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Brief Overview of Findings

How do Creighton staff and administrators see and experience the University, its purported mission, and their work within the University? That is the essential question to which this survey was directed. The question itself is complex, and, so too is the answer.

Overall
- There was little experience of blatant and overt discrimination or harassment reported.
- Yet, there was considerable evidence suggesting consistent patterns of difference throughout all analyses—differences by exempt status, race/ethnicity, and/or gender suggesting important subtle inequities deserving further investigation.
- Perceptions and experience varied considerably by divisional location—with some suggestion that those units more directly involved in students and teaching/learning were more positive.

Relating to Job Characteristics and Work Environment
- Only fifty percent of all respondents agreed that their salary was equitable.
- Almost one-third of all respondents did not feel that they could speak their minds without fear.
- Few staff and administrators perceived possibilities for advancement within their department or the University.
- In general (and, with a few notable exceptions), exempt personnel were considerably more positive about the University and their experience within it than were their non-exempt counterparts.

Perception of Institution
- Staff and administrators perceptions of culture and mission-in-action typically differed by divisional location, exempt status, race/ethnicity, and, to some extent, gender—separately and in combination.
- For a sizeable minority (1/3) of respondents, perceptions of campus climate and mission-in-action are diminished by their cumulative experience with micro-inequities.

Self-Assessments and Personal Experience
- Exempt personnel were considerably more likely to see themselves as viewed positively on the Creighton campus than were their non-exempt counterparts.
- Most respondents scored highly in terms of sense of belonging. Indeed, this index was the single most consistently positive measure in the report. However, even it was negatively impacted by cumulative experience with micro-inequities.
- Consistent differences by race/ethnicity and gender in terms of reported experience with discrimination related to those two characteristics.

Cumulative Impact of Micro-Inequities
- Considerable and consistent evidence was found of the “chilling” effects of accumulating micro-inequities—including impacts on perceptions of work environment, campus climate, mission-in-action, sense of belonging, and perception of equal opportunity.
Staff/Administrator Climate Survey – Final Report

Historical Preface

In the spring of 1998, the University Committee on the Status of Women requested that the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment undertake a survey of the quality of life and campus climate for women at Creighton. In consultation with the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, President Michael G. Morrison, SJ agreed that such survey should be undertaken but it would extend to several facets of diversity on campus, including gender, race and ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, age, and disability. Additionally, it was decided that three surveys would be conducted – the first directed to students, the second to staff and administrators, and the third to faculty. This report summarizes the second of these to be completed, the student survey having been completed in 2000.

The questionnaire used to survey staff and administrators was constructed on campus. Its initial content and format derived from an extensive review of climate studies conducted at other institutions and agencies, as well as consultation with groups of campus faculty, staff and administrators. The initial draft was reviewed—and re-reviewed by many persons throughout the university. The final questionnaire, completed in mid-2001, was composed of seven major sections:

- Staff and administrator background characteristics
- Perceptions of job and work environment
- Experiences at Creighton University
- Perceptions of equity
- General climate on campus
- Perceptions of Creighton’s mission in action
- Narrative questions relating to sources of support, challenges, and suggestions for improvement.

In January, 2002, personalized letters and questionnaires were sent to all 1917 staff and administrators. Given the sensitive nature of some questions, respondents were guaranteed anonymity.¹

Due to impending University contingencies, the data collection period was limited to less than one month from initial delivery of letters and questionnaires to the final date for acceptance of returns. Thus, enormous effort was put into assuring a meaningful return rate. Numerous reminders and alerts were sent via email, Blue News, and person-to-person networks. Moreover, both the University Committee on the Status of Women and Staff Advisory Committee worked diligently to encourage people to respond openly, honestly, and quickly.

When data collection was closed, a total of 953 surveys had been returned for an overall response rate of 52.4%. Such a response rate is truly exceptional for a survey of this type and

¹ Given the volume of calls to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment about the issue of anonymity, it was clear that few individuals believed that anonymity could be assured.
magnitude. That it was achieved without a 2nd mailing or additional directed follow-up attests to the commitment of the faculty and staff leaders who worked to make it a reality.

The divisional representation of the final response set and the representation by division within the University were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>% Representation in University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Finance</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences, no-CMA</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences, CMA</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Ministry</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Relations</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Office</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Division Indicated</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from these data, most divisions are represented in numbers similar to their original representation. The two exceptions are the subdivisions of Health Sciences. However, as the analysis reveals, few findings are meaningful when we look at the University staff and administrator set as a whole. Thus, the variations were not problematic.

For purposes of this report, data are presented in what might be termed divisional categories—categories that represent a collapsing of units into 5 relatively meaningful divisions, each with sufficient responses to allow meaningful analyses without providing sufficient detail so as to identify any one respondent. These divisional categories and the units included are as follows:

- Academic Affairs = Academic Affairs
- Health Sciences = Health Sciences
- Student-Centered = President’s Office, Student Services, University Ministry
- Support Services = Administration & Finance, Information Technology, University Relations
- CMA = CMA

---

2 There did appear to be some confusion as to which subdivision people belonged to—and, this confusion was associated with differing interpretations of the original list of persons to receive the questionnaire. Thus, for purposes of this report, we shall assume that persons know their subdivision and report findings accordingly.
**Table 2: Socio-Demographic Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS or Less</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year College</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate work</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Degree</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial or Another</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic Christian</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Christian</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GBLU</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported Disability</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure at CU</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months-1 year</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Sex</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Classification</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-exempt</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

How do staff/administrators experience Creighton? That seems like a simple question; yet the answers are anything but simple. The diversity of responses paints a complex picture, with many components. In short, "it depends." And, as was found in the Student Climate Survey that preceded this one, the perceptions and experiences of Creighton staff and administrators both affirm and challenge the University community’s efforts to embody the words of our Credo and Mission Statement.

This report attempts to identify the key factors upon which staff/administrator assessment of their Creighton experience "depends"—and to do justice to the many staff and administrators who shared their perspectives and concerns. It is hoped they will recognize their voices in what follows.

A Note About Analyses

The Staff/Administrator Climate Survey elicited input on well over 100 items; thus, it generated an enormous amount of data—data that if considered in all detail overwhelm. To bring some sense of order and direction to the analytical process, various multivariate statistical techniques were used to find groupings of variables that might be taken as indicators of the experience of staff and administrators.

Several factor analyses\(^3\) and other multivariate analyses conducted on key item subsets yielded the following basic facets central to staff and administrator assessment of Creighton University. These facets—which form the core of this report—are:

- **Work Environment Issues**
  - Job Satisfaction
  - Job Qualities
  - Respect
  - Future Opportunities at Creighton University
  - Co-Worker Relationships
  - Appraisal of Work Environment Climate

- **Appraisal of the Institution as a Whole**
  - Appraisal of Overall Campus Climate
  - Creighton’s Mission in Action
  - Perceptions of Equity

- **Self-Assessment and Personal Experiences**
  - Sense of How They Are Viewed
  - Sense of Belonging
  - Experiences of Discrimination

- **Outcomes of Inequitable Experiences**

\(^3\) The factor methods used were principal components extraction and orthogonal rotation of factors using varimax rotation, as provided by SPSS-PC for Windows (Release 10.0, 2000). Further technical information on factor loadings, etc., available from Office of Teaching Excellence Institutional Research and Assessment
An Important Note about Missing Data

One of the most revealing aspects about the climate on this campus is the large quantity of missing data throughout this survey. Throughout Table 2, we saw evidence of this phenomenon at several points.

