provided a definition of hostile or intimidating behavior as being “unwelcome behavior pervasive or severe enough that a reasonable person would find it hostile and/or intimidating and that does not further the university’s academic or operational interests.” Based upon this definition, survey respondents were asked to answer items related to personal experiences with hostile or intimidating behavior on campus or in their respective department/unit or witnessing such behavior directed at someone else. Respondents were also asked their perceptions about the degree to which hostile or intimidating behavior was taken seriously on campus or in their respective departments/units.

A few interesting findings were found regarding responses about hostile or intimidating behavior. As noted in Table 10, all survey respondents were less likely to strongly agree or agree that hostile behavior was taken seriously both on campus and in their departments, than when asked the same questions with regard to sexual harassment. Staff of color responses revealed the greatest response gaps; while 88.9% of staff of color agreed that sexual harassment was treated seriously on campus, only 35% felt the same about hostile or intimidating behavior. Similarly, while 100% of staff of color indicated that sexual harassment was treated seriously in their departments/units, only 54.5% felt the same about hostile or intimidating behavior.

Additionally, all staff groups were more likely than their faculty counterparts to perceive that both the campus and their respective departments/units took hostile or intimidating behavior seriously. Finally, all faculty groups, as well as LGB staff, were more likely to indicate that hostile or intimidating behavior was common in their respective departments/units than when asked the same question about sexual harassment; in some cases the response gaps between sexual harassment and hostile/intimidating behavior were quite large.

Table 10. Sexual Harassment / Hostile or Intimidating Behavior is Taken Seriously. (Strongly Agree and Agree)

	Women		Men		LGB		Non-LGB		People of Color		White	
	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty
Sexual harassment is treated seriously on campus	81.7% n = 257	56.5% n = 100	88.7% n = 97	70.5% n = 78	60.0% n = 10	60.6% n = 6	85.3% n = 334	62.8% n = 165	88.9% n = 19	40.0% n = 9	83.8% n = 322	63.7% n = 163
Sexual harassment is treated seriously in my department/ unit	90.8% n = 251	58.9% n = 95	93.7% n = 95	80.7% n = 79	55.6% n = 9	67.2% n = 6	92.7% n = 328	68.6% n = 164	100.0% n = 20	46.7% n = 10	91.7% n = 314	69.5% n = 159
Sexual harassment is common in my department/ unit	17.6% n = 102	3.2% n = 106	26.3% n = 38	2.3% n = 80	16.7% n = 6	3.0% n = 6	20.2% n = 129	3.4% n = 174	50.5% n = 6	6.7% n = 15	18.0% n = 128	2.6% n = 165
Hostile behavior is treated seriously on campus	47.9% n = 257	25.8% n = 107	63.5% n = 96	38.6% n = 80	30.0% n = 10	31.8% n = 6	53.2% n = 31	30.0% n = 176	35.0% n = 20	20.0% n = 12	53.1% n = 318	31.1% n = 170
Hostile behavior is treated seriously in my department/ unit	60.1% n = 273	37.9% n = 113	65.7% n = 99	60.2% n = 85	50.0% n = 10	48.0% n = 6	61.7% n = 350	46.0% n = 186	54.5% n = 22	20.0% n = 11	62.6% n = 337	49.5% n = 181
Hostile behavior is common in my department	14.4% n = 292	17.7% n = 115	17.1% n = 105	6.8% n = 85	30.0% n = 10	13.6% n = 6	14.7% n = 375	12.9% n = 187	23.1% n = 26	13.3% n = 15	14.8% n = 358	13.7% n = 179

Experiencing Sexual Harassment and/or Hostile or Intimidating Behavior

Survey respondents were asked whether they had experienced either sexual harassment or hostile/intimidating behavior and, if they had, the frequency at which this behavior occurred. The responses from underrepresented staff and faculty groups were compared to all staff and faculty responses (Table 11). An analysis of this data revealed that the vast majority of underrepresented staff and faculty respondents (ranging from 72.7% to 100.0%) reported that they had never experienced sexual harassment in their departments/units. Those who had experienced sexual harassment were women staff, women faculty, and staff with a disability or chronic health condition.

