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Interesting Facts about Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interesting Facts about Survey Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree or higher</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Berkeley as student</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at another UC</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in one department</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal, Slightly/Very Liberal</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not associated with major religion</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional facts about survey respondents, refer to Section 4. Demographic Findings
Executive Summary

Introduction

This report summarizes the purpose, design, methodology, and results of the UCB Non-Academic Career Staff Climate and Career Development Survey. Completion of this survey was one of the major goals of the newly formed Office of the Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion. Conducted from November 2008 through March 2009, it is the first UC Berkeley campus-wide survey of non-academic career staff. This inaugural survey accomplishes the recommendation of the UC Staff Diversity Council to conduct staff climate surveys every four years. Climate surveys for other campus groups were recently completed for post-doctoral students, academic career staff, and faculty.

Purpose

The primary goal of this survey is to capture baseline data about non-academic staff for use in enhancing the campus work environment and career development opportunities. The survey results will be used to:

- Identify opportunities to improve job satisfaction, campus climate, and career development and advancement.
- Determine if significant response differences exist across diverse populations and workplace settings, and recommend actions to ensure that the campus is an equitable and inclusive environment.
- Recommend one to three actions the campus can take to make improvements, and encourage individual control units/divisions to identify actions to take in response to the survey results.

Survey Population and Response Rates

The survey was distributed to all career non-academic staff, which totaled 7,028 at that time. The response rate was 50% among individuals with email addresses, and included staff members
from all divisions on campus. However, despite efforts to provide paper versions of the survey and translations in six languages for the 500 staff members without email or access to computers, the response rate among this group was about 15%.

**Types of Questions**

To maximize the depth of the responses, the survey used four question types:

- Satisfaction ratings questions, four-point scale (Very Satisfied to Not at All Satisfied)
- Agreement ratings questions, four-point scale (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree)
- Truthfulness ratings questions, four-point scale (Very True to Not at All True)
- Open-ended text questions

The complete survey can be found in Appendix A: Survey Questions

**Survey Population Demography**

The survey participants were asked to complete an extensive demography section that included questions about employment status (such as work unit, position type, type of work, and seniority) and personal characteristics (including gender, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, age, religion, disability, language, education, citizenship, political affiliation, marital status, children, and distance living from campus).

Survey participants with dependents were asked to complete a dependent care module that contained questions about child care and elder care. A module for supervisors and managers was also included that asked questions about supervising employees, campus resources, and support for supervisors.

**Survey Design**

The survey design team, composed of administrators in academic and non-academic roles, made the decision to implement the survey as a research project governed by the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS), and incorporated steps to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of the survey responses.
The survey covers seven topics: work climate, manager/supervisor experiences, familiarity with campus policies and practices, career development and advancement, work-life and stress, and dependent care. The survey includes seventy-one basic questions, plus a dependent care module, a module for supervisors and managers, and supplemental questions for responses requiring additional information (e.g., a yes response to “Have you experienced any of the following in the last three years” goes to another question that asks for an explanation.)

The survey also includes benchmark questions taken from the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Quality of Work Life (QWL) Survey that enables Berkeley to compare campus results to the US workforce.

**Survey Results Analysis**

The responses to this first campus-wide survey of staff provide invaluable information about the composition of the non-academic staff, their impressions of the work environment, how they are supervised and managed, work environment factors that help or hinder their job satisfaction, and many other aspects of working at UC Berkeley.

The survey participants are 31% supervisors and managers and 68% workers (39% non-represented, 25% represented, and 5% not sure). For some questions, the survey results include a breakdown by age, seniority, employee type, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and disability. A few of the most relevant differences are included in the results summaries that follow.

**Work Environment and Job Satisfaction – Positive Aspects to Leverage**

Survey participants expressed a fairly high level of enjoyment from working at Berkeley. Overall, 85% of the respondents indicated that they are very or somewhat satisfied with their job. The table below summarizes the top 10 positive responses to questions about the work environment:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Type</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>I help coworkers/colleagues with work-related problems</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Benefits (health care, retirement, etc.)</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>I am proud to be working for UC Berkeley*</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Interactions with co-workers/colleagues</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>The people I work with can be relied on when I need help*</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>I have the freedom I need to decide how to do my work</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Flexibility (start, end, telecommuting)</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>On balance, the positives of my position outweigh the negatives</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>I am willing to put a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help UC Berkeley be successful</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement – Strongly Agree or Agree
Satisfaction- Very or Somewhat Satisfied
Truthfulness- Very or Somewhat True
*NIOSH Survey Question

These top-rated items were similarly rated across all groups with a few exceptions. Pride in working for Berkeley is high during the first three years of service, at 97% and then drops below the campus-wide response rate. The positives outweigh the negatives for all employee types except represented workers who rate this item at only 77%. Willingness to put a great deal of effort beyond that normally expect is higher than the campus average for all racial/ethnic groups except for Whites and Indian/Pakistani groups.

**Job Satisfaction – Aspects Requiring Attention**

The 10 lowest-rated responses in the area of enjoyment/employee satisfaction were:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Type</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Conditions on my job allow me to be about as productive as I could be</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>Office/work space (quality, privacy, noise)</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>Recognition for my work effort</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>Satisfied with salary</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>Promotions are handled fairly</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Even if I were offered a comparable position…I would not take it</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Opportunities to advance</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>There is clarity about career development/advancement opportunities</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>The chances for promotion are good</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>When I do my job well, it results in tangible rewards (e.g. money, recognition, advancement)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement – Strongly Agree or Agree
Satisfaction- Very or Somewhat Satisfied
Truthfulness- Very or Somewhat True
*NIOSH Survey Question

These lowest-rated aspects of job satisfaction/enjoyment indicate that many of the aspects of dissatisfaction are related to lack of career advancement opportunities, recognition, and compensation. Represented workers rated nearly all of these aspects lower than the campus levels. For the item concerning the offer of a comparable position, staff members with seniority levels between three to eight years, under the age of 40, and with a bachelors or masters degree indicate they are the most likely to leave.

Managers and supervisors play a critical role in creating a work environment that is professional, supportive, rewarding, and provides opportunities for growth. The ratings on the ten questions about relationship with manager/supervisor range from 79% to 84% satisfied. However,
represented workers are the most dissatisfied with results ranging from 25%-35% satisfied. Many open-ended comments make reference to the need to provide training for supervisors and managers, as well as improved communication and feedback.

Opportunities to improve workplace efficiency come in the form of questions related to the availability of resources (e.g., I have enough time, the necessary equipment/physical resources, and training opportunities to perform my job safely and competently). These aspects are of secondary importance compared to career advancement, recognition, and compensation. However, the argument can be made that enhancing the work environment by improving access to better job resources is a form of recognition or even compensation that will improve performance and may lead to career growth.

Workload and stress are twin thieves that rob workers of the ability to perform their jobs effectively. The frequency of finding work stressful was at 57%, and 10 stressors, including more work to do than can be done in an ordinary day and working excessively long hours, contributed to the frequency and amount of stress experienced at all levels of the organization and across all groups.

**Equity and Inclusion**

Five questions addressed the work environment in terms of equity, inclusion, diversity, and respect. All five aspects of equity and inclusion received high campus-wide ratings. Some differences in experiencing these aspects of equity and inclusion were shown in groups in terms of gender, employee type, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Type</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Outside my unit/department I am treated with respect</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>In my unit/department I am treated with respect *</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Respect for cultural/personal differences in my unit/department</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>UC Berkeley’s commitment to diversity</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Creating an equitable and inclusive work environment includes identifying and addressing acts of discrimination and harassment. When survey participants were asked if they feel they have experienced any of the following at UC Berkeley in the last three years, few reported discrimination (6%), sexual harassment (2%), and other types of harassment (6%) including fifteen items such as bullying, abusive supervision, retaliation, and incivility. Race, age, and gender were the three most cited bases for discrimination (ranging from 2.1% - 2.3%), and underrepresented minorities (URMs) reported the highest incidences of discrimination (3.1% - 6.6%). 8.6% of Indian/Pakistani staff reported experiencing race/ethnicity discrimination. Gender discrimination was highest for non-heterosexual women (8%).

Comparing UC Berkeley Non-Academic Staff to the US Workforce

Twenty-three questions used in the non-academic staff survey were drawn from the NIOSH Quality of Worklife Questionnaire, a nationally represented, stratified, weighted survey conducted as part of the General Social Survey in 2006. The same 23 questions were used in Berkeley’s academic staff survey, and seven of these questions were used on the Berkeley faculty survey. Berkeley’s non-academic staff survey results revealed that compared to the US workforce, Berkeley’s non-academic staff are equally as likely or more likely to experience the positive aspects of the work environment as the rest of the US workforce on ten survey items. The Berkeley staff response rate was more than 10% higher on three questions: you feel used up at the end of the day (16%); in general your health is excellent or very good (11%), and you take part with others in making decisions that affect you (14%).

Campus-wide Survey Results Action Items

Based on the survey results, three campus-wide action items were identified as areas of focus until the next survey is conducted in 2011–2012:
1. Campus-wide communication

2. Manager/supervisor development

3. Campus climate

**Next Steps**

1. Post the survey report on the Office of Equity & Inclusion website, and respond to questions, comments, and suggestions about the report.

2. Monitor campus-wide and division/unit results in two ways:

   - The three action items are broad in scope, and efforts to address them were already underway even before the survey completion date. The current campus priority on Operational Excellence will help to directly and indirectly focus attention on some of the action items such as communication and manager/supervisor development.

   - After the staff survey was conducted, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion released its 10-year strategic plan. Two of the three strategic plan priorities link directly to the staff survey results: Expanded pathways for access and success for staff, and creating and sustaining a healthy campus climate. Equity & Inclusion received a grant from the Evelyn and Walter Haas Jr. Fund that supports accomplishing these priorities and incorporates a program review component for monitoring activity that will enhance equity, inclusion, and diversity efforts. The staff survey action planning process will be integrated into the E&I Program Reviews.
SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Background

In June 2008, as part of the newly established Office of the Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion at the University of California, Berkeley, a department of Staff Diversity Initiatives was launched to focus attention on and develop programs for the 15,000 staff employed on campus. Just months earlier in April 2008, the UC Staff Diversity Council recommended that “[t]o create and sustain an inviting, supportive and nondiscriminatory work environment at each location, publicize the Principles of Community and administer a climate survey at least every four years.” This recommendation supported Staff Diversity Initiatives’ charge to assess staff needs in order to drive strategies and programs for staff.

Survey Description

This report presents the major findings of the career non-academic staff climate survey conducted at UC Berkeley from November 2008 through March 2009. The full survey title is the “UC Berkeley Non-Academic Career Staff Workplace Climate and Career/Life Issues Survey.” The hypothesis of the survey, designed as a research study, is that responses will stratify by demographic characteristics and workplace settings. Refer to Appendix A – Survey Questions.

The results of this first campus-wide survey provide baseline data that will be useful in identifying and implementing future staff initiatives to improve workplace efficiency, employee satisfaction, and campus climate, as well as to take actions to ensure that the campus is an equitable and inclusive work environment. Refer to Appendix B – Major Findings.

An environmental factor worth mentioning is that the survey closed in March 2009 just as the impact of budget cuts, furloughs, and layoffs began. Therefore, there is a high probability that the overall positive tone of the results has most likely shifted in the ensuing months as national, state, and local economic conditions have negatively impacted the campus.
The survey outcome was to identify one to three actions for the campus to take in response to the survey results. Individual control units/divisions were also encouraged to identify their own action items. Monitoring of these action items will become a part of the Equity & Inclusion Program Review process that is currently under development.

