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Purpose:
This survey, very similar to the campus climate surveys conducted in 2006 and 2010, sought to better understand the experiences of the campus community. It also coincided with the intent of the President’s Commission on Diversity (PCD) to understand campus climate.

Goals:
- Identify campus climate concerns affecting students, faculty, staff, and administrators.
- Compare campus climate data from a previous survey done in 2010.
- Help prioritize and target university actions to improve the campus climate.
Survey Methodology

All current students, faculty, staff, and administrators were invited via e-mail to complete the survey online in March and April 2015. Responses were anonymous, but those who provided their contact information were eligible to win a gift card for their participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population Contacted</th>
<th>Usable Responses Received</th>
<th>Estimated Participation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students 33,659</td>
<td>5,586</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (incl. temporary) 2,320</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; administration 5,329</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Respondent Profile: Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gender</strong></th>
<th>55% Female, 44% Male, 1% (Genderqueer, Transman, Transwoman, Intersex, Other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>Average age was 24. About 25% were younger than 20 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td>6% indicated having a disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>Asians (41%) were the predominant ethnic group, followed by White (24%), Latino (19%), Two or more races (7%), African American (3%), Middle Eastern (2%), Pacific Islander (1%) and others (4%). The predominant Asian nationalities were Asian Indian (27%), Chinese (25%), Vietnamese (19%), and Filipina/o (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the responses came from juniors (26%) and seniors (28%). Seniors were underrepresented in the sample, while juniors and graduate students were overrepresented. A plurality (43%) entered SJSU as freshmen.
The largest share of respondents (35%) spent more than 10 hours a week on campus, 74% had a commute time of 30 minutes or less (includes 14% on-campus students).
Most students identify as being Democrats or have no political affiliation. In terms of religious affiliation, most are Christians followed by agnostics and atheists.
# Respondent Profile: Employees

## Gender
63% Female, 35% Male, 2% were Genderqueer, Transman, Intersex and Other

## Age
Average age was 47. 20% were over the age of 60

## Disability
9% indicated having a disability

## Ethnicity
Most were White (44%), followed by Asians (18%), and Hispanic/Latino (16%), Two or more races (7%), African American (5%), Pacific Islander (1%), and Other (5%)
Respondent Profile: Employees

COLLEGE OR ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

- Student Affairs: 130 (17%)
- Applied Sciences & Arts: 128 (10%)
- Social Sciences: 111 (5%)
- Administration & Finance: 104 (12%)
- Humanities & Arts: 95 (5%)
- Business: 93 (8%)
- Sciences: 71 (5%)
- Engineering: 60 (5%)
- Education: 56 (3%)
- Academic Administration: 43 (6%)
- University Advancement: 39 (4%)
- MLK Library: 27 (4%)
- International & Extended Studies: 25 (3%)
- University Foundation: 10 (1%)
- President's Office: 1 (0%)
- Other: 95 (12%)
### Topic Areas Covered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>MPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General climate at SJSU</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate work climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success of diversity initiatives</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment/discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/out-of-classroom experience</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of open communication</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in diversity activities</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction &amp; career issues</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance issues</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preview of Findings

• The majority of students, faculty, staff, and administrators view the campus climate favorably

• Nonetheless there are frequent concerns about several issues, notably
  ▪ Experiences of discrimination, intolerance, and hostility
  ▪ Lack of open, respectful communication, especially on sensitive topics
  ▪ Opportunities for deeper social engagement and on-campus activities
  ▪ Physical safety, particularly among students
  ▪ The style and direction of campus leadership

• Where comparable data were collected, there are very few areas where perceptions of climate have measurably improved since 2010
General climate
Most Stakeholders Upbeat, But Room to Improve

- A majority of respondents in each constituent group—students, faculty, staff, and administrators—view most aspects of the overall campus climate favorably.
- Most perceived the climate as ‘moderately’ or ‘very much’ respectful (71% of students, and 67% of employees).
- Most also viewed the campus as ‘not at all’ or ‘slightly’ racist (73% of students and 64% of employees). They also viewed the climate as less sexist (77% of students and 65% of employees).
- African Americans were more likely to perceive the climate as more racist.
- LGBT students were more likely than their heterosexual peers to view the university climate as homophobic.
- Among those who identified as disabled 23% of disabled students and almost a third of disabled employees rated the SJSU climate as ‘not at all’ or only ‘slightly’ inclusive of the disabled.
### Ratings by students of the general campus climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respectful</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive of Disabled</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homophobic</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racist</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexist</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5,091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The ratings are based on a 1-5 scale.*
Ratings by all employees (faculty, staff, administrators) of the general campus climate

- Respectful: 4% Not at all, 7% Slightly, 22% Somewhat, 51% Moderately, 16% Extremely
  Average: 3.7
  1,261 Responses

- Safe: 14% Not at all, 32% Slightly, 41% Somewhat, 9% Extremely
  Average: 3.4
  1,265 Responses

