



# SUMMARY

## CLIMATE SURVEY 2006-2008-2010

Prepared by Sam Agronow, Ph.D., Director  
Office of Institutional Research

This document provides a summary of the results of the Climate Survey for Faculty, Students and Staff completed in the years 2006, 2008 and 2010. A more "comprehensive" presentation of Climate Survey results is at this link: <http://www.stmarys-ca.edu/about-smc/institutional-research/surveys/docs/ClimateSurvey2006-2008-2010DEANSandDIRECTORSPresentationFINAL.pdf>. Also detailed data tables showing Climate Survey results can be found at: <http://www.stmarys-ca.edu/about-smc/institutional-research/surveys/campus-climate-surveys.html>.

### **ITEMS-RESPONSES-RESPONSE RATES**

We now have collected three years of Climate Survey data, 2006, 2008, and 2010, for three SMC respondent groups: Faculty, Students, and Staff. There is good overlap of items on the surveys in these years, though 2008 and 2010 are more alike than 2006. The faculty response rate in 2010 (n=234, 58%) and staff rate (n=256, 56%) are up from prior years, while the student response rate (n=487, 13%) remains low. Despite the low response rates from students over the years, the numeric outcomes to the survey are not skewed or bimodal, though written student "comments" suggest polarization on the issues of diversity and inclusiveness. Responses are generally "representative" of the populations, save for greater response from females to the Faculty and Staff surveys.

### **FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION**

Faculty and staff satisfaction with campus administrative leadership, Academic Senate leadership and Staff Council leadership is below 50% in 2010, but up from previous years. About 4 of 5 Faculty and almost 3 of 4 Staff in 2010 indicate that "overall" they are satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs, with little change from previous years. However, only 28% of Faculty and 51% of Staff in 2010 describe their morale as good. Faculty/Staff morale ratings are correlated with degree of respect and support they receive. Staff job satisfaction ratings are notably higher for those who have worked at SMC for 10 years or more. Written comments by faculty and staff suggest that recent budget cuts are an issue. Non-administrative staff also indicate that they are asked to carry more of their share of the work load than faculty or administrators, and are especially resentful of having to work through lunch or work late.

### **STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY AND LEARNING RELATED TO DIVERSITY**

Very large percentages of students in 2010 (75% or more) say faculty are fair to all students regardless of ethnic background, are approachable inside or outside the classroom, are enthusiastic about teaching, seek student active participation in the learning process, encourage cooperation among students in the classroom, and provide a classroom environment that allows students to express ideas freely. These ratings are unchanged or improving slightly over the years. Very small percentages of students responding (25% or less) say they learned about discrimination based on ethnicity, disability, sexism, or homophobia, inside or outside of the classroom. Percentages have improved a little from the 2008 survey. Greater percentages of African American (44%) and Latino (35%) students are likely to have learned about discrimination outside the classroom compared with Asian (18%) or White (21%) students.

## **COLLABORATION AND COMMUNITY**

In 2010, 51% of Faculty and 52% of Students, but only 15% of Staff responding indicate that SMC places “A Great Deal of Emphasis” in encouraging collaboration among offices. These percentages (and notably the Faculty percentage) are up from prior years. About 47% of Faculty in 2010, 45% of Staff, and 51% of Students say SMC places “A Great Deal of Emphasis” on developing a sense of community among faculty, students and staff. All of these percentages are up notably from prior years. However, while 45% of Staff and 41% of Students in 2010 say SMC places “A Great Deal of Emphasis” on developing an “INCLUSIVE” community (both percentage up from prior years), only 14% of Faculty agreed. Finally, the percentages indicating that SMC places “A Great Deal of Emphasis” on developing an appreciation for a multicultural society or creating a climate where differences of opinion are aired openly and regularly, increased for all three respondent groups in 2010 though still were below 50%.

Greater percentages of Minority (vs. White), and Catholic (vs. Non-Catholic) respondents from all groups indicate that SMC places “A Great Deal of Emphasis” on developing an inclusive community and developing an appreciation for a multi-cultural society. Much greater percentages of Minority (vs. White) and Female (vs. Male) Students indicate that SMC SHOULD place “A Great Deal of Emphasis” on developing an appreciation for a multi-cultural society (an item not asked of Faculty or Staff).

