

The Fall 2010 Campus Climate Survey

Responses from Staff Members

Prepared by Office of Institutional Research – February 2011

The Campus Climate Committee (CCC), a presidential advisory group composed of faculty, students, administrators, and staff, in partnership with the Office of Institutional Research, conducted a survey to assess perceptions of campus climate at San José State University (SJSU). Campus climate was defined as “the formal environment in which we learn, teach, and work, and live in a postsecondary setting.” In addition to exploring campus members’ perceptions of the overall environment at SJSU, the project aimed to examine the extent to which campus members valued diversity, and perceived SJSU as safe, welcoming, respectful, and supportive of people of different genders, abilities, races, cultures, and sexual orientations.

The Campus Climate subcommittee developed four instruments to assess the perceptions of the distinct constituents on campus: students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Data collection began October 26, 2006 and ended December 22, 2010. Invitations to participate in an online survey were given to 1,096 staff members. Three hundred seventy (370) responded to the questionnaire, which equals a final response rate of about 34 percent.

The results of the survey are summarized below. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Dr. John Briggs, the Office of Institutional Research at (408) 924-1520 or Dr. Wiggys Sivertsen, Chairman Campus Climate Committee at (408) 924-5320.

Highlights/Selected findings:

Most staff members responded that SJSU was somewhat successful in complying with its Mission Statement.

Staff members responded that the two SJSU goals of students being active participants in the community and responsible citizens were important

Staff members responded that the immediate and general campus climate values diversity
Staff members see their work as an integral part of educating students at SJSU. They reported they are given enough opportunities to interact with students and become involved in campus activities.

Staff members are somewhat satisfied with the campus climate.

Most staff members at SJSU do not experience discrimination first-hand at SJSU.

However, some do and any discrimination is too much. SJSU should continue in its efforts to make its campus discrimination free.

Staff members responded that overwhelmingly that SJSU students should be taught to bring a positive change to society and that developing a sense of community at SJSU was important.

Work issues dominated the most disappointing finding for staff members. They responded that there were not opportunities for advancement in their department at SJSU, resources for training were inadequate, salaries were not equitable, and overtime was an issue.

Staff members responded that that diversity was much more a part of the SJSU environment now than in 2006. They responded that that SJSU celebrates and promotes diversity, differences of opinion are regularly aired, and there is an appreciation for multicultural society on campus.

Staff members responded that some things declined from 2006 to 2010. Among them was the amount of resources used for training, physical safety on campus, and respect by their supervisor.

I. Introduction

The Campus Climate Committee (CCC), a presidential advisory group composed of faculty, students, administrators, and staff, in partnership with the Office of Institutional Research, conducted a survey to assess perceptions of campus climate at San José State University (SJSU). Campus climate was defined as “the formal environment in which we learn, teach, and work, and live in a postsecondary setting.” In addition to exploring campus members’ perceptions of the overall environment at SJSU, the project aimed to examine the extent to which campus members valued diversity, and perceived SJSU as safe, welcoming, respectful, and supportive of people of different genders, abilities, races, cultures, and sexual orientations.

The Campus Climate subcommittee developed four instruments to assess the perceptions of the distinct constituents on campus: students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Data collection began October 26, 2006 and ended December 22, 2010. Invitations to participate in an online survey were given to 1,096 staff members. Three hundred seventy (370) staff members responded to the questionnaire, which equals a final response rate of about 34 percent.

A. Weightings

Because survey participants are self selected there is a problem with over- and under-representation of gender and ethnic groups within the survey. Table 1 shows the percentage of participants by ethnicity and gender and the percentage of the general student population by ethnicity and gender. For instance, White males make up 16.9% of the general population, yet are 12.3% of all survey participants, so are under-represented in the survey. On the other hand, White females are 21.7% of the general population and 28.2% of all survey participants, so are over-represented.

Table 1

Percentage Gender and Ethnicity for Survey and SJSU Population

Table 2.

Enriching Student Lives

	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q3b How important do you feel the following topics are for SJSU: Developing a sense of community among students, staff, and faculty	3.019	3.540	4.354*
q3f How important do you feel the following topics are for SJSU: Developing an appreciation for a multicultural society on campus	2.946	3.492	5.648*

¹ Rating Scale: 1 = None; 2 = Very little; 3 = Some; 4 = Great deal (Note: This analysis excluded “Don’t Know”=5)

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

2. *“To transmit knowledge to its students along with the necessary skills for applying it in the service of our society”*

Learning at SJSU takes place both inside and outside the classroom. Staff members should play a role in the transmission of knowledge to students. Most staff members responded that they were “Somewhat Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with the opportunities to interact with students and opportunities for involvement in campus events (Table 3). These measures increased between 2006 and 2010, but not significantly.

