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Introductory Statements

This report discusses the results of the 2008 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 and Office of Institutional Research. The first Pulse Survey was conducted in April, 2004 and the second was conducted in March 2006. The 2008 Pulse Survey was conducted in April 2008 and over 7,500 faculty and staff responded to the survey. The survey asked a variety of questions about employees' job experiences and attitudes about their jobs, departments, and the University.

The Pulse Survey will be an ongoing University-wide effort to "take the pulse" of University employees. In the years to come, similar surveys will be administered to track changes in the experiences of University employees.

If you have questions or concerns about the Pulse survey or would like to request the results in an alternative format, please e-mail ohr@umn.edu
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Taken as a whole, the Pulse Survey 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
- Satisfaction with benefits
- 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

On the following pages, you will find detailed results from the Pulse survey. The report is divided into nine major sections:
- Characteristics of the Respondents
- Job Satisfaction
- Pay and Benefits
- Job Stress
- Supervisor and Departmental Support
- University Climate
- Job Security and Retention
- Employee Workgroup
- 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 category. However, overall there were not many differences in responses by campus and job category and even apparent differences on graphs presented may not be statistically different from one another.
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

A total of 13,373 surveys were sent out to staff employees and 6,071 completed surveys were received for a response rate of 45%. 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 (90%), and representative of the three main job categories: civil service (42%), P & A Staff (32%) and bargaining unit (26%). The majority of the respondents are female (65%), white (87%), with a college degree (63.2%).
Job Category

- Civil Service: 42%
- P & A Staff: 32%
- Bargaining Unit: 26%

Supervise or manage other employees

- No response: 2%
- Yes: 42%
- No: 56%
Student Status

- Not currently a student: 84%
- Full-time: 12%
- Part-time: 2%
- No response: 2%

Gender

- Female: 65%
- Male: 33%
- Other: <1%
- Transgender: <1%
- No response: 2%
Race

- White: 87%
- Black: 2%
- Asian: 3%
- Hispanic: 1%
- Native American: 1%
- Arab: <1%
- Other: 1%
- No response: 5%

Marital Status

- Married: 62%
- Single: 20%
- Living with significant other/partner: 6%
- Widowed: 1%
- No response: 2%
- Divorced or Separated: 6%
- Same-sex domestic partner: 3%
### Highest level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate school</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school plus technical training or apprentice</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a high school diploma</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disability Status

Most recent generation of the family to come to the U.S.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christian</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Christian</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taoist</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS</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 may suggest differences among groups, in many cases these differences are not statistically – or meaningfully – different.

- For most of the job category 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. For example, one job category may have a score of 2.6 on work satisfaction and another may have a score of 2.4 on work satisfaction. This difference may be statistically significant, but not practically significant as they both show relatively favorable attitudes toward work. Practical significance rests on judgments of whether a difference is relevant or of any importance in the real world.

**Sample Size and Variability**
In some cases, the number of participants in a particular group is small. Results from a smaller group of participants are less stable and reliable as compared to results from a larger group of participants. Overall, standard errors (a simple measure of the degree of uncertainty of an average) were low (0.008-0.017) indicating that the different dimensions assessed in the Pulse Survey such as job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, etc. were sound estimates of the overall University population. Standard errors were slightly larger (0.06-0.14) for the Crookston and Morris campuses, due to their smaller sample size.
JOBS SATISFACTION

Satisfaction with Work
This graph is based on a set of questions, such as, “work gives a sense of accomplishment, is satisfying, is challenging” that assessed an employee’s satisfaction with work itself. The results appear to show that a majority of staff employees are very satisfied with their work across all four University of Minnesota campuses. Satisfaction with work is reported to be slightly lower for bargaining unit staff as compared to all groups of staff employees.

Satisfaction with Work

![Graph showing satisfaction with work]
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 campuses, with the Morris campus reporting the lowest promotion satisfaction. Bargaining unit employees showed the lowest average satisfaction with promotion across job categories.

Satisfaction with Promotion
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, and responsible." Overall, staff were very satisfied with their coworkers across all campuses and job categories.

