

Campus Climate Survey 2014 Results

To the OSU Community:

We are pleased to present to you the results from Oregon State's first annual campus climate survey. Among the various recommendations of the Equity and Inclusion strategic planning process was the creation of a committee to develop metrics and a means to collect data regarding the campus climate, in general and with regard to diversity. This committee was formed during the spring of 2013, and is composed of key administrators, faculty senate membership, tenured/tenure track faculty, professional faculty and research faculty. Although this committee did not include classified staff, the initial questions were piloted with a small number of represented employees to gather input regarding the relevance of the questions. This assessment is essential to helping us establish a baseline for future surveys so that we can assess our progress in maintaining a respectful work environment that promotes success for all. The results of each year's survey will also help us better determine where to focus our efforts.

The committee included:

Salvador Castillo, Director, Institutional Research
Daniel Newhart, Director, Student Affairs Research/Evaluation & Planning
Dave Blake, Assistant Vice President, Office of Human Resources
Rebecca Sanderson, former Director, Student Affairs Research, Evaluation & Planning
Dana Sanchez, Assistant Professor, Fisheries & Wildlife
Jo Alexander, Coordinator, Deaf & Hard of Hearing Access Services
Evviva Weinraub, Director, Emerging Technology & Services
Kerry McQuillin, Compliance and Assessment Associate, Office of Equity and Inclusion
Becky Warner, Senior Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
Kevin Gable, Former Faculty Senate President
Robyn Pease, Work/Life Coordinator
Anne Gillies, Senior Affirmative Action & Advancement Associate, Office of Equity and Inclusion
Roni Sue, Senior Title IX Response & Prevention Associate, Office of Equity and Inclusion

DESIGN PROCESS

The committee established basic design goals: create a brief survey instrument that could be given on an annual basis and result in a high response rate that was representative of the OSU community, and yet could touch upon a variety of key campus climate factors. A year-long effort by the committee yielded a survey instrument with about 26 general questions, plus some follow-up/branch options and demographic/identification questions.

We implemented the survey using the Qualtrics survey design tool and distributed via the Inform e-mail list. The survey was live from January 17, 2014 to February 27, 2014. Reminders were sent the 2nd and 4th week of the survey period. We present demographics and basic results in the rest of this paper. Further cross-tabulations and analysis of open-ended comments will be conducted later in the year.

SURVEY RATES

We chose to keep the survey anonymous and so we do not have a direct means to compute response rates or to determine if partial surveys represent an attempted start that were later completed, or even if individuals responded multiple times. For analysis purposes, we will report the total responses for each question. In some cases, respondents were only directed to a follow-up question depending on their answer to a screening question. In general, we will report percentages out of valid responses.

Active employee counts as of February 1, 2014 from the Banner HR system were used as the sample population. Some demographics are not available in Banner, but to the extent possible, we used those that are in Banner to estimate the representativeness of the survey.

There were 2187 responses, of which 1711 were generally complete and 476 which had partial or no responses (these were surveys that were opened, but not paged through). On February 1, 2014 there were 5482 active employees that could have been sampled for the survey (it is unclear how many are not reached by the Inform List or how many screen out e-mails from that list). Thus, the overall response rate was about 40%.

Employee Groups

The survey asked for self-identified primary employee category. While the wording for these categories did not exactly match categories in the Human Resources database, the following table provides approximate response rates for employee groups.

PRIMARY ROLE	Sample	%	Respondents	%	Response Rate
Classified	1476	26.9%	481	28.1%	32.6%
Emeritus	60	1.1%	-	-	-
Fixed Term Professor (clinical, practice, extension)	36	0.7%	9	0.5%	25.0%
Fixed Term Instructional Faculty	693	12.6%	101	5.9%	14.6%
Professional Faculty	1491	27.2%	633	37.0%	42.5%
Fixed Term Research Faculty	628	11.5%	101	5.9%	16.1%
Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty	1098	20.0%	310	18.1%	28.2%
Other	-	-	30	1.8%	-
Prefer not to answer	-	-	47	2.7%	-
Total	5482	100.0%	1712	100%	31.2%

475 did not respond at all.