Table 3

Transmission of knowledge and skills

Table 4

Expanding Knowledge Base

2006
Mean

Table 5

Active Participation in Communities			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q3g Recruiting high achieving students	2.866	3.286	4.130*
q3h Promoting and celebrating diversity	2.985	3.355	1.287

¹ Rating Scale: 1 = None; 2 = Very little; 3 = Some; 4 = Great deal (Note: This analysis excluded “Don’t Know”=5)

² * $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

6. *“Responsible citizenship and an understanding of ethical choices inherent in human development.”*

SJSU does not just turn out psychologists or engineers; it produces citizens who know what is right and wrong. Staff members agreed that SJSU is developing leadership among students (Table 6). Also, staff members think that this has improved from 2006 to 2010.

Table 6

Responsible Citizenship and Ethical Choices			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q3c Developing leadership ability among students	2.968	3.413	0.848

¹ Rating Scale: 1 = None; 2 = Very little; 3 = Some; 4 = Great deal (Note: This analysis excluded “Don’t Know”=5)

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

III. SJSU Diversity & Campus Climate

A. Diversity

“A rich mix of students, faculty, staff, and staff members make up the SJSU community.”

1. *“The campus not only values the diversity found here (e.g. age, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation)”*

Staff members found that their immediate campus environment values diversity. This includes being respectful, hospitable to the disabled, non-racist, non-sexist, non-homophobic, safe, supportive, and welcoming (Table 7). However, none of the measures improved significantly from 2006 to 2010. Although, there v3o 3f5.0827 0 TD1(inT8b)TfE9C5hcufigh650TD0 Tc0 T

Table 8

Immediate Campus Climate			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q2a Immediate Environment: Respectful	5.254	5.280	0.112
q2b Immediate Environment: Hospitable to the disabled	5.353	5.466	0.407
q2c Immediate Environment: Non-racist	5.258	5.343	0.009
q2d Immediate Environment: Non-sexist	5.133	5.281	0.118
q2e Immediate Environment: Non-homophobic	5.267	5.352	0.195
q2f Immediate Environment: Safe	5.563	5.460	3.338
q2g Immediate Environment: Supportive	5.124	5.009	1.261
q2h Immediate Environment: Welcoming	5.270	5.415	0.888

¹Rating Scale: 1 = Not at all; 4 = Neutral; 7 = Very much so

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

2. “*Seeks to support and nurture an environment welcoming to all.*”

Staff members found that the general campus environment somewhat values diversity. This includes being respectful, hospitable to the disabled, non-racist, non-sexist, non-homophobic, safe, supportive, and welcoming (Table 8). The general campus climate was not as welcoming to the principles of diversity as the immediate environment (Table 7). There is an improvement in the general environment from 2006 to 2010, although only one measure, safety, was significant.

Table 8

General Campus Climate			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q1.a General Climate: Respectful	4.952	5.121	0.542
q1b General Climate: Hospitable to the disabled	5.037	5.237	0.087
q1c General Climate: Non-racist	4.702	4.964	0.024
q1d General Climate: Non-sexist	4.625	4.883	0.006
q1e General Climate: Non-homophobic	4.754	4.955	0.001
q1f General Climate: Safe	4.855	4.853	4.513*
q1g General Climate: Supportive	4.548	4.786	2.546
q1h General Climate: Welcoming	4.653	4.991	1.400

¹Rating Scale: 1 = Not at all; 4 = Neutral; 7 = Very much so

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

B. Campus Climate

“SJSU aims to:”

1. “Create a campus climate that values diversity”

A climate of inclusiveness means valuing the diverse nature of SJSU’s students, faculty members, staff members, and administrators. Staff members “Somewhat Agree” to “Agree” that they value the work others do to promote diversity (Table 9). Also, this measure improved from 2006 to 2010.

Table 9

Campus Climate Values Diversity	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q9g I value the work that SJSU is doing to celebrate diversity	4.238	4.555	1.854

¹Rating Scale: 1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Disagree Somewhat; 4 = Agree Somewhat; 5 = Agree; 6 = Agree Strongly

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

3. *“Recruit, hire, and retain culturally diverse employees across all levels and areas of the university, regardless of funding source”*

A welcoming, inclusive environment means the faculty, staff, and administration is like the students they teach and serve. Staff members responded that some effort is being made to recruit

Table 14

Diversity in Curriculum and Pedagogical Strategies

	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q10v I see my work as an integral part of the overall mission of educating students here at SJSU	4.872	4.905	0.051

¹Rating Scale: 1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Disagree Somewhat; 4 = Agree Somewhat; 5 = Agree; 6 = Agree Strongly

²* *p*

Table 16

User-friendly Campus			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q4a Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Gender	3.874	4.246	7.414*
q4b Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Political Views	4.069	4.438	7.703*
q4c Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Race/ Ethnicity	3.825	4.286	6.508*
q4d Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Sexual Orientation	4.462	4.601	2.329
q4e Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Disability	4.644	4.675	4.083*
q4f Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Language and or accent	4.305	4.475	4.364*
q4g Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Religion	4.537	4.639	5.374*
q4h Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Age	4.020	4.301	9.458**
q4i Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Weight-Physical Size	4.393	4.542	6.598*
q4j Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Body Art (e.g. tattoo's, piercings)	4.757	4.804	1.720

¹Rating Scale: 1 = Frequently; 2 = Occasionally; 3 = Sometime; 4 = Seldom; 5 = Never

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

8. "Provide student support activities to facilitate an environment for success"

For staff members to provide the student support activities, they first must find out what students need. Most staff members "Somewhat agree" to "Agree" that they are doing their part by interacting with students (Table 17). This interaction increased between 2006 and 2010.

