

## Executive Summary

College campuses are complex social systems. They are defined by the relationships between faculty, staff, students, and alumni; bureaucratic procedures embodied by institutional policies; structural frameworks; institutional missions, visions, and core values; institutional history and traditions; and larger social contexts (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, Alma, & Allen, 1998; Smith, 2009).

Institutional missions suggest that higher education values multicultural awareness and understanding within an environment of mutual respect and cooperation. Academic communities expend a great deal of effort fostering climates that nurture their missions with the understanding that climate has a profound effect on the academic community's ability to excel in teaching, research, and scholarship. Institutional strategic plans advocate creating welcoming and inclusive climates that are grounded in respect, nurtured by dialogue, and evidenced by a pattern of civil interaction.

The climate on college campuses not only affects the creation of knowledge, but also affects members of the academic community who, in turn, contribute to the creation of the campus climate. Several national education association reports and higher education researchers advocate creating a more inclusive, welcoming climate on college campuses (AAC&U, 1995; Boyer, 1990; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Ingle, 2005; Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005).

Missouri University of Science and Technology (Missouri S&T) has a long history of supporting diversity initiatives<sup>1</sup> as evidenced by the college's support and commitment to this project. This project grew out of a Report to the Chancellor on Diversity and Inclusion commissioned in 2009 by John F. Carney III, former Missouri S&T chancellor. The Chancellor's Committee on Diversity and Inclusion CCDI made several recommendations, including recommending that a campus climate assessment should be developed and administered as a long term commitment of

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information on Missouri S&T diversity initiatives see <http://chancellor.mst.edu/cacaarr/history/> and <http://hraadi.mst.edu/hr/>.

the Chancellor's Office.<sup>2</sup> In 2010 a second Chancellor's Committee on Diversity and Inclusion (CCDI-II) was formed as a permanent committee. That committee was charged with starting the implementation of the recommendations of the first CCDI including developing, designing and implementing a campus climate assessment and reporting back to the chancellor on the findings. Working with the chancellor and UMSL, the committee began the search for a consulting firm that conducts climate surveys in higher education. Rankin & Associates (R&A) was identified as a leader in conducting multiple identity studies in higher education. R&A presented a proposal to the committee which was accepted and Missouri S&T contracted with R&A to facilitate a university-wide climate assessment. The CCDI-II served as the Climate Study Working Group (CSWG) and worked with R&A to design and administer the instrument.

Because of the inherent complexity of the topic of diversity, it is crucial to examine the multiple dimensions of diversity in higher education. The conceptual model used as the foundation for this assessment of campus climate was developed by Smith (1999) and modified by Rankin (2002). Informed by previous work of R&A, the CSWG developed the final survey instrument template that was administered at Missouri S&T in spring 2012.

The final climate survey contained 108 questions and was designed for respondents to provide information about their personal experiences with regard to climate issues and work-life experiences, their perceptions of the campus climate, and their perceptions of institutional actions (e.g., administrative policies and academic initiatives regarding climate issues and concerns) on campus. All members of the campus community (e.g., students, faculty, and staff) were invited to participate in the survey.

This report provides an overview of the results of the campus-wide survey. Qualitative comments offered by participants are provided throughout the narrative. Appendix A contains the commentary offered by respondents for the last two open-ended questions that were not linked to any particular quantitative question. A summary of the findings, presented in bullet form below, suggests that while Missouri S&T has several challenges with regard to diversity

---

<sup>2</sup> Members of the campus community can view the entire report at:  
[http://chancellor.mst.edu/media/administrative/chancellor/secure/Final\\_Report\\_to\\_Chancellor-Diversity\\_and\\_Inclusion\\_FINAL\\_EDITED\\_VERSION\\_V3\\_April\\_2010.pdf](http://chancellor.mst.edu/media/administrative/chancellor/secure/Final_Report_to_Chancellor-Diversity_and_Inclusion_FINAL_EDITED_VERSION_V3_April_2010.pdf)

issues, these challenges are found in higher education institutions across the country (Rankin & Associates, 2012).