Sizeable numbers of persons did not complete information relating to the University division in which they worked (8.1%). Likewise, some respondents did not provide their religious affiliation (7.1%), their fulltime or part-time status (12.9%), or their gender (10.4%). And, well over 30% of respondents did not provide their job classification—indicating either that they did not know that classification or leaving the question unanswered all together.

In an environment perceived as open and positive, one would not expect so many instances of not answering questions—particularly in basic background characteristics. Indeed, the amount of missing information clearly suggests that many were afraid their answers might be traced back to them if they provided full information. Indeed, the volume and nature of calls to the Office for Institutional Research & Assessment attested to that fear. That fear is further supported by the following illustrative comments drawn from questionnaires that were returned:

I find little support in the environment in which I work. An atmosphere of fear and tension prevail in my department. (White, female)

...has changed my department dramatically since...arrival to Creighton. Most of the camaraderie and family type atmosphere has been replaced by distrust, fear, and sinking morale. We are made to feel as if no matter how hard we work, it's never quite good enough. Many employees are afraid to fill out this survey because of...I thought a Jesuit university would stand for something other than this type of negative work environment. (White female)

My colleagues are afraid to submit this Survey due to the fact that they will be identified by their responses. The statements that I shared will be known by my administration. I have voiced my discontent; I do expect consequences in some form. (Nonwhite male)

Final Caveat

This report summarizes key patterns in staff and administrator perception and experience. It does not detail every finding or answer every question that could be asked of the data. An attempt was made to include core findings and implications so as to provide direction for future quality improvement.

In some ways, the report raises as many questions as it answers. Such is the nature of survey data—they survey the landscape, but they cannot provide depth of detail. Rather, they tell us where we need to dig deeper to gain a better understanding of the underlying issues and challenges, to determine what we need to do to make the University a welcoming, inclusive, and empowering place for all staff and administrators.
Work-Related Findings

Job Satisfaction
Composite Index, with range from low=8 to high=32, created by adding respondent scores on the following items:

- My work contributions to my department are appreciated by my supervisor
- Generally speaking, the criteria by which my supervisor judges my work are appropriate.
- I feel that I have received sufficient guidance/mentoring from other members of my department.
- I have sufficient opportunities to meet with supervisor to discuss my performance, career, etc.
- Performance evaluation decisions are made fairly in my department.
- I can speak my mind without fear of punishment.
- My department is supportive and responsive to special family needs (single or working parents, caring for elderly parents, etc.)
- My supervisor or boss treats me with respect.

Overall mean (average) value for all respondents = 24.25

Overall patterns found:

- As shown in Figure 1, exempt employees reported higher levels of job satisfaction than non-exempt employees. (One notable exception was among multi-racial exempt employees who reflected the same level of job satisfaction as their non-exempt colleagues.)

- Job satisfaction varies considerably by "location" within the institution. For example, among non-exempt employees, the mean satisfaction level varies by almost 2 full points from Academic Affairs (the high) to CMA (the low).

Figure 1: Job Satisfaction, by Division and Exempt Status
(Mean Scores on Job Satisfaction Index)
As shown in Figure 2, Multi-racial employees—regardless of employee status or location—had job satisfaction scores at least 1 point lower than their divisional colleagues.

- In Academic Affairs, the job satisfaction scores among Whites was almost 3 points higher than among Multi-racial respondents.
- In Health Sciences, the score differential was almost 3 and 2 points respectively.

**Figure 2: Job Satisfaction, by Division and Race/Ethnicity**
(Mean Scores on Job Satisfaction Index)

Job satisfaction scores did not vary as consistently by gender as they did by exempt status or race/ethnicity (Figure 3).

**Figure 3: Job Satisfaction, by Division and Gender**
(Mean Scores on Job Satisfaction Index)
• In only two divisional categories were there significant gender differences in job satisfaction.
  o In Health Sciences, job satisfaction scores among males were 2 points higher than their female counterparts.
  o In CMA, the difference was over one point.
• In the other three divisional categories, job satisfaction scores were comparable between the sexes.

As shown in Figure 4, job satisfaction scores varied more by race/ethnicity than they did by gender.
• Yet, while the difference between White males and White females was considerably less than a point, the difference between genders among Multi-racial respondents was almost 1.5 points.

**Figure 4: Job Satisfaction, by Gender and Race/Ethnicity**
(Mean Score on Job Satisfaction)

A Closer Look

*I can speak my mind without fear of punishment.*

• Almost 1/3 of survey respondents disagreed with this statement. Given our questions about the context impacting survey responses, this sizeable minority deserves further examination.
• Again, we find considerable variation by divisional location as well as exempt status, race/ethnicity, and gender. (Figures 5-7)
Interestingly, as shown in Figure 5, exempt and non-exempt respondents showed similar response patterns in 3 out of the 5 divisional categories.

- In Academic Affairs and CMA, exempt employees were much more likely than their non-exempt colleagues (upwards of 20 percentage points) to feel empowered to speak their minds.

**Figure 6: Can Speak Mind Without Fear, by Division and Race/Ethnicity**
(Percent Agreeing/Strongly Agreeing)
When racial variations are considered (Figure 6), we find remarkably similar patterns among the racial groupings in Health Sciences, Support Services, and CMA.

- In Academic Affairs, the rate of agreement was 20 points higher for Whites than for Multi-racial respondents.
- In the Student-Centered category, the rate of agreement was 10 points higher for Multi-racial respondents than for Whites.

**Figure 7: Can Speak Mind Without Fear, by Division and Gender**
(Percent Agreeing/Strongly Agreeing)

Figure 7 shows gender variations in perceived ability to speak freely.

- Women staff and administrators in Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and CMA are significantly less confident than their male counterparts in asserting the capacity to speak their minds (15-20 percentage points difference, depending on location).
- Upwards of 4 out of 5 men in the academic divisions agreed that they can speak their mind without fear of punishment. Men in the non-academic divisions are less positive about that capacity, showing a tendency to be equivalent to— or even sometimes slightly less optimistic than— their female counterparts.
- The highest rate of agreement among women, regardless of divisional location, was approximately 7 out of 10.
Job Qualities

Composite Index, possible range from 3 to 12, formed by summing responses to the following items:
- I receive an equitable salary in my department or work area.
- My actual job duties fit my job description.
- My classification is appropriate for my job duties.

Mean value = 7.79.

Overall findings:
- As a whole, the perception of job quality was less positive than might be hoped. To illustrate, if we were to convert the mean value to a 4 point scale, the “average” score on job quality was 2.6.
- Without exception, exempt employees had more positive perceptions about the quality of their jobs than their non-exempt counterparts (Figure 8).
  - In the non-academic divisions of the University, the gap between mean scores for exempt and non-exempt staff was about 1-1 ½ points.
  - In the academic divisions, the gap varied from almost 2 points (Health Sciences) to almost 3 points (Academic Affairs).
- Exempt employees in Academic Affairs were significantly more positive than exempt employees in any other divisional category.
- Non-exempt employees were remarkably similar, regardless of location.

