Summary of the 2002 Staff & Administrator Campus Climate Survey Report

Goal and Limitations of this Report

The goal of this report is to provide an executive summary of the Staff & Administrator Campus Climate Survey 2002 Final Report (the 2002 Report), authored by Drs. Shirley Scrutchfield and Lisa Riley in June, 2003. The history and rationale behind conducting the survey is adequately covered in the 2002 Report and will not be repeated here. The 64-page long 2002 Report mostly is comprised of graphical representations of statistical analyses, brief descriptions of those graphs, and several pages of summative analysis.

This report will summarize what was reported in the 2002 Report, identify strengths and weaknesses of that report, and recommendations for acting based on the survey results.

Summary of the 2002 Report

Demographics

The Climate Survey (the Survey) was constructed by compiling sets of questions from existing climate surveys. An unspecified number of faculty, staff, and administrators reviewed the Survey prior to its administration in 2001. The survey was designed to gather data across seven areas of concern:

1. Staff and administrator characteristics (demographics)
2. Respondents’ perceptions of their job and work environment
3. Respondents’ experiences with harassment and discrimination at CU
4. Respondents’ perceptions of equitable opportunities for advancement and influence across four categories of employees (racial/ethnic minorities, women, people with disabilities, gays and lesbians)
5. Respondents’ perceptions of the general climate on campus
6. Respondents’ perceptions of CU’s mission in action
7. Narrative questions relating to sources of support, challenges, and suggestions for improvement

Generalizability

The 52.4% response rate is quite good. Survey responses were aggregated into five “Divisions” as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Comprised of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Centered</td>
<td>President’s Office, Student Services, &amp; University Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support-Services</td>
<td>Administration &amp; Finance, Information Technology, &amp; University Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>CMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2002 Report notes that there was some apparent confusion among Health Sciences and CMA respondents regarding the Division to which they belonged. The 2002 Report assumes away that confusion, assuming that respondents accurately reported their Division. The number of respondents from each Division appears to accurately represent the number of employees in
those Divisions, with the exception of CMA, which is more than 50% under-represented. The cause for that lack of survey participation within CMA is unknown.

Sixty-eight point seven percent (68.7%) of the respondents were female, 20.9% were male, and 10.4% did not provide that information. The actual distribution of sex across all staff and administration at the time of the Survey was not reported. Thus, it is not known if the sex distribution for the survey accurately represents the university demographics at that time.

The same argument can be made for the remaining demographic information provided. That information is useful but no assumption of generalizability to the entire set of staff and administration employees can be made.

In most surveys of this nature, generalizability is assumed, particularly when there is a high response rate, as is the case with this survey. However, the authors of the 2002 Report make particular note of the number of respondents who did not provide complete demographic information. The authors conclude that the level of missing data seen in that section of the survey points to a fear-filled environment. That may be factually accurate, but no analysis is provided comparing perceptions of climate of those who did not provide complete demographic information and those who did provide that information. Thus, we do not know that respondents withheld information out of fear, as is purported by the 2002 Report authors. The assumption of a fear-filled workplace may be accurate, but no data or analyses are provided to corroborate that assumption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Question</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents Not Answering the Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time / part-time status</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (sex)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job classification *</td>
<td>30+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The large number of respondents not providing job classification information may have been due to the state of flux job classifications were in at the time of the survey.

Data Analysis and Categorization

The authors of the 2002 Report performed factor analysis and other multivariate analyses to identify "basic facets central to staff and administrator assessment of Creighton University" (p. 8, the 2002 Report). Performing factor and multivariate analyses with the type of data collected is appropriate. Such forms of analysis often show sets of questions/answers that are logically and statistically related. Those question sets are labeled by the data analysts to meaningfully summarize what the data represent. The following list shows the facet labels provided in the summary of the 2002 Report. In some cases, different and/or additional labels were provided in the body of the 2002 Report. Those labels are provided in parentheses below. No rationale is provided to help the reader understand why different facet labels were used in different parts of the 2002 Report.
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Work Environment Issues
- Job Satisfaction
- Job Qualities
- Respect (Job Respect)
- Future Opportunities at Creighton University (Future at Creighton – Advancement Opportunities)
- Co-Worker Relationships (Co-Worker Relationship)
- Appraisal of Work Environment Climate (Perceived Climate of Work Environment)

