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Executive Summary

History of the Project
SF State seeks to create an environment characterized by openness, fairness, and equal access for all students, staff, and faculty. Creating and maintaining a welcoming community environment that respects individuals, their needs, abilities, and potential is critically important.

The university undertook the Campus Climate Assessment Project to evaluate the current campus climate as experienced and perceived by all members of the university community. The goals were multifold:

- Identify successful initiatives.
- Uncover any challenges facing members of SF State community.
- Develop strategic initiatives to build on successes, address challenges, and create lasting positive change.

To ensure full transparency and to provide a more complete perspective, in fall 2017, SF State contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to help lead this effort. An R&A team worked with a Campus Climate Steering Committee (CCSC) of SF State students, staff, and faculty since February 2018 to develop an assessment and promote it during the October 9 to November 2, 2018 survey administration period. Two thousand, five hundred and twenty-one (2,521) members of the SF State community completed the San Francisco State University Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working, which represented a 7% overall response rate.
Methodology

Focus Groups. The first phase of the climate assessment process was to conduct a series of focus groups at SF State to gather information from students, faculty, administrators, and staff about their perceptions of the campus climate. On April 9, 2018 SF State students, faculty, administrators, and staff (67 in total) participated in 15 focus groups conducted by R&A facilitators. Feedback from these focus groups directly informed how survey questions were selected and most appropriately worded, so that the assessment would provide the insight necessary for SF State to understand key elements of the living, learning, and working environment.

Assessment Instrument Development. Over the course of a year, the assessment working group reviewed several drafts of the initial survey proposed by R&A and vetted the questions to be contextually more appropriate for SF State. The working group also reviewed the final focus group report and revised/added questions to the survey based on the themes offered from the focus groups. The final university-wide survey instrument contained 124 questions, including 101 quantitative questions and 23 open-ended questions for respondents to provide commentary. There were 31 opportunities for respondents to “write-in” a response should the list of response choices not include the specific response they wished to offer.

Incentives. As an incentive for completing the assessment, the SF State Alumni Association offered to donate money to the HOPE Crisis Fund based on the number of respondents to the survey.

Institutional Review. The study was vetted through an Institutional Review Board (IRB) process, which is meant to ensure confidentiality and protect the rights and welfare of individuals participating in a research study. The SF State IRB considered the activity to be designed to assess campus climate within the University and to inform SF State's strategic quality.

---

1 SF State contracted for 16 focus groups; however, no Native American/First Nation/Indigenous Students participated.
2 The full assessment is available in Appendix D in the full report.
improvement initiatives. The IRB determined the project was exempt from further IRB oversight on August 6, 2018.

Sample Construction. All eligible members of the SF State community were invited to participate in the assessment. Prospective respondents received an invitation from Vice President Hong that contained the URL link to the survey instrument. The assessment working group’s marketing subcommittee worked with SF State's communications team to create inclusive, thoughtful, and tailored messaging for email distribution, social media platforms, and flyers and other hard copy media. Two thousand five hundred twenty-one (2,521) surveys were returned for a 7% overall response rate. Of respondents, 55% (n = 1,378) of the sample were Undergraduate Students, 9% (n = 221) were Graduate Students, 3% (n = 78) were Non-Tenure-Track Academic Appointment respondents, 8% (n = 188) were Faculty Tenure-Track, and 26% (n = 656) were Staff members. Primary status data for respondents were collapsed into the following categories for analyses: Student respondents, Faculty respondents, and Staff respondents. Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic characteristics of assessment respondents.

Quantitative Data Analysis. The data first were analyzed to tabulate responses to each of the questions in the survey. Descriptive statistics were calculated by salient group memberships (e.g., gender identity, racial identity, primary position) to provide additional information regarding participant responses. This report presents data using valid percentages. Actual percentages with missing or “no response” information may be found in the frequency analyses tables in Appendix B. The purpose for this difference in reporting was to note the missing or “no