Figure 8: Perceived Job Qualities, by Division and Exempt Status
(Mean Scores on Job Qualities Index)
• Perhaps surprisingly, as revealed in Figure 9, racial groups were quite similar within divisional categories. In no division was there a significant difference between White and Multi-racial respondents in assessment of job quality.

Figure 9: Perceived Job Qualities, by Division and Race/Ethnicity
(Mean Scores on Job Qualities Index)

• As shown in Figure 10, gender differences—though small—were more readily apparent than in the case of race. In all divisions, there was a tendency for males to rate job quality more highly than did their female counterparts. Even here, the differences were not as marked as in the case of exempt status.

Figure 10: Perceived Job Qualities, by Division and Gender
(Mean Scores on Job Qualities Index)
A Closer Look

*I receive an equitable salary in my department or work area.*

Given the relatively low scores on job quality, an examination of component elements was warranted. It soon became apparent that the overall scores were tied most dramatically to responses to the question about receiving an equitable salary. Findings relating to these responses are presented in Figures 11-13.

- Overall, only about half of all respondents agreed/strongly agreed with this statement; 49.5% of respondents disagreed — 25% strongly.
- **Note:** It is important to remember that these assessments of salary equity were given before the salary freeze for 2002-2003 was announced.

**Figure 11: Receive Equitable Salary, by Division and Exempt Status**

(Percent Agreeing/Strongly Agreeing)

Variations by location and exempt status are shown in Figure 11.

- Generally, exempt staff and administrators were much more likely than non-exempt personnel to agree that they were receiving an equitable salary.
- Yet, there was considerable variation among the exempt personnel by divisional location, with exempt respondents in Academic Affairs and Health Sciences being more positive than those in other divisions in assessing their salaries.
  - Almost 10 percentage points separated the academic divisions from the student-centered ones.
  - Almost 15 percentage points separated support service locations from the academic divisions.
  - The rate of agreement among CMA personnel was 20 percentage points lower than the academic divisions.
• Only in CMA were exempt and non-exempt personnel essentially the same in their assessment of equity.

• In the other divisional locations, the gap between exempt and non-exempt varied from 20 to 30 percentage points.

• In every case but CMA, less than half of non-exempt staff members agreed that they were receiving an equitable salary.

**Figure 12: Receive Equitable Salary, by Division and Race/Ethnicity**
(Percent Agreeing/Strongly Agreeing)

Figure 12 presents the levels of agreement by racial groupings:

• There was considerable variation among divisional categories in the extent to which racial groupings varied in their assessment of salary equity — with most showing only about 50-55% agreement that salaries were equitable.

• In the two academic divisions and the more student-centered ones, the two groups were quite similar.

• However, in Support Services, less than 30% of Multi-Racial respondents agreed that their salaries were equitable, over 20 percentage points below their White counterparts.

• Among CMA respondents, the gap between the two groups was almost 15 percentage points.
Figure 13: Receive Equitable Salary, by Division and Gender
(Percent Agreeing/Strongly Agreeing)

Figure 13 presents gender variations in assessment of salary equity:

- As we saw with race/ethnicity, there was considerable variation across the University in the extent to which the genders varied in their assessment of salary equity.

- The rate of agreement between the two genders was quite similar in the Health Sciences and in the Student-Centered divisional categories.

- In the remaining three divisional categories, women were consistently less likely than their male counterparts to assess their salaries as equitable.
  - In Academic Affairs and Support Services, the gap was in the range of 10-12 percentage points.
  - CMA respondents displayed the greatest gap between the genders, with almost 70% of the men agreeing that their salaries were equitable—in contrast to less than 50% of the women doing so.
Job Respect

Composite Index, with range from low=3 to high=12, created by adding respondent scores on the following items:
- Faculty with whom I interact generally treat me with respect.
- Administrators with whom I interact generally treat me with respect.
- Students with whom I interact generally treat me with respect.
Mean score = 9.35

Overall, staff and administrators agreed that they were treated with respect by faculty, administrators, and students.

In contrast to other dimensions relating to job experience and environment, there were relatively few differences by exempt status, race/ethnicity or gender:
- Non-exempt employees in Support Services and CMA were significantly lower in their sense of respect received than their exempt counterparts — with CMA personnel reflecting the lowest appraisal on this dimension. (Figure 14)
- The only division showing differences by race/ethnicity was CMA —and, here, White respondents were significantly less positive in their appraisal than their Multi-Racial counterparts. (Figure 15)
- Only in Student-Centered divisions was there a significant gender difference in appraisal of this dimension. The mean score for men was almost 1 full point higher than that for women. (Figure 16)

**Figure 14: Sense of Respect in Job, by Division and Exempt Status**
(Mean Scores on Perceived Respect Index)
Figure 15: Sense of Respect in Job, by Division and Race/Ethnicity
(Mean Scores on Perceived Respect Index)

Figure 16: Sense of Respect in Job, by Division and Gender
(Mean Scores on Perceived Respect)
Future at Creighton-Advancement Opportunities

Composite Index, with range from low=3 to high=12, created by adding respondent scores on the following items:
- There are sufficient opportunities for advancement within my department.
- There are sufficient opportunities for advancement within Creighton.
- I understand the basic qualities that I need to advance to a higher level position.

Mean score = 6.71

Overall, Creighton staff and administrators appear to be relatively pessimistic about their prospects for advancement at the University. Yet, there were a few significant subgroup variations:
- There was only a slight tendency for exempt employees to be more optimistic about a future at CU than their non-exempt counterparts. The most marked difference was found in CMA, where the mean for exempt respondents was over one unit higher than that for non-exempt personnel. (Figure 17)
- The only significant difference found between racial groupings on this index was found in Health Sciences, where the mean for Multi-racial respondents was almost 2 points higher than for Whites. (Figure 18)
- Figure 19 displays a slight tendency for male respondents to be more optimistic than their female counterparts about future prospects.

Figure 17: Perceived Future Opportunities at CU, by Division and Exempt Status
(Mean Scores on Future Opportunity Index)
Figure 18: Perceived Future Opportunities at CU, by Division and Race/Ethnicity
(Mean Scores on Future Opportunity Index)

Figure 19: Perceived Future Opportunities at CU, by Division and Gender
(Mean Scores on Future Opportunity Index)
Co-Worker Relationship

Composite Index, with range from low=3 to high=12, created by adding respondent scores on the following items:

- My work contributions to my department are appreciated by my co-workers.
- In general, my work relationship with co-workers in my department is good.
- I often feel that I don’t “fit in” very well socially with co-workers in my department. (Recoded to coincide with other items.)

Overall Mean = 9.73

Overall findings indicate that CU administrators and staff give high marks for co-worker relationships, regardless of division, exempt status, race/ethnicity, or gender. Figure 20 illustrates the typical pattern.