In accordance with the recommendation from the UC Staff Diversity Council to conduct a staff climate survey every four years, the next career staff campus climate survey was scheduled to be conducted in 2012. However, in light of campus needs to gather input on the many changes the campus is implementing, such as the Equity & Inclusion Program Review process, the Operational Excellence campus initiative, and the financial challenges due to budget cuts, UC Berkeley plans to conduct the next survey in Fall 2011.
SECTION 2. SURVEY DESIGN

Survey Design Decisions

The staff survey design team was formed in February 2008, under the direction of Vice Chancellor Basri. (Refer to Appendix C – Survey Design Team for the list of design team members.) The staff survey design team, composed of administrators in academic and non-academic roles, made the following seven decisions about the staff climate survey process:

1. Divide the survey audience into three groups: career non-academic staff, academic staff, and faculty. The focus of this report is career non-academic staff. The survey results for the academic staff and faculty are presented in separate reports.

2. Conduct the survey as a research project under the auspices of the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS), with the Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion as the Principal Investigator, and the Director of Staff Diversity Initiatives as the project manager.

3. Communicate instructions and take steps in the survey design to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of the survey responses.

4. Allow staff to skip any questions that they choose not to answer and to save incomplete survey responses and return to the survey at another time. The survey introduction letter states, “All survey responses will be kept strictly confidential. You may withdraw from the survey at any time, or skip any questions you do not wish to answer or that are not relevant to your situation.”

5. Address seven major survey topics, including optional modules for specific groups:
   - Work Climate, including relationship with manager/supervisor, assessment of job situation, experience with on-campus events and services, and harassment and discrimination
   - Manager/Supervisor experiences (plus a separate module for managers/supervisors only)
• Familiarity with campus practices and policies
• Career advancement and development
• Work/life
• Family and child care (including a separate module for staff with dependents)
• Employee status and demography

6. In addition to using the survey and subject matter expertise of the design team and topics from best practice resources both on and off campus, compare campus results to nationwide workforce data using questions selected from the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Quality of Work Life (QWL) Survey.

7. Conduct the survey as a web-enabled online survey, and accommodate career staff without email addresses or access to computers by providing a paper-based version of the survey and translations of the survey in seven additional languages.

Survey Methodology

The Survey Design Team met from February through November 2008 to design the survey, establish the implementation plan, determine the process for presenting results, and recommend actions to address findings on a campus and division/department level.

To maximize the number of responses, a combination of closed and open question types was used. The survey was composed of modules that include four question types:

1. Level of satisfaction: four-scale - Very Satisfied to Not at All Satisfied
2. Agreement: four-scale - Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree
3. Truthfulness: four-scale - Very True to Not at All True
4. Open-ended – respondents are allowed to include comments of any length

In addition, to expedite responses, the extensive “Employee Status and Demographics” section used multiple choice and fill-in-the-blank data entry formats. Demographic question topics include:

• Current job group and type of work (pull down menus)
• Position type (non-supervisory-represented, non-represented, supervisor or manager)
• Length of service at UC Berkeley
• Number of departments worked in at UC Berkeley
• Current control unit
• Gender
• Sexual orientation
• Race/ethnic category
• Languages
• Religion
• Age
• Person with a disability
• Education level
• Political orientation
• UC Berkeley student alumnus
• Citizenship
• Marital/partner status
• Dependents
• For managers: number of UCB employees managed/supervised, manager support and resources

For some topics, additional questions were embedded in the survey based on responses. For example, if the response to the question, “Do you have any children?” was yes, a series of questions about parenting and child care was asked about each child. (The survey questions can be found in Appendix A–Survey Questions.)

To supplement the sources for questions with input from staff at all levels, and to pilot test the survey questions, eleven focus groups were conducted with staff groups including staff
organizations, equity and inclusion councils, leadership development program (LDP) participants and LDP alumni, and division and control unit leadership teams (Refer to Appendix C – Survey Design Team for the list of focus groups). During these focus groups, feedback on clusters of survey questions was gathered using Turning Technologies, Inc. hand-held clicker response keypads, as well as oral and written feedback.
SECTION 3. RESPONSE RATES

The Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion sent an email invitation to all career non-academic staff with email addresses. There was a 50% response rate among individuals with email addresses (3,528 responses out of 7,028 career non-academic staff with email addresses).

After collaborating with departments/units composed of staff without campus email addresses and/or access to a computer, arrangements were made to reserve conference rooms, visit muster stations, arrange for computer access, and provide paper surveys to accommodate these staff. For those who expressed a preference to complete the survey in another language, a Spanish translation version of the paper survey was provided and translators using the English paper version of the survey were deployed to select locations around campus. In addition to Spanish, translators were requested for Chinese (Cantonese and Mandarin), Tagalog, Lao, and Vietnamese. Eighty-three additional paper surveys were collected out of the 550 staff without campus email addresses.

The following four items summarize the non-academic career staff response levels based on several demographic categories. As a reminder, recall that since staff were not required to answer all questions, the number of responses for each question may vary widely.

Both the number of responses (N) and the percentage of total responses for each question are provided. Where possible, two columns of percent responses are provided: the percentage of the total responses with missing included (those who skipped answering the question) and the percentage of responses with missing excluded. In most instances, the percentage of responses with missing excluded is provided. Refer to Appendix D – Response Rate by Control Unit and Appendix E – Response Rate by Job Group and Position Type for more information.

Control Unit

Appendix D - Response Rate by Control Unit reveals that there is a good representation of non-academic career staff across the campus. According to the 2009 Affirmative Action Report, the
staff demographic breakdown was 13.4% Managers/Executives, 52.3% Professionals and 34% Trades/Administrative (represented) staff.

Job Group

Appendix E - Response Rate by Job Group and Position Type, indicates that there is adequate representation of non-academic career staff across the campus. However, during the survey period, the campus was in the process of finalizing a mapping of job group/type and job titles to the new Career Compass job groups and titles. In addition, the official job titles do not match the working job titles that many staff members use.

Position Type

Appendix E – Response Rate by Job Group and Position Type presents the response rate by manager/worker groups, i.e., position type. The results reveal the low number of union-represented, trades/administration staff that responded to the survey, compared to non-represented staff, supervisors, and managers. The percentage of staff that responded “not sure” or “other” indicates that there is a lack of clarity for some staff with respect to their position type. Managers/supervisors comprised 31.3% of staff that responded to the survey. Of staff who responded, 67.3% were workers (non-represented, represented, and not sure.) Trades/Administration represented staff comprised 34% of the workforce but only 24% of the survey respondents.
SECTION 4. DEMOGRAPHIC FINDINGS

Summarized below are the responses to the 15 demographic questions that describe the non-academic staff, information that will be useful in addressing needs and providing services in the future. The total number of responses varies for each question, and the totals and percentages do not include missing data (i.e., staff that did not answer the questions are excluded.) Refer to Appendix F – Demographic Responses for detailed results.

Seniority

Staff seniority is an important factor in analyzing the survey results. This series of questions also requests information about any break in employment, and if staff have ever worked at another UC. The number of years of nonstudent employment at UC Berkeley, ranges from less than one year to over 30 years. Appendix F – Demographic Responses, QUESTION 2: Years Working at UC Berkeley shows that overall, the percentages of responses are fairly evenly spread across the years of service. The highest percentage of staff (17.5%) had 8-11.99 years of service. Fewer staff members had less than one year of service (9.4%), 3-4.99 years (8.6%) and more than 30 years of service (5.7%). Responses also indicate that 89.8% of staff worked full time in their current position, while 4.9% worked 80-99% time, and 5.9% worked 50-79% time.

Breaks in Employment

The vast majority of staff employed at UC Berkeley (79.7%) has had no break in employment since starting to work at Berkeley. Appendix F: QUESTION 2 – Breaks in Employment shows the percentages of staff (0.6% to 3.7%) that have had breaks in employment ranging from less than one month to seven years.

Additionally, another question in this employment series asked if staff had worked at another UC campus (non-student employment). 9.6% of staff had worked at another UC campus.

Questions about current employment status distinguish current career staff from those in other employment categories, e.g., temporary, limited, etc.; and full-time from part-time staff. The
current employment status of staff that responded to this question is 94.1% career staff, with 1.1% working on contract, 0.5% temporary, 0.5% limited appointments, 0.1% student assistants, 2.3% not sure, and 1.4% other.

Appendix F - QUESTION 6 – Number of Different Departments as a UC Berkeley Employee, shows that a large number of staff worked in only one department (60.2%) or in only two departments (21.3%). The percentage of staff that worked in different departments dropped dramatically with three or more departments.

The remaining demographic questions requested information related to personal characteristics or dimensions of diversity. To simplify the report, some characteristics have been grouped together.

Gender and Sexual Orientation

The survey offered four choices for gender and five choices for sexual orientation (Appendix F: QUESTIONS 7-8 – Gender and Sexual Orientation). For the first time, the choices for gender (male, female) included a category to enable transgendered staff to self-identify. (1% of staff identified as transgender and .6% as other). From a sexual orientation perspective, staff selected from the choices of heterosexual, lesbian, gay, bisexual, or other. 12.3% of staff identified themselves as not heterosexual, including 3.6% lesbian, 4.7% gay, 2.3% bisexual and 1.7% other.

Race and Ethnicity

The survey provides 12 choices for identifying race and ethnicity. Appendix F- : QUESTION 9 – Race and Ethnicity, presents the results, listing them in order from the highest to the lowest percentage of staff that responded yes to each racial/ethnicity category. The five most frequently selected race/ethnicity categories among Berkeley non-academic staff were White (60.5%), Black/African American (10.2%), Chinese/Chinese American (7.6%), Mexican/Mexican American/Chicano (7.6%), and Other Race (4.7%).
Two additional questions in this category aggregate groups of racial/ethnic minorities. The grouping of Underrepresented Racial Minorities (URM) – including Mexican/Mexican-American/Latino, Other Hispanic origin, Black/African American, and American Indian/Alaska Native – reveals that 22.6% of UCB staff respondents were underrepresented minorities. The Asian Minority Group shows that 17.9% of respondents were Asian including Chinese/Chinese-American, Japanese/Japanese-American, Filipino/Pilipino, Pakistan/East Indian, and Other Asian.

The question on citizenship status showed that 96.2% of the respondents were US citizens, 3.1% were Permanent Residents, 0.3% were Non-Residents, and 0.4% selected Other.

**Language Spoken at Home**

In addition to race/ethnicity and citizenship, another aspect of culture the survey addresses is language. Appendix F - QUESTION 11 – Language Spoken at Home, presents in order of most frequently spoken to least frequently spoken language at home. In terms of languages spoken at home other than English (97%), the most prevalent languages spoken at home are Spanish (9.3%), Chinese (4%), Tagalog/Filipino (12.3%) and other languages (2.8%) that were not specifically called out on the list of 17 language choices.

*Six additional languages were listed in Question 11 on languages spoken at home. Each of the six had fewer than 15 “yes” responses (i.e., less than 0.5% response rate.) These languages were: Portuguese (0.4%), Persian (0.4%), Vietnamese (0.3%), Arabic (0.3%), Polish (0.2%), and Greek (0.1%).