Appraisal of the Institution as a Whole
- Appraisal of Overall Campus Climate (Perception of Campus Climate)
- Creighton’s Mission in Action (Appraisal of Institution: Mission in Action, with the following two sub-themes: 1) Commitment to Development & Quality and 2) Commitment to Diversity and Inclusiveness)
- Perceptions of Equity (Appraisal of Campus Culture – Perceptions of Equity, with three specific questions reported {note: these are not sub-themes, just specific questions pulled from the Survey}: 1) perceptions of equal and adequate representation, 2) perception of fair treatment, and 3) perception of opportunities for advancement)

Self-Assessment and Personal Experiences
- Sense of How They Are Viewed (Perception of How Viewed at Creighton University)
- Sense of Belonging (Overall Sense of Belonging)
- Experiences of Discrimination (Discrimination on Campus Due to Personal Characteristics)


Survey Results
The authors of the 2002 Report used a semi-standard structure to report their statistical analyses. The reporting of findings for most, but not all, facets included graphs and descriptive text for each of the following categories:

- Facet by Division and Exempt Status (e.g., Job Satisfaction by Div. and Exempt Status)
- Facet by Division and Race/Ethnicity (defined as White or Multi-Racial)
- Facet by Division and Gender (sex)
- Facet by Gender (sex) and Race/Ethnicity

The 2002 Report provides an extensive set of graphs to display the findings across those categories. Those tables show clear differences in responses across the categories measured. However, statistical significance is not reported, so conclusions regarding the strength of those
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differences cannot be made. In short, the 2002 Report shows that (for purposes of brevity, the word “employees” is assumed in the following text):

**Job Satisfaction** (overall, the scores were above the midpoint for the index used, equivalent to an “agree somewhat” response, which is the second best of the four possible responses)

- Exempts are more satisfied than non-exempts, across all divisions.
- Whites are more satisfied than non-whites, across all divisions.
- Males are more satisfied than females in Health Sciences and CMA.
- White males are more satisfied than non-white males and white females are more satisfied than non-white females.

**Job Qualities** (overall, the scores were near the midpoint for the index used, between a response of “disagree somewhat” and “agree somewhat”)

- Exempts perceive higher job quality than do non-exempts, across all divisions.
- There were no racial/ethnic differences in perceived job quality.
- Males perceived slightly higher job quality than did females, across all divisions.
- No Gender by Race/Ethnicity table was provided.
- 49.5% of respondents agreed with the statement, “I receive an equitable salary in my department or work area.”
  - Except in CMA where there was no difference, exempts were much more likely to agree that they received an equitable salary than did non-exempts.
  - In Support Services and CMA, whites were more likely than non-whites to agree that they received an equitable salary (there were no differences in the other divisions).
  - In Academic Affairs, Support Services, and CMA, males were more likely than females to agree that they received an equitable salary (females had slightly more agreement than males in the other divisions).

**Job Respect** (overall, the scores were above the midpoint of the index used, slightly better than an “agree somewhat” response)

- Exempts perceived more job respect than did non-exempts in Support Services and CMA, with no differences in the other divisions.
- Non-whites perceived more job respect than whites in CMA. No differences existed in the other divisions.
- Males perceived more job respect than females in the Student-centered division. No differences existed in the other divisions.
- No Gender by Race/Ethnicity table was provided.

**Future at Creighton - Advancement Opportunities** (Overall, scores were mostly below the midpoint of the index used, between a response of “disagree somewhat” and “agree somewhat”)
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- Exempts were more likely to perceive advancement opportunities than non-exempts in CMA. There were mixed, minor differences in the other divisions.
- Non-whites were more likely to perceive advancement opportunities in Health Sciences than whites. There were mixed, minor differences in the other divisions.
- Males were slightly more likely to perceive more advancement opportunities than females across all divisions.
- No Gender by Race/Ethnicity table was provided.

