

## **The Fall 2010 Campus Climate Survey Responses from Administrators**

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 175 administrators. Eighty-seven (87) responded to the questionnaire, a final response rate of about 50 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, Chair, Campus Climate Committee at (408) 924-5320.

### **Highlights/Selected findings:**

- Most administrators responded that SJSU was somewhat successful in complying with its Mission Statement.
- Administrators responded that the two SJSU goals of students being active participants in the community and responsible citizens were very important.
- Administrators responded that the immediate and general campus climate values diversity.
- Administrators responded that the current ethnic and gender composition of administrators was inadequate and there was a need to recruit, hire, and retain more minorities. Also, there continues to be a need to consider the interest of the disabled on campus. Otherwise, administrators somewhat agreed that the campus climate was good.
- Most administrators 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.
- Administrators responded overwhelmingly that SJSU students should be taught to bring a positive change to society and to develop a sense of community at SJSU.
- Some of the most disappointing findings dealt with the administrators’ work environment. Administrators responded that they were being pressured to work longer hours and there was little room for advancement. Even though it was a disappointing finding in 2010, administrators reported less pressure to put in overtime now than in 2006.
- Work conditions seemed to get worse for administrators between 2006 and 2010. They responded that there was less opportunity for advancement, less challenge to their position, less professional development, and SJSU was not a good place to work.
- Administrators responded that that SJSU was more welcoming now than in 2006.

## 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.

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 175 administrators. Eighty-seven (87) responded to the questionnaire, a final response rate of about 50 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 33.7% of the general population, yet are 27.4% of all survey participants, so are under-represented in the survey. On the other hand, White females are 32.0% of the general population and 47.9% of all survey participants, so are over-represented.

Table 1

Percentage	Survey		SJSU Population	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
American Indian	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%
Black	1.4%	1.4%	3.4%	2.2%
Asian/Pac Is	2.7%	8.2%	5.1%	9.0%
Hispanic	2.7%	5.5%	4.5%	5.6%
White	27.4%	47.9%	33.7%	32.0%
Other	2.7%	0.0%	1.1%	2.8%

This over- and under-representation is a problem because each ethnic/gender group may have different perceptions of the campus climate. If one group is over-represented its views will dominate over a group that is under-represented. To correct this bias a weighting system was developed. The weighting system takes the percentage of the population and divides it against the percentage of the survey for each gender/ethnic group and applies it to the answer for each individual in that group. For instance, White females would have a weight of 0.668 (32.0% / 47.9%) and White males would have a weight of 1.230 (33.7% / 27.4%).

These weights would be applied to the responses of the individuals in each of these two groups. Once the responses are weighted statistical tests can be applied and analysis can be performed. In this case, since most of the results are on Likert scales, the weight would be multiplied on the value to the answer on the scale.

## **B. Analysis of Results**

One of the most important aspects in analyzing campus climate is to make sure that SJSU is adhering to its Mission Statement and Goals. If SJSU is maintaining the standards that are stated in its Mission Statement and Goals, then it is a “responsive institution.” Therefore, in this analysis, we take each part of the Mission Statement and Goals and align it to the questions in the survey. The results of these questions will tell us how well SJSU is maintaining its institutional objectives.

Also, because one of the most important aspects of campus climate and the focus of the CCC is diversity and inclusiveness, we will also align Diversity and Campus Climate Statement to the questions in the survey.

## **C. Using 2006 Data**

A Campus Climate Survey was given in spring 2006. This Campus Climate Survey was identical to the survey given in fall 2010. Also, in the 2006 survey, 99 administrators responded out of a total administrator population of 188. This gives us a confidence interval of 6.79%. This is comparable to the confidence interval in 2010 of 7.47%. Therefore, we can compare the two surveys to find out if SJSU has improved or if there is need for improvement for various measures.

## **II. SJSU Mission Statement and Goals**

### **A. Mission Statement**

*“In collaboration with nearby industries and communities, SJSU faculty and staff are dedicated to achieving the university's mission as a responsive institution of the state of California:”*

#### *1. “To enrich the lives of its students”*

SJSU is not only a place to learn facts and figures, but it is a place to get an education. The purpose of this education is to enrich student lives. Administrators felt that SJSU helps develop a sense of community as well as develops an appreciation for multicultural society on campus. The administrators rated these two items between “Some” and a “Great Deal”. Administrators’ perceptions also increased between 2006 and 2010 for these two items, but not significantly (Table 2).

