1989 STAFF OPINION SURVEY

TWIN CITIES CAMPUS RESULTS

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

December 1989

Acknowledgments

Inquiries

For additional information contact Trisha Beuhring, Ph.D., Director of Personnel Research, University of Minnesota Personnel Department, Administrative Services Center, Room 220, St. Paul, MN 55104 (campus mail).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 198-item Staff Opinion Survey was mailed to a random sample of 1,050 Twin Cities staff on April 15, 1989. Returns were accepted until June 15, 1989, shortly before the beginning of the new fiscal year. The survey was returned by 80% of the Twin Cities staff who received it. Consequently, the opinions discussed in this report can be considered representative of the opinions of staff campus-wide.

The survey was designed to obtain opinions on a wide variety of topics so that future decisions that affect civil service staff could be based on fact rather than supposition. In particular, the survey was designed to provide the following information:

* **Staff Priorities.** Importance ratings and satisfaction ratings for 14 general aspects of the job provided a basis for prioritizing staff concerns and identifying the University's strengths as an employer.

* **Additional Insights.** More than 150 items provided additional information on the sources of staff satisfaction and the reasons behind their concerns. A comparison of opinions on the five campuses, and of the views of various subgroups of Twin Cities staff, provided information about differences of opinion that might influence policy or program decisions.

* **Retention Issues.** Comparing the opinions of staff who plan to stay at the University with the opinions of staff who are thinking about leaving helped identify other issues that must be addressed in order to effectively deal with the concerns of dissatisfied staff.

* **Female and Minority Staff.** Information about how female and minority staff viewed their employment at the University, compared to male and non-minority staff, provided another perspective on the effectiveness of the affirmative action program. It also provided an indication of ways in which the University might improve its recruitment of females and minorities in the future.

* **Action Plans.** Staff opinions on various proposals for improving benefits, recognition, communication, and career development provided an indication of how successful specific programs for addressing staff concerns are likely to be, if implemented.

The following is a summary of staff opinions in each of these areas. The terms used to describe their opinions, such as "highly satisfied" and "far more satisfied", refer to the size of the average rating for staff campus-wide, or to the difference in the average ratings for two subgroups of staff. The correspondence between specific terms, average ratings, and differences in average ratings, can be found in the Interpretation Guidelines section of the Introduction to the full report.

STAFF PRIORITIES

Good relations with their supervisor, good relations with co-workers, and the opportunity to use their abilities were as important to Twin Cities staff as salary and benefits. Other aspects of the job they considered highly important were recognition for doing their work well, job security, the size of their pay raises, the opportunity for promotion, and the opportunity to have more responsibility and learn new skills. Of lesser importance were flexible work hours, the opportunity to work part-time, and the availability of day care on campus or nearby.

Taking both the importance ratings and subsequent satisfaction ratings into account provided a basis for identifying the University's strengths as an employer along with areas where staff think there is room for improvement and areas that staff consider a priority for action.

> *Strengths.*   Overall, Twin Cities staff were very satisfied with four of the job aspects they considered highly important: Relations with their supervisor, relations with co-workers, benefits, and job security.

> *Room for Improvement.*   Twin Cities staff were moderately or marginally satisfied with five other job aspects they considered highly important: The opportunity to use their abilities, have more responsibility, and learn new skills, plus their salary and the recognition they receive for doing their job well.

> *Priorities for Action.*   Twin Cities staff were moderately or very dissatisfied with only two job aspects they considered highly important: The size of their pay raises and their opportunity for promotion.   As the two major staff concerns, these would be the top priorities for action.

These concerns notwithstanding, more than 90% of Twin Cities staff agreed that the University is a good place to work, and more than 80% agreed that their department and their college are good places to work as well.

ADDITIONAL INSIGHTS

Satisfaction with Specific Benefits

Twin Cities staff were highly satisfied with the number of paid holidays, sick leave days, and vacation days they receive, and with the Regents' scholarship program. The importance of the latter program was underscored by the fact that nearly 40% of Twin Cities staff plan to obtain additional vocational training or a college degree within the next five years.

At the time of the survey, staff were also very satisfied with the coverage of their health and dental plans, the two-week parental leave policy, and the amount of life insurance they receive. They were moderately satisfied with the cost of their health plan, and with the M.S.R.S. retirement plan. Staff were also moderately likely to agree that they understand the information they get about changes in their benefits, depite the complexity of those changes in the past two years.

Relations with Supervisor

Day-to-Day Supervision. Staff had very positive to mixed opinions about the kind of guidance and feedback they receive. Almost without exception, staff agreed that their supervisor allows them to work without close supervision. Even so, they were very likely to agree that their supervisor sets high standards for the quantity and quality of their work. They were also very likely to agree that their supervisor allows them to attend workshops, conferences, or classes to improve their knowledge and skills.

Staff were very likely to agree that their supervisor evaluates their performance fairly on a day-to-day basis, and they were moderately likely to agree that their supervisor clearly explains what they are expected to do, but they had mixed opinions about whether s/he gives them regular feedback about their performance.

Finally, staff were moderately likely to agree that their supervisor deals fairly with staff complaints, talks with them before making important decisions about their work, and understands the problems they face in their job.

All things considered, staff were evenly split on the question of whether their supervisor needs more training in supervisory skills. There were no differences of opinion among the subordinates of faculty, professional-academic, and civil service supervisors on this issue. Nor did the three groups of subordinates have different opinions about the kind of day-to-day supervision they receive.

Performance Appraisal. When asked how often in the previous year they had received a written evaluation of their performance, 16% of Twin Cities staff said they received two or more appraisals, 52% said they received a single appaisal, and 32% said they received none at all during that period.

Staff who received one or more appraisals were very likely to agree that their most recent performance ratings were fair. They were moderately likely to agree that the ratings of other staff in their department or division were fair. Regarding communication, they were moderately likely to agree that their most recent appraisal gave them a good idea of their strengths and where they could do better. They expressed mixed opinions, however, when asked whether they had discussed what their goals should be in the coming months, and they disagreed that they discussed ways they might develop further in their job or career.

There was some evidence that opinions were influenced by the kind of form that was used. Approximately 50% of those who received an appraisal said they were evaluated with the old Personnel Department form, 21% said it was the new Personnel Department form, and 19% said it was a college or department form (the rest said "other"). Staff who had been evaluated with the new Personnel Department form were somewhat more likely to agree that their most recent appraisal gave them a chance to talk with their supervisor about their job, and that they had discussed what their goals should be in the coming months.

Opinions were also influenced by the frequency of past appraisals. Staff who received two or more appraisals were much more likely to recommend frequent appraisals than staff who had received only one appraisal or no appraisal during the previous year. Staff who received two or more appraisals generally had more positive opinions about their most recent appraisal as well. Interestingly, staff who received two or more appraisals also had more positive opinions about many aspects of the day-to-day supervision they receive.

Relations with Co-Workers

Staff were very likely to agree that their co-workers help them out when they need it, work together as a team, and try to improve how things are done. Only half of the staff agreed that their co-workers have high morale, however, while half disagreed.

Job Security

At the time of the survey, only 10% of Twin Cities staff thought there was a good chance they might be laid off if there were staffing cutbacks. Over 40% thought this was unlikely to happen to them. The rest were not sure.

Perceptions of Salary

One of the reasons Twin Cities staff had mixed opinions about their salary seems to be that they do not believe they are paid the same or more than people at the State, or than people at local companies who have similar responsibilities and experience. Taking benefits into account substantially improved their perceptions of their total compensation package, but not to the point of alleviating their concerns.

Pay Raises

Policies for Distributing Pay Raises.

As a matter of general policy, over half of the staff said they would prefer to see raises given across-the-board when the general raise is less than, or about the same as, the increase in the cost of living. Opinions changed dramatically, however, when the general raise was more than the increase in the cost of living. In this case, more than half of the staff said they would prefer a policy of giving cost-of-living raises supplemented by an additional raise based on merit.

Depending on the size of the general raise, anywhere from one-third to two-thirds of the staff preferred some form of merit-based pay policy (pure merit or across-the-board plus merit). The fact that few supported the pure merit pay policy by itself, however, suggests that staff consider a cost-of-living raise the first priority.

No matter what the size of the general raise, there was little support for the policy of giving across-the-board raises supplemented by a step increase based on seniority, as is done at the State.

Other Pay Raise Issues. Staff did <u>not</u> support the idea of accommodating differences of opinion about how to distribute pay raises by allowing colleges to give raises in different ways (say across-the-board to clerical staff and merit raises to technical staff).

Staff had mixed opinions about whether they should always get the same raise as staff at the State, even if staffing cutbacks are needed to pay for it. The results of the Civil Service Committee's survey on options for the 1989-90 pay plan suggested there would have been strong support for the concept of matching the increase in the cost-of-living, however, if that question had been asked in this survey.

Staff were moderately likely to agree that they would not care about about moving up in their salary range if their annual raises were reasonable. This indicates that, for most staff, concerns about not moving up in the salary range for their job were mainly a reflection of concerns about the size of their pay raises. Nevertheless, a merit-based pay policy would help address this issue for the miniority of staff who have serious concerns about the relationship between their salary and the salary of newly hired employees.

Flexible Hours, Part-time Work, and Day Care

Overall, staff were very satisfied with the flexibility of their work hours. They were moderately satisfied with their opportunity to work part-time. They expressed mixed opinions, however, about the current availability of day care on campus or nearby, if they expressed any opinion at all. Interestingly, there were no differences in the satisfaction levels of staff who have children and those who do not, even on the day care issue.

Having flexible hours, having the opportunity to work part-time, and having day care available on campus were understandably more important, however, to staff who have children. While these issues were of not of high importance to Twin Cities staff as a whole, probably because 60% have no children, the changing demographics of the workforce make it likely that all three issues will become increasingly important over the next decade (U.S. Department of Labor, 1988).

Department-level Management Practices

Staffing and Communication. Twin Cities staff were very likely to agree that people in their department or division treat them fairly regardless of their sex, age, or racial/ethnic background. They expressed mixed opinions, however, when asked whether faculty treat them like "second class citizens": Half agreed this was the case while half disagreed.

Opinions on staffing practices and equipment issues were varied. Regarding equipment, Twin Cities staff were highly likely to agree they have the equipment and technology they need, but the majority wanted more training on how to use it. Regarding staffing, they were moderately likely to agree that work is assigned fairly to staff in their department or division, that there is a spirit of cooperation, and that there are enough staff for the amount of work to be done. They expressed mixed opinions, however, when asked whether they personally had too much work to do, and they were moderately likely to agree that poor performers are kept on the job too long.

Opinions on communication were mixed to negative. Staff were moderately likely to agree that they are aware of and understand the policies and procedures of their department or division. They expressed mixed opinons, however, when asked whether their department or division keeps them informed about issues that affect how they do their job (such as changes in University procedures) and issues that affect them personally (such as salary plans). They were moderately likely to disagree that their department or division talks with staff before making decisions that affect them (such as how to give annual raises). They also disagreed that people communicate openly at all levels in their department or division.

Support for Supervisors. Civil service supervisors strongly agreed that supervising others is an important part of their job, and they were very likely to agree that their superiors thought the same. They were moderately likely to agree that they have the time they need to supervise their staff, that they are consulted about policies that affect how they run their work group, and that their department's current performance appraisal form allows them to evaluate their staff fairly.

Personnel Issues

Personnel Department Services. Since no Personnel Department service was relevant to all staff, anywhere from 5% to 60% of staff said they had no idea about a given service. Interpretation of the results was complicated by the fact that staff who were not likely to have had experience with a service sometimes expressed an opinion about it (e.g., nearly half the male staff expressed an opinion about applying for secretarial/clerical jobs). In addition, both supervisors and non-supervisors expressed opinions about services they might be expected to view differently (e.g., job classification).

Staff who expressed an opinion about employment services were moderately satisfied with the content and location of job postings, and with the hours and location of the central application center. Those who expressed an opinion about the screening of applicants for jobs and the affirmative action/Form 18 procedures were moderately dissatisfied. The reasons were not clear, however, since both supervisors who do the hiring and non-supervisors who might have been affected as applicants expressed opinions about these procedures. Staff who expressed an opinion were moderately dissatisfied with the orientation for new employees, at least as they new it, although the orientation program implemented by the Personnel Department in May, 1988, has been well received by participants.

The one-half to three-quarters of staff who expressed an opinion about job classification were similarly dissatisfied with the old Job Review Questionnaire (JRQ) and the new Job Evaluation Questionnaire (JEQ), even though these systems offer two very different approaches to process and the nature of evaluation criteria. Moreover, little distinction was made between the process used to make a classification decision and the fairness of the outcome, under either system. Staff comments indicated that some of the generalized dissatisfaction with these systems was actually another reflection of their dissatisfaction with the size of their pay raises, especially among staff who confused job reclassification (a promotion and pay raise that is given because a person's responsibilities have increased significantly) with merit pay (an annual pay raise based on performance).

The one-half of staff who expressed an opinion about the Employee Assistance Program were moderately satisfied with it. Staff opinions about the quality of training programs, the interpretation of civil service rules and union contracts, the consulting provided on office and work issues, and the handling of formal grievances were mixed (one-third to one-half of the staff had no opinion about these services).

Personnel Policies.   Twin Cities staff were moderately likely to agree that they are aware of and understand the University's Civil Service Rules. They expressed mixed opinions, however, when asked whether they were aware of and understood the University's affirmative action policies, and the policies and procedures of the Personnel Department. Supervisors were only slightly more likely to agree that they understood these policies and procedures than staff campus-wide. Better communication in these areas might help address staff dissatisfaction with these policies and procedures.

Physical Working Conditions

On the whole, staff were very satisfied with the safety of their present working conditions. They were moderately satisfied with their physical comfort and with the cleanliness and appearance of the building where they work. Staff opinions regarding the availability of space for offices, meeting rooms, and breaks were mixed to moderately positive. Staff had mixed opinions about the availability and cost of parking, although they were very satisfied with the intercampus and off-campus bus service.

RETENTION ISSUES

While more than half of the Twin Cities staff said they plan to work at the University for five years or more, nearly one-quarter said they are thinking about leaving the University in the next twelve months, and the rest were unsure. Professional staff were even more likely to say they are thinking about leaving, while Service and Maintanence staff were much less likely to say so. Comparing the opinions of staff who plan to leave the University in the near future with those who plan to stay long term served to clarify and expand the list of retention issues.

Priorities

Staff who are thinking about leaving valued various aspects of their job to the same degree as staff who plan to stay, with the exception of job security which they viewed as somewhat less important. They were somewhat to far less satisfied, however, with most aspects of their job, including relations with their supervisor, the opportunities to use their abilities, have more responsibility, and learn new skills, the opportunity for promotion, the recognition they receive, their salary, and the size of their pay raises.

Their greater dissatisfaction with salary seems due to the fact that they were even more likely than others to think their salaries are lower than those of people outside the University who have similar responsibilities and experience. The actual salary for staff in the "leave" and "stay" groups was the same, on average.

Taking both the importance and satisfaction ratings into account revealed that staff who are thinking about leaving were satisfied with only three highly important aspects of their job (relations with co-workers, benefits, and job security) while they were dissatisfied with three others (size of pay raises, the opportunity for promotion, and salary). By contrast, staff who plan to stay were satisfied with six highly important aspects of their job (relations with co-workers, benefits, and job security, plus relations with their supervisor, the opportunity to use their abilities, and the recognition they receive), while they were dissatisfied with only one aspect (the size of their pay raises).

Relations with Co-Workers and Supervisor

Although staff who are thinking about leaving had positive opinions about their co-workers, they were far less likely to agree that their co-workers had high morale than staff who plan to stay.

Staff who are thinking about leaving had a less positive view of nearly every aspect of the supervisory relationship, especially the aspects concerning guidance, feedback, and general communication. As a consequence, they tended to agree that their supervisor needs more training in supervisory skills, while staff who plan to stay expressed mixed opinions on this issue.

Dissatisfaction with communication may also explain why staff who are thinking about leaving were more likely to recommend that their supervisor do frequent written evaluations of their performance, even though they had mixed to negative opinions about their most recent performance appraisal. Their recommendation is consistent with the fact that staff campus-wide who received frequent appraisals during the past year had a more positive view of their supervisory relationship than staff who did not.

Department-level Management Practices

In addition to concerns about communication with their supervisor, staff who are thinking about leaving had less positive or even negative opinions about the communication practices within their department or division. They also had less positive opinions about staffing issues, about how work is assigned, and about how they are treated by others.

Civil Service supervisors who are thinking about leaving also had concerns about communication. They were somewhat less likely to agree that they are consulted about policies that affect how they run their work group and they were less likely to agree that they have the time they need to supervise their staff than supervisors who plan to stay.

Personnel Department Services

Of those who expressed an opinion, staff who are thinking about leaving were less satisfied with the process of applying for jobs, with the fairness of both job classification systems, and with Personnel Department services involving the supervisor-subordinate relationship, such as grievances. These differences of opinion were consistent with the fact that they were more dissatisfied with their opportunity for promotion and with relations with their supervisor than staff who plan to stay.

The pattern of these differences of opinion indicates that no one issue can explain the dissatisfaction of staff who are thinking about leaving the University. Rather, it appears that efforts to retain staff may need to address several issues simultaneously in order to be successful. In addition to improving the opportunities for promotion and the size of pay raises, it may also be necessary to address staff concerns about total compensation relative to people outside the University, and concerns about the recognition they receive, about supervisor-subordinate communication, and about communication practices at the department level.

FEMALE AND MINORITY STAFF

The most notable thing about the opinions of female and minority staff was the similarity to the opinions of male and non-minority staff. There were meaningful differences of opinion on only a handful of the 198 items included in the survey.

Female Staff

Regarding the importance of job aspects, female staff placed somewhat more importance on having the opportunity to work part-time and on having day care available on campus or nearby than did male staff, even though female staff were half as likely to have a young child and somewhat less likely to have a school-age child. They were similarly satisfied with their opportunity to work part-time. Both female and male staff had mixed opinions about the current availability of day care on campus or nearby.

Regarding benefits, female staff were somewhat more satisfied with the Regents' Scholarship program than male staff, even though male staff were equally likely to say they plan to get additional vocational training or a college degree within the next five years.

Regarding pay raise policies, female and male staff had similar opinions about how funds should be distributed when the general raise is less than, or about the same as, the increase in the cost of living but female staff were more likely to prefer the cost-of-living-plus-merit policy when the general raise is larger than that.

Female and male staff placed similar importance on key aspects of the job, and they were similarly satisfied with those job aspects. They had similar priorities for action, they were similarly satisfied with all but one specific benefit, they had similar perceptions of how they are paid relative to people outside the University, and they had similar opinions on a variety of other issues, including the kind of day-to-day supervision they receive, their most recent performance appraisal, the support they receive as supervisors, co-workers, most pay raise policies, their department's management practices, and the services provided by the Personnel Department.

Most importantly, female staff were just as likely as male staff to agree that people in their department or division treat them fairly regardless of their sex. They were also equally likely to agree that the University is a good place to work.

Minority Staff

Regarding the importance of job aspects, minority staff placed somewhat more importance on having day care available on campus or nearby than did non-minority staff, even though they were no more likely to have a young child.

Among those who expressed an opinion about Personnel Department Services, minority staff were far more satisfied with the affirmative action/Form 18 procedure in employment than non-minority staff, but they were somewhat less satisfied with the Employee Assistance Program.

Minority and non-minority staff placed similar importance on key aspects of the job, and they were similarly satisfied with those job aspects. They had similar priorities for action, they were similarly satisfied with specific benefits, they had similar perceptions of how they are paid relative to people outside the University, and they had similar opinions a variety of other issues, including the kind of the day-to-day supervision they receive, their most recent performance appraisal, the support they receive as supervisors, their co-workers, all pay raise policies, their department's management practices, and most of the services provided by the Personnel Department.

Minority staff were very likely to agree that people in their department or division treat them fairly regardless of their race or ethnic background, although non-minorities were even more likely to agree this is the case. Minority and non-minority staff were equally likely to agree that the University is a good place to work.

On the whole, these opinions indicate that the University treats its female and minority staff as equitably as it treats its male and non-minority staff. These groups shared similar opinions about the University's strengths as an employer, similar concerns, and generally similar opinions about how they would like to see those concerns addressed.

For recruitment purposes, it is worth noting that by the year 2000 nearly 90% of the new entrants to the workforce are expected to be women and minorities, and the competition for workers is expected to become increasingly intense (U.S. Department of Labor, 1988). Consequently, the few issues on which female and minority staff expressed somewhat different opinions may become increasingly important over time.

The fact that 40% of the University's female staff, and 57% of its minority staff, plan to get additional vocational training or a college degree suggests that programs and policies which support continuing education are also likely to become increasingly important in recruiting and retaining staff.

ACTION PLANS

The following proposals were based on suggestions by civil service staff, the Civil Service Committee, and administrators. Staff opinions on these proposals provide a starting point for developing action plans to address staff concerns. In particular, they indicate which specific proposals deserve further consideration and how likely it is that they will be successful, if implemented. Even if the proposals are not feasible as stated here, they provide an indication of the kinds of changes staff would like to see.

Benefit Proposals

Although staff were highly satisfied with their benefits overall, they supported several proposals for changes in specific benefits and benefit policies.

Twin Cities staff were very interested in having a contact person on their campus (Minneapolis or St. Paul) to take their application for benefits. They were moderately interested in having the University offer reduced tuition for themselves, and for their spouse and dependent children, as additional benefits. Staff were also moderately interested in having a "cafeteria benefits plan" where they could choose the benefits they want up to a fixed total cost.

Staff were moderately in favor of two proposals for changing vacation and sick leave policies: (1) To allow staff to sell back some of their accumulated vacation days for cash, and (2) to allow the University to reduce the number of sick leave days staff get each year in return for letting them use their sick leave for personal business as well as for illness.

There was little support for any of the proposals that had been suggested for dealing with future increases in the cost of health plans. Staff were moderately likely to disagree that they would be willing to pay more for a health plan to keep the same coverage they have now, that the amount staff have to pay should depend on how much they earn, or that there should be fewer health plan companies to decide among.

Relations with Supervisor

Although Twin Cities staff expressed mixed opinions about whether their current supervisor needs more training in supervisory skills, they very strongly supported the proposal that new supervisors be required to obtain training. They also expressed strong support for the proposal that staff be asked to evaluate their supervisor.

Opinions on other items indicated that supervisors should consider doing written performance appraisals for their subordinates at least twice a year. Frequent appraisals were associated with greater staff satisfaction with the day-to-day supervision they receive, which was a major concern of those who are thinking about leaving. Supervisors should also consider broadening the scope of the appraisal interview to include a discussion of goals for the coming months and a discussion of ways in which their subordinates might develop further in their job or career.

Recognition Programs

Staff expressed strong support for having a merit pay program based on performance appraisals that are fair. Their support for the concept, however, does not mean that a merit pay program would necessarily be well received in practice. Many staff expressed concerns about the actual fairness of performance ratings in their department. Moreover, the majority of staff appear to believe the first priority is having pay raises that match, or come close to matching, the increase in the cost of living.

Staff expressed strong support for a program that would award lump sum bonuses for good performance, however, which suggests that bonuses may be a meaningful alternative to merit-based raises in years when the funding for raises is low.

Finally, staff expressed strong support for having a special awards program for staff who give consistently good service or teamwork, and for staff who suggest changes that save time, save money, or improve output. They expressed moderate support for a program that would recognize years of service as well, such as the program recently implemented by the Civil Service Committee.

Pay Raise Distribution Policies

The pattern of opinions on several issues suggests that colleges should consider giving an across-the-board raise plus lump sum bonuses based on performance when the general raise is less than, or the same as, the increase in the cost of living. They should consider giving cost-of-living-plus-merit raises in years when the general raise is larger than that. This would be consistent with the priority staff seem to place on receiving cost-of-living raises, and with the kinds of recognition programs they prefer once that condition is satisfied. In years when merit raises are feasible, the merit-based distribution policy would also help address concerns about moving up in the salary range for their job.

Department-level Proposals

Staff expressed strong support for the proposal that there be regular meetings of their work group, for the proposal that staff be asked to evaluate their department, and for the proposal that their department have a "suggestion form" to get staff ideas.

College-level Proposals

There was strong support for the proposal that there be a Staff Advocate to help staff who have problems with management or other units. There was moderate support for the proposal of having staff meetings with their dean or director. There was mixed support for the proposals that there be a staff association and a staff newsletter in their college or department.

Personnel Proposals

Programs Related to Promotion. Staff expressed very strong support for the proposal that there be a program to help pay for training to develop skills that are needed for future promotions. They also expressed strong support for a program that would help supervisors identify and train interested staff for future promotions. They expressed strong support for a program that would help staff plan how to develop in their job or career. Their support for these proposals underscored the importance staff placed on improving their oppportunity for promotion. This also probably explains why staff expressed strong support for making information about job openings available on computer terminals.