Table 17

Student Success			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q7b Opportunities to interact with students	4.533	4.556	0.337

¹Rating Scale: 1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Disagree Somewhat; 4 = Agree Somewhat; 5 = Agree; 6 = Agree Strongly

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

9. *“Promote and enhance community involvement”*

When staff members are involved with the community, they are promoting a diverse, inclusive environment. Most staff members responded that there are opportunities to be involved in campus activities (Table 18). Also, staff members responded that opportunities stayed the same between 2006 and 2010.

Table 18

Community Involvement			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q7f Opportunities to be involved in campus activities and events	4.102	4.249	1.295

1

would be a zero and a “Very much so” response intervals of 16.67 because there are five intervals).

Figure 1: Normalizing Likert Scales for Staff



There are exceptions to this method. In Question 4, the response “Frequently” would be very unfavorable and given a value of 100. In Question 5, the response “Disagree Strongly” would be the most favorable and given a value of zero. However, in Question 6, the response “Disagree Strongly” would be the most unfavorable and given a value of 100. In Question 7, the response “Disagree Strongly” would be the most favorable and given a value of zero. However, in Question 8, the response “Disagree Strongly” would be the most unfavorable and given a value of 100.

After these responses were normalized, they were entered into the ranking system in the previous section. The ranking system then ranked all of the normalized responses.

B. Most Promising Findings

Table 20 lists the questions that the eight (8) questions ask about perceptions of discrimination. It is difficult to say these are the most promising findings. SJSU should strive to make sure that all staff should experience discrimination.

Table 20

staff responded that it was important to develop a sense of community, to promote and celebrate diversity, and to have students develop an appreciation for a multicultural society on campus. This is in line with the University's goal of enriching student lives.

C. Most Disappointing Findings 2010

Table 21 lists the questions that had the five (5) most unfavorable normalized, weighted means. Staff members responded that (1) there were problems with advancement of campus; (2) there were not enough opportunities either at the University or in their department; (3) training for advancement was inadequate; (4) their pay was inequitable, and (5) there was a lot of pressure to put in overtime.

Table 21

Most Disappointing Finding Student Campus Climate Survey

	N	Mean	Std Dev.
--	---	------	----------

Table 22

 Most Promising Changes 2006 to 2010

	Change in Mean
q3i Promoting and celebrating diversity	18.991
q3e Promoting a climate where differences of opinion are regularly aired openly	18.249
q3f Developing an appreciation for a multicultural society on campus	17.907
q3d Helping students learn how to bring about positive change in society	17.888
q3b Developing a sense of community among students, staff, and faculty	17.121

B. Most Disappointing Changes: 2006 to 2010

Workplace issues dominated the most disappointing changes in Staff members' attitudes between 2006 and 2010 (Table 23). Staff members responded that there was a lack of resources for training staff, their supervisor treated them as incompetent, and there was not enough emphasis placed on diversity of staff members. This led them to say that SJSU was not a good place to work in 2010 relative to 2006. They also responded that they felt uncomfortable disclosing their sexual orientation, and that they feared for their personal safety.

Table 23

 Most Disappointing Changes: 2006 to 2010

	Change in Mean
q10h Too much emphasis is placed on achieving diversity within the staff	-4.597
q9e I feel uncomfortable disclosing my sexual orientation to my colleagues	-5.028
q10r My supervisor treats me like I am incompetent	-7.760
q9d I fear for my physical safety	-9.085
q9c The university uses its resources to help train staff for advancement	-11.932

VI. Conclusion

Most staff members felt SJSU was somewhat successful in complying with its Mission Statement.

On the positive side, Staff members responded that the two SJSU goals of students being active participants in the community and responsible citizens were important

Staff members responded that the immediate and general campus climate values diversity.

Further, Staff members see their work as an integral part of educating students at SJSU. They responded that they are given enough opportunities to interact with students and become involved in campus activities.

Staff members are somewhat satisfied with the campus climate.

Most staff members at SU do not experience discrimination first-hand at SJSU. However, some do and any discrimination is too much. SJSU should continue in its efforts to make its campus discrimination free.

Staff members felt overwhelmingly that SJSU students should be taught to bring a positive change to society and that developing a sense of community at SJSU was important.

Work issues dominated the most disappointing finding for staff members. Staff members responded that there were not opportunities for advancement in their department at SJSU, resources for training were inadequate, salaries were inequitable, and overtime was an issue.

Staff members felt that diversity was much more part the SJSU environment now than in 2006. They felt that SJSU celebrates and promotes diversity, differences of opinion are regularly aired, and there is an appreciation for multicultural society on campus.

Staff members felt some things declined from 2006 to 2010. Among them was the amount of resources used for training, physical safety on campus, and respect by their supervisor.