### Sample Demographics

Of the 8,559 Missouri S&T community members, 2,717 completed surveys for a response rate of 32%. The sample included:

- 1,568 (58%) undergraduate students, 405 (15%) graduate students, 8 post-doctoral fellows (<1%), 38 (1%) tenure-track faculty, 108 (4%) tenured faculty, 66 (2%) non-tenure track faculty, 204 (8%) staff exempt, 281 (10%) staff non-exempt, and 16 (1%) administrators
- 800 (29%) People of Color;<sup>3</sup> 1,795 (66%) White respondents
- 317 respondents (12%) with self-identified disabilities or conditions that affect major life activities
- 2,327 (88%) heterosexual people, and 111 (4%) people who identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or queer; 18 respondents (1%) who were questioning their sexuality, and 156 people (6%) who identified as asexual.
- 1,035 (38%) women; 1,655 (61%) men; 5 (1%) transgender<sup>4</sup>
- 58% of respondents (n = 1,576) were affiliated with a Christian denomination

---

<sup>3</sup> While recognizing the vastly different experiences of people of various racial identities (e.g., Chicano(a) versus African-American or Latino(a) versus Asian-American), and those experiences within these identity categories (e.g., Hmong versus Chinese), Rankin and Associates found it necessary to collapse some of these categories to conduct the analyses due to the small numbers of respondents in the individual categories. For demographics by individual racial categories, please see Figure 13 (p. 32).

<sup>4</sup> “Transgender” refers to identity that does not conform unambiguously to conventional notions of male or female gender, but combines or moves between these (Oxford English Dictionary 2003). OED Online. March 2004. Oxford UW Press. Feb. 17, 2006 <<http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/00319380>>.

## Quantitative Findings<sup>5</sup>

### Personal Experiences with Campus Climate<sup>6</sup>

- **Some of respondents believed<sup>7</sup> they had personally experienced offensive, hostile, or intimidating conduct that interfered unreasonably with their ability to work or learn on campus (hereafter referred to as harassment)<sup>8</sup> within the past year. Respondents most often indicated the harassment was based on their gender, position at Missouri S&T, and discipline of study.**

14% of respondents (n = 365) believed they had personally experienced offensive, hostile, or intimidating conduct that interfered unreasonably with their ability to work or learn on campus. Of the 14% of respondents who experienced this conduct the following was reported:

- 25% of respondents who experienced such behavior “very often” or “often” (n = 74) said the conduct was based on their gender. Others said they “very often” or “often” experienced such conduct based on their position (24%, n = 70), discipline of study (22%, n = 62), or age (18%, n = 52).
- Manners in which respondents experienced harassment included: 50% (n = 182) felt deliberately ignored or excluded; 40% (n = 144) felt intimidated/bullied, 36% (n = 130) felt isolated or left out, and 28% (n=101) were the target of derogatory verbal remarks.
- Compared with 12% of White people (n = 156), 17% of People of Color (n = 108) believed they had personally experienced such conduct.
- Of Respondents of Color who reported experiencing this conduct, 58% (n = 63) stated it was because of their race.
- Compared with 11% of men (n = 176), 17% of women (n = 178) believed they had personally experienced such conduct.
- Of the women who believed they had experienced this conduct, 78% (n = 111) stated it was because of their gender.

---

<sup>5</sup> The quantitative statistics reflect the n’s and percentages of participants who responded to each question. The percentages may not add to 100 and the n’s may not add to the total N for the question because respondents in some instances could mark more than one response. There are also sub-questions within sections where participants only chose those response choices that were salient for them. For example, of the 14% of respondents (n = 365) who believed that they had experienced harassment, 25% (n = 74) felt that it was based on their gender.

<sup>6</sup> Listings in the narrative are those responses with the greatest percentages. For a complete listing of the results, the reader is directed to the tables in the narrative and Appendix B.

<sup>7</sup> The modifier “believe(d)” is used throughout the report to indicate the respondents’ perceived experiences. This modifier is not meant in any way to diminish those experiences.