- Supportive: 6% Not at all, 13% Slightly, 28% Somewhat, 38% Moderately, 13% Extremely
  Average: 3.4
  1,264 Responses

- Welcoming: 12% Not at all, 26% Slightly, 40% Somewhat, 18% Extremely
  Average: 3.6
  1,258 Responses

- Inclusive of Disabled: 8% Not at all, 21% Slightly, 41% Somewhat, 25% Extremely
  Average: 3.8
  1,236 Responses

- Homophobic: 47% Not at all, 26% Slightly, 16% Somewhat, 7% Extremely
  Average: 1.9
  1,229 Responses

- Racist: 33% Not at all, 31% Slightly, 22% Somewhat, 11% Extremely
  Average: 2.2
  1,248 Responses

- Sexist: 36% Not at all, 29% Slightly, 20% Somewhat, 12% Extremely
  Average: 2.2
  1,244 Responses
Experiences of discrimination on campus
Many Students Experience Discrimination

• Just over half of student respondents indicated one or more episodes of discrimination or harassment on campus. This proportion is unchanged from 2010

• Race, Gender, and Political Views are the most commonly cited forms of discrimination or harassment

• African American reported experiencing more race-based harassment than other groups and women were much more likely to report gender discrimination

• Most often, other students are the source of discrimination

• Students in 2015 were less likely to feel that SJSU staff were sensitive to issues of sexism, racism, and homophobia than in 2010
### Student reports of discrimination or harassment by type and source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of discrimination reported</th>
<th>Fellow student</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Staff/Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political views</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and/or accent</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight/Physical size</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body art</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Status</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For example, in the Figure above, 10.2% of the reported incidents – 805 separate responses indicated an episode of race discrimination caused by a student.*
Faculty and Staff Report Many Instances, Too

- Gender, age, and ethnic discrimination are the most commonly cited forms of discrimination or harassment among employees.

- In-group discrimination was the most prevalent for faculty, staff, and administrators.

- The most prevalent discrimination instances by type of discrimination and source include:
  
  Faculty: Gender (by other faculty and by administrators)
  Administrators: Gender & Age* (both by fellow administrators)
  Staff: Race (by other staff) & Age* (by administrators)

* Age discrimination was prevalent in both younger and older employees
## Faculty/staff/administration reports of discrimination or harassment by type and source

### Who committed the act of discrimination or harassment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of discrimination reported</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff member</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political views</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight/Physical size</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and/or accent</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Activities</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body art</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Status</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open and respectful communication
Both Students and Employees Worry About Voicing Unpopular Opinions

- Part of the university community feels marginalized due to few venues for free, civil discussions and even overtly hostile encounters that discourage open exchange of ideas.

- This can include sensitive issues like past hate crimes, race, and the airing of other problems on campus.

- In general, as compared to students, employees are much more critical of the university not being successful at facilitating differences of opinions.
Ratings by students on perceptions of open communication

- I feel comfortable talking about my religion: 5% (Strongly Disagree), 14% (Disagree), 12% (Somewhat Disagree), 26% (Somewhat Agree), 9% (Agree), 34% (Strongly Agree). Average: 4.2 (3,745 responses).
- I feel comfortable talking about my political views: 5% (Strongly Disagree), 11% (Disagree), 13% (Somewhat Disagree), 30% (Somewhat Agree), 9% (Agree), 32% (Strongly Agree). Average: 4.1 (3,935 responses).
- My opinions are valued at SJSU: 7% (Strongly Disagree), 8% (Disagree), 15% (Somewhat Disagree), 37% (Somewhat Agree), 9% (Agree), 23% (Strongly Agree). Average: 3.8 (4,607 responses).
- I feel comfortable talking about my economic status: 6% (Strongly Disagree), 9% (Disagree), 17% (Somewhat Disagree), 28% (Somewhat Agree), 13% (Agree), 27% (Strongly Agree). Average: 3.8 (4,265 responses).
- I feel comfortable talking about my veteran status: 10% (Strongly Disagree), 13% (Disagree), 15% (Somewhat Disagree), 25% (Somewhat Agree), 14% (Agree), 23% (Strongly Agree). Average: 3.8 (872 responses).
- I feel uncomfortable discussing racially sensitive topics: 14% (Strongly Disagree), 6% (Disagree), 19% (Somewhat Disagree), 23% (Somewhat Agree), 28% (Agree), 11% (Strongly Agree). Average: 3.1 (4,418 responses).
- I feel uncomfortable discussing my sexual orientation: 34% (Strongly Disagree), 6% (Disagree), 11% (Somewhat Disagree), 10% (Somewhat Agree), 29% (Agree), 9% (Strongly Agree). Average: 2.5 (3,096 responses).
Ratings by students on perceptions of racial tension on campus

Comparison between 2015 and 2010:

- **2015**
  - Strongly Disagree: 16%
  - Disagree: 29%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 19%
  - Somewhat Agree: 23%
  - Agree: 9%
  - Strongly Agree: 5%
  - Average: 3.0
  - 4,307 responses