Co-Worker Relationship (overall, the scores were above the midpoint of the index used, between a response of “agree somewhat” and “agree strongly”)

- Exempts were slightly more likely than non-exempts to perceive good co-worker relationships, across all divisions.
- No other tables were provided, though mention was made that all employees “give high marks for co-worker relationships, regardless of division, exempt status, race/ethnicity, or gender.”

Perceived Climate of Work Environment (overall, the scores were above the midpoint of the index used, averaging a 3.8 on a 5-point scale in which 5 is the best score)

- Exempts were more likely than non-exempts to perceive a positive working environment, particularly in Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and CMA. All of Support Services and non-exempts in CMA gave the lowest scores in this section, but were still above average.
- Whites and non-whites perceived a positive working environment to nearly the same extent, except in Academic Affairs and CMA, where whites rated the environment as much more positive than did non-whites.
- Males were more likely than females to perceive a positive work environment across all divisions except for Support Services.
- White and non-white males rated the working environment nearly the same, while white females perceived a slightly less positive working environment, and non-white females perceived an even less positive working environment.

Appraisals of the Institution as a Whole - Perception of Campus Climate (overall, the scores were above the midpoint of the index used, averaging a 3.8 on a 5-point scale in which 5 is the best score)

- Exempts were more likely than non-exempts to perceive the CU climate favorably in Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and CMA. Results were mixed for the other two divisions.
- Whites were more likely than non-whites to perceive the CU climate favorably in Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and CMA. Results were mixed for the other two divisions.
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- Males were more likely than females to perceive the CU climate favorably in Academic Affairs. Results were mixed in the other divisions. However, Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and CMA showed more favorable ratings of the CU climate than did Support Services.
- There was little difference between white males and white females. But, white males provided more favorable ratings than did non-white males. White females provided more favorable ratings than did non-white females. And, non-white males provided more favorable ratings than did non-white females.

Appraisal of the Institution as a Whole: Mission in Action – Commitment to Development
(overall, the scores were about in the middle of five possible responses, equivalent to a response of “sometimes”)

- Exempts were more likely to perceive a commitment to development than non-exempts in Support Services and CMA, and less likely to perceive that commitment in Student-centered. Little difference in perceptions was seen in the other divisions.
- Non-whites were far more likely than whites to perceive a commitment to development in Student-centered, but less likely to perceive that commitment in CMA. Little difference in perceptions was seen in the other divisions.
- Males were more likely than females to perceive a commitment to development in Academic Affairs and Student-centered, and less likely to perceive that commitment in CMA. No differences were observed in the other divisions.
- No Gender by Race/Ethnicity table was provided.

Appraisal of the Institution as a Whole: Mission in Action – Commitment to Diversity and Inclusiveness (overall, the scores were above average, nearly an “often”, the second best of five possible responses)

- Exempts were more likely than non-exempts to perceive a commitment to diversity and inclusiveness in Health Sciences and CMA, but less likely to perceive that commitment in Student-centered or Support Services. No difference was observed in Academic Affairs.
- Non-whites were more likely than whites to perceive a commitment to diversity and inclusiveness in Student-centered, but less likely to perceive that commitment in the other divisions.
- No Gender by Race/Ethnicity table was provided.
- No gender information was provided in this section of the 2002 Report.
- With respect to the single question: “Creighton provides equal opportunities regardless of race or ethnicity”
  - Whites in all divisions responded with “often” or “always” between 61 – 78% of the time while non-whites responded with “often” or “always” between 44 – 61% of the time, with the largest gaps in perceptions occurring in Academic Affairs and CMA.
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- Regardless of sex, whites responded with “often” or “always” approximately 69% of the time while non-whites responded with “often” or “always” approximately 40% of the time.
- Males were more likely than females to perceive equal opportunities regardless of sex in Academic Affairs, Student-centered, and Support Services, particularly so in Academic Affairs.
- For both exempt and non-exempt employees, males were more likely than females to perceive equal opportunities regardless of their sex.