Table 2.

## Enriching Student Lives

	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q3b How important do you feel the following topics are for SJSU: Developing a sense of community among students, staff, and faculty	3.149	3.652	0.718
q3f How important do you feel the following topics are for SJSU: Developing an appreciation for a multicultural society on campus	2.996	3.581	1.660

<sup>1</sup> 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. Administrators should play a role in the transmission of knowledge to students. Most administrators responded they were "Somewhat Satisfied" or "Satisfied" with the encouragement the administration gives to creative and innovative ideas (Table 3). They also "Agree Somewhat" the university is using its resources to help students succeed (Table 4). These measures declined between 2006 and 2010.

Table 3

## Transmission of knowledge and skills (Part 1)

Survey Question	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q7d Extent to which the campus administration encourages you to develop creative and innovative ideas	4.508	4.180	0.061

<sup>1</sup> Rating Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 2 = Dissatisfied; 3 = Somewhat Dissatisfied; 4 = Somewhat Satisfied; 5 = Satisfied; 6 = Very Satisfied

<sup>2</sup> \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ , \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

Table 4

## Transmission of knowledge and skills (Part 2)

Survey Question	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q8c The university should use its resources to help students succeed	4.296	4.196	0.713

<sup>1</sup> Rating Scale: 1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Disagree Somewhat; 4 = Agree Somewhat; 5 = Agree; 6 = Agree Strongly

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

3. *“To expand the base of knowledge through research and scholarship.”*

Free and public discourse is necessary to expand the knowledge of students. From this, students learn to defend their ideas and critically analyze opposing viewpoints. Students also expand their knowledge base by learning how to bring a positive change to society. SJSU administrators agreed from “Some” to a “Great deal” that the University is placing emphasis on these goals. Administrators significantly agreed with this more in 2010 than in 2006 (Table 5).

Table 5

Expanding Knowledge Base			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q3d How important do you feel the following topics are for SJSU: Helping students learn how to bring about positive change in society	2.972	3.666	2.707
q3e How important do you feel the following topics are for SJSU: Promoting a climate where differences of opinion are regularly aired openly	2.987	3.563	8.629**

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

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

## B. Goals

*“For both undergraduate and graduate students, the university emphasizes the following goals:”*

1. *“In-depth knowledge of a major field of study.”*

There were no questions on the Administrators Campus Climate Survey that matched this goal.

2. *“Broad understanding of the sciences, social sciences, humanities, and the arts.”*

There were no questions on the Administrators Campus Climate Survey that matched this goal.

3. *“Skills in communication and in critical inquiry”*

There were no questions on the Administrators Campus Climate Survey that matched this goal.

4. *“Multi-cultural and global perspectives gained through intellectual and social exchange with people of diverse economic and ethnic backgrounds.”*

There were no questions on the Administrators Campus Climate Survey that matched this goal.

5. *“Active participation in professional, artistic, and ethnic communities.”*

To learn about the different subject areas, participation in professional and artistic communities is essential. To that end SJSU must recruit high-achieving students to lead these communities. To have diversity at SJSU it must be encouraged and celebrated. Administrators say that both these measures are “Some” to a “Great Deal” important. Administrators responded that these measures are more important in 2010 than they were in 2006.

Table 6

## Active Participation in Communities

	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q3g Recruiting high achieving students	2.955	3.440	2.682
q3h Promoting and celebrating diversity	3.028	3.529	0.777

<sup>1</sup> Rating Scale: 1 = None; 2 = Very little; 3 = Some; 4 = Great deal (Note: This analysis excluded "Don't Know"=5)

<sup>2</sup> \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ , \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

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. Administrators agreed that SJSU is developing leadership among students (Table 7). Also, administrators think that this has improved significantly from 2006 to 2010.

Table 7

## Responsible Citizenship and Ethical Choices

	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q3c Developing leadership ability among students	2.976	3.591	0.543

<sup>1</sup> 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 administrators make up the SJSU community.”*

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

Administrators 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 8). However, none of the measures improved significantly from 2006 to 2010.