Figure 20: Perceived Co-Worker Relationships, by Division and Exempt Status
(Mean Scores on Future Opportunity Index)
Perceived Climate of Work Environment

Composite index, formed by summation of employee responses to 14 polar comparisons included in Question 15. Employees were asked to: "Please rate the climate of your immediate work environment by marking the appropriate number on each line." Descriptor pairs included in this index are:

- Comfortable-Uncomfortable
- Friendly-Hostile
- Cold-Warm
- Communicative-Reserved
- Indifferent-Concerned
- Respectful-Disrespectful
- Uncooperative-Cooperative
- Insensitive-Sensitive
- Welcoming-Unwelcoming
- Supportive-Unsupportive
- Rejecting-Accepting
- Tolerant-Intolerant
- Open-Closed
- Worsening-Improving

Range of possible scores from low=14 to high=70. Overall mean=53.04

Overall findings: In general, respondents in the divisional categories of Support Services and CMA consistently displayed markedly less positive appraisals of their work environments than did the other three categories— with averages below the overall mean.

Figure 23: Perceived Climate of Work Environment, by Division and Exempt Status
(Mean Scores on Climate of Work Environment)
Exempt employees had consistently higher average scores than their non-exempt counterparts (Figure 23).

- In Academic Affairs and Health Sciences, the gap between the two groups was over 4 points.
- In CMA, the average for exempt personnel was 9 points higher than that of non-exempt employees.
- Two exceptions to that trend were found:
  - In the Student-Centered divisions, exempt and non-exempt were both higher than the overall average.
  - In the Support Services division, both classifications were significantly lower than the overall mean.

Figure 24: Perceived Climate of Work Environment, by Division and Race
(Mean Scores on Climate of Work Environment)

When the two racial groupings are examined (Figure 24), we find that two divisional categories were characterized by significant differences in the appraisal of work environment.

- In Academic Affairs, the average score for work environment for Whites was 4 points higher than that for Multi-Racial respondents.
- In CMA, the gap between the racial/ethnic groups was 6 points, with Multi-Racial respondents scoring an average just over 45 points—over 8 points off the overall mean.
As revealed in Figure 25, there were more gender differences within divisional categories than found between racial groupings.

- With the exception of Support Services, male respondents were more positive about their work environments than were female respondents.
  - In Academic Affairs, the mean for men was 3 points higher than for women.
  - In Health Sciences, the mean difference was almost 5 points.
  - Student-Centered divisions showed the smallest gender gap of just over 1 point.
  - In CMA, the mean difference was almost 2 points.

- The mean score on work environment for males in Support Service divisions was 2 points lower than their female counterparts—and the lowest among any gender-location group.

**Figure 26: Sense of Work Environment Climate, by Gender and Race/Ethnicity**
(Mean Score on Work Environment Climate)
Figure 26 depicts the interaction between gender and race/ethnicity as related to personnel analyses of work environment.

- Clearly, Multi-Racial women are the only group significantly off the overall mean:
- The means for White men and women and Multi-racial men are all within less than one point of each other as well as within less than ½ point of the overall mean.
- The mean score for women of color was over 3 points below the overall mean.
Appraisals of the Institution as a Whole

Perception of Campus Climate

Composite index, formed by summation of employee responses to 14 polar comparisons included in Question 15. Employees were asked to: "Please rate the climate of Creighton in general by marking the appropriate number on each line." Descriptor pairs included in this index are:

- Comfortable-Uncomfortable
- Friendly-Hospitable
- Cold-Warm
- Communicative-Reserved
- Indifferent-Concerned
- Respectful-Disrespectful
- Uncooperative-Cooperative
- Insensitive-Sensitive
- Welcoming-Unwelcoming
- Supportive-Unsupportive
- Rejecting-Accepting
- Tolerant-Intolerant
- Open-Closed
- Worsening-Improving

Range of possible scores from low=14 to high=70. Overall mean=52.97.

In general, exempt personnel were more positive in their appraisal of campus climate than were non-exempt respondents.

- In Academic Affairs and Health Sciences, the difference between the two groups was 3-4 points. In CMA, the difference between means was 7 points. (Figure 27)
- In both Student-Centered divisions and Support Services divisions, scores for exempt and non-exempt personnel were within one point of each other—and, substantially lower than those among exempt employees in Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and CMA.
- Non-exempt personnel in the Support Services divisions had the least favorable impression of campus climate

Figure 27: Perception of Campus Climate, by Division and Exempt Status
(Mean Scores on Campus Climate)
Figure 28 depicts considerable variation within divisions by race/ethnicity.

- In three divisions, White respondents were markedly more positive than their counterparts of Color — gaps of 3.5 points (Academic Affairs), 5 points (Health Sciences), and 7 points (CMA).

- In Student-Centered divisions, Multi-racial respondents were more positive than their White counterparts — though less markedly so.

- In Support Services divisions, there was no significant racial difference.

- Multi-racial respondents in Health Sciences and CMA were the least positive of any race-location grouping in their appraisal of campus climate — both markedly off the overall mean.

Gender variations were less marked than those by race (Figure 29).

- In 3 out of 5 divisional categories, the gap between men and women was less than 1 point.

- In Health Sciences, males were more positive in their appraisal of climate than females — by almost 2 points.

- In Academic Affairs, the gap was closer to 4 points.

- Notable is the considerable variation within gender — by division. The gap between the high score of Academic Affairs men and the lowest of those in Support Services was almost 8 points.

- For women, the variation was less marked — with the gap between high and low averages being 3 points.
Figure 29: Perceived Campus Climate, by Division and Gender
(Mean Scores on Campus Climate)

Figure 30 shows the variation in perception of campus climate by gender and race/ethnicity simultaneously.

Figure 30: Perception of Campus Culture, by Gender and Race/Ethnicity
(Mean Scores on Campus Culture)

- There was little difference in the appraisals of campus climate by White men and women—both group means were essentially equivalent to the overall mean.
• Multi-Racial respondents, in general, were significantly less positive than their White counterparts.
• However, men of color were significantly more positive about campus climate than were the women of color (2+ points).
Appraisal of Institution: Mission in Action

Administrators and staff were provided 18 statements that "might be used to describe Creighton’s operating philosophy and values – the extent to which our mission is apparent in our actions. Based on your experience at Creighton, please indicate the extent to which you think each applies in Creighton’s day-to-day activities and actions." Responses included never, rarely, sometimes, often or always.

Two common factors (themes) were found. Findings relating to each of the two factors are presented in the following pages.

Commitment to Development
Composite index (low=12; high=60), created by summing the responses to the following 12 items:

- Encourages continuous improvement in the quality of programs and services.
- Encourages learning and innovation among staff and administrators.
- Includes the views of relevant individuals or groups in decision-making.
- Invests in and encourages the development of worker’s potential.
- Demonstrates respect for individuals.
- Promotes accountability in the use of its resources.
- Encourages original and independent thinking.
- Encourages collaboration and teamwork.
- Insists on integrity in decision-making.
- Recognizes and rewards performance.
- Is committed to service to others.
- Is committed to justice.

Overall Mean\(^4\) = 42.84

Overall, the mean value suggests a weak endorsement of this “mission in action” — approximately equivalent to a little more than “sometimes.”

Figure 31 presents the variations by division and exempt status. Again, we find considerable variation by divisional location.