**Religion**

Religion has gained increasing attention as a workplace demographic to address. The survey included a question with 22 religion choices in Appendix F – Question 12 – Religion, The results are summarized below.

*There were 3,331 responses to the question about religion. The choices included the major religions, or faith traditions, that were identified during the survey design process. It is
noteworthy that 46.3% of staff responded that they are not associated with a major religion. The second highest category is for all Christians at 39%. Roman Catholic (17.8%), Jewish (5.4%), other religions (5.3%) and other Christian faiths (4.9%) were the most frequently selected choices.

Additionally, religion/faith tradition choices with less than 1% responses include: Hindu (0.8%), United Church of Christ/Congregational (0.8%), Muslim (0.7%), Eastern Orthodox (0.6%), Mormon (0.5%), Quaker (0.5%), Taoist (0.4%), Seventh Day Adventist (0.2%) and Sikh (0.1%).

Disability Status

People with disabilities are a frequently overlooked population amongst staff. Of staff who responded to the disability status question, 5.6% identified that they were a person with one or more disabilities; 93.7% of staff indicated that they were not disabled, and 0.7% responded as other. Appendix F: QUESTION 16 – Disability Categories Identified by Staff with a Disability, presents the responses to the disability categories for those staff that responded yes to the disability status question.

More than half of staff with a disability had a physical/orthopedic disability (52.1%). The next highest specific categories were cognitive disability (13.7%) followed by deaf/hard of hearing (11.6%). However, 26.3% of disabled staff chose Other Disability. This Other Disability category raises questions about hidden disabilities, multiple disabilities, and other unreported disabilities, and how to accommodate them on campus.

Age

The campus is a multigenerational work environment that includes people of all generations from teenagers to septuagenarians. Appendix F - : QUESTION 14 – Age at Time of Survey, identifies all age categories.

The Generation X staff (30s and 40s age group) is the largest age group on campus at 46.4% of staff. Boomers (50s to early 60s) make up 40% of the staff. Generation Y/Millennials (under
30s) account for 10.7% of staff, while Traditionals/Veterans (age 65 and over) comprise 2% of staff.

**Education Level**

*Appendix F: QUESTION 15: Highest Education Level,* presents the highest education level achieved by UC Berkeley staff.

The Berkeley campus has a highly educated staff. Of the 3,477 staff that responded to this question, three-fourths (75%) had a bachelors or higher degree: 42.6% had bachelors, 25.2% had masters, 2.5% had professional degrees, and 4.8% had doctorates. Moreover, all but 4.5% of the respondents had completed at least one year of college.

**Berkeley Alumni**

A related question revealed that 31.3% (1,021) of non-academic staff had attended UC Berkeley as a student. *Appendix F: QUESTION 15 – Highest Degree as a Berkeley Student* shows a high number of staff received bachelors degrees (57.7%, and Masters degrees (14.8).

**Marital and Family Status**

*Appendix F - : QUESTION 17 – Marital Status* presents the current marital/relationship status of staff. More than half (54.6%) of staff were married, and the next highest response rate is for staff that were never married or partnered (18.9%) and 8.9% were partnered.

In addition, 52.1% of staff had children while 47.9% had no children. Staff members with dependents were directed to a separate module on child and adult dependent care. This data will be used in a separate report on dependent care (child and elder care). *Appendix F: QUESTION 18 – Children Status and Childcare Needs* presents the significant findings from this module.

From a staff demographics perspective, there were two important results about family status. Figures 4.2 and 4.3 below show the distribution of staff with children by gender and age, and by race/ethnicity. More than 50% of both men and women over 40 had children, and for staff that
responded to the race/ethnicity question, more than 50% of African American, Filipino American, other Hispanics, and Chinese American staff had children.

**Percent of UC Berkeley Non-Academic Career Staff with Children by Gender and Age at Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at survey</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 30</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 40</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 50</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 55</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 65</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2 – Percent of UC Berkeley Non-Academic Career Staff with Children by Gender and Age at Survey

Figure 4.3 – Percent of UC Berkeley Non-Academic Career Staff with Children by Ethnicity

**Gross Annual Household Income**

A question asking about the very sensitive topic of income was responded to by 90% of the staff respondents. *Appendix F: QUESTION 20 – Gross Annual Household Income*, asked for the approximate annual household income (prior to taxes). This income data will be useful in determining the future service and program needs for staff.

For reporting purposes, the 18 income categories were grouped into three income ranges, low, middle and high, based on the 2000 US Census income ranges and the cost of living in the San Francisco Bay Area. 60.2% of campus staff fell into the middle income range ($60,000-
$199,000); 34.1% were in the lower-income range (less than $60,000); and 5.7% were in the upper-income range (greater than $200,000).

**Political Affiliation**

It comes as no surprise that in the activist and largely progressive campus environment, 42.7% of Berkeley staff identified themselves as liberal, and 16.9% identified themselves as very liberal. The total percentage of staff that identified as slightly to very liberal is 71%, in alignment with Berkeley’s historical reputation. Appendix F: QUESTION 13 – Political Affiliation, presents the full spectrum of political affiliation.

**Distance Living from Campus**

The final demographic category addresses commuting and how far staff members live from campus. Appendix F: QUESTION 21 – Distance Living from Campus shows that staff were provided with 18 choices (consolidated into 9 categories), from living on campus to living more than 100 miles away, and the category of Other for those who lived in more than one place (1.1%). Some staff resided part time outside of California. Nearly half of the staff (48.9%) lived within 9 miles of campus. At the other end of the spectrum, 2.5% of staff members live more than 50 miles away from campus.

**Summary of Demographic Findings**

The campus demographic findings indicate a number of policy implications and changes in administrative practices to consider. These policy and practice implications are presented in Section 7 – Policy Implications. The next few paragraphs summarize the demographic findings.

The employee status and demography results reflect the broad range of non-academic staff at Berkeley. Seniority was distributed fairly evenly, from new staff that had been on campus for less than three years to staff that had worked on campus more than 30 years. A majority of staff (approximately 90%) worked full time; nearly 80% had no break in employment; and despite the comprehensive scope of Berkeley’s academic, research, and administrative opportunities, a large percentage (60%) of staff had worked in only one department (and only 21% had worked in two departments.)
With respect to personal characteristics that enhance the rich diversity of the campus, respondents were two-thirds women and one-third men with a small percentage of staff that identified as transgender (0.1%). The percentage of staff identifying their sexual orientation as not heterosexual (i.e., lesbian, gay, bisexual, other) was 12%.

In an effort to identify many more race/ethnicity categories on campus, staff had 12 choices including other Asian, other Spanish, and other race. Approximately 23% of staff self-identified as Underrepresented Racial Minorities. Almost all respondents (96%) were US citizens. In addition to English (97%), the most prevalent languages spoken at home were Tagalog/Filipino (12.3%), Spanish (9.3%), Chinese (4%), and other languages (2.8%) that were not specifically called out on the list of 17 language choices.

Religion in the workplace is increasingly the focus of attention. The survey results show that a majority (46.3%) of Berkeley staff are “not associated with a major religion.” Of the 22 religion choices, the largest number of responses came from staff who identified as Christians at 39%, Roman Catholics at 17.8%, Jewish at 5.4%, other religions at 5.3%, and other Christians at 4.9%.

Staff that identified as a person with one or more disabilities comprised 5.6% of the non-academic staff. More than half of staff with disabilities identified a physical/orthopedic disability, followed by other disabilities (26.3%), and learning/cognitive (13.7%).

College campuses are typically among the most multigenerational work environments. Non-academic staff at Berkeley were 46.5% Gen X (ages in 30s and 40s), 40% Boomers (50s to early 60s); 10.7% Gen Y/Millennials (under 30), and 2% Traditionals/Veterans (over age 65).

Berkeley’s non-academic staff is highly educated with 75% of respondents possessing bachelor degrees or higher. This is further enhanced by the fact that 31.3% of staff attended Berkeley as a student. This high alumni rate can be beneficial for alumni relations and activities.
The results regarding marital and family status revealed that the majority of staff was married (54.8%) or partnered (8.9%) and 18% of staff were never married/partnered. Over half (52.1%) had children and questions regarding child and dependent care identified needs ranging from the 7–11% of staff that currently had children under five or adult dependent care needs, or those who had sought infant or child care in the last five years.

The question about gross annual household income revealed that the majority of non-academic staff (60.2%) fell into the middle income bracket, while 34.1% were lower income and 5.7% were upper income as identified by the 2000 US Census median income data. The high cost of living in the San Francisco Bay Area exacerbates income issues, particularly for low-wage workers.

Predictably, with Berkeley’s free speech, activist, social justice advocate reputation, the dominant political affiliation is 39.4% liberal and 15.5% very liberal.

Finally, the distance staff members live from campus has broad implications for transportation costs such as parking and public transit subsidies, as well as telecommuting and the use of technology to reduce commute time and costs. Nearly half of the respondents lived within 9 miles of campus, but at the other end of the spectrum, some staff lived more than 50 miles away, including a small number of staff (1.1%) that resided in more than one location.
SECTION 5. Survey Results by Content Category

This section focuses on the major survey findings based on the PowerPoint presentation in Appendix B – Major Findings. The survey questions are grouped by subject and by the question type, i.e., level of satisfaction, level of agreement, and level of truthfulness. The analysis highlights the top-rated and bottom-rated responses in each grouping. Where the results reflect statistically significant differences, additional major findings are presented by one or more of the following categories:

- Age
- Seniority (years employed at UCB)
- Employee Type
- Gender
- Race/ethnicity
- Sexual orientation
- Disability

The following five major survey topics are presented in this section:

- Work environment
- Equity and inclusion
- Relationship with Supervisor
- Career development and advancement
- Workload and stress

The first set of seven charts encompasses all of the survey topics with a brief narrative of the most significant results. The individual survey topics are called out separately and include additional relevant results by demographic categories such as gender and years of service. Moreover, questions marked with an asterisk (*) come from the NIOSH Survey and were used to
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compare the campus to the U.S. workforce. Results related to these questions will be presented in greater detail in the Section 6, Comparing UCB Survey Results to the U.S. Workforce

**Work Environment**

The survey includes 25 work environment-related questions asking for the level of agreement from strongly agree to strongly disagree. As shown in Figure 5.1, the eight questions with a high level of agreement (84% or higher) include personal satisfaction and personal effort, pride in Berkeley, and supervisor support. Note that questions about the relationship with supervisor are highlighted in yellow and the results are discussed later in this section in the Relationship with Supervisor topic, and the respect and diversity questions are discussed in the Equity and Inclusion topic. The highest rated statement is agreement about personal satisfaction in doing this job well is at 93%, (includes 50% strongly agree). Survey questions 3, 4, and 7 are compared against the U.S. workforce responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Agree (Strongly)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well</td>
<td>93% (50%)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outside my unit/department, I am treated with respect (at UC Berkeley)</td>
<td>92% (26%)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am proud to be working for UC Berkeley *</td>
<td>92% (42%)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In my unit/department, I am treated with respect *</td>
<td>87% (33%)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My supervisor demonstrates behavior that is consistent with UCB’s core values/mission</td>
<td>84% (39%)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help UC Berkeley be successful</td>
<td>84% (32%)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My supervisor is concerned about the welfare of those who report to him or her *</td>
<td>84% (45%)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. On balance, the positives of my position outweigh the negatives</td>
<td>84% (24%)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agree includes “Strongly agree” & “Agree”
Disagree includes “Disagree” & “Strongly Disagree”
* NIOSH Survey Question

Figure 5.1- Statements with Higher Level of Agreement

Additional breakdowns of survey responses are in Appendix B: Major Findings. A brief description of some of these findings are summarized below.

