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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 2012, Cal Poly and President Jeffrey Armstrong have firmly established a commitment to diversity and inclusive excellence as institutional values and have worked with advocates to establish the foundational infrastructure for implementing these values. Out of that work came a call for an unflinching assessment of Cal Poly’s campus climate, now offered in this report.

The Cal Poly Experience Initiative emerged in the winter of 2019, when senior leadership asked researchers from the Center for Strategic Diversity Leadership and Social Innovation to provide an objective third-party assessment of campus climate. Just before this, a series of difficult diversity flashpoints had left many on campus questioning the university and needing an expansive response of mission and interlocking activities to begin changing the DEI narrative at Cal Poly.

We engaged with thousands of community members to both establish a visible conversation about issues of diversity, equity and inclusion dynamics across the colleges and units, and to understand campus DEI dynamics at Cal Poly, using best-in-class research techniques and analysis. From this emerged evidence-based recommendations to support the institution’s efforts forward.

We must remember that diversity and inclusive excellence is more than a numbers game; it is a cultural shift that transforms an institution at many levels into a vibrant, interconnected community of inclusion, advancing and elevating the institution and its effectiveness as a whole. A commitment to inclusive excellence not only initiates a journey for the institution itself but for each individual—student, faculty, staff and campus leader—who is responsible for their own personal development and serves as a team member advancing the institution’s expedition to a better future for all. This report supports this journey, establishing a new base camp, founded on rigorous quantitative and qualitative data and data analysis, from which the team can evaluate and implement the next leg of this adventure.

Campus Climate and the CPX Research Project

On a campus, the term “climate” is used to discuss how individuals and groups experience their membership in the campus community (Hurtado and Associates, 1998) It summarizes the inclusivity dynamics of the organization, nested in broader socio-historical context of difference in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, disability and a near limitless range of social identities. In short, the presence of individuals from different backgrounds results in diversity; climate refers to the lived experiences of those diverse individuals and groups. Diversity and inclusion efforts are not complete unless they address issues of climate.

The CPX Research Project. Our research team used data gathered from one-on-one interviews, small-group listening sessions and online surveys to power our assessment. Three questions guided our efforts across all activities:

1. What is the lived experience of diverse groups at Cal Poly?
2. What are the key challenges and opportunities of diversity, equity and inclusion at Cal Poly?
3. What are core recommendations to help Cal Poly further support inclusive excellence?

Quantitative Data. Our research applied several well-respected and well-validated campus climate research frameworks, questions and methodologies. It mobilized a multi-level campaign strategy to drive a healthy level of survey participation. Following collection, data were weighted for representational accuracy. Student participant rates were consistent with university factbook data. For a full discussion, please reference the Cal Poly Experience (CPX) Research Study Student, Faculty and Staff Technical Reports.

Survey Respondents. Approximately 41% of students (8,749), 61% of faculty (894), and 60% of staff (1,127) responded to this census study of the Cal Poly Experience, a healthy response rate.
Qualitative Data (comments, written responses) were transcribed, coded and analyzed for themes and key insights using a traditional open-coding method (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

Mixed-Method Study Approach. These data are highly credible, grounded in best-in-class measures, in conservative but adequate analysis techniques and garnered very strong response rates. Further, the inclusion of so many different types of data offers several important benefits and helps us better interpret the data as well.

Listening Session Findings

Listening is foundational to embracing the journey of change. The process of being listened to allows participants reflect on the culture in which they work and learn. This listening is in many ways cathartic for those who have endured a traumatic time of heightened emotion, for example diversity flashpoints or microaggressions. Listening helps them to discover an emergent, better future.

In all, we spoke with nearly 600 Cal Poly students, faculty and staff from diverse subgroups on campus, as well as a small number of persons from the San Luis Obispo community. Three central ideas were heard consistently: 1.) The need for a multi-dimensional diversity, equity and inclusion plan that elevates the prior Collective Impact framework; 2.) Reports of a widespread culture of microaggression and resistance to the presence of diverse groups, with many individuals (not the university as a whole) professing no desire to prioritize DEI work; and 3.) The importance of confronting and overcoming the inertia of a legacy culture and a reputation of homogeneity.

Positives. While participants were generally critical of the university's DEI track record, there was a noticeable feeling that leadership was moving in the right direction and gaining momentum in what felt like a series of slow starts. Participants lauded a growing community of DEI champions, including many students at the grassroots level, plus clear steps taken by the university. Many wanted to see additional resources here. Diversity training and programming were noted as recent positives.

Challenges. Healthy recognition of challenges leads to outcomes. Participants identified both historic and contemporary cultural challenges for DEI at Cal Poly, from homogeneity to location to a past lack of leadership and change planning. Three key challenges emerged: 1.) A negative DEI brand image, a “good-old-boy school” known as “a White, wealthy school, where your diversity is not welcome.” 2.) A definite need to diversify the campus community, especially leadership and tenure-track faculty. 3.) A desired shift in engagement with alumni and San Luis Obispo. In the eyes of many, the ultimate pathway to a stronger Cal Poly experience is to prioritize DEI, visibly commit and ultimately enhance ethnic, racial, economic, gender and other diversity on campus.

A Scorecard Assessment Framework for Unpacking the Cal Poly Experience

The in-person listening sessions gleaned a cadre of valuable insights that were reinforced by our data collection. For this report, we created a proprietary color-coded infographic scorecard allowing immediate understanding of patterns in the data, from green areas of clear strength to red zones of challenge. Notably, students, faculty and staff reported similar perspectives in their views about General Campus Climate, DEI Campus Climate, Institutional Commitment to DEI, Feeling Valued and Belonging, and Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo. Many patterns replicate again and again.

Notably, DEI Climate was viewed as an area of concern across students, faculty and staff. The fact that so many on campus view the general climate as positive yet express concern about the DEI climate is unusual in our research experience and indicates a net positive—an extraordinary and widespread level of awareness about DEI issues and a concern for others even when one’s own experience is comfortable. These results point to a wide-open door for action at Cal Poly.
The Cal Poly Student/Faculty/Staff Experience

*Scorecards.* Consistently across all three population segments (student, faculty, staff), *identity matters.* Those who were female (vs. male), LGBTQIA (vs. heterosexual), disabled (vs. no disability), financially challenged (vs. financially stable) or of underrepresented racial/ethnic backgrounds (vs. White) consistently reported different and more-negative experiences. This finding is consistent in the data and visible in the scorecards across our five core measures.

In addition to the standard bivariate models, we provided additional multivariate analysis that further delved into the relative impact of sex, sexual orientation, ability status, financial stability, and race/ethnicity on the outcomes of Dissatisfaction (“Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied”) and of Discrimination (“Yes”). These findings confirmed the data summarized in the scorecards, accentuating the depth of the results—namely, that students, faculty and staff experience Cal Poly in different ways that are profoundly affected by their identities. Across every measure of this study, diverse communities reported a less favorable experience than their majority counterparts.

The listening sessions and survey data largely reinforced these results as existing everywhere institutionally. In comments, those in diverse communities reported greater challenges with the Cal Poly experience. They reported feeling like “the other.”

While we have not seen this level of *consistency* across students, faculty, staff and dependent measures at a single university, the outcomes of the assessment are common among higher education studies of this kind, not unique to Cal Poly (Harper and Hurtado, 2007). What will set Cal Poly apart, however, is what both university leadership and the entire institutional community do with these findings—how they come together to embrace a collective DEI journey that can strengthen the Cal Poly experience, both institutionally and individually, building a better educational and work experience for all.

**Strategic Diversity Leadership Recommendations**

The “embracing the journey” metaphor at the heart of this report posits that each person is potentially a catalyst for positive change. Listening sessions gathered suggestion that focused on: 1.) Leadership instituting a campus-wide DEI action plan, complete with accountability, incentives, infrastructure, and resources (AIIR) and 2.) That the campus community deeply embrace an ongoing individual and collective journey of DEI leadership development at all levels—student, faculty, staff and senior administrative levels through awareness, learning, recruitment, retention, outreach, and community engagement efforts.

**Recommendation 1.** Engage in campus-wide dialogues about the CPX study results. Leverage CPX toolkits among leadership, faculty and staff for their personal DEI journey and to activate a series of campus-wide dialogues about results of the CPX study. Senior leader visibility is key.

**Recommendation 2.** Create a centralized Inclusive Excellence framework to guide the DEI action-planning steps of colleges, administrative units, and student organizations. Develop a 5-year DEI action plan, uplifting relevant Collective Impact recommendations. Identify a DEI lead and team in every college and major administrative unit. Establish a clear accountability process by holding deans and VP’s responsible for plan development and implementation. Establish a scorecard to track and measure progress over time and produce an annual public forum.

**Recommendation 3.** Develop an Inclusive Excellence Innovation fund to support small and large grants to drive new DEI initiatives that focus on the university’s most difficult challenges. Align the fund to the core DEI framework and challenges noted in the CPX study. Prioritize evidence-based interventions and collaboration. Spark a culture of innovation, looking for programs that can make a big difference if scaled. Support current programs that have a strong evidence base.
Recommendation 4. Develop a multidimensional DEI training, curriculum and professional development program. Create learning moments for all. Begin with an online training for all in the campus community, and a shared learning experience for all DEI leads. Find creative ways to acknowledge DEI training unannual performance reviews, merit and promotion discussions, and hiring opportunities. Develop a certificate program. Pepper DEI learning into pre-existing, relevant programs and provide release time for employee training.

Recommendation 5: Invest in the campus DEI units to create a stronger, more evidence-based approach to driving high-impact diversity and inclusion outcomes. Invest in infrastructure of units, committees and leaders who are doing the day-to-day work. Make targeted investments that ensure every unit has a funded DEI activation lead role. Reexamine all current DEI committees. Scale up the Cal Poly Scholars program. Develop a major faculty diversity program as the university’s “big bet” and support retention, promotion, and leadership succession. Establish a staff leadership development program.

Recommendation 6: Develop the next phase of the CPX awareness campaign to create a positive brand halo and engagement both internally and externally with issues of diversity. Create awareness with alumni, the SLO community and campus citizens to spark a stronger culture of DEI at Cal Poly. Establish an appropriate messaging framework. Develop talking points for all leaders at Cal Poly regarding the CPX initiative. Drive development of the refreshed and DEI-strengthened Cal Poly brand. Conduct targeted outreach conversations with key board members, alumni, donors, corporate partners, others. Convene an external CPX-DEI advisory of supportive corporate partners, alumni, community leaders, and relevant influencers to support the university’s strategies.

Recommendation 7: Develop an Inclusive Excellence taskforce to identify 2-3 short- and long-term solutions to issues identified by the CPX Study. Establish a Cal Poly DEI Community Taskforce to reach out to the San Luis Obispo community and identify 3-5 top strategies to create a more inclusive experience on campus and in the SLO community.

Concluding Thoughts and Next Steps

As these results and other research has shown, educational institutions need a clear DEI infrastructure and plan, not only for building capacity in times of calm, but for responding well and swiftly in moments of crisis. Now is the time to redouble past DEI efforts and accelerate them into the future at Cal Poly.

Today the university is experiencing the often-painful early stages that demonstrate how greater demographic diversity does not necessarily create inclusion and belonging. In many ways, diversity is just the beginning. The greater challenge is to create a new DEI culture, supported by educational and work environments that allow such diversity to enrich itself and thrive—to create a broad-based and secure feeling of community, inclusion and belonging. This survey was a significant step forward toward that goal.

On behalf of The Center for Strategic Diversity Leadership & Social Innovation, thank you for the opportunity to serve your intentions and efforts as you take advantage of this critical juncture to embrace the DEI journey and drive new impact in the world.
INTRODUCTION

Cal Poly has established diversity and inclusive excellence as institutional values. Since 2012 President Jeffrey Armstrong has worked with advocates to establish the foundational infrastructure for implementing these values, creating the Office of Diversity and Inclusion and building the Collective Impact work. This project is an outgrowth of those efforts and their call to create a shared, data-driven picture of the current challenges and opportunities before the university.

To create an inclusive and high-performing learning institution, one key tactic is to build genuine solutions that deeply and permanently “interrupt the usual” dynamics that often stand in the way of operating as a diverse and inclusive community. A critical building block for driving change towards this goal is to develop a clear understanding of how diverse community members experience the campus today and the types of diversity and inclusion issues as well as capabilities that exist across campus.

Establishing this sort of clear understanding requires a willingness to engage in an unflinching assessment of the successes and the challenges at all levels of the organization. In embracing the journey to inclusive excellence, Cal Poly has stepped forward to take on that responsibility, and the results are delineated in this report.

Cal Poly’s commitment to inclusive excellence has initiated a journey not only for the institution itself but for each individual—student, faculty, staff and campus leader—as both an individual responsible for their own personal development and as a team member advancing the institution’s expedition to a better future for all. For this adventure, every person must play their role. This report advances this journey one step further, establishing a new base camp, founded on rigorous data and data analysis, from which the team can evaluate next steps and plan further action.

In offering these data, we acknowledge that diversity and inclusive excellence is of course more than a numbers game; it is a cultural shift that transforms an institution at many levels into a vibrant, interconnected community, advancing and elevating the institution and its effectiveness as a whole. This process, however, requires everyone to look at the same map and agree upon an analysis of current conditions. With that goal in mind, we offer this qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the Cal Poly Experience campus climate.

The Cal Poly Inclusive Excellence Partnership

The Cal Poly Experience Initiative emerged in the Winter of 2019, when senior leadership asked researchers from the Center for Strategic Diversity Leadership and Social Innovation to help strengthen the campus’s diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) work by providing an objective third-party assessment. This assessment would not only gather data but provide recommendations and, along the way, engage the entire campus community in the process of envisioning its collective future. While there is much potential in the richness of the university’s current diversity, our research identified serious differences in experience and attitude today that also indicate a great potential for improvement.

Responding to Diversity Flashpoints

As we began our work with the University, we did so knowing that the challenge may be difficult; our work began following a series of difficult diversity flashpoints that had left many on campus questioning the university’s commitment to and understanding of how to create a culture of inclusive excellence, even though Cal Poly is more diverse now than it has ever been. Not only have flashpoints occurred in the past but with today’s social media infrastructure, they remain a likelihood in the future.

Garcia and Hoelscher (2010) define a diversity flashpoint as a potentially explosive interpersonal situation between community members that arises out of both identity differences and any resulting conflict that can emerge from those differences. In these scenarios, there is a broken connection or a disruption of the
shared covenant that exists on campus around dynamics of teaching and learning in the classroom, expectations of civility and community in the residence halls, or even expectations of punishment and accountability, when individuals are perceived as crossing over a cultural line of acceptability in terms of race, gender, sexuality, religion, or some other aspect of diversity on campus.

As an increasingly diverse community, Cal Poly is experiencing the painful early stages that reveal how increasing demographic diversity is not the end-all be-all of inclusion. In many ways, it is just the beginning. The greater challenge is to create educational and work environments that allow such diversity to thrive—to create a broad-based, secure feeling of community, inclusion and belonging.

How the institution works to manage diversity flashpoints is a key part of the journey. University reactions can lead to outcomes that range from pain and suffering and erosion of the institution’s diversity brand, or they can lead to more positive feelings of self-worth, enhanced learning and a widespread belief that the university is deeply committed to—and working on—issues of diversity, equity and inclusion as a top institutional priority, despite an imperfect current reality. While today these events may be inevitable, they are not deterministic in defining a culture of exclusion or negativity, whether found in performance reviews, classrooms, social events and, with ever-increasing frequency, in social moments as part of our publicly digital lives.

Sparking Dialogue to Begin Change

At Cal Poly, past flashpoints had unfortunately gone viral, creating an immediate need for an expansive set of interlocking activities to spark dialogue, engagement, capacity-building and development—to begin changing the narrative and, more importantly, the lived experience on the ground. This call to action framed the work for our team as we engaged with thousands of community members across the life of this project.

The specific goals of our partnership were to:

- Establish a visible, campus-wide conversation about issues of diversity, equity and inclusion dynamics across the colleges and units of Cal Poly.
- Develop a grounded understanding of campus diversity, equity and inclusion dynamics at Cal Poly, using best-in-class research techniques and analysis.
- Offer clear, evidence-based recommendations to support the institution’s efforts to build an environment that is enriching, inclusive and excellent for all.
- Support the capacity-building efforts of the university by engaging in an intensive set of programs with students, faculty, staff and administrators that build from the recommendations that emerged during the campus research program.

At the heart of this project is a campus-wide campus climate survey data collection process in order to generate a quantitative baseline of perceptions of the institutional climate for diversity and inclusion across Cal Poly’s extensive campus.