Underrepresented staff and faculty responses to a similar question related to hostile/intimidating behavior revealed smaller percentages who indicated that they had never experienced hostile/intimidating behavior in their departments (ranging from 41.5% to 68.8%) or on campus (ranging from 29.4% to 68.8%). A wide range of responses was found between staff and faculty who reported never witnessing someone else experience hostile/intimidating behavior (ranging from 30.3% to 83.3%). For all three of these survey items, it was found that the two identity groups most likely to experience or witness hostile or intimidating behaviors were (1) individuals with a disability or chronic health condition and (2) women. While response rates on these survey items for other identity groups was too low to allow for analysis, it was noted that 50% of faculty who are not U.S. citizens and 37.5% of faculty of color reported witnessing hostile or intimidating behaviors directed at someone else between 3-5 times in the past three years.

“People are afraid to speak out about the unfair and bizarre targeting of individuals on campus for fear of losing their own jobs or becoming targets themselves. Individuals are even afraid to fill out this survey!” - Faculty

Table 11. Frequency of Experiencing Sexual Harassment or Hostile/Intimidating Behavior

	Women		LGB		People of Color		Not U.S. Citizens		Disability/Chronic Health Condition		All	
	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty
Personally experienced hostile or intimidating behavior on the NDSU campus												
More than 5 times	9.4% n=29	13.7% n=17	*	*	*	*	0.0% n=0	*	13.1% n=11	26.5% n=9	9.2% n=44	14.4% n=38
3-5 times	8.8% n=27	48.4% n=60	0.0% n=0	*	*	*	*	27.8% n=5	14.3% n=12	44.1% n=15	9.2% n=44	43.2% n=114
1-2 times	23.5% n=72	0.0% n=0	*	0.0% n=0	27.6% n=8	0.0% n=0	*	0.0% n=0	22.6% n=19	0.0% n=0	23.8% n=114	0.0% n=0
Never	58.3% n=179	37.9% n=47	45.5% n=5	*	51.7% n=15	68.8% n=11	62.5% n=5	61.1% n=11	50.0% n=42	29.4% n=10	57.7% n=276	42.4% n=112
Personally experienced hostile or intimidating behavior in your department/unit												
More than 5 times	9.4% n=29	12.9% n=16	*	*	*		0.0% n=0	*	14.3% n=12	23.5% n=8	9.4% n=45	11.7% n=31
3-5 times	8.8% n=27	45.2% n=56	0.0% n=0	*	*		*	*	8.3% n=7	35.3% n=12	9.4% n=45	39.4% n=104
1-2 times	23.5% n=72	0.0% n=0	45.5% n=5	0.0% n=0	20.7% n=6	0.0% n=0	*	0.0% n=0	23.8% n=20	0.0% n=0	24.5% n=117	0.0% n=0
Never	58.3% n=179	41.9% n=52	*	*	65.5% n=19		*	68.8% n=11	53.6% n=45	41.2% n=14	56.7% n=271	48.9% n=129
Witnessed hostile or intimidating behavior directed at someone else												
More than 5 times	12.7% n=39	17.9% n=22	*	*	*	*	0.0% n=0	*	15.5% n=13	33.3% n=11	11.6% n=55	16.7% n=44
3-5 times	7.8% n=24	50.4% n=62	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	*	37.5% n=6	*	50.0% n=9	11.9% n=10	36.4% n=12	10.3% n=49	47.1% n=124
1-2 times	33.2% n=102	0.0% n=0	*	0.0% n=0	27.6% n=8	0.0% n=0	*	0.0% n=0	28.6% n=24	0.0% n=0	32.8% n=156	0.0% n=0
Never	45.9% n=141	31.7% n=39	45.5% n=5	83.3% n=5	58.6% n=17	56.3% n=9	*	44.4% n=8	44.0% n=37	30.3% n=10	45.4% n=226	36.1% n=95

