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Introductory Statements

This report discusses the results of the 2004 University of Minnesota PULSE SURVEY. The PULSE SURVEY was commissioned by the University’s central administration and conducted in partnership with the Human Resources Research Institute. The PULSE SURVEY will be an ongoing University-wide effort to “take the pulse” of University employees. The survey asked a variety of questions about employees’ job experiences and attitudes about their jobs, departments, and the University. In the years to come, similar surveys will be administered to track changes in the experiences of University employees.

The first PULSE SURVEY was conducted in April, 2004. Over 6,000 faculty and staff responded to the survey—a truly overwhelming response. We are pleased that so many members of the University community took the opportunity to tell the research team about their work experiences. We hope for your participation in future administrations of the PULSE survey.

In this report, only results related to the staff survey will be discussed. A separate report is available describing the faculty survey results. We hope that you find this report interesting and will direct any comments or questions to the researchers using the contact information below.

Research Team:
Professors Theresa M. Glomb, Stephanie Lluis, and Brian McCall
Human Resources Research Institute
Department of Human Resources and Industrial Relations
University of Minnesota
Phone: (612) 624-6076
Email: hrri@csom.umn.edu
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Taken as a whole, the PULSE results suggest that employees at the University of Minnesota are satisfied with a variety of features regarding their employment and the University. Across a number of indicators, results suggest that respondents feel quite good about their jobs at the University.

In particular, we see some of the most favorable results in the following areas:
- Overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with the University as an employer
- Satisfaction with coworkers
- Satisfaction with supervisors
- Intentions to remain at the University
- General well-being outside of work

On several of these item sets, we see results that are at the very top end of the scales, suggesting very positive results.

Despite the generally favorable results, some areas showed more moderate degrees of favorability. This is not to say that results were unfavorable, but rather when considered in the context of the overall positive results, individuals were more moderately favorable or neutral.
- Satisfaction with promotion
- Satisfaction with pay
- Supervisor support for career development
- Perceptions of job security

Structure of the report

On the following pages, you will find detailed results from the PULSE survey. The report is divided into eight major sections:
- Characteristics of the Respondents
- Job Satisfaction
- Pay and Benefits
- Supervisor and Departmental Support
- University Climate
- Job Security and Retention
- Life Outside Work

Within each of these major sections, we identify the question sets used, present results for question sets, and briefly interpret the results. In most cases, results are presented for the overall set of respondents and then broken down by campus and by job classification. However, overall there were not many differences in responses by campus and job classification and even apparent differences on graphs presented may not be statistically different from one another.
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

A total of 12,565 surveys were sent out to staff employees and 4883 completed surveys were received for a response rate of 38.86%. The sample breakdowns on some main demographic categories are shown below.

The results of the descriptive analysis reveal that a majority of respondents are from the Twin Cities campus (89%), and from three main job categories: civil service (44%), P & A Staff (31%) and bargaining unit (25%). The majority of the respondents are female (67%), white (89%), with a college degree (70%), and working full-time (99%). The average age of employees is a little over 43 years, and they work over 42 hours a week on average. The respondents have been employed at the University of Minnesota for an average of approximately 12½ years and have spent close to 8 years in their current job.
Supervise or manage other employees

- No: 52%
- Yes: 45%
- No response: 3%

Student Status

- Not currently a student: 83%
- Full-time: 2%
- Part-time: 13%
- No response: 2%

Gender

- Female: 67%
- Male: 32%
- Transgender: <1%
- Other: <1%
- No response: 1%
### Race

- **White**: 89%
- **Black**: 2%
- **Arab**: 1%
- **Asian**: 3%
- **Hispanic**: 1%
- **Native American**: 1%
- **Other**: 1%
- **No response**: 3%

### Marital Status

- **Married**: 61%
- **Divorced or Separated**: 8%
- **Widowed**: 1%
- **Living with Partner**: 7%
- **Single**: 20%
- **No response**: 3%
- **Widowed**: 1%

### Highest level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a high school diploma</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school plus technical training or apprentice</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate school</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sexual Orientation

- Heterosexual: 88%
- Lesbian: 2%
- Gay: 2%
- Bisexual: 2%
- Other: 0%
- No response: 6%

Disability Status

- Yes: 2%
- No: 96%
- No response: 2%

Most recent generation of the family to come to the U.S.

- Great-grandparent(s): 33%
- Great-grandparent(s): 29%
- Parent(s): 4%
- Yourself: 4%
- Choose not to answer: 4%
- Before great-grandparents: 26%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christian religion</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-Christian religion</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taoist</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS/Mormon</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERPRETING THE RESULTS

When reviewing the results of the survey, please keep in mind some of the following issues:

Variables Not Accounted for in the Analysis
The results presented are meant to describe the overall pattern of the data. They do not take into account or “control for” any characteristics of the respondents. Although additional analysis can “control for” some of these effects, the current report presents an overall snapshot of the results due to the large number of possible variables.

Statistically Significant Differences
Although the graphs below may suggest differences among groups, in many cases these differences are not statistically—or meaningfully—different.

• For most of the job classification results, differences are unlikely to be due to chance. However, these differences may be the result of other variables that have not been “controlled for.”