<sup>8</sup> Under the United States Code Title 18 Subsection 1514(c)1, harassment is defined as “a course of conduct directed at a specific person that causes substantial emotional distress in such a person and serves no legitimate purpose” (<http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/vii.html>). In higher education institutions, legal issues discussions define harassment as any conduct that has unreasonably interfered with one’s ability to work or learn on campus. The questions used in this survey to uncover participants’ personal and observed experiences with harassment were designed using these definitions.

- Compared with 13% of heterosexual respondents (n = 294), 21% of LGBTQ respondents (n = 23) believed they had personally experienced such conduct.
- In response to experiencing harassment, 53% of participants (n = 194) reported that they were angry, 42% (n = 152) told a friend, 36% (n = 130) felt embarrassed, and 35% (n = 127) did nothing.
- While 6% of participants (n = 23) reported that they had made complaints to campus officials, 14% (n = 50) did not know where to go, and 15% (n = 55) didn't report it for fear their complaints would not be taken seriously.
- **A small percentage of respondents believed they had been sexually assaulted.**
  - 76 respondents (3%) believed that they had been sexually assaulted during their time at Missouri S&T.
    - Of these respondents, 44 respondents (58%) believed they had been assaulted off-campus and 37 respondents (49%) believed they had been assaulted on campus.
  - Of the 76 respondents who believed that they were sexually assaulted, 63 were students, 64 were women, 58 were White, and 59 were heterosexual.
  - The alleged perpetrators of the perceived sexual assault were most often reported as students (n = 47; 62%).

#### Satisfaction with Missouri S&T

- **70% of Missouri S&T faculty and staff (n = 499) were “highly satisfied” or “satisfied” with their jobs at Missouri S&T. 58% (n = 413) were “highly satisfied” or “satisfied” with the way their careers have progressed at Missouri S&T.**
  - Exempt staff and administrators were slightly more satisfied with their jobs, and the way their careers had progressed than were faculty members and non-exempt staff.
  - LGBTQ respondents were least satisfied with their jobs at Missouri S&T.
  - 35% (n = 252) of faculty and staff respondents were “highly satisfied” or “satisfied” with their compensation as compared to that of their colleagues.
  - 79% (n = 526) were “highly satisfied” or “satisfied” with their access to health benefits.
- **Students thought very positively about their academic experiences at Missouri S&T.**
  - 72% of students felt they were performing at their full academic potential.
  - 77% were satisfied with their academic experience at Missouri S&T.
  - 80% were satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling at Missouri S&T.
  - 59% felt they performed academically as well as they had anticipated they would.
  - The majority of students felt their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth and interest in ideas (81%) and that their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to Missouri S&T (77%).
  - 94% intended to graduate from Missouri S&T; 7% were considering transferring to another institution.
  - 67% of students (n = 1,299) felt valued by faculty in the classroom.
  - 59% (n = 1,131) felt valued by other students in the classroom.

- Many students thought that employees (65%, n = 1,262) and administrators (59%, n = 1,134) were genuinely concerned with their welfare.
- 71% of students (n = 1,371) had faculty they perceive as role models, and 55% (n = 1,046) had staff/administrators they perceived as role models.
- **16% of all respondents (n = 419) have considered leaving Missouri S&T.**
  - Among employees, 28% of men (n = 86) and 25% of women (n = 103) thought of leaving the institution.
  - 29% of employees of color (n = 54) and 26% of White employees (n = 121) have seriously considered leaving Missouri S&T.
  - 28% of LGBQ employees (n = 7) and 26% of heterosexual respondents (n = 164) have seriously thought of leaving the institution.
  - Among students 9% of women (n = 54) and 12% of men (n = 162) considered leaving the University.
  - 15% of Students of Color (n = 87) and 10% of White students (n = 127) thought of leaving Missouri S&T, as did 19% of LGBQ students (n = 16) and 11% of heterosexual students (n = 177).