	Women		LGB		People of Color		Not U.S. Citizens		Disability/Chronic Health Condition		All		
	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	
Within the last three years, how often, if at all, have you experienced sexual harassment in your department/unit													
More than 5 times	*	*	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	*	*
3-5 times	*	*	*	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	*	0.0% n=0	*	*
1-2 times	5.5% n=17	7.3% n=9	*	*	0.0% n=0	*	0.0% n=0	0.0% n=0	9.6% n=8	*	5.5% n=26	4.6% n=12	
Never	93.8% n=288	90.3% n=112	72.7% n=8	83.3% n=5	100.0% n=28	93.8% n=15	100.0% n=8	100.0% n=8	89.2% n=74	94.3% n=33	93.2% n=442	93.9% n=247	

*Data exist, however were not reported, for fewer than 5 respondents.

“Within my department there are few staff members who make lewd and sometimes sexual comments regarding [others] working within the department. I find those situations to be uncomfortable as their comments are disrespectful and disgusting, but I often stay silent as to not receive ridicule for my feelings towards their comments.” - Staff

Reporting Sexual Harassment and/or Hostile or Intimidating Behavior

A high percentage of survey participants indicated that they understood the steps to take when someone reports to them experiences with sexual harassment (Table 12). While the majority of staff and faculty also reported knowing the steps to take when a report of hostile or intimidating behavior was made, the percentage of respondents who strongly agreed and agreed with this statement was (between 17 and 26 percentage points) smaller than for incidents involving sexual harassment.

Table 12. I know the steps to take when... (Strongly Agree and Agree)

	All Staff	All Faculty
Reporting sexual harassment	77.5%	79.8%
Reporting hostile or intimidating behavior	60.3%	53.6%

Job Satisfaction

When asked if they had ever considered leaving NDSU because of their work environments, 60.1% of all staff and 67.6% of all faculty indicated that they had. However, in terms of actively searching for a new position, only 14.8% of staff and 14.3% of faculty had applied for a position and 6.6% of staff and 7.5% of faculty reported that they had received an offer for a different position. When analyzing the data further (see Table 13), it was apparent that a higher percentage of LGB staff and faculty who identified as having either a disability or a chronic health condition had considered leaving the institution.

Table 13. Who has Considered Leaving NDSU

	Staff		Faculty	
	Number	% of Respondents	Number	% of Respondents
People of color	16	51.6%	5	33.3%
White people	202	54.0%	128	67.4%
Sexual orientation minority	8	72.7%	*	*
Heterosexual	215	54.7%	128	64.6%
Women	168	54.7%	84	67.7%
Men	61	56.0%	52	59.1%
U.S. born citizen	239	57.2%	128	66.7%
Naturalized citizen	*	*	15	65.2%
Not a U.S. citizen	*	*	10	55.6%
Disability/chronic health condition	55	65.5%	29	82.9%

**Data exist, however were not reported, for fewer than 5 respondents.*

Those individuals who considered leaving NDSU were asked to report on the top reasons leading them to consider leaving, as well as the top reasons for staying at the institution. In terms of reasons for leaving (Table 14), staff in all groups ranked “salary” as a top reason for considering leaving the institution, though this was tied with “work/life satisfaction” for LGB staff and with “climate of their department/unit” for staff with a disability/chronic health condition. Women faculty, faculty with a disability/chronic health condition, and faculty of color ranked “salary and benefits” as their top reasons for considering leaving NDSU. However, faculty of color and faculty who are not U.S. citizens also indicated that a “lack of support for research” was a top reason to leave NDSU.