Report Overview

This CPX executive report summarizes the approach, findings and recommendations of our extensive campus climate survey and analysis work. We offer this report as a tool for Cal Poly towards increasing its DEI commitment, diagnosing the current climate for diversity, clarifying next steps, enhancing training and professional development, improving learning, and establishing a baseline for measuring progress as you advance toward your goals.
This executive report describes the entire project. We begin in Section 2 with major themes we identified in our on-campus listening sessions, supported by quotes from participants. Sections 3 through 6 offer a pointed discussion of a selection of key variables identified in our data surveys. We use a proprietary scorecard methodology to clearly elucidate current patterns in the data, to help drive understanding and administrative action. Finally, we offer key recommendations based on our extensive experience as well as concluding thoughts, how to best utilize this report and next steps for Cal Poly.

The eight major sections of this executive summary report that follow are:

- Section 1: What Is “Campus Climate”? A Framework and Methodology
- Section 2: Cal Poly Listening Session Findings
- Section 3: A Scorecard Methodology that Unpacks the Cal Poly Experience
- Section 4: Overview of The Cal Poly Student Experience Data
- Section 5: Overview of The Cal Poly Faculty Experience Data
- Section 6: Overview of The Cal Poly Staff Experience Data
- Section 7: Recommendations for Strategic Diversity Leadership at Cal Poly
- Section 8: Concluding Thoughts and Next Steps

Technical Reports

In addition to this report, we include three full supplemental reports that offer deep dives into the data analysis underlying sections 4, 5 and 6 of this report. All four reports work together as a system, with the three technical reports providing all statistical significance details underlying the executive summary report as well as several multivariate predictive models. (For example, while only six multivariate models are featured in this overview, specifically for “Dissatisfaction” and “Discrimination” across students, faculty and staff, there are 24 such models in the three technical reports.) The three data reports are:

- Embracing the Journey: The CPX Research Study Student Technical Report
- Embracing the Journey: The CPX Research Study Faculty Technical Report
- Embracing the Journey: The CPX Research Study Staff Technical Report

College Mini Reports

In addition to these reports, we also provide a bonus set of six mini reports on the overall student experience, broken down by the six colleges that comprise Cal Poly. This mini report features the results of multivariate models that examine the factor of Dissatisfaction and perception of Discrimination across student demographics, broken out for each college. The instrumentation for this mini-report is at the level of the campus-wide study, utilizing our questions as outlined in the CPX Research Study Student Technical Report, yet this unique mini report, broken out by college, gives leaders a big-picture understanding of how each school’s students experience the overall campus climate. This is an important distinction. These mini reports do not necessarily report how they experience the college climate, but instead provide an approximation for understanding this experience. To truly understand student perceptions of the college experience would require a different set of instrumentation.

In combination with the overall dataset, these ten reports position Cal Poly well for a depth of insight about current campus sentiments and conditions across students, faculty and staff—an excellent platform from which to thoughtfully develop the next stage of the university’s journey towards inclusive excellence for all campus denizens.
For many years, we have used the term “campus climate” in higher education and, more broadly, “organizational climate” in the corporate and nonprofit worlds. Because the term is used so often and by so many, we often assume all community members know what we mean when we discuss an organization’s climate, yet occasionally someone will stop us and ask, “Climate? What do you mean by that? Are you talking about the weather?” Although we definitely do not mean the physical temperature, in some ways we do mean the psychological temperature on campus, for instance, a feeling as if the campus is “chilly” or hostile to the presence of individuals who are different along any host of identity dimensions.

On a college or university campus, “climate” is used to discuss how individuals and groups experience membership in the campus community (Hurtado and Associates, 1998). It’s a general term that compactly summarizes the inclusivity dynamics of the organization and the degree to which various stakeholders feel included in or excluded from the environment. Because conversations around climate are inherently concerned with real and perceived realities of different groups, this concept always is nested in broader socio-historical context of difference defined in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, disability and a near limitless range of social identities.

Campus climate, however, is less about the statistics and more about moving beyond the numbers (Hurtado and Associates 1998). The presence of individuals from different backgrounds results in diversity. Climate, on the other hand, refers to the experience of those diverse individuals and groups on a campus—and the extent and quality of the interactions among those various groups and individuals. Diversity and inclusion efforts are simply not complete unless they also address climate. Stated another way, addressing campus climate is an important and necessary component in any comprehensive plan for diversity.

To provide a foundation for a vital community of learning, one primary mission of the academy must be to create a climate that cultivates diversity and celebrates difference. Because of the inherent complexity of the topic of diversity, it is crucial to examine the multiple dimensions that comprise campus climate on college and university campuses.

Campus Climate Conceptual Framework

Hurtado and Associates (1998) offers a multi-dimensional framework for understanding the concept of campus climate for diversity and inclusion. Their framework informed the data collection activities of this study (Exhibit 1.1).

Exhibit 1.1. Multi-dimensional model for campus climate for diversity in higher education
External Factors

Hurtado and Associates argue that institutional climates are shaped by both Government/Policy Context and Socio-Historical Context Dynamics. For example, when state policy shifts regarding race-conscious admissions law, or even when a statewide system of higher education creates policy around a particular diversity and inclusion topic such as protected speech, this policy impacts the campus climate. The California State System of Higher Education exerts a direct influence on the campus climate at Cal Poly. Campus climate is also influenced by the socio-historical dynamics of the region, in this context San Luis Obispo and the state of California. The politics, values, symbols and history of classism, sexism, racism, homophobia, the high cost of living in SLO and so much more pervade what happens on campus in ways that are nearly impossible for institutions to control or even influence in some ways. These forces directly influence the institution’s campus environment and, as you will discover in the paragraphs that follow, these environmental dynamics are exerting a significant influence on perceptions of the campus climate at Cal Poly.

Internal Factors

Within institutional environments, five key dimensions of climate are important for consideration:

- The Historical Context of Exclusion or Inclusion refers to the legacy of different groups on campus and the incidents that may have impacted the campus’s collective memory, whether it is a high-profile sexist chalking issue, a class-action lawsuit claiming relational violence and sexual harassment, or some other type of diversity flashpoint.

- The Demographic Dimension is defined as the numbers of minorities, women, LGTBQIA, members of the disability community, etc. It is their absolute number relative to the whole that plays a role in shaping the flavor of community that exists and the experiences those group members have on campus.

- The Psychological Dimension refers to perceptions of alienation, discrimination, belonging, being valued—in short, how individuals feel about their campus experience.

- The Behavioral Dimension is operationalized as the patterns of interaction across and between groups, for instance in student organizations, in class, etc. It is the self-reported ways that we behave on campus.

- Strategic Diversity Leadership Dimension of campus climate refers to the organizational dimensions of the campus in terms of formal plans, policies, departments, committees, job roles, programs and initiatives designed to impact the campus climate.

Study Focus

This study leveraged the model from Hurtado and Associates (1998) to examine Cal Poly’s campus climate of diversity and inclusion. While this study does not focus into the demographic diversity of the campus, it does provide a benchmark for measuring progress on diversity efforts at a high level, in terms of a deep assessment of Cal Poly’s campus climate (Psychological and Behavioral dimensions), institutional commitment to diversity and the presence of institutional diversity capabilities (both Strategic Diversity Leadership dimension) using a multi-method approach to gathering the type of information that can be used to develop a solid, evidence-inspired strategy (Exhibit 1.2).

Three key research questions guided our efforts across all activities:

1. What is the lived experience of diverse groups at Cal Poly?
2. What are the key challenges and opportunities of diversity, equity and inclusion at Cal Poly?
3. What are the most important recommendations to help Cal Poly move forward to support inclusive excellence?
Data Sources and Triangulation

Our analyses are built upon a foundation of triangulation across many sources of both quantitative and qualitative data. Specifically, we used data from interviews, listening sessions and online surveys to power our assessment. Exhibit 1.2 outlines the numerous ways in which we “listened to the campus community” in an effort to glean their perspectives, codify both their positive experiences and their challenges, and present some of their best thinking about what should be done to drive inclusive excellence at Cal Poly. The report that follows combines a multitude of data into a general story that offers the campus community a bird’s-eye understanding of the lived experience of diverse groups, as well as key areas of strength and opportunities for improvement moving forward. For a traditional treatment of all report variables, please see the CPX Research Study Student, Faculty and Staff Technical Reports.

Exhibit 1.2. Research: key data sources, research variables and participation levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Main Study Variables</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPX Experience Student, Faculty and</td>
<td>A multi-wave assessment of the campus climate at Cal Poly, using a survey</td>
<td>Demographic Variables:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Survey</td>
<td>instrument validated by the University of Michigan that relies upon several</td>
<td>• Primary Campus Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well-defined indices and items.</td>
<td>• Primary Campus Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gender Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sexual Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Religious Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial Situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Disability Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Military Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students: Parents’ Educational Experience; Faculty and Staff: Highest Degree Earned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Campus Climate</td>
<td>Seven questions, multivariate analysis, Cronbach’s alpha = 0.86 for students, 0.92 for faculty, 0.91 for staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hostile vs. Friendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Disrespectful vs. Respectful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Contentious vs. Collegial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Individualistic vs. Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Competitive vs. Cooperative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Unsupportive vs. Supportive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Unwelcoming vs. Welcoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student N=8747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEI Campus Climate</td>
<td>Five questions, multivariate analysis, Cronbach’s alpha = 0.82 for students, 0.84 for faculty, 0.85 for staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Racist vs. Non-Racist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Homogenous vs. Diverse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sexist vs. Non-Sexist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Homophobic vs. Non-Homophobic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ageist vs. Non-Ageist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>Two questions, multivariate analysis, Cronbach’s alpha = 0.80 for students, 0.76 for faculty, 0.72 for staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cal Poly has a strong commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cal Poly provides sufficient programs and resources to foster the success of a diverse student body/faculty/staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continued on next page
### Feeling Valued and Belonging
Six questions, multivariate analysis, Cronbach’s alpha = 0.83 for students, 0.87 for faculty, 0.86 for staff.
- I feel valued as an individual at Cal Poly.
- I feel like I belong at Cal Poly.
- I have considered leaving Cal Poly because I felt isolated or unwelcomed. *(reverse-coded)*
- I am treated with respect at Cal Poly.
- I feel others don’t value my opinions at Cal Poly. *(reverse-coded)*
- I have found one or more communities or groups where I feel I belong at Cal Poly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>8667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Thriving and Growing
Six questions, multivariate analysis, Cronbach’s alpha = 0.77 for students, 0.82 for faculty, 0.83 for staff.
- Cal Poly is a place where I am able to perform up to my full potential.
- I have opportunities at Cal Poly for academic/professional success that are similar to those of my peers/colleagues.
- I have to work harder than others to be valued equally at Cal Poly. *(reverse-coded)*
- My experience at Cal Poly has had a positive influence on my academic/professional growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>8663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perceptions of Fair Treatment
Student: 3 questions, multivariate analysis, Cronbach’s alpha = 0.87
- I am treated fairly and equitably on campus in general.
- I am treated fairly and equitably in classrooms and classroom settings.
- I am treated fairly and equitably in out-of-classroom university spaces.

Faculty: 7 questions, multivariate analysis, Cronbach’s alpha = 0.90
- The teaching workload is fairly and equitably distributed in my in my department/unit.
- There are fair and equitable expectations regarding research in my department/unit.
- There are fair and equitable expectations regarding service in my department/unit.
- There are fair and equitable processes for determining compensation in my department/unit.
- Support is provided fairly and equitably in my department/unit.
- Rewards for work performance are fairly and equitably distributed in my department/unit.
- I am treated fairly and equitably on campus in general.

Staff: 5 questions, multivariate analysis, Cronbach’s alpha = 0.86
- The workload is fairly and equitably distributed in my unit.
- There are fair and equitable processes for determining compensation in my unit.
- Support is provided fairly and equitably in my unit.
- Rewards for work performance are fairly and equitably distributed in my unit.
- I am treated fairly and equitably on campus in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>8673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (Dis)Satisfaction with Climate
One question, odds ratios for “Very Dissatisfied” and “Dissatisfied” answers by demographics for:
- “How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall campus climate/environment that you have experienced at Cal Poly within the past 12 months?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>8701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discrimination Felt
One question, odds ratio for “Yes” answers by demographics
• In general, over the past 12 months, have you felt discriminated against at Cal Poly?

| Campus Listening Sessions | Campus-wide listening sessions by select departments, social identity groups and leadership communities. | • Diversity and inclusion strengths at Cal Poly • Diversity and inclusion challenges at Cal Poly • Areas to improve diversity and inclusion at Cal Poly | N=559 |

The CPX Survey

Our research applies several well-respected and well-validated campus climate research frameworks, questions and methodologies to establish a baseline understanding of the lived experience of diverse groups at Cal Poly.

Research Instruments

Questions for this Cal Poly Experience Survey (CPX) were developed and validated by researchers at the University of Michigan (University of Michigan DEI Campus Climate Team, 2016). In close consultation with leadership from Cal Poly, our research team adapted instruments from the exemplary University of Michigan Survey to create a survey that could be completed in 15 minutes or less. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) at Cal Poly provided statistics related to overall enrollment numbers by campus role, sex identification and race/ethnicity group identification in addition to email addresses that allowed us to send a link for the survey to all campus community members defined by OIR, and to place this same tokenized link on student CPX personal pages in order to improve response rates.

CPX leaders mobilized a multi-level campaign strategy to drive survey participation. This strategy included, and is not limited to, campus marketing materials, survey completion events, CPX student ambassadors engaged in outreach, targeted completion efforts with students in the Greek system, student athletes, student government, members of the band and more.

These on-the-ground efforts were complemented by e-mail reminders sent by the project research team to drive response rates across the five-week data collection period. Specific follow-up emails were sent to non-respondents, and a student portal link with direct access to the survey was implemented in week 2 of the survey. No incentives were used to drive survey completion.

Survey Analyses

After the data collection was complete, statistical weighting adjustment factors were determined to ensure that the data provided by the survey respondents correctly represented the entire population for each segment: students, faculty and staff. After weighting, student participation rates were noted to be consistent with university data.

Bivariate analyses were conducted on key study variables mentioned here. In addition, we provided six multivariate analyses in this Executive Summary report. Twenty-four multivariate models are included in the CPX Research Study Student, Faculty and Staff Technical Reports, in addition to 12 multivariate models that are included in the additional six college mini reports provided. These multivariate models are above and beyond the initial scope of this project and are included as an in-kind contribution to create a powerful and clear discussion of the data for leaders and community members at Cal Poly. For a full discussion, please refer to the CPX Research Study Student, Faculty and Staff Technical Reports and the College Mini Reports.
Survey Respondents: Demographics

Overall, we saw a strong level of participation from all areas of the campus community. Approximately 41% of students, 61% of faculty and 60% of staff responded to this census study of the Cal Poly Experience. In total, participants numbered 8,749 students, 894 faculty and 1,127 staff.

Exhibit 1.3. Study participation level by campus role (student, faculty, staff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPX Community Role</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>Participation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>8,747</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a full campus climate survey providing significant depth, this study asked a range of detailed demographic questions including age, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, gendered identity, sexuality, disability, positional role and major or primary campus affiliation, and more. The scope of this project allowed for us to mine a full battery of demographic variables that are important to consider when engaging in a deep dive into the campus climate.

Some specific demographic findings:

- **Sex.** Percent of respondents reporting current sex as female, intersex, male, or “preferred response not listed” were:
  - Students: 49.1% (female), 0.2% (intersex), 50.6% (male), 0.2% (preferred response not listed).
  - Faculty: 41.3% (female), 0.1% (intersex), 58.4% (male), 0.1% (preferred response not listed).
  - Staff: 53.7% (female), 0.0% (intersex), 46.3% (male), 0.0% (preferred response not listed).

- **Gender.** Respondents reporting gender identity as woman, transgender or gender nonconforming, man, or “preferred response not listed” were:
  - Students: 48.6% (woman), 0.9% (transgender or gender nonconforming), 50.1% (man), 0.5% (preferred response not listed).
  - Faculty: 40.7% (woman), 1.0% (transgender or gender nonconforming), 58.0% (man), 0.3% (preferred response not listed).
  - Staff: 53.5% (woman), 0.5% (transgender or gender nonconforming), 46.0% (man), 0.0% (preferred response not listed).

- **Sexual Orientation.** Most respondents to the survey identified as heterosexual (84.3% students, 88.0% faculty, 89.3% staff) compared to LGBTQIA1 (15.1% students, 11.4% faculty, 9.9% staff).

