



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Assessment • Planning • Interventions

Missouri University of
Science and Technology

Campus Climate
Research Study
Executive Summary

September 2017



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Executive Summary

Introduction

Missouri S&T affirms that diversity and inclusion are crucial to the intellectual vitality of the campus community, and that they engender academic engagement where teaching, working, learning, and living take place in pluralistic communities of mutual respect. Free exchange of different ideas and viewpoints in supportive environments encourage students, faculty, and staff to develop the critical thinking and citizenship skills that will benefit them throughout their lives.

Missouri S&T also is committed to fostering a caring community that provides leadership for constructive participation in a diverse, multicultural world. As noted in Missouri S&T's mission statement, "Missouri S&T integrates education, research and application to create and convey knowledge that serves our state and helps solve the world's great challenges."¹ To better understand the campus climate, the senior administration at Missouri S&T recognized the need for a comprehensive tool that would provide campus climate metrics for the experiences and perceptions of its students, faculty, and staff. During the fall 2016 semester, Missouri S&T conducted a comprehensive survey of all students, faculty, and staff to develop a better understanding of the learning, living, and working environment on campus.

In May 2016, members of Missouri S&T worked with the University of Missouri System to form the Systemwide Climate Study Team (SCST). The SCST was composed of faculty, staff, and administrators across the entire University of Missouri System. Ultimately, the University of Missouri System contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to conduct a campus-wide study entitled "Missouri University of Science and Technology Climate for Learning, Living, and Working." Data gathered via reviews of relevant University of Missouri System literature and a campus-wide survey addressing the experiences and perceptions of various constituent groups will be presented at community forums, which will develop and complete two or three action items by spring 2018.

¹ <https://chancellor.mst.edu/mission/>

Project Design and Campus Involvement

The conceptual model used as the foundation for Missouri S&T's assessment of campus climate was developed by Smith et al. (1997) and modified by Rankin (2003). A power and privilege perspective informs the model, one grounded in critical theory, which establishes that power differentials, both earned and unearned, are central to all human interactions (Brookfield, 2005). Unearned power and privilege are associated with membership in dominant social groups (Johnson, 2005) and influence systems of differentiation that reproduce unequal outcomes. Missouri S&T's assessment was the result of a comprehensive process to identify the strengths and challenges of campus climate, with a specific focus on the distribution of power and privilege among differing social groups. This report provides an overview of the results of the campus-wide survey.

In total, 1,522 people completed the survey. In the end, the Missouri S&T's assessment was the result of a comprehensive process to identify the strengths and challenges of the campus climate at Missouri S&T.

Missouri S&T Participants

Missouri S&T community members completed 1,522 surveys for an overall response rate of 15%. Only surveys that were at least 50% completed were included in the final data set for analyses². Sixty-two percent ($n = 937$) of the sample were Undergraduate Students, 5% ($n = 68$) of the sample were Graduate Student/Professional Student, 1% ($n = 7$) were Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Residents³, 10% ($n = 114$) were Faculty members (including Administrator with Faculty Rank), fewer than 5 were Emeritus Faculty members, and 24% ($n = 364$) were Staff (including Administrator without Faculty Rank).⁴ Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic characteristics of survey respondents. The percentages offered in Table 1 are based on the numbers of respondents in the sample (n) for each demographic characteristic.⁵

²Thirty-one surveys were removed because the respondents did not complete at least 50% of the survey. Additional responses ($n = 2$) were removed because they were judged to have been problematic (i.e., the respondent did not complete the survey in good faith).

³Post-doctoral scholar/fellow/resident were included with Graduate Students for analyses.

⁴Emeritus faculty members were excluded for analyses.

⁵The total n for each demographic characteristic may differ as a result of missing data.

