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Climate In Higher Education

Assessing Campus Climate

What is it?

• Campus Climate is a construct

Definition?

• Current attitudes, behaviors, and standards and practices of employees and students of an institution

How is it measured?

• Personal Experiences
• Perceptions
• Institutional Efforts
Campus Climate & Students

How students experience their campus environment influences both learning and developmental outcomes.¹

Discriminatory environments have a negative effect on student learning.²

Research supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty on enhancing learning outcomes.³

² Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Hagedron, 1999; Feagin, Vera & Imani, 1996; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005
The personal and professional development of employees including faculty members, administrators, and staff members are impacted by campus climate.\(^1\)

Faculty members who judge their campus climate more positively are more likely to feel personally supported and perceive their work unit as more supportive.\(^2\)

Research underscores the relationships between (1) workplace discrimination and negative job/career attitudes and (2) workplace encounters with prejudice and lower health/well-being.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Settles, Cortina, Malley, and Stewart, 2006; Gardner, S. 2013; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, J. 2009

\(^2\) Costello, 2012; Sears, 2002; Kaminski, & Geisler, 2012; Griffin, Pérez, Holmes, & Mayo, 2010

\(^3\) Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2007; Waldo, 1999
Climate Matters
Student Activism in 2016
Climate Matters

Student Activism in 2016
While the demands vary by institutional context, a qualitative analysis reveals similar themes across the 76 institutions and organizations (representing 73 U.S. colleges and universities, three Canadian universities, one coalition of universities and one consortium of Atlanta HBCUs.) Chessman & Wayt explore these overarching themes in an effort to provide collective insight into what is important to today’s students in the heated context of racial or other bias-related incidents on college and university campuses.

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016; http://www.thedemands.org/
Seven Major Themes

- Policy (91%)
- Leadership (89%)
- Resources (88%)
- Increased Diversity (86%)
- Training (71%)
- Curriculum (68%)
- Support (61%)

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016; http://www.thedemands.org/
Responses to Unwelcoming Campus Climates

What are students’ behavioral responses?
30% of respondents have seriously considered leaving their institution due to the challenging climate.

What do students offer as the main reason for their departure?

Source: R&A, 2015; Rankin, et al., 2010; Strayhorn, 2012
Suicidal Ideation/Self-Harm

Experienced Victimization

Lack of Social Support

Feelings of hopelessness

Suicidal Ideation or Self-Harm

Source: Liu & Mustanski 2012
Projected Outcomes

KUMC will add to their knowledge base with regard to how constituent groups currently feel about their particular campus climate and how the community responds to them (e.g., work-life issues, curricular integration, inter-group/intra-group relations, respect issues).

KUMC will use the results of the assessment to inform current/on-going work.
Setting the Context for Beginning the Work

Examine the Research
- Review work already completed

Preparation
- Readiness of each campus

Assessment
- Examine the climate

Follow-up
- Building on the successes and addressing the challenges
Transformational Tapestry Model©
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Project Overview

Phase I
• Review of Institutional Data/Focus Groups

Phase II
• Assessment Tool Development and Implementation

Phase III
• Data Analysis

Phase IV
• Final Report and Presentation
In collaboration with R&A, the Campus Climate Steering Committee (CCSC; comprised of students, faculty, staff, and administrators) was created.

23 focus groups were conducted at KU’s campus by R&A (212 participants: 63 students; 130 faculty, staff, or administrators; 19 didn’t identity position status)

Data from the focus groups informed the CCSC and R&A in constructing questions for the campus-wide survey.
Phase II
Spring/Summer 2016

Meetings with the CCSC to develop the survey instrument

The CCSC reviewed multiple drafts of the survey and approved the final survey instrument.

The final survey was distributed to the entire KUMC community (students, faculty, staff, and administrators) via an invitation from President Kathleen Murray.
Instrument/Sample

Final instrument
- 112 questions and additional space for respondents to provide commentary
- On-line or paper & pencil options

Sample = Population
- All community members were invited to take the survey
- The survey was available from September 13 to October 14, 2016
Survey Limitations

- Self-selection bias
- Response rates
- Social desirability
- Caution in generalizing results for constituent groups with low response rates
Method Limitation

Data were not reported for groups of fewer than 5 individuals where identity could be compromised.