---

3 A detailed presentation of sample characteristics is offered in the full report.
4 The CCSC, in collaboration with R&A, decided to collapse Undergraduate Student (n = 1,378) and Graduate Student (n = 221) respondents, leading to more methodologically sound analyses.
5 The CCSC, in collaboration with R&A, decided to collapse Faculty Tenure-Track (n = 188) and Non-Tenure-Track Academic Appointment (n = 78) respondents, leading to more methodologically sound analyses.
6 More details on the quantitative and qualitative methods are provided in the methods section of the full report.
7 For a complete review of the responses for each question offered in the survey, refer to Appendix B.
8 Analyses were performed to explore how survey responses differed based on selected demographic characteristics. All the findings are presented as percentages of the entire sample or of the subgroups being examined. The percentages in these figures and tables do not always add up to 100% due to respondents being able to select more than one answer to a question (“mark all that apply”) or due to rounding. Where the n’s were considered small enough to compromise the identity of the respondent, n < 5 is reported.
9 Valid percentages were derived using the total number of respondents to an item (i.e., missing data were excluded).
10 Actual percentages were derived using the total number of survey respondents.
response” data in the appendices for institutional information, while removing such data within the report for subsequent cross tabulations and significance testing using the chi-square test for independence. Chi-square tests identify that significant differences exist, but do not specify if differences exist between specific groups. Therefore, these analyses included post-hoc investigations of statistically significant findings by conducting z-tests between column proportions for each row in the chi-square contingency table, with a Bonferroni adjustment for larger contingency tables. This statistical approach is useful because it compares individual cells to each other to determine if they are statistically different. Thus, the data may be interpreted more precisely by showing the source of the greatest discrepancies. The report offers statistically significant distinctions between groups. For groups with response rates less than 30%, caution is recommended when generalizing to the entire constituent group. The generalizability of the results is noted in each section of the report.

Factor Analysis\textsuperscript{11}

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on one scale embedded in Question 12 of the assessment. The factor score for \textit{Perceived Academic Success} was created by taking the average of the scores for the six sub-questions in the factor. Each respondent who answered all the questions included in the given factor was given a score on a five-point scale. Higher scores on \textit{Perceived Academic Success} factor suggests a student or constituent group is more academically successful.

Means Testing

When only two categories existed for the specified demographic variable (e.g., sexual identity), a t-test for difference of means was used. If a difference in means would have been significant, effect size would have been calculated using Cohen’s $d$ and any moderate-to-large effects would have been noted. When the specific variable of interest had more than two categories (e.g., racial identity), ANOVAs were run to determine whether any differences existed. If an ANOVA would have been significant, post-hoc tests would have been run to determine which differences

\footnote{A more detailed review of the factor analysis methodology is offered in the full report.}
between pairs of means were significant and any moderate-to-large Eta² effect size would have been noted.

**Qualitative Data Analysis.**\(^{12}\) Several assessment questions provided respondents the opportunity to describe their experiences at SF State, elaborate upon their assessment responses, and append additional thoughts. Comments were solicited to give voice to the data and to highlight areas of concern that might have been missed in the quantitative items of the survey. Analyses of each question generated common themes, which are provided in the narrative of the full report directly following the analyses of the quantitative question that primed the qualitative response.

**Limitations.**\(^{13}\) Two limitations existed in this project that may have influenced the representativeness of the sample. Respondents “self-selected” to participate in the study. This type of bias can occur when an individual’s decision to participate is correlated with experiences and concerns being measured by the study, causing a type of non-representativeness known as selection bias. The second limitation pertains to group response rates that were less than 30%. For groups with response rates less than 30%, caution should be used when generalizing the results to the entire constituent group. In order to strengthen the generalizability of the Staff respondents’ results to the SF State Staff population, the CCSC agreed to limit the Staff sample to MPP Staff and Salary Staff respondents for many analyses\(^{14}\) resulting in a 35% response rate. The generalizability of the results is noted in each section of the report.

---

\(^{12}\) Qualitative analyses are offered in the full report. Hourly Staff respondents \((n = 53)\) and Auxiliary Professional respondents \((n = 8)\) were included in the Staff sample for the qualitative analyses.

\(^{13}\) A more detailed explanation on limitations is offered in the full report.