Professional faculty are over-represented, with nearly a 43% response rate. It is unclear how many tenured faculty in administrative functions counted themselves in this group. The sample data counts all tenured staff in the tenured/track group. Classified and tenured/tenure track faculty were represented according to overall response rates, especially if we assume that emeritus professors identified as tenured faculty. Instructional faculty and research faculty are underrepresented, compared to the overall average. About half of the instructors are part-time, so for instructors, this may represent a lack of access to the survey or a reduced interest in career issues. It is unclear why research faculty responded in lower numbers.

Gender/Ethnic Group

The survey allowed for a wider range of self-reported identity than is available in the human resources system (survey terms are in parentheses). Where possible, I group to represent the response rate as closely as possible.

GENDER	Sample	%	Respondents	%	Response Rate
Female (Woman)	2934	53.5%	980	57.2%	33.4%
Male (Man)	2548	46.5%	541	34.5%	21.2%
(Transgender/gender queer)	-	-	8	0.5%	-
(Other Self-identify)	-	-	13	0.8%	-
(Prefer not to answer)	-	-	122	7.1%	-
Unknown/other (sum of prior three)	-	-	143	8.3%	-
Total	5482	100.0%	1714	100%	31.3%

473 did not respond at all.

Women appear to be proportionally represented. Men are seemingly underrepresented, but it is possible that the majority of the “prefer not to answer” are men. If so, this would bring the proportion close to representativeness. Other gender identities cannot be cross-checked with HR data.

ETHNIC GROUP	Sample	%	Respondents	%	Response Rate
American Indian/Alaskan/Native Hawaiian	44	0.7%	46	2.7%	104.5%
Asian	204	3.7%	30	1.8%	14.7%
Black	45	0.8%	9	0.5%	20.0%
Hispanic	213	3.9%	85	5.0%	39.9%
Two or more	64	1.2%	24	1.4%	37.5%
White	3805	69.4%	1277	74.5%	33.6%
Non US Resident	145	2.6%	17	0.9%	11.7%
Unknown (Prefer not to answer)	962	17.5%	226	13.2%	23.5%
Total	5482	100.0%	1714	100%	31.3%

473 did not respond at all.

Since the survey allowed respondents to reconsider their ethnic identity separately from what they have originally entered in their employee demographics, it is possible that some of these responses do not match the employee’s records. Small identity groups may particularly be affected. For example, American Indian/Alaskan/Native Hawaiians are clearly well represented, although the greater than 100% representation may reflect a greater response rate than in the employee records.

Other “over-represented” respondents are Hispanic, those reporting Two or more races, and White.

Asians, Blacks, Non US Residents (international without permanent residency) and “prefer not to answer” are underrepresented. Historically, about 80% of “decline to state” are White (when other data sources are available) and 15% are Asian. If this distribution holds for these respondents, then Whites are fully represented and Asians are underrepresented by about 10%. The lower rates for Asians and non US residents may be related to the lower rates of research faculty responses.

Job Location

JOB LOCATION	Sample	%	Respondents	%	Response Rate
Corvallis	4704	85.5%	1503	87.8%	32.0%
Cascades	119	2.2%	42	2.5%	35.3%
Newport	129	2.4%	20	1.2%	15.5%
Other	530	9.7%	116	6.8%	21.9%
(Prefer not to answer)	-	-	31	1.8%	-
Total	5482	100.0%	1714	100%	31.3%

473 did not respond at all.

Corvallis and Cascades appear to be well represented. Newport and other locations appear to be underrepresented. This also matches the underrepresentation of research faculty.

SURVEY RESPONSES

What is your impression of OSU?