- In Academic Affairs, exempt and non-exempt respondents essentially agreed in their appraisal of the extent to which CU invests in its employees and the overall quality improvement.
- In Health Sciences, exempt personnel were slightly more positive in their assessment of this dimension of mission than non-exempt.
- Interestingly, in the Student-Centered divisions, non-exempt staff were more positive than their exempt counterparts.
- In both Support Services and CMA, exempt personal were markedly more positive in their assessment of this facet of mission in action than non-exempt — by over 4 points.

\(^4\) 11.2% of respondents did not complete this section of the questionnaire.
Figure 31: Perceived University Commitment to Development & Quality, by Division and Exempt Status
(Mean Scores on Mission Commitment to Development)

Figure 32 depicts the variations in assessment of University commitment to development and quality by race/ethnicity and division.

Figure 32: Perceived University Commitment to Development & Quality, by Division and Race/Ethnicity
(Mean Scores on Mission Commitment to Development)
• Interestingly, three divisional categories—Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and Support Services show little variation by race/ethnicity. In all three cases, the mean scores by race are essentially equivalent.

• Perhaps surprisingly, in the Student-Centered divisions, Multi-racial respondents were much more positive in their appraisal of the University investment in development of itself and employees than were their White counterparts. (7 point difference)

• In CMA, the mean value for Whites was 3 points higher than for employees of color—whose overall appraisal was markedly the lowest overall.

Figure 33: Perceived University Commitment to Development & Quality, by Division and Gender
(Mean Scores on Mission Commitment to Development)

Figure 33 provides variation by gender, within divisions.

• In Academic Affairs and Student-Centered divisions, males were more positive about this facet of mission enactment than were females. (2 points)

• Within CMA, women were slightly more positive than men.

• In Health Sciences and Support Services division, there were no significant gender differences.
University Commitment to Diversity & Inclusiveness

Composite measure (low=6; high=30), sum of responses to the following set of statements:
- Provides equal opportunities regardless of gender.
- Provides equal opportunities regardless of race or ethnicity.
- Provides equal opportunities regardless of disability.
- Provides equal opportunities regardless of sexual orientation.
- Provides equal opportunities regardless of religion.
- Actively promotes respect for and understanding of group differences.

Overall mean=22.90.

Figure 34: Perceived University Commitment to Diversity & Inclusiveness, by Division and Exempt Status

(Mean Scores on Mission Commitment to Development)

Variations by exempt status and division are presented in Figure 34.

- In Health Sciences and CMA, exempt personnel were more likely than non-exempt personnel to assess the University’s commitment to diversity positively.
- In the Student-Centered and Support Services divisions, the opposite was true—non-exempt staff and administrators were more likely to report seeing this dimension of mission enacted.
- Only in Academic Affairs did exempt and non-exempt personnel’s appraisals converge.
Figure 35: Perceived University Commitment to Diversity & Inclusiveness, by Division and Race/Ethnicity
(Mean Scores on Mission Commitment to Development)

Figure 35 presents variations in the appraisal of the University’s mission in action by race/ethnicity within divisional categories.

- In only one divisional category—Student-Centered—were staff and administrators of color more likely than their White counterparts to endorse this facet of mission in action. (3 point difference)

- In all other divisional categories, White respondents were more likely than respondents of color to view the University’s actions relating to diversity positively. (Range of differences between 1.5 to 3 points)

- Multi-racial respondents in Academic Affairs and CMA were the least positive in their appraisals.

A Closer Look

*Creighton provides equal opportunities regardless of race or ethnicity.*

To get a better understanding of how the racial groups answered on this dimension, further analysis was done on the item eliciting perceptions of the equity of opportunity “regardless of race or ethnicity.” Figure 36 provides that analysis.

- Clearly, racial differences in perception of equal opportunity were marked.
- While over 2/3 of White respondents in Academic Affairs felt that the University often or always provides equal opportunity regardless of race or ethnicity, only just over 40 percent of respondents of color so indicated.

- The gaps were smaller in Health Sciences and in Support Services divisions, but there were still 12-15 percentage points difference between White and Multi-racial respondents.

- In CMA, the gap was almost 30 percentages points (78.1% - Whites; 46.7% - Multi-Racial).

- Only in the Student-Centered divisions did the assessment of equal opportunity by race converge.

**Figure 36: CU Provides Equal Opportunities Regardless of Race, by Division and Race/Ethnicity**

(Percent Indicating CU Provides Equal Opportunity Often/Always)

The impact of race on employee perception of equal opportunity regardless of race is further illustrated in Figure 37, which presents respondent perceptions by race and exempt status.

**Figure 11: Equal Opportunity Regardless of Race, by Race/Ethnicity and Exempt Status**

(Percent indicating Often/Always)
• Contrary to the sizeable differences found by exempt status on other dimensions, in this case race clearly is the more important status.

• Regardless of exempt status, White respondents were markedly more likely than respondents of color to perceive the University as offering equal opportunity regardless of race.

Figure 38 presents gender variations in the appraisal of the University’s mission in action, within divisional categories.

• In two divisions, the genders concur in their appraisal that Creighton provides equal opportunity regardless of gender—Health Sciences and CMA.

• In the remaining 3 divisional categories, male respondents consistently and markedly were more likely than their female counterparts to endorse this proposition.

• The gap between men and women on this variable varied from 14 percentage points (Student-Centered) to over 30 percentage points (Academic Affairs).

**Figure 38: CU Provides Equal Opportunities Regardless of Gender, by Division and Gender**

(Percent Indicating CU Provides Equal Opportunity Often/Always)

Figure 39 depicts respondent perceptions of equal opportunity regardless of gender, by gender and exempt status.

• Though not as pronounced, we see a pattern similar to that found when looking at race and the relationship to perception of equal opportunity regardless of race.
• In general, women—regardless of exempt status—were less likely than men to positively endorse this assertion.

• The gender gap on this variable was less marked among non-exempt employees.

Figure 39: CU Provides Equal Opportunities Regardless of Gender, by Gender and Exempt Status
(Percent Indicating CU Provides Equal Opportunity Often/Always)
Appraisal of Campus Culture – Perceptions of Equity

Perceptions of Equal and Adequate Representation

To assess perceptions of representation on campus governance committees, staff and administrators were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements:

- Racial/Ethnic Minorities
- Women
- People with Disabilities
- Gays and Lesbians

Figure 40 shows the overall rates of agreement with each assertion, graphed by divisional scores.

- Clearly, respondents more readily agreed that minorities and women were adequately represented than were either people with disabilities or GLBT persons. The percentage difference ranged from 10 to 25 points.
- Personnel in Health Sciences, CMA, and Support Services divisions tended to be more positive in their appraisal of any one group’s representation than did those in Academic Affairs and Student-Centered divisions.

Figure 40: Perception of Adequate Representation by Division
(Percent Reporting Agree/Strongly Agree)
Perception of Fair Treatment

To assess perceptions of fair treatment of various categories of person, staff and administrators were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements:

- Minority staff are treated fairly on this campus.
- Women staff are treated fairly on this campus.
- Staff with disabilities are treated fairly on this campus.
- Gays and lesbian staff are treated fairly on this campus.

*Figure 41: Perception of Fair Treatment by Division*  
(Percent Reporting Agree/Strongly Agree)

Figure 41 shows the percent of staff/administrators in each division positively assessing the fairness of treatment for each group.