A review of the ranked reasons to stay at NDSU for both faculty and staff (Table 15) reveal a less clear distinction between the reasons provided. Staff who are women, people of color, or have a disability/chronic health condition all indicated that “benefits” were their top reasons for remaining at the institution. Staff who are not U.S. citizens also added “colleagues in their departments/units” as a top reason for staying at NDSU. However, LGB staff responded differently than their peers, having selected only six salient reasons to stay at NDSU and all received the same low ranking (12.5%).

Table 14. Top 10 Reasons for Leaving

	Women		LGB		People of Color		Not U.S. Citizens		Disability/Chronic Health Condition		All	
	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty
Salary*	46.4%	--	50.0%	--	56.3%	--	75.0%	--	40.0%	--	17.8%	
Benefits*	--	--	12.5%		--		25.0%	--	--			
Salary and benefits+	--	35.7%	--	--	--	60.0%	--	30.0%	--	44.8%		14.1%
Climate of department/unit/lab	35.1%	33.3%	37.5%	25.0%	43.8%	20.0%	50.0%	--	40.0%	27.6%	13.9%	9.0%
Colleagues in department/unit/lab	25.0%	26.2%	12.5%	--	12.5%	--	25.0%	--	12.7%	31.0%	7.1%	8.2%
Professional relationship with supervisor	26.8%	--	37.5%	--	25.0%	--	25.0%	--	38.2%	--	9.6%	
Workload allocation	34.5%	32.1%	12.5%	25.0%	25.0%	20.0%	25.0%	--	23.6%	27.6%	11.7%	9.4%
Lack of opportunities for promotion	32.1%	--	25.0%	--	31.3%	--	--	--	25.5%	--	12.8%	
Lack of support for research	--	20.2%	--	25.0%	--	60.0%	--	40.0%	--	20.7%		8.6%
Faculty start-up	--	--	--	--	--	20.0%	--	--	--	--		
Lack of research opportunities	--	--	--	--	--	20.0%	--	--	--	--		
Opportunities available for spouse/partner	--	--	--	50.0%	--	--	--	20.0%	--	--		
Prestige of department/unit	--	--	--	25.0%	--	--	--	--	--	--		
Prestige of university	--	--	--	50.0%	--	40.0%	--	20.0%	--	--		
Quality of administrators	14.3%	16.7%	--	--	12.5%	--	25.0%	30.0%	14.5%	17.2%		9.4%
Quality of students	--	--	12.5%	--	18.8%	20.0%	25.0%	30.0%	--	--		
Quality of staff	--	--	--	--	12.5%	--	--	--	--	--		
Climate for women	4.8%	11.9%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	6.9%		
Climate for faculty of color	--	--	--	--	--	20.0%	--	--	--	--		
Work/life satisfaction	24.4%	33.3%	50.0%	25.0%	--	--	25.0%	20.0%	29.1%	20.7%	9.0%	8.6%
Availability of childcare	--	--	--	--	12.5%	--	--	--	--	--		
Geographic location	--	11.9%	12.5%	75.0%	--	20.0%	--	30.0%	7.3%	20.7%		

*Options only available to staff.

+Options only available to faculty.

Faculty reasons for remaining at NDSU were similarly diverse. Women faculty indicated that “work/life satisfaction” was the most salient reason to remain at the institution. LGB faculty, much like LGB staff, listed only five reasons to remain at NDSU, but the most highly rated reason was “quality of faculty.” Faculty of color indicated their reason for staying resulted in a tie between “opportunities available for partner/spouse” and “quality of the community.” Faculty who are not U.S. citizens agreed that “opportunities available for partner/spouse” and “quality of the community” were important, but also recorded a tie with “salaries and benefits” being the third top reason to stay at NDSU. Faculty with a disability/chronic health condition identified several reasons to consider staying at the institution, but there was no strong agreement over one or two top reasons within their listing.