Personnel Issues. Twin Cities staff expressed strong support for keeping the branch office of the Personnel Department that covers their area or campus (the Health Science and Finance area, Minneapolis area, and St. Paul area offices). They expressed moderate support for the proposal that the Personnel Department publish a newsletter.

Training. Approximately half of the staff expressed a serious interest in attending a workshop or training program on personal computers, and a program on personal financial planning. Somewhat less than half were seriously interested in attending a program on self-directed career planning and a program on managing time or stress. Approximately one-third were seriously interested in programs that would deal with preparing to become a supervisor or administrator, handling office conflicts, adjusting to a new work role (such as promotion to supervisor), Civil Service Rules, the Job Evaluation Questionnaire, and word processing skills. One-quarter of the supervisors expressed a serious interest in attending a workshop or training program to improve their supervisory skills. Training programs in these areas could be conducted at the college level, if not centrally.

In addition to the specific program and policy proposals summarized here, items elsewhere in the survey provide a source of ideas on ways to improve staff satisfaction and efficiency (for example, improving communication and consultation with staff on issues that affect them, and ensuring greater compliance with the requirement of annual performance appraisals).

INTRODUCTION

This section provides technical information on the development and administration of the Staff Opinion Survey. The profile of staff who responded to the survey and the interpretation guidelines are especially useful for understanding the following report of survey results.

OVERVIEW

The goal of the Staff Opinion Survey was to find out the views of civil service staff on a variety of issues in order to assist the University's administration, deans, and directors in developing programs and policies that respond to staff needs.

Staff on the Twin Cities, Duluth, Morris, Crookston, and Waseca campuses were asked their opinions about job satisfaction, salary and benefits, service and training needs, staffing and communication practices, their supervisory relationship, physical working conditions, ways of improving efficiency and job satisfaction, and what is most important to them as a University of Minnesota employee.

A copy of the survey is included at the back of this report for easy reference.

DESIGN AND ADMINISTRATION

Survey Items

Input on topics for the survey was requested from staff associations, key administrators in each college and support unit, and a random sample of staff themselves. Their suggestions were collated and used to revise or expand upon the list of questions typically included in staff opinion surveys. The end result was a 16-page 198-item survey that covered the traditional areas of interest to staff along with some issues that were unique to the University. In addition, staff were asked to indicate the importance of 14 general aspects of their job. This provided a basis for prioritizing staff concerns and identifying the University's strengths as an employer, rather than assuming that all areas of dissatisfaction were equally important to staff.

Sampling

Eligibility. The survey was intended to obtain the opinions of non-hospital civil service and bargaining unit staff who work 75--100% time. The following number of staff were eligible to be surveyed according to these guidelines: 7,381 on the Twin Cities campus, 626 on the Duluth campus, 159 on the Morris campus, 100 on the Crookston campus, and 91 on the Waseca campus. Staff in nearly 400 job classes were covered, from Secretarial Assistant, Building and Grounds Worker, and Lab Technician to Senior Administrative Director, Building and Grounds Supervisor, and Senior Scientist.

Sampling Strategy. One out of seven eligible staff on the Twin Cities campus, and all staff on the Duluth, Morris, Crookston, and Waseca campuses, were surveyed. In addition, all minority staff and all staff in a representative set of colleges and support units on the Twin Cities campus were surveyed. All in all, a total of 4,490 staff were surveyed.

All minority staff were surveyed because a random sample would have been too small to produce accurate results when discussing their opinions alone. For the campus-wide results, however, the equivalent of one out seven minority staff were included in the Twin Cities sample. Since 10% of the staff on the Twin Cities campus are minorities, the full sample of 1,052 staff was comprised of 947 non-minority and 105 minority staff.

All staff in a representative set of 14 colleges and support units on the Twin Cities campus were surveyed as part of a special study to determine whether staff opinions vary depending on the kind of unit in which they work, and to determine whether campus-level results would encourage the development of action plans.

Data Collection

Minnesota Center for Survey Research (M.C.S.R.). M.C.S.R. was contracted to handle the administration of the survey from initial mailing through the preparation of a computer tape of the returned data. It is a non-profit affiliate of the University that conducts survey research for State and private organizations as well as for University faculty, graduate students, and organizations. It had the experience and resources to manage a project of this scope and its independence from the Personnel Department, which sponsored the survey, helped ensure confidentiality.

Confidentiality. Each staff member in the sample was assigned a random number for mailing and follow-up purposes. A single master list that connected a staff member's name with his or her identification number was kept by M.C.S.R. in a locked cabinet. The staff member's identification number was written on the front of his or her survey before it was mailed out. If the staff member returned the survey, his or her name was crossed off the master list. If not, follow-up reminders were mailed. At the end of the study, the master list was destroyed. It is no longer possible to connect a name with a number.

Demographic Information. At the time the address labels were generated, an extra label listing demographic information for each staff member, such as sex and bargaining unit, was also prepared. The demographic label had the staff member's identification number but not the staff member's name. When a staff member returned his or survey, which contained only an identification number on the front, the demograhpic label with the same identification number was attached to the survey. In this way, the correct background information was associated with each survey without using any names. Since the master listed mentioned above has been destroyed, there is no way to connect a name with either the demographic data or the survey.

Improving Response Rate. In order to obtain a high response rate, it is necessary to conduct at least three mailings (Dillman, 1978). First, a survey was mailed to every staff member in the sample along with an explanatory cover letter. One week later, a postcard reminder was sent to all staff in the sample. Two weeks after that, another survey was mailed to staff who had not yet responded. The overall response rate was 31% one week after the first mailing, 64% two weeks after the postcard, and 79% by the end of the study (this is based on all 4,490 surveys that were mailed). Details on the methodology used in this survey are available in a technical report from M.C.S.R. or Dr. Beuhring.

ACCURACY OF RESULTS

Response Rate

The uncorrected response rate (number of surveys returned divided by the number of surveys mailed out) was 80% for the Twin Cities campus (838 out of 1052), 79% for the Duluth campus (492 out of 626), 82% for the Morris campus (130 out of 159) 73% for the Crookston campus (73 out of 100), and 77% for the Waseca campus (70 out of 91).

Representativeness

At least two-thirds of the individuals who received the survey needed to return it in order to consider the opinions of the respondents representative of the opinions of staff campus-wide, including those who were not part of the random sample (Dillman, 1974). Less than a two-thirds return would have raised the possibility that we were hearing the opinions of a self-selected group of staff who were especially dissatisfied, or otherwise different, from staff as a whole. Given the high response rate reported above, however, the reader can be confident that the opinions of staff who responded to the survey are in fact representative of the opinions of staff campus-wide.

The representativeness of Twin Cities respondents was also verified directly, partly out of concern over the fact that minority staff had a lower response rate than non-minority staff (64% and 82%, respectively). Although the response rate for minority staff met the two-thirds criterion, the fact that it was quite a bit lower raised the possibility that they were not representative of minority staff as a whole. In order to determine whether this might be the case, the profile of demographic characteristics for minority staff who returned the survey was compared to the profile of demographic characteristics for all 752 minority staff who had been mailed a survey. The profiles were the same in all respects (same average salary and average seniority, same proportions of males and females, and same proportions of staff in different occupational groups, in exempt versus non-exempt jobs, and in academic versus support units). Consequently, the opinions of minority respondents can be considered representative of the opinions of minorities campus-wide. A similar analysis verified the representativeness of the non-minority respondents as well.

Sampling Error

Twin Cities Staff. Since only a sample of Twin Cities staff were surveyed, there is some sampling error in the Twin Cities campus results. In other words, if a different sample of 1,052 staff were surveyed, the results might have changed somewhat. This would be true even if everyone in the two samples responded. Since the random sample was so large, however, the margin of error was small.

The percentages reported in this report for staff campus-wide are accurate within plus or minus 3%. The average ratings reported for Twin Cities staff are accurate within plus or minus 0.1 on a six-point scale. This means that if 70% of the Twin Cities staff in this random sample were satisfied with a service, then surveying other random samples of Twin Cities staff would have produced very similar results (67% to 73% satisfied) about 95 times out of 100. If the average rating for Twin Cities staff in this sample was 4.5, then surveying other random samples of staff would have produced very similar average ratings as well (4.4 to 4.6).

Subgroups of Twin Cities Staff. The margin of error for subgroups of Twin Cities staff is somewhat larger because the number of staff in each subgroup is necessarily smaller than the full sample of staff campus-wide. For most subgroups, the margin of error in average ratings is plus or minus 0.2 on a six-point scale. On the rare occasions when percentages are reported for subgroups of staff, the margin of error is approximately plus or minus 6%.

Opinions of Minority Staff. Since all minority staff were surveyed, there is no sampling error in their results. Rather than selecting one out seven minority staff at random for inclusion in the Twin Cities sample, as was done with the non-minority staff, the ratings for every minority staff member were multiplied by 1/7th instead (this was equivalent to averaging the ratings of seven minority staff members and using that average to represent one individual in the sample). This strategy meant that the opinions of every minority staff member counted, that there was no sampling error in the average ratings for minority staff when comparing their opinions to those of non-minority staff, and yet their contribution to the campus-wide results remained proportional to number of minority staff campus-wide. I am indebted to Tim Beebe and Dr. William Craig, Director of M.C.S.R., for this efficient statistical strategy.

Staff on Coordinate Campuses. Since all staff on the coordinate campuses were surveyed, there is no sampling error in their results. The only issue was whether staff who returned the survey were representative of all staff on the campus. The high return rates indicate they were representative.

Data Analyses

Differences of Opinion Between Subgroups of Staff. The Twin Cities sample was so large that very small differences of opinion between subgroups of staff were usually statistically significant (for example, differences of 0.2 in the averge ratings for male and female staff were often statistically significant at $p < .05$). Such small differences of opinion were not going to influence policy or program decisions, however, and they unnecessarily complicated the discussion of survey results. Consequently, only differences of 0.5 or more on a six-point scale are reported. Differences of this magnitude usually meant there was at least a 10% difference in the percent of staff who expressed firm opinions about an issue (for example, 50% of males vs. 60% of females indicating they were mostly or very satisfied with a service).

Differences of Opinion with Staff on Other Campuses. It was also necessary to establish a guideline for reporting differences of opinion between Twin Cities staff and staff on the other four campuses. In this case, statistical tests of significance were not an issue. Statistical tests are designed to estimate how likely it is that a difference of opinion is real, given the sampling error in each group's average rating. Since all staff on the coordinate campuses were surveyed, however, there was no sampling error in their results. In other words, even minor differences of opinion were real. The only issue was how large the differences of opinion needed to be to have a meaningful impact on policy or program decisions. Only differences of 0.5 or more in the average ratings for staff on each campus were treated as meaningful, for the reasons discussed above.

PROFILE OF STAFF

The following is a summary of the demographic characteristics for staff campus-wide and the demographics of the subgroups of staff whose opinions are compared in the body of the report. The reader should bear in mind that opinions of the subgroups are not independent (for example, the opinions of Clerical/Office staff will be similar to the opinions of female staff because most Clerical/Office staff are female).

Staff Thinking About Leaving versus Planning to Stay

Overall, 58% of the survey respondents said they plan to stay at the University for five years or more, 15% said they did not have such plans, and 26% said they were unsure.

On a separate question, 24% of survey respondents said they are thinking about leaving the University in the next twelve months, 64% said they are not, and 11% were unsure.

In the body of the report, the opinions of staff who said yes to the first question were compared to the opinions of staff who said yes to the second question. Some staff said "yes" to both questions, however, perhaps due to some confusion about the meaning of the questions (some staff who marked yes to the question about leaving the University may have meant they were thinking about switching jobs within the University instead).

These inconsistencies were ignored in the data analyses, so differences of opinion between staff who are really thinking about leaving the University and staff who plan to stay may actually be larger than what is reported.

Academic Units Compared to Support Units.

Overall, 63% of the survey respondents worked in academic units (colleges, schools, and libraries) while 37% worked in support units (such as Support Services and Operations, the Personnel Department, and the computer centers).

Non-exempt Jobs Compared to Exempt Jobs.

Overall, 54% of the survey respondents held non-exempt jobs (they must be compensated for overtime) while 46% held exempt jobs (they are exempt from the overtime requirement).

Occupation (Bargaining Unit)

Overall, 12% of the survey respondents were Service/Maintenance staff (unit C), 26% were Clerical/Office staff (unit F), 19% were professional staff (unit L), 21% were supposedly lead workers or supervisors (unit M), and the remaining 22% were members of smaller bargaining units. In order to keep the data analyses manageable, only the opinions of the four major occupational groups were analyzed.

It should be noted that one-third of the staff members who were listed as supervisors in the personnel records did not identify themselves as official supervisors in the survey (some of these exceptions are due to the fact that bargaining unit M includes lead workers as well as official supervisors).

Conversely, one-third of the staff who identified themselves as supervisors in the survey were not members of the supervisory bargaining unit according to the personnel records. Since a choice between these definitions had to be made, the survey results reported for supervisors were based on the group of staff who self-identified themselves as supervisors in the survey, although there was little difference when the opinions of those in bargaining unit M were considered instead.

Female Staff Compared to Male Staff

Overall, 66% of the survey respondents were female and 34% were male.

Minority Staff Compared to Non-Minority Staff

Overall, 10% of staff campus-wide are minorities and 90% are non-minorities. This relationship was maintained in the group of survey respondents as well.

Seniority Comparisons

Overall, 35% of the survey respondents had been at the University for less than three years, 35% had been at the University for three to ten years, and 30% had been at the University for more than ten years (22% had been here for 10--20 years and 8% had been here more than 20 years). These groups are referred to as Newer, Mid-Senior, and Senior staff in the body of the report.

Comparisons Among Salary Groups

Overall, the mean salary of the survey respondents was $23,847 (the median salary was $25,000). Broken into groups, 30% of the survey respondents earn less than $20,000 per year, 30% earn $20,001--$25,000 per year, 21% earn $25,001--$30,000 per year, and 19% earn more than $30,000 per year. These are referred to as Salary Groups I, II, III, and IV in the body of the report.

Education

Overall, 8% of the survey respondents had some high school or a high school degree, 47% had some college or specialized training or a two-year degree, 37% had a bachelor's degree, 7% had a master's degree or the equivalent, and 1% had a doctorate.

Other Characteristics

Children. Based on information provided by survey respondents, 15% of them have a child or children younger than five years old, 28% have a child or children five to 18 years old, and 60% of staff have no children under 18 (the percentages add up to more than 100% because 3% of staff have both young and older children). Overall, 11% of the survey respondents said they were a single parent.

Educational Plans. Overall, 39% of the survey respondents said they plan to get additional vocational training or a college degree within the next five years, 43% said they did not plan to get additional training or education, and 18% were not sure.

INTERPRETATION GUIDELINES

Campus-wide Results

Tables. The average rating for each item, the percent of respondents who marked each rating category on the six-point scale, and the number of respondents who expressed an opinion on each item are listed in tables in the body of the report. The reader may wish to use the tables to clarify the summary of results, to reach additional conclusions about what the results mean, or to compare staff opinions on related issues.

Terminology. The terms used to describe staff opinions, such as "highly satisfied" and "moderately satisfied", refer to the size of the average rating for the item. The correspondence between specific terms, average ratings, and the percent of staff who expressed a positive or negative opinion is shown below.

Term	Average Rating*	Approximate Percent of Staff
Highly positive or satisfied	4.9 to 6.0	90% agreed or satisfied to some degree. Three-quarters mostly or strongly so.
Very positive or satisfied	4.3 to 4.8	80--85% agreed or satisfied to some degree. One-half mostly or strongly so.
Moderately positive or satis.	3.8 to 4.2	65--80% agreed or satisfied to some degree. One-third mostly or strongly so.
Mixed opinions	3.3 to 3.7	50--65% agreed or satisfied to some degree. One-quarter mostly or strongly so.
Moderately negative or dissat.	2.7 to 3.2	50--65% disagreed or dissat. to some degree. One-third mostly or strongly so.
Very negative or dissatisfied	2.6 or less	75% disagreed or dissatisfied to some degree. One-half mostly or strongly so.

* On a six-point rating scale (definitions were modified for ratings made on a five-point scale).

Percent mostly or very satisfied. The summary of campus-wide results focuses on the percent of staff who marked the two most positive ratings on the six-point rating scale used throughout the survey (for example, the percent of staff who were mostly or very satisfied with a service, or who mostly or strongly agreed with a proposed policy). This is because the two highest ratings provide the best indication of the extent of firm support for a program or policy, or the extent of genuine satisfaction with a service or aspect of the job. Similarly, the percent of staff who marked the two lowest ratings indicated the extent of firm opposition to a program or policy, and the extent of serious dissatisfation.

Percent satisfied altogether. Because there was no neutral point on the six-point rating scale used throughout the survey, staff who did not have firm opinions were required to indicate which way they leaned (for example, were they somewhat satisfied or somewhat dissatisfied with a service? Did they somewhat agree or somewhat disagree with a proposed change in policy?). In order to give the reader a sense of how staff leaned overall, the summary also reports the percent of staff who marked the three highest ratings on the scale. In other words, the percent of staff who expressed a positive opinion to some degree. For example, if the report states "30% of staff mostly or strongly agreed with the proposed change in policy -- altogether, 55% agreed with the policy change to some degree", this means that 30% of staff firmly agreed with the change and another 25% of staff said they somewhat agreed with it.

Differences of Opinion

Terminology. The terms used to describe differences of opinion, such as "far more satisfied", refer to the size of the difference in the average ratings for two groups of staff. The following table shows the correspondence between terms used to describe a difference of opinion and the size of the difference in their average ratings. A difference of 0.5 or more generally meant there was a difference of 10% of more in the percent of staff in each group who expressed a positive opinion. Other than that, the relationship between the difference in average ratings and the difference in the percent of positive opinions was not very clear, so no equivalencies are listed in this table.

Term	Difference In Average Ratings*
Not meaningfully different	.4 or less
Somewhat more positive or satisfied	.5 to .7
Far more positive or satisfied	.8 or more

* On a six-point rating scale (definitions were modified for ratings made on a five-point scale).

Comparisons with other Campuses. Only widespread meaningful differences of opinion among staff on the five campuses are likely to influence policy and program decisions. With this in mind, differences of opinion were reported only if the average rating for Twin Cities staff was different from the average rating of staff on at least three other campuses by 0.5 or more. Both the average ratings and the percent of staff who expressed firm opinions on the issue are reported for ease of comparison. Details on the full range of opinions for staff on other campuses can be found in their campus reports.

Comparisons Among Subgroups of Staff. Differences of opinion between subgroups of Twin Cities staff are discussed only in terms of differences in their average ratings. In the absence of a complete table of data for each subgroup, the average rating is the most informative summary of each subgroup's full range of opinions. For purposes of comparison, the reader may refer to the table of campus-wide results to see what the average rating for an item was campus-wide.

For all but the occupational comparisons, the average rating of one subgroup is compared to the average rating of the other subgroup. For the occupational comparisons, the average rating for each of four major occupational groups is compared to the average rating for staff campus-wide. This provides an indication of how well the campus-wide results represent the opinions of a particular occupational group, and it is also easier to interpet than a complex pattern of differences among them.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

Staff were asked to indicate the importance of fourteen general aspects of their job, such as salary and relations with their supervisor. They were also asked to indicate how satisfied they were with each aspect. Taken together, these importance and satisfaction ratings provided a basis for prioritizing staff concerns and identifying the University's strengths as an employer.

The remainder of the survey was designed to provide additional insights into the reasons behind these opinions, as well an indication of ways in which the University might best address staff concerns and build upon its strengths. With this in mind, most of the remaining survey items are discussed in sections according to the job aspect with which they deal. The sections have been ordered according to staff priorities, beginning with areas related to the University's strengths (such as benefits) and moving on to to areas where staff expressed serious concerns (such as pay raise issues).

The report concludes with staff opinions on other issues that affect them, including management practices at the department and college level, personnel practices, and opinions of their physical working conditions. Staff opinions about the various proposals for doing things better were included in the sections where they were most relevant.

I. IMPORTANCE OF JOB ASPECTS

In order to assist the University's administration, deans, and directors in setting priorities for developing programs and policies that respond to staff needs, staff were asked to rate the importance of fourteen personal and external aspects of their job on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (extremely important).

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

The average importance of each job aspect, and the distribution of importance ratings for each one, are shown in Table 1. Although the job aspects are listed in order of their importance to staff, the reader should note that most of the differences are quite small.

Table 1. Importance of Job Aspects
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	IMPORTANT[b]				
		Not at All	Slightly	Some-what	Very	Extremely
Salary (or wages)	4.4	0 %	0 %	6 %	42 %	52 %
Benefits overall	4.4	0	0	8	45	47
Opportunity to use abilities	4.4	0	1	6	46	47
Good relations with supervisor	4.4	0	1	7	46	46
Good relations with co-workers	4.3	0	1	8	51	40
Job security	4.2	0	3	13	37	47
Opportunity to learn new skills	4.2	0	1	12	47	40
Recognition for doing work well	4.2	0	1	14	45	40
Size of pay raises	4.2	0	1	17	42	40
Opportunity for promotion	4.0	1	3	22	41	33
Oppor. to have more responsibility	4.0	2	2	22	45	29
Flexible of work hours	3.5	4	10	35	30	21
Opportunity to work part-time	2.3	37	21	24	10	8
Day care at work or nearby	1.8	64	10	12	7	7

[a] On a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (extremely important) listed in order of importance.

[b] Percent of staff expressing each opinion (*n* = 814--837 per item).

Over 90% of the staff said that salary, benefits, the opportunity to use their abilities, good relations with their supervisor, and good relations with co-workers were very or extremely important to them personally.

Over 80% of the staff said that recognition for doing their job well, the opportunity to learn new skills, job security, and the size of their pay raises were very or extremely important.

Nearly 75% of the staff said the opportunity for promotion and the opportunity to have more responsibility were very or extremely important.

Although the eleven job aspects listed above could be rank ordered in terms of their average importance ratings, as shown in Table 1, the fact that three-quarters or more of the staff considered these job aspects to be very or extremely important makes it appropriate to consider them all highly important to staff campus-wide.

Of lesser importance to staff were having flexible work hours (very or extremely important to half the staff), the opportunity to work part-time (very or extremely important to only 18% of staff), and the availability of day care on campus or nearby (only 14% of staff said this was very or extremely important to them personally, which was consistent with the fact that only 15% reported having a young child).

Comparison With Other Campuses

There were no widespread meaningful differences of opinion with staff on the other four campuses.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Differences of opinion between subgroups of staff are discussed only in terms of differences in average ratings. In the absence of a complete table of data for each subgroup, this is the most informative summary of each subgroups's full range of opinions. Table 1 shows the average ratings for staff campus-wide.

Thinking about Leaving versus Planning to Stay

Staff who are thinking about leaving placed somewhat less importance on job security than staff who are planning to stay, although both groups viewed job security as important (average ratings = 4.0 vs. 4.4, respectively, on a five-point scale).

Occupational Comparisons

As can be seen in Table 2 on the next page, Service/Maintenance staff placed somewhat more importance on job security than staff campus-wide. They placed somewhat less importance, however, on the opportunity to have more responsibility.

Finally, Professional staff placed somewhat more importance on having flexible work hours than staff campus-wide.

Table 2. Differences in the Importance of Job Aspects
Occupational Comparisons[a]

	Campus-wide	Service Maint.	Clerical Office	Profes-sional	Super-visory
Job security	(4.2)	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.2
Opportunity to have more responsibility	(4.0)	3.6	4.1	4.0	4.0
Flexible work hours	(3.5)	3.4	3.6	3.9	3.4

[a] Only items where the opinions of an occupational group differed from opinions campus-wide by at least .4 on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (extremely important) are reported.

Female Compared to Male Staff

Female staff placed somewhat more importance on the opportunity to work part-time than male staff, although it was not a priority for either group (average ratings = 2.5 vs. 2.0 on a five-point scale). This difference of opinion does not seem to reflect a greater need on the part of female staff to balance the demands of work and family, since they were half as likely as male staff to report having a young child, and somewhat less likely to report having a school-age child. Moreover, there was no difference of opinion between female and male staff about the importance of having day care available on campus or nearby.

Minority Compared to Non-Minority Staff

Minority staff placed somewhat more importance of having day care available on campus or nearby than non-minority staff (average ratings = 2.4 vs. 1.8 on a five-point scale) even though they were no more likely to have a young child. Over one-quarter of the minority staff said the availability of day care on campus or nearby was very or extremely important.

Seniority Comparisons

Newer and Mid-Senior staff placed somewhat more importance on having day care available on campus or nearby than Senior staff (average ratings = 2.1, 1.9 and 1.5, respectively, on a five-point scale). This was consistent with the fact that 17% of Newer and 19% of Mid-Senior staff said they have a young child, verus only 9% of Senior staff.