### Perceptions of Campus Climate

- **Most respondents indicated that they were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the overall climate at Missouri S&T (82%, n = 2,210), in their departments or work units (80%, n = 2,156), and in their classes (83%, n = 1,813). The figures in the narrative show slight disparities based on race, disability, and sexual orientation.**
- **Almost one-quarter of all respondents indicated that they were aware of or believed they had observed harassment on campus within the past year. The perceived harassment was most often based on gender expression and sexual orientation. LGBQ respondents were more aware of perceived harassment.**
  - 25% of the participants (n = 665) believed that they had observed conduct on campus that created an offensive, hostile, or intimidating working or learning environment.
  - Most of the observed harassment was based on gender expression (25%, n = 166), sexual orientation (23%, n = 154), gender (20%, n = 133), ethnicity (17%, n = 115), country of origin (17%, n = 111), and race (15%, n = 100).
  - Compared with 25% of White respondents (n = 446), 24% of Respondents of Color (n = 188) believed they had observed or personally been made aware of such conduct.
  - Compared with 24% of heterosexuals (n = 547), 42% of LGBQ (n = 47) believed they had observed or personally been made aware of such conduct.
  - 24% of students (n = 468), 27% of non-exempt staff (n = 74), 25% of faculty (n = 54) and 29% of exempt staff/administrators (n = 63) believed they had observed such conduct.

- Respondents most often believed they had observed or were made aware of this conduct in the form of someone subjected to derogatory remarks (51%), someone being deliberately ignored or excluded (31%), someone being isolated or left out (24%), or being intimidated/bullied (21%).
- These incidents were reported to an employee or official only 3% of the time (n = 19).
- **Faculty and Staff Work-Life Issues and Wellness**
  - 31% of all faculty and staff respondents (n = 224) felt that salary determinations were fair, and 31% (n = 218) felt salary determinations were clear.
  - More than half of faculty and staff respondents thought the university understood the value of a diverse faculty (65%, n = 460) and staff (61%, n = 434).
  - 82% (n = 589) of all faculty and staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they were comfortable asking questions about performance expectations.
  - 76% (n = 544) felt their colleagues treated them with the same respect as other colleagues.
  - 74% (n = 521) thought their colleagues had similar expectations of them as other colleagues/co-workers.
  - More than half of all faculty and staff respondents (64%, n = 452) felt comfortable taking leave that they were entitled to without fear that it might affect their jobs/careers.
  - 29% percent (n = 205) thought there were many unwritten rules concerning how one was expected to interact with colleagues in their work units.
  - Slightly less than half of all faculty respondents felt their teaching expectations and research requirements were similar to those of their colleagues in other divisions (43%, n = 92), and 50% (n = 107) felt their research interests were valued by their colleagues.
  - Less than half of all faculty respondents felt the tenure processes (42%, n = 89) or promotion processes (40%, n = 85) were clear. Less than half felt the tenure standards (46%, n = 97) or promotion standards (45%, n = 96) were reasonable.
  - 50% of faculty (n = 105) believed their colleagues included them in opportunities that will help their careers as much as they do others in their positions.
  - Employee respondents felt that staff (11%, n = 80) and faculty 9% (n = 62) who have children were considered less committed to their careers.
  - Faculty and staff felt that staff (11%, n = 78) and faculty (8%, n = 58) who do not have children were often burdened with work responsibilities.
  - Faculty and staff believed they had support from decision makers/supervisors (55%, n = 394) and colleagues/co-workers (61%, n = 429) who supported their career advancement.
- **Some faculty and staff respondents believed that they had observed discriminatory employment practices and indicated that they were most often based on Missouri S&T status and gender.**
  - 20% of faculty and staff respondents (n = 142) believed that they had observed discriminatory hiring.

- 13% (n = 94) believed that they had observed discriminatory employment-related disciplinary actions at Missouri S&T (up to and including dismissal).
- 26% (n = 187) believed that they had observed discriminatory promotion practices.
- **Students expressed financial concerns.**
  - 50% of student respondents (n= 980) indicated they experienced financial hardship at Missouri S&T. Of those students, 77% (n = 750) had difficulty affording tuition, 50% (n = 486) had difficulty purchasing their books, and 27% (n = 264) had difficulty participating in social events.
  - Sixty percent of student respondents used loans to pay for college, while 60% earned academic scholarships, 54% had loans, and 46% had family contributions.
  - 3% (n = 61) used their credit cards to pay for college.
- **With regard to campus accessibility, most respondents did not know how accessible most aspects of campus were.**
  - Respondents who offered responses reported that the campus was “fully accessible” for people with mobility and visual impairment (63%).
  - Respondents also reported that elevators (63%), the library (62%), walkways and pedestrian paths (59%), restrooms (57%), Missouri S&T Website (52%), and classroom buildings (52%) were also “fully accessible.”