Satisfaction with Coworkers
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, employees were generally satisfied with their supervisors.

Satisfaction with Supervisor
Overall Job Satisfaction

Overall, I am satisfied with my employment at the University.

- Strongly Disagree: 2%
- Disagree: 6%
- Neither agree or disagree: 12%
- Agree: 49%
- Strongly agree: 30%

79% of the employees reported that they were satisfied with their employment at the University.
Would you recommend employment at the University to a friend or colleague?

A majority (77%) of staff employees indicated that they would consider recommending the University as an employer to a friend.
If I were doing it again, I would accept a position at the University.

About 82% of staff would seek employment with the University again.
PAY AND BENEFITS

Satisfaction with pay was assessed by a variety of items on four specific dimensions:

- **pay level** (“my take home pay”, “my current salary”, etc.)
- **benefits** (“my benefit package”, “the value of my benefits”, etc.)
- **pay raise** (“my most recent pay raise”, “influence my supervisor has over my pay”, etc.)
- **pay structure/administration** (“consistency of UMN’s pay policies”, “UMN’s pay structure”, etc.).
- **overall** (a composite of the above)

**University-wide Pay Satisfaction**

Overall, satisfaction with pay was moderate to low across all campuses and job categories. Staff indicated favorable levels of satisfaction with the benefits they receive but lower levels of satisfaction on the other three dimensions. This trend is prevalent across campuses and job categories and across the 2004 to 2008 time periods. There does appear to be a trend increase in satisfaction with all but Pay Structure and Administration between 2004 and 2008.
Satisfaction with Pay Structure/Administration

The bar chart shows the distribution of satisfaction levels with pay structure/administration, ranging from dissatisfied to satisfied. The y-axis represents the frequency, and the x-axis represents the satisfaction levels. The chart indicates the highest frequency of satisfaction between 3.00 and 4.00, with lower frequencies as we move towards the dissatisfaction end of the spectrum.
Satisfaction with Pay Structure by Campus

Satisfaction with Pay Structure by Employee Group
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STRESS

Job Stress
This graph is based on responses to statements that assessed staff’s job stress, such as, “I feel a great deal of stress because of my job.” The results appear to show that a majority of staff employees feel moderate stress due to their job across all four University of Minnesota campuses. Job stress is reported to be slightly higher for P&A staff as compared to all groups of staff employees.

Job Stress by Campus

Job Stress by Employee Group
**Challenge Stress**

This graph is based on responses to statements that assessed staff’s challenge stress, which promotes personal growth, mastery, and job performance such as “I have a high level of accountability for my work” and “I have to balance several projects at once.” Overall, staff reported that they feel high levels of challenge stress. Challenge stress is reported to be slightly higher for P&A staff as compared to all groups of staff employees.

**Challenge Stressors by Campus**
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- Morris
- Duluth
- Crookston
- UMN-2008

**Challenge Stressors by Employee Groups**

- P & A Staff
- Civil Service
- Bargaining Unit
- UMN-2008
SUPPORT

Supervisory Support
These graphs are based on responses to statements that assessed staff’s satisfaction with supervisors’ support. Overall, staff reported that they receive moderate to high levels of support from their supervisors or responsible administrators.

Supervisory Support

![Histogram showing frequency of supervisory support ratings ranging from low to high support. The x-axis represents support levels from 1.00 to 5.00, while the y-axis represents frequency from 0 to 300. The distribution is centered around the moderate support range with a peak around the 4.00 mark.]
This table reports results for items that assessed supervisor 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>Understanding when I have an unexpected family problem</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports efforts to balance work and personal needs</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports attempt to acquire add. training to further my career</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure I get the credit when I accomplish 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>Provides assignments that give opp. strengthen new skills</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives helpful feedback about performance</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives helpful advice about improve performance when I need it</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take time to learn about career goals and aspirations</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides special projects that increase my visibility in the University of MN</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps informed about different career opportunities at the University of MN</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department Support
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 Duluth campuses reported the highest levels of departmental support.
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 dept. when have a problem</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dept. really cares about my well being</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dept. takes pride in my accomplishments at work</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dept. will extend itself to help me perform my job to the best of my ability</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dept. cares about my opinions</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY dept. cares about general satisfaction at work</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY dept. shows very little concern for me</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. Between 2004 and 2008, there does appear to be a slight increase in overall confidence related to the direction the University is heading. This trend is also observed for confidence in the department’s direction.