Comparisons Among Salary Groups

Salary Group II staff placed somewhat more importance on the opportunity to work part-time than Salary Group IV staff; the other two groups fell in between (average ratings = 2.3, 2.5, 2.3 and 2.0 for Groups I--IV, respectively).

Salary Group I and II staff placed somewhat more importance on having day care available on campus or nearby than Salary Group III and IV staff (average ratings = 2.0, 2.0, 1.6 and 1.5 for Groups I--IV, respectively) although there were no significant differences among the groups in the percent of staff who currently have a young child.

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no meaningful differences of opinion between staff in academic and support units or staff in non-exempt and exempt jobs regarding the importance of any job aspects.

II. SATISFACTION WITH JOB ASPECTS

In order to determine key areas of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, staff were asked to rate how satisfied they were with the fourteen job aspects discussed above, this time on a scale from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (very satisfied).

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

The average level of satisfaction with each job aspect, and the distribution of satisfaction ratings for each one, are shown in Table 3 on the next page. Note that the job aspects are now listed in order of the level of satisfaction.

At the time of the survey, staff were highly satisfied with two aspects of their job: 76% were mostly or very satisfied with their overall benefits and 76% were mostly or very satisfied with their relations with co-workers (altogether, over 90% were satisfied with each of these job aspects to some degree).

Staff were very satisfied with three other aspects of their job. Over 60% were mostly or very satisfied with relations with their supervisor, the flexibility of their work hours, and their job security (altogether, over 80% were satisfied with each of these job aspects to some degree). This was before the announcement, however, that a reallocation of funds within departments would be necessary to help cover the costs of the 1989-90 pay plan.

Staff were moderately satisfied with five aspects of their job. Approximately 40% said they were mostly or very satisfied with their opportunity to work part-time, use their abilities, learn new skills, and have more responsibility, and with the recognition they receive for doing their work well (altogether, over 70% were satisfied with each of these job aspects to some degree).

Staff had mixed opinions about their salary, however, and they were moderately dissatisfied with the the size of their pay raises. On the one hand, 32% of staff were mostly or very satisfied with their salaries (altogether 67% were satisfied to some degree). On the other hand, only 9% were mostly or very satisfied with the size of their pay raises (altogether, only 25% were satisfied with their raises to some degree). There was some relationship between opinions on these two issues. The less satisfied staff were with their salary, the less satisfied they tended to be with the size of their raises, and vice versa (statistical correlation was .60 out of 1.00, $p < .001$).

Staff were also moderately dissatisfied with their opportunity for promotion. Only 18% of staff were mostly or very satisfied with their opportunity for promotion (altogether, only 43% were satisfied to some degree). Since promotions have become the major avenue for improving one's salary, it should not be surprising that there was some relationship between opinions on these two issues. The less satisfied staff were with their salary, the less satisfied they tended to be with their opportunity for promotion, and vice versa (statistical correlation was .48 out of 1.00, $p < .001$).

Table 3. Job Satisfaction
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	DISSATISFIED[b]			SATISFIED[b]		
		Very	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Very
Benefits overall	4.9	1 %	1 %	6 %	16 %	50 %	26 %
Relations with co-workers	4.9	1	2	6	15	50	26
Flexible work hours	4.7	4	3	8	21	37	27
Relations with supervisor	4.6	5	5	8	18	37	27
Job security	4.5	5	3	8	23	43	18
Opportunity to work part-time	4.2	5	3	13	38	27	14
Opportunity to use abilities	4.1	6	6	14	29	34	11
Opportunity to learn new skills	4.1	5	6	17	30	32	10
Opportunity to have more responsibility	4.1	5	7	17	31	29	11
Recognition for doing your work well	4.0	6	10	14	28	30	12
Salary (or wages)	3.7	11	10	18	29	27	5
Day care at work or nearby	3.6	15	9	16	35	14	11
Opportunity for promotion	3.1	19	14	24	25	15	3
Size of pay raises	2.5	35	19	21	16	7	2

		DISAGREE			AGREE		
		Strongly	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Strongly
The 'U' is a good place to work.	4.7	1 %	2 %	6 %	26 %	48 %	17 %
My college/similar unit is a good place to work.	4.4	3	4	9	29	41	14
My department/division is a good place to work.	4.4	4	5	11	24	37	19

[a] On a scale from 1 (very dissatisfied/strongly disagree) to 6 (very satisfied/strongly agree), listed in order of the level of satisfaction or agreement.

[b] Percent of staff expressing each opinion (n = 823--837 for all but part-time item where the n = 709 and the daycare item where n = 370).

In general, staff had mixed opinions about the availability of day care on campus or nearby, if they expressed any opinion at all: 25% of those who expressed an opinion said they were mostly or very satisfied (altogether, 60% of those who expressed an opinion said they were satisfied to some degree). Staff who have a young child, however, were dissatisfied: Only 17% were mostly or very satisfied with the availability of day care on campus or nearby (altogether, only 31% were satisfied to some degree).

While staff were less satisfied with some aspects of their job than with others, on the whole they had very positive opinions about working at the University: 65% mostly or strongly agreed the University is a good place to work, 55% mostly or strongly agreed their college or similar unit is a good place to work, and 56% mostly or strongly agreed their department or division is a good place to work. Altogether, over 90% of staff agreed to some degree that the University is a good place to work, and over 80% agreed to some degree that their college and department are good places to work.

Comparison With Other Campuses

There were four widespread, meaningful differences of opinion between Twin Cities staff and staff on other campuses, as can be seen Table 4 below.

Table 4. Differences in Job Satisfaction
Twin Cities Compared to Other Campuses[a]

	TWIN CITIES		DULUTH	MORRIS	CRKSTN	WASECA
Salary (wages)	3.7	<	4.2	4.6	4.3	4.3
Size of pay raises	2.5	<	3.2	3.6	3.5	3.3
The 'U' is a good place to work.	4.7	<	5.2	5.3	5.3	4.8
My college/similar unit is a good place to work.	4.4	<	5.0	5.2	5.2	4.6

[a] Only items where the opinions of Twin Cities staff differed from the opinions of staff on three or four other campuses by at least .5 on a scale from 1 (very dissatisfied/strongly disagree) to 6 (very satisfied/strongly agree) are reported.

Twin Cities staff were somewhat less satisfied with their salaries than staff on all other campuses: Only 32% of Twin Cities staff were mostly or very satisfied with their salary compared to 48% of Duluth staff, 65% of Morris staff, 52% of Crookston staff, and 56% of Waseca staff. This may be due to the fact that staff on other campuses see themselves as better paid in relation to their local market (see section IV).

Twin Cities staff were far less satisfied with the size of their pay raises than staff on all other campuses, although in this case satisfaction was generally low: Only 9% of Twin Cities staff were mostly or very satisfied with the size of their pay raises compared to 21% of Duluth staff, 25% of Morris staff, 34% of Crookston staff, and 26% of Waseca staff.

Finally, Twin Cities staff were somewhat less likely to agree that the University and their college are good places to work than staff on three other campuses. For example, 65% of Twin Cities staff mostly or strongly agreed that the University is a good place to work, compared to 85% of Duluth staff, 85% of Morris staff, and 92% of Crookston staff. Over half of Twin Cities staff mostly or strongly agreed that their college (or similar unit) is a good place to work compared to over three-quarters of the staff on three other campuses.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Thinking About Leaving versus Planning to Stay

The differences in satisfaction between staff who are thinking about leaving and staff who plan to stay are shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Differences in Job Satisfaction
Staff Thinking About Leaving vs. Planning to Stay[a]

	MAY LEAVE	PLAN TO STAY
Relations with supervisor	4.0	4.8
Opportunity to use their abilities	3.6	4.4
Opportunity to learn new skills	3.7	4.2
Oppor. to have more responsibility	3.5	4.2
Recognition for doing their job well	3.4	4.3
Salary	3.2	3.9
Opportunity for promotion	2.4	3.4
Size of pay raises	2.1	2.7

[a] Only differences of .5 or more on a scale from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (very satisfied) are reported.

Staff who are thinking about leaving were far less satisfied with relations with their supervisor, the opportunity to use their abilities, the recognition they receive for doing their work well, and their opportunity for promotion than staff who are planning to stay.

They were somewhat less satisfied with their opportunity to learn new skills and have more responsibility, and with their salary and the size of their pay raises.

The difference in satisfaction with salary was not due to a difference in actual salary, since staff who are thinking about leaving are paid the same, on the average, as staff who plan to stay (mean salary = $24,413 versus $24,699, respectively). Moreover, similar percentages of staff in the "leave" and "stay" groups are receiving a salary increase, no increase, or having their salary range frozen due to the implementation of pay equity. The only remaining explanation seems to be their difference of opinion about how well they are paid relative to people outside the University who have similar responsibilities and experience (see section IV).

Occupational Comparisons

There were several meaningful differences between the satisfaction of staff campus-wide and the satisfaction of staff in a particular occupational group, as shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6. Differences in Job Satisfaction
Occupational Comparisons[a]

	Campus-wide	Service Maint.	Clerical Office	Profes-sional	Super-visory
Flexible work hours	(4.7)	4.2	4.4	5.1	4.8
Opportunity to learn new skills	(4.1)	3.6	4.0	4.3	4.3
Salary (or wages)	(3.7)	4.2	3.5	3.4	4.0
Opportunity for promotion	(3.1)	3.2	2.9	3.2	3.6
Size of pay raises	(2.5)	3.3	2.2	2.3	2.5

[a]Only items where there the opinions of an occupational group differed from opinions campus-wide by least .5 on a scale from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (very satisfied) are reported.

Service/Maintenance staff were somewhat less satisfied with the flexibility of their work hours than staff campus-wide. This may be due partly to the fact that they hold non-exempt jobs which typically require a staff member's presence during fixed hours.

Service/Maintenance staff were also somewhat less satisfied with their opportunity to learn new skills, which may again be related to the fact that they all hold non-exempt jobs (non-exempt jobs generally permit less independence in carrying out assignments than exempt kinds of work).

On the other hand, Service/Maintenance staff were somewhat more satisfied with their salary than staff campus-wide, which may be related to the fact that they have the least negative perceptions about how well they are paid relative to people outside the University (see section IV).

Service/Maintenance staff were also somewhat less dissatisfied with the size of their pay raises than staff campus-wide. The difference in satisfaction may be due to the fact that, in recent years, Service/Maintenance staff have received pay raises comparable to what their counterparts at the State received while other civil service staff did not. Even so, they were moderately dissatisfied with the size of their raises.

Finally, Supervisory staff were somewhat more satisfied with their opportunity for promotion than staff campus-wide. Their greater satisfaction is probably due to the fact that they have already received a promotion. For other staff, however, the recent revision of the classification system has meant fewer promotional opportunities at a time when promotion has become the main avenue for improving one's salary. (The process of clarifying distinctions among job classes often lead to a reduction in the number of promotionally-related classes in a job series; see Beuhring & Erickson, 1985.)

Seniority Comparisons

Mid-Senior staff were somewhat less satisfied than *Newer* staff with the recognition they receive for doing their work well (average ratings = 4.3, 3.8 and 3.9 for the three seniority groups).

Mid-Senior staff were somewhat less satisfied than *Senior* staff with the availability of day care on campus or nearby (average ratings = 3.6, 3.3 and 3.9 for the three seniority groups).

Comparisons Among Salary Groups

There were three meaningful differences of opinion related to salary, as shown in Table 7 below.

Table 7. Differences in Job Satisfaction
Comparisons Among Salary Groups[a]

	Campus-wide	SALARY GROUP			
		I	II	III	IV
Salary (or wages)	(3.7)	3.4	3.6	4.0	4.0
Day care at work or nearby	(3.6)	3.6	3.2	3.6	4.0
Opportunity for promotion	(3.1)	2.9	2.9	3.3	3.5

[a] Only differences between two or more groups of at least .5 on a scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (very satisfied) are reported. Salary Groups: I (less than $20,000), II ($20,000--$24,999), III ($25,000--$29,999) and IV ($30,000 or more).

Not surprisingly, staff in Salary Group I were somewhat less satisfied with their salary than staff in Salary Groups III and IV.

Staff in Salary Group I staff were also somewhat less satisfied with their opportunity for promotion, which has become the principal method for improving one's salary.

Staff in Salary Group II were far less satisfied than staff in Salary Group IV with the availability of day care on campus or nearby, although there was no difference in the proportion of staff in each group who currently have a young child.

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no meaningful differences in job satisfaction between staff in academic and support units, staff in non-exempt and exempt jobs, minority and non-minority staff, or female and male staff on any of these job aspects.

III. PRIORITIES FOR ACTION

In order to determine staff priorities for action plans, the fourteen job aspects were categorized according to both their importance and satisfaction ratings. On the one hand, job aspects that could be categorized as high importance--dissatisfied indicated key areas where the University needs to improve, in the opinion of its staff. Job aspects that could be categorized as high importance--satisfied, on the other hand, provided an indication of the University's strengths as an employer.

CAMPUS-WIDE PRIORITIES

Twin Cities Campus

The priorities of Twin Cities staff are shown in Table 8 below. Job aspects listed within each category may be considered similar in importance and satisfaction, although the reader may wish to make more refined distinctions based on the results presented earlier in Tables 1 and 3.

Table 8. Priorities for Action[a]
Twin Cities Campus

	DISSATISFIED	BORDERLINE	SATISFIED
H I G H I M P O R T	*Size of raises* *Promotion*	*Salary* *Recognition* *Use abilities* *Learn new skills* *More responsbility*	*Benefits* *Supervisor relations* *Co-worker relations* *Job security*
L O W		*Work part-time* *Day care on campus*	*Flexible hours*

[a]On a scale of *1 to 5*, High Importance = average rating of 3.8 or more (very or extremely important to over 75% of staff) and Low Importance = 3.7 or less (very or extremely important to less than 50% of staff). On a scale of *1 to 6*, Satisfied = average rating of 4.3 or more (over 60% of staff were mostly or very satisfied), Borderline = 3.3--4.2 (25--50% of staff were mostly or very satisfied), and Dissatisfied = 3.2 or less (20% or fewer staff were mostly or very satisfied).

Twin Cities staff were clearly dissatisfied with two job aspects they considered highly important: The size of pay raises and the opportunity for promotion. These would be their top priority for action, according to the categories developed for this report.

Staff expressed borderline opinions about five other job aspects they considered highly important: Salary, the recognition they receive for doing their work well, the opportunity to use their abilities, the opportunity to learn new skills, and the oppportunity to have more responsibility (see Table 3 for details). These would be the next set of priorities for action, according to the categories developed for this report. It should be noted that programs designed to address the top priority concerns may help address these concerns as well, and vice versa.

Twin Cities staff were satisfied with four of the 11 job aspects they considered highly important: Benefits, relations with their supervisor, relations with their co-workers, and job security. As will be seen later, efforts to maintain or even improve upon these strengths might be considered the foundation for any program designed to improve the recruitment and retention of staff.

Comparisons with Other Campuses

Staff on the other four campuses were satisfied with more aspects of their job than staff on the Twin Cities campus. Moreover, Duluth staff were dissatisfied with only one job aspect they considered highly important (the size of pay raises) while Morris, Crookston, and Waseca staff were not dissatisfied with any aspect of their job, according to the categories developed for this report.

PRIORITIES FOR SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Thinking About Leaving versus Planning to Stay

Staff who are thinking about leaving in the next twelve months were dissatisfied with three job aspects they considered of high importance: The size of their pay raises, the opportunity for promotion, and their salary. They were satisfied with only three others: Benefits, relations with co-workers, and job security. In contrast to staff campus-wide, they expressed mixed satisfaction with their supervisory relationship.

Staff who are planning to stay five years or more were dissatisfied with only one job aspect they considered of high importance: The size of their pay raises. They were satisfied with a total of six others: Benefits, relations with co-workers, and job security, plus relations with their supervisor, the opportunity to use their abilities, and the recognition they receive for doing their work well.

This pattern of findings suggests the determining factor in the decision to leave or stay may be the number of positive job aspects compared to the number of negative ones, rather than dissatisfaction with any one job aspect per se. In other words, efforts to retain dissatisfied staff may need to address several concerns simultaneously in order to be successful over the long run.

Judging from the differences of opinion between staff who are thinking about leaving in the next twelve months and those who plan to stay five years or more, efforts to retain dissatisfied staff should include programs aimed at improving the relationship between supervisors and subordinates, communication at the department-level, the recognition of good performance, and career development. (See sections VII, VIII, XI, XIII, and XVI for information about staff opinions on these issues.)

The University may also need to address staff concerns about how well they are paid relative to people at the State and at local companies. While staff who are thinking about leaving are paid the same, on average, as staff who plan to stay ($24,413 versus $24,699) they have more negative perceptions about how they are paid in comparison to people outside the University (see section IV). This may explain why they were clearly dissatisfied with their salary while staff who plan to stay were not.

Occupational Comparisons

Campus-wide priorities applied equally well to Clerical/Office and Professional staff, but not to Service/Maintenance and Supervisory staff.

Service/Maintenance staff were satisfied with the same four key job aspects as staff campus-wide (benefits, relations with their supervisor, relations with their co-workers, and job security) but they were dissatisfied with only one job aspect instead of two (the opportunity for promotion). The reader should keep in mind these results may have changed because of a subsequent layoff of Service/Maintenance staff.

Supervisory staff were satisfied with a total of seven of the 11 key job aspects: Benefits, relations with their own supervisor, relations with their co-workers, job security, and the opportunity to use their abilities, learn new skills, and have more responsibility. They were dissatisfied with only one, the size of pay raises.

As might be expected from the above differences of opinion, Service/Maintenance and Supervisory staff were somewhat more likely to say they plan to stay at the University for five years or more than Clerical/Office and Professional staff (76%, 65%, 54% and 58%, respectively). The pattern was not as clear, however, when looking at the percent of staff who said they are thinking about leaving in the next twelve months (14%, 20%, 22% and 31%, respectively). The difference lay in the percent of staff who were uncertain about their plans (10%, 15%, 24%, 11%, respectively).

Although Clerical/Office and Professional staff had no more concerns than staff campus-wide, Professional saff were the most likely to be thinking about leaving (31%) and Clerical/Office staff were the most likely to be unsure about their plans (24%). Thus it appears that other factors must play an important role in the decision about whether to leave or stay. Staff perceptions about how well they are paid in relation to people outside the University appear to be one of those other factors (see section IV for details).

Other Subgroup Comparisons

Campus-wide priorities applied equally well to staff in academic and support units, to staff in non-exempt and exempt jobs, to female and male staff, to minority and non-minority staff, to staff in the three seniority groups, and to staff in the four salary groups.

IV. BENEFITS

Benefits were very or extremely important to 93% of Twin Cities staff, and staff were highly satisfied with their benefits overall. This made benefits one of the University's two greatest strengths as an employer, from the staff's point of view.

This section provides further information about staff opinions in this area. It is divided into two parts, one regarding staff satisfaction with specific benefits and the other regarding staff opinions about proposed changes in benefits or benefit policies.

SATISFACTION WITH SPECIFIC BENEFITS

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

Satisfaction with specific benefits varied rather widely despite the high level of satisfaction with benefits overall, as can be seen in Table 9 below.

Table 9. Satisfaction With Specific Benefits
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	DISSATISFIED[b]			SATISFIED[b]		
		Very	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Very
Number of paid holidays	5.1	1 %	1 %	4 %	13 %	45 %	36 %
Number of sick leave days	5.1	1	1	4	12	43	39
Number of vacation days	5.0	1	2	6	15	41	35
Regents scholarship for staff	5.0	2	2	5	18	33	40
Dental care coverage	4.7	2	3	7	24	40	24
Health plan coverage	4.7	3	3	7	20	43	24
Two-week paid leave for parents of a new child	4.5[c]	6	4	8	24	29	29
Amount of life insurance	4.4	2	3	11	34	37	13
Health plan cost	4.1	8	7	17	20	29	19
Retirement plan (M.S.R.S.)	3.8	9	9	16	30	28	8

[a] On a scale from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (very satisfied) ordered from high to low.

[b] Percent of staff expressing each opinion (n = 813--825 for all but one item).

[c] For those who expressed an opinion (n = 762).

Staff were highly satisfied with the number of vacation days, paid holidays, and sick leave days they receive, and with the Regents scholarship program. Three-quarters or more of the staff were mostly or very satisfied with each of these benefits (altogether, over 90% were satisfied to some degree with each one). Satisfaction with the Regents scholarship program was consistent with the high level of interest staff expressed in continuing their education. Nearly 40% of Twin Cities staff said they plan to get additional vocational training or a college degree within the next five years.

Staff were very satisfied with the amount of life insurance the University provides, and with the two-week paid leave for parents of a new child. Approximately half of the staff were mostly or very satisfied with both the life insurance and parental leave benefits (altogether, over 80% were satisfied to some degree with each one). Some staff commented, however, that the paid parental leave policy seemed inequitable because there was no comparable benefit for those who did not have young children.

Staff were also very satisfied with their health plan coverage and dental care coverage. Approximately two-thirds were mostly or very satisfied with their coverage (altogether, over 85% were satisfied to some degree with their coverage). At the time of the survey, staff were moderately satisfied with the cost of their health plan. Half of the staff were mostly or very satisfied (altogether, 68% were satisfied to some degree). Although it is not clear how many staff selected a high-cost plan last year, 7% of staff said they have a spouse at the University who must carry independent coverage, which effectively increases their total cost for family coverage.

Finally, staff were moderately satisfied with their M.S.R.S. retirement plan. One-third of the staff were mostly or very satisfied the plan (altogether, 66% were satisfied to some degree).

Comparisons with Other Campuses

The differences opinion with staff on other campuses are shown in Table 14 below.

Table 10. Differences in Satisfaction With Specific Benefits
Twin Cities Compared to Other Campuses[a]

	TWIN CITIES		DULUTH	MORRIS	CRKSTON	WASECA
Health plan cost	4.1	<	4.7	5.1	5.0	5.0
Retirement plan (M.S.R.S)	3.8	<	3.9	4.3	4.5	4.4

[a]Only items where the opinions of Twin Cities staff differed from the opinions of staff on three or four other campuses by at least .5 on a scale from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (very satisfied) are reported.

Although Twin Cities staff were moderately satisfied with the M.S.R.S. retirement plan, they were somewhat less satisfied than staff on three other campuses: 35% of Twin Cities staff, along with 35% of Duluth staff, were mostly or very satisfied with the M.S.R.S. plan compared to 49% of Morris staff, 62% of Crookston staff, and 51% of Waseca staff.

Although Twin Cities staff were also moderately satisfied with the cost of their health plan, they were far less satisfied than staff on all other campuses. Approximately half of the Twin Cities staff were mostly or very satisfied with the cost of their health plan compared to 63% of Duluth staff, 73% of Morris staff, 70% of Crookston staff, and 71% of Waseca staff. These differences in satisfaction were probably due to the fact that Blue Cross/Blue Shield, a popular health plan, was the most expensive option for Twin Cities staff during the year before the survey while it was the no-cost option for staff on all other campuses.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Occupational Comparisons

As can be seen in Table 15, Service/Maintenance staff were somewhat less satisfied than with the number of sick leave days they receive than staff campus-wide, and they were far less satisfied with the Regents Scholarship program. These differences did not have an impact, however, on their satisfaction with benefits overall (see section II). Moreover, taking benefits into account improved their perceptions of their total compensation package as much as it did for other staff (see section IV).

Table 11. Differences in Satisfaction with Specific Benefits
Occupational Comparisons[a]

	Campus-wide	Service Maint.	Clerical Office	Profes-sional	Super-visory
Number of sick leave days	(5.1)	4.6	5.0	5.2	5.3
Regents scholarship for staff	(5.0)	4.3	5.2	5.1	5.0

[a]Only items where the opinions of an occupational group differed from the opinions of staff campus-wide by at least .5 on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) are reported.

Female Compared to Male Staff

Female staff were somewhat more satisfied with the Regents Scholarship program than male staff (average ratings = 5.2 and 4.7, respectively).

Seniority Comparisons

Newer and Mid-Senior staff were very satisfied with the number of vacation days they receive, they were somewhat less satisfied than Senior staff (average ratings = 4.8, 4.8 and 5.3, respectively). These differences of opinion were consistent with the fact that staff receive an increasing number of vacation days as they gain seniority.

Newer staff were somewhat more satisfied that Mid-Senior and Senior staff with the M.S.R.S. retirement plan (average ratings = 4.1, 3.6 and 3.7, respectively). While the Newer staff were moderately satisfied, the Mid-Senior and Senior staff had mixed opinions.

