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Climate In Higher Education

Community Members

Create and Distribute Knowledge

Climate (Living, Working, Learning)

Assessing Campus Climate

What is it?

- Campus Climate is a construct

Definition?

- Current attitudes, behaviors, and standards and practices of employees and students of an institution

How is it measured?

- Personal Experiences
- Perceptions
- Institutional Efforts
How students experience their campus environment influences both learning and developmental outcomes.\(^1\)

Discriminatory environments have a negative effect on student learning.\(^2\)

Research supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty on enhancing learning outcomes.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005
\(^2\) Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Hagedron, 1999; Feagin, Vera & Imani, 1996; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005.
The personal and professional development of employees including faculty members, administrators, and staff members are impacted by campus climate.¹

Faculty members who judge their campus climate more positively are more likely to feel personally supported and perceive their work unit as more supportive.²

Research underscores the relationships between (1) workplace discrimination and negative job/career attitudes and (2) workplace encounters with prejudice and lower health/well-being.³

¹Settles, Cortina, Malley, and Stewart, 2006
²Sears, 2002
³Costello, 2012; Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2007;
Projected Outcomes

Cal Poly will add to their knowledge base with regard to how constituent groups currently feel about their particular campus climate and how the community responds to them (e.g., work-life issues, curricular integration, inter-group/intra-group relations, respect issues).

Cal Poly will use the results of the assessment to inform current/on-going work.
Setting the Context for Beginning the Work

Examine the Research
- Review work already completed

Preparation
- Readiness of each campus

Assessment
- Examine the climate

Follow-up
- Building on the successes and addressing the challenges
Transformational Tapestry Model

- Access/Retention
- Research/Scholarship
- Current Campus Climate
- Inter/Intragroup Relations
- Curriculum/Pedagogy
- External Relations
- University Policies/Service

**Assessment**
- Baseline Organizational Challenges
- Systems Analysis
- Local/Sate/Regional Environments
- Contextualized Campus Wide Assessment
- Advanced Organizational Challenges
- Consultant Recommendations

**Transformation via Intervention**
- Symbolic Actions
- Fiscal Actions
- Educational Actions
- Administrative Actions

**Transformed Campus Climate**
- Access
- Retention
- University Policies/Service
- Research
- Scholarship
- Curriculum/Pedagogy
- Inter/Intragroup Relations
- External Relations
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Overview of the Project

Phase I
- Assessment Tool Development and Implementation

Phase II
- Data Analysis

Phase III
- Final Report and Presentation
Phase I
Fall 2013 – Spring 2014

Meetings with Cal Poly’s Campus Climate Work Group (CCWG) to develop the survey instrument.

The CCWG (which comprised faculty, staff, students and administrators) reviewed multiple drafts of the survey and approved the final survey instrument.

The final survey was distributed to the entire Cal Poly community (students, faculty, and staff) from February 26th, 2014 – April 4th, 2014.
Final instrument
• 108 questions and additional space for respondents to provide commentary
• On-line or paper & pencil options

Sample = Population
• All students, faculty and staff of Cal Poly’s community received an invitation to participate.
Survey Limitations

- Self-selection bias
- Response rates
- Social desirability
- Caution in generalizing results for constituent groups with low response rates
Method Limitation

Data were not reported for groups of fewer than 5 individuals where identity could be compromised.

Instead, small groups were combined to eliminate possibility of identifying individuals.
Phase II
Spring 2014

Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted
Phase III
Summer 2014

Report draft reviewed by the CCWG.

Final report submitted to Cal Poly.

Presentation to Cal Poly campus community.
Results

Response Rates
Who are the respondents?