\(^{14}\) Hourly Staff respondents \((n = 53)\) and Auxiliary Professional respondents \((n = 8)\) were excluded from the Staff sample for these analyses.
### Table 1. SF State Sample Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position status</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Tenure-Track</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Tenure-Track Academic Appointment</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trans-spectrum</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic identity</td>
<td>White/European American</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional People of Color incl. Multiracial</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Asian American</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latina/o/x or Hispanic</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African American/Africana</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual identity</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGBQ</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship status</td>
<td>U.S. Citizen-Birth</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Citizen-Naturalized</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-U.S. Citizen</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability status</td>
<td>Single Disability</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Disability</td>
<td>2,078</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation</td>
<td>No Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Religious Affiliations</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings – Areas of Strength

1. Levels of Comfort With The Climate at SF State

Climate was defined as the current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of employees and students concerning the access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and potential. The level of comfort experienced by faculty, staff, and students is one indicator of campus climate.

- 67% (n = 1,658) of survey respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate at SF State.
- 62% (n = 530) of Faculty and Staff respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their departments/programs or work units.
- 77% (n = 1,433) of Student and Faculty respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their classes.

2. Faculty Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Faculty Work

Tenure-Track

- 72% (n = 135) of Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the criteria for tenure/promotion were clear.
- 82% (n = 154) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that teaching was valued by SF State.
- 9% (n = 16) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that faculty members in their department/program who use family accommodation (FMLA) policies are disadvantaged in promotion/tenure.

All Faculty

- 72% (n = 191) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by faculty in their department/program.
- 73% (n = 193) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by their department/program chairs.

---

15 Rankin & Reason (2008)
70% (n = 182) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by other faculty at SF State, while 85% (n = 221) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by students in the classroom.

71% (n = 188) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that health insurance benefits were competitive.

70% (n = 184) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their teaching was valued.

3. **Staff Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Staff Work**

- 79% (n = 463) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by coworkers in their department.
- 70% (n = 414) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by their supervisors/managers.
- 76% (n = 441) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their supervisors were supportive of their taking leave.
- 73% (n = 427) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that health insurance benefits were competitive.

4. **Student Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Academic Experiences**

The way students perceive and experience their campus climate influences their performance and success in college. Research also supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for improving learning outcomes. Attitudes toward academic pursuits are one indicator of campus climate.

- 72% (n = 1,130) of Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by SF State faculty in the classroom.
- 75%, (n = 163) of Graduate Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” they felt they had adequate access to their advisors.
- 80% (n = 174) of Graduate Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” their advisors responded to their emails, calls, or voicemails in a prompt manner.

---

16 Pascarella & Terenzini (2005)
- 77% \((n = 167)\) of Graduate Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” they felt comfortable sharing their professional goals with their advisors.
- Most Graduate Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their department faculty members \((86\%, \ n = 189)\) and department staff members \((85\%, \ n = 186)\) (other than advisors) responded to their emails, calls, or voicemails in a prompt manner.

5. **Student Respondents Perceived Academic Success**

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the scale, *Perceived Academic Success*, derived from Question 12 on the survey. Analyses using this scale revealed no statistically significant group differences based on undergraduate student status, gender identity, racial identity, sexual identity, citizenship status, or first-generation/low-income status.

**Key Findings – Opportunities for Improvement**

1. **Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct**

Several empirical studies reinforce the importance of the perception of non-discriminatory environments for positive learning and developmental outcomes.\(^{18}\) Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.\(^{19}\) The survey requested information on experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile conduct.

- 25% \((n = 617)\) of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.\(^{20}\)
  - Most of the exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct was based on gender identity, position status, and ethnicity.

---

\(^{18}\) Aguirre & Messineo (1997); Flowers & Pascarella (1999); Pascarella & Terenzini (2005); Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora (2011)

\(^{19}\) Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley (2008); Waldo (1998)

\(^{20}\) The literature on microaggressions is clear that this type of conduct has a negative influence on people who experience the conduct, even if they feel at the time that it had no impact (Sue, 2010; Yosso et al., 2009).
Differences Based on position status, gender identity, and racial identity

- By position status, a higher percentage of Faculty respondents (41%, n = 108) and Staff respondents (36%, n = 236) than Student respondents (17%, n = 273) noted they believed that they had experienced this conduct.
  - Of those respondents who noted that they had experienced this conduct, 44% (n = 103) of Staff respondents, 29% (n = 31) of Faculty respondents, and 11% (n = 31) of Student respondents indicated that the conduct was based on their position status.