Comparisons Among Salary Groups

The two meaningful differences among salary groups paralleled the differences among seniority groups, no doubt because of the relationship between seniority and salary. Salary Group I--III staff were slightly to somewhat less satisfied with the number of vacation days they receive than Salary Group IV staff (average ratings = 4.8, 4.9, 5.0 and 5.3, respectively). Salary Group I staff, on the other hand, were slightly to somewhat more satisfied with the M.S.R.S. retirement plan than staff in the other salary groups (average ratings = 4.2, 3.8, 3.7 and 3.5, respectively).

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no differences in the satisfaction of staff who are thinking about leaving and those who plan to stay, staff in academic and support units, staff in non-exempt and exempt jobs, or minority and non-minority staff regarding specific benefits.

OPINIONS OF BENEFIT PROPOSALS

The following proposals were based on suggestions by civil service staff, the Civil Service Committee, and administrators. They were included in order to obtain information about the extent of staff interest in each proposal before deciding whether to explore the feasibility of implementing them.

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

Staff opinions of ten benefit proposals are shown in Table 16 on the following page.

Staff were moderately interested in having reduced tuition offered as an additional benefit: 47% said they probably or definitely wanted reduced tuition for their spouse and dependent children; 33% said they probably or definitely wanted reduced tuition for themselves, other than Regents Scholarship (altogether, nearly three-quarters of the staff expressed some degree of interest in these reduced tuition proposals). The interest in reduced tuition for themselves was consistent with the fact that nearly 40% of the staff said they plan to obtain additional vocational training or a college degree within the next five years. Supervisors are sometimes reluctant to give regular approval of a Regents Scholarship for this purpose, especially if the courses are not directly job-related.

Staff were also moderately in favor of the proposed changes in vacation and sick leave policies: 40% said they probably or definitely wanted the University to allow them to sell back some of their accumulated vacation days for cash; 40% also said they probably or definitely wanted to allow the 'U' to reduce the number of sick leave days they get each year in return for letting them use their sick leave for personal business as well as for illness. (Altogether, 70% of the staff supported to some degree the proposed changed in vacation policy and 63% supported to some degree the change in sick leave policy.) It is important to note, however, that 29% of staff probably or definitely did not want the latter change, which means a sizeable minority of staff might actively oppose any change in the number of their sick leave days regardless of the trade-offs.

Staff were moderately interested in having a "cafeteria benefits plans" where they could choose the benefits they want up to a fixed total cost. Approximately 31% of staff said they probably or definitely wanted such a plan (altogether, 73% expressed some degree of support for introducing such a plan). When asked which of five additional benefits they would seriously think about choosing if there was a cafeteria benefits plan, nearly two-thirds chose disability insurance, one-third chose extra life insurance, one-quarter chose a bigger deductible on their health plan (which lowers the plan's cost) and payment for day care or extended-day expenses, and less than one-fifth chose coverage for legal expenses, "other", or nothing at all (staff were allowed to select more than one option). While staff may not have fully understood the implications of such a plan, the fact that they did not express an even greater interest in this option was also consistent with their high level of satisfaction with current benefits (see section II). Moreover, a significant new benefit helps reduce the remaining cost of other benefits. Staff are now able to use "pre-tax" dollars to pay for health plan premiums, other health-related costs, and child care expenses.

Table 12. Opinions of Benefit Proposals
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	DO NOT WANT[b]			WANT[b]		
		Definite.	Prob.	Possibly	Possibly	Prob.	Definite.
Reduced tuition for your spouse and dependent children.	4.2	12 %	8 %	7 %	26 %	17 %	30 %
Allow you to sell back some of your acccumlated vacation days for cash.	4.0	11	11	8	30	17	23
A "cafeteria benefits plan" where you choose the benefits you want up to a fixed total cost.	4.0	7	9	11	42	16	15
Reduced tuition for yourself (other than Regents scholarship).	3.9	9	11	10	37	16	17
Allow the 'U' to reduce the number of sick leave days you get each year in return for letting you use them for personal business as well as illness.	3.8	19	10	8	23	18	22

		DISAGREE[b]			AGREE[b]		
		Strongly	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Strongly
There should be a contact person on my campus (Mpls/St. Paul/Duluth/etc.) to take my application for benefits.	4.4	1 %	5 %	9 %	39 %	29 %	17 %
I understand the information I get about changes in my benefits.	4.1	2	6	16	34	38	4
I am willing to pay more for a health plan in the future to keep the same coverage I have now.	3.1	18	14	23	30	12	3
The amount staff have to pay for a health plan should depend on how much they earn.	2.9	26	18	17	23	9	7
There should be fewer health plan companies to decide among.	2.7	20	23	30	18	6	3

[a] On a scale of 1 (definitely do not want/strongly disagree) to 6 (definitely want/strongly agree).

[b] Percent of staff expressing each opinion (n = 805--823, except "spouse/dep. tuition" item n = 781).

Staff did not support any of the options for dealing with further increases in the cost of health plans. Only 15% mostly or strongly agreed they would be willing to pay more for a health plan in the future in order to keep the same coverage they have now (altogether, half of the staff agreed with this proposal to some degree and half disagreed). Only 16% mostly or strongly agreed that the amount staff have to pay for a health plan should depend on how much they earn (altogether, only one-third of staff supported this proposal to some degree). Perhaps because staff are concerned about balancing the trade-offs between coverage and cost, only 9% mostly or strongly agreed there should be fewer health plan companies to choose among (altogether, only 27% agreed with this proposal to some degree).

Staff were moderately likely to agree that they understand the information they get about changes in their benefits: 42% of staff mostly or strongly agreed this was the case (altogether, 76% agreed to some degree). This was reassuringly high considering the number and complexity of changes in benefits that have been made in the last two years.

Not surprisingly, staff were very likely to agree that there should be a contact person on their campus (Minneapolis or St. Paul) to take their application for benefits: 46% of staff mostly or strongly agreed with this proposal (85% of staff agreed with this proposal to some degree).

Comparison with Other Campuses

The only meaningful, widespread difference of opinion was one of degree. Only 8% of Twin Cities staff mostly or strongly agreed there should be fewer health plan companies to decide among compared to 21% of Duluth staff, 12% of Morris staff, 23% of Crookston staff, and 11% of Waseca staff. As these percentages suggest, however, there was not much support for the proposal on any campus.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Thinking About Leaving versus Planning to Stay

Staff who are thinking about leaving were somewhat more likely to want the change in sick leave policy than staff who are planning to stay (average ratings = 4.2 vs. 3.6, respectively).

They were also somewhat more likely to want reduced tuition for themselves (average ratings = 4.2 vs. 3.7, respectively). The latter difference of opinion was consistent with the fact that 44% of those who are thinking about leaving said they plan to get additional vocational training or a college degree within the next five years compared to 35% of those who plan to stay.

Non-exempt Jobs Compared to Exempt Jobs

Staff in non-exempt jobs were somewhat more likely than staff in exempt jobs to agree that the amount staff have to pay for a health plan should depend on how much they earn (average ratings = 3.2 vs. 2.6, respectively) although they did not support this proposal either.

Occupational Comparisons

Service/Maintenance staff were somewhat less likely to want the proposed change in sick leave policy than staff campus-wide (average rating = 3.2, 3.8, 4.1 and 3.7, for Service/Maintenance, Clerical/Office, Professional, and Supervisory staff, respectively, compared to 3.8 for staff campus-wide).

Minority Compared to Non-Minority Staff

Minority staff were somewhat more likely than non-minority staff to want reduced tuition for themselves as an added benfit (average ratings = 4.4 vs. 3.9, respectively). Their greater interest was consistent with the fact that 57% of minority staff said they plan to get additional vocational training or a college degree within the next five years, compared to 37% of non-minority staff. Minority staff were somewhat more likely to want reduced tuition for their spouse and dependent children as well (average ratings = 4.9 vs. 4.2).

They were also somewhat more likely to say they wanted to be allowed to sell back some of their accumulated vacation days for cash (average ratings = 4.5 vs. 4.0, respectively).

Seniority Comparisons

Newer staff were somewhat more likely than Mid-Senior and Senior staff to want reduced tuition for themselves as an added benefit (average ratings = 4.2, 3.8 and 3.6, respectively). This was consistent with the fact that 54% of Newer staff said they plan to get additional vocational training or a college degree within the next five years compared to 41% of Mid-Senior staff and only 18% of Senior staff.

Both Newer and Mid-Senior staff were slightly to somewhat more likely than Senior staff to want reduced tuition for their spouse and dependent children (average ratings = 4.4, 4.3 and 3.9, respectively). This was somewhat surprising given the fact that only half as many Newer staff, and two-thirds as many Mid-Senior staff, said they have 5- to 18-year-old children as Senior staff. Since seniority and salary were related, it may reflect a difference in the ability to afford additional education instead.

Comparisons Among Salary Groups

Salary Group I and II staff were slightly to somewhat more likely than Salary Group III and IV staff to want reduced tuition for themselves (average ratings = 4.2, 3.9, 3.8 and 3.5, respectively) and for their spouse and dependent children (average ratings = 4.4, 4.3, 3.9 and 4.0).

The first difference of opinion is consistent with the fact that staff in Groups I and II were twice as likely to say they plan to get additional vocational training or a college degree in the next five years (54%, 42%, 24% and 22%, respectively). Since they were less likely to report having 5 to 18 year old children, the second difference may reflect their lesser ability to afford the costs of dependent education instead.

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no differences of opinion between staff in academic and support units, or between female and male staff regarding these benefit proposals.

V. RELATIONS WITH SUPERVISOR

Good relations with their supervisor was very or extremely important to 92% of the staff. Staff were moderately satisfied with their supervisory relationship overall.

This section provides additional information about where the supervisor-subordinate relationship was most satisfactory and where there was still room for improvement, from the staff's point of view. It is divided into two parts, one regarding day-to-day supervision and the other regarding performance appraisal. Although many of the opinions in these areas were predictable, there were a few surprises that have implications for future program and policy decisions.

DAY-TO-DAY SUPERVISION

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

The opinions of Twin Cities staff regarding various aspects of the day-to-day supervision they receive are shown in Table 13 on the next page.

Staff felt moderately to very positive about the guidance and feedback they receive from their supervisor, although there was room for improvement in some areas. Fully 86% of staff mostly or strongly agreed that their official supervisor allows them to work without close supervision (altogether, 96% agreed to some degree). Even so, 61% mostly or strongly agreed that their official supervisor sets high standards for the quantity and quality of their work (altogether, 86% agreed with this statement to some degree).

Over 40% of staff mostly or strongly agreed that their supervisor clearly explains what they are expected to do (altogether, 69% agreed with this statement to some degree), and 34% mostly or strongly agreed that s/he gives them regular feedback about their performance (altogether, 59% agreed to some degree). Finally, 52% of staff mostly or strongly agreed that they have received the orientation and training they need to do their job (altogether, 79% agreed to some degree).

Given these opinions, it's not surprising that 57% of staff mostly or strongly agreed that their official supervisor evaluates their performance fairly (altogether, 79% agreed with this statement to some degree). The fact that nearly all staff expressed an opinion on this point, even though one-third of them had not received a written performance appraisal in over a year, suggests they were referring to day-to-day evaluations of their performance.

Twin Cities staff were very likely to agree that their official supervisor allows them to attend workshops, conferences, or classes to improve their knowledge and skills: 57% mostly or strongly agreed this was the case (altogether, 80% agreed with this statement to some degree). This appears to be both a wise investment by management and an important benefit from the staff's point of view (see section IV). It may also contribute to staff satisfaction with the opportunity to use their abilities and learn new skills.

Table 13. Day-to-Day Supervision
Twin Cities Campus

PRACTICES	Average Rating[a]	DISAGREE[b]			AGREE[b]		
		Strongly	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Strongly
My official supervisor allows me to work without close supervision.	5.3	1 %	1 %	2 %	10 %	35 %	51 %
I can see my supervisor when I need to.	4.8	2	3	7	20	37	31
S/he is generally supportive of me.	4.7	4	3	8	19	36	30
My official supervisor ...							
... sets high standards for the quantity and quality of my work.	4.6	3	3	8	23	39	24
... allows me to attend workshops, conferences, or classes to improve my knowledge and skills.	4.5	7	5	8	20	31	29
... evaluates my performance fairly.	4.4	5	5	11	22	38	19
... is open to suggestions.	4.4	6	6	8	22	35	23
... generally makes good decisions.	4.4	6	5	9	23	38	19
I feel comfortable talking with my supervisor about work problems.	4.4	7	7	10	20	31	25
I have received the orientation and training I need to do my job.	4.3	3	7	11	27	38	14
My official supervisor ...							
... deals fairly with staff complaints.	4.2	8	8	12	21	32	19
... talks with me before making important decisions about my work.	4.1	9	8	13	22	32	16
... knows and understands the problems I face in my job.	4.1	9	7	12	27	30	15
... clearly explains what I am expected to do.	4.0	7	10	14	26	30	13
... gives me regular feedback about my performance.	3.7	11	11	19	25	23	11
My supervisor needs more training in supervisory skills.	3.6[c]	14	18	16	19	14	19

PROPOSALS	Average Rating[a]	WOULD NOT HELP[b]			WOULD HELP[b]		
		Definite.	Prob.	Possibly	Possibly	Prob.	Definite.
Require training for new supervisors.	5.0	0 %	1 %	4 %	24 %	31 %	40 %
Ask staff to evaluate their supervisor.	4.3	3	10	10	33	23	21

[a] On a scale from 1 (strongly disagree/definitely would not help) to 6 (strongly agree/definitely would help) ordered from high to low within each section.

[b] Percent of respondents expressing each opinion (n = 802--830 per item).

[c] A low rating (disagreement with the statement) is positive for this item.

Staff felt moderately to very positive about the kinds of decisions their official supervisor makes. Approximately half of the staff mostly or strongly agreed that their official supervisor is open to suggestions, generally makes good decisions, deals fairly with staff complaints, talks with them before making important decisions about their work, and knows and understands the problems they face in their job (over 70% of staff agreed with each of these statements to some degree).

Staff also felt very positive about the general aspects of their supervisory relationship. Two-thirds mostly or strongly agreed that they can see their supervisor when they need to, and that s/he is generally supportive of them (altogether, over 85% of staff agreed with each of these statements to some degree). Over half of the staff mostly or strongly agreed that they feel comfortable talking with their supervisor about work problems (altogether, 75% of staff agreed with this statement to some degree).

Given the generally positive opinions about the supervisory relationship, it should not be surprising that staff had mixed opinions about whether their supervisor needs additional training in supervisory skills. While one-third of the staff mostly or strongly agreed that their supervisor needs more training, fully one-third mostly or strongly disagreed with this proposition (altogether, half the staff agreed with this proposal to some degree, while half disagreed). This outcome ran counter to the prevailing assumption that all supervisors need more training. Evidently, the one-third of staff who firmly believe their supervisor needs more training have been more vocal about their opinions than those who disagree. More importantly, these mixed opinions suggest it would be more cost effective to encourage or require additional training only for those supervisors who would benefit most rather than to require such training for all supervisors indiscriminately.

While staff had mixed opinions about whether their current supervisor needs more training, they very strongly supported the idea of requiring training for *new* supervisors: 71% thought this probably or definitely would help improve communication, efficiency, or staff satisfaction (altogether, 96% of staff thought it was at least possible it would help).

In addition, staff expressed strong support for the proposal that they be asked to evaluate their supervisor: 44% thought this probably or definitely would help improve communication, efficiency, or staff satisfaction (altogether, over three-quarters of staff thought it was at least possible it would help). Subordinate evaluations of supervisors might also useful for identifying the supervisors who would benefit most from additional training (questions from this survey on day-to-day supervision and performance appraisal skills could be used to obtain relevant information).

Comparisons with Other Campuses

There were no meaningful, widespread differences of opinion with staff on the other four campuses on any of these issues or proposals.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Subordinates of Faculty, P & A, and Civil Service Supervisors

Overall, 28% of survey respondents said their official supervisor was a faculty member, 28% said their supervisor was a member of the professional and administrative (P & A) staff, and 33% said their supervisor was a civil service member (11% were not sure or marked "other"). The opinions of staff in these three groups were compared to determine whether the campus-wide results were masking differences of opinion related to the kind of supervisor for whom they worked.

There were no differences of opinion among the subordinates of faculty, P & A, and civil service supervisors regarding any aspect of the supervisory relationship. Nor were there differences of opinion regarding their supervisors' need for additional training. If anything, subordinates of faculty members were slightly more likely to agree that their supervisor sets high standards for the quality and quantity of their work, and that s/he allows them to attend workshops or courses to improve their knowledge and skills. It should be noted that civil service supervisors were equally likely to be the subordinate of a faculty member, a P & A staff member, or another civil service member.

Thinking About Leaving versus Planning to Stay

Staff who are thinking about leaving the University had a less positive view of nearly every aspect of their supervisory relationship than staff who are planning to stay. This was consistent with the fact that they were far less satisfied with their supervisory relationship overall (see sections II and III of this report). A review of Table 14 on the following page reveals two things about their differences of opinion.

First, the size of the difference of opinion was about the same for every supervisory item listed. In other words, no single supervisory shortcoming appeared to a critical factor in the greater discontent of staff who are thinking about leaving.

Second, most of the perceived shortcomings concerned the quality of communication with their supervisor. Staff who are thinking about leaving were somewhat less likely to agree that their supervisor clearly explains what they are expected to do, gives them regular feedback about their performance, knows and understands the problems they face in their job, talks with them before making important decisions about their work, and is open to suggestions. They were far less likely to agree that they feel comfortable talking with their supervisor about work problems.

The remaining aspects of the relationship on which there were differences of opinion were arguably related to communication as well. Staff who are thinking about leaving were somewhat less likely to agree that their supervisor evaluates their performance fairly, generally makes good decisions, and is generally supportive of them. They were far less likely to agree that their supervisor deals fairly with staff complaints.

Given these differences of opinion, it is not surprising that staff who are thinking about leaving were somewhat more likely to agree that their supervisor needs additional training in supervisory skills. In fact, staff who are thinking about leaving were moderately likely to agree this was the case, while those who are planning to stay had mixed opinions.

Table 14. Differences of Opinion about Day-to-Day Supervision[a]
Staff Thinking About Leaving vs. Planning to Stay

	MAY LEAVE	PLAN TO STAY
My supervisor is generally supportive of me.	4.2	4.9
My official supervisor ...		
... evaluates my performance fairly.	4.0	4.6
... is open to suggestions.	4.0	4.6
... generally makes good decisions.	3.9	4.6
I feel comfortable talking with my supervisor about work problems.	3.8	4.6
My official supervisor ...		
... deals fairly with staff complaints.	3.6	4.4
... knows and understands the problems I face in my job.	3.6	4.3
... talks with me before making important decisions about my work.	3.6	4.3
... clearly explains what I am expected to do.	3.5	4.2
... gives me regular feedback about my performance.	3.4	3.9
My supervisor needs more training in supervisory skills.	4.0[b]	3.4

[a] Only differences of at least .5 on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) are reported. Average ratings of 3.3--3.7 indicate mixed opinions.

[b] A high rating (agreement with the statement) is negative for this item.

Looking at the nature of the differences of opinion suggests that training programs for supervisors should emphasize communication skills, especially those involved in performance appraisal. Done properly, performance appraisal is a process for providing guidance and feedback rather than merely a written evaluation for administrative purposes (see Bernardin & Beatty, 1984, and Beuhring, 1988a for summaries of the research literature on this issue).

Non-exempt Jobs Compared to Exempt Jobs

Staff in non-exempt jobs were somewhat less likely to agree that their supervisor allows them to attend workshops or courses to improve their knowledge and skills than staff in exempt jobs (average ratings = 4.3 vs 4.8, respectively).

Occupational Comparisons

As can be seen in Table 15, Service/Maintenance staff were somewhat less likely to agree that their supervisor sets high standards for the quantity and quality of their work than staff campus-wide.

They were far less likely to agree that their supervisor allows them to attend workshops, conferences, or classes to improve their knowledge and skills.

Table 15. Differences of Opinion About Day-to-Day Supervision[a]
Occupational Comparisons

	Campus-wide	Service Maint.	Clerical Office	Profes-sional	Super-visory
My official supervisor ...					
... sets high standards for the quantity and quality of my work.	(4.6)	4.1	4.8	4.7	4.7
... allows me to attend workshops, conferences, or classes to improve my knowledge and skills.	(4.5)	3.5	4.6	4.8	4.7

[a] Only differences of opinion between an occupational group and staff campus-wide of at least .5 on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) are reported.

The lack of differences of opinion about the training and evaluation proposals was noteworthy. Staff in the four occupational groups, including Supervisory staff, were in complete agreement about the likelihood that requiring training for new supervisors would improve communication, efficiency or staff satisfaction. All four groups also agreed to a similar degree that asking subordinates to evaluate their supervisors would help

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no meaningful differences of opinion between staff in academic and support units, female and male staff, minority and non-minority staff, staff in the three seniority groups, or staff in the four salary groups regarding the day-to-day supervisory issues or the proposals.

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

When asked how many written performance appraisals they had received in the last twelve months, 32% of Twin Cities staff said none, 52% said one, 12% said two, and 4% said three or more. Thus, it seems one-third of Twin Cities staff have not received a written evaluation of their performance in more than a year, despite the Civil Service Rule that requires an annual appraisal.

When asked how often they thought their supervisor should do a written evaluation of their performance, 62% of Twin Cities staff said every twelve months, 27% said every six months, 4% said every four months, and 4% said every three months (6% did not respond or said "other"; zero was not an option).

There was some relationship between the number of appraisals staff had received during the previous year, however, and the number of appraisals they recommended. There was a statistical relationship between experience and recommendations among those who had received one to three appraisals (statistical correlation was .34 out of 1.00, $p < .001$). There was also evidence of a relationship when people who had not received an evaluation were taken into account. Two-thirds of the staff who had received no appraisal or only one appraisal in the previous year recommended an annual appraisal. By contrast, only half of those who had received two appraisals, and one-third of those who had received three appraisals, thought an annual appraisal would be sufficient. The remainder tended to recommend the number of appraisals they had received in the past. Thus, while a majority of Twin Cities staff thought annual appraisals would be sufficient, it appears that experience with more frequent appraisals could change their minds (see Bernardin & Beatty, 1984, and Beuhring, 1988c, for a discussion of research on why frequent appraisals improve communication and rating accuracy).

The two-thirds of staff who had received at least one written evaluation in the previous twelve months were asked for their opinion about their most recent appraisal and the form that was used. The results are shown in Table 16 on the next page.

Staff had very positive to moderately positive opinions about the outcome of their most recent appraisal: 63% mostly or strongly agreed that their own performance ratings were fair, and 43% mostly or strongly agreed that the ratings of other staff in their department/-division were fair (altogether, 84% agreed to some degree that their ratings were fair, and 73% agreed to some degree that the ratings of others were fair). The fact that one-quarter of the staff had concerns about fairness, however, suggests that colleges who wish to improve the effectiveness of their merit pay program might do well to focus on improving the perceived fairness of the ratings on which merit pay decisions are based, presumably through improving rating accuracy (see Bernardin & Beatty, 1984, and Beuhring, 1988b, for a review of relevant research).

Table 16. Opinion of Most Recent Performance Appraisal
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	DISAGREE[b]			AGREE[b]		
		Strongly	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Strongly
My performance ratings were fair.	4.5	5 %	4 %	7 %	21 %	42 %	21 %
It gave me a chance to talk to my supervisor about my job.	4.2	6	9	12	27	31	15
Based on what I know, I believe the performance ratings of other staff in my department/divison were fair.	4.1	7	7	13	30	32	11
It gave me a good idea of my strengths and where I could do better.	3.9	6	11	16	32	26	9
We discussed what my goals should be in the coming months.	3.5	15	14	21	21	20	10
In general, I liked the form.	3.4	15	13	17	30	21	4
We talked about ways I might develop further in my job or career.	3.0	23	18	24	18	12	6

[a] On a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) ordered from high to low.

[b] Percent of staff expressing each opinion (n = 501--546 per item, out of 572 who had at least one appraisal during the previous twelve months).

Staff opinions about the communication aspects of their performance appraisal ranged from moderately positive to moderately negative. Nearly half the staff mostly or strongly agreed that their most recent appraisal gave them a chance to talk with their supervisor about their job (altogether, 73% agreed with this statement to some degree). One-third mostly or strongly agreed that it gave them a good idea of their strengths and where they could do better (altogether, two-thirds agreed with this statement to some degree). Surprisingly, only 29% mostly or strongly agreed that they discussed what their goals should be in the coming months (altogether, only half the staff agreed with this statement to some degree). Only 18% said they talked with their supervisor about ways they might develop further in their job or career (altogether, only one-third of staff agreed with this statement to some degree).