Respondents frequently commented on the “Our Struggle is Tied with Yours” demonstration that took place just before the Climate Surveys were administered in 2010, taking strong opposing positions for or against that demonstration, its participants, and its goals, with some saying that the criticism of the students involved in the demonstration was misguided, while others were critical of the demonstration for promoting “disunity” in the campus community. One faculty member responding to “inclusiveness” issues summed up the SMC situation in his/her statement “I think it really depends on which campus groups you are examining: there are really 2 SMCs – a conservative one and a social justice one.” Unrelated to this issue, several Staff used this section on community and inclusiveness to comment on their status as “third rate citizens” or on being on the “outside looking in” relative to faculty and students.

## **CIVILITY**

One way civility was assessed was in terms of “how often one hears insensitive/disparaging remarks” about a particular group of people. For Faculty respondents in 2010 disparaging/insensitive remarks are most often heard “Frequently” or “Occasionally” toward Women (54%), GLBT (47%), People of Color (39%), Religious (36%), Men (26%), Older (19%), and Disability (17%). For Staff these percentages are Women (37%), GLBT (37%), People of Color (32%), Religious (23%), Men (22%), Older (20%), and Disability (12%). For Students these percentages are GLBT (45%), Women (40%), People of Color (39%), Religious (27%), Men (20%), Disability (19%), and Older (17%). For Staff and Students the percentage hearing these remarks “Frequently” or “Occasionally” have declined from earlier surveys (most notably for remarks directed toward Women). However, for Faculty the percentages are the same or slightly higher from earlier survey years. Greater percentages of Minority (vs. White) and Female (vs. Male) respondents from all groups report hearing insensitive/disparaging remarks directed at People of Color. Similarly, greater percentages of Female (vs. Male) respondents report hearing insensitive/disparaging remarks directed to Women, while greater percentages of Male (vs. Female) respondents report hearing insensitive/disparaging remarks directed toward Men.

Respondent comments regarding instances of incivility are reported for every one of the target groups listed above, though most comments are about incivility toward Women, followed by GLBT, Catholics, and People of Color. Comments in 2010 from females focus on not being respected and are not that different from what was reported on SMC Climate Surveys conducted in 1992 (surveys with very different “objective” survey items, so statistical comparisons between 2006-2008-2010 and these 1992 surveys are not possible):

2010 Female Faculty respondent: “Several times male faculty have said to me in so many words ‘shut up’ and I don’t find them talking this way to male professors.”

1992 Female Faculty respondent: “Discrimination against female faculty members is rather subtle. But I’ve been at many meetings where certain faculty members interrupt females very aggressively while allowing other men to speak. This kind of behavior seems to be diminishing over time.”

Comments against those who are “Religious” in 2010 are usually directed at Catholics and can be summed up in a comment from a Faculty respondent: “There is an increasing anti-Catholic tone on campus”.

Finally, several Staff respondents in 2010 comment in this section of the survey on the lack of respect they receive from supervisors and coworkers usually because of their lower position in the hierarchy.

### **INCREASING REPRESENTATION OF PEOPLE OF COLOR**

Less than 1/3 of all respondents say that SMC places “A Great Deal of Emphasis” in increasing the representation of People of Color in the Faculty, Administration, or Staff. The percentage endorsing this statement is particularly low for increasing representation in the Administration (13% or less of any respondent group saying SMC places “A Great Deal of Emphasis”). However, all percentages, though low have increased from the 2006 and/or 2008 Climate Surveys. Greater percentages of White (vs. Minority) Students and Staff in 2010 indicate that SMC places “A Great Deal of Emphasis” on increasing representation of People of Color in the Faculty. Much greater percentages of Minority (vs. White) Students (50%-60% of Minority vs. 15%-20% of White) in 2010 indicate that “A Great Deal of Emphasis” SHOULD BE placed on increasing representation in the SMC Faculty, Administration, and Staff (these “SHOULD BE” items were not asked of Faculty and Staff respondents in 2010). Respondent comments are polarized on this issue with some saying SMC is not trying hard enough while others say increasing representation is too difficult to accomplish or not important. Several respondents question the willingness, beyond the rhetoric, to make changes in terms of “practice and resources.”