6,366 people responded to the call to participate
(29% overall response rate)
Response Rates

- Undergraduate ($n = 4,641$): 25%
- Graduate ($n = 260$): 31%
- Faculty/Librarians ($n = 531$): 42%
- Staff ($n = 934$): 84%
Results

Additional Demographic Characteristics
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Duplicated Total)

- White: 77%
- Latino(a)/Chicano(a)/Hispanic: 15%
- Asian: 15%
- Middle Eastern: 3%
- American Indian: 2%
- Black/African American: 2%
- Pacific Islander: 1%
- Alaskan Native: <1%
- Native Hawaiian: <1%
- Other: 1%
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%) (Unduplicated Total)

- Multiple Race: 14%
- White: 63%
- People of Color: 21%
Respondents by Position (%)

- Undergraduate Students: 73%
- Graduate Students: 4%
- Faculty/Librarian: 8%
- Staff: 15%
Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (%)

- Grad Students
  - Women: 53%
  - Men: 45%
  - Genderqueer: <1%

- Undergrad Students
  - Women: 54%
  - Men: 44%

- Staff
  - Women: 62%
  - Men: 36%

- Faculty/Librarian
  - Women: 40%
  - Men: 57%

Note: Responses with n’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure
Respondents by Sexual Identity and Position Status ($n$)

Note: Responses with $n$’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure.
Respondents with Conditions that Substantially Affect Major Life Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health/Psychological Disability/Condition</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vision</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability/Condition</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Disability/Condition</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of Hearing</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys/Mobility disability/condition that affects walking</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys/Mobility disability/condition that does not affect walking</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/Communication Condition</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired/Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asperger's/Autism Spectrum</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Religious/Spiritual Affiliation (%)
## Citizenship Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen</td>
<td>6,154</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Resident</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non U.S. citizen (F-1, J-1, H1-B, A, L, G, E and TN visa holder)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented resident/AB540</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# First Generation and Low Income Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Gen/Low-Income</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not First-Generation/Not Low Income</td>
<td>6,003</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Generation/Low Income</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Political Views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Views</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far left</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate or middle of the road</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far right</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Respondents by Age ($n$)

- **23 or younger**
  - Staff: 14
  - Faculty/Librarian: 20
- **24-29**
  - Staff: 82
  - Faculty/Librarian: 133
- **30-39**
  - Staff: 209
  - Faculty/Librarian: 157
- **40-49**
  - Staff: 218
  - Faculty/Librarian: 157
- **50-59**
  - Staff: 295
  - Faculty/Librarian: 130
- **60 and over**
  - Staff: 91
  - Faculty/Librarian: 80
Undergraduate Students by Current Year \((n)\)
Students’ Family Income by Dependency Status (%)

- **UG Dependent**
  - Below $30K: 9%
  - $30K - $89,999: 7%
  - $90K-$124,999: 23%
  - $125K-$299K: 29%
  - $300K or more: 31%

- **UG Independent**
  - Below $30K: 3%
  - $30K - $89,999: 5%
  - $90K-$124,999: 19%
  - $125K-$299K: 33%
  - $300K or more: 73%

- **Grad Dependent**
  - Below $30K: 6%
  - $30K - $89,999: 6%
  - $90K-$124,999: 21%
  - $125K-$299K: 35%

- **Grad Independent**
  - Below $30K: 3%
  - $30K - $89,999: 7%
  - $90K-$124,999: 21%

Note: Responses with n’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure.
## Students’ Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University-owned Housing</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Campus Housing</td>
<td>3,029</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity/Sorority house</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient/Homeless</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes student respondents (n = 4,091).
# Student Participation in Clubs or Organizations at Cal Poly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic/Professional Organizations</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not participate in any student organizations</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramurals/Club Sports</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest Organizations</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Fraternities and Sororities</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious/Spiritual Organizations</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural/Multicultural Campus Community Groups</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes student respondents ($n = 4,091$).
Student Participation in Clubs (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Leadership Groups</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Societies</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Organizations/Civic Engagement</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music/Performance Organizations</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA Varsity Athletics</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Housing Associations</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructionally Related Activity (IRA)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and Media Organizations</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Groups</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes student respondents (n = 4,091).
Time Students Spent on Experiential Learning Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I did not participate in any experiential learning activities in the past year</td>
<td>2,357</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–5 hours</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 hours</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20 hours</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30 hours</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40 hours</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes student respondents (n = 4,091).
Students’ Cumulative G.P.A. (n)