Finally, only 25% of staff mostly or stongly agreed that they liked the form that was used (altogether, only half liked the form to some degree). Opinions varied somewhat depending on the form that was used, however, as will be discussed shortly.

Comparisons with Other Campuses

There were some differences in the percent of staff on each campus who said they had received a written evaluation in the previous 12 months: 68% of Twin Cities staff, 52% of Duluth staff, 67% of Morris staff, 56% of Crookston staff, and 89% of Waseca staff said they received at least one appraisal during that period.

When asked how often their supervisor should do a written evaluation of their performance, 80% of Crookston staff said every twelve months while only 60--69% of the staff on the Twin Cities, Duluth, Morris, and Waseca campuses thought an annual appraisal would be sufficient. The remainder thought more frequent appraisals were advisable.

Once again, there appeared to be a relationship between the number of performance appraisals staff had received and the number of appraisals they recommended. Only 5% of the Crookston staff who had received an appraisal said they received more than one during the previous year, while 25% of the Twin Cities, Duluth, Morris, and Waseca staff said they had received more than one. Thus, the more staff there were who had received frequent appraisals, the more staff there were who recommended frequent appraisals.

There was one notable difference in the mix of forms that had been used on the various campuses: 90% of the Crookston staff who had received an appraisal in the previous year said the old Personnel Department form was used, while 85% of the Morris said the new Personnel Department form had been used.

This difference in the kind of form that was used was accompanied by some differences in how favorably they viewed their most recent appraisal. For example, 31% of Crookston staff versus 45% of Morris staff mostly or strongly agreed the appraisal gave them a good idea of their strengths and where they could do better. In addition, 41% versus 55% mostly or strongly agreed that it gave them a chance to talk to their supervisor about their job. Finally, 51% versus 61% mostly or strongly agreed that their performance ratings were fair, and 38% verus 48% mostly or strongly agreed the ratings of other staff in their department/division were fair.

While these differences of opinion might be due to differences in the nature of the campuses, the fact that they consistently favored the new form provided some evidence that it was serving the goals for which it was designed. Comparisons among subgroups of Twin Cities staff also provided some support for this conclusion (see below).

There were no interpretable differences of opinions among the other three campuses, largely because a mix of forms had been used on each one: 50% of Twin Cities staff, 63% of Duluth staff, and 79% Waseca staff received their appraisals with the old Personnel Department form. The remaining staff on each campus received their appraisal with the new Personnel Department form or a college form.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Opinions Related to the Form

Although the form is the least important part of the performance appraisal process, some forms are more compatible with the process than others (see Bernardin & Beatty, 1984 and Beuhring, 1988b, for a review of the research literature on forms). Consequently, the Personnel Department recently revised the performance appraisal form it offers centrally in order to improve the match between the form and the process, with the goal of improving communication as well as rating accuracy (Beuhring, 1988d). A number of colleges and support units have designed their own forms with similar goals in mind.

In order to obtain some preliminary evidence on the success of these efforts, staff who received at least one appraisal in the previous year were divided into groups according to the form that was used. The old Personnel Department form (a single green or buff sheet with a 5-point rating scale) was used with 50% of the staff who received at least one appraisal in the previous year (n = 265), the new Personnel Department form (a white booklet with a 7-category rating scale) was used with 21% of those who received an appraisal (n = 109), and a college form was used with 19% of those who received an appraisal (n = 103), according to their self-reports. (Another 11% said some other kind of appraisal was conducted, such as a narrative description of performance without ratings.) Two meaningful differences of opinion were related to differences in the kind of form that was used.

First, 59% of the staff whose appraisals were conducted with the new Personnel Department form mostly or strongly agreed that the appraisal gave them a chance to talk with their supervisor about their job, compared to 45% of those whose appraisals were conducted with the old Personnel Department form and 43% of those whose appraisals were conducted with a college form (average ratings = 4.5, 4.1 and 4.0, respectively). This finding was consistent with the Personnel Department's intent of improving the usefulness of the form as an aid to communication (Beuhring, 1988d).

Second, 42% of the staff whose appraisals were conducted with the new Personnel Department form mostly or strongly agreed that they had discussed what their goals should be in the coming months, compared to only 28% of those whose appraisals were conducted with the old Personnel Department form and 23% of those whose appraisals were conducted with a college or department form (average ratings = 3.9, 3.4 and 3.2, respectively). While the new Personnel Department form seemed to be an improvement over the old form in this regards, it still fell far short of what was expected, since the new form recommends that supervisors conclude each appraisal interview with a discussion of performance standards (goals) for the next six-month review period. (Re-wording the survey item to explicitly ask whether performance standards were discussed may have produced even more positive results.)

Since both the new Personnel Department form and some of the college/department forms have been in use for only a year or so, a better assessment of their effectiveness might be made after staff and their supervisors have had more experience with the forms (if staff in the relevant colleges and support units were re-surveyed using the performance appraisal questions from this survey, the campus-wide results reported here could be used as a basis for comparison).

A re-survey of relevant units would be especially useful for evaluating the new Personnel Department form since two-thirds of the staff with whom it was used said they had received only one appraisal and a minimum of two appraisals are necessary to complete a full appraisal cycle under the new program (see Beuhring, 1988d, for details). In addition, a re-survey of colleges and support units that use their own form would be the only meaningful way to evaluate their individual success, since the forms differ widely from each other in terms of what's evaluated, the rating scales, and the nature of the supporting procedures and training programs.

Opinions Related to the Frequency of Past Appraisals

Staff who received two or more appraisals in the previous twelve months had a more positive opinion of their most recent appraisal than staff who had received only one. They were somewhat more likely to agree that the appraisal gave them a good idea of their strengths and where they could do better (average ratings = 4.2 vs. 3.8), gave them a chance to talk with their supervisor (average ratings = 4.7 vs. 4.0), that they discussed what the goals should be in coming months (average ratings = 4.1 vs. 3.3), and talked about ways they might develop further in their job or career (average ratings = 3.5 vs. 2.8). They were also somewhat more likely to say that they liked the form that was used (average ratings = 3.7 vs. 3.3).

Even more interesting is the fact that staff who received two or more written appraisals had a more positive opinion about the kind of day-to-day supervision they receive. Compared to staff who received no appraisal during the previous year, staff who received two or more appraisals were somewhat more likely to agree that they receive regular feedback (average ratings = 4.8 vs. 4.4), that their supervisor evaluates their performance fairly (average ratings = 4.7 vs. 4.2), that their supervisor knows and understands the problems they face in their job (average ratings = 4.4 vs. 4.0), talks with them before making important decisions about their work (average ratings = 4.4 vs. 4.0), and deals fairly with staff complaints (average ratings = 4.6 vs. 4.1). They were also somewhat more likely to agree that they feel comfortable talking to their supervisor about work problems (average ratings = 4.7 vs. 4.3), and somewhat less likely to agree that their supervisor needs more training (average ratings = 3.3 vs. 3.7). The opinions of staff who had received a single appraisal tended to fall in between.

Overall, this pattern of findings is consistent with the research literature on performance appraisal, which indicates that supervisors tend to underestimate how important communication is to their staff (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984). It also raises the possibility that supervisors who are initially required to conduct frequent appraisals may later choose to do so voluntarily because of its apparent positive effects on the supervisory relationship.

Thinking About Leaving versus Planning to Stay

There was no difference in the number of written apraisals that staff who are thinking about leaving and staff who are planning to stay said they received in the previous twelve months.

When asked how often their supervisor should do a written evaluation, however, 46% of those who are thinking about leaving recommended two or more appraisals per year compared to 34% of those who are planning to stay. This was consistent with the fact that staff who are thinking about leaving had mixed opinions about the guidance and feedback they receive day-to-day (see first part of section VII) and with the fact that communication is more important to staff than supervisors generally realize (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984).

Despite their greater support for frequent appraisals, those who had received at least one appraisal in the previous year had mixed to negative opinions about their most recent appraisal, as can be seen in Table 17 on the next page. Compared to staff who are planning to stay, staff who are thinking about leaving were somewhat less likely to agree that the ratings of other staff in their department or division were fair, that their most recent appraisal gave them a good idea of their strengths and where they could do better, that they had discussed what their goals should be in the coming months, and that they had talked with their supervisor about ways they might develop further in their job or career.

Table 17. Differences of Opinion About Most Recent Appraisal[a]
Staff Thinking About Leaving vs. Planning to Stay

	MAY LEAVE	PLAN TO STAY
Based on what I know, I believe the ratings of other staff in my department/division were fair.	3.6	4.3
It gave me a good idea of my strengths and where I could do better.	3.5	4.0
We discussed what my goals should be in the coming months.	3.1	3.6
In general, I liked the form.	3.1	3.6
We talked about ways I might develop further in my job or career.	2.6	3.2

[a]Only differences of at least .5 on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) are reported.

Staff who are thinking about leaving were also somewhat less likely to agree that they liked the form than staff who plan to stay. The fact that there was no objective difference between the "leave" and "stay" groups in the mix of forms that had been used supports the consensus of the research literature that the form is the least important part of a performance appraisal program (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984). It also suggests that shortcomings in the performance appraisal process tend to be attributed to the form rather than to the supervisor who uses it. This should be taken into account when evaluating the success of any new performance appraisal program.

Academic Units Compared to Support Units

There were no meaningful differences in the number of appraisals that staff in academic units and support units received in the previous year, nor in the number of written evaluations they thought their supervisor should do.

Staff in academic units who had received an appraisal in the previous twelve months, however, were somewhat less likely than staff in support units to agree that they had discussed what their goals should be (average ratings = 3.3 vs. 3.8, respectively).

Occupational Comparisons

Service/Maintenance staff were far less likely to have had a written performance appraisal during the previous twelve months than staff campus-wide (35% of Service/Maintenance staff vs. 68% campus-wide; 73% of Clerical/Office staff, 79% of Professional staff, and 68% of Supervisory staff said they had received at least one appraisal). Surprisingly, however, half of the Maintenance/Service staff who did receive an appraisal said they received three or more during that period.

When asked how often they thought their supervisor should do a written evaluation, 51% of the Service/Maintenance staff recommended two or more appraisals per year while only 38% of staff campus-wide made that recommendation (43% of Clerical/Office staff, 30% of Professional staff, and 31% of Supervisory staff recommended two or more appraisals per year).

Seniority Comparisons

There were no meaningful differences in the number of appraisals that staff in the different seniority groups said they had received during the previous twelve months.

When asked how often their supervisor should do a written evaluation, however, 53% of Newer staff recommended two or more times per year, while only 33% of Mid-Senior staff and 26% of Senior staff made that recommendation. The greater interest of the Newer staff in written evaluations underscores the value staff place on performance appraisal as a communication tool.

Comparisons Among Salary Groups

There were no differences in the number of written appraisals that staff in the four salary groups said they had received during the previous twelve months. When asked how often their supervisor should do a written evaluation, however, 53% of staff in Salary Group I recommended two or more appraisals per year, while only 29--33% of those in Salary Groups II--IV made this recommendation. The greater interest in frequent appraisals on the part of the lowest paid staff may be related to the fact that they were also the least senior staff, on average (see seniority differences above).

There were no differences in the mix of forms that had been used with those who had received an appraisal. Nevertheless, staff in Salary Group I were somewhat more likely than staff in Salary Groups II--IV to agree that their most recent appraisal gave them a good idea of their strengths and where they could do better (average ratings = 4.2, 3.8, 3.7, and 3.8, respectively). They were also somewhat more likely to agree it gave them a chance to talk with their supervisor about their job (average ratings = 4.5, 4.0, 4.0, and 4.1).

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no meaningful differences between staff in non-exempt and exempt jobs, female and male staff, or minority and non-minority staff in the number of appraisals received, the number of appraisals staff they thought their supervisor should do, the mix of forms used with those who received an appraisal, or in opinions about the process and outcome of their most recent appraisal (where this applied).

VI. RELATIONS WITH CO-WORKERS

Good relations with co-workers was very or extremely important to 91% of Twin Cities staff, and staff were highly satisfied with their present co-worker relationships. A few additional survey items indicated why.

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

As can be seen in Table 18, over half of the Twin Cities staff mostly or strongly agreed that their co-workers help them out when they need it, work together as a team, and try to improve how things are done (altogether, more than 80% agreed with these statements to some degree).

Only 31% mostly or strongly agreed, however, that their co-workers have high morale (altogether, only half the staff agreed with this statement to some degree). This was consistent with the fact that one out of four staff are thinking about leaving the University in the next twelve months.

Table 18. Relations With Co-Workers
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	DISAGREE[b]			AGREE[b]		
		Strongly	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Strongly
My co-workers ...							
... *help me out when I need it.*	4.5	2 %	3 %	8 %	29 %	40 %	18 %
... *work together as a team.*	4.4	3	6	11	28	35	17
... *try to improve how things are done.*	4.3	4	5	12	28	36	15
... *have high morale (a positive attitude towards their job).*	3.6	12	11	21	25	23	8

[a] On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) ordered from high to low within each section.

[b] Percent of staff expressing each opinion (*n* = 824 per item).

Comparison with Other Campuses

There were no differences of opinion among staff on the five campuses regarding their co-worker relationships or their co-workers' morale.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Thinking About Leaving versus Planning to Stay

Staff who are thinking about leaving were far less likely to agree that their co-workers have high morale than staff who plan to stay (average ratings = 3.0 vs. 3.8, respectively).

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no meaningful differences of opinion between staff in academic and support units, staff in non-exempt and exempt jobs, staff in different occupational groups, female and male staff, minority and non-minority staff, staff in the three seniority groups, or staff in the four salary groups.

VII. JOB SECURITY

Job security was very or extremely important to 84% of Twin Cities staff, and staff were very satisfied with their job security at the time of the survey.

One additional survey item touched on job security. <u>Only 10% of staff mostly or strongly agreed that they might be laid off if there were staffing cutbacks, while 42% mostly or strongly disagreed</u> (altogether, one-third agreed with this statement to some degree while two-thirds disagreed).

It should be noted that staff opinions may have changed since the survey was conducted in Spring 1989. Shortly thereafter the administration announced that a 2% budgetary reallocation within colleges and support units would be necessary to help fund the 1989-90 pay plan. While a reallocation does not necessarily mean layoffs, some units may have found it harder than others to find alternatives (for example, leaving vacant positions unfilled or using recurring funds from a supplies budget).

VIII. USE ABILITIES, HAVE RESPONSIBILITY, LEARN SKILLS

The opportunity to use their abilities was very or extremely important to 93% of staff, the opportunity to learn new skills was very or extremely important to 87% of staff, and the opportunity to have more responsibility was very or extremely important to 74% of staff. Staff were moderately satisfied with their current opportunities in all three areas.

It should be noted that satisfaction with the opportunity to use one's abilities, with the opportunity to learn new skills, and with the opportunity to have more responsibility were highly interrelated (statistical correlations among the three were .73--.75 out of 1.00, p's < .001). Satisfaction with each of these job aspect was somewhat related, in turn, to satisfaction with the opportunity for promotion (statistical correlations were .44--.51 out of 1.00, p's < .001).

The fact that staff opinions of the three personal job aspects were more strongly related to each other than to satisfaction with the opportunity for promotion suggests that supervisors might improve staff satisfaction by encouraging or allowing staff to use more of their abilities, to learn new skills, and to have more responsibility in their present job. Encouraging development on the job would be especially appropriate if a staff member's opportunities for promotion are limited for one reason or another (e.g., few vacancies in higher-level job classes). Supervisors need to be mindful of the fact, however, that significant increases in responsibility will lead to a reclassification of the staff member's position into a higher-paid job class, with an associated promotional salary increase for the incumbent.

See the following sections for survey information related to the opportunity to use one's abilities, learn new skills, and have more responsibility: Section IV (regarding staff satisfaction with Regents scholarship program and their interest in a reduced tuition program), section V (regarding supervisors' willingness to allow their staff to attend workshops, courses, etc.), section XVI (regarding their opinion of program proposals related to career development and development on the job).

IX. RECOGNITION

Recognition was very or extremely important to 85% of Twin Cities staff. Only 42% of staff, however, were mostly or very satisfied with the level of recognition they receive for doing their work well. This section discusses staff opinions of some recognition programs that might be implemented to address this issue.

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

Staff expressed moderate to strong support for the five proposed recognition programs in the survey, as can be seen in Table 19 below.

Table 19. Recognition
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	WOULD NOT HELP[b]			WOULD HELP[b]		
		Definite.	Prob.	Possibly	Possibly	Prob.	Definite.
A merit pay program based on performance appraisals that are fair.	4.8	5 %	4 %	3 %	18 %	32 %	38 %
Lump sum bonuses for good performance.	4.7	4	5	5	25	29	32
Special awards program for ...							
... consistently good service/teamwork.	4.5	2	6	4	32	36	20
... suggesting changes that save time, save money, or improve output.	4.5	2	5	5	32	37	19
... years of service.	4.0	5	13	9	34	25	14

[a] On a scale from 1 (definitely would not help) to 6 (definitely would help), ordered from high to low.

[b] Percent of respondents expressing each opinion (n = 805--813 per item).

The strongest support was for merit pay and bonus programs: 70% of staff said a merit pay program based on performance appraisals that are fair would probably or definitely help improve communication, efficiency, or staff satisfaction (altogether, 88% said it was at least possible it would help); 61% of staff said lump sum bonuses for good performance would probably or definitely help (altogether, 86% thought it was at least possible they would help).

It is important to note that support for the merit pay program was based on the assumption that the performance appraisals would be "fair". While two-thirds of the staff who had received an appraisal in the previous year mostly or strongly agreed that their own ratings were fair, only half mostly or strongly agreed that the ratings of other staff in their department were fair (see Performance Appraisal in section V). While positive, it would seem that an even larger proportion of staff would need to have confidence in the fairness of the ratings on which merit decisions are based in order for merit-based pay to serve as an effective incentive and reward.

It should also be noted that the actual level of support for a merit pay program may vary from year to year depending on the level of funding for pay raises (see Policies for Distributing Pay Raises in section XI). The level of support expressed for a lump-sum bonus program indicates that bonuses may be a meaningful way to maintain the principle of merit pay in those years when the funding for pay raises is low.

Aside from merit pay and bonuses, there was moderate to strong support for three special awards programs: 56% of staff thought that special awards for giving consistently good service or teamwork would probably or definitely help improve communication, efficiency, or staff satisfaction, and 56% also thought that special awards for suggesting changes that save time, save money, or improve output would probably or definitely help (altogether, 88% of staff thought it was at least possible these two awards programs would help). Finally, 39% of staff thought a special awards program for years of service would probably or definitely help (altogether, 73% of staff thought it was at least possible that such a program would help).

Comparison with Other Campuses

There were no meaningful differences of opinion with staff on the other four campuses.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Thinking About Leaving versus Planning to Stay

Staff who are thinking about leaving were somewhat less likely to agree that a special awards program for years of service would help than those who plan to stay (average ratings = 3.7 vs. 4.2, respectively). Although staff who are thinking about leaving had less seniority, it was not so little that it might account for this difference of opinion (averages = 7.1 years vs. 9.2 years at the University, respectively).

Occupational Comparisons

Service/Maintenance staff were somewhat less likely than staff campus-wide to say that a merit pay program based on fair performance appraisals would help improve efficiency or staff satisfaction (average ratings = 4.2 vs. 4.8 campus-wide).

Minority Compared to Non-Minority Staff

Minority staff were somewhat more likely than non-minority staff to say that a special awards program for years of service would help improve efficiency or staff satisfaction (average rating = 4.6 vs. 4.0, respectively).

Seniority Comparisons

The Newer and Mid-Senior staff were somewhat less likely than the Senior staff to say that a special awards program for years of service would help (average ratings = 3.9, 3.8 and 4.4, respectively).

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no meaningful differences of opinion between staff in academic and support units, staff in non-exempt and exempt jobs, female and male staff, or staff in the four salary groups regarding any of these recognition programs.

X. PERCEPTIONS OF SALARY

Salary was very or extremely important to 93% of Twin Cities staff. Satisfaction with salary was mixed, however, with roughly 60% of staff saying they were satisfied to some degree and 40% saying they were dissatisfied.

The following questions regarding staff perceptions of how well they are paid in relation to people outside the University provided some insight into the reasons behind staff concerns. The reader should bear in mind that staff were asked to base their judgments on their experience or general impressions, since early testing indicated few staff would feel comfortable expressing an opinion otherwise.

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

Overall, Twin Cities staff had a negative view of how well they are paid in relation to people outside the University, as can be seen in Table 20 below.

Table 20. Perceptions of Salary
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	DISAGREE[b]			AGREE[b]		
		Strongly	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Strongly
I think I am paid the same or more than most people at the State who have similar responsibilities and experience.	2.5	28 %	24 %	24 %	17 %	6 %	1 %
I think I am paid the same or more than most people at local companies who have similar responsibilities and experience.	2.6	30	22	18	20	7	3
I think my total compensation package (salary + benefits) is the same or better than what most people at local companies with similar resp. and experience receive.	3.4	14	15	20	28	17	6

[a] On a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

[b] Percent of staff expressing each opinion (*n* = 809--817 per item).

Staff had very negative opinions about how they are paid relative to people at the State and relative to people in local companies. Less than 10% mostly or strongly agreed that they are paid the same or more than people at the State or people at local companies who have similar responsibilities and experience, while 52% mostly or strongly disagreed (altogether, only one-third agreed to some degree that they are paid the same or more, while two-thirds disagreed to some degree).

Staff had mixed opinions, however, about their total compensation package (salary plus benefits): 23% mostly or strongly agreed that their total compensation is the same or better than what people at local companies with similar responsibilities and experience receive, while 29% mostly or strongly disagreed (altogether, half agreed to some degree that their total compensation was the same or better, while half disagreed to some degree). By inference, the substantial improvement in perceptions when benefits were taken into account means that most staff believe the University offers better benefits overall than companies in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. It also underscores the importance of benefits to staff.

Comparison with Other Campuses

Twin Cities staff had more negative perceptions of how well they are paid relative to others outside the University than staff on other campuses, as can be seen in Table 21 below.

Table 21. Differences in Perceptions of Salary
Twin Cities Compared to Other Campuses[a]

	TWIN CITIES		DULUTH	MORRIS	CRKSTON	WASECA
I think I am paid the same or more than most people at the State who have similar resp. and experience.	2.5	<	3.0	3.2	3.5	3.3
I think I am paid the same or more than most people at local companies who have similar resp. and experience.	2.6	<	3.4	4.0	4.0	3.8
I think my total compensation package (salary + benefits) is the same or better than what most people at local co. with similar resp. & exper. receive.	3.4	<	3.9	4.5	4.5	4.5

[a] On all items, the opinions of Twin Cities staff differed from the opinions of staff on all other campuses by at least .5 on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

Although Twin Cities staff had the most negative perceptions of their salary relative to what the State pays, staff on the other four campuses also had negative perceptions in this regards. Only 7% of Twin Cities staff, 16% of Duluth staff, 18% of Morris staff, 23% of Crookston staff, and 13% of Waseca staff mostly or strongly agreed that they are paid the · same or more than people at the State who have similar responsibilities and experience.

Staff on the other four campuses had less negative or even positive perceptions, however, of their salary relative to what local companies offer. Only 10% of Twin Cities staff mostly or strongly agreed that they are paid the same or more than people at local companies who have similar responsibilities and experience, compared to 27% of Duluth staff, 42% of Morris staff, 43% of Crookston staff, and 29% of Waseca staff. This is consistent with the fact that outstate companies tend to offer lower salaries than their counterparts in the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

<u>Perceptions were more positive on every campus when benefits were taken into account</u>: 22% of Twin Cities staff, 35% of Duluth staff, 61% of Morris staff, 56% of Crookston staff, and 43% of Waseca staff mostly or strongly agreed that their total compensation package (salary plus benefits) is the same or better than what people at local companies with similar responsibilities and experience receive. <u>In other words, Twin Cities staff had mixed perceptions of their total compensation relative to what local companies offer, while staff on all other campuses had somewhat positive to moderately positive perceptions of their total compensation package</u>.

The fact that the biggest improvement in perceptions was among Twin Cities staff, who were the least satisfied with their salaries, indicates that benefits may play a critical role in retaining Twin Cities staff. It also suggests that both salary and benefits should be taken into account when making comparisons with the marketplace.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Thinking About Leaving versus Planning to Stay

As can be seen in Table 22 below, <u>staff who are thinking about leaving the University had a somewhat more negative perception of how well they are paid relative to people at the State and people at local companies than staff who plan to stay</u>.