- Interestingly, the appraisals of fairness are nearly equivalent—regardless of referent.
- Over 70 percent of all staff/administrators agreed that each of the four groups are treated fairly on this campus.
- In Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and the Support Services divisions, there is a slight tendency to be less positive about the situation for women than other groups.
- Also, in Academic Affairs, respondents were more likely to agree that minorities and people were disabilities are treated fairly than both women and GLBT persons.
Because these aggregate data may obscure racial and gender differences,\(^5\) Figures 42 and 43 present more detail regarding these standpoints in regard to fair treatment of minorities (Figure 42) and women (Figure 43).

- Figure 42 shows that there are large differences between White and Multi-Racial respondents in their assessment of this treatment.

**Figure 42: Minority Staff Treated Fairly, by Division and Race/Ethnicity**
*(Percent Agreeing/Strongly Agreeing)*

- Regardless of division, Whites were always more likely to agree than their Multi-Racial counterparts that minority staff are treated fairly on campus.
- The difference between Whites and personnel of color varied from a low of 17 points (Student-Centered) to a high of 40 points (Support Services).

\(^5\) Differences by disability status and sexual orientation were not apparent in these data — perhaps due to the very small numbers of persons self-declaring in minority status.
Figure 43: Women Staff Treated Fairly, by Division and Gender
(Percent Agreeing or Strongly Agreeing)

- Figure 43 shows that the genders are also different in their appraisals of the fair
treatment of women on campus.
- While the differences are not as marked as they were with racial standpoints, men in
every division were more likely than their female counterparts to agree that women are
treated fairly on campus.
- The gender difference ranged from a low of 11 points (Health Services and CMA) to a
high of 24 points (Academic Affairs).

Clearly, racial and gender standpoints impacted the way staff and administrators
viewed the situation.

Perception of Opportunities for Advancement

To assess perceptions of equality of opportunity, staff and administrators were asked
to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements:
- * Minority staff are given the same opportunities for executive/supervisory/management
positions as White staff members.
- * Women staff are given the same opportunities for executive/supervisory/management
positions as men.
- * Staff with disabilities are given the same opportunities for executive/supervisory/
management positions as those without disabilities.
- * Gays and lesbian staff are given the same opportunities for executive/supervisory/
management positions as heterosexual staff.
Figure 44: Perception of Equal Opportunity for Advancement by Division
(Percent Reporting Agree/Strongly Agree)

Figure 44 depicts overall assessment of opportunity, within divisional categories.

- In general, the assessments of opportunity were consistent regardless of the group being focused on. Within each division, there was little difference whether the focus was minorities, disabilities, or sexual orientation.

- Perhaps surprisingly, the least positive assessment was in the situation of women—a finding that probably reflects the predominance of women among respondents. In every division, the percent agreeing that women receive equal opportunity was at least 10 points below that for any other group.

Again, because we have often seen how aggregate data obscure differences, attention was directed to racial and gender standpoints in responding to these questions. Figures 45 and 46 present these data.

As we saw previously, Figure 45 shows how racial status clearly changed response to this question.

- In every division, Multi-Racial respondents were less likely than their White counterparts to agree that minority staff are given the same opportunities.

- The differences in agreement between the two racial groupings varied from a low of 10 points (Student-Centered) to a high of 50 points (Support Services).

- Among Multi-Racial respondents, there was considerable variation by divisional location—with 70 percent of personnel of color in Student-Centered divisions agreeing that there is equal opportunity in contrast to approximately 35% in Support Services units.

- Within academic units, personnel of color were as likely to disagree with the assertion of equal opportunity as they were to agree.
Similar findings were apparent when gender differences were examined.
• In all divisions, male staff and administrators were much more likely than their female counterparts to agree that women personnel are given the same opportunities for advancement.

• The gender differences ranged from a low of 17 points (CMA) to a high of 35 points (Academic Affairs, Support Services).

• There was considerable variation within gender—according to divisional location.
  - The lowest percentage agreement (44%) among women was in the Student-Centered divisions.
  - The highest percentage agreement (over 75%) among women respondents was in CMA.
  - Even among male respondents, there was moderate variation among divisions.

Clearly, as we saw in the perception of fairness, social demographic characteristics and location impacted perception of equal opportunity.
Self-Assessments and Personal Experience with Discrimination

Perception of How Viewed at Creighton University

Composite indicator, formed by the summation of responses to the 11 polar comparisons included in Question 19. Staff and administrators were asked to "Please describe how you think you are viewed at Creighton." Descriptor pairs included:

- Respected-Disrespected
- Admired-Resented
- Successful-Unsuccessful
- Intelligent-Unintelligent
- Included-Marginalized
- Valued-Demeaned
- Appreciated-Worthless
- Encouraged-Discouraged
- Strong-Weak
- Hardworking-Lazy
- Integral to the campus-Tolerated

Possible high score = 55, lowest possible score = 11. Overall mean = 41.05.

Figure 47: Sense of How Viewed, by Division and Exempt Status
(Mean Score on Sense of How Viewed)

Figure 47 presents the divisional mean scores on Sense of How Viewed by exempt and non-exempt status.

- With one exception (Student-Centered), exempt personnel saw themselves more positively viewed on campus than did non-exempt personnel.

---

6 There were 100 (10.5%) respondents who did not complete this section.
• The actual degree of difference varied widely among the divisional units.
  o The smallest differential between means was 1.5 points—in Academic Affairs.
  o The means for exempt personnel in Health Sciences and Support Services were 3-3.5 points higher than those for non-exempt personnel.
  o In CMA, the gap was over 6 points.

**Figure 48: Sense of How Viewed, by Division and Race/Ethnicity**
(Mean Score on Sense of How Viewed)

Unlike the differences by exempt status, racial and gender differences were not as clearly defined.
• In Figure 48, we see that there were no significant racial differences on Sense of How Viewed within the Student-Centered and Support Services divisions.
• In the remaining 3 divisions, Whites were more likely than their Multi-Racial counterparts to see themselves as viewed positively.
  o In Academic Affairs, the difference was just over 1 point.
  o In Health Sciences, it was approximately 2 points.
  o In CMA, the mean among Whites was 2.5 points higher than that among Multi-Racial personnel.
• In Figure 49, we see that only in the Student-Centered divisions is there a significant gender difference in Sense of How Viewed.
• In those divisions, the mean for men was 2.5 points higher than that for women.
Figure 49: Sense of How Viewed, by Division and Gender
(Mean Score on Sense of How Viewed)

- Clearly, race/ethnicity makes more of a difference in Sense of How Viewed that does gender.
- Regardless of gender, there was approximately 1.5 points difference between White and Multi-Racial personnel in their appraisal of how they are viewed on campus— with Whites being more positive.
- There was a slight tendency for women of both racial groups to be less positive than their same race counterparts.

Figure 50: Sense of How Viewed, by Gender and Race/Ethnicity
(Mean Score on Sense of How Viewed)
Overall Sense of Belonging

Composite indicator, formed by the summation of 4 items drawn from Q16 which presented staff and administrators with a variety of possible experiences and asked them to indicate “How many times since coming to Creighton have you experienced the following?” The items composing this variable are:

- Felt a sense of belonging at Creighton.
- Felt I have the opportunity to succeed at Creighton.
- Felt that I had to change my personal characteristics (e.g., language, dress, behaviors) in order to fit in.
- Felt excluded from campus activities.