ITEM	Responses	Average	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1. I would recommend my current department as an employer	1869	3.9	103	177	202	639	748
	100%	of 5	5.5%	9.5%	10.8%	34.2%	40.0%
2. I would recommend OSU as an employer	1857	4.0	50	109	230	856	612
	100%	of 5	2.7%	5.9%	12.4%	46.1%	33.0%

The following questions are related to my understanding of my position's connection to the University's larger purpose:

ITEM	Responses	Average	Disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree
3. I understand the University's strategic goals	1861	2.4	158	859	844
	100%	of 3	7.2%	39.3%	38.6%
4. I have opportunity to participate in shaping policy at OSU	1861	1.8	740	792	329
	100%	of 3	39.8%	42.6%	17.7%
5. I have opportunity to participate in shaping policy in my unit	1863	2.2	410	658	795
	100%	of 3	22.0%	35.3%	42.7%

If answered "agree" or "somewhat agree" to #3, then the following question

ITEM	Responses	Average	Disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree
6. I understand how my job helps the university meet its strategic goals	1687	2.6	74	525	1088
	100%	of 3	4.4%	31.1%	64.5%

7. I receive regular performance reviews.

Yes 1402 76.2%
 No 439 23.8%
 Total 1841 100.0%

Of those that responded “Yes” to receiving regular performance reviews:

ITEM	Responses	Average	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
8. My reviews provide useful information on my actual performance	1349	3.7	34	154	239	649	273
	100%	of 5	2.5%	11.4%	17.7%	48.1%	20.2%
9. My performance reviews are relevant to my advancement	1341	3.4	98	195	324	480	244
	100%	of 5	7.3%	14.5%	24.2%	35.8%	18.2%

I am informed about changes and issues relevant to my position by my...

ITEM	Responses	Average	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Unsure
10. Unit/Department	1786	3.8	46	192	432	567	524	25
	100%	of 5	2.6%	10.8%	24.2%	31.7%	29.3%	1.4%
11. College/Administrative Division	1772	3.2	162	314	537	461	222	76
	100%	of 5	9.1%	17.7%	30.3%	26.0%	12.5%	4.3%
12. Institution	1769	3.0	185	341	548	438	153	104
	100%	of 5	10.5%	19.3%	31.0%	24.8%	8.6%	5.9%

Questions about respect and open communications

ITEM	Responses	Average	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
13. I work in a unit where the leader fosters respect amongst employees	1800	3.9	137	180	220	542	721
	100%	of 5	7.6%	10.0%	12.2%	30.1%	40.1%
14. I am able to speak freely about my concerns to my colleagues.	1742	4.0	37	139	200	704	662
	100%	of 5	2.1%	8.0%	11.5%	40.4%	38.0%
15. I am able to speak freely about my concerns to my supervisor.	1760	3.8	134	195	200	602	629
	100%	of 5	7.6%	11.1%	11.4%	34.2%	35.7%
16. My suggestions and improvements are welcomed by my stakeholders/ customers.	1715	3.8	19	66	531	715	384
		of 5	1.1%	3.8%	31.0%	41.7%	22.4%

17. My suggestions and improvements are welcomed by my colleagues.	1767	4.0	25	95	258	902	487
		of 5	1.4%	5.4%	14.6%	51.0%	27.6%
18. My suggestions and improvements are welcomed by my supervisor.	1764	3.8	104	177	261	695	527
		of 5	5.9%	10.0%	14.8%	39.4%	29.9%
19. I feel valued by my stakeholders/ customers.	1731	4.0	25	61	373	720	552
		of 5	1.4%	3.5%	21.5%	41.6%	31.9%
20. I feel valued by my colleagues.	1767	4.1	33	87	211	820	616
		of 5	1.9%	4.9%	11.9%	46.4%	34.9%
21. I feel valued by my supervisor.	1771	3.8	133	155	215	628	640
		of 5	7.5%	8.8%	12.1%	35.5%	36.1%

In the last year, I have experienced uncivil and/or disrespectful interactions with my...