Instead, small groups were combined to eliminate possibility of identifying individuals.
Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted
Report draft reviewed by the CCSC

Final report submitted to KUMC

Presentation to KUMC campus community
Results: Response Rates
Who are the respondents?

1,621 surveys were returned for a 24% overall response rate.
Response Rates by Employee Position

- **>100%**: Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank ($n = 22$)
- **42%**: Tenure Track Faculty ($n = 115$)
- **29%**: Staff ($n = 553$)
Response Rates by Employee Position

- **21%** • Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank \((n = 16)\)
- **19%** • Research Scientist/Engineer \((n = 27)\)
- **16%** • Non-Tenure-Track Faculty/Academic Staff \((n = 137)\)
Response Rates by Student Position

- 28% • Undergraduate ($n = 144$)
- 27% • Graduate/Professional ($n = 567$)
- 5% • Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident ($n = 40$)
Response Rates by Gender Identity

- **Woman** $(n = 1,074)$: 19%
- **Man** $(n = 516)$: 19%
- **Genderqueer/Transgender/Non-Binary** $(n < 5)$: N/A
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- **Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander** ($n = 25$) (>100%)
- **White/European American** ($n = 1,234$) (25%)
- **Alaska Native/American Indian/Native** ($n = 9$) (22%)
- **Black/African American** ($n = 72$) (20%)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- 17% • Asian/Asian American (n = 109)
- 17% • Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ (n = 45)
- N/A • Multiracial (n = 87)
Response Rates by Citizenship Status

- **75%**
  - U.S. Citizen, Naturalized \((n = 100)\)

- **25%**
  - Permanent Resident \((n = 70)\)

- **23%**
  - U.S. Citizen, Birth \((n = 1,397)\)

- N/A
  - A Visa Holder (such as F-1, J-1, H1-B, and U) \((n = 27)\)
Additional Demographic Characteristics
88% \((n = 1,420)\) were full-time in their primary positions
Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (%)

- **Men**
  - Undergrad: 11
  - Staff/Res: 32
  - Grad/Prof/Post-Doc/Fel/Res: 35
  - Faculty/Se: 39
  - Admin w/o Fac rank: 61
  - Admin w/ Fac rank: 65

- **Women**
  - Undergrad: 89
  - Staff/Res: 68
  - Grad/Prof/Post-Doc/Fel/Res: 65
  - Faculty/Se: 61
  - Admin w/o Fac rank: 39
  - Admin w/ Fac rank: 35
Respondents by Sexual Identity and Position Status ($n$)
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%) (Duplicated Total)

- White/European American: 81%
- Asian/Asian American: 8%
- Black/African American: 5%
- Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@: 4%
- American Indian/Native: 2%
- Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian: 2%
- Racial identity not listed: 1%
- Pacific Islander: >1%
- Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%) (Unduplicated Total)

- White: 76%
- Asian/Asian American: 7%
- Multiracial: 5%
- Black/African American: 4%
- Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@: 3%
- Additional People of Color: 2%
8% \((n = 129)\) of Respondents Had a Condition/Disability that Influenced Their Learning, Working, or Living Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention deficit disorder and/or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic diagnosis or medical condition</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic illness and/or health condition</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Religious/Spiritual Identity (%)

- Christian Affiliation: 58%
- No Affiliation: 29%
- Additional Religious/Spiritual Affiliation: 6%
- Multiple Affiliations: 4%
## Citizenship/Immigration Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen, birth</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen, naturalized</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visa holder (such as F-1, J-1, H1-B, and U)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Military Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never served in the military</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now on active duty (including Reserves or National Guard)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On active duty in the past but not now</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired veteran</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents by Age (n)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Employee Respondents by Age ($n$)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Student Respondents by Caregiving Responsibilities (%)

