

The Fall 2010 Campus Climate Survey Responses from Faculty 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 survey to assess perceptions of campus climate at 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 San Jose State University (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 1,740 faculty members. Three Hundred (300) responded to the questionnaire, a final response rate of about 17 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. Wiggy Sivertsen, Chairman Campus Climate Committee at (408) 924-5320.

Highlights/Selected findings:

- Most faculty members felt that SJSU was adhering somewhat to its Mission Statement.
- Faculty members had mixed reviews about SJSU’s performance in attaining its Institutional Goals.
- In regards to campus climate, faculty members felt that minorities were not being represented in the ranks of the faculty, staff, and administration. They were dissatisfied with campus administrative leadership. Specifically, they were dissatisfied with the grievance system, evaluation process, reexamination of curriculum, and shared governance.
- Most faculty 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.
- Faculty members’ morale is down. Faculty also expressed concern about availability of funds for research and equipment.
- Multiculturalism is taking hold in the faculty. They are developing a sense of appreciation of the diversity of the student body. Faculty members are also more concerned about safety on campus.
- Finally, more should be done to address the needs of the disabled.

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 survey to assess perceptions of campus climate at 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 San Jose State University (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 1,740 faculty members. Three hundred (300) responded to the questionnaire; a final response rate of about 17 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 32.0% of the general population, yet are 27.6% of all survey participants, so are under-represented in the survey. On the other hand, White females are 31.8% of the general population and 42.4% of all survey participants, so are over-represented.

Table 1

Percentage	Survey		SJSU Population	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
American Indian	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%
Black	1.6%	1.6%	1.4%	1.4%
Asian/Pac Is	5.6%	9.6%	9.3%	7.4%
Hispanic	2.8%	6.0%	2.8%	3.6%
White	27.6%	42.4%	32.0%	31.8%
Other	1.6%	0.8%	4.6%	5.1%

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. In order 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 0.7500 ($31.8\% / 42.4\%$) and White males would have a weight of 1.159 ($32.0\% / 27.6\%$).

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. In the 2006 survey, 407 faculty members responded out of a total faculty population 1,700. This gives us a confidence interval of 4.24%. This is comparable to the confidence interval 2010 of 5.15%. 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 acquire an education. The purpose of this education is to enrich student lives. Faculty members felt that SJSU helps develops a sense of community as well as develops an appreciation for multicultural society on campus. The faculty members rated these two items between “Some” and a “Great Deal”. Faculty members’ perceptions also increased significantly between 2006 and 2010 for these two items (Table 2).

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	3.647	3.671	11.732**
q3f How important do you feel the following topics are for SJSU: Developing an appreciation for a multicultural society on campus	3.484	3.618	7.859*

¹Rating 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. Faculty members who make themselves available to students outside the classroom open up a new dimension of learning. Most faculty members felt they were "Somewhat Satisfied" or "Satisfied" with the quality of interaction with students outside the classroom. This measure declined significantly between 2006 and 2010 (Table 3).

Table 3

Transmission of knowledge and skills

Survey Question	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q7b Quality of interaction with students outside the classroom	4.352	4.346	6.680*

¹Rating Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 2 = Dissatisfied; 3 = Somewhat Dissatisfied; 4 = Somewhat Satisfied; 5 = Satisfied; 6 = Very Satisfied

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

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

Free and public discourse is necessary to expand the knowledge of a student. 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 faculty members agreed from "Some" to a "Great deal" that the University is placing emphasis on these goals. It also found that they significantly agree with this more in 2010 than in 2006 (Table 4).

Table 4

Expanding Knowledge Base			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q3d How important do you feel the following topics are for SJSU: Helping students learn how to bring about positive change in society	3.573	3.735	10.166**
q3e How important do you feel the following topics are for SJSU: Promoting a climate where differences of opinion are regularly aired openly	3.587	3.699	16.238***

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

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

4. SJSU Goals

"For both undergraduate and graduate students, the university emphasizes the following goals:"

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

In order to promote scholarship among the students, faculty members need to have time and money to complete independent research. Faculty members "Disagree Somewhat" to "Disagree" with the statement that there is adequate time and funds available for research. Faculty members felt this situation worsened from 2006 to 2010, but the difference was not significant (Table 5).