ITEM	Responses	Average	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
22. Unit	1701 100%	1.9 of 5	813 47.8%	423 24.9%	316 18.6%	126 7.4%	23 1.4%
23. Campus	1681 100%	1.7 of 5	830 49.4%	574 34.1%	216 12.8%	52 3.1%	9 0.5%
24. Stakeholders/ customers	1676 100%	1.7 of 5	809 48.3%	553 33.0%	266 15.9%	45 2.7%	3 0.2%
25. Local community	1688	1.5 of 5	1000 59.2%	514 30.5%	152 9.0%	19 1.1%	3 0.2%

I am aware of resources available to me when dealing with conflict in the workplace:

ITEM	Responses	I am aware but have not used	I am aware and have used	I am not aware
26. Ombuds Office	1712 100%	1178 68.8%	167 9.8%	367 21.4%
27. Human Resources	1706 100%	1180 69.2%	419 24.6%	107 6.3%
28. Deans	1688 100%	1031 61.1%	210 12.4%	447 26.5%
29. SEIU (Union)	1662	1154 69.4%	117 7.0%	391 23.5%
30. Faculty Senate Grievance Committee	1691	923 54.6%	29 1.7%	739 43.7%
31. Office of Equity & Inclusion	1698	1161 68.4%	236 13.9%	301 17.7%
32. Department Heads	1687	1134 67.2%	379 22.5%	174 10.3%
33. CAPS - Counseling and Psychological Services	1700	1268 74.6%	110 6.5%	322 18.9%
34. EAP - Employee Assistance Program	1699	1005 59.2%	162 9.5%	532 31.3%

Each item below is restricted to the people that reported awareness of the corresponding item in the prior set of questions.

I would feel comfortable accessing the following resources when dealing with conflicts in the workplace:

ITEM	Responses	Average	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
35. Ombuds Office	1332 100%	3.8 of 5	48 3.6%	91 6.8%	316 23.7%	476 35.7%	401 30.1%
36. Human Resources	1580 100%	3.5 of 5	106 6.7%	202 12.8%	343 21.5%	619 38.7%	310 19.6%
37. Deans	1224 100%	3.2 of 5	106 8.7%	209 17.1%	388 31.7%	330 27.0%	191 15.6%
38. SEIU (Union)	1237 100%	3.2 of 5	102 8.2%	156 12.6%	540 43.7%	306 24.7%	133 10.8%
39. Faculty Senate Grievance Committee	938 100%	3.3 of 5	51 5.4%	121 12.9%	408 43.5%	229 24.4%	129 13.8%
40. Office of Equity & Inclusion	1375 100%	3.6 of 5	66 4.8%	119 8.7%	389 28.3%	495 36.0%	306 22.3%
41. Department Heads	1493 100%	3.5 of 5	100 6.7%	184 12.3%	346 23.2%	537 36.0	326 21.8%
42. CAPS - Counseling and Psychological Services	1362 100%	3.7 of 5	35 2.6%	75 5.5%	423 31.1%	528 38.8%	301 22.1%
43. EAP - Employee Assistance Program	1148 100%	3.8 of 5	24 2.1%	47 4.1%	348 30.3%	442 38.5%	287 25.0%

The following questions are related to compensation, professional development and advancement.

ITEM	Responses	Average	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
44. My compensation/ benefits allow me to meet my basic needs	1708 100%	3.7 of 5	76 4.4%	239 14.0%	191 11.2%	834 48.8%	368 21.5%
45. I feel that I am compensated for the level of work I'm expected to perform	1708 100%	2.9 of 5	285 16.7%	504 29.5%	243 14.2%	483 28.3%	193 11.3%
46. My supervisor supports my participation in professional development opportunities	1709 100%	4.0 of 5	58 3.4%	117 6.8%	224 13.1%	675 39.5%	635 37.2%
47. I understand how I can advance at the university	1702 100%	3.2 of 5	184 10.8%	336 19.7%	390 22.9%	493 29.0%	299 17.6%

I feel my physical workspace at OSU is...