- No dependent care: 92 undergrads, 85 grad/prof/post-doc/fel/res
- Children under 5 yrs: 4 undergrads, 8 grad/prof/post-doc/fel/res
- Children 6-18 yrs: 4 undergrads, 7 grad/prof/post-doc/fel/res
- Dependent child 13 yrs or older: 0 undergrads, 15 grad/prof/post-doc/fel/res
- Independent child 18 yrs or older: 0 undergrads, 1 grad/prof/post-doc/fel/res
- Sick/disabled partner: 0 undergrads, 2 grad/prof/post-doc/fel/res
- Senior/other: 0 undergrads, 2 grad/prof/post-doc/fel/res

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Employee Respondents by Caregiving Responsibilities (%)

- **Fac/Senior Admin w/ Fac rank**
- **Staff/Res Sci/Eng/Senior Admin w/out Fac rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependency Type</th>
<th>Fac/Senior Admin</th>
<th>Staff/Res Sci/Eng/Senior Admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No dependent care</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 5 yrs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 6-18 yrs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent child 13 yrs or older</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent child 18 yrs or older</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick/disabled partner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Undergraduate Student Respondents’ Year in College Career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth year</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth year</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth year (or more)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a complete list of Undergraduate Student respondents academic majors, please see Table B20 in Appendix B.

Note: For a complete list of Graduate/Professional Student respondents academic divisions, please see Table B21 in Appendix B.
## Student Respondents’ Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I work on campus</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I work off campus</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I work on and off campus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of hours worked on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of hours worked off campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Residence

Off-campus housing

(99%, n = 741)
# Off-Campus Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where live</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-campus housing</strong></td>
<td>741</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity/sorority house</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independently in an apartment/house</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with family member/guardian</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private student housing (e.g., Naismith)</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undergraduate Student Respondents’ Income by Dependency Status (\%)
Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident Respondents’ Income by Dependency Status (%)

- **Dependent Students**
  - Below $30,000: 6%
  - $30,000 - $99,999: 37%
  - $100,000 - $249,999: 43%
  - $250,000 or more: 14%

- **Independent Students**
  - Below $30,000: 2%
  - $30,000 - $99,999: 34%
  - $100,000 - $249,999: 10%
  - $250,000 or more: 53%
33% \( (n = 249) \) of Student Respondents Reported Experiencing Financial Hardship…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial hardship</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affording tuition</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording housing</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing my books/course materials</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in social events</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording health care</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording food</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording other campus fees</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording co-curricular events or activities</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes Student respondents who reported having experienced financial hardship \( (n = 249) \) only.
Financial Hardship Cont’d…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial hardship</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affording travel to and from KU (e.g., semester breaks, holidays)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording unpaid internships/research opportunities</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording alternative spring breaks</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording commuting to campus/clinical site</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording child care</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An experience not listed here</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes Student respondents who reported having experienced financial hardship (n = 249) only.
### How Student Respondents Were Paying For College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent(s)/guardian(s)/family</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contribution/job</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-need-based scholarship (e.g., merit, ROTC, donor)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate assistantship/research assistantship</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need-based scholarship (e.g., Gates, donor)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant (e.g., Pell)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit card</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus employment/work study</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A method of payment not listed here</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI Bill</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs or Organizations at KUMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not participate in any clubs or organizations at KU</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic organization/society</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional organization</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special interest organization</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate interest organization</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/philanthropic organization</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic honorary organization</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellness organization</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek life organization</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs or Organizations at KUMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith or spirituality based organization</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus governance organization</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural based organization</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational organization</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports club organization</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; culture specific organization</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletics</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political or issue-oriented organization</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing organization</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Student Respondents’ Cumulative GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Graduate*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75 - 4.00</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 - 3.74</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25 - 3.49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 3.24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75 - 2.99</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 - 2.74</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 - 2.49</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 - 2.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 2.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes Graduate Student, Professional Student, Post-Doctoral Scholar, Fellow, and Resident respondents*
Findings
Comfort Levels
“Very Comfortable”/“Comfortable”