Table 8

Immediate Campus Climate			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q2a Immediate Environment: Respectful	5.899	5.695	0.073
q2b Immediate Environment: Hospitable to the disabled	5.752	5.784	0.005
q2c Immediate Environment: Non-racist	5.897	5.878	0.393
q2d Immediate Environment: Non-sexist	5.813	5.770	0.271
q2e Immediate Environment: Non-homophobic	5.809	5.836	0.040
q2f Immediate Environment: Safe	5.750	5.800	0.003
q2g Immediate Environment: Supportive	5.700	5.513	0.148
q2h Immediate Environment: Welcoming	5.591	5.686	0.629

<sup>1</sup>Rating Scale: 1 = Not at all; 4 = Neutral; 7 = Very much so

<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ , \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

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

Administrators 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 9). The general campus climate was not as welcoming to the principles of diversity as the immediate environment (Table 8). There is a decline in the general environment from 2006 to 2010, although this is not significant.

Table 9

General Campus Climate			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q1.a General Climate: Respectful	5.448	5.285	0.229
q1b General Climate: Hospitable to the disabled	5.486	5.465	0.042
q1c General Climate: Non-racist	5.330	5.287	0.249
q1d General Climate: Non-sexist	5.109	5.006	0.642
q1e General Climate: Non-homophobic	5.153	4.959	0.233
q1f General Climate: Safe	5.289	4.799	0.283
q1g General Climate: Supportive	4.975	4.983	0.004
q1h General Climate: Welcoming	4.850	4.998	0.404

<sup>1</sup>Rating Scale: 1 = Not at all; 4 = Neutral; 7 = Very much so

<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ , \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

## 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. Administrators “Somewhat Agree” to “Agree” that they value the work others do to promote diversity (Table 10). Also, this measure improved from 2006 to 2010.

Table 10

Campus Climate Values Diversity			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q8h I value the work that SJSU is doing to promote diversity	4.425	4.576	1.869

<sup>1</sup>Rating Scale: 1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Disagree Somewhat; 4 = Agree Somewhat; 5 = Agree; 6 = Agree Strongly

<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

### 2. “Create the administrative and organizational structure needed to coordinate and monitor campus climate progress”

One of the best ways to ensure campus climate progress is to have an effective administrative leadership. SJSU administrators were “Somewhat Satisfied” with the campus administrative leadership. This attitude declined between 2006 and 2010 (Table 11). In addition, Administrators “Agree Somewhat” that SJSU is a well-managed university (Table 12). Again, this attitude declined between 2006 and 2010.

Table 11

Coordinate and Monitor Campus Climate (Part 1)			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q7b Campus administrative leadership	4.644	4.308	0.815

<sup>1</sup>Rating Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 2 = Dissatisfied; 3 = Somewhat Dissatisfied; 4 = Somewhat Satisfied; 5 = Satisfied; 6 = Very Satisfied

<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

Table 12

Coordinate and Monitor Campus Climate (Part 2)			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q9h In my opinion SJSU is a well-managed university	4.154	3.946	0.098

<sup>1</sup>Rating Scale: 1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Disagree Somewhat; 4 = Agree Somewhat; 5 = Agree; 6 = Agree Strongly

<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

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. Administrators responded that some effort is being made to recruit minorities for employment at SJSU (Table 13). Also, this effort has improved from 2006 to 2010. Administrators also “Somewhat Disagree” that the current gender/ethnicity composition of Administrators is adequate (Table 14). This attitude has declined between 2006 and 2010.

Table 13

Recruit, Hire, and Retain Diverse Employees (Part 1)			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q3a Increasing the representation of minorities in the faculty, staff, and administration	2.874	3.181	0.173

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

<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ , \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

Table 14

Recruit, Hire, and Retain Diverse Employees (Part 2)			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q9d The current ethnic composition of administrators at SJSU is adequate	3.873	3.543	1.181
q9e The current gender composition of administrators at SJSU is adequate	4.429	3.715	0.479

<sup>1</sup>Rating Scale: 1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Disagree Somewhat; 4 = Agree Somewhat; 5 = Agree; 6 = Agree Strongly

<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ , \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

4. *“Provide professional development activities that assist all personnel in the understanding of their own and other cultures”*

One the best ways for administrators to learn about other cultures is through professional development. For the most part, administrators were “Somewhat Satisfied” to “Satisfied” with mentoring and technical support (Table 15). These attitudes did not change from 2006 to 2010.