• For most of the campus results, small differences between groups are likely to be due to chance fluctuations and the groups can be treated as equivalent to one another.

Practical Significance
Differences that may be statistically significant may not be practically significant. Practical significance rests on judgments of whether a difference is relevant or of any importance in the real world.

Sample Size
In some cases, the number of participants is small. Results from a smaller group of participants are less stable and reliable as compared to results from a larger group of participants.
JOB SATISFACTION

Satisfaction with Work
This graph is based on responses to statements that assessed staff’s satisfaction with work, such as “Work gives a sense of accomplishment, is satisfying, is challenging.”

The results appear to show that a majority of staff across all four campuses are very satisfied with work. It is worth noting that satisfaction with work is reported to be slightly lower among bargaining unit staff compared to those from other job classifications.
Satisfaction with Promotion

This graph is based on responses to statements that assessed staff’s satisfaction with promotion opportunities, such as “good chance for promotion, unfair promotion policy, promotion of ability.”

Overall, satisfaction with promotion was low across all four campuses. Bargaining unit employees showed the lowest satisfaction compared to those from other job classifications.
Satisfaction with Coworkers

This graph is based on responses to statements that assessed staff’s satisfaction with their coworkers, such as “The majority of the people I work with are helpful, intelligent, responsible.”

Overall, staff were very satisfied with their coworkers across all four campuses and job classifications.
Satisfaction with Supervisor

This graph is based on responses to statements that assessed staff's satisfaction with their supervisors, such as “praises good work, tactful, up-to-date.”

Overall, staff were generally satisfied with their supervisors.
Overall Job Satisfaction

Staff were asked to select the face that best described how they typically feel as an indicator of their overall job satisfaction.

A majority of staff across all four campuses and job classifications reported fairly high levels of job satisfaction. Specifically, the staff on the Morris campus and bargaining unit employees reported somewhat lower than average levels of overall job satisfaction, while staff on the Crookston campus reported slightly higher than average levels of overall job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Sad</th>
<th>Very Sad</th>
<th>Archive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookston</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Cities</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining Unit</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P &amp; A Staff</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority (70%) of staff reported that they would recommend the University as an employer. This is consistent with the result that almost 80% of staff would seek employment with the University again.

**Would you recommend employment at the University to a friend?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If I were doing it again, I would accept a position at the University.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PAY AND BENEFITS

These graphs assess staff satisfaction with pay in the following areas:

- Pay level – satisfaction with take home pay, current salary, etc.
- Benefits – satisfaction with benefit package, the value of benefits, etc.
- Pay raise – satisfaction with most recent pay raise, influence of supervisor on pay raise, etc.
- Pay structure/administration – satisfaction with consistency of the University’s pay policies, pay structure, etc.
- Overall – a composite of the above

Overall, satisfaction with pay was moderate to low across all four campuses and all job classifications. Staff reported fairly favorable levels of satisfaction with benefits but low levels of satisfaction in the other areas, especially pay raises, across all four campuses and all job classifications.
Overall Pay Satisfaction

Twin Cities
Morris
Duluth
Crookston
University-wide

Dissatisfied to Satisfied

Overall Pay Satisfaction

Civil Service
Bargaining Staff
P & A Staff
University-wide

Dissatisfied to Satisfied
SUPPORT

Supervisory Support (overall)

These graphs are based on responses to statements that assessed staff’s satisfaction with supervisors.

Overall, staff reported that they receive moderate levels of support from their supervisors or responsible administrators.
Supervisory Support (item level)

This table reports results for items that assessed supervisory support in different areas. Items were scored on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale and this table reports item means from high to low.

Item means suggest that staff perceived higher levels of support from their supervisors in balancing their personal and family needs. They perceived lower levels of supervisory support for improving their career opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Support</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is understanding when I have an unexpected family or personal problem</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is supportive of my efforts to balance work and personal needs</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports my attempts to acquire additional training or education to further my career</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure I get the credit when I accomplish something substantial on the job</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares about whether or not I achieve my goals</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives me helpful feedback about my performance</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides assignments that give me the opportunity to develop and strengthen new skills</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives me advice about improving my performance when I need it</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes time to learn about my goals and aspirations</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides me special projects that increase my visibility in the University</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps me informed about different career opportunities for me in the University</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items are scored on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale.*
**Department Support (overall)**

These graphs are based on responses to statements that assessed staff’s satisfaction with departmental support.

Overall, employees reported moderate levels of support from their departments. Staff at the Crookston and Morris campuses reported the highest levels of departmental support, bargaining unit staff reported the lowest levels of departmental support.
Departmental Support (item level)

This table reports results for items measuring departmental support in different areas. Items were scored on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) scale and this table reports item means from high to low.

Item means suggest that staff perceived the highest levels of departmental support when they felt they had a problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Support</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help is available from my department when I have a problem</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department really cares about my well-being</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department takes in pride in my accomplishments at work</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department cares about my opinions</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the best of my ability</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department cares about my general satisfaction at work</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department strongly considers my goals and values</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, my department would fail to notice</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department shows very little concern for me</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Items are scored on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) scale.
UNIVERSITY CLIMATE/ CULTURE

Overall confidence

These graphs are based on responses to statements that assessed staff’s confidence in the respective directions their departments and the University are heading.