Table 1. Missouri S&T Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Subgroup	<i>n</i>	% of Sample
Position status	Undergraduate Student	937	61.6
	Graduate Student/Professional Student	68	4.5
	Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident	7	0.5
	Faculty (including Administrator with Faculty Rank)	144	9.5
	Emeritus Faculty	< 5	---
	Staff (including Administrator without Faculty Rank)	364	23.9
Gender identity	Woman	712	46.8
	Man	728	47.8
	Transpectrum	58	3.8
Racial/ethnic identity	American Indian/Alaska Native	< 5	---
	Asian/Asian American	66	4.3
	Black/African/African American	39	2.6
	Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@	23	1.5
	Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian	13	0.9
	Multiracial	82	5.4
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0.0
	White/European American	1,235	81.1
Sexual identity	LGBQ	147	10.5
	Heterosexual	1,259	89.5
Citizenship status	US Citizen	1,359	89.3
	Non-US Citizen	134	8.8
	Missing/Unknown	29	1.9
Disability status	Single Disability	128	8.4
	No Disability	1,321	86.8
	Multiple Disabilities	55	3.6
Religious/Spiritual Identity	Christian Religious/Spiritual Identity	868	57.0
	Other Religious/Spiritual Identity	62	4.1
	No Religious/Spiritual Identity	487	32.0
	Multiple Religious/Spiritual Identity	58	3.8

Note: The total *n* for each demographic characteristic may differ as a result of missing data.

Key Findings – Areas of Strength

1. High levels of comfort with the climate at Missouri S&T

Climate is defined as the “current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of employees and students concerning the access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and potential.”⁶ The level of comfort experienced by faculty, staff, and students is one indicator of campus climate.

- 75% ($n = 1,146$) of the survey respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate at Missouri S&T.
 - 78% ($n = 565$) of Men respondents and 75% ($n = 534$) of Women respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the overall climate on campus.
- 73% ($n = 369$) of Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents and Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate in their primary work areas.
- 83% ($n = 955$) of Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident and Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes.

2. Faculty Respondents – Positive attitudes about faculty work

- 69% ($n = 29$) of Non-Tenure-Track respondents felt that teaching was valued by Missouri S&T.
- 95% ($n = 39$) of Non-Tenure-Track respondents felt that research was valued by Missouri S&T.

⁶Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 264

3. Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents – Positive attitudes about staff work

- 86% ($n = 312$) of Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents thought their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance.
- 85% ($n = 306$) of Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents believed that they were given a reasonable time frame to complete assigned responsibilities.
- 81% ($n = 294$) of Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents thought that they had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.

4. Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident Respondents – Positive attitudes about academic experiences

The way students perceive and experience their campus climate influences their performance and success in college.⁷ Research also supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for improving learning outcomes.⁸ Attitudes toward academic pursuits are one indicator of campus climate.

Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident respondents

- 70% ($n = 697$) of Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident respondents felt valued by faculty in the classroom.
- 72% ($n = 717$) of Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident respondents felt valued by other students outside of the classroom.

⁷Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005

⁸Hale, 2004; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2004

Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident respondents

- 99% ($n = 74$) of Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident respondents thought that department staff members (other than advisors) responded to emails, calls, or voicemails in a prompt manner.
- 95% ($n = 70$) of Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident respondents felt that they received due credit for their research, writing, and publishing (e.g., authorship order in published articles).
- 91% ($n = 68$) of Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident respondents felt they had adequate access to their advisors.
- 85% ($n = 64$) of Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident respondents were satisfied with the quality of advising they have received from their departments.

Undergraduate and Graduate Student Respondents *Perceived Academic Success*

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the scale *Perceived Academic Success*, derived from Question 15 on the survey. Analyses using this scale revealed:

- A significant difference existed in the overall test for means for Undergraduate and Graduate students by racial identity, gender identity, sexual identity, disability status, income status, and housing status on *Perceived Academic Success*.
 - Transspectrum Graduate Student respondents have less *Perceived Academic Success* than Male Graduate Student respondents.
 - LGBTQ Undergraduate Students have less *Perceived Academic Success* than Heterosexual Undergraduate Students.
 - Undergraduate Student respondents that live in Campus Housing have greater *Perceived Academic Success* than Undergraduate Student respondents that live in Off-Campus Housing.