For Item 3, “I am proud to be working for UC Berkeley,” results are examined across years of service in Figure 5.2. Pride is high (strongly agree and agree), above 90% for all seniority levels. The highest pride levels are in the first year of employment (97%) and more than 20 years (92%-93%). A decrease in pride occurs after one year (down to 92%) and remains in the 90%-92% range up to years of service.

![Chart showing percentage of staff agreement with pride in working for UC Berkeley](chart.png)


*GSS 2006 Question Version: I am proud to be working for my employer"
Results distribution was also examined by race/ethnicity for willingness to put in a great deal of effort, as shown in Figure 5.3. For all but Whites and Indian/Pakistan Americans, the results were higher than the campus average. Some Asian groups were at 90% (strongly agree/agree), and Underrepresented Minorities were at 88%-89%.

As shown in Figure 5.4, nine questions fall in the middle-range level of agreement which is 79% to 83% agree/strongly agree. Five middle-range questions relate to supervisor communication and responsiveness to subordinates. These questions will be addressed in the Relationship to Supervisor topic. Questions 9 and 10 are US workforce comparison questions. The other
questions relate to skill-building opportunities, recommending employment at Berkeley to others, and the similarity between personal and Berkeley values.

The “strongly agree” responses to two questions are particularly low compared to other questions in this figure. Only 26% of staff members strongly agree that they would recommend Berkeley to friends and family seeking employment (item 12), and 18% would strongly agree that their values and UCB’s values are very similar (item 17).

### Statements with a Middle-Range Level of Agreement (9 to 17)

*Please Indicate Whether You Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Agree (Strongly)</th>
<th>Dis-agree</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My job lets me use my skills and abilities *</td>
<td>83% (33%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job requires that I keep learning new things *</td>
<td>83% (36%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is open to ideas about how to improve the work process</td>
<td>83% (41%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend UC Berkeley to friends and family seeking employment</td>
<td>82% (26%)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor encourages two-way communication</td>
<td>82% (39%)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor encourages creative thinking and new approaches to problems</td>
<td>81% (40%)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor can be relied on when I need help</td>
<td>81% (40%)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor supports team-based approaches to complex work issues</td>
<td>79% (37%)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find my values and UCB’s values are very similar</td>
<td>79% (18%)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UC Berkeley, Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009.

* NIOSH Survey Question

**Figure 5.4 – Statements with a Middle-Range Level of Agreement**

**Figure 5.5** presents the eight questions with the lowest levels of agreement about supervision, working at Berkeley and job conditions. The lowest-rated statement asks whether staff would leave the campus for a comparable position with slightly higher pay and benefits. Fifty-two
percent of staff agree or strongly agree that they would not leave, with only 14% strongly agreeing with that statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Agree (Strongly)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 <strong>My supervisor supports my career development</strong></td>
<td>79% (35%)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 <strong>The reason I prefer UC Berkeley to other organizations is because of its mission</strong></td>
<td>76% (26%)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 <strong>My supervisor communicates a clear sense of direction for my organization</strong></td>
<td>73% (28%)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 <strong>My supervisor provides ongoing feedback to help me improve my performance</strong></td>
<td>72% (24%)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 <strong>Since I began working at UC Berkeley, my level of personal commitment to UCB has increased</strong></td>
<td>70% (20%)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 <strong>My unit/department really inspires the best in me in the way of job performance</strong></td>
<td>67% (20%)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 <strong>Conditions on my job allow me to be about as productive as I could be</strong></td>
<td>66% (16%)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 <strong>Even if I were offered a comparable position with slightly higher $/benefits at another organization I would not take it</strong></td>
<td>52% (14%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>3252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UC Berkeley, Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009.

Figure 5.5 – Statements with Lower Level of Agreement

Figure 5.6 presents the top 7 of 14 questions about the truthfulness of statements. The high level of true/very true ratings are 82% or higher, with the statement about helping coworkers/colleagues with work-related problems rated highest at 98% true or very true. The next three highest ratings (88% and above) concern the availability resources, such as information, equipment/physical resources, and training. The remaining questions deal with the ability to rely on coworkers for help, the freedom to make work-related decisions, and taking personal initiative with career advancement. Questions 2 and 5 are US workforce questions.
Statements with Higher Level of “Truthfulness”  
(top 7 out of 14)
Please indicate whether the statement is very true, somewhat true, not too true, or not at all true

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>True (Very)</th>
<th>Not True*</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  I help co-workers/colleagues with work-related problems</td>
<td>98% (74%)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  I have enough information to get the job done *</td>
<td>93% (47%)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  I have the necessary equipment/physical resources</td>
<td>90% (55%)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  I have the training opportunities I need to perform my job safely and competently *</td>
<td>88% (41%)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  The people I work with can be relied on when I need help *</td>
<td>88% (48%)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  I have the freedom I need to decide how to do my own work</td>
<td>88% (50%)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  I take an active role in advancing my career</td>
<td>82% (34%)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes “Not too true” and “Not at all true.”

Source: UC Berkeley, Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009.

*NIOSH Survey Questions

Figure 5.6 – Statements with Higher Level of “Truthfulness”

As shown in Figure 5.7, the seven lowest level truthfulness statements are rated significantly lower than the highly rated ones. Staff rate opportunities for learning, promotion, advancement, and reward for a job well done as true or very true from 79% to 39%. The chances for promotion and tangible rewards are particularly low, at 36% for each statement. These questions will be discussed in the Career Development and Advancement topic. Questions 8, 9, 11 and 13 are US workforce questions.
### Statements with Lower Level of “Truthfulness” *(bottom 7 out of 14)*

*Please indicate whether the statement is very true, somewhat true, not too true, or not at all true*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>True (Very)</th>
<th>Not True*</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities *</td>
<td>79% (28%)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I have enough time to get the job done *</td>
<td>69% (28%)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I have the learning opportunities I need to advance my career (at UCB)</td>
<td>69% (22%)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Promotions are handled fairly *</td>
<td>53% (13%)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 There is clarity about career development/advancement opport.</td>
<td>48% (12%)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 The chances for promotion are good *</td>
<td>36% (7%)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 When I do my job well, it results in tangible rewards (e.g. $, recognition, advancement)</td>
<td>36% (8%)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes “Not too true” and “Not at all true.”

Source: UC Berkeley, Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009.

* NIOSH Survey Question

*Figure 5.7 – Statements with Lower Level of “Truthfulness”*

As shown in **Figure 5.8**, the top eight job aspects that received the highest satisfaction levels were 83% or higher, and include the most salient aspects of working at Berkeley that attract staff to campus. Benefits top the list at 96% satisfied or very satisfied, with 57% very satisfied. Interactions with coworkers and respect for cultural/personal differences in my unit are at 89% and 87% satisfied or very satisfied. Flexibility, work-family balance, support for diversity and the meaningfulness of work are all positive factors for staff members. The respect and diversity items will be discussed in greater detail in the Equity and Inclusion topic. The work/family and flexibility items will be discussed in the Workload and Stress section.
Job Aspects with Higher Level of Satisfaction* (top 8 out of 16)

In regard to each of the following, how satisfied are you with your job situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Aspects</th>
<th>Satisfied (Very)</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Benefits (e.g. health care, retire., etc.)</td>
<td>96% (57%)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Interaction with coworkers/colleagues</td>
<td>89% (40%)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Respect for cultural/personal differences in my unit/department</td>
<td>87% (44%)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 UCB’s commitment to diversity</td>
<td>86% (40%)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Flexibility (start, end, telecommuting, etc.)</td>
<td>85% (47%)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Support for work-family balance in my unit/department</td>
<td>84% (40%)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Support for diversity in my unit/departm.</td>
<td>83% (38%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 The meaningfulness of the work I do</td>
<td>83% (38%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not applicable excluded. Satisfied includes “Very” and “Somewhat” satisfied. Not satisfied includes “Not too” and “Not at all” satisfied.

Source: UC Berkeley Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009.

Figure 5.8 – Job Aspects with Higher Level of Satisfaction

Item 8, the meaningfulness of the work I do, shows 83% very satisfied or somewhat satisfied, including 38% of staff members who are very satisfied and 17% not too and not at all satisfied.

A breakdown of the results by employee type in Figure 5.9 reveals that the level of very satisfied staff members decreases significantly from the Senior Management Group (88%) to Managers (50%) to Workers (Non-Represented at 36% and Represented Workers at 30%).
By and large, the job aspects rated the lowest at 80% satisfied or less [not clear what this means] involve access to opportunities outside of the job, work space, recognition/reward, and salary, as shown in Figure 5.10. The least satisfying job aspect is opportunities to advance at 50% satisfied/very satisfied, closely followed by salary at 53% satisfied/very satisfied. It is worth noting that statements about career advancement, chances for promotion, development opportunities, and recognition are at the lower level of both satisfaction and truthfulness statements. These questions are discussed in the Career Development and Advancement topic.
Summary of Work Environment Questions

Below are lists of the top-rated and bottom-rated questions. The top-rated questions deal with positive worker/colleague interactions, pride in and willingness to work hard at UC Berkeley, and satisfaction with benefits, freedom to make decisions and flexibility. The bottom-rated questions encompass reward/recognition, advancement and office/work conditions.

Top-rated questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Type</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>I help coworkers/colleagues with work-related problems</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Benefits (health care, retirement, etc.)</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey of Non-Academic Staff on Workplace Climate and Career/Life Issues Report

| Agreement | I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well | 93% |
| Agreement | I am proud to be working for UC Berkeley | 92% |
| Satisfaction | Interactions with co-workers/colleagues | 89% |
| Truthfulness | The people I work with can be relied on when I need help | 88% |
| Truthfulness | I have the freedom I need to decide how to do my work | 88% |
| Satisfaction | Flexibility (start, end, telecommuting) | 85% |
| Agreement | On balance, the positives of my position outweigh the negatives | 84% |
| Agreement | I am willing to put a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help UC Berkeley be successful | 84% |

**Bottom-rated questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Type</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Conditions on my job allow me to be about as productive as I could be</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>Office/work space (quality, privacy, noise)</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>Recognition for my work effort</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>Satisfied with salary</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>Promotions are handled fairly</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Even if I were offered a comparable position…I would not take it</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Opportunities to advance</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>There is clarity about career development opportunities</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>The chances for promotion are good</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>When I do my job well, it results in tangible rewards (e.g. money, recognition, advancement)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equity and Inclusion

The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion seeks to use the information from the survey to develop equity, inclusion, and diversity programs and processes. To that end, equity, inclusion, diversity, and respect are topics that relate to work environment, general perceptions about campus climate, and future policy and compliance initiatives.

Five questions previously presented are discussed with additional data that distribute results by the following categories: 1. Outside my unit I am treated with respect; 2. Inside my unit I am treated with respect; 3. Respect for cultural differences; 4. Support for diversity in my unit, and 5. UCB commitment to diversity. Some relevant distributions of response data for this topic include: employee type, gender, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, years of service, and disability. In addition, this topic includes survey questions related to common work experiences in the last three years.