- **Financial Stability.** We split answers to five questions into two categories: Financially Stable (“I do not have to worry about money” and “I have extra money after paying the bills”) and Financially Struggling (“I am breaking even,” “I am barely making it,” and “I cannot make ends meet”). Those reporting Financially Stable situations were: 56.8% of students, 63.0% of faculty and 45.5% of staff. Those reporting Financially Struggling were 43.2% of students, 37.0% of faculty and 54.5% of staff.

- **Race.** As noted in Exhibit 1.4, the majority of respondents at the student (60.1%), faculty (76.2%) and staff (69.6%) levels were White.

---

1 Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, Queer, Intersexed, Asexual/Agendered.
Exhibit 1.4. Study participants by racial and ethnic identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Identity</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black (AA)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Asian (As)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx (H)</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/North African (N)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan Native (N)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (N)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (W)</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial/-ethnic: Two or More Selections (M)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Response Not Listed</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to the limited sample sizes of the Native American/Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and Middle Eastern/North African racial/ethnic groups across all of the CPX surveys (students, faculty, and staff), these three groups were combined into one group for analysis (Native|HPI|ME/NA, or "N"), which you will see in the scorecards and tables. Our convention of naming each combined group is a more inclusive approach and stands in contrast to standard reporting procedures that typically name collapsed groups as "Other."

Overall, student participant rates were consistent with university factbook data. For a complete overview of all response rates in detail, plus other demographic elements, including religious background, disability identity, military experience, and education, refer to the CPX Research Study Student, Faculty and Staff Technical Reports.

Mixed-Method Study Approach

These data are highly credible, being grounded in best-in-class measures, in conservative but adequate analysis techniques and in very strong response rates. Further, the inclusion of so many different types of data, including both quantitative and qualitative, offers several important benefits that further validate this research.

One such benefit is the ability to clarify the meaning of responses to closed-end survey items, to allow us to probe beyond the numbers and generate further depth of information. The goal is to not just clarify what people said, but, hopefully, to understand root causes behind how different groups are experiencing the campus climate across social identity groups. You will find that we try to make clear what we believe the data mean, providing a starting point for making sense of the information and building the recommendations offered here as well as, centrally, for molding the strategy the university will put into place moving forward.

The CPX Listening Sessions

The CPX listening sessions were conducted face-to-face in small groups by a multiracial, multiethnic, gender- and sexuality-diverse team of experienced researchers. All sessions were conducted by two researchers, with one taking notes and the other facilitating responses to the three key questions that were asked: what is going well with respect to DEI at Cal Poly, what are the challenges at Cal Poly with respect to DEI, and what are recommendations for change at Cal Poly with respect to DEI.

In addition to the verbal questioning, every participant was also asked to complete a hand-written protocol that laid out each of these three questions again. All data were transcribed, coded and analyzed for themes and key insights using a traditional open-coding method, where we looked to identify common concepts and categories grounded in the collected data (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).²

² We would like to thank Drs. Kristen Renn and Mary Ann Villarreal who served as research associates during the campus data collection phase of the project, facilitating campus listening sessions with students, faculty and staff during one of our site
SECTION 2: CAL POLY LISTENING SESSION FINDINGS

The CPX study’s listening sessions were an important part of assessing the Cal Poly Experience and in many ways foreshadowed a number of findings that emerged in our quantitative analyses.

In all, we spoke with nearly 600 Cal Poly students, faculty and staff, as well as a small number of persons from the San Luis Obispo community who agreed to share their perspective. Many of these participants were in student, faculty and staff roles of leadership, many were diversity and inclusion champions, or members of Greek life, or held student government roles, and others have been involved in the conversation of campus climate and institutional commitment to diversity for some time—particularly since the blackface incidents.

Listening Is Foundational to Embracing the Journey

We asked participants to share their perspective on three key questions with respect to DEI: what is going well, what is challenging, and what are their personal insights or recommendations for action steps at Cal Poly? Surveying insiders with these questions and allowing them to respond is foundational to embracing the journey of change. This process allows the participants to step back and reflect on the kind of culture in which they work and learn. Additionally, this collection of qualitative data is more than complementary to the overall survey process—we find that listening to participants is in many ways cathartic for those who have engaged in a traumatic time of heightened emotions in their institution’s history: it helps them to discover and hone in on an emergent future.

By creating a context from which these individuals can analyze the past, focus on the present and envision the future, we begin enacting change in the minds and hearts of all those who participate. This change is triggered simply by asking them to clarify: what is now, what is possible, and what are the critical action steps necessary to make such change happen on campus? This process not only confronts the problem but works from an asset-based perspective, empowering each participant to envision the potential for a stronger Cal Poly experience and become an architect of change. Such action is required of leaders as they cascade positive change throughout the institution and inspire others toward achieving a shared vision (Cramer, 2014).

As we analyzed participant responses to our guiding questions, three central, yet in some ways conflicting, ideas seemed to cut across our discussion. They are:

1. The need for a multi-dimensional diversity, equity and inclusion plan that elevates Cal Poly beyond the prior Collective Impact framework and presents a comprehensive vision and action plan for DEI over the next several years.

2. Reports of a culture of microaggression and resistance to the presence of diverse groups at the same time that many feel no need or desire to prioritize DEI work (referring to individuals, not the university as a whole).

3. The importance of confronting and overcoming the inertia of a legacy culture and a reputation of homogeneity among a largely White community of students, faculty, staff, parents and alumni.

What follows is a brief discussion of the strengths and challenges that emerged in our listening sessions, highlighting the main points that we identified across answers to two of our guiding questions: what is going well and what is challenging. We return to campus listening session recommendations in Section 8 of this report, which offers pointed guidance for moving forward.

visits to campus. We also would like to thank Dr. Edmundo Roberto Melipillán, who served as data analyst to this effort, leveraging his expertise to support all facets of the analyses of the quantitative work on the project.
Listening Session Findings: Positives

While critical of the university’s track record on diversity and inclusion generally, many listening session respondents felt that leadership was moving in the right direction (Exhibit 2.1). There was a noticeable feeling that the CPX survey and resultant action planning process would help the university gain momentum in what felt like a series of slow starts, unclear plans, and a lack of data-inspired leadership.

When asked to define what is going well with respect to DEI at Cal Poly, participants talked about establishing new momentum with the Collective Impact and CPX work; growing leadership’s commitment to DEI; plus strengthening DEI infrastructure, training, and programming efforts on campus. Most importantly, we heard them speak of a growing community of DEI champions that are the backbone of the campus’s ability to create a more inclusive and equitable campus experience.

Exhibit 2.1. Listening session strengths: by key theme, relative strength and number of comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Relative Strength</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Momentum and Elevated Conversation</td>
<td>The campus has made substantial progress in the last year and we are talking about the issues, doing something, and facing our challenges.</td>
<td>√√√√</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Leadership Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>The president and leadership have made a strong investment and commitment into DEI efforts, elevating it’s importance on campus.</td>
<td>√√√</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening DEI Infrastructure</td>
<td>We have a CDO, campus diversity committees, officers in colleges, support offices, and other DEI infrastructure that are working to make a difference in the campus experience, along with informal faculty, staff, and student DEI champions that are leading the way on the ground.</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Training and Education Programs</td>
<td>We have diversity education and training programs that are helping our campus to move forward, with a number emphasizing the work taking place in Greek Affairs.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Programs and Speakers on Campus</td>
<td>The campus is lively with diversity programs, speakers, and organizations that transform the campus experience, making it more inclusive.</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Importance of the Collective Impact Work and Clarifying the Lived Experience

Much like the members of our research team, many felt that the Collective Impact work should be elevated as a part of a CPX research and action planning process. They saw the Collective Impact report as a major part of the momentum that is currently gathering on campus. Listening session participants were excited by the potential of this CPX research to build from the Collective Impact report and to clarify the lived experience of diverse communities by illumining the campus climate of inclusion and exclusion.

Often, absent such data and absent an ability to come together in dialogue around the findings of this research survey, we find the discussion of campus climate and culture is often too ephemeral. Without data upon which to center the discussion of discrimination, belonging, satisfaction and other measures at the heart of this study, campus-wide progress is difficult. These data create a more corporeal understanding of how the campus experience is perceived differently, or similarly, based upon one’s social identities. This set of insights creates a potential for conversation, dialogue, and collective action moving forward.

Building the DEI Infrastructure

We heard that while the blackface incident represented a time of pain and trauma for many, participants were quick to point to how this painful scenario has created new energy on campus around issues of diversity, equity and inclusion. While the university had taken positive steps before the blackface flashpoint to build the campus’s DEI infrastructure, this single incident served as a powerful catalyst to highlight past
challenges and galvanize the university community forward with a shared experience that helped more people to begin making DEI issues a greater priority.

Session participants noted that students themselves are leading the way toward building the campus’s DEI infrastructure at the grassroots level, with new student organizations and initiatives emerging in recent years. They also mentioned as positive: the Cal Poly Scholars program, having a VP-level Office of University Diversity and Inclusion (OUDI), the Collective Impact report, having diversity and inclusion officers in the colleges, and the Cross-Cultural Centers in Student Affairs. While many were quick to say that units like the Pride, Multicultural, and Black Student Centers needed more resources, their very existence was identified as an important part of the work taking place on campus. A number noted the potential of the Cal Poly Scholars program and some faculty cluster hiring initiatives as key touchstones that can help to diversify the ranks of both students and faculty moving forward.

Efforts by formal campus DEI units and leaders are complemented by those faculty and staff who serve as internal diversity champions. These informal leaders define the campus’s diversity commitment in ways that are often invisible to the masses, yet contributors to this study drew attention to their transformative works. Participants were also keen to point to how these leaders should be consulted early and often when defining steps that the university should take now and into the future, a theme that foreshadows the need to continue elevating the influence of the formal and informal DEI infrastructure on campus.

Diversity Training and Campus Programming

Finally, diversity training and campus diversity programming were celebrated as positive steps of recent years. Specifics like WOW, training on unconscious bias, and featured guest speakers that elevated the climate and consciousness around diversity and inclusion issues were commended as important parts of a growing conversation of belonging across campus. The experiences taking place in individual colleges were viewed as especially important by some, because students live so much of their campus experience in their academic disciplines and schools.

Also noted as an important part of the emerging DEI training and campus programming infrastructure was the recent training and activities that have taken place with Greek life students. Many felt this step was necessary, while others felt it too dramatically singled out the Greek community as bearing too much responsibility for the DEI challenges that exist at Cal Poly. We return to this insight later when we discuss the need for broad-based DEI learning experiences for the entire Cal Poly community.

Reflective Comments: Positives

Some relevant reflective comments we heard about what is going well include (these are direct quotes):

- “The blackface incident, while showing some of the worst of Cal Poly, also raised many out of their complacency and into action. The President’s Cal Poly Scholar initiative to draw high-achieving low-income students to Cal Poly by lowering the financial barriers, the efforts of the Diversity and Inclusion Office to promote workshops on unconscious bias and other forms of insensitivity is a step in the right direction, as is the training happening in Greek life. But it’s got to go beyond the Greek students.”

- “Dialogue and conversations are happening on campus amongst numerous stakeholders. This feels different. We have awareness and growing campus acknowledgement of the challenges. The CPX process is about action. I like this because the first step is to acknowledge Cal Poly has a diversity problem—and it has. It has been very transparent about it in its communications. Next is acting to solve the problem and keeping up with our momentum. Cal Poly has set up committees and task forces. These steps have all begun the important process of understanding the diversity issue, to drive more dialogue. Lastly, Cal Poly is gaining feedback through its CPX campaign to inform the next steps and what actions the university needs to take to solve the diversity problem.”

- “Cal Poly understood that the blackface incident was a big deal because it was a culmination of microaggressions that students experience on campus and [they] are taking actions like this listening session
to make real changes. The diversity and inclusion committee within Greek life are effective. The faculty have been supportive with the encouragement of the individual college leadership. Individual college efforts is the way to go."

- “As a resident advisor (RA), I feel I’ve seen how much effort and the resources that are put into creating inclusive spaces and focusing on social change. Upper administration has put a large emphasis on it this year, especially after the blackface incident last spring. Places like the Gender Equity Center, Men and Masculinity, SAFER, Pride Center, and others are doing a good job at putting on programming, but I’m not sure how aware the general student body is of what these organizations do. It is probably good that these organizations exist, though I’m not sure the larger positive impact they have.”

- I believe with the hiring of a new Chief Diversity Officer, a VP of D&I, an inclusivity specialist in CTLT, a new diversity hire for housing—we are taking the right steps to move closer to a more inclusive campus. The AVP of D&I in Student Affairs did great work at WOW week events. I like the fact that we are introducing diversity, equity and inclusion to all the new students during WOW. This is a great step.”

- “Cal Poly has been in a very interesting, some may say exciting, place. There has been a lot of momentum of interest in changing the campus climate, particularly as it relates to efforts re: Diversity & Inclusion. This has been attributed after a number of incidents, both bad and good. The major positive developments include the formal creation of the OUDI office (led by a VP/CDO); a number of students organizing in strategic ways and very invested in seeing/demanding changes; the establishment of a number of associate deans focusing on D&I across the colleges; the CCC continue to do programming that reflects the needs of students; last year (2017-2018) an invested commitment to collective impact that must not be lost in this discussion.”

- “Cal Poly has hired expert level faculty and staff who are committed to this work. These folks are the drivers of D&I initiatives on this campus in both academic and student life. They carry this work on their backs oftentimes without support. They are our champions for change. They have developed diversity initiatives for faculty in the classroom. They have built programs for underrepresented minority students. They have introduced housing communities for students. They are on the ground. Our students are also extremely invested in this work, as well, and are leading the way.”

**Summary**

While there is no magic pill for creating a climate of inclusion and belonging, as we will learn in subsequent sections of this report, the positive themes heard in our listening sessions emphasize the widespread perception of positive DEI momentum taking place on campus as well as the core desire to keep this momentum going as the university moves forward. Listening session participants felt strongly that the CPX action, research and planning process was progressing in a good direction and that leadership should definitely keep going!

**Listening Session Findings: Challenges**

Listening session participants were quick to identify the cultural challenges, both historic and contemporary, that make establishing a culture of diversity, equity and inclusion difficult for Cal Poly. From discussions of an overly ethnically, racially and economically homogenous community of students, faculty, staff, leadership and alumni, to the very location of Cal Poly in central California, to a lack of a vision and planning for change, participants recognized and acknowledged the steep challenges associated with embracing and advancing the DEI journey on campus. Because it is necessary to explore the challenges ahead of us in order to build a careful strategy to address, overcome or manage them, we next discuss the insights gleaned about DEI challenges at Cal Poly.

*Reputation, Homogeneity and Resistance to Change*

Respondents identified the university’s reputation, demography and culture as sending a message of homogeneity that must be addressed in a multi-dimensional way if the Cal Poly experience is to be
Exhibit 2.2. Listening session challenges: by key theme, relative strength and number of comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Relative Strength</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reputation, Homogeneity and Resistance to Change</td>
<td>The university culture, reputation and demographics all send a message of homogeneity that must be addressed in a multi-dimensional way, if the university is to strengthen the Cal Poly experience for all.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions and Discrimination Coupled with a Lack of Concern</td>
<td>A campus environment where many feel that DEI issues exist but they are not treated as a priority. Others note a campus experience that is fraught with everyday inclusion challenges experienced by community members of color, women, and members of the LGBTQIA community.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vision, Plan nor Systems for Accountability</td>
<td>There has been no clear vision, plan or consistent leadership commitment to DEI issues, yet, to strengthen the Cal Poly culture, the university will need to move strategically with accountability over time.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

strengthened. Three key clear messaging or communication issues seemed to emerge over and again as people talked about the culture of the campus.

1. **A negative DEI brand image.** In today’s social age, people are continuously and publicly sharing the good or bad about your brand or service, each and every day. Unfortunately for Cal Poly, many felt that any mention of DEI has a negative halo effect with regard to the university’s brand, one that is grounded in a culture of homogeneity, exclusion and high-profile diversity flashpoint moments. One participant noted that, “Many see us as a good-old-boy school that is more known for issues like blackface or Milo Yiannopoulos than we are for supporting diverse students. Students, and in some instances faculty, avoid this place simply because of our reputation and perception as a White, wealthy school, where your diversity is not welcome.”