Table 22. Differences in Perceptions of Salary
Staff Thinking About Leaving vs. Planning to Stay[a]

	MAY LEAVE	PLAN TO STAY
I think I am paid the same or more than most people at the State who have similar resp. and experience.	2.2	2.7
I think I am paid the same or more than most people at local companies who have similar resp. and experience.	2.1	2.8
I think my total compensation package (salary + benefits) is the same or better than what most people at local co. with similar resp. & exper. receive.	2.8	3.6

[a]Differences were at least .5 on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

<u>Taking benefits into account substantially improved the perceptions of both groups, although it did not eliminate their concerns</u>. Staff who plan to stay now had mixed perceptions of their total compensation, while staff who are thinking about leaving merely had a less negative perception than before.

Non-Exempt Jobs Compared to Exempt Jobs

Staff in non-exempt jobs had a somewhat less negative perception of how well they are paid relative to people at local companies than staff in exempt jobs (average ratings = 2.9 vs. 2.2, respectively). This was not due to differences in actual salary, since staff in non-exempt jobs earn substantially less than staff in exempt jobs, on the average. It may be related to the implementation of pay equity, however, since the majority of female-dominated jobs at the University are both non-exempt and receiving pay equity increases.

Once again, taking benefits into account substantially improved the perceptions of both groups. Staff in non-exempt jobs now had a mixed perception of their total compensation relative to what people at local companies receive, while staff in exempt jobs merely had a less negative perception than before (average ratings = 3.6 vs. 3.0, respectively).

Occupational Comparisons

As can be seen in Table 23 below, Professional staff had far more negative perceptions of their salary and total compensation relative to what people at local companies receive than staff campus-wide, although they had similar perceptions of how well they are paid relative to people at the State.

Table 23. Differences in Perceptions of Salary
Occupational Comparisons[*]

	Campus-wide	Service Maint.	Clerical Office	Profes-sional	Super-visory
I think I am paid the same or more than most people at the State who have similar resp. and experience.	(2.5)	3.1	2.4	2.2	2.5
I think I am paid the same or more than most people at local companies who have similar resp. and experience.	(2.6)	3.3	2.9	1.8	2.5
I think my total compensation package (salary + benefits) is the same or better than what most people at local co. with similar resp. & exper. receive.	(3.4)	4.1	3.7	2.7	3.3

[*] The opinions of an occupational group differed from the opinions of staff campus-wide on all items by at least .5 on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

Service/Maintenance staff, on the other hand, had far less negative perceptions of how well they are paid relative to people at the State and people at local companies than staff campus-wide.

Taking benefits into account substantially improved the perceptions of all four occupational groups to approximately the same degree, although the end result was different. Service/Maintenance staff had a moderately positive perception of their total compensation package relative to what people at local companies receive, while Clerical/Office and Supervisory staff had mixed perceptions and Professional staff had moderately negative perceptions in this regards.

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no meaningful differences in the perceptions of staff in academic and support units, female and male staff, minority and non-minority staff, staff in the three seniority groups, or staff in the four salary groups.

XI. PAY RAISES

The size of pay raises was very or extremely important to 82% of Twin Cities staff. Staff were dissatisfied, however, with the size of their raises. Altogether, only 25% of staff were satisfied to some degree while three-quarters of staff were dissatisfied to some degree. This made pay raises one of the two priorities for action.

This section provides information about staff opinions on policy issues that deal with pay raises. It is divided into two parts, one regarding policies for distributing pay raises and the other regarding other pay raise issues.

POLICIES FOR DISTRIBUTING PAY RAISES

Although the fundamental problem is one of funding, policies for distributing pay raises when funding is low may either help minimize or further aggravate staff concerns. It should be emphasized that staff were asked for an opinion about what general policy they would endorse under different kinds of conditions, not what specific policy they would endorse for the current fiscal year under current conditions. A short survey on the 1989-90 pay plan, conducted by the Civil Service Committee, underscored the importance of this distinction, as will be noted shortly.

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

It is common practice in opinion surveys to ask staff which of several distribution policies they would prefer to see implemented as a general policy (for example, giving raises across-the-board). Early input from University staff, however, indicated that opinions might vary depending on the size of the general raise relative to the increase in the cost of living. In order to determine the extent to which this influenced staff opinions, the pay raise questions in this survey were designed to take the cost-of-living factor into account.

Staff were told that in any given year the state legislature might approve a general salary increase that was less than, more than, or the same as the increase in the cost of living. They were then asked which of four policies for distributing pay raises they would prefer under each condition:

ATB	Give each person the general raise (across the board).
Merit	Give each person a raise based on how well s/he performed.
ATB + merit	A smaller across-the-board raise, plus an extra raise based on merit.
ATB + step	A smaller across-the-board raise, plus a step increase based on seniority.

For the condition where the general raise was more than the cost-of-living, the last two policy options were reworded to refer to a "cost-of-living raise plus an extra raise based on merit" (COLA + merit) and "a cost-of-living raise plus a step increase based on seniority" (COLA + step). The change was made because it seemed unlikely that staff would support a base raise that was smaller than the increase in the cost of living under these circumstances.

Opinions did in fact change as the size of the general raise increased relative to the increase in the cost of living. The results are shown in Table 24 below.

Table 24. Policies for Distributing Pay Raises[a]
Twin Cities Campus

	ATB	ATB + MERIT	MERIT	ATB + STEP
What do you think your college or department should do when the general raise (say 3.0 %) is LESS than the cost of living?	58 %	23 %	11 %	8 %
What do you think your college or department should do when the general raise (say 5.0 %) is about the SAME as the cost of living?	51	30	12	7
What do you think your college or department should do when the general raise (say 7.0 %) is MORE than the cost of living?	24	54	11	11

[a] Percent of staff preferring each policy (*n* = 818).

When the general raise is LESS than the increase in the cost of living, 58% of staff would prefer the ATB policy. Another 23% would prefer the ATB-plus-merit policy. Only 11% would prefer a pure merit policy and only 8% would prefer the ATB-plus-step policy.

When the general raise is about the SAME as the increase in the cost of living, 51% would still prefer the ATB policy. Another 30% would prefer the ATB-plus-merit policy. Similar to before, only 12% would prefer a pure merit pay policy and only 7% would prefer an ATB-plus-step policy.

When the general raise is MORE than the increase in the cost of living, however, 54% would now prefer the COLA-plus-merit policy. Only 24% still recommend the straight ATB policy. Similar to before, no more than 11% prefer either the pure merit or ATB-plus-step increase policies.

In sum, the majority of staff would prefer an across-the-board policy when the general raise is less than, or about the same as, the increase in the cost of living. The majority would prefer a COLA-plus-merit policy, however, when the general raise is more than the increase in the cost of living. There was very little support for either the pure merit pay policy or the seniority-based increase under any cost-of-living condition.

The general shift from an across-the-board policy towards an across-the-board-plus-merit policy seems even stronger when one takes into account the small group of staff who supported the pure merit policy. Over 40% of staff supported some form of merit pay (pure merit or ATB-plus-merit) when the general raise was less than, or about the same as, the increase in the cost of living. That figure increased to 65% of staff when the general raise was greater than the increase in the cost of living.

The fact that opinions shifted from a preference for across-the-board raises towards a preference for across-the-board-plus-merit raises suggests two important things.

First, it appears that the size of the general raise is not as important as the size of the general raise relative to the recent increase in the cost of living. In other words, a 7% general raise may be perceived as generous or insufficient depending on whether the cost of living has increased by more or less than that amount (it has done both in the past decade). If valid, this inference suggests that the recent increase in the cost of living should be a major consideration when determining the size of the general raise for any given year.

Second, staff apparently believe the priority in distributing the available raise should be to keep their salaries even with increases in the cost-of-living, or as close to even as possible. Keep in mind that the level of support they expressed for merit pay as an abstract concept (see section IX) was not matched here except in the context of pay raises that were greater than the cost of living. Even then, five times as many staff preferred the cost-of-living-plus-merit policy as preferred the pure merit policy alone. This suggests that colleges and support units who wish to institute or maintain a merit pay program consider giving across-the-board raises supplemented by lump-sum bonuses in years when the funding for pay raises does not permit the COLA-plus-merit option (see section IX regarding support for a bonus program).

Staff opinions on issues that must be considered when determining the final size of the general raise, such as how to handle increases in the cost of benefits and whether to withstand a reallocation of funds in order to improve upon the State's allocation, can be found in section II and the part of this section dealing with other pay raise issues.

Comparison with Other Campuses

The same or even greater proportion of staff on the other four campuses preferred the ATB option when the general raise was less than, or about the same as, the increase in the cost of living.

A quarter or more of the staff on every campus shifted to the COLA-plus-merit option when the general raise was more than the increase in the cost of living. Only on the Twin Cities campus, however, was this option preferred by the majority of staff. Whereas twice as many Twin Cities staff preferred the COLA-plus-merit option to the ATB option, there was a nearly even split between these two options on the other four campuses.

The pure merit option, and the ATB-plus-step increase option, received little support on any campus (only 7--15% of the staff on any campus supported pure merit pay under any cost-of-living condition, and only 3--16% of staff on any campus supported the ATB-plus-step increase option under any condition).

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Academic Units Compared to Support Units

There was no difference of opinion when the general raise was less than, or about the same as, the increase in the cost of living.

Staff in academic units showed a bigger shift towards the COLA-plus-merit policy, however, when the general raise went from being the same as to being more than the increase in the cost of living. In academic units, 59% of the staff preferred the COLA-plus-merit option while only 19% preferred straight ATB. By contrast, 46% of staff in support units preferred the COLA-plus-merit option while 32% still preferred straight ATB. This difference of opinion may be a reflection of the fact that Service/Maintenance staff, who work almost exclusively in support units, had very different opinions from other occupational groups (see occupational comparisons below).

Neither group supported the pure merit or the ATB-plus-step increase policies (only 5--11% of staff in either group chose these options under any cost-of-living condition).

Non-exempt Jobs Compared to Exempt Jobs

There was no difference of opinion when the general raise was less than, or about the same as, the increase in the cost of living cost of living.

Staff in non-exempt jobs showed a smaller shift towards the COLA-plus-merit option, however, when the general raise was more than the increase in the cost of living: 45% of staff in non-exempt jobs preferred the COLA-plus-merit policy while 34% still preferred the straight ATB policy. By contrast, 65% of the staff in exempt jobs preferred the COLA-plus-merit policy and only 12% still preferred the ATB policy.
This difference of opinion may also be a reflection of occupational differences of opinion, since all of the Service/Maintenance and Clerical/Office jobs held non-exempt jobs, while all of the Professional and more than half of the Supervisory staff held exempt jobs.

Neither group supported the pure merit or ATB-plus-step policies (only 6--11% of staff in either group chose these options under any cost-of-living condition).

Occupational Comparisons

Over 60% of Service/Maintenance staff preferred the ATB policy under all three cost-of-living conditions while staff in the other occupational groups shifted heavily towards the ATB-plus-merit policy as the size of the general raise increased. The specific results for each occupational group are shown in Table 25 on the next page.

The Clerical/Office staff's shift towards the ATB-plus-merit policy was substantial, but not as dramatic as the shifts made by the Professional and Supervisory staff. In the end, half of the Clerical/Office staff, compared to roughly two-thirds of the Professional and Supervisory staff, said they would prefer the COLA-plus-merit policy when the general raise is more than the increase in the cost of living.

Table 25. Differences of Opinion About Policies for Distributing Pay Raises[a]
Occupational Comparisons

What policy when the general raise is ...	ATB	ATB + MERIT	MERIT	ATB + STEP
... *LESS* than the cost of living?				
Service/Maintenance staff	69 %	11 %	10 %	10 %
Clerical/Office staff	55	24	12	9
Professional staff	62	23	11	4
Supervisory staff	60	24	9	7
... *about the SAME as the cost of living?*				
Service/Maintenance staff	77 %	12 %	6 %	5 %
Clerical/Office staff	52	26	13	9
Professional staff	49	32	13	6
Supervisory staff	43	39	9	9
... *MORE* than the cost of living?				
Service/Maintenance staff	63 %	21 %	8 %	8 %
Clerical/Office staff	28	52	10	10
Professional staff	12	65	15	8
Supervisory staff	12	67	9	12

[a] Percent of staff preferring each policy (n = 99 Service/Maintenance staff, 222 Clerical/Office staff, 158 Professional staff, and 188 Supervisory staff).

Once again, there was little support for the pure merit or ATB-plus-step increase policies in any occupational group under any cost-of-living condition.

Female Compared to Male Staff

Female staff were somewhat more likely than male staff to prefer the COLA-plus-merit policy when the general raise was more than the increase in the cost of living (57% vs. 48%, respectively). In other words, they showed a somewhat greater shift away from the ATB policy than male staff.

Seniority Comparisons

Newer staff were somewhat more likely than Mid-Senior and Senior staff to prefer the pure merit policy under all cost-of-living conditions, although it was not a popular choice even for them (for example, 17% of Newer staff, 9% of Mid-Senior staff, and 8% of Senior staff preferred that option when the general raise was greater than the increase in the cost of living).

Senior staff were somewhat more likely to prefer the ATB-plus-step increase under all cost-of-living conditions, although it was not a popular choice for them either (for example, 4% of Newer staff, 10% of Mid-Senior staff, and 19% of Senior staff preferred that option when the general raise was more than the increase in the cost of living).

Comparisons Among Salary Groups

Staff in Salary Group IV showed a much greater shift towards the ATB-plus-merit policy as the size of the general raise increased than did staff in the lower paid salary groups. Staff in Salary Groups I--III, went from roughly 22% to 27% to 52% who preferred the ATB-plus-merit policy as the size of the general raise increased. Staff in salary Group IV, on the other hand, went from 22% to 46% to 66% who preferred the ATB-plus-merit option as the size of the general raise increased.

It should be noted that Salary Group IV is composed almost entirely of professional and supervisory staff who hold exempt jobs, so it should not be surprising that their opinions are similar to those reported earlier for staff in these occupational groups.

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no differences of opinion between minority and non-minority staff under any of the three cost-of-living conditions. While staff who are thinking about leaving were even less satisfied with the size of their pay raises then staff who plan to stay (see section II), they had similar opinions about how the available raise should be distributed.

OTHER PAY RAISE ISSUES

This section discusses other issues that may influence policy decisions on how to determine and distribute pay raises.

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

Staff opinions on four other issues regarding how pay raises are shown in Table 26 below.

Table 26. Other Pay Raise Issues
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	DISAGREE[b]			AGREE[b]		
		Strongly	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Strongly
I might be laid off if there are staffing cutbacks at the 'U'.	2.9[c]	18 %	24 %	23 %	25 %	5 %	5 %
I wouldn't care about moving up in my salary range if my annual raises were reasonable.	3.8	10	10	16	31	24	9
'U' staff should always get the same raise as staff at the State, even if staffing cutbacks are needed to pay for it.	3.6	11	13	22	26	15	13
Colleges should be allowed to give raises in different ways (say across-the-board to clerical c.s. staff, and merit for technical c.s. staff).	3.1	27	14	15	23	13	8

[a] On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) ordered from high to low (with one exception).

[b] Percent of staff expressing each opinion (n = 804--812 per item).

[c] A low rating (disagreement with the statement) is positive for this item.

Staff opposed the idea of responding to differences of opinion about how to distribute pay raises by implementing different policies for different groups. Only 21% mostly or strongly agreed that colleges should be allowed to give raises in different ways (say across-the-board to clerical civil service staff and merit for technical civil service staff) while 41% mostly or strongly disagreed with this proposal. (Altogether, 44% supported this proposal to some degree and 56% opposed it to some degree.)

Staff had mixed opinions about whether the University should match the pay raise at the State as a matter of general policy. Only 28% of Twin Cities staff mostly or strongly agreed that they should always get the same raise as staff at the State, even if staffing cutbacks are needed to pay for it, while 24% mostly or strongly disagreed with this proposal (altogether, half supported the proposal to some degree and half opposed it). The mixed reaction was unexpected in light of the salience of this issue was at the time of the survey.

The mixed opinions on matching the State pay plan could not easily be explained by concerns about job security, since only 10% of the staff mostly or strongly agreed they might be laid off if there were staffing cutbacks while 42% mostly or strongly disagreed that their jobs might be at stake (altogether, one-third agreed that there was at least some chance they might be laid off while two-thirds disagreed).

An equally informative question, in light of these results and the results discussed in the first part of this section, would have been whether staff should always receive a raise that at least matches the increase in the cost of living, even if staffing cutbacks are needed to pay for it. The results of a brief Civil Service Committee survey suggest there would have been substantially stronger support for this policy than there was for the policy of matching pay raises at the State: Of the 46% of staff on all campuses who responded to the Civil Service Committee's survey, three-quarters preferred a cost-of-living raise that might require a 4% reallocation of salaries in their unit while less than one-quarter preferred a smaller raise that would require only a 2% reallocation of salaries.

A final item in this survey was intended to clarify the nature of staff concerns about not moving up in the salary range for their job. It was hypothesized that dissatisfaction with the size of pay raises might be at the root of this concern. Staff opinions indicated this was largely, but not entirely, the case. Staff were moderately likely to agree that they would not care about moving up in their salary range if their annual raises were reasonable: 33% of staff mostly or strongly agreed this was true (altogether, 64% agreed at least somewhat with this statement). The minority of staff who mostly or strongly disagreed probably did so because they have seen new staff hired at a similar salary despite their greater experience in the job. Their concerns should be kept in mind when choosing a pay raise distribution policy. Two of the main ways in which staff can move up in the salary range for their position are pay raises based on seniority (a policy staff did not support) and pay raises based on merit (a policy staff supported to varying degrees, depending on the circumstances).

Comparison with Other Campuses

There were no widespread meaningful differences of opinion with staff on the other four campuses.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Occupational Comparisons

Service/Maintenance staff were somewhat less likely than the others to agree that 'U' staff should always get the same raise as staff at the State, even if staffing cutbacks are needed to pay for it (average ratings = 3.2, 3.6, 3.8 and 3.8 for Service/Maintenance, Clerical/Office, Professional and Supervisory staff, respectively). This was consistent with the fact that job security was somewhat more important to Service/Maintenance staff than to staff in the other occupational groups (see section I).

Professional staff were more likely than other staff to agree that colleges should be allowed to give raises in different ways, although even they had mixed opinions on this issue (average ratings = 3.1, 2.8, 3.4 and 2.8 for Service/Maintenance, Clerical/Office, Professional and Supervisory staff, respectively).

Seniority Comparisons

Newer staff were somewhat more likely than Mid-Senior and Senior staff to agree that they might be laid off if there are staffing cutbacks at the 'U', although none of the groups thought this was likely (average ratings = 3.2, 2.8 and 2.7, respectively).

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no meaningful differences of opinion between staff who are thinking about leaving and those who are planning to stay, staff in academic and support units, staff in non-exempt and exempt jobs, female and male staff, minority and non-minority staff, or staff in the four salary groups on any these pay raise issues.

XII. OPPORTUNITY FOR PROMOTION

The opportunity for promotion was very or extremely important to 74% of Twin Cities staff. Staff were moderately dissatisfied, however, with their present opportunities for promotion, making this one of the two priorities for action.

It should be noted that there was a modest relationship between staff satisfaction with the opportunity for promotion and staff satisfaction with salary and the size of pay raises (statistical correlations were .43 and .39 out of 1.00, respectively, p's < .001). This suggests that programs aimed at improving the opportunities for promotion might indirectly help address staff concerns about salary and pay raises as well.

Satisfaction with the opportunity for promotion was also related to satisfaction with the opportunity to learn new skills, to use one's abilities, and to have more responsibility (statistical correlations were .44--.51 out of 1.00, p's < .001). This suggests that programs aimed at improving the opportunities for promotion might also improve satisfaction with these more personal aspects of the job, and vice versa.

There are several ways in which the opportunities for promotion might be improved, from better communication about internal job opportunities to providing assistance in planning and preparing for career development. For information about staff opinions of such proposals, see Section XVI (Personnel Policies and Program Proposals). Also see section V (Benefits Proposals) regarding staff opinions of the proposal for reduced tuition benefits.

Deans and directors might also study the feasibility of instituting policies that allow a flexible work schedule for staff who wish to attend vocational or college courses, or that provide staff who are interested in pursuing a more intensive course of study with the opportunity to work part-time.

Given that nearly 40% of the staff plan to get additional vocational training or a college degree within the next five years, programs and policies that support staff development are likely to be viewed as important additional benefits. As such, they are likely to help colleges and support units recruit and retain well qualified staff.

XIII. FLEXIBLE WORK HOURS, PART-TIME WORK, DAY CARE

Three job aspects were of relatively low importance to staff as a whole: Having flexible work hours, the opportunity to work part-time, and the availability of day care on campus or nearby. The reader should keep in mind, however, that the importance of these job aspects was underestimated to some degree because civil service staff who work less than 30 hours per week were not surveyed.

FLEXIBLE WORK HOURS

On the whole, having flexible work hours was very or extremely important to 51% of staff who work more than 30 per week. Staff were very satisfied with the flexibility they currently have.

Some additional insights were obtained by looking at the issue for staff who had children and for staff who plan to obtain further education.

Having flexible work hours was more important to staff who have children than to staff who do not: 61% of staff with a child under 5 years old (126 out of the 838 respondents) and 67% of staff with an older child (227 out of 838) said that flexible work hours was very or extremely important to them personally, compared to 40% of staff without children (485 out of 838). The fact that flexible work hours was of high importance to a large percentage of staff who do not have children, however, suggests this was not just a parental issue.

Surprisingly, there was little evidence that having flexible work hours was an educational issue either. Flexible hours were no more important to staff who are planning to obtain additional vocational training or a college degree within the next five years than to staff who do not have such plans. Nor was there any difference in satisfaction with the current flexibility of their work hours. These results might have been different had the opinions of staff who work less than 30 hours per week been considered.

OPPORTUNITY TO WORK PART-TIME

On the whole, the opportunity to work part-time was important to only 18% of staff who work 30 hours or more per week. These staff were moderately satisfied with their present opportunity to work part-time.

Once again, some additional insights were obtained by looking at the issue for staff who had children and for staff who plan to obtain further education.

<u>The opportunity to work part-time was somewhat more important to staff who have children than to staff who do not have children, but not greatly so</u> (25% vs. 13% considered it very or extremely important, respectively). There were no differences in the degree of satisfaction with their current opportunities to work part-time.

<u>Surprisingly, this was not an educational issue</u>. The opportunity to work part-time was no more important to staff who plan to obtain additional vocational training or a college degree in the next five years than it was to those who do not have such plans or who are unsure. Nor was there any difference in how satisfied they were with their current opportunities to work part-time.

On the whole, only 14% of staff said having day care available on campus or nearby was very or extremely important to them personally, which was consistent with the fact that only 15% of staff who work more than 30 hours per week have a young child. The one-half of staff campus-wide who indicated their satisfaction with the current availability of day care had mixed opinions.

The issue was understandably more important to the staff who have a young child: 44% of those with a young child said having day care available on campus or nearby was very or extremely important to them. In contrast to staff campus-wide, only 14% of staff with a young child were satisfied with the current availability of day care on campus or nearby (nearly all such staff expressed an opinion).

While this provided information on the value of campus day care to staff at a personal level, another item solicited information about whether staff supported the concept of more having more day care on campus.

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

As can be seen in Table 27 below, Twin Cities staff strongly supported the proposal of providing more day care on campus or nearby: 44% of staff thought having more day care on campus probably or definitely would help improve efficiency or staff satisfaction, even though relatively few of them could expect to benefit personally (altogether, 81% of staff thought it was at least possible it would help).

Table 27. Day Care Proposal
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	WOULD NOT HELP[b]			WOULD HELP[b]		
		Definitely	Prob.	Possibly	Possibly	Prob.	Definitely
More daycare on campus for staff.	4.3	6 %	5 %	8 %	37 %	23 %	21 %

[a] On a scale from 1 (definitely would not help) to 6 (definitely would help).

[b] Percent of staff expressing each opinion (n = 738).

The high level of support for more day care on campus was not simply the result of staff being uncritical of the proposals included in the survey. Other proposals that were relevant to all staff received only moderate support (for example, only 30% of staff thought that regular meetings with their dean or director probably or definitely would help improve efficiency or staff satisfaction, and only 24% thought a newsletter from the personnel department probably or definitely would help).

Comparison with Other Campuses

While 44% of Twin Cities staff thought having more day care on campus probably or definitely would help improve efficiency or staff satisfaction, only 26% of Duluth staff, 22% of Morris staff, 18% of Crookston staff, and 30% of Waseca staff thought this was likely to help on their campuses (average ratings = 4.3, 3.8, 3.7, 3.5 and 3.8 for the five campuses, respectively).

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Occupational Comparisons

Service/Maintenance staff were somewhat less likely than staff campus-wide to think that more day care on campus would help improve efficiency or staff satisfaction (average ratings = 3.8 vs. 4.3, respectively).

Female Compared to Male Staff

Female staff were somewhat more likely than male staff to agree that more day care on campus would help improve efficiency or staff satisfaction (average ratings = 4.5 vs. 3.9). This was despite the fact that half as many female staff had a young child (12% of the women vs. 22% of the men said they have a child younger than five).