The possible high for this variable was 16, the lowest possible score was 4. The last two items were reversed to maintain consistent meaning in the composite variable. Thus, for example, if an employee answered *often felt excluded*...the score was recoded to a 1.

Overall mean = 13.34, indicating overall scores were quite positive on sense of belonging. Yet, as with the other variables, employees’ sense of belonging varied by location, exempt status, race/ethnicity, and gender.

**Figure 51: Sense of Belonging, by Division and Exempt Status**

(Mean Scores on Belonging Index)

Figure 51 presents mean scores on Sense of Belonging within divisional units, by exempt status.

- Except in the Student-Centered divisions, the mean scores on Sense of Belonging were 1-1.5 points higher for exempt personnel than for their non-exempt counterparts.
- Within exempt status, there was little variation across divisions in Sense of Belonging.

---

7 Response categories were: 1=Never; 2=Rarely; 3=Sometimes; and 4=Often.
Figure 52 shows relatively few differences in Sense of Belonging by race/ethnicity, except in the case of CMA — where the mean score on belonging for exempt personnel was 2 points higher than for non-exempt.

**Figure 52: Sense of Belonging, by Division and Race/Ethnicity**  
(Mean Scores on Belong Index)

Figure 53 shows a slight tendency for men to have a greater sense of belonging than women, but differences are relatively small or insignificant.

**Figure 53: Sense of Belonging, by Division and Gender**  
(Mean Scores on Belong Index)
Discrimination on Campus Due to Personal Characteristics

Composite Indicator, formed by summation of responses to 6 items included in Question 16. Staff and administrators were asked, “How many times since coming to Creighton have you experienced the following?” Response categories included never, rarely, sometimes, often; and, the items included:

- Been discriminated against because of my:
  - Race/ethnicity
  - Gender
  - Disability
  - Sexual Orientation
  - Religion
  - Age

Possible lowest score = 6; highest possible score was 24. Overall mean=7.06. This overall mean is quite low, indicating that the majority of staff and administrators did not report any experience of discrimination due to personal characteristics.

Yet, there were some significant (though still relatively small) divergence from that overall trend. Staff and administrators of color, in particular, reported higher levels of discrimination than others. Figures X and X depict this difference.

Figure 54 shows the report of discrimination due to personal characteristic by exempt status in conjunction with either race/ethnicity or gender.

- Clearly, gender increases the probability that one experienced discrimination, with women being slightly more likely than males (regardless of exempt status) to report having experienced discrimination.

- Yet, it is race that truly changes that the probability of experience with discrimination. Employees of color, whether exempt or non-exempt, were significantly more likely to have experienced discrimination due to a personal characteristic.

- Moreover, among Multi-racial respondents, non-exempt personnel were slightly more likely than exempt to report such experience.
Figure 54: Experience of Discrimination Due to Personal Characteristic
(Mean Score on Discrimination Index)

Figure 55 directly depicts the amount of racial discrimination reported by staff and administrators, by race/ethnicity within divisional location. This figure charts the percentages of subgroups that indicated never having experienced racial discrimination on campus.

- Clearly, racial status impacted this experience, with upwards of 20 percentage points difference between White and Multi-Racial respondents report of experience.

- Regardless of division, staff and administrators of color were much more likely than their counterparts to have experienced events or behaviors they defined as discriminatory.

- Between 30 and 40% of Multi-Racial respondents—both men and women—indicated some degree of discrimination, in contrast to less than 10% report by Whites.

Figure 55: Experience of Racial Discrimination
(Percent Saying Never)
Figure 56: Experience of Racial Discrimination, by Race/Ethnicity and Exempt Status
(Percent Reporting Never)

Figure 56 shows racial difference in reported experience of racial discrimination by exempt status. Perhaps, surprisingly, Multi-Racial respondents with exempt status were more likely than their non-exempt racial counterparts to report having experienced racial discrimination.

Figure 57: Experience of Gender Discrimination, by Division and Gender
(Percent Reporting Never)

Figure 57 shows gender differences in reported experience of gender discrimination, by division and gender.

- In every division but CMA, men were consistently less likely to report having experienced gender discrimination than were women.
- In CMA, the genders are essentially “tied” in their report of gender discrimination.
- Among the other divisions, Health Science respondents were the least different—with a 16 point gap in reports of the two genders.
• In Academic Affairs and the Student-Centered divisions, approximately 30 percentage points separated the men from the women.
• In Support Services, the gap was over 35 points.

Figure 58 reports differences in the experience of gender discrimination by gender and exempt status.
• Here as we saw in the interaction of race/ethnicity and exempt status, women with exempt status were more likely to report having experienced gender discrimination than their non-exempt counterparts.
• The gap between exempt men and women was almost 40 points, compared to 20 points between men and women with non-exempt status.

**Figure 58: Experience of Gender Discrimination, by Gender and Exempt Status**
(Percent Reporting Never)
The Cumulative Effects of Minor Inequities

Throughout this report, we have seen evidence of a variety of inequities and differences—many which, in and of themselves, are minor in their impact upon individual staff members and administrators. However, taken together they form a tapestry of inequities—a kind of heaviness that impacts some members of the Creighton community more than others, yet remains almost invisible to many.

In the 1980s, Bernice R. Sandler coined the term, chilly climate, to refer to the subtle ways in which women and other minorities are often treated differently at work, in the classroom, on campus, and in social events. Many of these behaviors or attitudes that contribute to the “chilly climate” may be described as “micro-inequities”—small, everyday inequities in which individuals are treated differently based on their gender, race, age, or other “outsider” status.

When taken by itself, one micro-inequity makes a small, probably inconsequential effect on the person it impacts. However, when these behaviors happen over and over and in combination, they accumulate. When these micro-inequities occur frequently and repeatedly, they become oppressive and the impact is like being weighed down by a “ton of feathers” (term coined by Paula Kaplan). Moreover, it is not only the “target” of such inequities that is harmed, but those who participate or experience such inequities—even if not themselves the target. If these “events” are not recognized and altered, they can have damaging effects; and, the resulting climate is chilling and stifling, rather than warm, inclusive, and empowering.

Throughout this report we have seen direct and indirect evidence of micro-inequities. In this final section of the report, we will look explicitly at four types of micro-inequities captured in the survey and their cumulative impact on staff and administrative work and lived experience on Creighton’s campus.

Four sets of micro-inequities are used: racial inequities, gender inequities, disability inequities, and sexual orientation inequities. A composite indicator was developed using staff and administrator responses to questions regarding how many times they had experienced the following:

Racial Inequities:
- Been discriminated against because of my race/ethnicity
- Heard insensitive or disparaging comments about racial/ethnic minorities from administrators, faculty, staff, or students
- Been present at Creighton events where racial/ethnic minorities were portrayed in a derogatory manner
- Seen material in university publications that is offensive to race/ethnic minorities

Gender Inequities:
- Been discriminated against because of my gender
- Heard insensitive or disparaging comments about women from administrators, faculty, staff, or students
- Been present at Creighton events where women were portrayed in a derogatory manner
- Seen material in university publications that is offensive to women

Disability Inequities:
- Been discriminated against because of my disability
- Heard insensitive or disparaging comments about persons with disabilities from administrators, faculty, staff, or students
• Been present at Creighton events where persons with disabilities were portrayed in a derogatory manner
• Seen material in university publications that is offensive to persons with disabilities

Sexual Orientation Inequities:
• Been discriminated against because of sexual orientation
• Heard insensitive or disparaging comments about gays and lesbians from administrators, faculty, staff, or students
• Been present at Creighton events where gays and lesbians were portrayed in a derogatory manner
• Seen material in university publications that is offensive to gays and lesbians

Responses included never, rarely, sometimes, and often.