Additional analysis of the reporting trends from faculty and staff on their top reasons for staying and leaving the institution revealed some patterns that should be considered. For example, “professional relationship with supervisor” was a top ten response given by all groups of staff as both a reason to leave the institution and a reason to stay; clearly, these professional relationships are salient for staff. Further, while “salary” was a top reason for staff to look for employment elsewhere, “benefits” were critical in encouraging them to remain at NDSU.

Nearly all faculty and staff indicated that “climate of department/lab/unit,” “workload allocation,” and “work/life balance” were both important reasons that impacted the consideration to leave the institution. “Workload allocation” was only listed by LGB staff, as well as several faculty groups, as a potential reason to stay. “Opportunities available for spouse/partner” was only a top reason for faculty respondents to this survey. Several other considerations were only listed by faculty as reasons to consider staying or leaving the institution; those considerations were specific to the experiences of faculty (i.e., tenure, research, teaching). However, since “opportunities available for spouse/partner” was a benefit available to both staff and faculty it was interesting that this consideration did not register as a salient reason for any staff groups. Finally, “geographic location” and “quality of the community” appeared to be important considerations for faculty and staff to remain at NDSU.

“The #1 thing that keeps me from looking at other positions is the certainty that I would never be able to replicate the sense of community I have here at NDSU.” - Faculty

Table 15. Top 10 Reasons for Staying

	Women		LGB		People of Color		Not U.S. Citizens		Disability/Chronic Health Condition		All	
	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty
Salary*	12.5%	--	--	--	12.5%	--	--	--	12.0%	--		
Benefits*	56.0%	--	12.5%	--	43.8%	--	50.0%	--	55.5%	--	26.5%	
Salary and benefits+	--	11.9%	--	--	--	40.0%	--	10.0%	--	3.4%		8.1%
Climate of department/unit/lab	24.4%	10.7%	--	25.0%	18.8%	--	--	10.0%	23.6%	6.9%	11.4%	8.9%
Colleagues in department/unit/lab	25.0%	21.4%	--	--	31.3%	60.0%	50.0%	20.0%	23.0%	6.9%	10.6%	14.9%
Professional relationship with supervisor	19.0%	--	12.5%	--	18.8%	--	25.0%	--	19.9%	--	9.4%	
Workload allocation	--	7.1%	12.5%	--	--	20.0%	--	10.0%	--	--		
Faculty start-up	--	--	--	--	--	20.0%	--	--	--	--		
Opportunities for promotion	--	--	--	--	6.3%	--	--	--	--	--		
Opportunities available for spouse/partner	--	10.7%	--	--	--	80.0%	--	30.0%	--	3.4%		8.5%
Tenure standards	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3.4%		
Prestige of department/unit	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	10.0%	--	--		
Lack of teaching opportunities	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3.4%		
Quality of administrators	--	--	--	--	--	20.0%	--	10.0%	--	--		
Quality of students	--	9.5%	--	--	--	--	25.0%	--	5.2%	6.9%		
Quality of staff	5.4%	--	--	25.0%	6.3%	--	--	--	5.2%	3.4%		
Quality of faculty	--	4.8%	--	50.0%	--	20.0%	--	--	--	3.4%		
Climate for people of color	--	--	--	--	12.5%	20.0%	25.0%	10.0%	--	--		
Work/life satisfaction	22.0%	25.0%	12.5%	--	12.5%	40.0%	25.0%	30.0%	23.0%	6.9%	10.4%	15.3%
Family reasons	6.0%		--		--	--	--	--	7.3%			
Geographic location	12.5%	6.0%	12.5%	--	12.5%	20.0%	25.0%	10.0%	11.0%	--		
Quality of the community	6.0%	9.5%	12.5%	--	--	80.0%	25.0%	30.0%	7.9%	3.4%		10.5%
Quality of public schools	--	--	--	25.0%	--	20.0%	--	10.0%	--	--		
Community resources and organizations	--	--	--	25.0%	--	--	--	10.0%	--	--		

*Options only available to staff.