Table 5

Knowledge of Major Field of Study			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q9x Special funds and release time for research or professional development are adequate	2.416	2.344	0.369

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

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

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

SJSU does not just produce chemists or accountants; we produce students with a broad knowledge of the world. One of the ways this is accomplished is through GE courses. Faculty members "Disagree Somewhat" to "Disagree" with the statement that too much emphasis was placed on racial/ethnic issues in GE courses (Table 6). They felt that more could be done. This perception improved significantly between 2006 and 2010.

Table 6

Broad Understanding in Variety of Subjects			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q9n Too much emphasis placed racial, ethnic issues in GE courses	2.904	3.103	5.377*

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

There were no questions on the Faculty 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.”*

Today’s students live in a global economy which involves many cultures. In order to understand these cultures, SJSU must educate students about them. Faculty members “Agree Somewhat” that such subject are incorporated in the curriculum. Faculty members also felt that this situation did not improve from 2006 to 2010 (Table 7).

Table 7

Multi-cultural and Global Perspective			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q9o Faculty encouraged to incorporate ethnic and gender material into curriculum	4.302	4.112	4.383*

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

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

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

In order to learn about the different subject areas, participation in professional and artistic communities is essential. To that end, SJSU must recruit high-achieving students in order to lead these communities. Faculty members say that this is somewhat important to SJSU (Table 8), but has lessened in importance important from 2006 to 2010. In order to have diversity at SJSU, it must be encouraged. Faculty members say that this is “Some” to a “Great Deal” important. Faculty members feel that this is more important in 2010 than in 2006.

Table 8

Active Participation in Communities			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q3g Recruiting high achieving students	3.522	3.485	12.717***
q3h Promoting and celebrating diversity	3.441	3.497	9.396**

¹Rating 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. Faculty members agreed that SJSU is developing leadership among students (Table 9). Faculty members also think that this has improved significantly from 2006 to 2010.

Table 9

Responsible Citizenship and Ethical Choices			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q3c Developing leadership ability among students	3.432	3.672	10.949**

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 administrators make up the SJSU community.”

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

Faculty 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 10). However, six out of the eight measures for immediate environment declined significantly from 2006 to 2010, this included being respectful, hospitable to the disabled, non-sexist, safe, supportive, and welcoming.

Table 10

Immediate Campus Climate			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q2a Immediate Environment: Respectful	5.553	5.530	12.095**
q2b Immediate Environment: Hospitable to the disabled	5.669	5.516	18.573***
q2c Immediate Environment: Non-racist	5.814	5.825	19.145***
q2d Immediate Environment: Non-sexist	5.698	5.632	11.664**
q2e Immediate Environment: Non-homophobic	5.795	5.823	12.340***
q2f Immediate Environment: Safe	5.941	5.442	22.157***
q2g Immediate Environment: Supportive	5.390	5.214	9.071**
q2h Immediate Environment: Welcoming	5.455	5.362	8.965**

¹ Rating 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.”*

Faculty members found that the general campus environment values diversity somewhat. This includes being respectful, hospitable to the disabled, non-racist, non-sexist, non-homophobic, safe, supportive, and welcoming (Table 11). The general campus climate, however, was not as welcoming to the principles of diversity as the immediate environment (Table 10). There also seems to be less of a decline in the general campus environment from 2006 to 2010, than in the immediate campus environment during the same period.

Table 11

General Campus Climate			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q1.a General Climate: Respectful	5.295	5.230	6.715*
q1b General Climate: Hospitable to the disabled	5.321	5.184	18.312***
q1c General Climate: Non-racist	5.236	5.420	15.178***
q1d General Climate: Non-sexist	5.098	5.206	12.901***
q1e General Climate: Non-homophobic	5.015	5.234	11.001**
q1f General Climate: Safe	5.206	4.669	5.259*
q1g General Climate: Supportive	4.793	4.607	2.577
q1h General Climate: Welcoming	4.760	4.771	3.785

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”*

It is important that the campus show sensitivity to the issues of ethnicity, race, sexism, and sexual preference in order to have a campus that values diversity. SJSU Faculty members believe minority faculty are not represented in important Academic Senate committees (Table 12). For the most part, however, faculty members are somewhat satisfied with campus climate and diversity. Also, in four out of the six measures attitudes improved from 2006 to 2010.