Note: Table includes student respondents (n = 4,091).
Findings
“Comfortable”/ “Very Comfortable” with:

- Overall Campus Climate (80%)
- Department/Work Unit Climate (68%)
- Classroom Climate (Undergraduate, 85%)
- Classroom Climate (Graduate, 84%)
- Classroom Climate (Faculty, 78%)
Comfort With Overall Climate

Differences

- Staff and Faculty/Librarian respondents less comfortable than Undergraduate Student respondents and Graduate Student respondents
- People of Color respondents less comfortable than White respondents and Multiple Race respondents
- LGBQ respondents less comfortable than Heterosexual respondents
Comfort With Overall Climate

Differences

• Respondents with Disabilities less comfortable than respondents with No Disabilities
• First-Generation Student respondents less comfortable than Not-First-Generation Student respondents
• Low-Income Student respondents less comfortable than Not-Low-Income Student respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Non-Exempt Staff respondents and Exempt Staff respondents less comfortable than Administrator respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Women Faculty/Librarian and Staff respondents less comfortable than Men Faculty/Librarian respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty/Librarian and Staff Respondents with Disabilities less comfortable than Faculty/Librarian and Staff respondents with No Disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comfort with Classroom Climate

Differences

• Faculty respondents less comfortable than Undergraduate and Graduate Student respondents
• Undergraduate Student respondents who Started as Transfer Students less comfortable than Undergraduate Students who Started as First-Year Students
• Women Faculty/Librarian and Student respondents less comfortable than Men Faculty/Librarian and Student respondents
• People of Color Faculty/Librarian and Student respondents less comfortable than Multiple Race Faculty/Librarian and Student respondents and White Faculty/Librarian and Student respondents
### Comfort with Classroom Climate

#### Differences

- LGBQ Faculty/Librarian and Student respondents less comfortable than Asexual/Other Faculty/Librarian and Student respondents and Heterosexual Faculty/Librarian and Student respondents
- Faculty/Librarian and Student respondents with Disabilities less comfortable than Faculty/Librarian and Student respondents with No Disabilities
- First-Generation Student respondents less comfortable than Not-First-Generation Student respondents
- Low-Income Student respondents less comfortable than Not-Low-Income Student respondents
Challenges and Opportunities
Experiences with Exclusionary Conduct

- 1,410 respondents indicated that they had personally experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct at Cal Poly
## Top Three Forms of Experienced Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isolated or left out</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberately ignored or excluded</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment ($n = 1,410$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Personally Experienced Based on…(%)

- Major Field of Study (n=317)
- Gender Identity (n=245)
- Ethnicity (n=237)
- Physical Characteristics (n=217)
- Philosophical Views (n=197)
- Political Views (n=196)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment (n = 1,410). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct Due to Gender Identity (%)

- **Overall experienced conduct¹**: 18%
- **Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their gender identity²**: 44% for Women, 25% for Men

1. Percentages are based on total n split by group.
2. Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct Due to Position Status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall experienced conduct¹</th>
<th>Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their position²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 890)¹</td>
<td>(n = 143)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 44)¹</td>
<td>(n = 20)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Librarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 185)¹</td>
<td>(n = 76)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 291)¹</td>
<td>(n = 170)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages are based on total n split by group.
² Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
### Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct Due to Race (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Of Those Who Experienced Exclusionary Conduct, Said They Experienced Conduct as a Result of Race</th>
<th>Of Those Who Experienced Exclusionary Conduct, Said They Experienced Conduct as a Result of Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People of Color</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Race</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **White**
  - Overall experienced conduct: 20 (n = 797)
  - Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of race: 26 (n = 62)
  - Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of ethnicity: 25 (n = 91)

- **People of Color**
  - Overall experienced conduct: 67 (n = 357)
  - Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of race: 51 (n = 182)
  - Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of ethnicity: 44 (n = 240)

- **Multiple Race**
  - Overall experienced conduct: 44 (n = 224)
  - Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of race: 29 (n = 66)
  - Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of ethnicity: 29 (n = 99)

1. Percentages are based on total n split by group.
2. Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct Due to Sexual Orientation (%)