Appraisal of Campus Culture – Perceptions of Equity (no statistics were provided from which a determination of “average” could be calculated)

- This section of the survey asked if certain “groups are adequately represented on important campus governance committees.” The groups include racial/ethnic minorities, women, people with disabilities, and gays and lesbians. This question assumes that respondents can accurately categorize Creighton employees into these categories based on visual cues. That is possible for men and women, sometimes not accurate with respect to racial/ethnic minorities and persons with disabilities, and always not possible with gays and lesbians in the workplace. While respondents may know persons fitting into these categories, it is likely their perception of the actual number of people in those categories will be inaccurate, leading to inaccurate estimations of the extent to which they are treated equitably. Thus, some of the information in this section of the 2002 Report will not be summarized here due to its lack of validity.
- A more accurate measure of perceptions of equity is to ask persons within those categories about their own experiences with (in)equity. That analysis was reported for non-whites and females, but not for the other categories.
  - 48% of the non-whites in Support Services, and 62 – 69% of the non-whites in other divisions, “agree” or “strongly agree” that they are treated fairly.
  - 89% of the females in CMA, and between 65 and 78% of the females in the other divisions, “agree” or “strongly agree” that they are treated fairly.
  - Of non-whites, approximately 35% in Support Services, 50% in Academic Affairs and Health Sciences, 60% in CMA, and 70% in Student-centered “agree” or “strongly agree” that “minority staff are given the same opportunities for executive/ supervisory/management positions as white staff members.”
  - Of females, approximately 44% in Students Centered, 50% in Support Services, 56% in Academic Affairs, 61% in Health Sciences, and 76% in CMA “agree” or “strongly agree” that “women staff are given the same opportunities for executive/ supervisory/management positions as men.”

Self-Assessment and Personal Experience with Discrimination: Respondents’ Perceptions of How They are Viewed at Creighton (overall, the scores were above the midpoint of the index used, averaging a 3.7 on a 5-point scale in which 5 is the best score)
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- Except in Student-centered where there was no difference, exempts’ perception of how they are viewed is higher than non-exempts’ perception of how they are viewed, particularly in CMA.
- Whites’ perception of how they are viewed in higher than non-whites’ perception of how they are viewed in Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and CMA, with little difference in Student-centered and Support Services.
- There is little difference in males’ and females’ perceptions of how they are viewed, except in Student-centered, where males’ perceptions of how they are viewed are higher than females’ perceptions of how they are viewed.
- Overall, males’ perceptions of how they are viewed are higher than females’ perceptions of how they are viewed and whites’ perceptions of how they are viewed are higher than non-whites’ perceptions of how they are viewed.

Self-Assessment and Personal Experience with Discrimination: Overall Sense of Belonging
(overall, the average belongingness score was 13.34 out of a maximum 16)

- Exempts had a greater sense of belonging than did non-exempts in each division, but the lowest division scores for non-exempts were almost 13 out of 16.
- There was little difference in belonging scores across divisions for whites and non-whites, except for CMA where non-whites averaged just less than 11 compared to the whites’ average of just more than 13.
- There was little difference in belongingness scores across divisions for males and females.