Table 12

Campus Climate Values Diversity			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q9e Student diversity is appreciated by the faculty on this campus	4.428	4.660	15.499***
q9f Minority faculty are adequately represented on important Academic Senate committees	3.766	3.903	8.744**
q9g Women faculty receive the same level of support as male faculty	4.152	4.134	12.627***
q9h Senior faculty are supportive of junior faculty in my department	4.349	4.355	6.866**
q9k My colleagues are committed to the curtailment of sexual harassment.	4.587	4.703	14.892***
q9l Subtle discrimination is tolerated on this campus	3.157	3.315	2.639

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

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

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 effective administrative leadership. SJSU faculty members were “Somewhat Dissatisfied” with the campus administrative leadership. This attitude declined significantly between 2006 and 2010 (Table 13). Some of the organizational structures that help bring about an inclusive and diverse environment are an effective grievance process and shared governance. Faculty members were “Somewhat Dissatisfied” with both of these (Table 14). The attitude, however, toward the grievance process improved significantly between 2006 and 2010.

Table 13

Coordinate and Monitor Campus Climate (Part 1)			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q7c Campus administrative leadership	3.697	3.491	.817

¹Rating Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 2 = Dissatisfied; 3 = Somewhat Dissatisfied; 4 = Somewhat Satisfied; 5 = Satisfied; 6 = Very Satisfied

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

Table 14

Coordinate and Monitor Campus Climate (Part 2)			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q9p The process by which complaints and grievances against faculty are resolved is fair and equitable	3.835	3.975	7.773*
q9q Administrators actively support shared governance	3.716	3.345	2.158

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 are like the students they teach and serve. Faculty members feel that some effort is being made to recruit minorities for employment at SJSU (Table 15). This effort has improved from 2006 to 2010. Faculty members also “Somewhat Agree” to “Agree” that an honest effort is being made in their department to create a diverse workforce (Table 16), although, this attitude declined significantly between 2006 and 2010.

Table 15

Recruit, Hire, and Retain Diverse Employees (Part 1)			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q3a Increasing the representation of minorities in the faculty, staff, and administration	3.064	3.208	6.669*

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

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

Table 16

Recruit, Hire, and Retain Diverse Employees (Part 2)			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q9v In the last 5 years, my department made an honest effort to hire diverse faculty	4.744	4.713	17.107***
q9y The evaluation process for lecturers is fair and equitable	3.672	3.791	4.715*

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

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

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

One the best ways for faculty members to learn about other cultures is through professional development. For the most part, faculty members were “Somewhat Dissatisfied” with all phases

of professional development (Table 17). These attitudes declined from 2006 to 2010, with autonomy and independence declining significantly.

Table 17

Professional Development Activities			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q6a Opportunity for scholarly and creative pursuits	3.915	3.704	1.987
q6e Autonomy and independence	4.854	4.756	9.059**
q6j Advice & mentoring you have received from faculty in your department	4.073	3.944	2.376
q6k Opportunities for professional development	3.947	3.653	1.494

¹Rating Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 2 = Dissatisfied; 3 = Somewhat Dissatisfied; 4 = Somewhat Satisfied; 5 = Satisfied; 6 = Very Satisfied

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

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

The faculty members are a student’s primary contact with the SJSU campus. In order to teach students respect for diverse perspectives, departments should be incorporating the importance of diversity into their curriculum. Most faculty members “Disagree Somewhat” that these is being done and believe changes to curriculum are not rewarded (Table 18). Faculty members feel that the situation has worsened significantly from 2006 to 2010.

Table 18

Diversity in Curriculum and Pedagogical Strategies			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q9s Efforts to reexamine the curriculum or pedagogical practices are rewarded at SJSU	3.701	3.514	3.962*

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

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

6. *“Enhance professional development opportunities”*

In order to promote and retain qualified, diverse employees, SJSU must enhance professional development activities. Faculty members somewhat agree that SJSU is doing this (Table 19). However, there was a significant decline from 2006 to 2010 in two out of the four measures.