### *Institutional Actions*

- More than half of all faculty and staff thought providing more flexibility for promotion for faculty (58%, n = 387) and staff (82%, n = 555) would positively affect the campus climate.
- They also thought that providing diversity training for staff (79%, n = 534) and faculty (73%, n = 487) would positively affect the climate.
- Faculty and staff were in favor of providing, promoting and improving access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment (81%, n = 542); providing mentorship for new faculty (79%, n = 525); providing mentorship for new staff (88%, n = 594); and providing a clear and fair process to resolve conflicts (90%, n = 600).
- More than half of faculty and staff respondents thought increasing the diversity of the faculty and staff (76%, n = 508), the administration (76%, n = 503), and the student body (74%, n = 484) would positively affect the climate.
- 70% (n = 462) of faculty and staff thought increasing funding to support efforts to change campus climate would positively affect the climate.
- Students felt that providing diversity training for all students (76%, n = 1,358), staff (81%, n = 1,442), and faculty (82%, n = 1,445) would positively affect the climate.
- Students also thought increasing the diversity of the faculty and staff (72%, n = 1,281) and student body (77%, n = 1,064) would positively affect the climate.
- 82% of students (n = 1,441) were in favor of providing a person to address student complaints of classroom inequity.

- Many students believed increasing opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among students (82%, n = 1,453) and between faculty, staff, and students (82%, n = 1,438) would positively affect the climate.
- Students also thought incorporating issues of diversity and cross-cultural competence more effectively into the curriculum (72%, n = 1,265) and providing more effective faculty mentorship of students (86%, n = 1,504) would positively affect the climate at Missouri S&T.

### UM System Support of Missouri S&T

- 38% (n = 982) of respondents were “very satisfied”/“satisfied” with the System’s support of Missouri S&T. 38% (n = 982) were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 25% (n = 658) were “dissatisfied”/“very dissatisfied” with the System’s support of Missouri S&T.

## **Qualitative Findings**

Out of the 2,717 surveys received at Missouri S&T, several respondents contributed remarks to one or more of the open-ended questions. No respondents commented on all open-ended questions. Respondents included undergraduate and graduate students, as well as faculty, exempt staff/administrators, and non-exempt staff. The open-ended questions asked whether their campus experiences differed from experiences in the surrounding community, for general elaboration on personal experiences and thoughts<sup>9</sup>, and to comment on their perceptions of the level of support that Missouri S&T receives from the University of Missouri System.

One of the open-ended items queried, “Are your experiences on campus different than those you experience in the community surrounding campus? If so, how are these experiences different and where do they occur?” One hundred ninety-seven (197) people answered the question. Several respondents indicated that they had similar experiences on campus and in the surrounding area. Some respondents felt they were treated more respectfully off-campus, where individuals do not “care about your job classification.” The majority of respondents who had differing experiences at Missouri S&T and in Rolla said the university atmosphere was more “tolerant,” “warm,” and “accepting of people’s differences.” A number of women respondents commented that they face more harassment and/or discrimination on campus than in the surrounding area.

---

<sup>9</sup> The complete survey is available in Appendix C.

Another of the open-ended items allowed respondents to elaborate on any of their survey responses, further describe their experiences, or offer additional thoughts about climate issues. Nine hundred eight (908) respondents offered a wide range of comments. Several respondents felt that Missouri S&T boasted a welcoming and inclusive atmosphere which needed little, if any, improvement. Some respondents were worried about reverse discrimination, where majority candidates were overlooked for jobs and scholarship opportunities. Additionally, quite a number of students lamented that attention to diversity may have contributed to the number of teaching assistants whose primary languages were other than English. Respondents suggested that women students, faculty, and staff faced a great deal of harassment and discrimination on campus, and suggested that increasing the number of women students and women in positions of power (e.g., the new chancellor, women in full professorships and administrative leadership positions) might offer partial solutions. Individuals also commented on the need for education and awareness around issues concerning LGBTQ and transgender people. Several people touched on employee compensation, the lack of pay raises in recent years, and the perception that Missouri S&T faculty and staff were the lowest paid in the system. Finally, many respondents described “caste systems” at play on campus, where “lower level” workers were mistreated by those faculty and staff who held more highly regarded positions and where non-STEM fields were routinely marginalized.