- By gender identity, there were no statistical differences in the percentages of Trans-spectrum respondents (32%, n = 158), Women respondents (24%, n = 1,476), and Men respondents (24%, n = 793) who indicated that they had experienced this conduct.
  - 58% (n = 29) of Trans-spectrum respondents, 34% (n = 117) of Women respondents, and 17% (n = 32) of Men respondents who had experienced this conduct indicated that the conduct was based on their gender identity.

- By racial identity, a higher percentage of White respondents (29%, n = 221) than Latina/o/x or Hispanic respondents (21%, n = 88) or Asian/Asian American respondents (18%, n = 80) indicated that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct within the past year (Black/African American/Africana respondents (27%, n = 31) and Additional Respondents of Color (25%, n = 159) did not statistically differ from the other three groups).
  - A higher percentage of Black/African American/Africana respondents (52%, n = 16), Latina/o/x or Hispanic respondents (34%, n = 30), Asian/Asian American respondents (34%, n = 27), and Additional Respondents of Color (27%, n = 43) than White respondents (15%, n = 33) who had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct indicated that the conduct was based on their ethnicity.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct at SF State. Three hundred twenty-five respondents elaborated on experiences with this conduct. Three themes
emerged from all respondents: conduct by students, the reporting process, and identity-based discrimination. Two themes were specific to Employee respondents (Faculty Tenure-Track, Non-Tenure Track Academic Appointment, and Staff respondents): conduct by supervisor, and conduct from co-workers. There was one theme specific to Student (Undergraduate and Graduate Student) respondents: conduct from faculty.

2. Less Comfort With Campus, Workplace, and Classroom Climates

Prior research on campus climate has focused on the experiences of faculty, staff, and students associated with historically underserved social/community/affinity groups (e.g., women, People of Color, people with disabilities, first-generation students, and veterans). Statistical analyses showed that several groups at SF State, including MPP Staff respondents, Black/African American/Africana Student & Faculty respondents, Non-Transfer & Re-Entry Student respondents, and Not-First-Generation/Not-Low-Income Student respondents indicated that they were less comfortable than their majority counterparts with the climates of the campus, workplace, and classroom.

Examples of Findings for Overall Climate at SF State

- A higher percentage of Staff respondents (21%, n = 122) and Faculty respondents (25%, n = 65) than Student respondents (7%, n = 117) felt “uncomfortable” or “very uncomfortable” with the overall climate at SF State.

- 23% (n = 123) of Transfer Student respondents were “very comfortable” with the overall climate at SF State compared with 15% (n = 117) of Non-Transfer & Re-Entry Student respondents.

- 26% (n = 34) of MPP Staff respondents compared with 13% (n = 62) of Salaried Staff respondents felt “uncomfortable” with the overall climate.

Examples of Findings for Department/Program and Work Unit Climate

- 20% (n = 120) of Staff respondents compared with 12% (n = 32) of Faculty respondents felt “neither comfortable nor uncomfortable” with the climate in their department/program or work unit.

---

21 Harper & Hurtado (2007); Hart & Fellabaum (2008); Rankin (2003); Rankin & Reason (2005); Worthington, et al. (2008)
Examples of Findings for Classroom Climate

- A lower percentage of Student respondents (20%, \( n = 321 \)) compared with Faculty respondents (30%, \( n = 79 \)) was “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes.

- 41% (\( n = 34 \)) of Black/African American/Africana Student & Faculty respondents compared with 58% (\( n = 307 \)) of White Student & Faculty respondents and 58% (\( n = 289 \)) of Additional Student & Faculty Respondents of Color were “comfortable” with the climate in their classes (Asian/Asian American Student & Faculty respondents (57%, \( n = 190 \)) and Latina/o/x or Hispanic Student & Faculty respondents (52%, \( n = 178 \)) did not statistically differ from the other groups).

- A lower percentage of First-Generation/Low-Income Student respondents (48%, \( n = 154 \)) than Not-First-Generation/Not-Low-Income Student respondents (59%, \( n = 707 \)) felt “comfortable” with the climate in their classes.

3. Faculty and Staff Respondents – Seriously Considered Leaving SF State

- 63% (\( n = 166 \)) of Faculty respondents and 66% (\( n = 391 \)) of Staff respondents had seriously considered leaving SF State in the past year.