For the topic of respectful treatment in my unit/department, the overall campus result was in the higher level of agreement category with 87% strongly agree or agree, and 33% strongly agreeing with that statement. A look at the results distributed by race/ethnicity in Figure 5.11 reveals that there is not a significant difference across race/ethnicity. However, the traditional URM groups, namely Native American, African American, Mexican American, and Other Hispanic American groups, rate respect in unit at the lowest levels (below the 87% campus average), while some Asian groups and White staff are at the top and above the campus average.
Figure 5.11 – Respect in Unit by Race/Ethnicity Agreement with “In my unit/department, I am treated with respect”

Figure 5.12 shows the results by employee type, gender, and disability for respect in unit by other categories. For all employee types except Represented Workers, the response rates are at or above the campus-wide rate of 87%. The Senior Management Group is at 100% agreement with this statement. Men and women agree equally with this statement (87% agreement), and at the same rate as the campus. Staff members with disabilities responses were significantly lower than the rest of the groups, with only 77% agreement with the statement.
By race/ethnicity, the results vary widely across groups. **Figure 5.13** shows a range of 94% to 84% satisfied for Asian Groups, 91% for Whites, and 83% to 78% for URMs, with Indian/Pakistani American (75%) and Other (72%) at the lowest levels of satisfaction.
The campus-wide results revealed that more staff members report respectful treatment outside the unit (92%) than treatment inside the unit/department (87%). This trend generally holds true across most of the campus staff populations. However, as Figure 5.14 shows, one exception to this trend was the gay population whose response was 87% more respected in the unit but only 85% were more respected outside the unit.
The campus response to the degree of satisfaction with support for diversity in my unit was 83% satisfied or very satisfied. However, the responses across groups varied considerably. Results by employee type, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation are provided below.

Figure 5.15 shows the Senior Managers at 100% very satisfied or satisfied, with the satisfaction percentages dropping from Managers at 89% to Represented Workers at 75% very satisfied or satisfied.
Figure 5.15 - Support for Diversity in My Unit by Employee Type Degree of Satisfaction with: “Support for diversity in my unit/department”

Figure 5.16 shows the Other Asian group (89%) and Whites (88%) above the campus percentage rate of 83% for support for diversity in unit/department, with URMs the lowest (Mexican American at 75% and African American at 72%), and Indian/Pakistani American at 72%.
Figure 5.16 – Support for Diversity in Unit by Race/Ethnicity Degree of Satisfaction with: “Support for diversity in my unit/department”

Figure 5.17 shows that heterosexual staff members’ level of satisfaction with support for diversity is the same as the campus-wide level at 83%. For lesbian staff members the percentage increase to 85% and even higher for gay staff members at 89%.
The question regarding UC Berkeley’s commitment to diversity is an important question for the campus, given that the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion had just formed one year prior to conducting the survey. The long history of diversity and inclusion efforts undoubtedly played a role in the fairly high campus commitment to diversity results associated with a new division. The campus-wide degree of satisfaction response totaled 86% (with 40% very satisfied and 46% satisfied), with a breakdown by ethnic category shown in Figure 5.18.
Hypothesizing that higher seniority might equate to a higher degree of satisfaction about UC Berkeley’s commitment to diversity, Figure 5.19 shows that this is not the case. Staff members with less than 1 year of service were most satisfied (93% very satisfied or satisfied), and the percentages drop to 88% for 1-2.99 years of service, and range between 84% and 87% for three or more years of service ranges.

*Not satisfied"
Common Work Experiences in the Last Three Years

The survey includes a series of questions about a variety of common job aspects staff members may have experienced in the last three years, both positive (in green) and negative (in red), with the focus on current experiences. The results are divided between the top nine responses and the bottom eight responses. The complete list of responses can be found in Appendix B – Major Findings.

*Figure 5.20* presents the top 9 of 17 more common experiences in the last three years, ranging from the top response at 35% for the opportunity to provide excellent service, to 16% of staff...
that have been blocked in their career path. Career-related questions and responses are addressed in the career development and advancement topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Experiences</th>
<th># Yes</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opp. to provide excellent service to clientele</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to learn important new job skills</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to work with others in first-rate successful collaborative effort</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair level of compensation</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly beneficial mentoring/support</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good advancement opportunities</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public recognition of workplace achievement</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job insecurity</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocked in career path</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on check all that apply question series.
Source: UC Berkeley, Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009.

Figure 5.20 – More Common Experiences

Two of the more common experiences briefly summarized here are job insecurity and public recognition for work. With respect to job insecurity, 17% of staff members indicated that they were experiencing job insecurity. Economic conditions and campus restructuring efforts may be contributing factors. It is interesting to note that the employee type that responded at the highest rate is non-represented workers at 20%, following by represented workers (16%), managers (15%) and supervisors (13%). From a race/ethnicity perspective, the group identified as other had the highest response rate at 26% for experiencing job insecurity. Asian Americans (20%), Native Americans (19%) and Whites (18%) had the next highest numbers, with the remaining race/ethnic groups ranging from 17% to 11% with no particular trends for URMs, Asians, etc.
Public recognition for workplace achievement received a surprisingly low response rate of 19%. **Figure 5.21** lists the bottom 8 of 17 less common experiences on campus in the last three years. Some of the most negative experiences appear on the less common experiences list, including experiences with potential legal and compliance consequences including sexual harassment (2%), discrimination (6%), and working conditions (6%).

### Less Common Experiences in the Last 3 Years* (bottom 8 out of 17)

*Do you feel you have experienced any of the following as an employee at UC Berkeley in the last 3 years?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Experiences</th>
<th># Yes</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Active engagement in a workplace that embraces diversity of individuals</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Participation in a highly equitable, supportive workplace setting</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Unfair personnel evaluations</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Passed over for promotion</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Unsafe/unhealthy work condition</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Other types of harassment</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Discrimination</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sexual harassment</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on check all that apply question series.

Source: UC Berkeley, Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009.

**Figure 5.21** – Less Common Experiences in the Last 3 Years

**Figure 5.22** presents some areas experienced in the last three years by gender and disability. Staff members with disabilities have experienced twice as many situations with unsafe, unhealthy work conditions (16% compared to 8% for non-disabled), discrimination at a rate of 11% (compared to 6%) and other types of harassment (14% compared to 6%). A similar pattern exists for women compared to men with respect to discrimination (7% compared to 4% for men) and sexual harassment (2% compared to 1%).
Despite the low number of reports of discrimination and harassment, the campus should consider addressing concerns about staff members that have experienced discrimination and harassment a high priority. Refer to Section 7. Policy Implications for more information. Figure 5.23 present the responses about discrimination, sexual harassment, and other types of harassment.
Do you feel you (all staff) have experienced any of the following as an employee at UC Berkeley in the last three years? Please check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of resp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of harassment</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UC Berkeley, Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009.

Figure 5.23 - Response Rates for Discrimination, Sexual and Other Types of Harassment

Figure 5.24 identifies the types of discrimination experienced in the last three years. Discrimination based on race, age, and gender are the top three types of discrimination identified. The percentages of responses are low, between 2.1-2.3%.
Figure 5.24 – Types of Discrimination Experienced in the Last Three Years

Discrimination based on race/ethnicity indicates that Indian/Pakistani Americans, African Americans, and Mexican Americans have experienced discrimination at percentage rates above the campus-wide percentage of 6% as shown in Figure 5.25.
Figure 5.25 – Experienced Discrimination by Race

As shown in Figure 5.26, staff members 65 and older reported experiencing the highest level of age discrimination at 7.7%.
Figure 5.26 – Experienced Discrimination by Age

Figure 5.27 provides responses to the discrimination question based on gender and sexual orientation, and reveals additional distinctions that are significant in that eight of eleven categories are higher than the campus-wide percentage of 2%.
In addition to sexual harassment, staff members had the opportunity to identify experiences of other types of harassment. As shown in Figure 5.28, almost one in fifteen (6.5%) of staff members responded that they experienced a form of harassment other than sexual harassment. Fifteen categories of other types of harassment were listed, including an option for other. Bullying (2.9%) and abusive supervision (2.6%) are the most frequently identified other types of harassment.
Summary of Equity and Inclusion Questions

The campus-wide responses to the five equity and inclusion questions are positive, ranging from 83% for support for diversity in my unit to 92% for being treated with respect outside my unit. Staff report being treated with more respect outside of their unit/department compared to how they are treated inside their unit. Berkeley’s commitment to diversity and unit/department-level support for diversity are the lowest-rated questions on this topic, but are still highly rated. Differences in results exist across race/ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation and gender. From an equity and inclusion perspective, it is important to address inequities and experiences of exclusion. Harassment and discrimination are among the least common experiences of staff campus-wide (6% experienced discrimination, 1.86% experienced sexual harassment and 6% experienced other forms of harassment). Race/ethnic origin, age and gender discrimination top
the list of fourteen types of discrimination experienced. In addition to sexual harassment, bullying (2.9%) and abusive supervision (2.6%) top the list of other types of harassment. Some suggestions about addressing these issues are included in Section 7. Policy Implications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Type</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Outside my unit/department I am treated with respect</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>In my unit/department I am treated with respect</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Respect for cultural/personal differences in my unit/department</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>UC Berkeley’s commitment to diversity</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Support for diversity in my unit/department</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationship with Supervisor**

Ten survey questions ask staff members about their relationship with their manager/supervisor, as previously presented in Figures 5.1-5.3. Survey responses indicate that staff members rate managers/supervisors actions fairly high, ranging from 79% to 84% agreement on manager/supervisor behaviors and actions toward staff. **Figure 5.28** below indicates the distribution of percent of disagreement on responses by Employee Type (Senior Management Group, Manager, Supervisor, Represented and Non-represented workers). The results show that Represented Workers are more dissatisfied than any other group on every item (25%–35% disagreement). Every group is more dissatisfied with communication and feedback than with the support for teamwork, creative thinking, and their own development. Overall, about one-fourth of campus managers and supervisors lack clear direction and adequate feedback from their managers.
With respect to manager/worker relationships, Figure 5.29 indicates that managers and supervisors rated the manager/worker relationship the highest at 87% very or somewhat satisfied. Represented workers rated it the lowest at 68% followed by non-represented workers at 77%.
Effective supervisors and managers lead their teams to accomplish the goals of the campus, the unit, and their own individual professional development goals. Areas already mentioned regarding supervisors include communication and feedback, reward and recognition, and an equitable and inclusive work environment free of harassment and discrimination.

**Summary of Relationship with Supervisor Questions**

The manager/employee relationship significantly contributes to campus climate and employee satisfaction with the work environment. The responses from the represented workers were the least positive on all ten supervisor/manager questions. Communication, feedback, support and career development are the lowest-rated items. Refer to Section 7. Policy Implications for suggested actions. The next topic, career development and advancement, provides additional results related that point to the supervisor/manager relationship.
Career Development and Advancement

The career development and advancement section of the survey poses questions about learning, development, and advancement opportunities. Figure 5.30. Career Development shows that the most highly rated items involve a personal commitment to continuous growth and development, and to taking advantage of learning and development opportunities, including awareness of job-related training opportunities (88% agreement), learning new things (83%), and taking an active role in career advancement (82%).