Table 19

Professional Development Opportunities

	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q9a I believe I have less time available for research than other faculty in my dept	3.471	3.559	3.722
q9b My department is supportive of the faculty's use of various teaching styles	4.664	4.719	8.277**
q10a I have sufficient opportunities to meet with my chair	4.916	4.820	19.449***
q10e The subject matter I choose to focus on in my scholarly work is valued	4.315	4.087	7.478*

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

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

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 faculty members should not have any incidence of harassment or discrimination. Most of the SJSU faculty members have never been discriminated against (Table 20). Obviously, any incident, no matter how small, should not be tolerated. There have been some faculty members who have encountered discrimination, but most have not. Incidences of discrimination declined significantly for gender, political views, race, language, and body art; but it increased for sexual orientation, disability, religion, age, physical size and union activities between 2006 and 2010.

Table 20

User-friendly Campus

	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q4a Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Gender	4.268	4.302	11.553**
q4b Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Political Views	4.398	4.418	8.364*
q4c Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Race/ Ethnicity	4.453	4.469	14.463***
q4d Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Sexual Orientation	4.743	4.694	12.604***
q4e Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Disability	4.839	4.736	15.406***
q4f Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Language and or accent	4.719	4.778	22.080***
q4g Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Religion	4.727	4.694	17.872***
q4h Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Age	4.453	4.343	14.231***
q4i Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Weight-Physical Size	4.734	4.699	16.055***
q4j Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Body Art (e.g. tattoo's, piercings)	4.963	4.968	22.025***
q4k Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Union Activities	4.741	4.513	14.459***

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”*

Helping underprepared students through remediation and other support activities is one way to facilitate and environment of success. Most faculty members somewhat agree that they are doing their part by meeting with students outside of class (Table 21).

Table 21

Student Success			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q7b Quality of interaction with students outside the classroom	4.352	4.346	6.680*

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 faculty members are involved with the community, they are promoting a diverse, inclusive environment. Most faculty members felt that they were not rewarded for this activity (Table 22). Also, faculty members felt that rewards for campus service declined between 2006 and 2010.

Table 22

Community Involvement			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q10c My service to the campus is rewarded by my department	3.928	3.743	5.074*
q10d My work on or off campus with specific ethnic or cultural groups is rewarded	3.751	3.591	2.574

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

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

Faculty members stated somewhat that more consideration should be given to the needs of the disabled (Table 23). This attitude improved between 2006 and 2010.

Table 23

SJSU Compliance to ADA			
	2006 Mean ¹	2010 Mean ¹	t-test ²
q8j I believe more consideration should be given to the needs and interests of disabled people on campus	3.843	3.929	4.632*

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

IV. Most Promising and Disappointing Findings 2010

This section is devoted to determining the most promising findings in the faculty responses to the Campus Climate Survey; 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 faculty members have identified as areas of concern that SJSU should be working on as a university and as a community.

A. Normalizing Likert Scales

In order 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 general questions there are six different Likert scales, so comparison is difficult without devising some type of system to make the responses equal.

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 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 Faculty 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 Occaisionally 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 b, c, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, m, o, p, q, r, s, t, u, w, x, y Q10 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 a, d, l, n 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”, this would not be counted. Question 4 asks about personal experiences with discrimination, 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: My opinions/input are valued at SJSU, “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, “Disagree Strongly” would be a very favorable response and given a value of 100.

After these responses were normalized, the responses were then 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 on Appendix C.

B. Most Promising Findings

Table 24 lists the questions that had the most favorable normalized, weighted means. As you can see, the first six questions ask about personal experience with discrimination: very few faculty members are experiencing discrimination at SJSU. However, it is difficult to say these are the most promising results in that any amount of discrimination is too much. SJSU should be working towards making this value 100; no faculty member at SJSU should experience discrimination.