Key Findings – Opportunities for Improvement

1. Members of several constituent groups indicated that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

Several empirical studies reinforce the importance of the perception of non-discriminatory environments for positive learning and developmental outcomes.⁹ Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.¹⁰ The survey requested information on experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

- 18% ($n = 269$) of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.¹¹
 - 27% ($n = 72$) noted that the conduct was based on their gender/gender identity, 25% ($n = 67$) felt that it was based on their position status, 19% ($n = 50$) felt that it was based on their age, and 16% ($n = 42$) felt that it was based on their ethnicity.
- Significant differences emerged based on gender/gender identity, position status, age, and ethnicity:
 - 22% ($n = 211$) of Women respondents and 16% ($n = 77$) of Men respondents indicated that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.
 - 37% ($n = 51$) of Women respondents and 14% ($n = 16$) of Men respondents who indicated that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct indicated that the conduct was based on their gender identity.
 - 40% ($n = 57$) of Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents, 23% ($n = 85$) of Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents, 15% ($n = 11$) of Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident respondents, and 12% ($n = 116$) of

⁹Aguirre & Messineo, 1997; Flowers & Pascarella, 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001

¹⁰Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008; Waldo, 1999

¹¹The literature on microaggressions is clear that this type of conduct has a negative influence on people who experience the conduct, even if they feel at the time that it had no impact (Sue, 2010; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009).

Undergraduate Student respondents indicated that they had experienced this conduct.

- 44% ($n = 37$) of Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents, 32% ($n = 18$) Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents, fewer than five Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident respondents, and 8% ($n = 9$) of Undergraduate Student respondents thought that the conduct was based on their position status.
- 36% ($n = 37$) of respondents aged 35-44 Years, and 33% ($n = 51$) of respondents aged 45-54 Years indicated that they believed that they had experienced this conduct more so than respondents in all other age categories.
 - Of those respondents who noted that they had experienced this conduct, respondents aged 25-34 Years (45%, $n = 9$) offered that they thought the conduct was based on their age, more so than respondents in all other age categories.
- 34% ($n = 21$) of Black/African/African American or Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ respondents and 31% ($n = 5$) of Additional Respondents of Color believed they had experienced this conduct more so than all other ethnic/racial categories.
 - 57% ($n = 12$) of Black/African/African American or Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ respondents indicated that they thought the conduct was based on their ethnicity/race more so than respondents in all other ethnic/racial categories.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct at Missouri S&T. One hundred twenty-six respondents students, faculty, and staff contributed comments regarding these personal experiences. Three themes emerged from their narratives: (1) disrespectful intergroup dynamics, (2) diversity and inclusion related concerns, and (3) sexism. Respondents reported disrespect and exclusion with issues related to harassment or exclusionary conduct. Several respondents from

all constituent groups noted concerns regarding incidents of diversity and inclusion. For Undergraduate Student respondents, sexism emerged as a theme. Undergraduate Student respondents described a pervasive atmosphere where people not of a certain gender or sexual identity are ignored, where there are difficult and bullying males, and an overall sexist environment exists.

2. Several constituent groups indicated that they were less comfortable with the overall campus climate, workplace climate, and classroom climate.

Prior research on campus climate has focused on the experiences of faculty, staff, and students associated with historically underserved social/community/affinity groups (e.g., women, People of Color, people with disabilities, first-generation students, veterans).¹² Several groups at Missouri S&T indicated that they were less comfortable than their majority counterparts with the climates of the campus, workplace, and classroom.