Overall experienced conduct

Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their sexual identity

1 Percentages are based on total n split by group.
2 Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct Due to Religious/Spiritual Affiliation (%)

Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their religious/spiritual affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Conduct Due to Religious/Spiritual Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith-Based Affiliation</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 581)</td>
<td>(n = 258)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 293)</td>
<td>(n = 29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 465)</td>
<td>(n = 75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Affiliations</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 37)</td>
<td>(n = 16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages are based on total n split by group.
² Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct Due to Age (%)

Overall experienced conduct¹

Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their age²

1 Percentages are based on total n split by group.
2 Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct Due to Political Views (%)

- **Overall experienced conduct**: 25% for Far Left/Liberal, 21% for Moderate, 19% for Conservative/Far Right, 19% for Undecided, 34% for Other, 16% for Libertarian.

- **Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their political views**: 37% for Far Left/Liberal, 27% for Moderate, 40% for Conservative/Far Right, 16% for Undecided, 38% for Other, 11% for Libertarian.

---

1 Percentages are based on total n split by group.
2 Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
### Location of Experienced Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at Cal Poly</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While working at a Cal Poly job</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In campus housing</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment \((n = 1,410)\). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Position Status (%)

- **Staff**
  - Supervisor: 4%
  - Staff: 6%
  - Faculty: 38%
  - Student: 13%

- **Faculty/Librarian**
  - Supervisor: 5%
  - Staff: 11%
  - Faculty: 30%
  - Student: 13%

- **Graduate Student**
  - Supervisor: 2%
  - Staff: 9%
  - Faculty: 17%
  - Student: 23%

- **Undergraduate Student**
  - Supervisor: 4%
  - Staff: 6%
  - Faculty: 38%
  - Student: 13%
What did you do?

**Personal responses:**
- Was angry (52%)
- Felt embarrassed (43%)
- Told a friend (42%)
- Ignored it (34%)
- Told a family member (33%)

**Reporting responses:**
- Didn’t report it for fear the complaint wouldn’t be taken seriously (13%)
- Didn’t know to whom to go (12%)
- Did report it but did not feel the complaint was taken seriously (8%)
- Reported it to a Cal Poly employee/official (8%)
Unwanted Sexual Contact at Cal Poly

302 respondents (5%) experienced unwanted sexual contact while a member of the Cal Poly community.
Unwanted Sexual Contact at Cal Poly

Multiple Race respondents (8%, n = 71)

LGBQ respondents (10%, n = 47)

Women (8%, n = 264)

Respondents with Disabilities (9%, n = 109)
When the Incident Occurred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First quarter</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quarter</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quarter</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quarter</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth quarter</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth quarter</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh quarter</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth quarter</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth quarter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth quarter</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh quarter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth quarter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 12th quarter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Perpetrator of Unwanted Sexual Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance/friend</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Did You Do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I told a friend</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt embarrassed</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt somehow responsible</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was angry</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did nothing</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ignored it</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was afraid</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I left the situation immediately</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t know what to do</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It didn’t affect me at the time</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I told a family member</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sought support from campus resource</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t know who to go to</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Themes

Why Unwanted Sexual Contact Went Unreported

Fearful to Report Unwanted Contact

Felt Responsible

Felt Embarrassed

Did Not Perceive the Incident as Sexual Assault
"I didn’t want to make a big deal out of it, get him in trouble, and have unnecessary and unwanted attention on me.”

“I knew I was violated and didn’t give consent but at the time didn’t want to make a big deal of it. I regret that decision now.”

“It was my first week in college...I wanted to forget about it and not let it define my freshman year.”
“I didn’t think anyone cared enough. As much as it bothered me and still bothers me I don’t think I am supposed to be bothered by it”

it was just a sexual assault and I don’t think it was necessary to report it.”

“I didn’t feel it was bad enough to report. I was too drunk to get him off of me.”

“It was only consensual because we weren’t entirely sober.”

“I felt pressured way too much to report it to the police when at the time all I needed was emotional help and therapy.”
Employees Who Seriously Considered Leaving Cal Poly

56% of Faculty/Librarian respondents (n = 489)

53% of Staff respondents (n = 498)
Faculty & Staff Who Seriously Considered Leaving Cal Poly

By Citizenship Status
- 55% of U.S. Citizen respondents
- 37% of Non-U.S. Citizen respondents

By Sexual Identity
- 67% of LGBQ respondents
- 54% of Heterosexual respondents
- 46% of Asexual/Other respondents

By Disability Status
- 64% of respondents With Disability
- 52% of respondents Without Disability

By Faculty/Librarian Position
- 60% of Tenure-Track respondents
- 48% of Non-Tenure Track respondents
Reasons Employees Seriously Considered Leaving

- Lack of salary raises
- Limited opportunities for advancement
- Financial reasons
- Tension in department/work unit
- Tension in department/work unit with supervisor/manager
- Increased workload
- Hostile work environment
25% ($n = 1,162$) of Undergraduate Students Seriously Considered Leaving Cal Poly

**By Racial Identity**
- 30% of People of Color respondents
- 26% of Multiple Race respondents
- 23% of White respondents

**By Sexual Identity**
- 40% of LGBQ respondents
- 25% of Asexual/Other respondents
- 24% of Heterosexual Student respondents

**By Disability Status**
- 37% of Student respondents With Disability
- 21% of Student respondents Without Disability
Undergraduate Students Who Seriously Considered Leaving Cal Poly

By Citizenship Status
- 26% of Non-U.S. Citizen Student respondents
- 21% of U.S. Citizen Student respondents
- 19% of Multiple Citizen respondents

By Generational Status
- 30% of First-Generation respondents
- 24% of Not-First-Generation respondents
When Students Seriously Considered Leaving Cal Poly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reasons Students Seriously Considered Leaving Cal Poly

- Lack of a sense of belonging/lack of support group
- Didn’t like major/couldn’t change major
- Campus climate was unwelcoming
- Homesick
- Personal reasons
Respondents who observed conduct or communications directed towards a person/group of people that created an exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile working or learning environment…

32% \ (n = 2,052)
Form of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory remarks</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person felt isolated or left out</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberately ignored or excluded</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic profiling</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption that someone was admitted/hired/promoted based on his/her identity</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory/unsolicited messages through technological mediums (e.g., e-mails, Facebook posts, Twitter posts, etc.)</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 2,052). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct Based on…(%)
Source of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct (%)

- Student (58%)
- Stranger (18%)
- Faculty Member (16%)
- Staff Member (11%)
- Friend (10%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 2,052). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
### Location of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at Cal Poly</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 2,052). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Position Status (%)

- Undergraduate Students (n = 1,426)
- Graduate Students (n = 73)
- Faculty/Librarian (n = 228)
- Staff (n = 325)
Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Hiring Practices

19% (n = 129) of Faculty/Librarian respondents
18% (n = 142) of Staff respondents
Faculty/Librarian and Staff Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Hiring Practices by Select Demographics

By Racial Identity
- 39% of Multiple Race respondents
- 34% of People of Color respondents
- 25% of White respondents

By Sexual Identity
- 37% of LGBQ respondents
- 31% of Asexual/Other respondents
- 28% of Heterosexual respondents

By Disability Status
- 34% of respondents with Disabilities
- 27% of respondents without Disabilities
Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

14% (n = 75) of Faculty/Librarian respondents
14% (n = 131) of Staff respondents
Faculty/Librarian and Staff Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions by Select Demographics

**By Racial Identity**
- 17% of People of Color respondents
- 13% of White respondents
- 11% of Multiple Race respondents

**By Disability Status**
- 23% of respondents with Disabilities
- 12% of respondents without Disabilities
Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Practices Related to Promotion

29% \((n = 155)\) of Faculty/Librarian respondents
31% \((n = 288)\) of Staff respondents
Faculty/Librarian and Staff Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Practices Related to Promotion by Select Demographics

By Gender Identity
- 32% of Women respondents
- 28% of Men respondents

By Racial Identity
- 36% of Multiple Race respondents
- 33% of People of Color respondents
- 29% of White respondents