2. **A need to diversify the campus community.** Secondly, participants discussed the overarching noticeable homogeneity of the campus and the need to diversify the student, faculty and staff ranks. They specifically pointed to the need to continue diversifying both leadership and tenure-track faculty as priorities. In the eyes of many, the most important pathway to a stronger Cal Poly experience is to enhance ethnic and racial diversity, economic diversity and gender diversity on campus. For many, anything less than success along these dimensions of campus climate rings hollow. Campus diversity champions are looking for tangible increases in the demographic diversity of the institution that can be seen and felt moving forward.

Please note that here we are reporting the themes we heard verbalized to us. These comments are not necessarily reflective of Proposition 209 of the California constitution (Article 1, section 31), which states in pertinent part: “The State shall not discriminate against, nor grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting.” This limitation legally restricts certain activities by Cal Poly regarding preferences in selection, hiring, and training, potentially resulting in policies and actions different or less proactive than requested by some campus community members.

3. **A shift in engagement with alumni and San Luis Obispo communities.** Session participants argued that to truly move the Cal Poly culture, support must be garnered from alumni, donors and SLO community leaders—a task that is monumental in size and complexity. (As a positive example, one such effort began in 2014 with the Cal Poly Local Economic Development Committee convening regional leaders and has since birthed the independent Hourglass Project, a collective of community, government, educational, business and individual leaders working together to make the Central Coast region an economically viable place to live and work.)
In numerous comments, study participants highlighted the need to develop a segmented engagement strategy for students, parents, alumni, donors and San Luis Obispo community members to overcome the lack of understanding and resistance in those groups. Survey participants were quick to highlight how the university is nested in a rural community, one that loves the history and charm of the university and would love to see it remain unchanged. Holding on to the Cal Poly of yesterday, however, stands in the way of embracing the journey to create a stronger and more inclusive Cal Poly experience for today. We heard particularly poignant comments about how the University must find the ideal messaging framework that will allow them to make the case with a largely White, rural, agriculture-focused donor and alumni community, who needs help understanding that diversity and inclusion is about creating a more vibrant learning-centered experience for all students. The university needs to shift the conversation from the negative energy that surrounded the blackface incident to a more positive discussion of how everyone can benefit from more inclusive, and therefore stronger, Cal Poly.

In a related area, session participants also mentioned the financial costs of living in the San Luis Obispo community. They talked of meeting basic needs for students and the need for affordable housing for faculty, staff and students alike. In addition, session participants spoke to a range of other financial challenges, such as childcare for parents of young children, as well as transportation challenges in and around San Luis Obispo.

Microaggressions and Discrimination Coupled with a Lack of Concern

Many session participants felt that DEI issues may exist, but they are not treated as a priority in the campus environment, while others noted a campus experience that is fraught with everyday inclusion challenges experienced by community members of color, women and those identifying as LGBTQIA. We identified two main issues here:

1. **A microaggressive environment.** Divisions that separate by gender, race, age and socioeconomic class were all highlighted in the comments of listening session participants. They spoke about a climate of microaggressive dynamics, where diverse community members either consciously or unconsciously are made to feel like “other.” The campus was described as an environment where they feel discriminated against and positioned as outsiders on campus, an observation confirmed by our quantitative data and analysis (sections 3-7).

   Microaggressions, a term popularized by the scholarship of Professor Derald Wing Sue of Columbia University, are the everyday slights, insults, putdowns, invalidations and offensive behaviors that diverse group members experience in daily interactions, often with generally well-intentioned colleagues and peers who may be unaware that they have engaged in demeaning ways toward target groups, whether the target’s diversity is defined by race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender or other factor (Sue, 2015). One way of coping with microaggressions is bystander intervention training, where individuals who witness a bias incident, such as a microaggression, can undergo training to help shift from merely being a passive, disempowered observer to becoming a partner in creating a positive outcome for all. Cal Poly does participate in bystander intervention programs such as the With US program.

   Diverse session participants themselves noted that they were too often seen in ways in which their full humanity was not acknowledged. They argued that not enough was being done to break down biases and help people see as individuals those whom they may unconsciously view as “other.” Respondents spoke of a need to create more experiences where everyone can connect with people who are different from themselves, whether by race, gender, sexual orientation, speech-language disorder or other disability or ethnicity, as the key for helping a stronger campus culture to emerge.

2. **A lack of widespread concern.** In a related fashion, participants also noted a lack of depth and breadth of concern and engagement in the daily work of creating an everyday culture of inclusion, especially among people with boots on the ground, on campus, every day. While the most limited resource on college campuses is time and attention (Hirschhorn and May, 2000), for change to
happen, leaders must get people to pay attention to their change issues and actively get involved. In a world of competing priorities, the work of DEI must be made an active part of the Cal Poly experience—in the classrooms, in the dorms, in Greek life, throughout campus. According to session participants, this is not happening for the masses, even given the backdrop of momentum and awareness following high-profile diversity and inclusion flashpoints on campus.

It is true that DEI work has the attention of many in the campus community. This point in fact will be made more salient as we discuss this survey’s quantitative findings, which show that Cal Poly community members across the board recognize the challenges of DEI on campus. Yet this awareness has not yet translated into a shared commitment to action for many, according to session participants.

Academic DEI research in this area has found several reasons that may explain such a lack of engagement, including yet not limited to (Sue, 2015): (a) The invisibility of modern forms of bias and discrimination, (b) The trivialization of diversity challenges as innocuous and of no real or lasting consequence, (c) Diffusion of responsibility for who should act and get involved to overcome bias, (d) Fear of repercussions or retaliation if one were to say something or get involved, and (e) The paralysis of not knowing what to do or how to handle the situation when instances of bias are witnessed. Each of these types of rationales were noted in the listening session comments. Participants insightfully argued that to develop a stronger culture of inclusion at Cal Poly, more persons must be empowered with the skills to both handle bias and to make inclusion and belonging a daily priority, a point that we explore in the next sections of this discussion.

No Vision, Plan nor Systems for Accountability

As we alluded to in our discussion of the momentum gathering with the CPX survey and action-planning process, campus leaders were also quite critical of past leadership around diversity, equity and inclusion. They argued that the campus has never had a multi-year strategy to guide the way, with common frameworks, expectations, infrastructure and systems of accountability.

On the one hand, while positive campus momentum was noted, on the other, many session participants still pointed out that a lack of strategic direction has stood in the way of making progress. For all of the grassroots DEI energy that has grown among students, faculty and staff, it takes a lot of planning and substantial infrastructure to be able to drive change across campus over time. As with any major initiative, what is needed are support systems, resources, coordination and an architecture of participation. Indeed, the effort may require even a new revenue model, something that was, at least in part, established when leadership created a tuition differential initiative to fund the Cal Poly Scholars program.

Session participants were particularly critical of the university’s immediate response to the blackface flashpoint and perceived a noticeable lack of “punitive measures” taken against the involved students or anyone who uses “hateful speech” on campus. A number of session participants wanted to see a “zero-tolerance policy” regarding any speech that is “hateful, discriminatory or exclusionary of any group.” A number of participants specifically called out the Milo Yiannopoulos visit, the “Free Speech Wall,” and other events that these groups have identified as microaggressive environmental dynamics that create a hostile and invalidating social climate for diverse students, faculty and staff.

Embedded in these passionate and well-articulated perspectives is a request for the university to quell the perspective of conservative voices. These same voices also appeared in our listening sessions and noted how they themselves, at times, feel they are the “other” on campus. This situation calls for leadership to support inclusion in ways that historical precedent suggests may result in a lawsuit, for example if radical conservative speakers like Yiannopoulos were prohibited from appearing on campus. As a result, the key is to not prohibit but rather to manage the situation as best you can.

The conundrum here is this: The call for a clear plan to guide the University’s efforts moving forward is both clear and doable, and the call for campus to create a clear vision for the future is necessary, yet the
call to create a zero-tolerance policy or to quell certain voices on campus does not seem possible, as Cal Poly has legal constraints as a public institution in the CSU system. This inherent conflict is a clarion call for campus leaders to deeply consider how they have been building a big-picture plan and establishing stronger systems of accountability while allowing hurtful speech and other difficult and indeed microaggressive aspects of the campus community lived experience to exist at the same time that they are striving to educate community members and reduce the presence of these negative factors in the environment. We will return to these perplexing and potentially conflictive dynamics in our discussion of recommendations in Section 7.

Reflective Comments: Challenges

Some relevant reflective comments about the challenges on campus include (these are direct quotes):

- “Cal Poly has no control over the cultures and environments from which our applicants come. Cal Poly has traditionally been seen by student applicants and their parents as a haven from diversity. This perception must be changed, but it will take a lot of time and the persistence of message.”

- “The setting of CP feels rural, and the history and culture seems rooted in agricultural industry. Traditionally, ag industry is led by people who grew up in rural America and does not have a large number of minority owners. We have to find a way to reach these alumni, these donors, and friends and let them know that diversity is not a bad thing. It’s a good thing.”

- “We have a 120-year-old campus. Women were only allowed in since 1949. Until 20 or so years ago, Cal Poly was only known as an agriculture school. With that, there has been the ‘good old boy’ mentality brought to campus by legacy students that they learned from their fathers and grandfathers. It wasn’t until maybe 15 years ago when the Colleges of Engineering and Architecture became highly ranked that Cal Poly even had diverse students applying. The last administration did not face, or maybe did not acknowledge, this issue. SLO is one of the least diverse communities in California and has one of the top cost-of-living indexes in California. This is the problem—culture, cost and location.”

- “The lack of diversity in the broader SLO community: There remains resistance from some students, faculty and staff. Some see DEI as a threat rather than progress. A lack of critical mass on campus is a big problem that, until we get more on campus, nothing else matters. Some people don’t see enough reflection of themselves to feel welcome here. Lack of scholarships in comparison to competitors make CP a less viable option. Cost of living coupled with less diversity makes this an even less desirable location for communities of color. Institutional history from our past challenges make it tough for people to see hope or move towards the positive.”

- “It’s a very White campus, and I don’t think we have a great reputation within communities of color [for] us being a safe place to send your child. The blackface incident last spring noticeably hurt in that area. It’s expensive to come here because of the fee structure, leading to some basic needs challenges that we see all of the time with our students. In many ways, it’s the one-on-one interactions or certain small moments that shape the college experience, and there’s still a lot of ignorance that can lead to comments or actions (microaggressions) that make people feel unwelcome. You will hear wealthy students talking all the time about their life, and low-income students are just in earshot and are like, ‘you’re living in a fantasy land.’ People need to understand their privilege.”

- “Inability to recruit diverse faculty and having URM students feel comfortable and want to apply to Cal Poly. Inclusion efforts to educate faculty/staff, while they are available, are not mandatory. Getting people and encouraging them to attend is a challenge. These sessions right now are great, but I would not have attended usually. But due to encouragement of my leadership, I did come. We get so stuck in our day-to-day routines. Not enough funding. Lack of awareness. Lack of action from the many. We have to get more people involved.” [Note: This is a direct quote from a participant, not a recommendation. Compliance with Proposition 209 of the California constitution creates legal restrictions in terms of Cal Poly actively recruiting faculty of color.]

- “It is difficult to voice opinions that challenge or elevate the issues. While major strides have been made here, we are still VERY homogenous and many of our diverse folks do not stay for very long. Climate issues have led to a chilling effect and it is difficult to raise issues when folks don’t believe you because you are the only
one. We also have other diversity issues unrelated to ‘protected classes’ (e.g., job titles/rank) where discrimination runs rampant.”

- “This campus has a long history of racism and bias. To many minority groups, it can be a hostile environment. Name-calling, shunning, microaggressions on an everyday basis has been a problem. The blackface incidents last year, Milo coming to campus twice, and a long history of incidents have made this campus a hard place for non-Whites.”

- “One major challenge at the faculty level is unconscious bias. In a hiring process recently, one of the candidates was an Asian woman. She was softly spoken and had a slight accent. Every single other candidate was talked about based on their credentials or presentation. For the Asian woman candidate, my (white, female, liberal) colleagues said things about the candidate’s personality. Unconscious bias against Asians, even among allies. This is in addition to the explicit bias.”

- “A faculty example that I want to highlight is ‘toxic masculinity.’ In a meeting, a male instructor was described as a ‘STUD! ’ ‘He’s a stud!’ What is the female equivalent?”

- “You can’t move forward and progress if you are not willing to address the elephant in the room. Although we have made much progress, thanks to our current leadership, we still need more. We need to own it, live it, call it out. For example, I don’t understand why we cannot call the Student Republican Club ‘Free Speech Wall’—what is it—they put it up with the free speech front and call it a commemorative wall for the fall of the Berlin Wall. But why, if that occurred in November, why are they being allowed to put it up in April? Specifically, during Poly Cultural Weekend? And more specifically, why in the middle of the same space/location where diverse events are being held?”

- “Our unwillingness to take a strong stance on hate speech. The lack of current diversity in both staff/faculty and students. It’s hard to get people to come here if they don’t see a possible community for themselves.”

- “There has not been reactionary disciplines to last year’s events. We need a zero-tolerance expulsion policy. Why did blackface-implicated students receive no additional punishment? We are not doing enough. Yes, we are making efforts, but there is not enough substance behind them. This needs to stop now, if we are really committed.” [Note: This is a direct quote from a participant, not a recommendation. Title V in the educational code prohibits expulsion based on speech, which is held as free.]

**Summary**

This portion of our in-person listening sessions gleaned a cadre of valuable insights that, as you will see, were reinforced by our data collection efforts, discussed in the next few sections of this report. Again, we will review the astute recommendations that emerged from our listening sessions later in this report, in Section 7: Recommendations.

While some of the challenges we heard about were based on past events and actions (or lack thereof), the focus for the university now is to embrace the journey forward from here. To move beyond past issues that can no longer be changed, focus must be placed on a visible and competent plan of action combined with coordinated, public events that address today what has happened in the past, clearly declare a commitment to change, take visible action on the university-wide and micro levels, and work to improve participation from all on campus.

Next, we will review the CPX Survey’s quantitative data profiling students, faculty and staff and their experience of the campus climate.
SECTION 3: A SCORECARD ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR UNPACKING THE CAL POLY EXPERIENCE

Scoring Assessment Matrix

In this report, we use a proprietary color-coded assessment matrix (Exhibit 3.1) that acts as an infographic or scorecard allowing immediate understanding of patterns in the data collected (Williams and Wade-Golden, 2019). Survey results are color-coded, based on their values, from positive results (green) to more negative results (red). Green zones represent areas of clear strength at Cal Poly. Blue zones represent areas of emerging strength. Yellow zones point to areas of concern, and red zones represent major challenges that require attention. By applying this scorecard system, we help unpack and interpret the Cal Poly Experience data at a glance.

Exhibit 3.1. The CSDLSI scoring assessment matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Zone: Clear Strength</td>
<td>A dimension of strong performance with minor areas for improvement.</td>
<td>4.0-5.0 (80-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Zone: Emerging Strength</td>
<td>A dimension that is trending in the right direction, with some areas for improvement.</td>
<td>3.5-3.9 (70-79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Zone: Area of Concern</td>
<td>A dimension of clear challenge requiring significant attention, developing long-term solutions for improvement.</td>
<td>3.0-3.4 (60-69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Challenge</td>
<td>A dimension of major concern requiring significant and immediate attention, developing long-term solutions for improvement.</td>
<td>0-2.9 (0-59%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


While a traditional, statistical treatment of the data is presented in the corresponding Embracing the Journey: The CPX Research Study Student, Faculty and Staff Technical Reports, we chose a more visual, and in some ways simplified, way of presenting findings in this Executive Report. As noted earlier, the goal is not to develop another informational report that sits on the shelf, but rather to develop an insightful report that is easily consumable as it examines a range of aspects of the campus climate and identifies areas of strength as well as opportunities for action and improvement in the Cal Poly Experience.

Why an Organizational Assessment Matrix?

We chose this framework as way of strengthening the campus-wide conversation—to enable every student, faculty, staff, alumni, parent and community member to easily interpret these findings and participate in the process of dialogue, skill-building, and strengthening the Cal Poly experience for all. Only by establishing a shared understanding of the collective experience and how it converges and diverges for campus citizens can we point up those areas requiring focused, and at times urgent, attention.