Campus Climate

- By position status: Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents (17%, $n = 24$) were less likely to indicate they were “very comfortable” with the overall climate at Missouri S&T than Undergraduate Student respondents (29%, $n = 271$), Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident respondents (21%, $n = 16$), and Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents (23%, $n = 84$).
- By gender identity: Men respondents (30%, $n = 221$) were more likely to indicate they “very comfortable” with the overall climate at Missouri S&T than Women respondents (22%, $n = 153$).
- By racial identity: White respondents (27%, $n = 337$) were more likely to indicate that they were “very comfortable” with the overall climate at Missouri S&T than Respondents of Color and Multiracial respondents¹³ (20%, $n = 44$).

¹²Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hart & Fellabaum, 2008; Norris, 1992; Rankin, 2003; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart, 2008

¹³ Owing to low response numbers in many of the categories for racial identity, a new variable was created that combined all categories other than White (not including Multiracial); this new variable included two response categories: “People of Color and Multiracial” and “White.”

Workplace Climate

- By position status: Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents (35%, $n = 51$) were less likely to indicate that they were “very comfortable” with the workplace at Missouri S&T than Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents (36%, $n = 130$).
- By racial identity: White Employee respondents (39%, $n = 164$) were more likely to indicate that they were “very comfortable” with the climate in their primary work areas at Missouri S&T than Employees who identify as Respondents of Color or Multiracial respondents¹⁴ (20%, $n = 11$).

Classroom Climate

- By racial identity: White Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank and Students respondents (33%, $n = 308$) were more likely to indicate that they were “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes at Missouri S&T than Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank and Students who identified as Respondents of Color or Multiracial¹⁵ (24%, $n = 46$).
- By income status: Not-Low-Income Student respondents (33%, $n = 264$) were more likely to indicate that they were “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes at Missouri S&T than Low-Income Student respondents (27%, $n = 48$).

¹⁴ Owing to low response numbers in many of the categories for racial identity, a new variable was created that combined all categories other than White (not including Multiracial); this new variable included two response categories: “People of Color and Multiracial” and “White.”

¹⁵ Owing to low response numbers in many of the categories for racial identity, a new variable was created that combined all categories other than White (not including Multiracial); this new variable included two response categories: “People of Color and Multiracial” and “White.”

3. Employee Respondents – Challenges with work-life issues

- 69% ($n = 100$) of Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents and 54% ($n = 195$) of Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents had seriously considered leaving Missouri S&T in the past year.
- 34% ($n = 171$) of Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank and Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents observed unjust promotion, tenure, and/or reclassification, 24% ($n = 122$) observed unjust hiring, and 12% ($n = 61$) observed unfair/unjust disciplinary actions
- 58% ($n = 77$) of Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents and 41% ($n = 142$) of Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents noted that they believed that people who have children or elder care were burdened with balancing work and family responsibilities (e.g., evening and evenings programming, workload brought home, Missouri S&T breaks not scheduled with school district breaks).
- 67% ($n = 241$) of Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents felt that a hierarchy existed within staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than others.
- 21% ($n = 75$) of Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents felt that staff salaries were competitive.

4. Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank Respondents – Challenges with faculty work

- 66% ($n = 57$) of Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents believed that they performed more work to help students than did their colleagues.
- 51% ($n = 44$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents noted that they believed that they were burdened by service responsibilities (e.g., committee memberships, departmental/program work assignments) beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations.
- 37% ($n = 52$) of Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents believed that salaries for Tenure-Track faculty positions were competitive.

- 30% ($n = 36$) of Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents thought that child care benefits were competitive.
- 39% ($n = 16$) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt pressured to do extra work that was uncompensated.
- 36% ($n = 31$) of Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents believed that they were pressured to change their research/scholarship agenda to achieve tenure/promotion.

Thirty-nine Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents contributed comments regarding their employment-related experiences. The theme that emerged from these comments: A low sense of value and low morale. Narratives made mention of inclusion concerns, leadership and pay. Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents explained that the campus culture is racist, sexist, homophobic and ageist. Leadership is said to be out of touch and does not value staff skills and work. Staff pay was noted as a part of low morale and sense of value.

Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents were provided the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences regarding workplace climate. Twenty-two Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents elaborated on their survey responses related to their sense of value at Missouri S&T. The theme that emerged from their comments: A poor sense of value. Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents perceived a lack of value for service and teaching by the administration. This was stated in regard to the administration not addressing the needs of faculty, staff, and at risk/underserved students.

5. A small, but meaningful, percentage of respondents experienced unwanted sexual conduct.

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

- 10% ($n = 151$) respondents indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual conduct while at Missouri S&T.
 - 1% ($n = 17$) of respondents experienced relationship violence (e.g., ridiculed, controlling, hitting) while a member of the Missouri S&T community.
 - 2% ($n = 30$) of respondents experienced stalking (e.g., physical following, on social media, texting, phone calls) while a member of the Missouri S&T community.
 - 5% ($n = 75$) of respondents experienced unwanted sexual interaction (e.g., cat-calling, repeated sexual advances, sexual harassment) while a member of the Missouri S&T community.
 - 2% ($n = 29$) of respondents experienced unwanted sexual contact (e.g., fondling, rape, sexual assault, penetration without consent) while a member of the Missouri S&T community.
- Undergraduate Student respondents, Women respondents, Transspectrum respondents, LGBTQ respondents, and respondents with a Disability more often reported unwanted sexual experiences than their majority counterparts.
- Missouri S&T students, acquaintances/friends, strangers, and current or former dating/intimate partners were identified as sources of unwanted sexual experiences.
- The majority of respondents did not report the unwanted sexual experience.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on why they did not report unwanted sexual experiences. Two themes emerged among Missouri S&T's respondents who explained why they did not report unwanted sexual experiences. The primary rationale cited for not reporting these incidents was the perception that the behavior was not reportable. The second most common rationale provided for not reporting unwanted sexual experiences was a lack of faith in the reporting process at Missouri S&T. Respondents reported shame, fear of being blamed, desire for privacy, lack of faith in reporting and the perception that they would not be supported since they were under the influence of alcohol. Others indicated that "a report will get

ignored/accomplish nothing” and “there was no telling what they would have done to make it look like my fault” if they reported the conduct.

Conclusion

Missouri S&T climate findings¹⁶ were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.¹⁷ For example, 70% to 80% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” A similar percentage (75%) of Missouri S&T respondents reported that they were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate at Missouri S&T. Likewise, 20% to 25% of respondents in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At Missouri S&T, a slightly smaller percentage of respondents (18%) indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. The results also paralleled the findings of other climate studies of specific constituent groups offered in the literature.¹⁸

Missouri S&T’s climate assessment report provides baseline data on diversity and inclusion, and addresses Missouri S&T’s mission and goals. While the findings may guide decision-making in regard to policies and practices at Missouri S&T, it is important to note that the cultural fabric of any university and unique aspects of each campus’s environment must be taken into consideration when deliberating additional action items based on these findings. The climate assessment findings provide the Missouri S&T community with an opportunity to build upon its strengths and to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. Missouri S&T, with support from senior administrators and collaborative leadership, is in a prime position to actualize its commitment to promote an inclusive campus and to institute organizational structures that respond to the needs of its dynamic campus community.

¹⁶Additional findings disaggregated by position status and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.

¹⁷Rankin & Associates Consulting, 2015

¹⁸Guiffrida, Gouveia, Wall, & Seward, 2008; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2004; Hurtado & Ponjuan, 2005; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Sears, 2002; Settles, Cortina, Malley, & Stewart, 2006; Silverschanz et al., 2008; Yosso et al., 2009