- **2010**
  - Strongly Disagree: 23%
  - Disagree: 36%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 21%
  - Somewhat Agree: 14%
  - Agree: 4%
  - Average: 2.5
  - 4,136 responses
Ratings by faculty, staff, and administrators on perceptions of open communication

- **I feel comfortable talking about my religion**
  - Strongly Disagree: 7%
  - Disagree: 10%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 11%
  - Somewhat Agree: 25%
  - Agree: 13%
  - Strongly Agree: 30%
  - Average: 3.9
  - 1,066 Responses

- **I feel comfortable talking about my political views**
  - Strongly Disagree: 6%
  - Disagree: 8%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 17%
  - Somewhat Agree: 28%
  - Agree: 11%
  - Strongly Agree: 27%
  - Average: 3.9
  - 1,085 Responses

- **I feel comfortable talking about my economic status**
  - Strongly Disagree: 8%
  - Disagree: 6%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 20%
  - Somewhat Agree: 27%
  - Agree: 16%
  - Strongly Agree: 20%
  - Average: 3.5
  - 1,083 Responses

- **My opinions are valued at SJSU**
  - Strongly Disagree: 12%
  - Disagree: 7%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 19%
  - Somewhat Agree: 29%
  - Agree: 13%
  - Strongly Agree: 19%
  - Average: 3.5
  - 1,097 Responses

- **I feel uncomfortable discussing racially sensitive topics**
  - Strongly Disagree: 19%
  - Disagree: 15%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 20%
  - Somewhat Agree: 28%
  - Agree: 12%
  - Average: 2.9
  - 1,094 Responses

- **I feel uncomfortable discussing my sexual orientation**
  - Strongly Disagree: 45%
  - Disagree: 6%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 4%
  - Somewhat Agree: 32%
  - Agree: 5%
  - Strongly Agree: 0%
  - Average: 1.9
  - 1,054 Responses
Social engagement and campus activities
Students and Employees Seek Deeper Interaction, More Events

- Students living both on and off campus expressed interest in having more activities—including many ideas about clubs—as well as better notifications about upcoming events, including via e-mail and Canvas.

- Faculty and staff described similar concerns about lack of community and a wish for more social events.

- African Americans were less likely to believe that SJSU was building a sense of community.
Personal safety
Students Increasingly Concerned About Safety

- More than 300 written comments referred to matters of physical safety on campus, with women and minorities more likely to have fears.
- The percentage expressing fear rose substantially from 2010 to 2015.
- Females and nontraditional gender students were more likely than men to express concerns about safety.
- Asian students were also significantly more likely than either whites or Latina/os to express concerns about safety.
Ratings by students on whether they fear for their safety on campus

2015
- Strongly Disagree: 10%
- Disagree: 19%
- Somewhat Disagree: 17%
- Somewhat Agree: 32%
- Agree: 14%
- Strongly Agree: 8%

4,601 responses

Average: 3.6

2010
- Strongly Disagree: 22%
- Disagree: 30%
- Somewhat Disagree: 18%
- Somewhat Agree: 20%
- Agree: 8%

4,159 responses

Average: 2.7
Job satisfaction
## Faculty Morale Low, Staff Seek Recognition

- Faculty had concerns about decision-making, sharing of information, and opportunities for research and professional development, while staff and administrators sought more mentoring and recognition.

- Both faculty and administrator overall job satisfaction declined from 2010 to 2015, and compensation was cited often by faculty and staff.

- African American employees reported having greater satisfaction with their level of autonomy and overall job satisfaction, and rated their professional relationship with coworkers higher.
Ratings by faculty on whether they believe faculty morale is good

- **2015**
  - Strongly Disagree: 31%
  - Disagree: 20%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 18%
  - Somewhat Agree: 18%
  - Agree: 9%
  - Average: 2.6
  - 444 responses

- **2010**
  - Strongly Disagree: 12%
  - Disagree: 19%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 24%
  - Somewhat Agree: 30%
  - Agree: 13%
  - Average: 3.2
  - 291 responses
Governance and campus leadership
Dissatisfaction with Campus Leadership

• Satisfaction with campus leadership dropped precipitously from 2010 to 2015 among faculty, staff, and administrators
• The largest decrease among administrators and the smallest among staff.
• Many respondents perceived a lack of transparency, disconnected decision-making, and a decline of shared governance
Ratings by administrators on whether they believe SJSU is a well-run university

2015
- 16% Strongly Disagree
- 22% Disagree
- 20% Somewhat Disagree
- 18% Somewhat Agree
- 20% Agree

Average: 3.1
99 responses

2010
- 6% Strongly Disagree
- 7% Disagree
- 18% Somewhat Disagree
- 27% Somewhat Agree
- 32% Agree
- 10% Strongly Agree

Average: 4.0
84 responses
The survey highlighted the importance of the following issues:

- Safety in particular for students on campus after dark
- Civility, respectful discourse, and constructive social engagement among students
- Structured, supportive venues for open discourse on topics of concern, including controversial subjects
- Sensitivity/awareness training for the whole campus community
- Accessible campus leadership
Discussion