The last survey item asked respondents to further elaborate on their satisfaction with the support Missouri S&T receives from the University of Missouri System. Four hundred sixty-seven (467) respondents shared their thoughts. Several respondents indicate that they were not aware of how the University of Missouri System supports Missouri S&T. Again, survey participants lamented that S&T employees were the lowest paid in the System. Several individuals felt there existed little cooperation or coordination among the System campuses. Many other respondents believed that S&T receives less than its fair share of System resources. Comments that support this theme include “[S&T is the] red-headed, bastard step-child”; “[the] power base for the system resides in Columbia”; and “We may not be Mizzou, but we are important too!”

In addition, a few respondents commented on the survey instrument and the project process. Some applauded the University’s participation in the assessment and wanted to make certain that

the results were made public and used to better Missouri S&T. Several respondents insisted that Missouri S&T leadership share with its constituents the climate assessment findings and initiatives instituted as a result of the survey.

### **Summary of Strengths and Potential Challenges**

Three strengths/successes emerged from the quantitative data analysis. These findings should be noted and credited. First, 82% (n = 2,210) of respondents reported that they were very comfortable/comfortable with the overall climate at Missouri S&T, and 80% (n = 2,156) with their department or work unit. Eighty-three percent (n = 1,813) of faculty and students were very comfortable/comfortable with the classroom climate. Second, students felt and thought very positively about their academic experiences at Missouri S&T. The majority of all students felt: they were performing up to their full academic potential (72%); satisfied with their academic experience at Missouri S&T (77%); satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling at Missouri S&T (80%); they performed academically as well as they had anticipated they would (59%); their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth and interest in ideas (81%); their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to Missouri S&T (77%); and, they intended to graduate from Missouri S&T (94%). Furthermore, the majority of students felt valued by faculty (67%) and students (59%) in the classroom. Third, more than half of all employee respondents were highly satisfied or satisfied with their jobs at Missouri S&T (70%, n = 499) and with how their careers have progressed (58%, n = 413). Finally, many faculty and staff respondents expressed positive attitudes about work-life issues and wellness. These quantitative results were also supported by various voices offered in response to the open-ended questions. The respondents' voices echoed the positive experiences with the Missouri S&T campus climate. However, disparities existed where respondents from under-served constituent groups typically reported less satisfaction and comfort with the overall campus climate, their department/work unit climate, and their classroom climate at Missouri S&T than their majority counterpart respondents. These underrepresented groups include People of Color, women, LGBTQ people, and staff members.

Four potential challenges were also revealed in the assessment. The first challenge relates to racial tension. A larger proportion of Respondents of Color (17%, n = 108) reported personally experiencing exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (harassing behavior) that has interfered with their ability to work or learn at Missouri S&T when compared to their White counterparts (12%, n = 156). Of Respondents of Color who experienced harassment, 58% (n = 63) said the harassment was based on their race.

People of Color were slightly less comfortable than White respondents with the overall climate for diversity at Missouri S&T, the climate in their departments/work units, and the climate in their classes. A further evaluation of the classroom climate indicates that while 80% of White students thought the classroom climate was welcoming based on race, 71% of Students of Color agreed, indicating a difference in perceptions.

Finally, 29% of Employees of Color (n = 54), in comparison with 26% of White employees (n = 121), have seriously considered leaving Missouri S&T. Among students, 15% of Students of Color (n = 87) and 10% of White students (n = 127) thought of leaving Missouri S&T.