### **VALUE OF DIVERSITY**

About 85% of Faculty, 84% of Staff, and 76% Students in 2010 endorse that the statement that “A diverse student body enhances the educational experiences of all students.” These percentages are actually lower than the endorsement rates of 95% of Faculty, 94% of Staff, and 82% of Students, in the 2006 and/or 2008 surveys. More notably, in response to the item “A diverse student body is appreciated by the faculty on this campus,” the percentage of Faculty endorsing (this item was not asked of Staff or Students) has slipped from 71% in 2006, to 58% in 2008 and to 52% in 2010. Comment from Faculty on this issue is polarized, partly in response to the “Our Struggle” demonstration. Some question the value of diversity itself, while others are “appalled” by such an attitude.

Very small percentages of Faculty, Students or Staff (about 10% or less in 2010) report that they fear for their safety on campus because of their sexual orientation, ethnicity or gender, nor do they report feeling uncomfortable disclosing their sexual orientation to others on campus. These percentages are also largely unchanged from prior years. While 72% of Faculty and 81% of Staff in 2010 report that they “know how to officially report any racist, sexist or otherwise offensive behavior,” only 45% percent of Students agree with this statement. However, the Student percentage in 2010 (45%) is up from 22% in 2006 and 37% in 2008. The percentage indicating they are uncomfortable discussing racially sensitive topics on campus with members of other races and ethnicities stood at 30% for Faculty respondents in 2010, 23% for Staff Respondents, and 30% for students. While these percentages are largely unchanged from 2006 and 2008 for Staff and Students, there is a marked increase for Faculty from 2006 when only 12% indicated this was true. The percentage of Students saying “there is racial tension on campus “(a question only asked of Student respondents) has increased from 23% in 2006 to 35% in 2008, and 32% in 2010 with a 12% difference between Minority (39% agreeing) vs. White Students (27% agreeing) in 2010.

Greater percentages of Catholics (vs. Non-Catholics) respondents endorse the statement that they are “comfortable talking about my religion on campus”. Greater percentages of Catholic (vs. Non-Catholic) students say they are involved in social activities at SMC. While the majority of Faculty and Staff in all three survey years say they value the work being done by the Intercultural Center, the percentage of Students valuing this work has slipped from 73% in 2006 to 48% in 2008, and 47% in 2010. Moreover, there are major differences in response from Whites vs. Minority Student respondents over this period, with 73% of Minority and 72% of White Students supporting the Intercultural Center in 2006, while 57% of Minority and 39% of White Students supported it in 2010. There are a number of comments, primarily in the Student Survey, in 2010 focused on support for, or opposition to, Intercultural Center activities.

Staff comments are very positive toward the Campus of Difference Workshops offered in 2010, though some Staff indicate that there are incidents of “reverse discrimination” taking place at the Workshops, or that the “wrong people” are attending, or that more “ideas/intentions need to be put into practice.”

### **SUMMARY OF RESPONSES AND COMMENTS IN 2010**

STUDENTS: Generally like SMC and SMC faculty but hold strong opposing opinions on diversity issues.

FACULTY: Provide positive job satisfaction ratings (and receive high ratings from students), but have concerns about morale, being respected, civility, and hold opposing opinions on diversity.

STAFF: Have some of the same concerns as faculty and students, but are *less* contentious in their comments. Staff respondents also have significant issues about being the lowest in the hierarchy at SMC.

### **CHARTING PROGRESS WITH THE ORGANIZATIONAL MODEL OF INCLUSION (ODMI)**

In response to the Climate Survey findings Provost Dobkin and the CCIE view SMC’s current status in terms of the Organizational Model of Inclusion. There are four phases in this model: Exclusion, Symbolic Inclusion, Prescribed Inclusion, and Inclusion. SMC currently may best be described as in the Symbolic Inclusion phase characterized by: “Usually precipitated by external forces or crises,” “‘Qualified’ others must fit in, play by the rules, and ignore differences,” “Fear of differences supports avoidance of issues,” “Norms don’t change,” and “To avoid conflict, systems place those who were excluded in ‘symbolic positions’”. SMC’s goal is to move beyond this to “Prescribe Inclusion” and, eventually, “Inclusion”.