Seniority Comparisons

Newer and Mid-Senior staff were somewhat more likely than Senior staff to agree that additional day care on campus would help improve efficiency or staff satisfaction (average ratings = 4.5, 4.4 and 4.0, respectively). This difference of opinion may be related to the fact that more Newer and Mid-Senior than Senior staff said they have a young child (17%, 19% and 9%, respectively).

Comparisons Among Salary Groups

Staff in Salary Groups I and II were somewhat more likely than staff in Groups III and IV to think that having more day care on campus would help (average ratings = 4.5, 4.5, 4.1 and 3.8, respectively). This differences of opinion is probably another reflection of the differences seen in the subgroup comparisons above.

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no meaningful differences of opinion between staff who are thinking about leaving and those who plan to stay, staff in academic and support units, staff in non-exempt and exempt jobs, or minority and non-minority staff.

XIV. DEPARTMENT-LEVEL PRACTICES AND PROPOSALS

Interpretation of opinions in this section should be made with the understanding that there was some confusion over terms. Colleges and other academic units are usually divided into departments. For support units, however, the term "department" often refers to the equivalent of a college (e.g., Personnel Department) and the breakdowns are generally called divisions (e.g., Division of Employee Benefits).

In an effort to clarify equivalencies in academic and support units, survey items always stated "college/similar unit" or "department/division". Nevertheless, staff in support units may well have been thinking about their college-equivalent unit instead when answering questions targeted at the smaller "department/division" level.

STAFFING, COMMUNICATION, WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

Staff opinions on a variety of issues that are relevant at the department/division level are presented in Table 28 on the next page.

<u>Staff opinions about how others in their department or division treat them with regard to their sex, age, and race or ethnic background were highly positive</u>: 75% of staff mostly or strongly agreed they are treated fairly regardless of their race or ethnic background, 72% mostly or strongly agreed they are treated fairly regardless of their age, and 68% mostly or strongly agreed they are treated fairly regardless of their sex (altogether, roughly 90% of staff agreed with these statements to some degree). Opinions of the relevant subgroups were consistent with these campus-wide results (see below).

<u>Staff had mixed opinions about how they are treated by faculty, however</u>: 28% mostly or strongly agreed that, in their experience, faculty treat staff like "second class citizens" while another 28% mostly or strongly disagreed that this was the case (altogether, 56% of staff agreed to some degree). Staff who are supervised by faculty were just as split in their opinions as staff who are supervised by P & A members or other civil service members.

<u>Staff opinions about equipment were very positive</u>: 54% mostly or strongly agreed they have the equipment or technology they need (altogether, 76 agreed to some degree). Nevertheless, 31% mostly or strongly agreed they wanted more training on how to use it (altogether, 63% of staff agreed to some degree).

<u>Staff opinions regarding work assignments were moderately positive</u>: 44% of staff mostly or strongly agreed that work is asssigned fairly to staff (altogether, 70% agreed to some degree) and 35% mostly or strongly agreed there is a spirit of cooperation in their department/division (altogether, 66% agreed to some degree).

Table 28. Department-level Practices and Proposals
Twin Cities Campus

STAFFING AND EQUIPMENT	Average Rating[a]	DISAGREE[b]			AGREE[b]		
		Strongly	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Strongly
I have the eqpmt./technology I need.	4.3	6 %	5 %	13 %	23 %	38 %	16 %
In my department/division ...							
... poor performers are kept on the job too long.	4.0°	5	13	19	25	14	24
... work is assigned fairly to staff.	4.0	7	8	15	26	37	7
... there is a spirit of cooperation.	3.9	7	10	17	31	27	8
... there are enough staff for the amount of work to be done.	3.8	12	10	17	17	32	12
I want more training on how to use the equipment/technology I have.	3.8°	5	13	19	32	18	13
I have too much work to do.	3.7°	5	16	25	29	13	12

COMMUNICATION							
I am aware of an understand the policies and procedures of my department/division.	3.8	7 %	10 %	16 %	33 %	27 %	7 %
My department/division ...							
... keeps me informed about issues that affect how I do my job (such as changes in 'U' procedures).	3.5	12	13	19	29	21	6
... keeps me informed about issues that affect me personally (such as salary plans).	3.4	14	14	21	26	19	6
In my department/division, administrators/managers know and understand staff concerns.	3.3	15	13	23	27	19	3
People communicate openly at all levels in my department/division.	3.1	20	18	19	22	17	4
My dept./div. talks with staff before making decisons that affect them (such as how to give annual raises).	2.8	26	17	25	19	10	4

(continued next page)

Table 28. Department-level Practices and Proposals, continued
Twin Cities Campus

TREATMENT BY OTHERS	Average Rating[a]	DISAGREE[b] Strongly	Mostly	Some.	AGREE[b] Some.	Mostly	Strongly
I believe people in my dept./division treat me fairly ...							
... regardless of my race/ethnic background.	5.0	2 %	1 %	4 %	18 %	43 %	32 %
... regardless of my age.	4.9	2	2	5	19	42	30
... regardless of my sex.	4.8	3	3	7	19	40	28
In my experience, faculty treat staff like "second class citizens."	3.6[c]	10	18	16	28	16	12

PROPOSALS		WOULD NOT HELP[b] Definitely	Prob.	Possibly	WOULD HELP[b] Possibly	Prob.	Definitely
Regular meetings of your work group.	4.5	3 %	5 %	7 %	33 %	30 %	22 %
Ask staff to evaluate their department.	4.5	2	8	6	32	30	22
A department "suggestion form" to get staff ideas.	4.3	4	9	6	36	26	19

[a] On a scale from 1 (strongly disagree/definitely would not help) to 6 (strongly agree/definitely would help) ordered from high to low within sections.

[b] Percent of staff expressing each opinion (*n* = 805--833 per item).

[c] A low rating (disagreement with the statement) is positive for this item.

Opinions about staffing practices were more mixed: 44% of staff mostly or strongly agreed there were enough staff in their department or division for the amount of work to be done, while 22% mostly or strongly disagreed that there were enough staff (altogether, 61% agreed to some degree and 39% disagreed). Consistent with this, 25% of staff mostly or strongly agreed that they personally have too much work to do (altogether, 54% of staff agreed to some degree). More noteworthy is the fact that 38% of staff mostly or strongly agreed that poor performers in their department or division are kept on the job too long (altogether, 63% of staff agreed to some degree).

Opinions regarding communication practices were mixed to moderately negative. One-third of the staff mostly or strongly agreed they are aware of and understand the policies and procedures of their department or division (altogether, 67% agreed to some degree). However, only one-quarter of the staff mostly or strongly agreed that their department or division keeps them informed about issues that affect how they do their job, such as changes in 'U' procedures, or issues that affect them personally, such as salary plans (altogether, only half the staff agreed with these two statements to some degree).

Only 14% of staff mostly or strongly agreed that their department or division talks with staff before making decisions that affect them, such as how to give annual raises (only 33% agreed with this statement to some degree). Finally, only 22% of staff mostly or strongly agreed that administrators and managers in their department know and understand staff concerns (altogether, only half the staff agreed to some degree). Consistent with these views, only 21% mostly or strongly agreed that people communicate openly at all levels in their department or division (only one-third of staff agreed to some degree).

Staff expressed moderate support for three department-level program proposals: 52% thought that regular meetings of their work group probably or definitely would help improve communication, efficiency, or staff satisfaction, 52% also thought that asking staff to evaluate their department probably or definitely would help, and 45% thought that a department "suggestion form" to get staff ideas probably or definitely would help (altogether, over 85% of staff thought it was at least possible these proposals would help).

Comparison with Other Campuses

There was only one widespread meaningful difference of opinion with staff on the other campuses. While 43% of Twin Cities staff and 37% of Duluth staff mostly or strongly agreed that there are enough staff in their department or division for the amount of work to be done, only 28% of Morris staff, 23% of Crookston staff, and 21% of Waseca staff mostly or strongly agreed that this was the case (average ratings = 3.8, 3.6, 3.3, 3.2 and 3.1, respectively).

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Thinking About Leaving versus Planning to Stay

There were numerous differences of opinion, as can be seen in Table 29 on the next page. Staff who are thinking about leaving had more negative opinions about work assignments, staffing practices, communication, and how they are treated by others in their department or division than staff who plan to stay.

Regarding work assignments and staffing practices, staff who are thinking about leaving were somewhat less likely to agree that there are enough staff in their department/division for the amount of work to be done than staff who are planning to stay. They were far less likely to agree that work is assigned fairly to staff or that there is a spirit of cooperation in their department. They were somewhat more likely to agree that poor performers are kept on the job too long.

Regarding communication, staff who are thinking about leaving were somewhat less likely to agree that people communicate openly at all levels in their department/division, that they are kept informed about issues that affect how they do their job, and that their department/division talks with staff before making decisions that affect them (such as how to give annual raises). They were also somewhat less likely to agree that admnistrators and managers know and understand staff concerns.

Table 29. Differences of Opinion About Department-Level Practices
Staff Thinking About Leaving vs. Planning to Stay

	MAY LEAVE	PLAN TO STAY
Staffing and Equipment		
In my department/division ...		
... work is assigned fairly to staff.	3.4	4.2
... there is a spirit of cooperation.	3.3	4.1
... there are enough staff for the amount of work to be done.	3.5	4.0
... poor performers are kept on the job too long.	4.4*	3.9*
... administrators/managers know and understand staff concerns.	2.9	3.6
Communication		
My department/division ...		
... keeps me informed about issues that affect how I do my job (such as changes in 'U' procedures).	3.1	3.7 ,
... talks with staff before making decisions that affect them (such as how to give annual raises).	2.4	3.0
People communicate openly at all levels in my department/division.	2.7	3.3
Treatment by Others		
I believe people in my dept./div. treat me fairly regardless of my age.	4.5	5.1
In my experience, faculty treat staff like "second class citizens".	4.0*	3.4*

Only differences of at least .5 on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) are reported.

* A low rating (disagreement with the statement) is positive for this item.

Regarding their treatment by others, staff who are thinking about leaving were somewhat less likely to agree that people in their department or division treat them fairly regardless of their age, although they were still moderately positive about their treatment. Since staff who are thinking about leaving have less seniority than those who plan to stay (average of 7.1 vs. 9.2 years, respectively), and thus are likely to be younger, it is unlikely that they are being discriminated against in the traditional sense.

<u>Finally, staff who are thinking about leaving were somewhat more likely to agree that, in their experience, faculty treat staff like "second class citizens."</u> The fact that they had to switch to the other side of the rating scale to express their more negative opinion on this issue indicates they gave some thought to the question before expressing an opinion.

Minority Compared to Non-Minority Staff

<u>Minority staff were very likely to agree that people in their department or division treat them fairly regardless of their race or ethnic background, although non-minority staff were even more likely to agree</u> (average ratings = 4.4 vs. 5.0, for minority and non-minority staff, respectively).

Seniority Comparisons

<u>Surprisingly, Newer staff were somewhat more likely than Mid-Senior and Senior staff to agree that people communicate openly at all levels of their department or division</u> (average ratings = 3.4, 2.8 and 3.1, respectively), <u>that they are kept informed about issues that affect how they do their job such as changes in 'U' procedures</u> (average ratings = 3.8, 3.3, 3.4, respectively), <u>and that their department or division talks with staff before making decisions that affect them such as how to give annual raises</u> (average ratings = 3.1, 2.6 and 2.8, respectively). <u>Their opinions were merely mixed, however, rather than moderately negative.</u>

Comparisons Among Salary Groups

There were only two meaningful differences of opinion, both of which were interesting.

First, <u>staff in Salary Group I and IV were somewhat more likely than staff in Salary Groups II and III to agree that administrators/managers in their department know and understand staff concerns</u> (average ratings = 3.5, 3.1, 3.3 and 3.6 for Groups I--IV, respectively). It's important to note, however, that no group expressed a positive opinion on this issue.

<u>Second, agreement that they have too much work to do increased as the salary level increased</u> (average ratings = 3.4, 3.6, 3.7 and 4.0 for Groups I--IV, respectively). In this case, the lower paid staff expressed mixed opinions about having too much work while the higher paid staff were moderately likely to agree this was the case for them.

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no differences of opinion between staff in academic and support units, staff in non-exempt and exempt jobs, staff in the four occupational groups, or between female and male staff on any of the issues (female and male staff were equally likely to agree they are treated fairly regardless of their sex).

SUPPORT FOR SUPERVISORS

This section summarizes the opinions of civil service supervisors' on a few issues that may influence their motivation or ability to effectively manage their staff. Supervisors' views on the other issues covered by the survey, including their opinions about their own supervisors, are discussed in each section under the subgroup heading titled 'occupational comparisons.'

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

The opinions of supervisors regarding some issues that affect how they do their job are shown in Table 30 below.

Table 30. Suppport for Supervisors
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	DISAGREE[b]			AGREE[b]		
		Strongly	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Strongly
Supervising others is an important part of my job.	5.1	2 %	1 %	5 %	14 %	33 %	45 %
My superiors believe supervision is an important part of my job.	4.8	3	2	8	19	36	32
I have the time I need to supervise my staff.	4.1	8	8	11	23	37	12
My department's current performance appraisal form allows me to evaluate my staff fairly.	3.9	11	8	14	28	27	12
I am consulted about policies that affect how I run my work group.	3.9	9	10	16	27	26	12

[a] On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), ordered from high to low within each section.

[b] Percent of respondents expressing each opinion (*n* = 173--184 per item out of 187 supervisors).

Over three-quarters of the 187 respondents who said they were official supervisors of civil service or bargaining unit mostly or strongly agreed that supervising others is an important part of their job (altogether, 92% agreed to some degree). Over two-thirds mostly or strongly agreed that their superiors believe supervision is an important part of their job (altogether, 87% of agreed to some degree). The fact that self-identified supervisors and their superiors generally agreed on the importance of supervisory responsibilities in their job suggests that the vast majority have the necessary motivation to effectively manage their staff.

Self-identified supervisors were moderately likely to have the necessary time and adminstrative support to manage their staff, although there was room for improvement. Half of the self-identified supervisors mostly or strongly agreed they have the time they need to supervise their staff (altogether, 72% agreed to some degree), 38% mostly or strongly agreed that they are consulted about policies that affect how they run their work group (altogether, 65% agreed to some degree), and 39% mostly or strongly agreed that their department's current performance appraisal form allows them to evaluate their staff fairly (altogether, 67% agreed to some degree).

Comparison with Other Campuses

There were no widespread meaningful differences of opinion with self-identified supervisors on the other four campuses.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Thinking About Leaving versus Planning to Stay

Of the 187 self-identified official supervisors, 19% said they are thinking about leaving in the next 12 months while 54% said they plan to stay five years or more (the remainder answered "no" or were unsure). These percentages were roughly the same as observed with the entire Twin Cities sample.

Self-identified supervisors who are thinking about leaving were somewhat less likely than those who plan to stay to agree that they have the time they need to supervise their staff (average ratings = 3.6 and 4.2, respectively, n = 35 vs. 101, p < .05) or that they are consulted about policies that affect how they run their work group (average ratings = 3.5 and 4.1, respectively, p < .05).

Non-exempt Jobs Compared to Exempt Jobs

Self-identified supervisors in non-exempt jobs were somewhat less likely to agree that supervising others is an important part of their job than supervisors in exempt jobs (average ratings = 4.6 and 5.2, respectively, n = 38 vs. 145, p < .001), and that their superiors believe supervision is an important part of their job (average ratings = 4.4 and 4.9, respectively, p < .05). They were also somewhat less likely to agree that they are consulted about policies that affect how they run their work group (average ratings = 3.5 and 4.0, respectively, p < .05). It appears that supervisors in non-exempt jobs may be consulted less frequently because their superiors are less likely to perceive supervision as an important part of their job -- a perception with which they are likely to agree.

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no meaningful differences of opinion between self-identified supervisors in academic and support units (n = 112 and 72, respectively), female and male self-identified supervisors (n = 118 and 69, respectively), minority and non-minority self-identified supervisors (n = 11 and 172, respectively), Newer, Mid-Senior, and Senior self-identified supervisors (n's = 28, 59 and 96, respectively), or Salary Groups I--IV (n's = 16, 45, 47 and 78, respectively). Occupational comparisons did not apply since the supervisory group was the only one included in this analysis. (Measurement error due to small sample sizes does not account for the lack of statistically significant differences, since average ratings for all these subgroups were very similar.)

XV. COLLEGE-LEVEL PROPOSALS

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

There was strong support for one college-level proposal but only moderate to mixed support for three others, as can be seen in Table 31 below.

Table 31. College-level Proposals
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	WOULD NOT HELP[b]			WOULD HELP[b]		
		Definitely	Prob.	Possibly	Possibly	Prob.	Definitely
A Staff Advocate to help staff who have problems with management or other units.	4.5	1 %	3 %	10 %	40 %	28 %	19 %
Staff meetings with your dean or director.	3.8	6	16	12	36	19	12
Staff association in your college/department.	3.7	5	15	16	39	18	7
Staff newsletter for your college/department.	3.6	8	15	16	35	18	8

[a] On a scale from 1 (definitely would not help) to 6 (definitely would help), ordered from high to low.

[b] Percent of respondents expressing each opinion (n = 773--803 per item).

There was strong support for having a Staff Advocate: 47% thought having a Staff Advocate to assist staff who have problems with management or other units probably or definitely would help improve communication, efficiency or satisfaction (altogether, 86% thought it was at least possible this would help).

There was moderate support for the idea of having regular staff meetings with their dean or director: 31% of staff thought that regular meetings probably or definitely would help improve communication, efficiency or staff satisfaction (altogether, two-thirds of staff thought it was at least possible this might help).

Only 25%, however, thought a staff association in their college or department probably or definitely would help (altogether, two-thirds thought it was at least possible it would help) and only 26% thought a staff newsletter for their college or department probably or definitely would help (altogether, 61% thought it was at least possible it would help).

Some of these opinions may have been based on experience, since staff were instructed to mark how helpful these programs actually were if they had already been implemented in their department or division.

Comparison with Other Campuses

There were no widespread meaningful differences of opinion with staff on the other four campuses.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

There were no meaningful differences of opinion among any of the subgroups regarding these college-level proposals.

XVI. PERSONNEL PRACTICES AND PROPOSALS

This section is divided into three parts: Personnel Department services, personnel policies and program proposals, and training needs.

PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT SERVICES

The reader should keep two things in mind when reviewing staff opinions of Personnel Department services. Unlike other survey questions, the number of staff who expressed an opinion varied between 41% and 94%, depending on the service, because few services were relevant to all staff. When reviewing opinions of services such job classification and consulting, it is therefore important to keep in mind that one-quarter to one-half of the staff said they had no idea.

In addition, there was some evidence of a response bias among those who did express an opinion. The more satisfied a respondent was with one service, the more satisfied s/he tended to be with related services, and the less satisfied a respondent was with a service, the less satisfied s/he tended to be with related services. For example, statistical correlations among opinions of the nine employment services ranged from .33 to .68 out of 1.00, correlations among opinions of the four classification services ranged from .43 to .90, and correlations among opinions of the five special services ranged from .48 to .83.

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

Campus-wide opinions of Personnel Services are shown in Table 32 on the next page. As will be noted later when comparing occupational groups, the opinions of supervisors did not differ from the opinions of staff campus-wide, although supervisors and non-supervisors undoubtedly had different reasons for their opinions.

Staff were moderately satisfied with job postings: 40% of staff were mostly or very satisfied with the location of the postings (altogether, two-thirds were satisfied to some degree). In addition, 37% were mostly or very satisfied with the information on the postings (altogether, two-thirds were satisfied to some degree). There was a fairly strong relationship between opinions on these two issues (correlation = .64, $p < .001$).

Staff were also moderately satisfied with the application center: 36% were mostly or very satisfied with its hours (altogether, two-thirds were satisfied to some degree); 31% were mostly or very satisfied with its location (more than half were satisfied to some degree). There was a fairly strong relationship between opinions on these two issues as well (correlation was .60, $p < .001$). In addition, the more satisfied staff were with the location of the application center, the more satisfied they tended to be with the location and content of job postings, and vice versa (correlations were .56 and .53, respectively, p's $< .001$). This may be because the main job posting board is at the central application center.

Table 32. Satisfaction with Personnel Department Services
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	(n out) (of 838)	DISSATISFIED[b]			SATISFIED[b]		
			Very	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Very
Employment								
Location of job postings	3.9	(785)	7 %	7 %	19 %	27 %	31 %	9 %
Information on job postings	3.9	(772)	6	7	19	31	31	6
Hours of application center	3.9	(726)	8	7	17	32	31	5
Location of application center	3.6	(768)	10	11	22	26	24	7
Process of applying for other kinds of jobs.	3.6	(651)	10	10	22	32	23	3
Process of applying for secretarial/clerical jobs.	3.3	(439)	20	10	16	31	20	3
Orientation for new employees.	3.2	(651)	19	13	18	30	16	4
Screening applicants for jobs.	3.1	(675)	18	15	26	28	12	2
Affirmative action/Form 18 process.	3.0	(544)	26	12	21	24	13	4
Job Classification								
Process of classifying jobs with old Job Review Questionnaire (JRQ).	3.0	(400)[c]	19	14	25	30	10	2
Fairness of the classification decision with the JRQ.	3.0	(393)[c]	19	15	26	29	9	2
Fairness of the classification decision with the JEQ.	2.8	(570)	28	16	20	25	9	2
Process of classifying jobs with the Job Evaluation Questionnaire (JEQ).	2.7	(596)	31	18	17	24	8	2
Other Services								
Employee Assistance Program (offers private counseling on personal and work-related problems).	4.2	(346)[c]	5	4	11	37	33	10
Interpreting civil service rules and union contracts.	3.7	(531)	9	9	18	37	24	3
Quality of training programs offered.	3.7	(513)	11	7	19	32	26	5
Consulting on office/work issues.	3.6	(428)	10	9	20	39	18	4
Handling formal grievances by staff.	3.5	(375)[c]	13	11	18	35	19	4

[a] On a scale from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (very satisfied), ordered from high to low within each section.

[b] Percent of staff expressing each opinion (number responding to each item is shown next to average rating).

[c] Less than half of the survey respondents expressed an opinion about this service.

<u>Staff had mixed opinions about the process of applying for jobs</u>. Of those who expressed an opinion, 23% were mostly or very satisfied with the process of applying for secretarial/clerical jobs and 26% were mostly or very satisfied with the process of applying for other kinds of jobs (altogether, more than half were satisfied to some degree with each application process). Again, there was a fairly strong relationship between opinions on these two issues (correlation was .68, $p < .001$). In addition, the more satisfied staff were with the screening of applicants for jobs, the more satisfied they tended to be with the process of applying for secretarial/clerical jobs and other kinds of jobs, and vice versa (correlations were .61 and .62, respectively, p's $< .001$). This may be because the Personnel Department's screening for minimum qualifications determines whether an applicant will be referred to the hiring department for further consideration.

<u>Staff were moderately dissatisfied with two hiring procedures, although the reasons for this were unclear</u>. Only 14% of those who expressed an opinion were mostly or very satisfied with the screening of applicants for jobs, and only 17% were mostly or very satisfied with the affirmative action/Form 18 process (altogether, only 40% were satisfied to some degree with either procedure). It should be noted, however, that only supervisors were expected to answer these questions, and yet more than two-thirds of the survey respondents expressed an opinion. This suggests that two entirely different perspectives were represented: That of the supervisor who does the hiring and that of the non-supervisor who is applying for jobs. As a result, the reasons for staff dissatisfaction with these procedures are unclear (for example, supervisors may be dissatisfied that the Personnel Deparment only screens for minimum qualifications while non-supervisors may be dissatisfied that the Department does any screening at all instead of forwarding all applications to the hiring department). Additional questions would be needed in a future survey to clarify the underlying issues.

<u>Staff were also moderately dissatisfied with the orientation for new employees, at least as they knew it</u>. Only 20% of those who expressed an opinion were mostly or very satisfied with the orientation new employees receive (altogether, half were satisfied to some degree). Earlier in the survey, however, 52% of staff mostly or strongly agreed that they had received the orientation and training they need to do their job (altogether, 79% agreed to some degree -- see Day-to-Day Supervision under section V). The difference of opinion may be due to staff making a distinction between orientation at the department level and University level. <u>If so, their opinions support the Personnel Department's May, 1988, decision to implement a University-wide orientation program for new staff</u>. Evaluations distributed at the end of the two-hour sessions indicate the program has been well received in the 1-1/2 years since it was implemented (for example, the ratings of three orientation sessions conducted in Spring 1989 averaged 7.7 on a nine-point scale).