The experiences shared by LGBQ respondents' calls attention to the second challenge at Missouri S&T: homophobia and heterosexism. LGBQ respondents (21%) were more likely than heterosexual respondents (13%) to believe that they had experienced harassment. Of those who believed they had experienced this type of conduct, 52% (n = 12) of LGBQ respondents versus 13% (n = 37) of heterosexual respondents indicated that this conduct was based on sexual orientation. This means LGBQ respondents were four times as likely as their heterosexual counterparts to attribute the harassment to their sexual identity. Over fifteen percent more LGBQ respondents (42%) believed they had observed offensive, hostile, exclusionary, or intimidating conduct than did heterosexual respondents (24%), and of all respondents who observed misconduct, many believed it was based on sexual orientation (23%, n = 154).

Heterosexual respondents were more comfortable than LGBQ respondents with the overall climate for diversity at Missouri S&T, the climate in their departments/work units, and the climate in their classes. LGBQ employee respondents (38%) were less likely than heterosexual

respondents (52%) to believe the workplace climate was welcoming based on sexual orientation. LGBQ employee respondents were least satisfied with their jobs and the way their careers have progressed at Missouri S&T than other demographic groups. Finally, 28% of LGBQ employees, compared to 26% of heterosexual employee respondents, have seriously thought of leaving the institution, with 19% of LGBQ students and 11% of heterosexual students reporting the same consideration.

A third challenge is gender disparities experienced or perceived between women and men. Women (17%, n = 178) were more likely than men (11%, n = 176) to experience harassment; women were also more likely than men to indicate the harassment was based on gender (78% compared with 40%, respectively). Gender expression (25%) and gender (20%) were among the top three bases for observed harassment for all respondents. Women employees (21%) were slightly more likely than men (19%) to believe they had observed discriminatory hiring practices and discriminatory promotion/tenure/reappointment/reclassification practices (28%, 24%, respectively). Gender was consistently cited as one of the top three observed reasons for employment discrimination during hiring (27%), employment-related disciplinary action (19%), and discriminatory practices related to promotion/tenure/reappointment/reclassification (26%). Women were also less likely than men to perceive their workplace climate as welcoming (66%, 70%, respectively).

With regard to faculty and staff attitudes about work-life issues, women employees: felt they have to work harder than their colleagues do in order to be perceived as legitimate and to achieve the same recognition; believed that their colleagues don't include them in opportunities that will help their career as much as they do others in their position; and, felt that staff who have children are considered by Missouri S&T to be less committed to their jobs/careers.

The final challenge relates to mistreatment of Missouri S&T members based on university position and differential treatment among different types/categories of university positions. Of the 365 respondents (14%) who experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct, position at Missouri S&T (24%, n = 70) was cited as the primary basis for the mistreatment. Faculty (25%) personally experienced this mistreatment at higher rates than

students and staff. Notably, of the 20% of staff who indicated that they experiences harassment, more than 75% of staff members indicated that it was due to their position as a staff member. University position was also one of the top two most often cited bases for observed discriminatory hiring (23%); employment-related disciplinary actions, up to and including dismissal (20%); and discriminatory practices related to promotion/tenure/reappointment/reclassification at Missouri S&T (26%).

Faculty and non-exempt staff members were less satisfied with their jobs and how their careers have progressed than exempt staff/administrators. Non-exempt staff were also less satisfied with their compensation compared to their peers at Missouri S&T, while faculty members and exempt staff/administrators were more likely than non-exempt staff to have seriously considered leaving Missouri S&T because of the climate.

What do the results of this study suggest? At minimum, they add additional empirical data to the current knowledge base and provide more information on the experiences and perceptions for several sub-populations in the campus community. The findings parallel those from investigations at other Research Universities<sup>10</sup>. A more interesting question is, given that there is some structure in place to address diversity issues on campus, *how effective have the campus's efforts been in positively shaping and directing campus climate with respect to diversity?*

It was the intention of the CSWG that the results be used to identify specific strategies to address the challenges facing their community and to support positive initiatives on campus. The recommended next steps include the CSWG and other campus constituent groups using the results of the internal assessment to help to lay the groundwork for future initiatives.

---

<sup>10</sup> *Research University* is a classification offered by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.