ITEM	Responses	Average	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
48. Attractive	1706 100%	3.4 of 5	140 8.2%	321 18.8%	315 18.5%	584 34.4%	345 20.2%
49. Comfortable	1706 100%	3.5 of 5	111 6.5%	281 16.5%	278 16.3%	691 40.5%	345 20.2%
50. Accessible	1705 100%	3.8 of 5	98 5.7%	146 8.6%	201 11.8%	821 48.2%	439 25.7%
51. Safe	1702 100%	3.9 of 5	58 3.4%	143 8.4%	219 12.9%	807 47.4%	477 28.0%

52. During the last 12 months, have you seriously considered leaving OSU

Yes, I have been actively seeking other employment	211	12.3%
Yes, I have considered/thought about leaving.	662	38.7%
No, I have no intention of leaving OSU in the short term	441	25.8%
No, I have no intention of leaving OSU.	357	20.9%
No, I am unable to leave OSU	38	2.2%
Total	1709	100.0%

There is visible leadership to foster diversity at OSU from:

ITEM	Responses	Average	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
53. The President's office	1689 100%	3.7 of 5	53 3.1%	130 7.7%	495 29.3%	669 39.6%	342 20.2%
54. My academic dean/unit head	1676 100%	3.6 of 5	82 4.9%	130 7.8%	566 33.8%	554 33.1%	344 20.5%
55. My department head/direct supervisor	1687 100%	3.7 of 5	93 5.5%	127 7.5%	436 25.8%	625 37.0%	406 24.1%
56. Colleagues in my department	1689 100%	3.7 of 5	41 2.4%	123 7.3%	475 28.1%	700 41.4%	350 20.7%

57. I am involved in diversity initiatives on campus

Yes	540	31.8%
No	993	58.5%
I would like to be	163	9.6%
TOTAL	1696	100%

ITEM	Responses	Average	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
58. I feel that OSU values my involvement in diversity initiatives on campus	1677 100%	3.4 of 5	52 3.1%	126 7.5%	766 45.7%	528 31.5%	205 12.2%

Selected cross-tabulations

Q1. "I would recommend my current department as an employer" by Self-Reported Employee Group

ITEM	Responses	Average	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Classified Staff	480 100%	3.8 of 5	32 6.7%	56 11.7%	54 11.3%	163 34.0%	175 36.5%
Professional Faculty	632 100%	4.1 of 5	24 3.8%	60 9.5%	63 10.0%	197 31.2%	288 45.6%
Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty	310 100%	4.1 of 5	23 7.4%	26 8.4%	35 11.3%	95 30.8%	131 42.3%
Fixed Term Research Faculty	101 100%	3.9 of 5	4 4.0%	3 3.0%	21 20.8%	41 40.6%	32 31.7%
Fixed term Professors	9 100%	3.4 of 5	1 11.1%	2 22.2%	0 0.0%	4 44.4%	2 22.2%
Other	29 100%	3.8 of 5	2 6.9%	3 10.3%	4 13.8%	11 37.9%	9 31.0%
Fixed Term Instructors	101 100%	3.8 of 5	8 7.9%	11 10.9%	6 5.9%	45 44.6%	31 30.7%
Prefer not to answer/no reply	207 100%	4.0 of 5	9 4.3%	16 7.8%	19 9.2%	83 40.0%	80 38.6%
TOTAL	1869 100%	3.9 of 5	103 5.5%	177 9.5%	202 10.8%	639 34.2%	748 40.0%

Statistically significant association (chi square test significance .000)

Note: 45 marked "prefer not to answer" and averaged 3.5.

Q1. "I would recommend my current department as an employer" by Gender Identity/Expression

ITEM	Responses	Average	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Woman	979 100%	3.9 of 5	51 5.2%	102 10.4%	120 12.3%	317 32.4%	389 39.7%
Man	591 100%	4.0 of 5	29 4.9%	47 8.0%	56 9.5%	208 35.2%	251 42.5%
Transgender/Gender Queer	8 100%	4.0 of 5	0 0.0%	1 12.5%	2 25.0%	1 12.5%	4 50.0%
Self Identify	13 100%	3.7 of 5	1 7.7%	2 15.4%	2 15.4%	3 23.1%	5 38.5%
Prefer not to answer/ no reply	278 100%	3.9 of 5	22 7.9%	25 9.0%	22 7.9%	110 39.6%	99 35.6%
TOTAL	1869 100%	3.9 of 5	103 5.5%	177 9.5%	202 10.8%	639 34.2%	748 40.0%

Statistically significant association (chi square test significance .000)

Note: 118 marked "prefer not to answer" and averaged 3.5.