+Options only available to faculty.

Work-life Balance

Staff and faculty were asked questions related to work-life balance, drawing from previous FORWARD Work-life survey items. Results from those responses (Table 16) were analyzed based on three main factors: gender; status on providing care for dependent child(ren); status on providing care for aging/ill adult(s). Staff in all identity categories appeared to be in greater agreement about their levels of satisfaction in balancing professional and personal life responsibilities, in comparison with faculty peers, regardless of their gender or personal care commitments. Staff and faculty reported low levels of agreement related to their needs to forego professional activities because of personal responsibilities; the highest reported agreement with that statement came from staff who are providing care for dependent children (25.4%). However, staff and faculty reported greater agreement about choosing to forego personal activities because of professional responsibilities; while faculty across all groups reporting higher levels of agreement than staff; the highest level of agreement came from faculty providing care for an aging/ill adult (48.9%).

Overall, staff were more likely than faculty to have reported that work-life balance was possible to achieve at the university. However, both staff and faculty reported that they were more likely to report foregoing personal activities for professional responsibilities than to forego professional activities for personal responsibilities.

“I like working at NDSU, but am concerned for my health over the long run. I’m looking for another job that will allow me to have a more balanced life.” - Staff

Table 16. Work-life Balance. (Strongly Agree or Agree)

	Women		Men		Providing Care for Dependent Children		Not Providing Care for Dependent Children		Providing Care for Aging/Ill Adult		Not Providing Care for Aging/Ill Adult	
	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty
Satisfied balance between professional and personal life	69.6% n = 306	44.4% n = 124	69.7% n = 109	59.1% n = 88	70.8% n = 192	47.6% n = 126	67.2% n = 244	53.3% n = 107	64.9% n = 94	42.6% n = 47	69.9% n = 342	51.6% n = 186
Forego professional activities for personal responsibilities	19.6% n = 306	16.9% n = 124	15.6% n = 109	14.8% n = 88	25.4% n = 193	20.6% n = 126	11.9% n = 243	14.0% n = 107	18.1% n = 94	23.4% n = 47	18.4% n = 342	16.1% n = 186
Forego personal activities for professional responsibilities	20.8% n = 307	37.1% n = 124	21.1% n = 109	31.8% n = 88	20.7% n = 193	39.7% n = 126	20.5% n = 244	31.8% n = 107	21.3% n = 94	48.9% n = 47	20.7% n = 343	33.3% n = 186

NDSU Programs to Address Climate and Work-life Balance

Survey respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of university-sponsored programs and resources intended to improve the working environment. The responses of staff and faculty (Table 17) highlighted some helpful programs and resources.

Table 17. University Programs and Resources to Improve the Working Environment.

	Very or Quite Valuable	
	Staff	Faculty
Anti-Racism Training (ARMAC – primarily intended for faculty)	58.1% n = 43	50.0% n = 21
Community of Respect (cultural competency)	64.6% n = 95	52.8% n = 28
Equal Opportunity/Title IX Training (mandatory)	62.5% n = 198	46.0% n = 86
Supervisor Supplement – Equal Opportunity/Title IX Training	69.0% n = 100	53.6% n = 45
Safe Zone Training (LGBTQ diversity and confronting bias)	73.2% n = 131	70.7% n = 58
Search Committee Training	63.2% n = 67	62.5% n = 95
Discover U (professional development workshops)	49.2% n = 90	--
Spousal/Partner hiring policy	53.4% n = 31	51.2% n = 21
New Employee/Faculty Orientation	65.3% n = 196	53.3% n = 90
FORWARD Ally Training (gender equity)	--	57.5% n = 50
FORWARD Advocate Program (gender equity)	--	60.0% n = 30
Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation Training	--	65.6% n = 63
Office of the Ombuds	--	44.0% n = 37
Commission on the Status of Women Faculty	--	66.7% n = 20
Faculty Conferences/Luncheons	--	65.2% n = 122
Promotion to Full Professor*	--	86.9% n = 73
Extension of Tenure Clock*	--	84.8% n = 39