At the other end of the spectrum, responses demonstrate a lack of clarity about career development (48%) and opportunities to advance (50%). Regarding promotions, only 36% of staff indicated their chances for promotions were good and 53% responded that promotions were handled fairly. Taken together, these two factors indicate the limited career advancement opportunities on campus. Presented next are three additional career advancement questions: taking an active role in career advancement, opportunities to develop your own special abilities, and clarity about career advancement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Development</th>
<th>Agree (Strongly)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 I have the training opportunities I need to perform my job safely and competently</td>
<td>88% (41%)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 My job requires that I keep learning new things</td>
<td>83% (36%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I take an active role in advancing my career</td>
<td>82% (34%)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities</td>
<td>79% (28%)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Opportunities to work with others outside my own unit/department</td>
<td>72% (23%)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Opportunities to acquire additional training/career develop.</td>
<td>68% (24%)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Promotions are handled fairly</td>
<td>53% (13%)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Opportunities to advance</td>
<td>50% (11%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UC Berkeley, Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009.  
*Agree includes “Strongly agree” & “Agree”  
Disagree includes “Disagree” & “Strongly Disagree”
Figure 5.30 Career Development

The extent to which individuals personally take an active role in career advancement can have a significant impact on the success of career development programs. Campus-wide, 82% (very true and somewhat true) of staff members indicate that they are taking an active role in advancing their careers. The responses to this question are further elaborated upon in two ways: by employee type and by race/ethnicity. Figure 5.31 shows that, at 76%, represented workers take the least active role in their own career development, and personal involvement increases as for managers, with 91% of both senior managers and managers taking an active role.

![Bar Chart: I take an active role in advancing my career]

*Includes “Not too true” and “Not at all true.”

Source: UC Berkeley, Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009.

Figure 5.31 - Active Role in Advancing Career by Employee Type

The race/ethnicity breakdown of responses in Figure 5.32 reveal that other ethnic groups at 89% and URM and White staff at 83% to 88% are above the campus response rate of 82% very or somewhat true. All of the Asian groups are below the campus rate, ranging from 73% to 81%.
In Figure 5.33 the extent to which staff members have the opportunity to develop their own special abilities is highest for the Senior Management Group with all responses very (67%) or somewhat true (33%). 31% of Represented Workers rated this statement as not true.
Figure 5.33 – I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities

Figure 5.34 shows that staff perceptions of learning opportunities vary by years of service. Learning opportunities begin to decline after one year of service from 79% (32% very and 53% somewhat true) to 68% (29% very and 49% somewhat true) in the second year. Opportunities are lowest at 3–4.99 years of service at 75% and increase steadily until they decline after 20 years of service.
Interestingly, as shown in Figure 5.35, clarity about career advancement across education levels is at a lower level for staff with bachelors and advanced degrees, at 46% and 57% respectively, and only 39% for staff with professional degrees. Clarity about career advancement is above 50% for staff with some college (associate degree or 1+ years of college), and is highest for those with a high school diploma or less at 61%.
Figure 5.35 – Clarity about Career by Education Level

A review of the experiences of staff members in the last three years includes seven questions about career development and advancement-related opportunities. Figure 5.36 shows that more than 30% of respondents experience the opportunity to learn new skills and the opportunity to work with others collaboratively. Other positive experiences were mentoring/support and advancement opportunities at 21% for each, and three questions shown in red indicated less positive experiences: concern with being blocked in career path (16%), unfair personnel evaluations (11%) and passed over for promotion (11%).
Figure 5.36 – Career Development and Advancement Opportunities

Figure 5.37 shows that the advancement opportunities of the senior management group are significantly higher at 50% compared to the manager group at 30% and drop to only 14% for represented workers.
Figure 5.37 – Do you feel you have experienced good advancement opportunities?

Figure 5.38, which analyses advancement opportunities by seniority, shows a significant increase from 1-2 years at 16% to 27% at 3-4 years. Opportunities remain steady until seniority reaches twelve years, and then opportunities decline from 27% to 15%.
Another career development-related experience is the opportunity to work in a collaborative effort. As Figure 5.39 shows, the higher the employee type level, the greater the number of collaborative work opportunities. While 19% of represented staff experienced opportunities to work in a collaborative effort, 71% of senior managers had this opportunity.
**Figure 5.39** – Do you feel like you have experienced opportunities to work collaboratively?

**Figure 5.40** shows the opportunity to work collaboratively by race/ethnicity. White staff experienced this opportunity at 37%, while other groups experienced collaborative efforts at 14% to 34%.
Figure 5.40 – Opportunity to Work with Others in a Collaborative Effort

The experience of being passed over for promotion varies by seniority as shown in Figure 5.41. The greatest numbers of staff members reporting this experience at eight to twelve years of experience (16%) and twenty to twenty-thirty years of experience (15%).
The experience of being blocked in career path is one that is shared by all age groups. **Figure 5.42** shows that staff members in the 40-50 age range have the highest rate of this experience at 20%.
By contrast, Figure 5.43 shows that the experience of being blocked in career path by seniority level is at 15% for staff with one to three years of experience and peaks at 20% at 8-12 years of experience.
Summary of Career Development and Advancement Questions

Despite reporting high levels of commitment to personal growth and development (over 80%), the results on many of the career development and advancement questions indicate a lack of opportunities to act on this commitment. A lack of clarity about career development and advancement opportunities, few opportunities for promotion, feeling blocked in career path, and a lack of tangible rewards for a job well done are among the career development issues staff rated low. For most of the career development questions, represented workers rated career advancement opportunities low. Section 7. Policy Implications includes suggestions for career development, advancement and staff recognition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Percentage Agree/Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have the training opportunities I need to perform my job safely and competently</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job requires that I keep learning new things</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take an active role in advancing my career</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to work with others outside my own unit/department</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to acquire additional training/career development</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions are handled fairly</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to advance</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clarity about career development/advancement opportunities</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chances for promotion are good</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I do my job well, it results in tangible rewards (e.g., money, recognition, advancement)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workload and Stress**

Workload and stress can significantly impact the health and well-being of staff, thus making these factors important contributors to the work environment and campus climate. It is a positive sign that 84% of staff strongly agreed or agreed that there is support for work/family balance in their unit/department. The series of eleven questions in Figure 5.44 poses questions to determine the frequency of situations and experiences that may cause stress. Fifty-seven percent of staff
members reported feeling used up at the end of the day, as opposed to only 20% that felt energized. Forty-eight percent found their work stressful and 40% of staff reported having more work to do than could be done in an ordinary day. During the survey design phase, staff focus groups contributed questions to the list of other stressors such as working on unnecessary task or projects and receiving conflicting requests. (Refer to Appendix C for a list of focus groups.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency/stress related survey question</th>
<th>% often*</th>
<th>Tot. N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often during the past month have you felt . . . used up at the end of the day?</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you find your work stressful?</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>3304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having more work to do than can be done in an ordinary day</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having responsibility for an unmanageable number of projects or assignments at the same time</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working excessively long hours at the office or in the field</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving conflicting requests from two or more people</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on unnecessary tasks or projects</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often during the past month have you felt . . . energized at the end of the work day?</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking work home in the evenings or on weekends to stay caught up</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking the authority to carry out my job responsibilities</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending too much time in unimportant meetings that take me away from my work</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Often=“Very often,” or “Often” vs. “Sometimes,” “Rarely,” or “Never.”

Source: UC Berkeley, Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009.

Figure 5.44 – Frequency of Situations that Cause Stress

Figure 5.45 compares the frequency of feeling used up or energized at the end of the day by seniority. At every seniority level, staff members were almost twice as likely to report feeling used up as opposed to energized at the end of the day.
Figure 5.45 – Feeling Used Up or Energized by the End of the Day

Figure 5.46 identifies how often staff find work stressful by employee type. The trend holds true that the higher the level where you work in the organization the more the work is stressful. Represented staff reported 37% (very often or often) finding work stressful, while the senior management group reported finding work stressful 77% of the time. Senior managers also experience stress due to taking work home in the evenings or weekends to stay caught up at a rate of 71%, compared to managers at 39”% and trending downward to represented workers at 6%.
Lacking the authority to carry out job responsibilities as a stress factor is reported by race/ethnicity in Figure 5.47. The stress level range is 17% to 28% with no particular trend by race grouping, e.g., URMs in a particular order.
How often does lacking the authority to carry out my job responsibilities cause you stress related to your work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>% “very often” or “often”*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Pakistani American</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian American</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other group</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic American</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese American</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese American</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino American</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UC Berkeley, Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009. *vs. sometimes, rarely, or never. 131

Figure 5.47 – Authority to Carry Out Job Responsibilities

Figure 5.48 shows the distribution by years of service for stress caused by having more work to do than can be done in an ordinary day. After the first year, the rate jumps from 23% to 34%, stays in the 34% to 40% range for up to twelve years, and peaks at 49% after 20 years of service.
In addition to questions asking staff members to identify potential stressors in the workplace, a general health self-assessment question revealed that 24% of staff rated their own general health as excellent, 43% as very good, 25% as good, 7% as fair, and 1% as poor.

**Summary of Workload and Stress Questions**

Staff members reported that their work is stressful (48%), they feel used up at the end of the day (57%) and there is more work than can be done in an ordinary day (40%). As you move up the staff hierarchy, the stress levels increase with 37% of represented workers feeling stressed or very stressed compared to 71% of the Senior Management Group feeling stressed. Many other stress-producing factors contribute to workplace stress. Yet, 67% of staff reported that their general health is excellent or good. Suggestions for addressing workload and stress concerns are presented in Section 7. Policy Implications.
SECTION 6. COMPARING UCB SURVEY RESULTS TO THE U.S. WORKFORCE

To benchmark UCB’s climate survey results against those from survey results for the US workforce, the UCB survey includes 23 questions from the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Quality of Worklife (QWL) Questionnaire, part of the General Social Survey conducted in 2006. This section compares answers to the UCB career non-academic staff survey the US workforce survey, then provides a question-by-question analysis of responses by UCB career non-academic staff, academic staff, and faculty in comparison to those from the US workforce survey.

Comparing UCB Career Non-Academic Staff to the US Workforce

Figure 6.1 - Comparing UCB career non-academic staff to the US workforce, contains 23 NIOSH survey questions. The positively stated questions are ordered by the percentage of difference between the UCB and US Workforce results (from highest to lowest percent difference. However, the last two questions (numbers 22 and 23) differ from questions 1-21 in that they are negatively stated questions. UC Berkeley has higher percentage responses to these questions. In general, the percentage rates of UCB and US workforce responses are within ten percentage points of each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>UCB</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your job, how often do you take part with others in making decisions that affect you?</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you say that in general your health is Excellent, Very good, Good, Fair, Poor? (Excellent, Very Good)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My main satisfaction in life comes from my work</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you do your job well, are you likely to be praised (complimented, thanked, etc.) by your supervisor or employer?</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How easy would it be for you to find a similar job with another</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager/supervisor is concerned about the welfare of those who report to him or her</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to be working for UC Berkeley</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have enough information to get the job done</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job requires that I keep learning new things</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people I work with can be relied on when I need help</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the training opportunities I need to perform my job safely and competently</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job lets me use my skills and abilities</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my unit/department, I am treated with respect</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking everything into consideration, how likely is it that you will make a genuine effort to find a new job with another employer within the next year?</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have enough time to get the job done</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chances for promotion are good</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions (e.g. reclassifications, etc.) are handled fairly</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions on my job allow me to be about as productive as I could be</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often during the past month have you felt used up at the end of the day?</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often does each of the following occur? The demands of your job interfere with your family (personal) life?</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.1 - Comparing UCB Career Non-Academic Staff to the US Workforce

**UC Berkeley non-academic staff responses are more positive than US workforce**

UCB staff rated nine items equal to or more positively than the US workforce. The six more positively rated items, shown in italicized text, and indicated by the parenthesized item number, are: take part in making decisions (1); my main satisfaction in life comes from my work (3); likely to be praised for doing your job well (4); demands of family don’t interfere with work (12); less likely to look for another job in the next year (17); and general health is excellent or very good (2) [note this isn’t italicized in the table]. The UCB results on these questions include some key indicators of job satisfaction with respect to work environment, job satisfaction, recognition, and health.