The hope at Cal Poly is of course for every student, faculty and staff member to have a “perfect” experience, indicated by a score of 5.0 (or 100 percent) across all groups and indicators. Unfortunately, this expectation is not a realistic one; such a data story has not yet manifested in any credible social scientific assessment of any campus climate that we have seen to date. As a result, with no indicator scored at a perfect level, areas for improvement abound in this study, though some areas are presented as directionally positive and others as a clear strength for the university to build upon.
As you can see in Exhibit 3.1, four levels of coding are used to clarify the data and guide the discussion presented. At the highest level of this framework are “Clear Strength” indicators. In the tables that follow, this level is identified by the color green and represents responses that scored 4.0-5.0 (for scaled indicators) or 80-100% (for single item indicators). This level of the framework is depicted as “the green zone” to indicate areas of health and strength in survey responses. Put simply, these areas are where the university is doing well, although there may be differences between the scores of different groups. The aspirational vision of this study is that every indicator tested would score in the green zone.

The blue zone represents indicators described as an “Emerging Strength.” These indicators represent responses that scored 3.5-3.9 or 70.0-79.9%. One step down from the green zone in our assessment matrix, the blue zone is an area of performance where the University is operating from a place of relative strength from the perspective of respondents. While the sentiment is not as strong as with green indicators, blue indicators are directionally positive, implying a possible area for improvement, but not an acute concern in the same way as indicators coded yellow or red are.

The yellow zone signifies an “Area of Concern” and clearly indicates challenge points for the university that require attention. Indicators in the yellow zone represent responses that fell in the ranges of 3.0-3.4 or 60.0-69.9%. And of course, even more serious are indicators coded in the red zone, areas of “Major Challenge,” which scored below 3.0 or below 60.0% and represent the lowest level of the assessment matrix presented in Exhibit 3.1.

Overall Comparison: Students, Faculty, Staff

Our first scorecard pans back to compare data at the level of institutional identity, across our three major groups of participants: students, faculty and staff (Exhibit 3.2). Notably, all three groups reported similar perspectives in their views about General Campus Climate, DEI Campus Climate, Institutional Commitment to DEI, Feeling Valued and Belonging, and Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo. While the majority of students, faculty and staff had a positive take on the General Campus Climate (Emerging Strength) and felt that they were treated fairly in the San Luis Obispo community (Emerging to Clear Strengths), their perspective was more concerning in terms of the other indicators.

Some specific findings in this context include:

- **General Climate.** Students, faculty and staff all scored their experience with the General Campus Climate as an Emerging Strength with scores ranging between 3.5 and 3.6. This finding is positive, implying that the entire Cal Poly community views their experience as more friendly than hostile, more respectful than disrespectful, more collegial then contentious, more cooperative than competitive, and more supportive than unsupportive.

- **DEI Climate** was viewed as an area of concern for students (3.2), faculty (3.2) and staff (3.2). While not in the red zone, the general perspective of respondents is that the environment is too homogeneous, a place where issues and dynamics of racism, sexism, homophobia, ageism and elitism are unfortunately a part of their perceived reality on campus, whether they are taking classes, teaching classes, or engaging in the critical leadership and support functions of the campus.

It is notable that, when carefully considered, the fact that so many on campus view the general climate as positive yet express concern about the DEI climate indicates a net positive—an extraordinary and widespread level of awareness about DEI issues and a concern for others even
Exhibit 3.2. Overall comparison of students, faculty and staff across CPX Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Climate</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued and Belonging</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

when one’s own experience is considered comfortable. These contrasting results point to a wide-open door for action at Cal Poly, as we will detail in our full report.

- **Institutional Commitment to DEI.** Neither does the university community have a fully positive assessment of the campus’s Institutional Commitment to DEI, with an average score in the yellow zone of between 3.0 and 3.2 across all three groups. This campus-wide finding contrasts with the major theme from listening session participants who feel as if there is new energy and action being taken to improve DEI issues at Cal Poly. This difference of opinion buttresses the need to ensure a broad and participatory engagement with these data, and, most importantly, with the actions steps under development for creating positive change on campus.

- **Valued and Belonging.** Also of concern was the result that neither students, faculty nor staff perceived their experience as one where they felt a sense of belonging and a feeling of being valued on campus, with indicators again coding in the yellow zone, between a low of 3.2 (staff), to a high of 3.4 (students), narrowly missing the low end of the blue zone.

- **Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo.** Another positive finding is that, overall, all three groups felt that they were treated fairly in the San Luis Obispo environment, with students (75.1%) and staff (77.8%) scoring in the blue zone, and faculty (82.7%) actually scoring in the green zone.

**Summary: Students, Faculty, Staff Comparison**

This panoramic snapshot sets the stage for the details that follow, where we see this general pattern replicate over and over—namely, that many view the general Cal Poly experience positively, while everyone also sees clear challenges across specific indicators of this research that probed the lived experience of diversity, equity and inclusion. This pattern of a positive general climate perspective combined with a challenging diversity experience perspective will be clarified and areas of urgency noted as subsequent scorecards are disaggregated by sex, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation and financial status across these same indicators for students, faculty and staff.
SECTION 4: THE CAL POLY STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Student Findings: Overview

While students’ overall perception of the general campus climate is somewhat encouraging, with numerous groups scoring in the blue zone, diverse social identity group members very consistently reported more negative experiences than their fellow students, irrespective of background.

When data are examined through the lens of race and ethnicity, African American/Black and Hispanic/Latinx students, and in some instances Asian American/Asian students were likely to have lower scores than their White peers, often dipping into the red and yellow zones, across every dimension reported here. Highlights of the results include:

- Students across the board identify challenges with the campus climate.
- Female students (49.1% of students) were likely to report a lesser experience with campus climate compared to males (50.6% of students), with both groups generally viewing the campus climate as one that is fraught with challenges.
- LGBTQIA students (15.1% of students) reported a consistently less positive experience than their heterosexual peers (84.3% of students).
- Students with financial challenges (43.2% of students) reported a consistently lesser experience than their financially stable peers (56.8% of students).
- While not featured in a stand-alone scorecard, students with disability (8.2% of students) scored lower on every Cal Poly Experience indicator when compared to those without any disability (91.8% of students).
- When controlling for multiple social identity factors in our multivariate analyses, statistically significant relationships were found that further validated these findings as students of color (39.9% of students) were more likely to have felt discriminated against and to feel less satisfied in their White peers (60.1% of students).
- One finding that was particularly evident was that African American/Black students (0.9% of students) were least satisfied and reported feeling the most discriminated against, followed by Hispanic/Latinx (13.4% of students), and Asian American/Asian students (15.7% of students).
- Also from our multivariate analyses, statistically significant relationships were found that further validated these findings where females (49.1% of students) were more likely to have felt discriminated against and to feel less satisfied than their male peers.
- When controlling for multiple social identity factors in our multivariate analyses, statistically significant relationships were found where LGBTQIA students (15.1% of students) were more likely to have felt discriminated against and to feel less satisfied than their heterosexual peers.
- When controlling for multiple social identity factors in our multivariate analyses, statistically significant relationships were found where those experiencing financial instability (43.2% of students) were more likely to have felt discriminated against and to feel less satisfied than their financially stable peers (56.8% of students).

Next is a specific discussion of the student scorecards considering student responses by sex, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation and financial stability across the five key indicators: General Campus
Climate, DEI Campus Climate, Institutional Commitment to DEI, Feeling Valued and Belonging, and Feelings of Fair Treatment in the San Luis Obispo community. We follow that and conclude this section with a treatment of two multivariate analyses, looking at Perceptions of Dissatisfaction and Perceptions of Discrimination as two dependent Cal Poly Experience Indicators that are used to further this discussion of the lived experience on campus and in the local community of San Luis Obispo.

**Student Findings by Sex**

Females and males reported similar and consistent perspectives across the indicators of General Climate, DEI Climate, Institutional Commitment to DEI, Valued and Belonging, and Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo (Exhibit 4.1). Yet in each of these instances, females (49.1% of students) reported a slightly more negative and different experience than males (50.6% of students) did. This finding is consistent across these five indicators and is further clarified in the multivariate analysis that is highlighted at the end of this overview of the Cal Poly student experience.

**Exhibit 4.1. Students: Sex scorecard across CPX Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Climate</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued and Belonging</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some specific findings include:

- Both females and males viewed the general campus climate in the blue zone as an emerging strength, although males reported a slightly more positive perception of their experience (3.7) than females did (3.5).

- Females and males both characterized the DEI climate, Cal Poly’s institutional commitment, and feelings of valued and belonging negatively (yellow zone), further reinforcing the perceived challenges reported in the above discussion that compared the experiences of students, faculty and staff.

- Females offered a particularly strong critique of Cal Poly’s institutional commitment, scoring in the red zone (2.9), implying that this area of concern was significant for respondents, who did not feel the university was as committed and invested in building a diverse and inclusive Cal Poly Experience.

- Both females and males reported that their experience in San Luis Obispo was an emerging strength (74.9% and 75.4%, respectively), with both groups feeling they were treated fairly, scoring this indicator in the blue zone.
Student Findings by Race and Ethnicity

The discussion of the Cal Poly Experience began to come into focus through the lens of sex with males consistently reporting a more positive perception of the campus DEI experience than females. The lived experience unfortunately becomes crystal clear when viewed through the lens of race and ethnicity. With 60.1% of students identifying as White, minority students generally report a negative perception regarding their experience at Cal Poly as well as in the San Luis Obispo environment (Exhibit 4.2).

This result depicts a classic theme in the higher-education and organizational research in this area (Harper and Hurtado, 2007). In the research, historically underrepresented minorities tend to report a widely divergent experience from their majority peers at the same institutions, all too often less-than-favorable, a finding replicated in the Cal Poly study.

Exhibit 4.2. Students: Race and ethnicity comparison scorecard across CPX Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>AA BLACK</th>
<th>ASIAN AMER ASIAN</th>
<th>HISPANIC LATINX</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>NATIVE</th>
<th>HPI</th>
<th>ME/NA</th>
<th>MULTI-RACIAL ETHNIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Climate</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued and Belonging</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some pointed findings regarding race and ethnicity include:

- For the first time in this discussion, we find some groups that did not report a positive general experience with the campus environment (General Campus Climate). African American/Black Students (3.3) and Hispanic/Latinx (3.3) students both responded to the survey in ways that allow us to see that their general experience was perceived less positively than that of their peers. Notably, general climate was not as negative as other parts of the scorecard.

- Perceptions of the DEI Climate, Institutional Commitment, and Valued and Belonging were identified as areas of concern or even a red-zone major challenge for every racial/ethnic group, with one exception: White students reported feelings of being valued and belonging at Cal Poly that crossed into the lower end of the Blue Zone (3.5), implying that this is an emerging area of strength for these students, but clearly not a towering strength.

- Students of color were hyper-critical in their perspective of Cal Poly’s institutional commitment to DEI, with African American/Black (2.4), Hispanic/Latinx (2.6), Asian American/Asian (2.8), and Native|HPI|ME/NA (2.9) scoring squarely in the red zone.

- White students identified the DEI climate and institutional commitment to DEI as areas of concern (3.7). This finding indicates that many students at Cal Poly have a consciousness about this challenge to a degree that is not always present at other institutions, based on our experience with similar studies at other studies and in terms of the general literature in this area (Harper and
This level of White student consciousness, where most recognize that Cal Poly has challenges with DEI issues, is a foundational factor that can be built upon as we move into the action-oriented phase of continuing to improve the Cal Poly Experience.

- In terms of the Valued and Belonging indicator, a key variable in defining one’s lived experience on campus, African American/Black (2.9) and Hispanic/Latinx (2.9) students scored in the red zone, while Asian/Asian American (3.1), Multiracial (3.3) and the amalgam of Native and other students (3.3) scoring in the yellow zone.

- White students and Multiracial students reported a positive experience in the San Luis Obispo environment (86.7% and 74.0%, respectively). By comparison, the low scores of African American/Black (43.8%), Hispanic/Latinx students (46.9%) and Asian American/Asian (56.7%) belied major challenges in the San Luis Obispo environment.

### Student Findings by Sexual Orientation

Exhibit 4.3 presents the Cal Poly scorecard comparing the experiences of LGBTQIA community members and those who identify as heterosexual. Overall LGBTQIA community members (15.1% of students) report a less positive experience than their heterosexual peers (84.3% of students), with every Cal Poly Experience indicator either in the yellow or red zones. In comparison, heterosexual student respondents report their perception of the general campus climate, as well as their feelings of being treated fairly in San Luis Obispo, as emerging strengths, in the blue zone.

### Exhibit 4.3. Students: LGBTQIA scorecard across CPX Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>LGBTQIA</th>
<th>HETEROSEXUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Climate</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued and Belonging</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some specific findings include:

- LGBTQIA members reported a lesser experience with the general campus climate than their comparable heterosexual peers, scoring in the yellow zone at 3.3, implying that this is an area of concern for this group.

- LGBGTQIA community members similarly reported low perceptions of feeling valued and belonging (3.0) and receiving fair treatment in San Luis Obispo (62.3%), in the yellow zone.

- LGBTQIA members reported DEI climate and institutional commitment to DEI in the red zone, where respondents have viewed the climate of inclusion as a major challenge at Cal Poly and
question the commitment of the university to proactively advance a clear strategy related to diversity and inclusion.

- Heterosexual respondents identified yellow-zone level concerns with the three primary measures of climate on campus: DEI Climate (3.2), Institutional Commitment (3.1) and Valued and Belonging (3.4)

**Student Findings by Financial Stability**

Those with and without financial challenges scored differently across four of the five Cal Poly Experience indicators presented in Exhibit 4.4. Those reporting financial challenges (43.2% of students) had a less favorable perception of their Cal Poly Experience across all five indicators. Moreover, not one aspect of their experience rose to the levels of the blue or green zones. By comparison, those who are financially stable (56.8% of students) reported a strong perception of the general climate, feeling valued and belonging, and a green-zone level response to being treated fairly in San Luis Obispo.

**Exhibit 4.4. Students: Financial stability scorecard across CPX indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>FINANCIALLY CHALLENGED</th>
<th>FINANCIALLY STABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Climate</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued and Belonging</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some specific findings noted here include:

- Financially challenged students identified the variables of General Climate (3.4), DEI Climate (3.0), Valued and Belonging (3.2), and treatment in the San Luis Obispo community as areas of concern, with perceptions of the DEI climate nearly descending into the red zone.

- Financially challenged students responded in the red zone (2.9) on the Institutional Commitment to DEI indicator.

- Notably, financially stable students identified challenges in DEI climate as well as the institutional commitment to DEI, both scoring in the yellow zone, again indicating a recognition of diversity challenges and the need for Cal Poly to express greater levels of commitment to DEI.

- Unsurprisingly, financially stable students felt positively about their general experience both on campus (3.7, blue zone) and in the broader San Luis Obispo community (82.3%, green zone).
Multivariate Analyses for Students: Diversity Matters

Exhibit 4.5 presents two multivariate predictive models, for student perceptions of Dissatisfaction and for Discrimination. Both dependent measures are based upon each student’s experiences over the 12 months prior to the survey.

Exhibit 4.5. Students: Multivariate predictive model for Dissatisfaction and Discrimination

<p>| Multivariate Logistic Regressions: Odds Ratios for Key Metrics (Students) within the Past 12 Months at Cal Poly, 2019 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissatisfaction [^4] “Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied”</th>
<th>Discrimination [^5] “Yes”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female (Relative to Male Students)</td>
<td>1.31*** (4.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQIA (Relative to Heterosexual Students)</td>
<td>2.19*** (11.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (Relative to Students with No Disability)</td>
<td>1.55*** (4.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially Challenged Students (Relative to Financially Stable)</td>
<td>1.40*** (5.98)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race (Relative to White Students)

- African American/Black | 2.57*** (3.21) | 6.46*** (6.28) |
- Asian American/Asian | 1.67*** (6.50) | 3.83*** (17.19) |
- Hispanic/Latinx | 2.27*** (9.15) | 5.32*** (18.45) |
- Native | HPI | ME/NA | 1.64* (2.32) | 2.83*** (4.80) |
- Multiracial | 1.45*** (5.11) | 1.96*** (8.81) |

Respondents | 8701 | 8701 |

Odds ratios, with t statistics shown in parentheses.
*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p<0.001. Two-tailed tests.

This multivariate analysis examined the relative impact of sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQIA relative to heterosexual), ability status (disability relative to no disability), financial stability (those expressing the experience of financial challenges relative to financial stability), and race (African American/Black, Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latinx, Native | HPI | ME/NA, and Multiracial communities, relative to Whites) on the outcomes of Dissatisfaction (“Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied”) and of Discrimination (“Yes”).