I have confidence in the direction the University is heading

![Bar Chart](image)
I have confidence in the direction the University is heading

- Twin Cities: Agree
- Morris: Agree
- Duluth: Agree
- Crookston: Agree
- UMN-2008: Agree
- UMN-2006: Agree
- UMN-2004: Agree
I have confidence in the direction the department is heading
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Disagree to Agree
These graphs are based on responses to statements that assessed staff's awareness of their role in the University’s mission and their clarity in what is expected of them at work. 78% employees indicated that they are aware of how their job contributes to the mission of the University, at least to some extent, while 87% of employees have clarity regarding what is expected from them at work.

I know how my job contributes to the mission of the University.

- Strongly agree: 20%
- Agree: 40%
- Slightly agree: 18%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 12%
- Slightly disagree: 4%
- Disagree: 4%
- Strongly disagree: 2%
I know what is expected of me at work

- Strongly agree: 26%
- Agree: 49%
- Slightly agree: 12%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 4%
- Slightly disagree: 3%
- Disagree: 3%
- Strongly disagree: 2%
Direct experiences of discrimination, harassment, and hostility
These charts are based on responses to statements that assessed acts of discrimination, harassment, and hostility, and the source of, type of and reasons for these actions.

For many of the items, a majority of employees (59-97% depending on item) had never experienced these behaviors during the previous year. When individuals did report these behaviors, it was likely to be experienced fairly infrequently. Saying something bad about the individual (41%) or doing something to make the individual look bad (37%) were the most common acts reported. Those who reported experiencing incidents indicated that other staff members within their unit (32.8%) were the mostly likely sources of perpetrating acts of discrimination, harassment, or hostility. Individuals reported that they believed that these acts were most likely to be undertaken due to their gender (8%), age (6%) or other (11%).

Over the past year during your work at the University, please indicate how often someone has directed the following behaviors toward you personally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1 or 2 times a year</th>
<th>3 or 4 times a year</th>
<th>About once a month</th>
<th>Once a week or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Said bad things about you</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did something to make you look bad</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabotaged your work</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made sexist remarks</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lied to get you in trouble</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made an obscene comment or gesture in front of you</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursed at you</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made an ethnic, racial, religious or offensive slur toward you</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened you</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave you unwanted sexual attention</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who was most frequently the source of these behaviors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee not in unit</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin/Department chair</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone outside University</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Multiple options could be selected by each respondent.

Do you think these behaviors are ever due to any of your personal characteristics?
- No (80.3%)
- Yes (29.7%)

If yes, what do you think this discrimination, harassment, or hostility was due to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Customs</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Multiple options could be selected by each respondent.
Workplace misconduct

These charts are based on responses to statements that assessed workplace misconduct such as a violation of law, workplace rules, or significant University policy.

A majority of employees (89.5%) indicated that they had not experienced or observed any significant misconduct such as a violation of law or workplace rules within their departments in the last year; 11% of employees did experience misconduct.

Of the staff who reported these problems, 51% stated that they or someone else reported these problems to the University. About 34% of the problems were not reported. Of the 51% of employees who reported these problems, 21% indicated that the University took appropriate corrective actions, while the majority stated that they did not or did not know.

I have experienced or observed a significant misconduct (e.g., violation of law, workplace rules, or significant University policy) in my unit/department within the last twelve months

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If Yes...If the misconduct was not known by responsible University officials, did you or some else report it to the University officials or the University’s confidential reporting service?

- Don’t know: 15%
- No, it was not reported: 34%
- Yes, others reported it: 21%
- Yes, I reported it: 30%

If Yes, do you believe responsible University officials took appropriate corrective action?