Discrimination on Campus Due to Personal Characteristics

- Respondents were asked “how many times since coming to Creighton have you experienced the following: Been discriminated against because of my: 1) race/ethnicity, 2) gender, 3) disability, 4) sexual orientation, 5) religion, 6) age.” Possible responses included never, rarely, sometimes, and often. Responses were numerically coded from 1 = never to 4 = often, providing a possible range of scores from 6 to 24, with an average of 7.06 (1.18 on the 4-point scale). Thus, overall respondents reported very little discrimination in their experience.
- Exempt scores ranged from approximately 1.1 for males to approximately 1.3 for non-whites. Non-exempt scores ranged from approximately 1.1 for males to approximately 1.4 for non-whites.
- Across divisions, approximately 2 – 9% of whites reported experiencing racial discrimination while approximately 30 - 40% of non-whites reported the same.
- Across divisions, except for CMA, 10 – 15% of males reported experiencing gender discrimination while 30 - 45% of females reported the same. In CMA, approximately 30% of the males and 25% of the females reported experiencing gender discrimination.
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Additional Analysis
Nearly 11% of the 2002 Report is dedicated to a discussion of "the cumulative effects of minor inequities," including racial inequities, gender inequities, disability inequities, and sexual orientation inequities. The 2002 Report argues that the inequities discovered in the data analysis may have minor effects on people when taken individually. However, "taken together they form a tapestry of inequities" creating a "chilly climate" in which the inequities "become oppressive and the impact is like being weighed down by a 'ton of feathers.'" A series of questions were asked about persons' direct experiences of being discriminated against, hearing insensitive or disparaging comments, seeing groups of people portrayed in a derogatory manner, or having seen material in university publications that is offensive to those people. The last question is potentially ambiguous, to the extent that a respondent who is not a member of the group in question may or may not accurately determine what is offensive to members in that group.

Of the sixteen possible types of inequities about which the survey inquired, the 2002 Report provides the following distribution of occurrences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Inequities</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
<th>Inverse Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 6</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing / not answered</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The theory behind the cumulative effects of minor inequities is sound. However, the questions asked did not impose a time constraint, so there is no way of knowing if the inequities encountered happened recently or in the past. Further, respondents were not asked if actions were taken to resolve or repair damage from the inequities they encountered. Regardless of the answers to those questions not asked, 15.5% of the respondents have experienced five or more incidents of inequities. Nearly one-third of the respondents have experienced three or more incidents of inequities.

Strengths of the 2002 Report
- The survey was designed to assess the workplace climate with respect to gender, race, and ethnicity. The survey was well designed for that purpose.
- The facets identified via the factor and multivariate analyses have face validity, appearing to make sense on the surface.
- The results presented in the tables appear to make sense and appear to show some consistent trends from facet to facet.
- The survey gathered both quantitative and qualitative data.
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- The response rate was quite high.

- Combining smaller work divisions with larger work divisions may have protected the identity of individuals and small groups of people whose answers might otherwise have been identified through their demographic characteristics.

- The questions comprising each index were provided in the 2002 Report.

Weaknesses of the 2002 Report

- The 2002 Report provides only descriptive information, and it does so without the statistics required to determine the relative importance of the findings. Further, it does not provide, nor attempt to provide, any answers to the problems it claims exist. Qualitative data were gathered but not analyzed or reported. Often, in surveys of this type, respondents’ qualitative responses provide their suggestions for ameliorating problems they encounter or perceive to exist. In this survey, respondents were asked to respond to the following three “narrative questions relating to sources of support, challenges, and suggestions for improvement”:

  1. Who/what has been the greatest source of support for you at Creighton? Please tell us about that support.
  2. Who/what has presented the greatest difficulty or challenge for you at Creighton? Please explain briefly.
  3. What specific things could Creighton do to improve the quality of your experience?

- The qualitative responses garnered from those questions are perhaps the most important data gathered from the study as they provide direct input from Creighton employees regarding how to improve the climate for them.

- Information used to report statistical significance is not included in the report. It appears the intended target audience for the report is comprised of persons who are not statistical experts. Writing for that audience prevents those who understand statistics from gleaning all the meaning that is available from the data collected. At present, no digital or paper-based copy of the statistical analyses performed by the 2002 Report’s authors has been found at Creighton University. Requests for those files have been made of the first author of the 2002 Report. That author’s response has been to advise CU that she is uncertain if she has retained the files. The end result is that it is not possible to know if the claims of difference presented in the 2002 Report are statistically significant. It is possible that only statistically significant results were included in the report, but this executive summary will not assume that to be true without seeing the original analyses or re-analyzing the data.