Overall Campus Climate (81%)
- Men respondents more comfortable than Women and Transspectrum respondents
- Not-Low-Income Student respondents more comfortable than Low-Income Student respondents
- Not-First-Generation Student respondents more comfortable than were First-Generation Student respondents

Primary Work Unit* (82%)
- No significant differences by any demographic in primary work unit

Classroom Climate** (87%)
- No significant differences by any demographic in classroom climate

*Employee (including Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident) responses (n = 910) only
**Student and Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank responses (n = 1,019) only.
Comfort With Overall Climate

- Undergraduate Student respondents more comfortable than were Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents
- Men respondents more comfortable than were Women respondents
- Respondents with No Disability more comfortable than were Respondents with a Disability
Comfort With Overall Climate

Not-Low-Income Student respondents more comfortable than were Low-Income Student respondents

Not-First-Generation Student respondents more comfortable than were First-Generation Student respondents

Note: There were no significant differences in responses for comfort with climate in work unit or climate in the classroom.
Challenges and Opportunities
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

• 220 respondents indicated that they had personally experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct at KUMC within the past year

14%
Personally Experienced Based on…(%)

- Position (n=70)
- Age (n=41)
- Educational credentials (n=39)
- Did not know (n=38)
- Gender/gender identity (n=34)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 220). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
## Forms of Experienced Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignored or excluded</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated or bullied</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated or left out</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced a hostile work environment</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of derogatory verbal remarks</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of workplace incivility</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 220). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
### Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Position Status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct¹</th>
<th>Of Those Who Experienced Exclusionary Conduct, Said They Experienced Conduct as a Result of Position Status²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrads</td>
<td>6 (n = 13)¹</td>
<td>6 (n &lt; 5)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/Prof/Post-Doc/Fel/Res</td>
<td>31 (n = 69)¹</td>
<td>31 (n = 22)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/Senior Admin w/ Fac Rank</td>
<td>21 (n = 46)¹</td>
<td>13 (n = 9)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Res Sci/Eng/Senior Admin w/out Fac Rank</td>
<td>42 (n = 92)¹</td>
<td>54 (n = 38)²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages are based on total n split by group.
² Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Age (%)

- **Overall experienced conduct**
  - 20-21: 9 (n = 8)¹, (n < 5)²
  - 22-24: 6 (n = 18)¹, (n < 5)²
  - 25-34: 16 (n = 66)¹, 18 (n = 12)²
  - 35-44: 11 (n = 26)¹, 19 (n = 5)²
  - 45-54: 17 (n = 30)¹, (n < 5)²
  - 55-64: 24 (n = 47)¹, 23 (n = 11)²
  - 65-74: 16 (n = 5)¹, (n < 5)²

- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of age
  1 Percentages are based on total n split by group.
  2 Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Gender Identity (\%) 

- Overall experienced conduct \(^1\)
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their gender identity \(^2\)

Women: 
- $(n=144)^1$
- $(n=30)^2$

Men: 
- $(n=65)^1$
- $(n<5)^2$

\(^1\) Percentages are based on total n split by group.
\(^2\) Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Ethnicity (%)

- Overall experienced conduct¹
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of ethnicity²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Excluded by Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>(n = 146)¹</td>
<td>(n = 5)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>(n = 45)¹</td>
<td>(n = 17)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>(n = 16)¹</td>
<td>(n &lt; 5)²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages are based on total n split by group.
² Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
**Location of Experienced Conduct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While working at a KU job</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a faculty office</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a KU administrative office</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 220). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Student Position (%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 220).
Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Employee Status (%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 220). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Staff Position (%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n = 220$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Faculty Position (%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (*n* = 220).
Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?

Emotional Responses

- Felt angry (57%)
- Felt embarrassed (44%)
- Ignored it (27%)
- Was afraid (22%)
- Felt somehow responsible (17%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n=220$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?

Actions

- Told a family member (41%)
- