2018 Campus Climate Survey

Commission on Diversity and Inclusion

California State University, Northridge

Introduction

Four CSUN campus populations were surveyed during April of 2018 using a questionnaire and written and marketed by Insight Viewfinder Campus Climate Surveys, LLC. The questionnaire consisted of 430 items, each identifying ten respondent's individual characteristics, including their sex/gender, race/ethnicity, age, marital status, residence, years on campus, citizenship, type of campus employment or student status, and division employed or students' college major.

Each population was also asked to indicate their status relative to each of seven categories (Veterans, Deaf/hard of Hearing, those with Disabilities, those having Religious Affiliation, those identifying with LBGTQIA, persons of color, and those with International Status). With respect to each of these reference categories, those who identify with the category were asked a series of questions, including their feelings concerning satisfaction with their campus services, their perceived respect from others and the degree of welcoming they have experienced.

In addition, all respondents across the four samples were asked about issues ranging from need for mandatory diversity training, how welcoming, in general, is our campus, is racial interaction integrated on campus, have respondents experienced any intimidation or hostility, do they feel safe on campus, are the campus police diversity qualified, does campus promote interaction among diverse groups, and do the respondents want to or have considered quitting or leaving campus.

Due to the unusually large number of potential relationships among the variables (10 background variables by 420 substantive questions among four populations = 16,800 separate analyses), we have made several simplifying assumptions. In particular, we have limited my analysis here to the comparisons and identifications across the four samples and the seven reference categories, as well as providing a breakdown of the background variables for each of the four samples by the individual characteristics of

sex, race/ethnicity, age, and time at CSUN. These were chosen because 1) they are standard qualifying questions used to assess the veracity of samples, 2) they are the background variables with the most variation, and as such provide the best vehicle to assess their effect on the seven reference groups, and 3) they stand as the status characteristics necessary to further assess variations among those responding to the issues identified.

Moreover, of the multiple questions asked of each sub-group, the analysis was limited to breakdowns of the three common stimulus questions: 1) Are the services provided to that group adequate, 2) Do members of that group feel welcomed on campus, and 3) Do members of that group feel respected by others.   As well, of the general issues asked of every respondent, the analysis was limited to the perceptions of 1) how welcoming in general is our campus; 2) Is our campus integrating racial interaction; 3) has the respondent experienced intimidation/hostility in the past three years; 4) does the respondent feel safe on campus; 5) are campus police diversity qualified; 6) do campus police represent diversity; 7) is there overall satisfaction with interactions on campus; and 8) have they felt like quitting or leaving.

The results are, therefore, presented in four sections as follows: Section One is a) an analysis of the sampling error for each population and b) their distribution across reference categories. Section Two is a breakdown of each sample by each reference category as to their comparative views on the three key questions of services, respect, and welcoming. Section Three is a comparative summary of the responses by each sample to the key common issues asked in the questionnaire, as well as the perception of overall satisfaction with interactions on campus and whether they have considered quitting or leaving. Section Four puts forth three observations as to the trends in these data and suggestions as to what might be the next step in further analyzing these data.

Section One – The Sample

As revealed in the table below, 1618 students, 362 faculty, 312 staff, and 112 administrators responded to the survey. This represents a 4.1% response rate for students, 17.0% for faculty, 41.1% for staff and 55.7% for administrators, respectively.

	Students	Faculty	Staff	Admin	Total
Sample Size	1618	362	714	112	2806
Population Size	39816	2127	1737	201	43881
Response Rate	4.1%	17.0%	41.1%	55.7%	6.4%

Although the staff and administration response rates are typical of campus surveys carried out on college campuses, the faculty response rate is somewhat lower and the student response rate significantly lower than most campus surveys. Therefore, it leads to the suggestion that the sampling error, especially among students, is perhaps too high to be of use in generalizing to the campus population (Population date were taken from Institutional Research and HR).

To assess this premise, these samples were sub-divided by the four individual characteristics mentioned above to see whether these reduced sample sizes, across individual characteriestics, are significantly different from the population:

Students	Sex		Race/Ethnicity					Age			Yrs at CSUN		Major				
Pop = 39816	Female	Male	While	Hispanic	Asian	Black	Other	16-20	21-24	>24	1-2	>2	STEM	HHD	SBS	Bus	Other
Population	55%	45%	23%	49%	11%	5%	13%	34%	37%	29%	30%	70%	19%	18%	17%	18%	28%
Sample	68%	32%	28%	47%	12%	6%	7%	28%	39%	33%	32%	68%	17%	21%	25%	13%	25%
Error	13%	-13%	4%	-2%	1%	1%	-5%	-5%	1%	4%	2%	-2%	-2%	3%	8%	-5%	-4%

As can be seen from the table, but for the 13% oversampling of females and 7.9% oversampling of SBS students, the student sample of 1,618 is surprisingly close to the population of 39,816 students on campus. While students who are women, in general, are more likely to

answer online campus surveys, caution should be used in considering the effects of sex on the criteria variables. That said, while the student sample may not allow for precise generalizations to the student population, given its tolerable levels, it is sufficient to assess general trends.

The same analysis was done for the faculty, staff and administrator samples. The results for each of the samples are as follows:

Faculty	Sex		Race/Ethnicity					Age			Yrs at CSUN	
Pop = 2127	Female	Male	While	Hispanic	Asian	Black	Other	≤40	41-50	>50	≤10	>10
Population	50.7%	49.3%	63.8%	11.2%	12.5%	4.3%	8.20%	25.2%	23.1%	51.7%	69.6%	30.4%
Sample	61.8%	38.2%	70.0%	10.9%	9.4%	4.6%	5.1%	23.7%	28.1%	48.2%	52.3%	47.7%
Error	11.1%	-11.1%	6.2%	-0.3%	-3.1%	0.3%	-3.1%	-1.5%	5.0%	-3.5%	-17.3%	17.3%

Staff	Sex		Race/Ethnicity					Age			Yrs at CSUN	
Pop = 1737	Female	Male	While	Hispanic	Asian	Black	Other	≤40	41-50	>50	≤10	>10
Population	60.7%	39.3%	38.6%	33.3%	13.1%	9.0%	6.0%	47.3%	20.6%	32.1%	66.2%	33.8%
Sample	69.2%	30.8%	47.9%	27.3%	11.0%	6.5%	7.3%	50.3%	19.7%	30.0%	65.1%	34.9%
Error	8.5%	-8.5%	9.3%	-6.0%	-2.1%	-2.5%	1.3%	3.0%	-0.9%	-2.1%	-1.1%	1.1%

Admin	Sex		Race/Ethnicity					Age			Yrs at CSUN	
Pop = 201	Female	Male	While	Hispanic	Asian	Black	Other	≤40	41-50	>50	≤10	>10
Population	51.7%	48%	62.7%	16.9%	10.4%	6.0%	4.0%	16.4%	29.4%	54.2%	50.8%	49.2%
Sample	58.9%	41.1%	55.0%	11.3%	10.4%	7.6%	15.7%	16.2%	35.1%	48.7%	47.3%	52.7%
Error	7.2%	-7.2%	-7.7%	-5.6%	0.0%	1.6%	11.7%	-0.2%	5.7%	-5.5%	-3.5%	3.5%

What we see is the same disproportionate number of females in each of the samples (11%, 8.5%, and 7.2% respectively), albeit not as pronounced as the 13% in the student sample. Again, while women, in general, are more likely to answer online campus surveys of all types, one should take into account such an effect. Moreover, there appears to be an oversampling of

4

white respondents among faculty and staff (6.2% and 9.3% respectively, but an under-sampling among administrators (-7.7%).   As well, although Hispanic respondents are adequately represented among faculty respondents, they are underrepresented among staff and administrators (-6.0% and -5.6%, respectively).   This cumulative variation leads to an average sampling error of roughly 6%.   Although this is more than that typically acceptable for generalizing to populations, it does come close enough to merit assessing trends in the data.

Given the variation in these individual characteristics, it is also useful to understand how these samples distribute across the categories referenced in the survey. Accordingly, in the table below you can see the number in each sample identifying with each of the reference groups:

Reference Categories	Students	Faculty	Staff	Admin	Total
Veterans	1.9% - (29)	3.5% - (12)	3.5% - (24)	0.9% - (1)	66
Deaf/Hard of Hearing	1.6% - (24)	3.8% - (13)	1.7% - (7)	4.5% - (5)	49
Diabilities	10.0% - (149)	5.6% - (18)	4.4% - (28)	6.4% - (7)	202
Religion/Spiritual Affiliation	78.7% - (1135)	68.2% - (219)	83.1% - (532)	82.7% - (86)	1972
LGBTQIA	11.0% - (159)	12.3% - (40)	6.8% - (44)	17.0% - (18)	261
Person of Color	54.8% - (781)	22.5% - (72)	36.8% - (235)	24.8% - (28)	1116
International Status	5.6% - (80)	7.2% - (23)	4.5% - (29)	6.7% - (7)	139

This should be read as 1.9% or 29 of the 1618 students who responded identified themselves as veterans. If there was a zero sampling error that would mean that 1.9% of our 39,816 students or 756 should be veterans. However, so that you are mindful of the sampling issue, this number is likely an underestimate as a higher proportion of veterans, in general, are males. We have oversampled females. Therefore, the number is likely higher in the population.

Moreover and interestingly, among those responding, there is a higher percentage of faculty and administrators who identify with being deaf/hard of hearing, LGBTQIA, and having international status than do students. Conversely, a larger percentage of students identify with having disabilities and are twice as likely to identify as persons of color than do those in the other three samples. Finally, it is of interest that an average of 80% of the students, staff, and administration identify with some form of religion/spirituality, while only slightly more than 68%, and significantly less, of faculty, do.

Section Two – Categories of identification by Sample by Outcome Questions

Given this variation in membership identification across the four samples, it is instructive to examine that variation among these groups as it relates to each of their perceptions of feelings about support services, being welcomed, and respected, the three key questions asked of each group. The results, by reference category, can be found below:

Veterans - Percent Who Agree			
	Services	Respect	Welcome
Students (N=29)	86%	69%	54%
Faculty (N=12)	22%	44%	44%
Staff (N=24)	46%	58%	51%
Admin (N=1)	100%	100%	100%

Among those identifying as Veterans, a higher percentage of students report services are adequate (86%), feel they are respected (69%) and welcome (54%) than do any of the other categories. Conversely, only 22% of faculty feel services are adequate and less than half feel they are respected and welcome. Staff appears to be somewhere between students and faculty. This

could be accounted for in that while the campus has programs servicing student veterans, those programs may not be salient to faculty or staff.

The same analysis was carried out for each of the seven categories of reference. Results of those identifying with deaf or hard of hearing are reported in the following table:

Deaf/Hard of Hearing - Percent Who Agree			
	Services	Respect	Welcome
Students (N=24)	77%	67%	70%
Faculty (13)	42%	67%	58%
Staff (N = 7)	50%	50%	75%
Admin (N = 5)	40%	67%	50%

As with Veterans, students who are deaf or hard of hearing have the highest adequacy of services rating of the four groups (77%) who identify with deaf or hard of hearing, while faculty and administration the lowest (42% and 40% respectively). Staff appears to feel less respected (50%) than do the other samples, while administrators report feeling least welcome (50%). Note that while there are relative differences, as noted above, among most groups across most questions, the majority report satisfaction or agreement.

Disabilities - Percent Who Agree			
	Services	Respect	Welcome
Students (N=149)	72%	78%	81%
Faculty (N = 19)	58%	69%	67%
Staff (N = 28)	43%	54%	53%
Admin (N = 7)	67%	83%	67%

Similarly, among those with disabilities students rated the services as most adequate (72%) while staff rated them the lowest. Staff also felt less respected (43%) and less welcomed (53%) than did the other samples. Parenthetically, we would note that among those who identified with having a disability, 75% of the students said they suffered from mental health or ADHD issues, while nearly half the staff reported their issue as medical or mobility in nature.

The Religious or spiritual affiliation category did not have a satisfaction with services question. However, the ability to express one's religious beliefs and experiencing respect from others were reported. The results are as follows:

Religion Affiliated - Percent Who Agree		
	Express	Respect
Students (N=1135)	72%	74%
Faculty (N=223)	58%	48%
Staff (N=525)	57%	62%
Admin (N=86)	63%	66%

Again, a higher proportion of students agreed they were able to express their religious belief (72%) and felt respected (74%) than did the other three samples. Faculty feel least respected (48%) and nearly the least agreeing able to express their religious beliefs (58%)

LGBTQIA - Percent Who Agree			
	Services	Express	Respect
Students (N = 159)	69%	82%	82%
Faculty (N=40)	58%	68%	68%
Staff (N=44)	70%	84%	81%
Admin (N=18)	55%	95%	90%

Among those identifying with LGBTQIA, Students and Staff have the highest percentage feeling services are adequate (69% and 70%, respectively), and second highest in feeling they can express their identity (82% and 84%) and are respected (82% and 81%). Faculty has the second lowest rated satisfaction (58%) or agreement concerning expression and respect (68%). Interestingly, while Administrators have the lowest rating of satisfaction with services, they express the highest percentage in feeling they can express their identity and are respected.

Persons of Color Percent Who Agree		
	Respect	Welcome
Students (781)	90%	93%
Faculty (N=72)	70%	79%
Staff (N=235)	77%	88%
Admin (N=26)	82%	84%

Those identifying as persons of color were also not asked a question concerning services on campus. However, as to feeling respected and welcome, although all samples reported significant majority percentages in agreement, 90% of staff and 100% of Administrators felt respected and welcome. Faculty again, although the majority agreed, reported the lowest percentages.

International Status - Percent Who Agree			
	Services	Respect	Welcome
Students (N = 80)	79%	80%	83%
Faculty (N=29)	58%	78%	85%
Staff (N=29)	61%	90%	88%
Admin (N=7)	67%	100%	88%

Among those identifying with international status, although students found services on campus to be the most satisfactory (79%) and faculty the lowest (58%), administrators and staff had the highest percentage agreement with feeling respected and welcome (100% and 88%, respectively)   However, across all samples on all questions, the majority of international respondents reported to be satisfied with services or in agreement concerning experiencing respect and welcoming.

Section Three – Percentage Agreement on Common Questions by Sample

In addition to those questions asked of each reference group category of respondents, there were several issues asked of all respondents in each of the categories. The first was feelings about mandatory diversity training for various groups. Herein are those results:

Percent Agreement - Mandatory Diversity Training Needed					
		Students	Faculty	Staff	Admin
Students		79%	88%	87%	88%
Faculty		80%	85%	84%	87%
Staff		83%	89%	86%	90%
Admin		80%	90%	88%	92%

By these results, it would appear there is a homogenous agreement both within and between the samples as to the need for mandatory Diversity Training for Students, Faculty, Staff, and Administrators. What is interesting, of course, is not that these numbers are so high but that they are not 100%. Significantly, 21% of students do not feel that students need mandatory diversity training. Were the sampling margin of error zero, that would mean approximately 8,000

students do not feel the need to require mandatory diversity training, nor do 20% of the Faculty

and administration, and 17% of the staff.

The second general question asked of all samples had to do with how welcoming is the

campus to various groups. Hereinbelow are those having to do the race/ethnicity and directly

below it, four of the reference groups with which respondents identified

Percent Agreement - Campus is Welcoming					
		White	Hispanic	Asian	AA -Black
Students		82%	86%	78%	76%
Faculty		85%	88%	81%	83%
Staff		84%	87%	82%	87%
Admin		87%	90%	73%	80%

Percent Agreement - Campus is Welcoming					
		Veterans	Disability	LGBTQIA	International
Students		75%	80%	78%	76%
Faculty		76%	81%	78%	75%
Staff		79%	82%	80%	78%
Admin		93%	89%	89%	86%

Interestingly, while it would seem the vast majority of each sample strongly agrees or

agrees that the campus is welcoming to each of the dominant racial and or reference categories,

comparing these to the answers given by those identifying with these groups, reveals an

interesting dichotomy. For example, while all survey respondents report an average of 83% who

feel the campus is welcoming to those with disabilities, the table in Section Two given the same

response from those who identify as disabled, is an average of 67%. The same is true of Veterans.

On average in the total pool of respondents, 80% feel the campus is welcoming to Veterans. Yet, among those identifying as Veterans, barely 50% say they feel welcome. Clearly, there is a disconnect between perceptions by the campus in aggregate and those identifying with that particular status. Further efforts should be made to explore this disconnect.

The third question had to do with the perception of integration of racial interaction in various venues. Below are the results, by sample.

Percent Agreement - Integrated Racial Interaction				
	Campus	Dorms	Activities	Sports
Students	84%	48%	73%	52%
Faculty	83%	13%	40%	27%
Staff	75%	24%	55%	43%
Admin	88%	24%	57%	52%

Of note, while each of the samples strongly agrees or agrees that the campus promotes integrated racial interaction, only a small minority feel that is true for the dorms or for sports activities. And only marginally more feel that is true of student activities. Clearly, there is a different perception for what is campus, apart from where a student lives, and what activities a student engages in, else these percentages would not be so disparate.