- The Survey asks questions only about “gays and lesbians” but the 2002 Report provides findings about “GLBT”, presumably referring to gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons.
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- The survey reports “gender” without testing for gender. Gender cannot be assumed by asking if a person is male or female, as is done in the survey. Asking for that information provides a measure of sex (which is a biological construct) not gender (which is socially constructed). Thus, the Survey is not so much a gender differences study as it is a sex differences study.

- The possible ranges of some of the Composite Indexes are incorrectly reported.

- The roll-up of work divisions into five divisions potentially hid important findings from the divisions that were combined for purposes of the report.

- While the questions comprising the indices were provided, no textual explanation, description, or definition of the indices was given. Thus, when persons discuss the report without the questions in hand, they are likely to impute meaning to the index labels (i.e., the facet labels) that do not match the meanings provided and constrained by the questions used.

- No specific suggestions are provided through which to improve the CU workplace climate. No such suggestions based on respondents’ qualitative comments are provided, either. The 2002 Report merely describes, it does not offer answers to the “whys” behind the perceptions of climate. Those answers are what are required before directed action can be taken.

- The survey was designed to assess the workplace climate with respect to gender, race, and ethnicity. The survey was well designed for that purpose. However, perceptions of workplace climate are not limited to issues of gender, race, and ethnicity. Additional factors, such as communication, individual competencies, leadership, organizational change, performance evaluation, safety, supervision, etc. are often studied in climate surveys. Investigating the complete picture of workplace climate often allows more flexibility to address problems within existing resource and time constraints than does just focusing on gender, race, and ethnicity at the expense of typical business issues or conversely, just focusing on typical business issues at the expense of gender, race, and ethnicity.

Recommendations

Recommendation: Report that quantitative data have been analyzed and reviewed but the qualitative data were not analyzed. Move ahead with the other recommendations provided, with the knowledge that the analysis of the qualitative data will provide some of the details needed to fully enact those recommendations. Commission the analysis of those qualitative data.

Overall, the results are slightly above average; not great but not bad, though there are areas of concern that are below average for the distributions used. Regardless of problems associated with
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how the results were reported, it is clear that there is room for improvement in workplace climate across all domains measured, with the possible exception of "belongingness."

**Recommendation:** Report to the university the categories of climate identified in the survey, the above-average nature of the results, and the existence of pockets of problems that will be addressed.

There are significant concerns about salaries. Efforts to correct those types of concerns have already been implemented at the university level. Attention should continue to be focused on perceptions of salary issues, both in general (e.g., perceptions of university-level support) and in specific (e.g., perceptions of college/school support).

**Recommendation:** Report to the university that salary concerns were clearly represented in this survey. Task the Deans and other administrative heads to determine the sense of satisfaction with the President's salary initiative and report that to a central location (e.g., ombudsman). Open a communication channel for direct feedback from CU employees to top decision-makers.

The 2002 Study addressed staff and administrator workplace climate issues. Creighton University, like all modern organizations, should be viewed systemically, with the understanding that changes affecting one area will affect other areas, often in unintended ways. Thus, care must be taken when seeking to improve the climate for staff and administrators that students and faculty are not adversely affected.

**Recommendation:** When reporting the results of this survey and any actions coming from the survey, do so using a systemic framework in an attempt to help all organizational members understand the interdependencies of our actions and inactions.

In general, there appear to exist differences in perceptions of climate across certain groups: exempts tend to see a better climate picture than do non-exempts, males tend to see a better climate picture than do females, and whites tend to see a better climate picture than do non-whites. Some of those results may be confounded with each other. Insufficient analysis was reported from which to support or refute such a conclusion. Insufficient analysis was reported from which to deduce the strength or importance of those differences.

**Recommendation:** At this point in time, do not emphasize these differences. Instead, commission an analysis of the qualitative data to learn what it tells us. After that analysis, reconsider those group differences to see if they are understood in such a way that we can take corrective action on them.