Generally, these findings confirmed the findings outlined in each of the scorecards presented in Exhibits 4.1 to 4.4. Namely, that students experience Cal Poly in ways that are influenced by their identities as

---

[^4]: How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall campus climate/environment that you have experienced at Cal Poly within the past 12 months?
[^5]: In general, over the past 12 months, have you felt discriminated against at Cal Poly?
women, as LGBTQIA, as disabled, as members of communities of color, and as economically challenged. As presented in Exhibit 4.5, each of these social identity measures is a statistically significant predictor of perceptions of satisfaction and discrimination. These findings further illustrate that a student’s social identity matters. That diverse identities greatly influence the type of experience those students are having at Cal Poly.

Some pointed findings in our multivariate analyses of Dissatisfaction indicate that:

- Female students (49.1% of students) are 0.31 times (31%) more likely than male students (50.6% of students) to report feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

- LGBTQIA students (15.1% of students) are 1.19 times more likely than heterosexual students (84.3% of students) to report feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

- Students with disabilities (8.2% of students) are 0.55 times (55%) more likely than students without a disability (91.8% of students) to report feeling dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

- Students who are challenged financially (43.2% of students) are 0.40 times (40%) more likely than students who are financially stable (56.8% of students) to report feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

- With respect to race, generally, minority students (39.9% of students) are more likely to report feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly compared to White students (60.1% of students), with African American/Black (0.9% of students) and Hispanic/Latinx students (13.4% of students) reporting the highest levels of perceived dissatisfaction among all racial groups.

- The largest effect observed in this model is that African American/Black students are 1.57 times more likely than White students (60.1% of students), to report feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

Some pointed findings in our multivariate analyses of Discrimination indicate that:

- Female students (49.1% of students) are 0.32 times (32%) more likely than male students (50.6% of students) to report feeling they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

- LGBTQIA students (15.1% of students) are 1.01 times more likely than heterosexual students (84.3% of students) to report feeling they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

- Students with disabilities (8.2% of students) are 1.10 times more likely than students without a disability (91.8% of students) to report feeling as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

- Students who are challenged financially (8.2% of students) are 0.64 times (64%) more likely than students who are financially stable to report feeling as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

- With respect to race, generally, minority students (39.9% of students) are more likely to report feeling they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly compared to White students (60.1% of students), with African American/Black (0.9% of students) and Hispanic/Latinx students (13.4% of students) reporting the highest levels of perceived discrimination among all racial groups.
• The largest effect observed in this model (and indeed throughout this report) is that African American/Black students (0.9% of students) are 5.46 times more likely than White students (60.1% of students) to report feeling as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

Summary: Student Experience

Students experience Cal Poly in ways that are distinctly influenced by their social identity. Across every measure of this study, racial-minority and other diverse student communities reported a less favorable experience than their majority counterparts. This fact can be found whether examined through the social identity lenses of sex, race/ethnicity, sexuality, disability or financial stability.

While all students recognize challenges with the DEI climate at Cal Poly and question institutional commitment, diverse students in particular expressed deep challenges with their Cal Poly experience that too often dipped into the red zone, particularly for African Americans, and Hispanic/Latinx students who consistently exhibited the lowest scores across groups. Further, the more powerful multivariate predictive models confirm the narrative told by the scorecards and revealed a profound lack of satisfaction and feelings of discrimination amongst diverse communities at Cal Poly.
SECTION 5: THE CAL POLY FACULTY EXPERIENCE

Faculty Findings Overview

Most studies of campus climate have found that groups with power and privilege on campus generally view the climate as positive, while groups that are underrepresented and/or marginalized take a more negative view of the climate (Harper and Hurtado, 2007). Unfortunately, gender, race and other social identity characteristics emerged in this analysis, consistent with the literature, where diverse faculty members at Cal Poly consistently reported lesser experiences than their majority peers.

The institutional environment can play a crucial role in fostering or impeding the full scholarly, professional and leadership development of any faculty member. Improving the quality of not only the campus learning environments but also the professional work environments for those who teach and research is something that should therefore be taken seriously as a way of improving the campus experience for all.

Highlights of the results include:

- White faculty (76.2% of faculty) and Multiracial/-ethnic faculty (6.5% of faculty) reported a positive perception of the General Campus Climate. These findings diverged from those of African American/Black faculty (1.7% of faculty) and Hispanic/Latinx faculty (4.1% of faculty), who scored their general experience with the day-to-day realities of climate as challenging, in ways that were similar to student findings reported in Section 4.

- Across the board, faculty identified challenges with the DEI Climate, Institutional Commitment and perceptions of Valued and Belonging, with no group scoring this dimension above the yellow zone.

- LGBTQIA faculty (11.4% of faculty) reported a consistently less positive experience than their heterosexual peers (88% of faculty), and this identity was predictive of dissatisfaction and perceptions of discrimination in our multivariate analyses.

- Faculty with financial challenges (37.0% of faculty) reported a consistently lesser experience than their financially stable peers (63.0% of faculty), a finding that held true in our multivariate analyses as well. These faculty were more likely to report feelings of dissatisfaction and to feel discriminated against, even when controlling for disability, gender, race/ethnicity and sexual orientation.

- When controlling for multiple social identity factors in our multivariate analyses, statistically significant relationships were found that further validated our scorecard findings. African American/Black, Asian American/Asian, and Hispanic/Latinx faculty (1.7%, 5.9% and 4.1% of faculty, respectively) were most likely to have felt discriminated against and to feel less satisfied than their White peers (76.2% of faculty), even when controlling for other facets of their identity, such as disability, financial stability, gender and sexual orientation.

- Female faculty (41.3% of faculty) were more likely to have felt discriminated against and to feel less satisfied than their male peers (58.4% of faculty), even when controlling for other facets of their identity, such as disability, financial stability, race/ethnicity and sexual orientation.

In the next section, we go into a specific discussion of the faculty scorecards, examining the effects across sex, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation and financial stability for five key indicators: General Campus Climate, DEI Campus Climate, Institutional Commitment to DEI, Feeling Valued and Belonging, and Feelings of Fair Treatment in the San Luis Obispo community.

We follow that discussion, and conclude this section, with a treatment of two multivariate analyses, looking at Perceptions of Dissatisfaction and Perceptions of Discrimination as two dependent Cal Poly Experience
Indicators that are used to further this discussion of the lived experience of faculty both on campus and in the local community of San Luis Obispo.

**Faculty Findings by Sex**

Females and males reported similar patterns across the indicators of General Climate, DEI Climate, Institutional Commitment to DEI, Valued and Belonging, and Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo (Exhibit 4.1). Much like the student data, in each of these instances, females (41.3% of faculty) reported a slightly more negative and different experience than males (58.4% of faculty). This finding is consistent across these five indicators and is clarified in the multivariate analysis that is highlighted at the end of this discussion of the Cal Poly faculty experience. At the most basic level, females report a less positive experience than males for several factors, findings that the Embracing the Journey: The CPX Research Study Faculty Technical Report outlines as largely statistically significant.

**Exhibit 5.1. Faculty: Sex scorecard across CPX Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Climate</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued and Belonging</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly in SB</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some specific findings include:

- Both females and males viewed the general campus climate in the blue zone as an emerging strength, although males (3.6) reported a slightly more positive perception of their experience than did females (3.5).

- Females and males characterized the DEI Climate (3.3 and 3.0, respectively) and Feelings of Valued and Belonging (3.4 and 3.2, respectively) in the yellow zone.

- Females offered a particularly strong critique of Cal Poly’s institutional commitment to DEI, scoring in the red zone (2.9), implying that this concern was significant for respondents, who did not feel the university was as committed and invested in building a diverse and inclusive Cal Poly Experience.

- Both females and males reported that their experience in San Luis Obispo was a clear strength (81.7% and 83.3%, respectively), scoring in the green zone, with both groups feeling they were treated fairly.
Faculty Findings by Race and Ethnicity

As with the student and staff responses, examining the faculty experience further strengthens the observation that the Cal Poly experience is highly defined by race and ethnicity. Three minority faculty groups (African American/Black, Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latinx) generally report a negative perception of the environment on campus, as well as, and perhaps even more acutely, in the San Luis Obispo environment (Exhibit 5.2). In contrast, White faculty (76.2% of faculty), Multiracial (6.5% of faculty) and Native/HP/ME/NA (2.4% of faculty) faculty reported a more positive experience with the general campus climate and in San Luis Obispo. Yet all faculty reported challenges with the diversity and inclusion climate across the indicators of DEI Climate, Valued and Belonging, and Institutional Commitment to Diversity. African American/Black (1.7% of faculty) and Hispanic/Latinx faculty (4.1% of faculty) were highly critical of the university; indeed, multiple scores in the red zone imply an experience that is problematic on multiple levels.

Exhibit 5.2. Faculty: Race scorecard across CPX Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>AA BLACK</th>
<th>ASIAN AMERICAN</th>
<th>HISPANIC LATINX</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>NATIVE/HP/ME/NA</th>
<th>MULTI-RACIAL ETHNIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Climate</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued and Belonging</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some pointed findings regarding race and ethnicity include:

- African American/Black faculty (3.2), Hispanic/Latinx (3.4) and Asian American/Asian faculty (3.4) all responded to the survey in ways that allow us to see that their general experience, scoring in the yellow zone, was not perceived as positively as that of their peers, which scored in the blue zone. Notably, General Climate was scored higher for these groups than other dimensions, many of which fell in the red zone.

- Perceptions of DEI Climate, Institutional Commitment to DEI, and Valued and Belonging were identified as areas of concern or even a red-zone major challenge for every racial/ethnic group.

- In terms of Cal Poly’s institutional commitment to DEI, faculty of color were hypercritical in their perspective, with African American/Black (2.5) and Hispanic/Latinx (2.7), scoring squarely in the red zone, while all other groups scored institutional commitment in the yellow zone.

- Notably, White faculty identified the campus DEI climate and institutional commitment to DEI as areas of concern (3.2), in contrast with some of their personal experiences. This finding indicates that faculty have a consciousness about this challenge that is not typically present at other institutions. This level of White faculty consciousness, where most recognize that Cal Poly has
challenges with DEI issues, is something that can be built upon as we move into the action-oriented phase of continuing to improve the Cal Poly Experience.

- In terms of the Valued and Belonging indicator, a key variable in defining one’s lived experience on campus, African American/Black (2.9) faculty scored in the red zone, while Asian/Asian American (3.3), Hispanic/Latinx (3.0), Multiracial (3.3) and the amalgam of Native and other diverse faculty (3.2) scored in the yellow zone. White faculty (3.4) scored the highest, though still in the yellow zone.

- White faculty (87.8%) and Multiracial faculty (80.2%) reported a positive experience in the San Luis Obispo community. By comparison, the notably lower scores of Asian American/Asian (57.8%) and Hispanic/Latinx faculty (67.8%) indicate that they encounter major challenges functioning in San Luis Obispo, while the abysmal score for African American/Black faculty (20.5%), deep in the red zone, stands out starkly.

**Faculty Findings by Sexual Orientation**

Exhibit 5.3 presents the Cal Poly scorecard comparing the experiences of LGBTQIA faculty compared to those faculty who identify as heterosexual. Overall LGBTQIA faculty (11.4% of faculty) report a less positive experience than their heterosexual peers (88.0% of faculty) in every dimension, with two Cal Poly Experience indicators in each of the yellow and red zones, and just one (perceptions of fair treatment in San Luis Obispo) in the blue zone. In comparison, heterosexual faculty responses scored in the yellow, blue and even green zones, with no red zones.

**Exhibit 5.3. Faculty: LGBTQIA scorecard across CPX Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>LGBTQIA</th>
<th>HETEROSEXUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Climate</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued and Belonging</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some specific findings include:

- Both LGBTQIA (76.9%) and heterosexual (83.8%) faculty identified their treatment in the San Luis Obispo environment positively, scoring in the blue and green zones, respectively.

- LGBTQIA faculty members reported a lesser experience with the general campus climate than their heterosexual peers (3.6), scoring in the yellow zone at 3.3, implying that this is an area of concern for this group.
- LGBTQIA (3.1) and heterosexual (3.4) faculty both reported low perceptions of feeling valued and belonging in the yellow zone.

- Of note, LGBTQIA members reported DEI Climate (2.9) and Institutional Commitment to DEI (2.8) in the red zone, meaning respondents view the climate of inclusion as a major challenge at Cal Poly and question the commitment of the university to proactively advance a clear strategy related to diversity and inclusion.

- Heterosexual respondents identified yellow-zone concerns with the three primary measures of climate on campus: DEI Climate (3.2), Institutional Commitment (3.1) and Valued and Belonging (3.4). These numbers reflect an awareness that all is not perfect on campus.

**Faculty Findings by Financial Stability**

Faculty with financial challenges (37.0% of faculty) reported a less favorable perception of their Cal Poly Experience across all five indicators, scoring four yellow-zone responses. Only one aspect of their experience rose to the level of the blue zone (treated fairly in San Luis Obispo). By comparison, those who are financially stable (63.0% of faculty) reported a strong perception of General Climate and feeling Valued and Belonging as well as a green-zone response to being treated fairly in San Luis Obispo.

**Exhibit 5.4. Faculty: Financial stability scorecard across CPX indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>FINANCIALLY CHALLENGED</th>
<th>FINANCIALLY STABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Climate</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued and Belonging</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some specific findings noted here include:

- Financially challenged faculty rated the variables of General Climate (3.4), DEI Climate (3.1) and Valued and Belonging (3.1) as areas of concern, in the yellow zone, with Institutional Commitment to DEI (3.0) nearly descending into the red zone.

- Notably, financially stable faculty identified challenges with DEI climate as well as with the institutional commitment to DEI, both scoring in the yellow zone, again indicating a recognition of diversity challenges and the need for Cal Poly to express greater levels of commitment to DEI.

- Unsurprisingly, financially stable faculty felt positively about their general experience both on campus (3.7) and in the broader San Luis Obispo community (85.7%), scoring in the blue and green zones respectively.
Multivariate Analyses for Faculty: Diversity Matters

Exhibit 5.5 presents two multivariate predictive models, for faculty perceptions of Dissatisfaction and for Discrimination. Both dependent measures are based upon faculty experiences over the 12 months prior to the survey.

This multivariate analysis examined the relative impact of sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGBTQIA relative to heterosexual), ability status (disability relative to no disability), financial stability (those expressing the experience of financial challenge relative to financial stability), and race (African American/Black, Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latinx, Native|HPI|ME/NA and Multiracial faculty relative to White faculty) on the outcomes of Dissatisfaction (“Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied”) and Discrimination (“Yes”).

Exhibit 5.5. Faculty: Multivariate predictive model for Dissatisfaction and Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multivariate Logistic Regressions: Odds Ratios for Key Metrics (Faculty) within the Past 12 Months at Cal Poly, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissatisfaction</strong> “Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (Relative to Male Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQIA (Relative to Heterosexual Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (Relative to Faculty with No Disability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially Challenged Faculty (Relative to Financially Stable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race (Relative to White Faculty)

- African American/Black | 3.22* (2.22) | 4.37** (2.85) |
- Asian American/Asian | 1.08 (0.21) | 1.39 (0.90) |
- Hispanic/Latinx | 1.70 (1.37) | 2.58* (2.38) |
- Native | HPI | ME/NA | 1.37 (0.90) | 2.21* (2.20) |
- Multiracial | 0.95 (-0.15) | 0.97 (-0.08) |

Respondents 860 857

Odds ratios, with t statistics shown in parentheses. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p<0.001. Two-tailed tests.

Generally, these findings confirmed the findings outlined in each of the scorecards presented in Exhibits 5.1 to 5.4. Namely, that the ways faculty experience Cal Poly are influenced by their identities as women,

---

6 How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall campus climate/environment that you have experienced at Cal Poly within the past 12 months?
7 In general, over the past 12 months, have you felt discriminated against at Cal Poly?
as disabled, as African American/Black and Hispanic/Latinx community members, and as economically challenged. As presented in Exhibit 5.5, each of these social identity measures is a statistically significant predictor of perceptions of satisfaction and/or discrimination. These findings further illustrate that a faculty member’s social identity matters. That diverse identities influence the type of experience those faculty are having at Cal Poly.