Table 15

Professional Development Activities			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q6g Advice/mentoring you have received from people in your department	4.514	4.516	1.027
q6i Access to technical support and assistance	4.676	4.444	0.107

<sup>1</sup>Rating Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 2 = Dissatisfied; 3 = Somewhat Dissatisfied; 4 = Somewhat Satisfied; 5 = Satisfied; 6= Very Satisfied

<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ , \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

5. *“Infuse diversity into the curriculum and promote pedagogical strategies that encourage student involvement and facilitate respect of diverse perspectives”*

Educating SJSU students is one part of the overall mission of this university. Administrators “Agree” that their work is important to the mission of educating SJSU students (Table 16). Also, administrators responded that the situation has not changed from 2006 to 2010.

Table 16

Diversity in Curriculum and Pedagogical Strategies			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q9m I see my work as an integral part of the overall mission of educating students here at SJSU	5.110	4.994	1.765

<sup>1</sup>Rating Scale: 1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Disagree Somewhat; 4 = Agree Somewhat; 5 = Agree; 6 = Agree Strongly  
<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ , \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

6. *“Enhance professional development opportunities”*

To promote and retain qualified, diverse employees, SJSU must enhance professional development activities. Administrators somewhat agree that SJSU is doing this (Table 17). However, there was a decline from 2006 to 2010 for this measure.

Table 17

Professional Development Opportunities			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q9q My professional development is supported	4.771	4.173	0.443

<sup>1</sup>Rating Scale: 1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Disagree Somewhat; 4 = Agree Somewhat; 5 = Agree; 6 = Agree Strongly  
<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ , \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

7. *“Promote a user-friendly campus in which all campus citizens, students, as well as employees, feel welcomed and appreciated”*

All campus citizens need to feel welcome at SJSU. This means that administrators should not have any incidence of harassment or discrimination. Most of the SJSU administrators have never been discriminated against (Table 18). Obviously, any incident no matter how small should not be tolerated. While some administrators have encountered discrimination, most have not. Incidences of discrimination declined for gender, disability, religion, and age; but the incidences increased for political views, race, sexual orientation, language, physical size, and body art between 2006 and 2010.

Table 18

User-friendly Campus			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q4a Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Gender	4.023	4.133	1.406
q4b Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Political Views	4.338	4.355	0.006
q4c Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Race/ Ethnicity	4.369	4.356	0.873
q4d Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Sexual Orientation	4.622	4.547	0.619
q4e Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Disability	4.752	4.757	0.341
q4f Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Language and or accent	4.768	4.528	0.059
q4g Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Religion	4.646	4.670	0.009
q4h Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Age	4.226	4.338	0.188
q4i Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Weight-Physical Size	4.522	4.392	0.073
q4j Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Body Art (e.g. tattoo's, piercings)	4.879	4.675	0.051

<sup>1</sup>Rating Scale: 1 = Frequently; 2 = Occasionally; 3 = Sometime; 4 = Seldom; 5 = Never

<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ , \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

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

For administrators to provide the student support activities, they first must find out what students need. Most administrators "Somewhat agree" to "Agree" that they are doing their part by interacting with students (Table 19). However, this interaction is declining.

Table 19

Student Success			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q7a Opportunities to interact with students	4.549	4.448	0.232

<sup>1</sup>Rating Scale: 1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Disagree Somewhat; 4 = Agree Somewhat; 5 = Agree; 6 = Agree Strongly

<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ , \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

9. “Promote and enhance community involvement”

When administrators are involved with the community, they are promoting a diverse, inclusive environment. Most administrators responded that there are opportunities to be involved in campus activities (Table 20). Also, administrators responded that opportunities stayed the same between 2006 and 2010.

Table 20

Community Involvement (Part 1)			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q7e Opportunities to be involved in campus activities and events	4.804	4.844	0.000

<sup>1</sup>Rating Scale: 1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Disagree Somewhat; 4 = Agree Somewhat; 5 = Agree; 6 = Agree Strongly

<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

10. “Ensure and monitor university compliance with the findings and recommendations of the Americans with Disabilities Act Self-Evaluation Transition Report”

Administrators stated they “Disagreed Somewhat” that more consideration should be given to the needs of the disabled (Table 21). This attitude stayed the same between 2006 and 2010.