<u>Staff were moderately dissatisfied with both the old and the new job classification systems, even though the two systems are entirely different</u>. The old Job Review Questionnaire (JRQ) asks supervisors to write a description of the job's responsibilities which the Personnel Department then compares to general descriptions of job classes in order to make a classification decision. The Job Evaluation Questionnaire (JEQ) asks the supervisor to answer a large number of multiple-choice questions about the amount of skill, effort, and responsibility the job requires, which the Personnel Department then scores to get a point total that can be used to make a classification decision (see Beuhring & Erickson, 1985, for details). Unlike the JRQ, the evaluation criteria in the JEQ were selected by staff (Beuhring, in press; Beuhring & Erickson, 1985).

Nevertheless, only 10% of those who expressed an opinion about the JEQ were mostly or very satisfied with its process, and only 11% were mostly or very satisfied with the fairness of the classification decision (altogether, only 35% were satisfied to some degree with either the process or the fairness of the JEQ). It should be noted, however, that many more staff expressed an opinion about the JEQ than are likely to have had experience with it (70% expressed an opinion, and yet it is unlikely that 70% of all staff have had occasion to fill out the JEQ during the three years since it was implemented for position classification purposes).

Opinions about the old JRQ were similar, although in this case less than half of the survey respondents expressed an opinion. Of those who did, only 12% were mostly or very satisfied with the JRQ's process, and only 11% were mostly or very satisfied with the fairness of the classification decision (altogether, only 40% were satisfied to some degree with either the process or the fairness of the old JRQ).

There was a very strong relationship, however, between opinions of process and fairness. For the JEQ, the correlation was .83 out of 1.00; for the old JRQ the correlation was .90. Since roughly 85% of reclassification requests are granted under both systems, it appears opinions of process determine opinions of fairness rather than the other way around. If so, improvements in the JEQ process might improve acceptance of the new system. On the other hand, the fact that staff had similar opinions of both systems, despite the numerous differences between them, suggests staff may never be very satisfied with any process that controls classification decisions, and hence salaries.

Opinions are also unlikely to change as long as staff confuse job reclassification (a promotion and pay raise because of a significant increase in the person's responsibilities) with merit pay (an annual pay raise based on how well the person performed). This confusion was apparent in a variety of staff comments (e.g., "Get rid of the JEQ and make a system of raises based on merit"). A contributing factor may be the failure of supervisors to make a clear distinction between the two processes. A special survey of deans, directors, and department heads cited concerns that "the [JEQ] system is being abused to reclassify positions in an effort to provide increased salaries" (Task Force for the Review of Twin Cities Campus Support and Service Units, 1989, pp. 21).

Staff were moderately satisfied, or had mixed opinions, about the other services that are provided in response to special requests or special circumstances. Although less than half the survey respondents expressed an opinion about the Employee Assistance Program, for example, 43% of those who did have an opinion were mostly or very satisfied with it (altogether, 80% of them were satisfied to some degree).

Of the one-half to two-thirds who expressed an opinion about the remaining services, 31% were mostly or very satisfied with the quality of the training programs, 27% were mostly or very satisfied with the interpretation of civil service rules and union contracts, 22% were mostly or very satisfied with the consulting provided on office/work issues, and 23% were mostly or very satisfied with the handling of formal grievances by staff (altogether, close to two-thirds of those with an opinion were satisfied to some degree with these four services). It's worth noting that there were strong relationships among satisfaction with the interpretation of rules and contracts, satisfaction with consulting, and satisfaction with the handling of grievances (correlations were .73--.83, p's < .001). Satisfaction with these services was in turn related to satisfaction with various aspects of the supervisory relationship and to opinions about staffing and communication practices at the department level (correlations were .30 to .45, p's < .001).

Comparison with Other Campuses

There were no widespread meaningful differences of opinion with staff on the other four campuses regarding job classification or the miscellaneous services listed in the survey. Opinions on employment services were not compared because the applicant volume and process vary from campus to campus.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF TWIN CITIES STAFF

Thinking About Leaving versus Planning to Stay

Of those who expressed an opinion, staff who are thinking about leaving were less satisfied with the process of applying for jobs, the fairness of both classification systems, and services involving the supervisor-subordinate relationship than staff who plan to stay. The specific results are shown in Table 33 below.

Table 33. Differences in Satisfaction with Personnel Services[*]
Staff Thinking About Leaving vs. Planning to Stay

	MAY LEAVE	PLAN TO STAY
Employment		
Process of applying for other kinds of jobs.	3.2	3.7
Process of applying for secretarial/clerical jobs.	2.9	3.4
Orientation for new employees.	2.8	3.4
Job Classification		
Fairness of the classification decision with the JRQ.	2.7	3.2
Fairness of the classification decision with the JEQ.	2.4	3.0
Other Services		
Interpreting civil service rules and union contracts.	3.3	3.9
Handling formal grievances by staff.	2.8	3.8
Consulting on office/work issues.	3.0	3.7

[*] Only differences of at least .5 on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) are reported.

Staff who are thinking about leaving, and who chose to express an opinion, were somewhat less satisfied with the process of applying for secretarial/clerical jobs, the process of applying for other kinds of jobs, and the orientation for new employees (keep in mind that the University-wide orientation program was introduced just one year before the survey).

Staff who are thinking about leaving were also somewhat less satisfied with the fairness of the classification decisions made with either the old JRQ or the JEQ. This was consistent with their greater dissatisfaction with the size of their pay raises. (The overall correlation between satisfaction with pay raises and satisfaction with the fairness of the JEQ's classification decision was .30, p < .001.)

Finally, staff who are thinking about leaving were somewhat less satisfied with the interpretation of civil service rules and union contracts, somewhat less satisfied with consulting on office/work issues, and far less satisfied with the handling of formal grievances. These differences of opinion were consistent with their greater dissatisfaction with the supervisory relationship. (As noted earlier, opinions of the supervisory relationship and departmental staffing and management practices were correlated .30 to .45 with opinions of these services.)

Academic Units Compared to Support Units

Among those who expressed an opinion, staff in academic units were somewhat less satisfied with the process of applying for secretarial/clerical jobs than staff in support units (average ratings = 3.1 vs. 3.6).

Non-exempt Jobs Compared to Exempt Jobs

Among those who expressed an opinion, staff in non-exempt jobs were somewhat less satisfied with the old JRQ process than staff in exempt jobs (average ratings = 2.8 vs. 3.3, respectively). They were also somewhat less satisfied with the fairness of the classification decision with the JRQ (average ratings = 2.7 vs. 3.2, respectively).

There was no meaningful difference of opinion about the new JEQ. As a result, the net effect was that staff in non-exempt jobs were similarly dissatisfied with the two systems, while staff in exempt jobs were somewhat less satisfied with the JEQ. This outcome may be due partly to the fact that the evaluation of non-exempt secretarial/clerical jobs has for years been more structured than the evaluation of other kinds of jobs. (Like the JEQ, the old "Clerical Point Rating" system used a single set of evaluation criteria to assign a point value that could be used to classify jobs.)

Occupational Comparisons

Service/Maintenance staff expressed somewhat different opinions than staff campus-wide, as is shown in Table 34 on the next page.

Regarding employment services, Service/Maintenance staff were somewhat more satisfied than staff campus-wide with the process of applying for secretarial/clerical jobs, and with the orientation for new employees. The former finding was puzzling, since roughly half the Service/Maintenance staff who responded to the survey expressed an opinion on this issue and yet few of them are likely to have ever applied for secretarial/clerical jobs.

Table 34. Differences in Satisfaction with Personnel Services[a]
Occupational Comparisons

	Campus-wide	Service Maint.	Clerical Office	Profes-sional	Super-visory
Employment					
Process of applying for secretarial/clerical jobs.	(3.3)	3.9	3.2	3.6	3.1
Orientation for new employees.	(3.2)	3.7	3.1	3.1	3.2
Job Classification					
Fairness of the classification decision with the JEQ.	(2.8)	3.3	2.6	2.7	2.7
Process of classifying jobs with the Job Evaluation Questionnaire (JEQ).	(2.7)	3.4	2.5	2.4	2.5
Other Services					
Employee Assistance Program (offers private counesling on personal and work-related problems.	(4.2)	3.6	4.3	4.4	4.3

[a] Only items where the opinions of an occupational group differed from the opinions if staff campus-wide by at least .5 on a scale from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (very satisfied) are reported. Not all services were relevant to all staff, so the number of respondents per item varied widely.

Service/Maintenance staff were also somewhat more satisfied with the process and fairness of the JEQ, although they could not have had experience with it for job classification purposes (only the JRQ is used to classify or reclassify positions in the Service/Maintenance unit).

Finally, Service/Maintenance staff who expressed an opinion were somewhat less satisfied with the Employee Assistance Program than staff campus-wide.

It should be noted that the opinions of supervisors were not meaningfully different from the opinions of staff campus-wide, even though supervisors and non-supervisors may have had different reasons for expressing the same opinion (e.g., they would have different perspectives on the job classification systems and the process of applying for jobs).

Female Compared to Male Staff

Of those who expressed an opinion, female staff were somewhat more satisfied with the process of applying for secretarial/clerical jobs than male staff (average ratings = 3.7 vs. 3.1, respectively). The more negative opinion of men was intriguing, since it was unlikely to be based on personal experience. Nearly 40% of the male staff who responded to the survey expressed an opinion on this issue and yet very few men actually apply for secretarial jobs and only a small percentage apply for clerical non-typing jobs.

Female staff who expressed an opinion were also somewhat more satisfied with the Employee Assistance Program than the male staff (average ratings = 4.4 vs. 3.9, respectively).

Minority Compared to Non-Minority Staff

Of those who expressed an opinion, minority staff were far more satisfied with the affirmative action/Form 18 process in employment than non-minority staff (average ratings = 3.6 vs. 2.9, respectively) although even they had mixed opinions.

Minority staff were somewhat less satisfied with the Employee Assistance Program (average ratings = 3.9 vs. 4.4, respectively).

Seniority Comparisons

Of those who expressed an opinion, Newer staff were somewhat more satisfied than either the Mid-Senior or Senior staff with the process of applying for secretarial/clerical jobs (average ratings = 3.7, 3.1 and 3.1, respectively). They were also somewhat more satisfied with the affirmative action/Form 18 process in employment (average ratings = 3.3, 2.8 and 2.9, respectively).

Both Newer and Senior staff were somewhat more satisfied than Mid-Senior staff with the screening of applicants for jobs (average ratings = 3.3, 2.8 and 3.2, in order of seniority).

Newer and Senior staff were also somewhat more satisfied with the orientation for new employees (average ratings = 3.3, 2.9 and 3.5, in order of seniority). This may be because Newer staff were more likely than the others to have taken part in the new orientation program, while Senior staff were likely to have taken part in an orientation program that was in place a number of years ago.

Comparisons Among Salary Groups

Of those who expressed an opinion, staff in Salary Group I were somewhat more satisfied than staff in Salary Groups II--IV with the process of applying for secretarial/clerical jobs (average ratings = 3.6, 3.1, 3.1 and 3.2, respectively).

Staff in Salary Group I were also somewhat more satisfied than staff in Salary Group II with the affirmative action/form 18 process (average ratings = 3.2, 2.7, 3.0 and 2.9 for the Groups I--IV, respectively).

Finally, staff in Salary Groups I and II were somewhat less satisfied staff than staff in Salary Group IV with the fairness of the classification decision made with the old JRQ (average ratings = 2.8, 2.8, 3.0 and 3.3 for Groups I--IV, respectively).

PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROPOSALS

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

The extent to which staff believe they understand various personnel policies, and their opinions of various personnel program proposals, are shown in Table 35 below.

Table 35. Personnel Policies and Program Proposals
Twin Cities Campus

POLICIES	Average Rating[a]	(n out) (of 838)	DISAGREE[b]			AGREE[b]		
			Strongly	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Strongly
I am aware of and understand ...								
... the 'U' civil service rules.	3.8	(828)	5 %	9 %	22 %	35 %	24 %	5 %
... 'U' affirmative action policies.	3.4	(823)	8	15	26	30	17	4
... the policies and procedures of the Personnel Department.	3.3	(828)	9	17	28	30	14	2

PROGRAM PROPOSALS			WOULD NOT HELP[b]			WOULD HELP[b]		
			Definitely	Prob.	Possibly	Possibly	Prob.	Definitely
Promotion-related								
A program that helps pay for training or courses to develop the skills that are needed for future promotions.	4.9	(807)	1 %	1 %	4 %	28 %	38 %	28 %
A program to help supervisors identify and train interested staff for future promotions.	4.7	(804)	1	3	6	32	34	24
A program to help staff plan how to develop in their job or career.	4.5	(811)	1	4	7	37	33	19
Make information about job openings available on computer terminals.	4.5	(800)	2	5	8	34	29	22
General								
Keep branch office of the Personnel Department that covers your area or campus (Health Sci./Finance, Mpls. campus, St. Paul/coord. campuses).	4.5	(769)	1	3	7	38	30	21
Newsletter from Personnel Dept.	3.9	(794)	6	13	11	38	22	10

[a] On a scale from 1 (strongly disagree/definitely would not help) to 6 (strongly agree/definitely would help) ordered from high to low within each section.

[b] Percent of staff expressing each opinion (number responding to each item is shown next to average rating).

Staff had mixed opinions regarding their understanding of University policies: 29% mostly or strongly agreed that they were aware of and understood the University's civil service rules (altogether, 64% of staff agreed to some degree) and 21% mostly or strongly agreed they were aware of and understood the University's affirmative action policies (altogether, 51% of staff agreed to some degree). Only 16%, however, mostly or strongly agreed they understood the policies and procedures of the Personnel Department (altogether, 46% agreed to some degree). These opinions indicate there is a need for better communication about rules, policies, and procedures.

Staff expressed strong support for program proposals that would improve promotional opportunities. The strongest support was for the two programs that would pay for training and and support specific planning by supervisors. Two-thirds of staff thought that a program that helps pay for training or courses to develop skills that are needed for future promotions probably or definitely would help improve efficiency or staff satisfaction (94% of staff thought it was at least possible such a program would help). In addition, 58% thought that a program to help supervisors identify and train interested staff for future promotions probably or definitely would help (altogether, 90% of staff thought it was at least possible such a program would help). Half of the staff also thought a program to help staff plan how to develop in their job or career probably or definitely would help (88% thought it was at least possible such a program would help). Half of the staff thought making information about job openings available on computer terminals probably or definitely would help as well (84% thought it was at least possible it would help).

There was moderate to strong support for two other proposals. Half of the staff think keeping the branch office of the Personnel Department that covers their area of campus probably or definitely helps improve communication, efficiency, or staff satisfaction (89% thought it was at least possible that it helps). One-third of the staff thought that a newsletter from the Personnel Department probably or definitely would help (altogether, 70% thought it was at least possible it might help).

Comparison with Other Campuses

The only widespread meaningful difference of opinion concerned the value of computerizing job information. While 48% of Twin Cities staff thought making information about job openings available on computer terminals probably or definitely would help improve efficiency or staff satisfaction, while 38% of Duluth staff, 17% of Morris staff, 26% of Crookston staff, and 36% of Waseca staff thought this was likely to help on their campuses (average ratings = 4.5, 4.2, 3.8, 4.0 and 4.0, respectively).

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Occupational Comparisons

Service/Maintenance staff were somewhat less likely than staff campus-wide to agree that they were aware of and understood the 'U' Civil Service Rules (average ratings = 3.2 vs. 3.8, respectively). This was understandable since rules governing staff in that bargaining unit are determined through union contract negotiations instead.

Supervisors were only slightly more likely to say they understood affirmative action policies than staff campus-wide (average ratings = 3.8 vs. 3.4, respectively)

Female Compared to Male Staff

Female staff were somewhat more likely to agree that making information about job openings available on computer terminals would help (average ratings = 4.7 vs. 4.1, respectively).

Seniority Comparisons

Newer and Mid-Senior staff were somewhat less likely than Senior staff to agree that they were aware of and understood the 'U' affirmative action policies (average ratings = 3.2, 3.4 and 3.7, respectively).

Comparisons Among Salary Groups

Staff in Salary Group I were more likely than staff in Salary Group IV that making job announcements available on computer terminals would help; the other two salary groups fell in between (average ratings = 4.7, 4.5, 4.3 and 4.2 for Groups I--IV, respectively). This difference of opinion is probably another reflection of the differences seen in the subgroup comparisons above.

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no meaningful differences of opinion between staff who are thinking about leaving and those who plan to stay, staff in academic and support units, staff in non-exempt and exempt jobs, or minority and non-minority staff.

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

When asked which of 13 workshops and training programs they would probably or definitely attend, if offered, roughly half of the staff selected personal computers and personal financial planning. Somewhat less than half selected career planning, and managing time/managing stress. Roughly one-third of the staff selected preparing to become a supervisor or administrator, handling office conflicts, adjusting to a new work role such as promotion to supervisor, Civil Service Rules, the Job Evaluation Questionnaire, and word processing. Relatively few staff expressed a serious interest in attending workshops on supervisory skills (15%), Form 18 procedures (13%), or clerical/secretarial skills other than word processing (10%).

Regarding supervisory skills, however, it should be noted that 24% of official supervisors expressed a serious interest in attending a workshop or training program to improve their supervisory skills.

Comparison with Other Campuses

There was only one program where there were widespread, meaningful differences in the level of interest: 43% of Twin Cities staff were interested in attending a career planning workshop while only 25% of Duluth staff, 31% of Morris staff, 25% of Crookston staff, and 31% of Waseca staff were interested. This was consistent with the fact that Twin Cities staff were far less satisfied with their present salary and the size of their pay raises than staff on the other campuses, and thus were more likely to be looking for other options.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

The level of interest among subgroups of staff was not analyzed since the proposed workshops and training programs were likely to be offered on a University-wide basis, or at the college level, for a wide range of staff.

XVII. PHYSICAL WORKING CONDITIONS

CAMPUS-WIDE OPINIONS

Twin Cities Campus

Staff opinions about their physical working conditions varied widely, as can be seen in Table 36 below.

Table 36. Physical Working Conditions
Twin Cities Campus

	Average Rating[a]	DISSATISFIED[b]			SATISFIED[b]		
		Very	Mostly	Some.	Some.	Mostly	Very
Intercampus bus service (route 13)[c]	4.7	1 %	1 %	4 %	35 %	42 %	17 %
Safety from injury on the job	4.6	3	2	9	22	44	20
Lighting	4.4	4	4	11	20	46	15
Off campus bus service (route 52)[c]	4.3	4	4	8	37	33	14
Safety from theft or attack	4.3	4	5	17	23	37	14
Heating in the winter	4.2	7	8	13	18	40	14
Noise	4.1	6	9	14	22	37	12
Availability of meeting rooms	4.1	8	7	14	25	34	12
Image to clients or students	3.9	8	8	18	26	32	8
Cleanliness of your building	3.9	11	7	18	23	29	12
Coolness in the summer	3.8	14	9	16	17	33	11
Amount of office or lab space	3.7	13	11	18	16	30	12
Areas for breaks & brown bag lunch	3.6	18	11	14	19	26	12
Parking costs	3.6	20	11	15	19	16	19
Availability of parking	3.5	22	13	14	15	20	16

[a] On a scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (very satisfied), order from high to low satisfaction.

[b] Percent of respondents expressing each opinion (n = 784--821 for all but two items).

[c] Of those who expressed an opinion (Route 13 item n = 658; Route 52 item n = 618).

Staff were very satisfied with the safety of their present working conditions: 64% of Twin Cities staff were mostly or very satisfied with their safety from injury on the job, and 51% were mostly or very satisfied with their safety from theft or attack (altogether, more than three-quarters of staff were satisfied to some degree with each aspect of safety).

Staff were moderately satisfied with their physical comfort: 61% were mostly or very satisfied with the lighting, 54% were mostly or very satisfied with the heating in winter, 49% were mostly or very satisfied with the noise level, and 44% were mostly or very satisfied with the coolness in summer of the their present working conditions (two-thirds to three-quarters of staff were satisfied to some degree with each aspect).

Staff opinions regarding the availability of space varied: 46% of staff were mostly or very satisfied with the availability of meeting rooms, 42% were mostly or very satisfied with their amount of office or lab space, and 38% were mostly or very satisfied with the areas for breaks and brown bag lunch (altogether, more than half of the staff were satisfied to some degree). It should be noted, however, that nearly one-quarter of the staff were mostly or very dissatisfied with the amount of office/lab space and areas for breaks/lunches.

Staff were moderately satisfied with the appearance of their building: 40% were mostly or very satisfied with its cleanliness and 41% were mostly or very satisfied with its image to clients or students (altogether, two-thirds of staff were satisfied to some degree with each aspect).

Staff had mixed to very positive opinions about parking and transportation by bus. Only one-third of Twin Cities staff were mostly or very satisfied with the availability and cost of parking, while another one-third were mostly or very dissatisfied (altogether, half of the staff were satisfied to some degree with the availability and cost of parking and half were dissatisfied). Of those who expressed an opinion about bus service, however, roughly half were mostly or very satisfied with the Route 52 off-campus service to the University, and more than half were mostly or very satisfied with the Route 13 intercampus service (altogether, more than 80% were satisfied to some degree with these services).

Comparison with Other Campuses

There were no meaningful, widespread differences of opinion among staff on the five campuses.

OPINIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF STAFF

Thinking About Leaving versus Planning to Stay

Staff who are thinking about leaving were somewhat less satisfied with the availability of parking than staff who are planning to stay (average ratings = 3.2 vs. 3.7, respectively) although even the latter group was not very satisfied.

Academic Units Compared to Support Units

Staff in academic units were somewhat more satisfied than staff in support units with the coolness of their working conditions in the summer (average ratings = 3.9 vs. 3.6, respectively).

They were somewhat less satisfied with the availability of parking (average ratings = 3.2 vs. 3.9) and parking costs (average ratings = 3.4 vs. 3.9).

Occupational Comparisons

Service/Maintenance staff were somewhat less satisfied with the safety of their working conditions than staff campus-wide (average ratings = 4.0 and 4.6, respectively). This is no doubt a reflection of the fact that those kinds of jobs are more likely to involve exposure to physical risks.

Minority Compared to Non-Minority Staff

Minority staff were somewhat less satisfied with parking costs than non-minority staff (average ratings = 3.1 vs. 3.6).

Seniority Comparisons

Newer staff were somewhat less satisfied than Mid-Senior and Senior staff with the availability of parking (average ratings = 3.1, 3.6 and 3.7, respectively) although even the latter two groups were not very satisfied.

Comparisons Among Salary Groups

Staff in Salary Groups I and II were somewhat less satisfied than staff in Salary Group IV with the availability of parking (average ratings = 3.2, 3.4, 3.6 and 3.8 for Groups I--IV, respectively) and with parking costs (3.4, 3.4, 3.6 and 4.0 for Groups I--IV, respectively).

Other Subgroup Comparisons

There were no meaningful differences of opinion between staff in non-exempt and exempt jobs, or between female and male staff.

REFERENCES

Bernardin, H. John and Beatty, Richard W. (1984). Performance Appraisal: Assessing Human Behavior at Work. Boston, MA: Kent Publishing Co. 403 pp.

Beuhring, Trisha (in press). Incorporating Employee Values in Job Evaluation. Journal of Social Issues.

Beuhring, Trisha (1988a). I. Purposes of Performance Appraisal. In-house technical report. University of Minnesota, Personnel Department. 19 pp.

Beuhring, Trisha (1988b). II. Performance Appraisal Methods and Forms. In-house technical report. University of Minnesota, Personnel Department. 39 pp.

Beuhring, Trisha (1988c). III. Performance Appraisal Procedures. In-house technical report. University of Minnesota, Personnel Department. 20 pp.

Beuhring, Trisha (1988d). IV. Development of the New Performance Appraisal Program. In-house technical report. University of Minnesota, Personnel Department. 47 pp.

Beuhring, Trisha and Erickson, John (1985). Civil Service Job Evaluation System: Summary of Its Development and Implementation. In-house technical report. University of Minnesota, Personnel Department. 19 pp.

Dillman, Don A. (1978) Mail and Telephone Surveys. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 327 pp.

Task Force for the Review of Twin Cities Campus Support and Service Units (May, 1989). Serving the University of Minnesota's Academic Mission. In-house report to the Senate Consultative Committee and the Acting Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. University of Minnesota. 104 pp.

Treiman, Donald (1984) A Critique of Job Evaluation Systems. Special report prepared by the National Academy of Sciences for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Washington, D.C.

Treiman, Donald and Hartmann, Heidi (1985) Women, Work, and Wages: Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Labor (Sept. 1988) Opportunity 2000: Creative Affirmative Action Strategies for a Changing Workforce. Prepared for Employment Standards Administration by Hudson Institute, Indianapolis, Indiana. Washington, DC: Supt. of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office.