

Executive Summary

Introduction

In accordance with the third goal of California State University, Fullerton's (CSUF) Strategic Plan¹ to recruit and retain a high-quality and diverse faculty and staff, President García charged the Diversity Action Plan Task Force (DAPT) to examine the campus climate. "Campus climate refers to the current attitudes, behaviors, standards and practices of employees and students of an institution. It's a way to take the temperature, if you will, on how closely our values are aligned with how we treat and work with one another," according to Lori Gentles, vice president of Human Resources, Diversity & Inclusion.

Rankin & Associates (R&A) was contracted by CSUF to conduct the *California State University, Fullerton Campus Climate Assessment for Recruitment and Retention of Staff and Faculty*. The purpose of the survey was to gather a wide variety of data related to institutional climate, inclusion, and work-life issues so that CSUF is better informed about the living and working environments for faculty and staff. The results of the survey will provide important information about the campus climate at CSUF and enable the recruitment and retention of high-quality and diverse faculty and staff at CSUF as outlined in Strategic Plan Goal 3.

Project Structure and Process

The development of the survey instrument was a collaborative effort between R&A and DAPT. The DAPT comprised CSUF faculty, staff, and administrators charged by President García to assist with the climate assessment. The CSUF survey contained 76 questions, including several open-ended questions so that respondents could provide commentary. The survey was available from March 12, 2014, through April 11, 2014, via a secure online portal. Confidential paper surveys were available to those who did not have access to an Internet-connected computer or who preferred a paper survey.

¹ <http://planning.fullerton.edu/index.asp>

The survey data were analyzed to compare the responses of various groups. Descriptive statistics were calculated by salient group memberships (e.g., position status, gender identity, racial identity) to provide additional information regarding participant responses. Meaningful and notable findings are included in this report based on descriptive and inferential analyses. In addition to the final two open-ended survey questions, additional narrative was requested for several questions in the survey.

Description of the Sample at CSUF

CSUF community members completed 1,574 surveys for an overall response rate of 37%; only surveys that were at least 50% completed were included in the final data set for analyses. Response rates by constituent group varied: 29% for Faculty ($n = 662$), and 46% for Staff ($n = 900$) and Coach ($n = 12$). Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic characteristics of survey respondents. The percentages offered in Table 1 are based on the numbers of respondents in the sample (n) for the specific demographic characteristic.²

²The total n for each demographic characteristic will differ as a result of missing data.

Table 1. CSUF Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Subgroup	<i>n</i>	% of Sample
Position Status	Faculty	662	42.1
	Staff	912	57.9
Gender Identity	Man	591	37.5
	Woman	929	59.0
	Genderqueer	6	0.4
Racial Identity	Other People of Color	231	14.7
	Underrepresented	309	19.6
	White	822	52.2
	Multiple Race	104	6.6
Sexual Identity	LGBQ	115	7.3
	Heterosexual	1,293	82.1
	Asexual/Other	69	4.4
Citizenship Status	U.S. Citizen	1,528	97.1
	Non-U.S. Citizen	18	1.1
	Multiple Citizenships	1	0.1
Disability Status	Disability	191	12.1
	No Disability	1276	81.1
Military Status	Military Service	80	5.1
	No Military Service	1,457	92.6
Religious/Spiritual Affiliation	Christian Affiliation	759	48.2
	Other Faith-Based Affiliation	101	6.4
	No Affiliation	441	28.0
	Multiple Affiliations	11	0.7
	Spiritual, No Affiliation	182	11.6

Note: The total *n* for each selected demographic characteristic differs as a result of missing data.

Key Findings – Areas of Strength

1. High levels of comfort with the climate at CSUF:

- 71% ($n = 1,109$) of the survey respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate at CSUF.
- 70% ($n = 1,103$) of respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate in their departments/work units.
- 86% ($n = 572$) of Faculty respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes.

2. Positive attitudes about work-life issues:

Staff Respondents

- 76% ($n = 681$) of Staff respondents found CSUF supportive of their taking leave.
- 73% ($n = 656$) of Staff respondents reported that they felt valued for the work that they did.
- 68% ($n = 609$) of Staff respondents indicated that their supervisors provided yearly feedback to help them improve their performance.
- 57% ($n = 514$) of Staff respondents indicated that CSUF was supportive of flexible work schedules.