Table 21

SJSU Compliance to ADA			
	2006 Mean <sup>1</sup>	2010 Mean <sup>1</sup>	t-test <sup>2</sup>
q8j I believe more consideration should be given to the needs and interests of disabled people on campus	3.882	3.673	0.905

<sup>1</sup>Rating Scale: 1 = Disagree Strongly; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Disagree Somewhat; 4 = Agree Somewhat; 5 = Agree; 6 = Agree Strongly

<sup>2</sup>\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .005$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .0005$

**IV. Most Promising and Disappointing Findings 2010**

This section is devoted to discovering the most promising findings in the student responses to the Campus Climate Survey. In other words, we want to know what SJSU is doing right in terms of diversity and inclusiveness. This section will also discuss the most disappointing finding of the survey. These are items that the students have identified as areas of concern that SJSU should be working on as a university and as a community.

**A. Normalizing Likert Scales**

To find the most promising and disappointing findings, we must rank all the questions from the most favorable responses to the least favorable responses. However, out of the eight (8) general questions there are six (6) different Likert scales. Thus, comparison is difficult.

The system we will use is “normalizing” the Likert Scale. To do this we take the most favorable response on the Likert scale and give it a value of 100. Then we take the least favorable response and give it a value of zero. Responses in between are given values at intervals in between zero and 100. For instance, in question 1a: General Climate is Respectful a “Not at all” response

would be a zero and a “Very much so” response would be 100. Values in between would be at intervals of 16.67 because there are five intervals between the greatest and the least value (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Normalizing Likert Scales for Student Campus Climate Survey

Question 1 & 2 Normalized Value	1 Not at all 0.00	2 16.67	3 33.33	4 Neutral 50.00	5 66.67	6 83.33	7 Very much so 100.00
Question 3 Normalized Value	1 None 0.00	2 Very Little 33.33	3 Some 66.67	4 Great Deal 100.00	5 Don't Know N/A		
Question 4 Normalized Value	1 Frequently 0.00	2 Occasionally 25.00	3 Sometime 50.00	4 Seldom 75.00	5 Never 100.00		
Question 6 & 7 Normalized Value	1 Very Dissatisfied 0.00	2 Dissatisfied 20.00	3 Somewhat Dissatisfied 40.00	4 Somewhat Satisfied 60.00	5 Satisfied 80.00	6 Very Satisfied 100.00	
Q8 a, b, c, h, i, k Q9 a, b, c, d, e, f, h, i, j, k, l, m, p, q, r, s, t, u, w, x, y Normalized Value	1 Strongly Disagree 0.00	2 Disagree 20.00	3 Disagree Somewhat 40.00	4 Agree Somewhat 60.00	5 Agree 80.00	6 Strongly Agree 100.00	
Q8 d, e, f, g, j Q9 g, n, o, v Normalized Value	1 Strongly Disagree 100.00	2 Disagree 80.00	3 Disagree Somewhat 60.00	4 Agree Somewhat 40.00	5 Agree 20.00	6 Strongly Agree 0.00	

There are exceptions to this method. In Question 3 one of the responses is “Don’t Know,” so this would not be counted. Question 4 asks about personal experiences with discrimination, so a “Frequently” response would be very unfavorable and given a value of zero, a “Never” response would be the most favorable and given a value of 100. In Question 8b, “[m]y opinions/input are valued at SJSU,” the response “Disagree Strongly” would be a very unfavorable response and given a value of zero. However, in Question 8d, “I fear for my physical safety on campus because of my race,” the response “Disagree Strongly” would be a very favorable response and given a value of 100.

After these responses were normalized, the responses were then weighted using the same weights system in the previous section. The mean value for each question was then calculated. The ranking for all of the normalized, weighted means can be found in Appendix C.

## B. Most Promising Findings 2010

Table 22 lists the questions that had the most favorable normalized, weighted means. The first three questions ask about personal experience with discrimination. Very few administrators are experiencing discrimination at SJSU. But, any amount of discrimination is too much. Thus, it is difficult to categorize these as the most promising results. SJSU should strive to make this value 100. In other words, no administrators at SJSU should experience discrimination.