*Asked only of tenured/tenure track faculty

--No responses in this category

“FORWARD has done good work, but now that funding is gone, I see some slippage.” - Faculty

Survey respondents were asked to provide open-ended responses to the question, “What could NDSU do to provide you with more support in your career?” Responses were analyzed and coded into themes, with the most commonly occurring themes presented in Table 18. Staff reported a desire to grow professionally at the institution, with several respondents expressing a need for increased professional development and for opportunities for career advancement within the institution. Climate concerns expressed by staff also reflected frustrations about feeling their efforts were neither recognized nor respected at the institution. Faculty concerns related to faculty support, which also included professional development, and improved relationships with administration. Overall, improved work-life balance was an expressed concern for both staff and faculty, with faculty also indicating the need for hiring more graduate students and support staff.

Table 18. Coded Responses to Additional Career Support Measures

Staff	Faculty
<p>Increase professional support (59 responses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial support for professional development - Increase staff professional development opportunities (webinars, speakers, workshops) - Provide/improve position training 	<p>Increase faculty support (64 responses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase research support - Increase professional development support - Address salary concerns
<p>Salary (51 responses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Salaries are inequitable for similar positions - Provide annual pay increase 	<p>Improve administration and relationships with faculty (33 responses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve upper administration management - Improve communication between faculty and administration
<p>Climate concerns (37 responses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would like my work to be recognized - I would like my work to be respected 	<p>Increase support for specific groups (20 responses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase support for non-tenure track faculty - Increase support for male faculty - Increase support for junior faculty
<p>Benefits (25 responses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved parental leave policies - Maintain or improve health care coverage & information 	<p>Improve work-life balance (18 responses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Address workload concerns - Support work-live balance
<p>Opportunities for career advancement (25 responses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide defined career paths/advancement opportunities 	<p>Address institutional administration concerns (17 responses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discouraged by state higher education climate - Discouraged by budget cuts - Align institutional goals/work with land-grant mission
<p>Work-life balance concerns (23 responses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support work-life balance - Workload has increased 	<p>Hire more personnel (15 responses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hire more graduate students - Hire more support staff

Employee Morale

Within the open-ended responses provided by staff and faculty participants in the survey, additional concerns were identified, specifically related to employee morale. While morale was not specifically identified as a factor within the survey instrument, the consistency with which respondents, especially staff, noted employee morale was noted. Of all respondents, 11 staff and 11 faculty specifically cited employee morale as a problem area, without prompting from the survey instrument. Most of those citations noted that morale was problematic due to recent budget cuts, including early retirements due to budget constraints and subsequent increased workload for remaining employees within those departments. However, additional sources for morale issues included the overall attitude towards higher education from stakeholders within the state of North Dakota. And, for staff respondents, morale issues were cited with relation to feelings of being undervalued by faculty and administrators.

“Staff morale is significantly down, and treatment of staff is quite poor. We are almost never appreciated or thanked, and even those we do receive are not genuine. Staff is treated as the least important and least valuable contribution to this campus.” - Staff

Summary of Findings

Many of the findings of the campus climate/work-life survey were consistent with past survey initiatives conducted at NDSU. Specifically, the 2003, 2009, and 2014 iterations of the campus climate for diversity surveys also revealed that while many staff and faculty reported that the campus climate was personally supportive, there was a recognition that climate for underrepresented staff and faculty was less supportive. Additionally, prior iterations of the work-life survey results revealed that faculty has concerns with equity in processes such as promotion, tenure, and evaluation committees, workload distribution, and work-life balance overall. The findings from the current campus climate/work-life survey continued to point to areas of strength and areas that require additional attention to ensure that all employees within the university feel welcomed and supported at the institution.