Some pointed findings in our multivariate analyses of Dissatisfaction indicate that:

- Female faculty (41.3% of faculty) are 0.32 times (32%) more likely than male faculty (58.4% of faculty) to report feeling dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

- LGBTQIA faculty (11.4% of faculty) are 0.62 times (62%) more likely than heterosexual faculty (88.0% of faculty) to report feeling dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

- Faculty with disabilities (7.6% of faculty) are 1.49 times more likely than faculty without a disability (92.4% of faculty) to report feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

- Faculty who are challenged financially (37.0% of faculty) are 0.76 times (76%) more likely than faculty who are financially stable (63.0% of faculty) to report feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

- With respect to race/ethnicity, the sole significant result observed in the model involves African American faculty (1.7% of faculty). Here, we see that African American/Black faculty are 2.22 times more likely than White faculty (76.2% of faculty) to report feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

Some pointed findings in our multivariate analyses of Discrimination indicate that:

- Female faculty (41.3% of faculty) are 1.36 times more likely than male faculty (58.4% of faculty) to report feeling as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

- There was no significant difference observed between LGBTQIA faculty (11.4% of faculty) and heterosexual faculty (88.0% of faculty) in relation to their feeling as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

- Faculty with disabilities (7.6% of faculty) are 0.79 times (79%) more likely than faculty without a disability (92.4% of faculty) to report feeling as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

- Faculty who are challenged financially (37.0% of faculty) are 1.09 times likely than faculty who are financially stable (63.0% of faculty) to report feeling as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

- With respect to race/ethnicity, generally, minority faculty (20.4% of faculty) are more likely to report feeling as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly compared to White faculty (76.2% of faculty), with African American/Black (1.7% of faculty) and Hispanic/Latinx faculty (4.1% of faculty) reporting the highest levels of perceived discrimination among all racial groups.

- The largest effect observed in this model is that African American/Black faculty are 3.37 times more likely than White faculty to report feeling as if they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.
Summary: Faculty Experience

The ways in which faculty experience Cal Poly are influenced by their social identity. This conclusion is similar to the results reported for students. Across every measure of this study, racial minority and other diverse faculty communities reported a less favorable experience than their majority counterparts. This fact can be found whether examined through the social identity lenses of gender, race/ethnicity, sexuality, disability or financial stability.

While all faculty recognize challenges with the DEI climate at Cal Poly and question institutional commitment, diverse faculty in particular expressed deep challenges with their Cal Poly experience that too often dipped into the red zone, particularly for African Americans and Hispanic/Latinx faculty, who consistently exhibited the lowest scores across groups. Further, the more powerful multivariate predictive models confirm the narrative told by the scorecards and reveal a profound lack of satisfaction compounded by feelings of discrimination amongst diverse communities at Cal Poly.
SECTION 6: THE CAL POLY STAFF EXPERIENCE

Staff Findings Overview

Cal Poly staff have experienced challenges both on campus and off, evidencing a general pattern of trends that has been well established in the analysis of both students and faculty survey results: that groups with power and privilege on campus generally view the climate as positive, while groups that are underrepresented and/or marginalized take a more negative view of the climate.

Highlights of the results for staff include:

- White staff (69.6% of staff) and Multiracial staff (10.1% of staff) reported a positive perception of the General Campus Climate, findings that diverged from African American/Black staff (2.0% of staff) and Hispanic/Latinx staff (11.2% of staff), who scored their general experience with the day-to-day realities of campus climate as challenging. Their challenges paralleled student and faculty findings reported in Sections 4 and 5.

- Across the board, staff identified challenges with the DEI Climate, Institutional Commitment, and perceptions of Valued and Belonging, with no group scoring this dimension above the yellow zone.

- LGBTQIA staff (9.9% of staff) reported a consistently less positive experience than their heterosexual peers (89.3% of staff), and this identity is predictive of both dissatisfaction and perceptions of discrimination compared to heterosexual staff peers based on our multivariate analysis.

- Staff with financial challenges (54.5% of staff) reported a consistently lesser experience than their financially stable peers (45.5% of staff), a finding that held true in our multivariate analysis as well. Financially challenged staff were more likely to report feelings of dissatisfaction and to feel discriminated against, even when controlling for disability, gender, race/ethnicity and sexual orientation.

- When controlling for multiple social identity factors in our multivariate analyses, we identified statistically significant relationships that further validated our scorecard findings. For instance, African American/Black staff (2.0% of staff) and Hispanic/Latinx staff (11.2% of staff) were most likely to have felt discriminated against and to feel less satisfied than their White peers (69.6% of staff), even when controlling for other facets of their identity, such as disability, financial stability, gender and sexual orientation.

- Female staff (53.7% of staff) were more likely to have felt discriminated against and to feel less satisfied than their male peers (46.3% of staff), even when controlling for other facets of their identity, such as disability, financial stability, race and sexual orientation.

Next, we specifically discuss the staff scorecards in light of sex, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation and financial stability factors across our five key indicators: General Campus Climate, DEI Campus Climate, Institutional Commitment to DEI, Feeling Valued and Belonging, and Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo (Exhibit 6.1). Similar to the student and faculty data, for each indicator, female (53.7% of staff) reported a slightly more negative and different experience than did males (46.3% of staff). This finding is consistent...
across these five indicators and the multivariate analysis that is highlighted at the end of this discussion of the Cal Poly staff experience. At the most basic level, females report a less positive experience than males.

**Exhibit 6.1 Staff: Sex scorecard across CPX Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Climate</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued and Belonging</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some specific findings include:

- Both females and males viewed the general campus climate in the blue zone as an emerging strength, although males (3.7) reported a slightly more positive perception of their experience than females did (3.5).

- Females and males critiqued the DEI Climate (3.1 and 3.4) and Cal Poly’s Institutional Commitment to DEI (also 3.1 and 3.4) in the yellow zone.

- Females (3.1) and males (3.3) offered a similar yellow-zone reflection of feelings of Valued and Belonging.

- Both females (77.4%) and males (78.2%) reported that their experience in San Luis Obispo was an emerging strength, with both groups feeling they were treated fairly, scoring this indicator in the blue zone, as students did. Interestingly, faculty scored in the green zone relative to their perceptions of treatment in the local community.

**Staff Findings by Race and Ethnicity**

The staff experience at Cal Poly is highly defined by race and ethnicity (Exhibit 6.2). Unfortunately, with 69.6% of staff identifying as White, minority staff generally report a negative perception of the environment on campus and, perhaps even more acutely, in the San Luis Obispo environment. White and Native|HPI|ME/NA staff (1.4% of staff) both reported a positive experience with the General Campus Climate, but, like other groups, reported challenges with the climate of diversity and inclusion when examined across the indicators of: DEI Climate, Valued and Belonging, and Institutional Commitment to Diversity. African American/Black staff (2.0% of staff) and Hispanic/Latinx staff (11.2% of staff) were highly critical of the university; scores in the red zone imply an experience that has problems on multiple levels.
Exhibit 6.2. Staff: Race scorecard across CPX Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>AA BLACK</th>
<th>ASIAN AMER ASIAN</th>
<th>HISPANIC LATINX</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>NATIVE</th>
<th>MULTI-RACIAL ETHNIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Climate</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued and Belonging</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some pointed findings regarding race and ethnicity for staff include:

- In terms of General Climate, African American/Black Staff (3.0), Asian American/Asian (3.4), Multiracial/-ethnic (3.3) and Hispanic/Latinx (3.2) staff responded to the survey in ways that allow us to see that their general experience, scoring in the yellow zone, was not perceived as positively as that of their White staff peers (3.7).

- Perceptions of the DEI Climate, Institutional Commitment, and Valued and Belonging were identified as areas of concern or even a red-zone major challenge for every racial/ethnic group.

- African American/Black staff were hyper-critical in their perspective of Cal Poly’s DEI Climate (2.7), Institutional Commitment to DEI (2.5), and Feelings of Valued and Belonging (2.8), scoring in the red zone.

- Hispanic/Latinx staff were similarly critical, scoring DEI climate at the lower yellow zone threshold (3.0), and Institutional Commitment to DEI and Valued and Belonging at 2.9, in the red zone.

- Asian American/Asian staff consistently scored all four on-campus dimensions of the race and ethnicity scorecard in the yellow zone: General Climate (3.4), DEI Climate (3.1), Institutional Commitment to DEI (3.0), Valued and Belonging (3.1).

- Multiracial/-ethnic staff consistently scored all four on-campus dimensions of the staff race and ethnicity scorecard in the yellow zone, though two were at the lowest possible value in the yellow zone and one (DEI Climate) fell in the red zone: General Climate (3.3), DEI Climate (2.9), Institutional Commitment to DEI (3.0), and Valued and Belonging (3.0).

- White staff identified the DEI climate (3.3) and Institutional Commitment to DEI (3.4) as areas of concern. This finding indicates that many staff have an awareness of the challenge.

- In terms of the Valued and Belonging indicator, a key variable in defining one’s lived experience on campus, we see red-zone values from African American/Black (2.8) and Hispanic/Latinx (2.9) staff, with Asian/Asian American (3.1), Multiracial/-ethnic (3.3) and the amalgam of Native and other diverse staff (3.0) scoring in the yellow zone.
• White staff also scored Valued and Belonging in the yellow zone (3.3), as White faculty did, while White students edged just into the blue zone (3.5).

• White staff reported a positive, green-zone experience in the San Luis Obispo environment (85.3%).

• All ethnic and racially diverse staff scored their experience in San Luis Obispo in the yellow zone or worse. The low, red-zone scores of African American/Black (41.9%) and Hispanic/Latinx staff (54.2%) indicate that they have serious challenges in the San Luis Obispo environment.

**Staff Findings by Sexual Orientation**

Exhibit 6.3 presents the Cal Poly scorecard comparing the experiences of LGBTQIA staff and those staff who identify as heterosexual. Overall LGBTQIA staff (9.9% of staff) reported a less positive experience than their heterosexual peers (89.3% of staff), with every Cal Poly Experience indicator in the yellow zone, and three of them at the lowest possible yellow zone value. In comparison, heterosexual staff respondents rated their perception of the General Campus Climate, feeling Valued and Belonging, and their feelings of being treated well in San Luis Obispo as emerging strengths, in the blue zone.

**Exhibit 6.3. Staff: LGBTQIA scorecard across CPX Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>LGBTQIA</th>
<th>HETEROSEXUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Climate</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued and Belonging</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some specific findings:

• LGBTQIA staff members reported challenges with the campus climate, with no part of their experience above the yellow zone and all indicators reported at a lower level than those of their heterosexual staff colleagues.

• LGBTQIA staff scored the General Campus Climate a 3.3 while heterosexual staff scored it in the blue zone at a level of 3.6.

• LGBTQIA staff reported low perceptions of feeling valued and belonging in the yellow zone (3.0), with heterosexual respondents scoring in the low end of the blue zone (3.5).

• LGBTQIA members reported DEI Climate (3.0) and Institutional Commitment to DEI (3.0) as a challenge at Cal Poly and question the commitment of the university to proactively advance a clear strategy related to diversity and inclusion.
• Heterosexual respondents identified yellow-zone level concerns about DEI, with two of the primary measures of campus climate: DEI Climate (3.3) and Institutional Commitment (3.3).

• Heterosexual (79.1%) staff identified their treatment in the San Luis Obispo environment positively, scoring in the blue zone, while LGBTQIA staff (67.0%) scored in the yellow zone, an area of concern.

**Staff Findings by Financial Stability**

Staff dealing with financial challenges (54.5% of staff) reported a less favorable perception of their Cal Poly Experience across all five indicators compared to their financially stable peers (45.5% of staff). Only one aspect of their experience rose to the levels of the blue zone. By comparison, those who are financially stable reported a stronger, blue-zone perception of the General Climate and of Feeling Valued and Belonging, with a green-zone level response to Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo.

**Exhibit 6.4. Staff: Financial stability scorecard across CPX indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>FINANCIALLY CHALLENGED</th>
<th>FINANCIALLY STABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI Climate</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to DEI</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued and Belonging</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Fairly in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some specific findings noted here include:

• Financially challenged staff identified all four on-campus variables of General Climate (3.4), DEI Climate (3.2), Institutional Commitment to DEI (3.2) and Valued and Belonging (3.0), in the yellow zone.

• Notably, financially stable staff identified challenges in the DEI Climate as well as Institutional Commitment to DEI, both scoring in the yellow zone, again indicating a recognition of diversity challenges and the need for Cal Poly to express greater levels of commitment to DEI.

• Unsurprisingly, financially stable staff felt positively about their general experience both on campus (3.7) and in the San Luis Obispo community (83.1%), scoring in the blue and green zones, respectively.

**Multivariate Analyses for Staff: Diversity Matters**

Exhibit 6.5 presents two multivariate predictive models, for staff perceptions of Dissatisfaction and for Discrimination. Both dependent measures are based upon staff experiences over the 12 months prior to the survey. This multivariate analysis examined the relative impact of sex (female relative to male), sexual orientation (LGTBQIA relative to heterosexual), ability status (disability relative to no disability), financial stability (those expressing the experience of financial challenges relative to financial stability), and race (African American/Black, Asian American/Asian, Hispanic/Latinx, Native|HPI|ME/NA and Multiracial
community members relative to Whites) on the lower outcomes of Dissatisfaction (“Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied”) and on Discrimination (“Yes”).

Exhibit 6.5. Staff: Multivariate predictive model for Dissatisfaction and Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multivariate Logistic Regressions: Odds Ratios for Key Metrics (Staff) within the Past 12 Months at Cal Poly, 2019</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction8 “Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied”</th>
<th>Discrimination9 “Yes”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female (Relative to Male Staff)</td>
<td>1.99*** (4.53)</td>
<td>1.97*** (4.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQIA (Relative to Heterosexual Staff)</td>
<td>1.63* (2.18)</td>
<td>1.72* (2.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (Relative to Staff with No Disability)</td>
<td>0.90 (-0.46)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially Struggling Staff (Relative to Financially Stable)</td>
<td>1.40* (2.27)</td>
<td>1.49* (2.60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race (Relative to White Staff)

- African American/Black 5.18*** (3.42) 6.48*** (3.88)
- Asian American/Asian 1.58 (1.29) 1.81 (1.54)
- Hispanic/Latinx 2.08*** (3.21) 3.44*** (5.35)
- Native | HPI | ME/NA 0.54 (-1.16) 1.46 (0.90)
- Multiracial 1.62* (2.13) 2.35*** (3.80)

Respondents 1053 1051

Odds ratios, with t statistics shown in parentheses. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001. Two-tailed tests.

Generally, these findings confirmed the findings outlined in each of the scorecards presented in Exhibits 6.1 to 6.4. Namely, that the ways that staff experience Cal Poly are influenced by their identities as women, as African American/Black and Hispanic/Latinx community members, as LGBTQIA, and as financially challenged. As presented in Exhibit 6.5, each of these social identity measures is a statistically significant predictor of perceptions of satisfaction and/or discrimination. These findings further illustrate that a staff member’s social identity matters, similar to our findings for faculty and students. Restated: diverse identities influence the type of experience those staff are having at Cal Poly.

Some pointed findings from our multivariate analysis of Dissatisfaction indicate that:

- Female staff (53.7% of staff) are 0.99 times (99%) more likely than male staff (46.3% of staff) to report feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

---

8 How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall campus climate/environment that you have experienced at Cal Poly within the past 12 months?
9 In general, over the past 12 months, have you felt discriminated against at Cal Poly?
- LGBTQIA staff (9.9% of staff) are 0.63 times (63%) more likely than heterosexual staff (89.3% of staff) to report feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

- There was no significant difference observed between staff who report having a disability (9.5% of staff) and those that do not (90.5% of staff) in their perception of feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

- Staff who are challenged financially (54.5% of staff) are 0.40 times (40%) more likely than staff who are financially stable (45.5% of staff) to report feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

- With respect to race, generally, minority staff (28.2% of staff) are more likely to report feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly compared to White staff (69.6% of staff), with African American/Black staff (2.0% of staff) and Hispanic/Latinx staff (11.2% of staff) reporting the highest levels of perceived dissatisfaction among all racial groups.

- The largest effect observed in this model is that African American/Black staff (2.0% of staff) are 4.18 times more likely than White staff (69.6% of staff) to report feeling dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall climate in the past year at Cal Poly.

Some pointed findings from our multivariate analysis of Discrimination indicate that:

- Female staff (53.7% of staff) are 0.97 times more (97%) likely than male staff (46.3% of staff) to report feeling they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

- LGBTQIA staff (9.9% of staff) are 0.72 times more (72%) likely than heterosexual staff (89.3% of staff) to report feeling they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

- There was no significant difference observed between staff who report having a disability (9.5% of staff) and those who do not (90.5% of staff) in their perception of feeling they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

- Staff who are challenged financially (54.5% of staff) are 0.49 times (49%) more likely than staff who are financially stable (45.5% of staff) to report feeling they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

- With respect to race, generally, minority staff are more likely to report feeling they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly compared to White staff, with African American/Black and Hispanic/Latinx staff reporting the highest levels of perceived discrimination among all racial groups.