For each of the above questions, staff and administrator scores were recoded into a dichotomous variable: never occurred vs occurred (often, sometimes, rarely). Scores were then combined to determine the percent of individuals who had never experienced any of the events corresponding to a particular target group, those who had experienced one, two...up to 4 per type of inequity.

The accumulated impact of inequity was created by taking the types of inequities and adding them as follows:

\[
\text{Perceived Racial Inequities} + \\
\text{Perceived Gender Inequities} + \\
\text{Perceived Disability Inequities} + \\
\text{Perceived Sexual Orientation Inequities}
\]

This provided an indicator of overall levels of perceived inequities, with a range from 0 (no inequities) to 16 (all inequities).\(^8\) This overall indicator was then recoded by collapsing categories for those who had no experience of any type of inequity, those who had 1 to 2 experiences, those who had 3 to 4 experiences, those with 5 to 6 experiences, and those who had 7 or more experiences. The resulting distribution is given in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Inequities</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 6</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having determined experience with micro-inequities, we can now consider the effects of accumulated experience on several perceptual and experiential variables previously examined.

---

\(^8\) Each number of possible inequities was found in the analysis.
Cumulative Inequity Experiences and Perception of Work Environment

Figure 59 graphically depicts the relationship between staff and administrator perceptions of their work environment and their experience of inequities.

- As the number of inequities experienced increases, the perception of the climate of work declines rather markedly—until the mean value on work environment plateaus at 5 or greater inequities.
- The highest mean value and the lowest mean value on work environment are separated by 6 points.
- Only those who experienced 2 or fewer inequities had mean scores on work environment exceeding the overall mean.
- Over 30 percent of respondents are represented in the mean scores on work environment falling below the overall mean.

Figure 59: Work Environment and Number of Inequities Reported
(Mean Scores for Work Environment)

Cumulative Impact of Inequity Experiences on Perception of Campus Culture

Figure 60 represents the same analysis except with respondents' perception of overall campus culture.

- The results here are even more marked that in the previous analysis, with a steeper decline found as one moves from no experience with inequities to 7 or more.
- The mean difference between the no-experience group and the 7+ group approaches 10 points.
Figure 60: Campus Climate and Number of Inequities Reported
(Mean Scores for Campus Climate)

Cumulative Impact of Number of Inequities on Perceived Mission-in-Action

Figure 61 graphically depicts the relationship between the number of inequities experienced and respondent perceptions of Creighton's mission-in-action when it comes to investing in the development and quality improvement of her people and programs.

Figure 61: Perceived Mission Commitment to Development and Number of Inequities Reported
(Mean Scores for Development Facet of Mission)

- Again, we see clear evidence of the cumulative impact of experience with inequities—with a clear decline in the hopeful perception of mission-in-action as experiences with inequities increase.
• Here the steepest drop occurs between those who experienced 1-2 inequities and those who reported 3-4 inequities—a drop of 4 points, with a seemingly “minor” increase in inequity experience.

• It appears that inequity experience clearly appears to counter a sense that Creighton values and invests in all its people—and the quality of its programs.

Figure 62: Perceived Enactment of Diversity Facets of Mission and Number of Inequities Experienced
(Mean Scores for Diversity Mission)

Figure 62 presents the impact of inequity experience on another facet of perceived mission-in-action—the commitment to diversity.

• Again, the pattern we have seen repeatedly—diminished belief in mission-in-action when inequity experience contradicts the words expressed.

• It should be noted that a drop of 6 points in a possible range of 24 points represents a substantial fall in “faith” in the diversity facets of mission-in-action.

Cumulative Impact of Number of Inequities on Sense of Belonging

Figure 63 represents the relationship between number of inequities experienced and staff and administrators’ Sense of Belonging on the Creighton campus. Here, again, we see the familiar pattern of decline in positive scores as experience with inequities increases. In this case, the fall is even more remarkable given the fact that respondents generally were very positive in their assessments of belonging.
Cumulative Impact of Number of Inequities on Perception of Equal Opportunity

Figures 64 and 65 present another way to examine the cumulative impact of inequity experience—this time looking at the relationship between number of inequity experiences and perception of Creighton as an equal opportunity employer.
In Figure 64, we see clearly how experience with inequities—not necessarily aimed at oneself—undermines faith in the University’s commitment to equal opportunity.

- Those who reported little or no experience of inequities believe strongly in the availability of equal opportunity—over 80% of those with no experience endorse that assertion.
- Among those with 7 or more inequity experiences, just over 30% see the University as committed to equal opportunity.

**Figure 65: Number of Inequities Experienced and Perception that CU Provides Equal Opportunity—Regardless of Gender**

(Percent Indicating CU Provides Equal Opportunity Often/Always)

![Bar chart showing number of inequities experienced and perception of equal opportunity](chart)

Figure 65 provides an almost identical picture—with the focus being on equal opportunity regardless of gender.

Again and again in this section, we see a clear pattern between equity experience and “belief in the system”—and recall, almost 1/3 of all respondents experienced 3 or more inequities. That 1/3 represents a significant minority of those who may—at best—be skeptical of assertions that ask for trust and patience in the midst of difficulty. And, why should they trust—theyir experience belies such requests.
Summary and Conclusions

The patterns found in this study are consistent with the student survey completed 3 years ago in that many of the patterns that appeared are part of the larger tapestry of U.S. society. Much of what was reported here is symptomatic of unexamined structures and processes that perpetuate traditional hierarchies and invisible privilege. It belies our purported commitments to equity, justice, and inclusive community.

No there was no “smoking gun” of overt harassment and/or discrimination. And, there was much that was positive—especially for some people, particularly those for whom the old structures and processes were created. Yet, there was also clear evidence of distrust, inequity, and dismay—for, at least, a significant minority.

When we think of Creighton University, we typically think of students and faculty—their activities, their work, their achievements. Seldom do we think of staff and administrators. Yet, staff and administrator roles—as administrative assistants, student programmers, recruiters, fundraisers, chaplains, deans, and maintenance workers—essentially create, maintain, and sustain the context for the activities of faculty and students.9

Given their pivotal contributions to the productivity and effectiveness of the institution, it is crucial that we enhance those elements of campus culture that sustain their work and humanity—and dismantle those elements that diminish. Given who we say we are, can we do otherwise? And, if we do not work to address the inequities that form “a ton of feathers,” can we claim to walk in the legacy of the Jesuit, Catholic commitments to equity, justice, inclusive community and solidarity with those “outsiders” in our midst?

9 In the 1999-2000 Student Climate Survey, we saw that students consistently pointed to staff persons as instrumental in their growth at the University.