Areas of Strength

Overall, a majority of staff (63.5%) and faculty (52.2%) indicated that the climate at NDSU was either extremely or moderately good overall (Table 4). Staff and faculty reported that, in general, they felt that they were treated with respect based on their personal identity (Table 7) and on their position type (Table 8); at the same time, they reported relatively low concerns about feeling excluded or isolated within their work environments.

All employees reported that sexual harassment was treated seriously at the university (Table 10) at the same time that they reported low rates of personal experience or observation of sexual harassment (Table 11). Staff and faculty were in general agreement that they knew how to report sexual harassment if it did occur or they observed it (Table 12).

In terms of work-life balance, staff responses indicated that, in general, they were satisfied with their abilities to maintain a positive balance between work and personal commitments and responsibilities (Table 16).

Finally, a number of university sponsored programs were identified by both staff and faculty as being effective in addressing concerns with the work environment (Table 17).

Areas for Improvement

Several areas for improvement were identified from this survey. First, employees perceived the climate for underrepresented individuals at the university to be less positive than

for their peers and staff who were themselves members of underrepresented identity groups reported lower satisfaction with climate than their peers did. Respondents indicated that, in general, their departments could do more to support diverse employees. A significant percentage of employees reported feeling underappreciated for their contributions, as reported by all employees, by underrepresented employees, and by position type.

Though all employees reported low experiences with sexual harassment in the workplace, staff were more likely than faculty to indicate that sexual harassment was common in their departments. Further, all employees reported much more common experiences with hostile or intimidating behavior in their work environments and were less likely to know how to report hostile or intimidating behavior than sexual harassment. Faculty were less likely than staff to report satisfaction with their ability to achieve balance between work and personal commitments.

Finally, both staff and faculty expressed concerns with employee morale at this time within the university. Frequently, budget constraints and workload allocation were cited as the primary reasons for the low morale.

Next Steps

The following section of this report outlines work previously done to develop a Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan with four specific priority areas. The action plan was compared to the key findings of the campus climate/work-life survey to identify if any additional priority areas remain to be addressed.

The results of this campus climate/work-life survey should be shared with the NDSU Inclusion Committee to determine additional actions focused on addressing problem areas for the Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan. Additionally, the results of this survey should be presented to the campus community.

"I think the key to finding success with improving the university environment is collegiality and respect from administration. If coworkers are supporting each other and empathic to the needs of colleagues, then many times the environment is a positive one for EVERY PERSON who is in it. Administrators who are support[ive] and communicate openly with the department and ask for department input are also a key component of that. We all just need to understand that each person has different needs and if we find a way to respect those needs we will all be more fulfilled." - Faculty

NDSU Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan

In 2016, a workgroup comprised of a cross-section of faculty and staff at NDSU came together for an appreciative inquiry process related to diversity and inclusion at the university. The results of that process was the development of the NDSU Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan.

Provocative Proposition

The NDSU community prioritizes and values diversity and inclusion. We take collective responsibility for ensuring a sense of belonging, respect, and justice that support the success of each person.

Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan

The Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan identified four overarching goals that relate to Structure, People, and Processes. Those four goals are:

1. Prioritize and foster an inclusive and diverse university culture;
2. Recruit, retain, and advance a diverse mix of faculty, staff, and students;
3. Maintain and prioritize professional, inclusive, collaborative, and equitable behavior in all university environments and operations; and,
4. Increase faculty, staff, and student satisfaction.

The results of the 2017 campus climate/work-life Survey highlight the importance of these goal areas. Concerns regarding feelings of inclusion remain an area of concern for staff and faculty. With recent budget constraints, a significant number of staff and faculty have left the institution and it would be helpful to note the impact of these departures on institutional equity efforts. Employee concerns about hostile or intimidating behavior, low morale, and feeling underappreciated for contributions to the department all underscore the need for continued work to address professional, inclusive, collaborative, and equitable behavior, in particular.