Q1. "I would recommend my current department as an employer" by Self-Reported Ethnic Group

ITEM	Responses	Average	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
American Indian/Alaska Native/ Native Hawaiian	46 100%	4.0 of 5	2 4.3%	2 4.3%	9 19.6%	12 26.1%	21 45.7%
Asian	29 100%	3.8 of 5	4 13.8%	1 3.4%	3 10.3%	10 34.5%	11 37.9%
Black	9 100%	4.2 of 5	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 22.2%	3 33.3%	4 44.4%
Hispanic	85 100%	3.9 of 5	5 5.9%	8 9.4%	11 12.9%	27 31.8%	34 40.0%
Two or more races	24 100%	4.0 of 5	0 0.0%	3 12.5%	4 16.7%	8 33.3%	9 37.5%
White	1277 100%	4.0 of 5	60 4.7%	127 9.9%	131 10.3%	435 34.1%	524 41.0%
Non US Resident	17 100%	3.8 of 5	2 11.8%	2 11.8%	2 11.8%	2 11.8%	9 52.9%
Prefer not to answer/ no reply	382 100%	3.8 of 5	30 7.9%	34 8.9%	40 10.5%	142 37.2%	136 35.6%
TOTAL	1869 100%	3.9 of 5	103 5.5%	177 9.5%	202 10.8%	639 34.2%	748 40.0%

Statistically significant association (chi square test significance .01)

Q31. "In the past year I have experienced uncivil and/or disrespectful interactions within my unit" by Gender Identity/Expression

ITEM	Responses	Average	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Woman	970 100%	2.0 of 5	444 45.8%	234 24.1%	202 20.8%	74 7.6%	16 1.6%
Man	582 100%	1.7 of 5	314 54.0%	146 25.1%	82 14.1%	37 6.4%	3 0.5%
Transgender/Gender Queer	8 100%	1.8 of 5	5 62.5%	0 0.0%	3 37.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Self Identify	13 100%	2.1 of 5	5 38.5%	3 23.1%	4 30.8%	1 7.7%	0 0.0%
Prefer not to answer/ no reply	138 100%	2.2 of 5	45 35.2%	40 31.3%	25 19.5%	14 10.9%	4 3.1%
TOTAL	1701 100%	1.9 of 5	813 47.8%	423 24.9%	316 18.6%	126 7.4%	23 1.4%

Statistically significant association (chi square test significance .007)

Note: 116 marked "prefer not to answer" and averaged 2.1.

Q31. "In the past year I have experienced uncivil and/or disrespectful interactions within my unit" by Self-Reported Ethnic Group

ITEM	Responses	Average	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
American Indian/Alaska Native/ Native Hawaiian	46 100%	1.8 of 5	21 45.7%	14 30.4%	8 17.4%	3 6.5%	0 0.0%
Asian	30 100%	2.1 of 5	12 40.0%	10 33.3%	3 10.0%	3 10.0%	2 6.7%
Black	9 100%	2.2 of 5	4 44.4%	1 11.1%	2 22.2%	2 22.2%	0 0.0%
Hispanic	84 100%	2.2 of 5	29 34.5%	24 28.6%	21 25.0%	7 8.3%	3 3.8%
Two or more races	24 100%	2.0 of 5	10 41.7%	7 29.2%	4 16.7%	2 8.3%	1 4.2%
White	1259 100%	1.9 of 5	632 50.2%	294 23.4%	232 18.4%	89 7.1%	12 1.0%
Non US Resident	17 100%	1.8 of 5	9 52.9%	4 23.5%	3 17.6%	1 5.9%	0 0.0%
Prefer not to answer/ no reply	232 100%	2.0 of 5	96 41.4%	69 29.7%	43 18.5%	19 8.2%	5 2.2%
TOTAL	1701 100%	1.9 of 5	813 47.8%	423 24.9%	316 18.6%	126 7.4%	23 1.4%

No statistically significant association (chi square test significance .239)