- Don’t know: 28%
- Yes: 21%
- No: 51%
Resolution of Workplace Problems
In addition to questions about specific workplace problems, employees were asked about the University's mechanisms for dealing with such problems. The majority of staff (60%) reported that they knew where to seek help for resolving workplace problems. 50% of staff indicated that they were confident they would be protected from retaliation if they reported a suspected violation; 22% of staff reported that they were not confident they would be protected. A majority of employees (65%) reported that the University leadership demonstrated integrity and ethical behavior.

I know where to report violations of policy (such as the University's confidential reporting line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I believe I would be protected from retaliation if I report a suspected violation

- Strongly Agree: 14%
- Agree: 36%
- Not Agree or Disagree: 28%
- Disagree: 13%
- Strongly disagree: 9%

University leadership demonstrates integrity and ethical behavior

- Strongly Agree: 13%
- Agree to some extent: 38%
- Slightly agree: 14%
- Uncertain: 18%
- Slightly disagree: 7%
- Disagree to some extent: 6%
- Strongly Disagree: 5%
University Of Minnesota Characteristics

A set of questions asked employees about whether they felt encouraged to promote certain characteristics of the University. This was designed to assess the perceived strengths and development areas for the University, and also serve as an indication of the University’s culture. The results indicate that staff felt supported in their efforts to encourage and demonstrate respect, integrity, high quality service and high quality work among other dimensions. Comparatively, the respondents reported less support for risk taking and promoting a sense of a common University community. This is consistent with 43% of staff reporting that they identify most with their department or unit whereas only 19% identify most with the University. The main reasons why employees work at the University are its benefits (74.4%), coworkers (61.1%), and the work environment (60.8%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In my current work setting, I am supported in efforts to...</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide high quality service</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate with integrity and comply with ethical practices</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate respect toward individuals in the University community</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform high quality work</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be collaborative and have a team orientation</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be results oriented</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt and change</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote diversity of ideas, experiences, and people</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote efforts that work towards the good of society</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be innovative</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote a sense of a common University community</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take risks</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items are scored on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale.
The area with which you identify the most:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My department or unit</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Minnesota</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My occupation</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My discipline</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My campus</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is (are) the reason(s) you work at the University of Minnesota?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good benefits</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy working with my coworkers/colleagues</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy the work environment at the U</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy my work tasks</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy working for my responsible administrator/department chair</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe in the University’s mission</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy living in this community</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel loyalty to the U</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good pay</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition benefits</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of job alternatives</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Multiple reasons were selected by respondents.
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. These perceptions remained relatively similar over time.

Perception of Job Security

![Bar chart showing frequency of job security perceptions](chart.png)
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 Duluth campus reported the lowest intentions to quit.

Turnover Intentions
Turnover Intentions by Campus
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YOUR WORKGROUP

Work Interdependence

In order to understand how employees experienced their workgroups, a set of questions were asked regarding their work interdependence and social interaction. Questions such as “how much do members of your workgroup depend on other workgroup members for help or assistance to do their work” examined the nature of the employee’s work group and the interdependence of work within the work group. Work Interdependence was reported to be moderate across all campuses and job classifications.

Work Interdependence

![Frequency Distribution](chart.png)
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Social Interaction

Social interaction was assessed through questions such as “How often do members of your workgroup spend breaks or lunch socializing with one another?” Employees across campuses and job classifications indicated moderate levels of social interaction within their workgroups.

Social Interaction

![Histogram showing frequency of social interaction ratings](image)
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, with P&A staff reporting the highest work family conflict.

![Work-Family Conflict Graph](image-url)
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; 93% reported their health to be excellent, very good, or good, an increase over the 2004 survey.

Overall Health

- Excellent: 24%
- Very good: 44%
- Good: 25%
- Fair: 6%
- Poor: 1%
General Well-being

Employees were asked to report their satisfaction with life as an indicator of their general well-being. Overall, employees indicate high levels of satisfaction with life across campuses and job classifications.

Satisfaction with Life
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