Overall, staff reported fairly moderate confidence in the direction of their departments and the University. Staff at the Morris campus reported the lowest levels of confidence in the direction the University is heading.

I have confidence in the direction my department is heading

I have confidence in the direction the University is heading

1 2 3 4 5
Disagree to Agree
University Climate for groups

Employees responded to a set of questions that examined their perceptions of the climate for specific employee groups. The University climate was largely favorable for different employee groups. The University was considered to have a favorable or very favorable climate for people of color (56%), people from different cultural customs (64%), people with different religious beliefs (60%), people with disabilities (60%), GLBT employees (62%), older employees (55%), women (60%) and men (67%). For each category, a section of respondents frequently reported that they had no response or a neutral opinion as regards the University climate for these employee groups.

Despite these general positive or neutral perceptions, within each category some percentage of employees did report that the climate was unfavorable or very unfavorable for specific employee groups. These percentages for specific groups are indicated in parenthesis: people of color (10%), people from different cultural customs (7%), people with different religious beliefs (6%), people with disabilities (7%), GLBT employees (5%), older employees (15%), women (10%) and men (4%).

In addition to the overall ratings shown above, the pattern of results indicated that members of each group reported lower favorability for that group than non-group members. For example, women reported that the University climate for women was less favorable than men reported the University climate for women.
Workplace problems

These charts are based on responses to statements that assessed workplace problems that impeded staff productivity, such as discrimination or unfair supervision, and the University response to such problems.

A majority of staff (68%) reported that they had not experienced a workplace problem, 32% reported that they had experienced workplace problems. Of those who experienced workplace problems, 57% reported these problems to the University. Of the staff who reported these problems, 39% felt that they received a fair response but 61% felt otherwise.
If Yes, did you receive a fair response with respect to the problem?

- Yes: 39%
- No: 61%
University Response to Workplace Problems

In addition to questions about specific workplace problems, staff were asked about the University’s mechanisms for dealing with such problems.

The majority of staff (72%) reported that they knew where to seek help for resolving workplace problems, but 13% reported that they did not. 25% of staff reported that they were not confident they would receive a fair response, 41% of staff reported that they were confident they would receive a fair response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I know where to go within the University to get help resolving a workplace problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I have confidence that if I report a workplace problem, I will receive a fair response regarding it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RETENTION AND JOB SECURITY

Job Security Index

The job security index is based on responses to questions that assessed staff’s perceptions about the future of their jobs at the University, and if they consider it to be “unpredictable, uncertain, almost guaranteed, etc.”

Overall, staff reported moderately low levels of job security across all four campuses and all job classifications.

Perceptions of Job Security
Turnover Intentions

These graphs are based on responses to questions that assessed staff’s intention to quit, such as “How often do you think about quitting your job?” and “How easy or difficult would it be financially for you to quit your job?”

Staff across all four campuses and all job classifications reported low intentions to quit their jobs. Staff on the Twin Cities campus reported the highest intentions to quit.

---

**Turnover Intentions**

- Twin Cities
- Morris
- Duluth
- Crookston
- University-wide

**Turnover Intentions**

- Civil Service
- Bargaining Staff
- P & A Staff
- University-wide
LIFE OUTSIDE WORK

Work Family Conflict

These graphs are based on responses to questions that assessed the extent to which staff’s work life interfered with their home life, such as “The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life” and “My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties.”

Work family conflict was reported to be moderate to low across all four campuses and all job classifications.
Family Work Conflict

These graphs are based on responses to questions that assessed the extent to which staff’s home life interfered with their work life, such as “The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities,” and “Family-related strain interferes with my ability to perform job-related duties.”

Family work conflict was reported to be extremely low across all four campuses and all job classifications.
Overall Health

This graph is based on responses to statements that assessed staff’s overall physical health.

Staff considered their general health to be quite good; 81% reported their health to be either excellent, very good, or good.

![Overall Health graph]

General Well-being

Staff were asked to select the face that best described how they typically feel as an indicator of their general well-being.

Staff at the Crookston campus reported the highest levels of well-being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University-wide</th>
<th>Crookston</th>
<th>Duluth</th>
<th>Morris</th>
<th>Twin Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%  53%  11% 3%</td>
<td>45% 50%  5%</td>
<td>38% 51%  9% 3%</td>
<td>42% 47% 12%</td>
<td>33% 53% 11% 3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bargaining Unit</th>
<th>Civil Service</th>
<th>P &amp; A Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34% 50% 13% 3%</td>
<td>33% 55% 11% 3%</td>
<td>34% 54% 10% 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparative results of Faculty and Staff

Although the faculty and staff surveys were slightly different, we can examine important common items. These graphs compare overall job satisfaction and general well-being of faculty and staff.

The results indicate overall job satisfaction is moderate among faculty and staff, with staff reporting marginally higher levels of satisfaction. Levels of general well-being are fairly high and similar for both faculty and staff.