  - 66% (\( n = 257 \)) of those Staff respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of low salary/pay rate and 63% (\( n = 248 \)) due to bureaucracy. Other reasons included limited opportunities for advancement (49%, \( n = 191 \)), cost of living in the Bay Area (47%, \( n = 182 \)), increased workload (43%, \( n = 169 \)), inability to effect change (42%, \( n = 163 \)), tension with their supervisors/managers (36%, \( n = 140 \)), and lack of professional development opportunities (31%, \( n = 120 \)).

  - 65% (\( n = 108 \)) of those Faculty respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of low salary/pay rate, and 55% each because of bureaucracy (\( n = 92 \)) or the cost of living in the Bay Area (\( n = 91 \)). Other reasons included institutional support (45%, \( n = 74 \)), increased workload (44%, \( n = 72 \)), inability to effect change (36%, \( n = 60 \)), lack of professional development opportunities (31%, \( n = 52 \)), limited opportunities for advancement (30%, \( n = 49 \)), the campus climate was not
welcoming (28%, \( n = 47 \)), and they were interested in a position at another
institution (25%, \( n = 42 \)).

Four hundred seven Employee (Faculty Tenure-Track, Non-Tenure-Track Academic
Appointment, and Staff) respondents elaborated on why they had seriously considered
leaving. There were four themes that emerged from the responses: salary concerns,
administration frustrations, issues of inequality, and lack of support.

4. Staff Respondents – Challenges With Work-Life Issues

- Few Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that staff salaries (11%, \( n = 66 \)) or child care benefits (17%, \( n = 100 \)) were competitive.
- 29% (\( n = 171 \)) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that staff
  opinions were valued on SF State committees and 21% (\( n = 120 \)) thought that
  staff opinions were valued by SF State faculty and administration.
- 45% (\( n = 261 \)) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt
  valued by SF State faculty, and 35% (\( n = 204 \)) felt valued by SF State senior
  administrators.
- 59% (\( n = 348 \)) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that a hierarchy
  existed within staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than
  others.
- 48% (\( n = 286 \)) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the performance evaluation
  process was clear and 31% (\( n = 181 \)) thought it was productive.
- 30% (\( n = 177 \)) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that SF State provided adequate
  resources to help them manage work-life balance.
- 43% (\( n = 252 \)) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that SF State was supportive of their
  taking extended leave.
- 24% (\( n = 137 \)) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that SF State policies (e.g., FMLA)
  were fairly applied across SF State.
- 31% (\( n = 177 \)) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that SF State was supportive of
  flexible work schedules.
17% \((n = 97)\) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that clear procedures existed on how they could advance at SF State and 28\% \((n = 163)\) felt positive about their career opportunities at SF State. Staff respondents elaborated on their perceptions of the work-place climate at SF State. Several themes emerged from the responses including: overwhelming workload, experiences with supervisors, inequities in the workplace, opportunities for advancement and professional growth, evaluation process, salary frustrations, leave taking options, job security, flexible work schedules, and feeling devalued.

5. Faculty Respondents – Challenges With Faculty Work

**Tenure-Track**

- 55\% \((n = 103)\) of Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that tenure standards/promotion standards were applied equally to faculty in their department/college.
- 54\% \((n = 99)\) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they were supported and mentored during the tenure-track years.
- 45\% \((n = 83)\) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that SF State faculty feel empowered to delay their tenure-clock if applicable.
- 52\% \((n = 97)\) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their service contributions were valued by SF State.
- 29\% \((n = 53)\) of Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that faculty opinions were taken seriously by senior administrators (e.g., dean, vice president, provost) and 47\% \((n = 88)\) felt that faculty opinions were valued within SF State committees.

**Non-Tenure-Track**

- 27\% \((n = 21)\) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the criteria used for contract renewal were clear and 22\% \((n = 17)\) thought the criteria used for contract renewal were applied equally to all positions.
- 23\% \((n = 18)\) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they had job security.
- 48\% \((n = 37)\) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that research was valued by SF State, and 61\% \((n = 47)\) thought that teaching was valued by SF State.
18% (n = 14) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their opinions were taken seriously by senior administrators.

All Faculty

8% (n = 22) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that salaries for tenure-track faculty positions were competitive and 6% (n = 14) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that salaries for adjunct professors were competitive.