By Disability Status
- 38% of respondents with Disabilities
- 29% of respondents without Disabilities
The majority of employee respondents expressed positive attitudes about work-life issues.
Work-Life Issues
Staff

Successes

• 79% of Staff respondents found Cal Poly supportive of their taking leave
• 66% indicated that they had adequate administrative support
• 60% indicated that Cal Poly provided them with adequate training to successfully complete their job duties.
• 59% acknowledged that their supervisors provided ongoing feedback to help improve their performance
## Work-Life Issues

### Staff

**Successes**

- 58% of Staff respondents reported that they had supervisors who provided them with resources to pursue educational/professional development opportunities.
- 55% reported that Cal Poly was supportive of flexible work schedules.
- 54% reported that they felt staff members have the opportunity to provide input on institutional/staff issues and concerns.
- 53% indicated that they had supervisors at Cal Poly who gave them career advice or guidance when they needed it.
Work-Life Issues
Staff

Challenges

• 45% of Staff respondents noted that they had access to campus recreational facilities
• 36% agreed that Cal Poly provides available resources to help employees balance work-life needs, such as child care and elder care
• 28% felt their current salary reflected their workload expectations
• 20% felt that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities (e.g., stay late, off-hour work, work weekends) beyond those who do have children
Successes

- 63% of Faculty/Librarian respondents believed that their colleagues included them in opportunities that helped their career as much as they did others in their position
- More than half believed that the tenure/promotion process was clear (53%) and reasonable (57%)
- 55% reported that Cal Poly was supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave
Tenure/Teaching Issues
Faculty/Librarians

Challenges

- 34% of Faculty/Librarian respondents felt burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues
- 27% had access to campus recreational facilities
- 27% felt that their diversity-related contributions have been/will be valued for promotion or tenure
- 24% felt pressured to change their research agendas to achieve tenure or be promoted
- 23% felt that people who did not have children were burdened with work responsibilities
Welcoming Workplace Climate
Workplace Climate was Welcoming Based on Race

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.
Workplace Climate was Welcoming Based on Gender

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.

Responses with n’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure.
Workplace Climate was Welcoming Based on Sexual Identity

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.
Workplace Climate was Welcoming Based on Religious/Spiritual Affiliation

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.
Responses with n’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure.
Workplace Climate was Welcoming Based on Political Views

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.
Campus Child Care at Cal Poly
Campus Child Care Centers

- **Aware of campus child care centers**
  - 82% of Faculty/Librarians
  - 88% of Staff

- **Have considered using campus child care centers**
  - 39% of Faculty/Librarians
  - 27% of Staff

- **Have actually used campus child care centers**
  - 11% of Faculty/Librarians
  - 7% of Staff
# Reasons for Not Using Campus Child Care Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Faculty/Librarian Respondents*</th>
<th>Staff Respondents*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have children who need care</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of services unaffordable</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No openings</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have to wait too long to gain access</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours do not meet the needs of my work schedule</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chose different child care center</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only answered by Faculty/Librarian respondents who did not use Cal Poly child care centers (n = 472).

* Only answered by Staff respondents who did not use Cal Poly child care centers (n = 866).
## Perceptions of Necessary Types of Campus Child Care Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Faculty/Librarian Respondents*</th>
<th>Staff Respondents*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time day care for newborn (0–2 years old)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time day care for toddler/preschooler (2–5 years old)</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time day care for newborn (0–2 years old)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time day care for toddler/preschooler (less than 5 years old)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before school day care</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school day care</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency/backup day care (mildly ill or drop-in care)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening care for children</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend care for children</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Perceptions of Campus Climate
Student Perceptions of Campus Climate

Majority of students felt valued by other students (82%) in the classroom.

Majority of students reported that Cal Poly faculty (84%) and staff (77%) were genuinely concerned with their welfare.

Majority of students had faculty (84%) and staff (59%) whom they perceived as role models.
Student Perceptions of Campus Climate

90% of students felt they had opportunities for academic success that were similar to those of their classmates.

40% of students felt faculty pre-judged their abilities based on their identities/backgrounds.