- The largest effect observed in this model is that African American/Black staff are 5.48 times more likely than White staff to report feeling they had been discriminated against in the past year at Cal Poly.

**Summary: Staff Experience**

The ways in which staff experience Cal Poly are clearly influenced by their social identity, much like the results reported for students and faculty. Across every measure of this study, racial minority and other diverse staff communities reported a less favorable experience than their majority counterparts. This fact can be found whether examined through the social identity lenses of sex, race/ethnicity, sexuality, disability or financial stability.
While all staff recognize challenges with the climate for DEI at Cal Poly and question the university’s institutional commitment, diverse staff in particular expressed deep challenges with their campus experience that too often dipped into the red zone, particularly for African Americans and Hispanic/Latinx staff who consistently exhibited the lowest scores across groups. Further, the more powerful multivariate predictive models confirm the narrative told by the scorecards and reveal a profound lack of satisfaction as well as feelings of discrimination amongst diverse communities at Cal Poly.
SECTION 7: STRATEGIC DIVERSITY LEADERSHIP RECOMMENDATIONS

The “embracing the journey” metaphor at the heart of this report assumes that one person can make a difference. It posits that each person is potentially a catalyst for positive change in their own everyday life and that this type of change is capable of then multiplying out into others’ lives, creating secondary and tertiary positive benefits that can, especially at an institute of higher learning, last a lifetime. Whether through participation in campus cultural events, bystander intervention or DEI training, one can embrace one’s own journey of growth and expansion while learning to better acknowledge and honor the journeys of others. Collectively, embracing the journey is about joining together as an interdependent team at all levels and sublevels to work together towards positive community and cultural shifts.

For each individual at Cal Poly, making the decision to embrace personal and organizational change can be a difficult one. Such a choice requires cutting away from past ways of doing things and adopting new approaches that may feel awkward, unclear and difficult. Yet, as Cal Poly engages in the journey, and as its students, faculty and staff deepen their awareness, talents and skills, then together everyone deepens their perceptions of what is possible. Ultimately, what is difficult becomes easier and easier over time.

The listening session and survey data discussed in this report largely reinforce the diversity, equity and inclusion challenges that exist institutionally everywhere. Namely, that people of color, women, those identifying LGBTQIA, those with disability, and those experiencing difficult economic circumstances reported a lesser experience than their majority counterparts. Across variables that included dissatisfaction, institutional commitment to DEI, perceptions of discrimination, thriving and belonging, and more, those diverse communities reported greater challenges with the Cal Poly experience. And they reported feeling like “the other.”

While the findings of this study are shockingly consistent across students, faculty, staff and dependent measures, the findings themselves are not surprising. Indeed, the outcomes of this assessment are all too common in college and university studies of this kind, not at all unique to Cal Poly. Indeed, the majority of research in this area finds similar results (Harper and Hurtado, 2007). What will make Cal Poly unique, however, is what both university leadership and the entire institutional community does with these findings—how they come together to embrace a collective DEI journey that can strengthen the Cal Poly experience, both institutionally and individually, creating an even better educational experience for all.

Institutional and Personal Leadership: Everyone Can Play a Role Leading Change

We are all regularly lured into playing the role of the powerless victim or the passive observer. But the key to accomplishing broad, sweeping change is for everyone to gain a shared understanding of the direction, to establish clear action steps to help leaders know what and how to take steps forward, and to support this change with the necessary financial, human, and technical resources to empower leaders to operate in a new way.

What became clear in our listening sessions was that many of those surveyed had their ear to the ground and, from that vantage, could offer two excellent and related main suggestions for moving forward (Exhibit 7.1). They believed these two action steps are essential to help the campus advance in its DEI journey.

The first suggestion was for leadership to create a campus-wide diversity, equity and inclusion action plan, complete with accountability, incentives, infrastructure, and resources (AIIR). The second was for the entire campus community to deeply embrace an ongoing journey of DEI leadership development at all levels—student, faculty, staff and senior administrative levels. They look for the entire campus community to embrace both an institutional and a personal change effort to improve the Cal Poly experience through a confluence of awareness, learning, recruitment, retention, outreach and community engagement efforts.
We applaud their perception and concur in many ways. The rest of this section will walk the reader through the seven specific recommendations that we gleaned from analyzing the qualitative and quantitative CPX Survey data.

Exhibit 7.1. Listening session recommendations by key theme, relative strength, number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Relative Strength</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create a campus-wide multidimensional plan</strong></td>
<td>We need a multi-dimensional plan that leadership across campus is involved in creating and activating, including a strong focus on improving racial and ethnic diversity in the students, faculty and staff, creating a stronger culture of inclusion, policies of accountability, and creating DEI learning experiences for everyone.</td>
<td>✅✅✅✅</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create moments of learning and growth for all</strong></td>
<td>We need to establish a culture of educating ourselves on how to do the everyday work of belonging and inclusion by committing to a series of courses, training and professional development experiences for every student, faculty, staff and administrative leader on campus.</td>
<td>✅✅✅</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven Recommendations to Galvanize Change at Cal Poly

Table 7.2 presents the seven recommendations that emerged from our review of data gathered in this project. These recommendations are offered as a vehicle to speed Cal Poly’s progress and respond in both immediate and long-term ways that galvanize greater potentials. These recommendations are proposed to not only help leadership build an institutional DEI strategy, but to help each and every Cal Poly citizen to become stronger and more skilled at creating an everyday culture of inclusion.

**Recommendation 1.  
Engage in campus-wide dialogues about the CPX study results.**

- Leverage CPX Toolkits from the Center for Strategic Diversity Leadership and Social Innovation to activate a series of campus-wide dialogues about results of the CPX study.
- Disseminate CPX Toolkits to empower leaders, faculty and staff with tools to aid in their personal DEI journey.
- Senior leaders should attend as many dialogues as possible.
- Centrally track the number of dialogues happening on campus and key action steps emerging from these discussions.

**Recommendation 2.**  
Create a centralized Inclusive Excellence framework to guide the DEI action-planning steps of colleges, administrative units, and student organizations.

- Develop a 5-year DEI action plan strategy to strengthen the Cal Poly experience.
- Uplift relevant Collective Impact recommendations as part of the process.
- Develop DEI plans across the university, in units, committees, colleges, etc.
- Create an Inclusive Excellence framework to guide development of local DEI plans across campus.
### Exhibit 7.2. Strategic diversity leadership: Cal Poly recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 1:</strong> Engage in a campus-wide dialogue about the results of this research with leaders, students, faculty and staff.</td>
<td>Leverage DEI activation toolkits to empower leaders to host a series of dialogues, leveraging Cal Poly Experience data, to drive conversation, learning and action steps moving forward. Senior leaders should be active participants in as many dialogues as they can possibly attend, creating a visible and engaged expression of their commitment to DEI on the ground.</td>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 2:</strong> Develop a centralized Inclusive Excellence framework and goals to guide the development of a 5-year DEI activation plan and implementation in every college, unit and student organization.</td>
<td>Develop a central framework to guide the campus community while committing resources to the development of a 5-year DEI activation plan, with every college and major administrative unit developing a local action plan and with central administration creating a process of accountability and support for activation. This process should begin with a careful consideration of the Collective Impact report recommendations and structures to guide both immediate and long-term next steps.</td>
<td>Winter 2020 Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 3:</strong> Allocate a centralized fund of resources to drive collaborative DEI innovation grants laser-focused on inclusion challenges facing diverse groups at Cal Poly.</td>
<td>Create a centralized Inclusive Excellence Innovation fund, connected to the overall DEI framework, to allow the campus community to have an ongoing opportunity to tap into both small and large grants in order to seed a stronger and more evidence-based culture of diversity and inclusion initiatives on campus.</td>
<td>Winter 2020 Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 4:</strong> Develop a multidimensional DEI training, leadership, curricular and professional development program for students, faculty, staff and senior leadership.</td>
<td>Develop a campus-wide set of DEI learning and growth initiatives to support the development of new DEI leadership skills and abilities to foster an everyday culture of inclusion, beginning with an introductory online learning experience for the entire campus community, launched online in November 2019.</td>
<td>Fall 2019 Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 5:</strong> Invest in the campus-wide DEI infrastructure to drive at a higher gear of inclusion and belonging for diverse groups.</td>
<td>Identify key DEI-focused offices and units in order to make targeted investments over time, strengthening the university’s ability to create a stronger culture of inclusion. This process should be evidence-based.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 6:</strong> Develop the next phase of the CPX campaign to bring awareness to the internal and external campus community about the power and possibilities of diversity, equity and inclusion.</td>
<td>Continue with the messaging and awareness-building campaign to create shared understanding of the Cal Poly Experience data, the university’s vision of inclusion, and the need for broad-based engagement and support among students, faculty, staff, alumni and community members.</td>
<td>Fall 2019 Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 7:</strong> Establish a Cal Poly DEI critical issues taskforce.</td>
<td>Create a taskforce group that can lift up the most acute DEI climate challenges and convene both internally and with key San Luis Obispo community leaders to develop 2-3 immediate and long-term action recommendations that can be seeded to support stronger inclusion dynamics for ethnic and racially diverse students, faculty and staff on campus and in the SLO community.</td>
<td>Winter 2020 Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Identify a DEI lead and team in every college and major administrative unit to represent their dean or VP in leading their plans development and activation.

• Establish a clear accountability process by holding deans and VP’s responsible for plan development and implementation.

• Establish a scorecard of indicators to track and measure progress over time.

• Implement a public forum every year, where deans and VP’s will give public updates about their plans and progress for the entire institutional community.

Recommendation 3.
Develop an Inclusive Excellence Innovation fund to support small and large grants to drive new DEI initiatives that focus on the university’s most difficult challenges.

• Align the innovation fund to the central DEI framework and challenges revealed through the CPX study.

• Develop the program in a way that prioritizes evidence-based interventions and collaboration.

• Have separate categories for students, faculty/staff and administrative units.

• Create small (one-time) as well as larger multi-year collaborative grants to spark a culture of innovation, looking for programs that can make a big difference if scaled.

• Seek out current programs that have a strong evidence base and for which this funding would allow them to grow and strengthen their proof of concept.

Recommendation 4.
Develop a multidimensional DEI training, curriculum and professional development program.

• Commit to establishing learning moments that will allow for growth and development of DEI leadership skills and abilities among students, faculty, staff and administrative leaders.

• Begin with an online introduction to everyday inclusion training for all students, faculty, staff and administrative leaders in November of 2019.

• Begin with a shared learning experience for all DEI leads with the goal of supporting their ability to lead their unit in the development of a high-caliber DEI activation plan—Cal Poly Inclusive Excellence Leadership Academy.

• Find creative ways to acknowledge DEI training as part of annual performance reviews, merit and promotion discussions, and hiring opportunities.

• Develop a DEI leadership certificate program for faculty, staff, students and senior leaders.

• Elevate previous discussions about strengthening how issues of power and privilege are introduced throughout the Cal Poly curricular experience.

• Look for spaces to pepper DEI learning into pre-existing orientations, first-year experiences, faculty development, training, and other relevant programs.

• Provide release time for faculty and staff to attend DEI training and learning, as part of their duties on campus.
Recommendation 5.
Invest in the campus DEI units to create a stronger, more evidence-based approach to driving high-impact diversity and inclusion outcomes.

- Invest in the campus-wide DEI infrastructure of units, committees and leaders who are doing the day-to-day work of DEI.

- Make targeted investments that ensure every college and major administrative unit has a funded DEI activation lead role at a comparable seniority, skill and level of scope necessary to lead on DEI work as a full-time diversity officer in this area.

- Examine all present DEI committees for sunsetting or re-chartering moving forward.

- Invest in the scale-up of infrastructure for the Cal Poly Scholars program, which is dramatically accelerating in size and scope. CPS program strategy should include an evidence-based retention and academic success program approach to support student retention, graduation and leadership development.

- Develop a major faculty diversity program as the university’s “big bet” to strengthen the racial and gender composition of the faculty, in addition to policy support and enhancements to support retention, promotion, and leadership succession.

- Establish a staff leadership development program, which helps diverse staff members to get broadening experiences, to support their readiness for more senior roles of leadership. This program, or one similar, might focus on merit, preparation, and the background and need for more diverse leadership on campus.

Recommendation 6.
Develop the next phase of the CPX awareness campaign to create a positive brand halo and engagement both internally and externally with issues of diversity.

- Develop the next phase of the Diverse and Inclusive CPX Experience Campaign to create awareness with alumni, community members and campus citizens—students, faculty and staff—to spark a greater understanding of the importance of developing a stronger culture of DEI at Cal Poly.

- Leverage CPX and brand study data to establish an appropriate messaging framework.

- Develop talking points for all leaders at Cal Poly regarding the next steps of the CPX initiative.

- Consider partnering with a multicultural advertising agency to drive development of the refreshed and DEI-strengthened Cal Poly brand.

- Conduct targeted outreach conversations with key board members, alumni, donors, corporate partners, and others.

- Convene an external CPX-DEI advisory of supportive corporate partners, alumni, community leaders, and relevant influencers to support the university’s strategies in this regard.

Recommendation 7.
Develop an Inclusive Excellence taskforce to identify 2-3 short- and long-term solutions for major challenges to on- and off-campus inclusion identified by the CPX Study.

- Establish a Cal Poly DEI Community Taskforce to identify strategies that can strengthen the inclusion dynamics of racial and ethnically diverse students, faculty and staff in the San Luis Obispo community.
This same committee might also take on other external challenges that could include affordable housing, childcare for faculty and staff with dependent children, and more.

- This group should identify 2-3 quick wins and 1-2 other significant, long-term solutions that the university can pursue over time (e.g., an affordable housing plan).

- Bring in the Local Economic Development Committee (LEDC), the Hourglass Project and Visit SLO CAL.
SECTION 8: CONCLUDING THOUGHTS AND NEXT STEPS

This report and its companion three technical reports that follow have outlined numerous research-based insights to better position Cal Poly to advance issues of diversity, equity and inclusion and to reap the rewards of doing so. Within this research, we offered insights about Cal Poly's campus climate as well as promising practices and recommendations in terms of building a clear framework of action, strengthening everyday inclusion skills for everyone on campus, driving awareness, and strengthening the campus-wide diversity, equity and inclusion infrastructure so that it can address both immediate and long-term goals.

While we offer this report to the Office of the President as a way of strengthening DEI work at Cal Poly, we do so in full acknowledgement that many individuals must become involved if Cal Poly is going to blossom into a more diverse, equitable and inclusive institution of learning and research. Part of the reason that the university has struggled in the area of diversity, equity and inclusion is that leadership has not developed a coordinated strategy to support change campus-wide.

As this discussion and other research has shown, educational institutions need a clear DEI infrastructure and plan to guide their work if it is to succeed. This formal structure is critical not only for building capacity in times of calm, but for helping leaders to respond well and swiftly in moments of crisis. Leadership has generally tended to move from issue to issue, crisis to crisis, with no big-picture strategy, compass or map for the journey. And while the university has made meaningful investments in their DEI infrastructure to date, created new programs like Cal Poly Scholars, and invested in important training programs, now is the time to redouble these efforts and accelerate them into the future. The students, faculty and staff of Cal Poly have spoken, and they are looking towards the university to take this stance.

**How to Leverage This Report**

As you consider these themes and recommendations and weigh your next actions, there are three particularly powerful ways to leverage this report:

1. *Engage the Cal Poly campus community* by downloading the campus’s DEI toolkits and resources, which include the executive summary of this report as well as guidance on how to host a dialogue session around these data and how they can be creatively leveraged to spark capacity on campus.

2. *Complete the personal reflection tools in the Cal Poly DEI Toolkit*, identifying key action steps that you can personally put into place to create a more inclusive Cal Poly.

3. *Provide the executive summary to alumni and other external stakeholders*, to let them know (beyond the headlines) how Cal Poly is moving forward to create a stronger and more powerful climate of diversity, equity and inclusion.

We were honored to work with the Cal Poly community in a series of conversations focused on how Cal Poly can become a higher-performing DEI institution. An essential next step will be to ensure that institutional leadership and the entire community is aware of and committed to building an inclusive, supportive campus environment where every member of the faculty, staff and student body is valued and encouraged to reach their highest potential in service to their strategic goals.

On behalf of The Center for Strategic Diversity Leadership & Social Innovation, thank you for the opportunity to serve your intentions and efforts as you take advantage of this critical time in your history to embrace the DEI journey and drive new impact in the world. We look forward to your next steps and are proud to be a friend to your work.
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