UCB staff and the US workforce identically rated three items: ease in finding a similar job with another employer (5); my manager/supervisor is concerned about the welfare of those who report to him or her (6); and I am proud to be working for this organization (7).

Conversely, UCB survey ratings are lower than the US workforce on the remaining fourteen questions, covering topics such as resources to get the job done, working conditions, career development and advancement, and respectful treatment. Lower UCB ratings of more than 10% difference exist for job conditions (21), promotions handled fairly (20), chances for promotion (19), feeling used up at the end of the day (22), and enough time to get the job done (18).

**Comparing UCB Non-Academic Staff, Academic Staff, and Faculty to the US Workforce**

The 23 NIOSH survey questions used in the Non-Academic Staff Survey (listed in Figure 6.1 above) were also used in the UCB Academic Staff Survey, and seven of the NIOSH questions were used in the UCB Faculty Climate Survey. Figures 6.2-6.24 summarize the data for these comparisons in five categories: work environment, equity and inclusion, relationship with supervisor, career development and advancement, and workload and stress. Refer to Appendix G – Comparing UC Berkeley Survey Responses to the U.S. Workforce.
Work Environment

Seven NIOSH questions on work environment issues were used in both the non-academic and academic staff surveys. The comparisons in Figure 6.2 show that 42% of non-academic staff and 48% of academic staff strongly agree that they are proud to be working for UCB compared to 38% of the US workforce who are proud to work for their employer.

Figure 6.2 – I am proud to be working for UC Berkeley

Figure 6.3 shows that 60% of academic staff responded very true that they have enough information to get the job done compared to 55% of the US workforce, but only 47% of non-academic staff responded very true.
I have enough information to get the job done

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very true</th>
<th>Somewhat true</th>
<th>Not too true</th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCB Non-Acad. Staff (2008-09)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB Acad. Staff (2009)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Workforce (2006)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 6.3 – I have enough information to get the job done

By contrast, Figure 6.4 shows that both non-academic (28%) and academic (27%) UCB staff responded that the statement “I have enough time to get the job done” is true compared to 41% for the US workforce.
Figure 6.4 – I have enough time to get the job done

As shown in Figure 6.5, UCB non-academic and academic staff had a similar response rate to the US workforce (47-50%) to the statement, “The people I work with can be relied on when I need help.”
Two questions ask about finding other jobs. Figure 6.6 reveals that 30% of the US workforce responded that it would be very easy to find a similar job compared to 20% of non-UCB academic staff and 16% of academic staff.
Figure 6.6 – Ease in finding a similar job

Figure 6.7 shows that one-third of UCB staff (34% of non-academic staff and 33% of academic staff) were not at all likely to look for another job while 0% of the US workforce responded that it is not at all likely that they would make an effort to find another job.
Taking everything into consideration, how likely is it you will make a genuine effort to find a new job with another employer within the next year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Not too likely</th>
<th>Not at all likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCB Non-Acad. Staff (2008-09)</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCB Acad. Staff (2009)</strong></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Workforce (2006)</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>62%*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: UC Berkeley, Non-Acad. Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009; UC Berkeley, Academic Staff Climate Survey, Spring 2009; NORC, General Social Survey (GSS), NIOSH Module, 2006. "The GSS 2006 survey did not include “Not too Likely” but only “Not at all Likely” on the not likely part of the response scale.

**Figure 6.7 – Likelihood of finding another job**

**Figure 6.8** shows that 49% of academic staff responded that they often take part in decision compared to 44% of non-academic staff and 40% of the US workforce.
In your job, how often do you take part with others in making decisions that affect you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCB Non-Acad. Staff (2008-09)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB Acad. Staff (2009)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Workforce (2006)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 6.8 – Take part with others in decisions that affect you

The remaining three work environment questions include faculty survey results. Figure 6.9 shows that 30% of the US workforce strongly agrees with the statement that conditions on their job allow them to be productive in comparison with 16%-21% of the three UCB employee groups.
Figure 6.9 – Conditions on my job allow me to be productive

Figure 6.10 indicates that academic staff and faculty strongly agree or agree (49% and 66%) to the statement “My main satisfaction in life comes from my work” at a higher rate than non-academic staff (32%) and the US workforce (28%).
My main satisfaction in life comes from my work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCB Non-Acad. Staff</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB Acad. Staff</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB Faculty (2009)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Workforce</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent who agree

Sources: UC Berkeley, Non-Acad. Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009; UC Berkeley, Academic Staff Climate Survey, Spring 2009; UC Berkeley, Faculty Climate Survey, Spring 2009; NORC, General Social Survey (GSS), NIOSH Module, 2006.

Figure 6.10 - My main satisfaction in life comes from my work

Finally, Figure 6.11 indicates that the US workforce responded very satisfied with their jobs at the highest rate of 48%, compared to faculty at 46%, academic staff at 42%, and non-academic staff at the lowest rate of 34%.
All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?

![Graph showing satisfaction levels for different groups.](image)

**Figure 6.11 – How satisfied are you with your job**

**Equity and Inclusion**

One NIOSH question about equity and inclusion is included in the non-academic staff and academic staff surveys. **Figure 6.12** shows that 42% of the US workforce strongly agrees to the statement “I am treated with respect” compared to 33% of non-academic staff and 35% of academic staff. The overall positive responses (strongly agree and agree) for all three groups are more than 80%: non-academic staff at 87%, academic staff at 86%, and the US workforce with the highest positive response rate at 93%.
**Relationship with Supervisor**

Two NIOSH questions are included in the non-academic and academic surveys. For both questions, the US workforce responses are more positive than those of the UCB staff. **Figure 6.13** reveals that all three groups responded at similar rates to the statement “My manager is concerned about the welfare of those who report to him or her”: 50% of the US workforce strongly agrees compared to 45% of non-academic staff and 46% of academic staff.
**Survey of Non-Academic Staff on Workplace Climate and Career/Life Issues Report**

**Figure 6.13** - My manager is concerned about the welfare of those who report to him or her

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCB Non-Acad. Staff (2008-09)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB Acad. Staff (2009)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Workforce (2006)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** UC Berkeley, Non-Acad. Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009; UC Berkeley, Academic Staff Climate Survey, Spring 2009; NORC, General Social Survey (GSS), NIOSH Module, 2006. *GSS 2006 Question Version: My supervisor is concerned about the welfare of those under him or her.

**Figure 6.14** shows that 57% of the US workforce responded yes to the statement “When you do your job well are you likely to be praised” compared to 55% of non-academic staff and 48% of academic staff.
Career Development and Advancement

Both the non-academic and academic staff surveys include six NIOSH questions related to career development and advancement. Figure 6.15 shows that 94% of academic staff responded significantly more positively (59% strongly agree, 35% agree) to the statement “My job requires that I keep learning new things” than the US workforce at 84% (35% strongly agree, 41% agree) and non-academic staff at 83% (35% strongly agree, 47% agree).
Figure 6.15 - My job requires that I keep learning new things

As shown in Figure 6.16, 43% of academic staff responded very true to the statement “I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities” compared to 40% of the US workforce, and only 28% for non-academic staff.
Figure 6.16 – Opportunity to develop my own special abilities

Figure 6.17 shows the same trend as the previous table with 52% of academic staff strongly agreeing with the statement “My job lets me use my skills and abilities,” a significantly higher percentage than 33% for non-academic staff and 41% for the US workforce.
However, where training and development focuses on safety and ability, Figure 6.18 reveals that 60% of the US workforce responded very true to the statement “I have the training opportunities I need to perform safely and competently,” significantly higher than academic staff at 49% and non-academic staff at 41%.

The last two career-related questions address advancement. Figure 6.19 shows that 21% of the US workforce responded very true to the statement “The chances for promotion are good,” triple the rate of non-academic staff at 7%, and nearly double the rate of academic staff at 12%.
The chances for promotion are good

A similar trend is found in Figure 6.20, with 30% of the US workforce responding very true that their promotions were handled fairly, higher than UCB academic staff at 24% and non-academic staff at only 13%.
Overall, academic staff responses are higher than those of the other two UCB groups for job development involving new learning and using personal skills. The US workforce has a higher response rate for receiving training opportunities to perform the job safely and competently, and having promotions handled fairly. On all six career development and advancement questions non-academic staff responses were lower than those for academic staff and the US workforce.

**Workload and Stress**

All three UCB surveys included the four NIOSH workload and stress questions. Figure 6.21 shows that the three UCB groups responded very often at a higher rate to the statement that they feel used up at the end of the day than the US workforce, with the faculty response rate at 39%, non-academic staff at 29%, academic staff at 27%, and the US workforce at 19%.
**How often during the past month have you felt used up at the end of the day?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCB Non-Acad. Staff (2008-09)</strong></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCB Acad. Staff (2009)</strong></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCB Faculty (2009)</strong></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Workforce (2006)</strong></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** UC Berkeley, Non-Acad. Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009; UC Berkeley, Academic Staff Climate Survey, Spring 2009; UC Berkeley, Faculty Climate Survey, Spring 2008; NORC, General Social Survey (GSS), NIOSH Module, 2006.

*Figure 6.21 – How often during the past month have you felt used up at the end of the day*

**Figures 6.22 and 6.23** present responses to questions about work/life balance. In Figure 6.22, non-academic staff report the lowest rate of job interfering with job (family) life at 10% compared to the US workforce at 11%, academic staff at 16%, and the significantly higher rate of 43% for faculty.
Figure 6.22 – Demands of your job interfere with your family (personal) life

Figure 6.23 shows a similar comparative trend, but with substantially lower percentages of the three groups responding that family (personal) life interferes with their job (15% for faculty, 5% for academic staff, and 2% for non-academic staff, compared to 4% for the US workforce).
How often do each of the following occur? The demands of your family (personal life) interfere with your work on the job?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: UC Berkeley, Non-Acad. Staff Climate Survey, 2008-2009; UC Berkeley, Academic Staff Climate Survey, Spring 2009; UC Berkeley, Faculty Climate Survey, Spring 2008; NORC, General Social Survey (GSS), NIOSH Module, 2006. *GSS 2006 Question Version: How often do the demands of your family interfere with your work on the job?

Figure 6.23 – Demands of family (personal) life interfere with your job

In Figure 6.24, non-academic staff report lower overall physical health: 24% report it as excellent compared to 27% of the US workforce and 35% of both academic staff and faculty.
Non-academic staff respondents report lower overall physical health and less interference between work and family (personal) life compared to the other groups, and only the US workforce respondents report a higher frequency of feeling used up at the end of the day.

**Summary of NIOSH Question Comparisons to Non-Academic Survey Responses**

The NIOSH comparative survey results serve as a baseline for benchmarking UCB non-academic staff, academic staff, and faculty with the US workforce. In general, non-academic staff responses are lower than those of the US workforce on eight of ten of the work environment questions, and lower than the academic staff on seven of ten work environment questions.
Non-academic staff responded at a lower rate than both the US workforce and academic staff on the equity and inclusion question about respectful treatment in the unit/department. On the two relationship with supervisor questions, non-academic staff responded slightly less strongly than academic staff and the US workforce about their supervisor’s concern about their welfare, and non-academic staff report that they are more likely to be praised for a job well done than academic staff and just slightly less than the US workforce.