As well, there were specific questions ask about whether the respondents had experienced intimidation or an act of hostility during the past three years; whether the respondents feel safe on campus; whether the campus police are diversity qualified; and whether the campus police reflect the diversity of the campus. Herein below are the results (see next page).

As the data in the table indicate, although a smaller percentage, the number of acts of hostility and/or intimidation, particularly for faculty (42%) would mean nearly half our faculty, a third of staff and administrators and nearly one-quarter of our students have experienced these acts in the last three years. While the modal category reported was "bullying" and the question did not clarify whether this occurred on or off campus, it is nevertheless disturbing.

On the positive side, an overwhelming majority (93% average) of each sample's respondents feel safe on campus. Notwithstanding, significantly fewer (55% average across all samples) feel the "campus police are trained to deal with all aspects of diversity". As well, a large majority (average 81%) agree that campus police "should be reflective of the diversity of our students."

Finally, there was a question as to the overall satisfaction with interaction on campus, as well as to whether they had ever considered leaving. The results are as follows:

Percent Agreement - satisfied or leaving		satisfaction	consider leave
Students		84%	15%
Faculty		90%	48%
Staff		93%	51%
Admin		93%	10%

Apparently across all samples, the vast majority of respondents strongly agree or agree they are satisfied with their interactions with others on campus. Conversely, therefore, a low percentage of students and administrators have considered leaving. Interestingly, however, while 90% of faculty are satisfied with their interactions, fully 48% have considered leaving. A

good deal of that desire could be simply the upward mobility inherent in faculty scholars but the same would not appear to be true of staff. While 93% of Staff say they are satisfied with their interactions with others on campus, a resounding 51% say they have considered quitting. In reviewing the reasons mentioned for considering leaving, 43% of staff mentioned inadequate salary/benefits while 35% mentioned no career advancement opportunities.

Section Four – Conclusions

This survey was commissioned through Insight Viewfinder as a Campus Climate Survey and is said to be standardized nationally. However, like all online surveys, it suffers the potential for wide variations in self-selected bias and low response rates. As a consequence, the sample response rates, especially from students, suffered. However, while experiencing a nearly 6% average sampling error, and realizing an oversampling in certain attributes relative to their proportion in the population, the rest of the target demographics are relatively representative. Therefore, summary information has been presented here, but caution is suggested in generalizing to the larger populations, particularly it relates to students.

Beyond the sampling issues, however, several observations can be made. First, while the number of students who identify with these reference categories is relatively well documented (e.g. those who are veterans, those with hearing impairment, even those identifying with LGBTQIA, and certainly those of international origin, one item is clear. A sizable number of faculty, staff and administrators are also identifying with those groups. Yet based on these results, they appear to report not finding the services, respect or welcoming nearly as much as do students. Per these data, that appears to be the case for Veterans, those who are deaf, those

14

with disabilities, and those with religious or spiritual beliefs, LGBTQIA, persons of color and those of international origins. Clearly, this needs to be explored further.

Second, as to the common questions, disconnects exist. While the percentage is high on each, of those agreeing there should be mandatory diversity training, a not insignificant percentage (average 15%) disagree that it should be mandatory. Moreover, as to the perception of the campus being welcoming, of those in a particular reference category, there is less than two-thirds the percentage of agreement among those in the reference group versus all respondents, who agree those groups are welcomed. This is true for Veterans, those with disabilities, LBGTQIA, and those with International status.

The same disconnect exists for other common questions. While all respondent agree the campus as a whole integrates racial interaction, it does not appear to be the case in dorms, student activities or sports. As well, while the vast majority of all respondents feel safe on campus, on average one-third of all respondents have experienced intimidation or a hostile act during the past three years.

Third, while nearly 90% of the respondents, on average, reported satisfaction in their interactions with others on campus, a significant number of faculty and staff (nearing 50%) have considered leaving.   Most referenced salary or lack of career opportunities. However, 11% mentioned bullying as a reason, 19% said it was because of co-worker tension and 28% reported it was that their work was not appreciated.

In short, the response rates together with the sampling error dictates these survey results can and should be looked at as one set of data points rather than as precisely generalizable

results. Accordingly, they should not be used for any long term policy decisions. Rather they should be used as indicators for further investigation and short term policy implications.