References

- Aguirre, A., & Messineo, M. (1997). Racially motivated incidents in higher education: What do they say about the campus climate for minority students? *Equity & Excellence in Education, 30*(2), 26–30.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (1995). *The drama of diversity and democracy*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Bartz, A. E. (1988). *Basic statistical concepts*. New York: Macmillan.
- Bilimoria, D., & Stewart, A.J. (2009). "Don't ask, don't tell": The academic climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty in science and engineering. *National Women's Studies Association Journal, 21*(2), 85-103.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Campus life: In search of community*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Brookfield, S. D. (2005). *The Power of Critical Theory: Liberating Adult Learning and Teaching*. San Diego, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cantor, D., & Fisher, W. B. (2015). Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct: Rockville, MD: Westat.
- Chang, M.J. (2003). Racial differences in viewpoints about contemporary issues among entering college students: Fact or fiction? *NASPA Journal, 40*(5), 55-71.
- Chang, M. J., Denson, N., Sáenz, V., & Misa, K. (2006). The educational benefits of sustaining cross-racial interaction among undergraduates. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(3), 430–455.
- D'Augelli, A. R., & Hershberger, S. L. (1993). African American undergraduates on a predominantly White campus: Academic factors, social networks, and campus climate. *Journal of Negro Education, 62*(1), 67–81
- Flowers, L., & Pascarella, E. (1999). Cognitive effects of college racial composition on African American students after 3 years of college. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 669–677.
- Gardner, S. K. (2013). Women and faculty departures from a striving institution: Between a rock and a hard place. *The Review of Higher Education, 36*(3), 349-370.

- Griffin, K.A., Bennett, J.C., & Harris, J. (2011). Analyzing gender differences in Black faculty marginalization through a sequential mixed methods design. In S. Museus & K. Griffin, (Eds.), *New Directions for Institutional Research*, No. 151, (pp. 45-61). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Guiffrida, D., Gouveia, A., Wall, A., & Seward, D. (2008). Development and validation of the Need for Relatedness at College Questionnaire (*nRC-Q*). *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 251–261. doi: 10.1037/a0014051
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72, 330–365.
- Hale, F. W. (2004). What makes racial diversity work in higher education: Academic leaders present successful policies and strategies: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Harper, S., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2007(120), 7–24.
- Harper, S. R., & Quayle, S. J. (2004). Taking seriously the evidence regarding the effects of diversity on student learning in the college classroom: A call for faculty accountability. *UrbanEd*, 2(2), 43–47.
- Hart, J., & Fellabaum, J. (2008). Analyzing campus climate studies: Seeking to define and understand. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 222–234.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1998). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, vol. 26, no. 8. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Hurtado, S., & Ponjuan, L. (2005). Latino educational outcomes and the campus climate. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 4(3), 235–251. doi: 10.1177/1538192705276548
- Ingle, G. (2005). Will your campus diversity initiative work? *Academe*, 91(5), 6–10.
- Johnson, A. (2005). *Privilege, power, and difference* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Johnson, D. R., Soldner, M., Leonard, J., Alvarez, P., Inkelas, K. K., Rowan, K. H., & Longerbeam, S. (2007). Examining sense of belonging among first-year undergraduates from different racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(5), 525–542.

- Krebs, C., Lindquist, C., Berzofsky, M., Shook-Sa, B., Peterson, K., Planty, M., Langton, L., Stroop, J. (2016). Campus Climate Survey Validation Study Final Technical Report *Bureau of Justice Statistics Research and Development Series* (pp. 1-193).
- Maramba, D.C. & Museus, S.D. (2011). The utility of using mixed-methods and intersectionality approaches in conducting research on Filipino American students' experiences with the campus climate and on sense of belonging. In S. Museus & K. Griffin, (Eds.), *New Directions for Institutional Research*, No. 151, (pp. 93-101). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Milem, J., Chang, M., & Antonio, A. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research based perspective*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Navarro, R.L., Worthington, R.L., Hart, J., & Khairallah, T. (2009). Liberal and conservative ideology, experiences with harassment, and perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 2(2), 78-90.
- Nelson Laird, T. & Niskodé-Dossett, A.S. (2010). How gender and race moderate the effect of interaction across difference on student perceptions of the campus environment. *The Review of Higher Education*, 33(3), 333-356.
- Norris, W. P. (1992). Liberal attitudes and homophobic acts: the paradoxes of homosexual experience in a liberal institution. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 22(3), 81–120.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1980). Predicting freshman persistence and voluntary dropout decisions from a theoretical model. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 51(1), 60–75.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Diego: Jossey-Bass.
- Patton, L. D., & Catching, C. (2009). Teaching while Black: Narratives of African American student affairs faculty. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22(6), 713-728.
- Patton, L.D. (2011). Perspectives on identity, disclosure, and the campus environment among African American gay and bisexual men at one historically Black college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 52(1), 77-100.
- Pittman, C.T. (2010). Race and gender oppression in the classroom. The experiences of women faculty of color with White male students. *Teaching Sociology*, 38(3), 183-196.