Faculty Respondents

- 61% ($n = 398$) of Faculty respondents believed that their colleagues included them in opportunities that would help their career as much as they did others in their position.
- 61% ($n = 402$) of Faculty respondents felt that the tenure/promotion process was clear and 57% ($n = 375$) felt that it was reasonable.
- 58% ($n = 379$) of Faculty respondents found CSUF supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave.

Key Findings – Opportunities for Improvement

1. Some members of the community experienced exclusionary conduct:

- 27% ($n = 421$) of respondents believed that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.
- Differences emerged based on various demographic characteristics including position, gender identity, ethnic identity, racial identity, and sexual identity. For example,
 - A higher percentage of Staff respondents reported experiencing exclusionary conduct based on their position than did Faculty respondents.
 - A higher percentage of Women respondents reported experiencing this conduct based on their gender identity than did Men respondents.
 - A higher percentage of ethnic and racial minority respondents reported experiencing this conduct based on their racial identity than did non-minority respondents.
 - A higher percentage of LGBTQ respondents reported experiencing this conduct based than did Heterosexual respondents.

2. Several constituent groups indicated that they were less comfortable with the overall campus climate, workplace climate, and classroom climate:

- Staff respondents were more comfortable with the overall climate at CSUF than were Faculty respondents.
- Faculty respondents were more comfortable with the climate in their departments/work units than were than Staff respondents.
- Academic Support Staff respondents were least comfortable, while Management/Administrative Staff respondents were most comfortable with the climate in their departments and work units at CSUF.
- Women respondents were more comfortable than Men respondents to feel comfortable with the overall climate at CSUF.
- Men Faculty respondents were significantly more likely to feel “very comfortable” in their classes than were Women Faculty respondents.

- A higher percentage of White Faculty respondents and Other People of Color³ Faculty respondents were comfortable with the climate in their classes than were other respondents.
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Queer/Questioning (LGBQ) Faculty/Staff respondents were less comfortable with the overall climate and the climate in their classes than were Heterosexual Faculty/Staff respondents.
- Faculty/Staff Respondents With Disabilities were less comfortable with overall climate and the climate in their departments/work units than were Faculty/Staff respondents With No Disabilities.
- Faculty respondents With Disabilities were less comfortable with the climate in their classes than were Faculty respondents With No Disabilities.

3. A small but meaningful percentage of respondents experienced sexual harassment:

- 7% ($n = 104$) of respondents believed that they had experienced sexual harassment while at CSUF.
- Higher percentages of Faculty respondents as compared to Staff respondents, Women respondents as compared to Men respondents, LGBQ respondents as compared to Heterosexual respondents, and respondents With Disabilities as compared to respondents Without Disabilities experienced sexual harassment.

Additional findings, disaggregated by position and other selected demographic characteristics, are provided in greater detail in the full report.

³While recognizing the vastly different experiences of people of various racial identities (e.g., Chicano(a) versus African-American or Latino(a) versus Asian-American), and those experiences within these identity categories (e.g., Hmong versus Chinese), Rankin and Associates found it necessary, with the DAPT's approval, to collapse some of these categories to conduct the analyses as a result of the small numbers of respondents in the individual categories. *Underrepresented* includes Alaskan Native, American Indian, African American/Black, and Latino(a)/Hispanic/Chicano(a). *Other People of Color* includes Asian / Asian American, Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian/African, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander.

The findings are consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of the consultant (Rankin & Associates Consulting, 2014). For example, 70% to 80% of all respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be “comfortable” or “very comfortable”; 71% of all respondents in the CSUF survey reported that they were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate at CSUF. However, 20% to 25% in similar reports believed that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct, yet at CSUF, a slightly higher rate of respondents (27%) believed that they personally had experienced exclusionary conduct. The results do parallel the findings of other climate studies of specific constituent groups offered in the literature (Guiffrida, Gouveia, Wall, & Seward, 2008; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2004; Hurtado & Ponjuan, 2005; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Sears, 2002; Settles, Cortina, Malley, & Stewart, 2006; Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009).