Table 22

## Most Promising Finding Student Campus Climate Survey

	N	Mean	Std Dev.
q4e Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Disability	73	93.357	39.9978
q4g Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Religion	72	92.412	38.7454
q4j Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Body Art (e.g. tattoo's, piercings)	70	91.502	40.4602
q3d Helping students learn how to bring about positive change in society	69	89.878	35.0952
q4d Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Sexual Orientation	72	89.404	37.7114
q3b Developing a sense of community among students, staff, and faculty	70	89.147	35.3170
q4f Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Language and/or accent	74	87.849	41.1822
q3c Developing leadership ability among students	70	87.464	34.2895
q3f Developing an appreciation for a multicultural society on campus	71	87.231	32.2671
q3e Promoting a climate where differences of opinion are regularly aired openly	71	85.475	38.9509

There are other, very promising findings from this survey. Administrators responded overwhelmingly that it was important to help students learn how to bring a positive change to society and to promote a climate where differences of opinion are regularly and openly aired. This is in line with the university's goal to expand the knowledge base through research and scholarship. Also, administrators responded that it was important to develop a sense of community and an appreciation for a multicultural campus society. This supports the university's goal to enrich student lives. Finally, administrators responded it was important to develop student leadership. This aligns with the goals for responsible and ethical student behavior.

### C. Most Disappointing Findings 2010

Table 23 lists the questions that had the five most unfavorable normalized, weighted means. Administrators responded there was a lot of pressure to put in overtime. Administrators reported that they and their staff had to work late to get the job done. One surprising finding on the survey was that not enough consideration has been given to the disabled on campus. There were also issues of career advancement and inclusiveness. Finally, administrators were not satisfied with the ethnic composition of their peers and felt there were few opportunities for advancement.

Table 23

Most Disappointing Finding Student Campus Climate Survey

	N	Mean	Std Dev.
q9d The current ethnic composition of administrators at SJSU is adequate	73	50.108	35.3188
q9y There are sufficient opportunities for my advancement within the administration at SJSU	75	49.230	35.2349
q8j I believe more consideration should be given to the needs and interests of disabled people on campus	73	42.400	24.1318
q9n I expect my staff to get the job done even if they have to work late	73	36.780	29.5611
q9o I feel a lot of pressure to work in the evenings and/or on the weekends to get my work done	75	36.749	29.5287

**V. Changes 2006 to 2010**

**A. Most Promising Changes 2006 to 2010**

Although working overtime was one of the most disappointing findings for 2010, it was an improvement from 2006 (Table 24). Administrators also reported that their immediate campus environments were more welcoming in 2010 than in 2006. One of the aims of the Campus Climate Master Plan is to promote diversity. Administrators responded that SJSU is accomplishing this goal. Finally, administrators perceive that age discrimination is less of a problem now than in 2006.

Table 24

Most Promising Changes 2006 to 2010

	Change in Mean
q9o I feel a lot of pressure to work in the evenings and/or on the weekends to get my work done	4.692
q2h Immediate Environment: Welcoming	3.771
q1h General Climate: Welcoming	3.656
q8h I value the work that SJSU is doing to promote diversity	3.474
q4h Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Age	3.385

**B. Most Disappointing Changes: 2006 to 2010**

Workplace issues dominated the most disappointing changes in Administrator attitudes between 2006 and 2010. Administrators responded there was a lack of professional development, challenging duties, and advancement. This led them to report that SJSU was not a good place to work in 2010 relative to 2006. Their biggest concern was the gender composition of their peers.

Table 25

## Most Disappointing Changes: 2006 to 2010

	Change in Mean
q9y There are sufficient opportunities for my advancement within the administration at SJSU	-8.991
q9i I am challenged by the duties associated with my position	-10.313
q9q My professional development is supported	-11.511
q9g SJSU is not a good place to work for administrators	-13.236
q9e The current gender composition of administrators at SJSU is adequate	-15.065

## VI. Conclusion

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

The two SJSU goals of students being active participants in the community and responsible citizens were very important. In fact, administrators responded overwhelmingly that SJSU students should be taught to bring a positive change to society and to develop a sense of community at SJSU.

Administrators also agreed that the immediate and general campus climate values diversity, and that SJSU is more welcoming now than in 2006.

Administrators felt the current ethnic and gender composition of administrators was inadequate and there was a need to recruit, hire, and retain more minorities. Also, there is a need to consider the interest of the disabled on campus. Otherwise, administrators somewhat agreed that the campus climate was good.

Most administrators 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.

Administrators 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.

Some of the most disappointing finding dealt with the administrators work environment. The felt they were being pressured to work longer hours and there was little room for advancement. Even though it was a disappointing finding in 2010, administrators felt less pressure to put in overtime now than in 2006.

Administrators felt that SJSU was more welcoming now than in 2006.

Work conditions seemed to get worse for administrators between 2006 and 2010. They felt there was less opportunity for advancement, less challenge to their position, less professional development, and SJSU was not a good place to work.