- Pike, G. R., & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Relationships among structural diversity, informal peer interactions, and perceptions of the campus environment.” *Review of Higher Education*, 29(4), 425–450.
- Rankin & Associates Consulting. (2016, May 15). Recent clients and reports. Retrieved from <http://www.rankin-consulting.com/clients>
- Rankin, S. (2003). *Campus climate for LGBT people: A national perspective*. New York: NGLTF Policy Institute.
- Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of Student College Development*, 46(1), 43–61.
- Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2008). Transformational tapestry model: A comprehensive approach to transforming campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 262–274. doi: 10.1037/a0014018
- Sáenz, V. B., Nagi, H. N., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Factors influencing positive interactions across race for African American, Asian American, Latino, and White college students.” *Research in Higher Education*, 48(1), 1–38.
- Sears, J. T. (2002). The institutional climate for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual education faculty. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43(1), 11–37. doi: 10.1300/J082v43n01_02
- Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Malley, J., & Stewart, A. J. (2006). The climate for women in academic science: The good, the bad, and the changeable. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30(1), 47–58. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00261.x
- Silverschanz, P., Cortina, L., Konik, J., & Magley, V. (2008). Slurs, snubs, and queer jokes: Incidence and impact of heterosexist harassment in academia. *Sex Roles*, 58(3–4), 179–191. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9329-7
- Smith, D. (2009). *Diversity’s promise for higher education: Making it work*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Smith, D. G., Gerbick, G. L., Figueroa, M. A., Watkins, G. H., Levitan, T., Moore, L. C., Figueroa, B. (1997). *Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

- Smith, E., & Witt, S. L. (1993). A comparative study of occupational stress among African American and White faculty: A research note. *Research in Higher Education, 34*(2), 229–241.
- Solórzano, D. G., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. J. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*(1), 60-73.
- Strayhorn, T.L. (2013). Measuring race and gender difference in undergraduate perceptions of campus climate and intentions to leave college: An analysis in Black and White. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 50*(2), 115-132.
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Trochim, W. (2000). *The research methods knowledge base* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog.
- Tynes, B.M., Rose, C.A., & Markoe, S.L. (2013). Extending campus life to the internet: Social media, discrimination, and perceptions of racial climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 6*(2), 102-114.
- Turner, C. S. V., Myers, S. L., & Creswell, J. W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation: The case of faculty of color in the Midwest. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*(1), 27–59.
- Villalpando, O., & Delgado Bernal, D. (2002). A critical race theory analysis of barriers that impede the success of faculty of color. In W. A. Smith, P. G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education: Continuing challenges for the twenty-first century*. (pp. 243–270). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Waldo, C. (1999). Out on campus: Sexual orientation and academic climate in a university context. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 26*, 745–774. doi: 10.1023/A:1022110031745
- Whitt, E. J., Edison, M. I., Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Nora, A. (2001). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the second and third years of college. *The Journal of Higher Education, 72*(2), 172–204.
- Worthington, R. L., Navarro, R. L., Loewy, M., & Hart, J. L. (2008). Color-blind racial attitudes, social dominance orientation, racial-ethnic group membership and college students' perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education 1*(1), 8–19.

Yosso, T. J., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. G. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(4), 659–690, 781, 785–786.