8% (n = 21) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that child care benefits were competitive.

9% (n = 24) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that SF State provided adequate resources to help them manage work-life balance and 30% (n = 79) felt that SF State provided them with resources to pursue professional development.

37% (n = 96) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by SF State senior administrators.

44% (n = 114) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that SF State encouraged free and open discussion of difficult topics.

41% (n = 106) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt positive about their career opportunities at SF State and 46% (n = 121) would recommend SF State as a good place to work.

Faculty respondents elaborated on statements regarding their perceptions of work-life balance at SF State. Two themes emerged from the Faculty respondents’ comments: salary concerns and limited resources. In addition, Tenure-Track Faculty respondents elaborated on the value of faculty opinions; committee work; Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) criteria and process; and inequities. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents commented on compensation, job security, and feelings of value.

6. Meaningful Percentage of Respondents Experienced Unwanted Sexual Conduct

In 2014, Not Alone: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault indicated that sexual assault is a substantial issue for colleges and universities nationwide, affecting the physical health, mental health, and academic success of students. The report highlights that one in five women is sexually assaulted
while in college. One section of the SF State survey requested information regarding sexual assault.

- 10% \((n = 251)\) of all respondents indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact/conduct while at SF State.
  - 2% \((n = 42)\) experienced relationship violence (e.g., ridiculed, controlling, hitting).
  - 3% \((n = 71)\) experienced stalking (e.g., following me, on social media, texting, phone calls).
  - 6% \((n = 154)\) unwanted sexual harassment (e.g., catcalling, repeated sexual advances, derogatory gender/gender identity/gender expression-based comments, asking for sexual favors).
  - 3% \((n = 72)\) experienced unwanted sexual contact (e.g. fondling, rape, sexual assault, penetration without consent).

- Non-Transfer/Re-entry Student respondents, Women respondents, Trans-spectrum respondents, LGBQ respondents, Multiracial respondents, Additional Respondent of Color, Not-First-Generation respondents, and U.S. Citizen-Birth respondents experienced unwanted sexual contact/conduct at higher rates than their counterparts.

- Respondents identified SF State students, SF State staff members, SF State faculty members, current or former dating/intimate partners, strangers, and acquaintances/friends as sources of unwanted sexual contact/conduct.

- For each of the four types of contact/conduct, 77% to 89% of the respondents who had experienced unwanted sexual contact/conduct had not reported the incident.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on why they did not or had not yet reported unwanted sexual contact/conduct. The rationales cited for not reporting these incidents included a fear of consequences, that the conduct was not serious enough to report, they expected no response to their report, that they handled it themselves, apprehension about the reporting process, and wanting to forget the incident.
Conclusion

SF State climate findings\textsuperscript{22} were similar with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.\textsuperscript{23} For example, 70\% to 80\% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be “very comfortable” or “comfortable.” A slightly lower percentage (67\%) of SF State respondents indicated that they were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate at SF State. Twenty percent to 25\% of respondents in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile conduct. At SF State, 25\% of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile conduct. The results also paralleled the findings of other climate studies of specific constituent groups offered in the literature.\textsuperscript{24}

SF State’s climate assessment report provides baseline data on diversity and inclusion, and addresses SF State’s mission and goals. While the findings may guide decision-making regarding policies and practices at SF State, it is important to note that the cultural fabric of any institution and unique aspects of each campus’s environment must be taken into consideration when deliberating additional action items based on these findings. The climate assessment findings provide the SF State community with an opportunity to build upon its strengths and to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. SF State, with support from senior administrators and collaborative leadership, is in a prime position to actualize its commitment to promote an inclusive campus and to institute organizational structures that respond to the needs of its dynamic campus community.

---

\textsuperscript{22} Additional findings disaggregated by position status and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.

\textsuperscript{23} Rankin & Associates Consulting (2016)

\textsuperscript{24} Guiffrida, Gouveia, Wall, & Seward (2002); Harper & Hurtado (2007); Harper & Quaye (2004); Hurtado & Ponjuan (2005); Rankin & Reason (2005); Sears (2002); Settles, Cortina, Malley, & Stewart (2006); Silverschanz et al. (2008); Yosso et al. (2009)
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