For all six of the career development and advancement question, non-academic staff responded less positively than academic staff and the US workforce. Non-academic staff also responded less favorably in three of the four stress and workload questions, compared to academic staff, faculty, and the US workforce, but had the second highest response rate on the frequency of feeling used up at the end of the day (29%) compared to faculty (39%).
SECTION 7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The non-academic staff survey results suggest opportunities to implement changes to current administrative policies. This section describes campus policy implications in the following ten areas:

• Information access for all non-academic staff
• Retention of career staff
• Support for staff organizations
• Career development, advancement, and staff recognition
• Supervisor /manager skills training
• Workload and stress
• Workplace accommodation
• UC Berkeley alumni staff members
• Telecommuting and virtual technology
• Equity and inclusion

Policy implication descriptions and recommendations for each area are provided below.

Information Access for All Non-Academic Staff

The survey shows that access to information affects staff in two ways. First, as presented in Section 3 - Response Rates, 50% of career non-academic staff with emails responded to the survey. However, at the time of the survey 550 staff did not campus email addresses, and only 83 paper-based surveys were collected. These career staff members without emails are typically found in the service worker jobs in housing and dining and in the physical plant. Despite efforts to make paper versions available and to set up computer kiosks in remote locations, the number of staff in this population who completed the survey was small. Second, there are service workers who are non-English speaking. A Spanish paper version of the survey was distributed
and live translators were provided to administer the survey in Chinese (Mandarin and Cantonese), Tagalog, Lao, and Vietnamese, but only 88 of these surveys were submitted.

Currently, staff members without email addresses rely on their supervisors to notify them about information provided to other staff via email. A change in policy to provide all career non-academic staff with campus email addresses would increase the likelihood that these staff will have access to the staff survey in the future, and to other information that is accessible through campus websites, such as public transportation passes, staff discounts for on-campus events and the like.

**Retention of Career Staff**

Pride in working for Berkeley is high during the first three years on campus, then the rate declines. Only 26% of staff members would recommend Berkeley to friends and family seeking employment, and staff members with seniority levels between three to eight years, under the age of 40, and with bachelors or masters degrees are the most likely to leave if offered another position.

These and other survey results indicate that efforts are needed to retain staff members that have been on campus more than three years. Career development, campus climate, and employee engagement efforts are potential areas to explore to increase retention.

Moreover, in light of current economic conditions, the campus has a continuing need to address the realities of what constitutes a living wage as housing, transportation, dependent care and consumer expenses continue to rise.

**Support for Staff Organizations**

For the survey question about willingness to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help UC Berkeley be successful, staff from all ethnic groups except White and Indian/Pakistani rated this item very high (85% agree/strongly agree). Other questions related to career development, campus climate, and respectful treatment indicate lower ratings from Under Represented Minorities compared to White staff.
A policy change to provide additional resources for and attention to staff organizations, particularly ethnic staff organizations, in the areas of professional development, improving campus climate, and increasing visibility for equity and inclusion topics could increase the contributions of these staff groups.

This survey asked for gender information including transgendered staff (0.1% of staff), and about sexual orientation, including heterosexual, lesbian, gay, bisexual or other, with 12% of staff identifying as not heterosexual. The Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the LGBT Community at Cal, comprising faculty, staff, and students, has proven to be effective in addressing the concerns of the LGBTQ campus community. Lavender Cal, the LGBTQ staff organization, should be included in efforts to solicit staff input on campus issues and policies.

**Career Development, Advancement, and Staff Recognition**

The least satisfying job aspect for staff who responded to the survey is opportunities to advance: only 50% indicated they were satisfied/very satisfied. Some of the key areas of dissatisfaction are related to a lack of career advancement, recognition, and compensation, particularly for represented workers. Additionally, the percentage of staff that worked in different departments drops dramatically with three or more departments, and 60% of non-academic staff have worked in only one department.

The continued development of Career Compass to complete the career mapping strategies will help to fulfill the career advancement needs of staff. Given the current economic environment, increased compensation and monetary recognition will be more challenging to accomplish, but additional ways to recognize staff have the potential to have a positive impact on staff perceptions about recognition.

**Supervisor/Manager Skills Training**

Overall, the survey results about relationships with supervisors/managers indicate the greatest dissatisfaction with communication, feedback, and a lack of clear direction. In addition,
numerous comments about the need to provide supervisor training indicate that these are important areas of supervision for the campus to address.

The age span of the entire campus community surfaces generational differences that are especially challenging for supervisors and managers. Sandwiched between the predominantly Gen Y/Millenial students and the senior faculty (presumably the oldest age group on campus) the Gen X and Boomer staff (in the 30s to 60s age group) need information, resources and support to work and manage effectively across generational differences. The comprehensive new supervisor training curriculum, Keys to Enhancing Your Supervision (KEYS), addresses these supervisory training needs. Based on the staff survey results and emerging campus environment issues, the campus should consider development of additional training modules.

**Workload and Stress**

Eleven questions regarding work/life, workload, and stress provide important indicators about the health and well-being of staff at all levels. Fifty-seven percent of staff members reported feeling used up at the end of the day and 48% found their work stressful.

The workload and stress results, along with the child care module results, were referred to the University Health Services Work/Life Advisory Group which will consider new policies.

**Workplace Accommodations**

With respect to religious affiliation, the survey responses indicate that 46% of staff members are not affiliated with a major religion, 39% are Christian, 5.4% Jewish and 5.3% other religions. The high number of staff members that are not affiliated with a major religion implies that religion is not a significant factor to consider in looking at campus climate and other work environment issues. However, despite the low number of staff identifying themselves as Muslims (7%), Arab-Israeli and anti-Muslim sentiments on campus and in the community indicate the need to ensure that staff practices and policies address religion and religious accommodation.

Although only a small percentage of staff (5.6%) identified that they have a disability, the potential impact of not addressing needs for accommodation may be significant. The most
frequently cited disabilities are: Physical/orthopedic disabilities (52.1%); other disability - multiple or hidden disabilities (26.3%); cognitive disability (13.7%); and deaf/hard of hearing (11.6%). At the very least, these results call for a review of policies for providing workplace accommodations for staff with disabilities.

**UC Berkeley Alumni Staff Members**

Slightly less than one-third (1,021 staff, 31.3%) of the Non-Academic Staff Survey respondents attended UC Berkeley (31.3%). The Alumni Association, as well as University Relations (donor relations and development), may benefit from direct and targeted involvement of alumni in their endeavors.

**Telecommuting and Virtual Technology**

Nearly half of the staff members live within nine miles of campus (48.9%); however a number of staff members live more than 50 miles away or live in multiple locations. The implications for providing public transit and parking assistance, as well as telecommuting and technology-enabled interaction via live video streaming, podcasts, and webcasts may enable staff members that live further away from campus to contribute more significantly by reducing the financial, physical, and emotional costs associated with long and congested commutes. These recommendation will be referred to the Divisions of Administration and Information Services and Technology.

**Equity and Inclusion**

Questions related to respectful treatment indicate that a higher percentage of staff members receive more respectful treatment outside of their unit/department than inside their unit/department, and that URM groups rate respectful treatment in their unit/department well below the campus average. This is a significant campus climate issue that the Division of Equity & Inclusion needs to continually focus upon.

Despite the low number of reports of discrimination (6%) and harassment (2%), the importance of addressing concerns about staff members that have experienced discrimination and
harassment remains a high priority. The responses identified discrimination based on race, age, and gender as the top three types of discrimination the compliance units and Human Resources should continue to address. Bullying is cited as one of the most frequently experienced forms of harassment. A policy or guidelines to address bullying needs to be implemented.
SECTION 8. RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Summary of Results

The UCB Non-Academic Career Staff Climate and Career Development Survey results reflect the work environment conditions at a time when economic conditions were better, budget issues were less pressing, and the campus was not making dramatic changes in how it operated. The survey results showed that staff were extremely positive about several aspects of the work environment, including:

- Positive interactions with co-workers/colleagues
- Benefits and flexibility in work hours
- Pride in working at Berkeley and a sense of personal satisfaction in doing the job well
- Having enough information and resources to get the job done
- Berkeley’s commitment to diversity

Bearing in mind that work environment issues are important to staff satisfaction and productivity, the survey results indicate the following areas to improve and expand upon:

- Communication channels across the campus
- Continued focus on career development and advancement
- Manager/supervisor effectiveness and communications
- Unit/department support for diversity, equity, and inclusion
- Campus climate
- Recognition and reward
- Managing workload and stress
Campus-wide Action Items

The action planning goal for the survey was to identify one to three action items to work on until the next survey is conducted. As a result of the survey and discussions with campus leaders about actionable focus areas, the campus is focusing on three action items:

1. Campus-wide communication
2. Manager/supervisor development
3. Campus climate

At the control unit/division level, individual divisions received staff survey results and determined specific action items for their organizations to take. In addition to the three campus-wide action items, division-level action items include improving public recognition of staff, involvement in on-campus activities, stress reduction, and increasing unit/department commitment to diversity. Campus-wide and/or Control Unit/Division-level survey results were presented to the following groups:

- Administration Management Team
- Administration Executive Leadership Team
- Administration Equity & Inclusion Council
- Administration Workforce Strategy Group
- Alianza
- Asia Pacific Systemwide Alliance
- AVC Admissions & Enrollments Leadership Team
- AVC Residential Student Services Programs Leadership Team
- Business Administration Services Leadership Team
- Berkeley Staff Assembly (BS)
- Black Staff and Faculty Organization (BSFO)
- Council of Administration Officers (CAO)
- Campus Assessment Network (CAN)
• Chancellor’s Cabinet
• Chancellor’s Staff Advisory Council (CSAC)
• Council of Ethnic Staff Organizations (CESO)
• Council of Staff Organizations (CSO)
• Council of UC Staff Assemblies (CUCSA)
• Operational Excellence Coordinating Committee
• Facilities Services
• Graduate Division
• Haas School of Business
• Human Resources - Boalt School of Law
• Physical Plant and Campus Services (PP-CS)
• RSSP – Office of Student Development
• RSSP – Social Justice Committee
• School of Public Health – Management Advisory Council
• Student Affairs Division Roundtable

Next Steps

As analysis and evaluation of the survey continues, preparations for the next survey have begun. Here are two steps that will engage all staff in taking action on the survey results:

• 1. Post the survey results on the campus website.
• 2. Monitor campus-wide and division/unit results in two ways:

  • The three action items are broad in scope, and efforts to address them were already underway even before the survey completion date. The current campus priority of Operational Excellence will help to directly and indirectly focus attention on some of the action items such as communication and manager/supervisor development.
• After the staff survey was conducted, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion released its 10-year strategic plan. Two of the three strategic plan priorities link directly to the staff survey results: Expanded pathways for access and success for staff, and creating and sustaining a healthy campus climate. Equity & Inclusion received a grant from the Evelyn and Walter Haas Jr. Fund that supports accomplishing these priorities and incorporates a program review component for monitoring activity that will enhance equity, inclusion, and diversity efforts on campus. The staff survey action planning process will be integrated into the E&I Program Reviews.
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