36% of students don’t see enough faculty/instructors/staff with whom they identify.
Student Respondents Who Did Not See Enough Faculty and Staff with Whom They Identify by Gender Identity, Sexual Identity, and Disability Status (%)

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.
Student Respondents Who Did Not See Enough Faculty and Staff with Whom They Identify by Racial Identity, First-Generation Status, and Low-Income Status (%)

- White: Agree 31, Disagree 63
- People of Color: Agree 49, Disagree 43
- Multiple Race: Agree 34, Disagree 58
- First Generation: Agree 42, Disagree 51
- Not First Generation: Agree 34, Disagree 59
- Low Income: Agree 38, Disagree 56
- Not Low Income: Agree 35, Disagree 58

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.
Institutional Actions
More than half of Faculty/Librarians thought the following positively influenced the climate:

- Providing flexibility for computing the probationary period for tenure
- Providing recognition and rewards for including diversity issues in courses across the curriculum
- Providing mentorship for new faculty
- Providing career-span development opportunities
More than half of Faculty/Librarians thought the following positively influenced the climate:

- Providing access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Providing a clear and fair process to resolve conflicts positively affected the climate
- Providing diversity and equity training to search committees and to appointment, promotion, and tenure committees
- Increasing diversity of the faculty, staff, administration and student body
More than half of Staff thought the following positively influenced the climate:

- Providing diversity training for staff, faculty, and students
- Providing mentorship for new staff
- Providing career-span development opportunities
Campus Initiatives
Staff

More than half of Staff thought the following positively influenced the climate:

- Providing access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Providing a clear and fair process to resolve conflicts positively affected the climate
- Increasing diversity of the faculty, staff, administration and student body
Summary

Strengths and Successes
Opportunities for Improvement
Although colleges and universities attempt to foster welcoming and inclusive environments, they are not immune to negative societal attitudes and discriminatory behaviors. As a microcosm of the larger social environment, college and university campuses reflect the pervasive prejudices of society. Classism, Racism, Sexism, Genderism, Heterosexism, etc.

Overall Strengths & Successes

- The majority of students thought very positively about their academic experiences at Cal Poly.
- The majority of employees expressed positive attitudes about work-life issues at Cal Poly.

- 80% of respondents were comfortable with the overall climate, and 68% of Faculty/Librarians and Staff with dept/work unit climate.
- 85% of Undergraduates, 84% of Graduates, and 78% of Faculty were comfortable with the classroom climate.

119
Overall Opportunities for Improvement

- **32%** had observed exclusionary conduct within the last year
- **5%** (n = 302) experienced unwanted sexual contact while at Cal Poly
- **22%** had personally experienced exclusionary conduct within the last year
- **56%** of Faculty/Librarians, **53%** of Staff and **25%** of Students seriously considered leaving Cal Poly
Next Steps
Proposal for Use of Climate Project Data

- Project Title
- Principal Investigator
  - Address:
  - Telephone:
  - Email:
- Sample Description (limit of 500 words)
- Project Description and Significance (limit of 1000 words)
- Relevant Literature and Benefit of Proposed Research (limit of 1500 words)
- Conceptual Framework and Research Methods (limit of 1000 words)
- Final Results and Product
- Projected Time-line
- Curriculum Vitae of the Principal Investigator (please attach)

Please submit research proposals to Campus Climate Survey Primary Investigator Rachel Fernflores (rfernflo@calpoly.edu)
Process Forward
Sharing the Report with the Community
Fall 2014

Full Power Point and Full Report available at:
campusclimate.calpoly.edu

Full Report available on Cal Poly website/hard copy at Library
Purpose

- To review the results and solicit community input
- To offer “next steps” based on climate report results that will be used to inform actions
- To identify 2-3 specific actions that can be accomplished in the next 12-18 months
Projected Calendar

November 2014
- Sponsor series of community forums

December 2014
- Facilitators meet and discuss the actions developed in forums
- Develop 2-3 actions members based on the forums

Jan 2015 – Sept 2015
- Distribute actions to the community
- Communicate updates on the progress of the action plan
Questions and Discussion