Table 24

Most Promising Finding Faculty Campus Climate Survey

	N	Mean	Std Dev.
q4j Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Body Art (e.g. tattoo's, piercings)	243	99.071	55.8779
q4f Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Language and/or accent	249	93.837	61.5032
q4e Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Disability	248	93.383	51.0320
q4i Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Weight/Physical Size	249	92.465	53.5260
q4d Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Sexual Orientation	250	92.387	51.2394
q4g Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Religion	249	91.992	63.3839
q8e I fear for my physical safety on campus because of my sexual orientation	247	88.855	51.8943
q3b Developing a sense of community among students, staff, and faculty	244	88.584	55.7743
q3e Promoting a climate where differences of opinion are regularly aired openly	243	88.427	57.4591
q4k Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Union Activities	250	87.152	54.4754
q4c Have you been discriminated against on campus because of your: Race/Ethnicity	249	86.441	52.4063
q3d Helping students learn how to bring about positive change in society	246	86.414	51.6731
q8d I fear for my physical safety on campus because of my race, ethnicity, or culture	246	86.268	51.1451

Besides experiences with discrimination, there are very promising findings from this survey. Faculty felt overwhelmingly that they did not have to fear for their safety due to their sexual

orientation. Also, they felt that it was important to develop a sense of community. This is in line with our goal of enriching student lives. They also agreed that SJSU should be able to discuss differences of opinion. This confirms that faculty members are trying to expand the students' knowledge base outside the classroom. Faculty members felt overwhelmingly that SJSU helps students learn to bring a positive change to society. This is in line with our goal to give students skills and knowledge to be of service to society. Finally, faculty members felt they were relatively safe on campus because of their race, ethnicity, or culture.

C. Most Disappointing Findings

Table 25 lists the questions that had the five most unfavorable normalized, weighted means. Faculty members felt there was limited money and time for research, and they were concerned about the maintenance of facilities and equipment. This is not surprising considering the recent budget problems at CSU. One surprising finding is that they felt that not enough consideration is being given to the disabled on campus. Finally, morale seems to be a big problem among faculty members. Again, this can be traced to the recent budget problems.

Table 25

Most Disappointing Finding Faculty Campus Climate Survey			
	N	Mean	Std Dev.
q9j Faculty morale is good at this campus	252	41.503	31.5708
q8j I believe more consideration should be given to the needs and interests of disabled people on campus	247	40.889	33.8743
q6l Facilities and equipment	260	37.102	39.3766
q9w There is little need for a faculty lunchroom	261	32.765	38.8805
q9x Special funds and release time for research or professional development are adequate	268	24.222	35.8439

V. Changes 2006 to 2010

A. Most Promising Changes 2006 to 2010

One of the most positive movements in faculty members attitudes measured in the Campus Climate Survey is that student diversity is appreciated by the faculty and that faculty members are developing an appreciation for a multicultural society on campus (Table 26). This is evidence that the programs and initiatives SJSU has implemented in the last four years in order to have an inclusive, multicultural community are working.

Table 26

 Most Promising Changes 2006 to 2010

	Change in Mean
q8i I feel comfortable talking about my religion on campus	4.943
q3c Developing leadership ability among students	4.925
q9e Student diversity is appreciated by the faculty on this campus	4.493
q1e General Climate: Non-homophobic	3.645
q3f Developing an appreciation for a multicultural society on campus	5.611

B. Most Disappointing Changes: 2006 to 2010

Among the most disappointing findings are the issues of safety on campus. Faculty members have indicated that feelings of safety have declined a lot from 2006 to 2010 (Table 27). Faculty members also have concerns about the administration relative to support, shared governance, and committee work.

Table 27

 Most Disappointing Changes: 2006 to 2010

	Change in Mean
q9d I believe I am asked to serve on more committees than colleagues within my department	(7.245)
q9q Administrators actively support shared governance	(8.017)
q2f Immediate Environment: Safe	(8.329)
q1f General Climate: Safe	(9.318)
q9r I feel supported by my dean	(10.398)

VI. Conclusion

Most faculty members felt that SJSU was adhering somewhat to its Mission Statement.

Faculty members had mixed reviews about SJSU's performance in attaining its Institutional Goals.

In regards to campus climate, faculty members felt that minorities were not being represented in the ranks of the faculty, staff, and administration. They were dissatisfied with campus administrative leadership, specifically, the grievance system, evaluation process, reexamination of curriculum, and shared governance.

Most faculty 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.

Faculty members' morale is down. Faculty also expressed concern about availability of funds for research and equipment.

Multiculturalism is taking hold in the faculty. They are developing a sense of appreciation of the diversity of the student body. Faculty members are also more concerned about safety on campus.

Finally, more should be done to address the needs of the disabled.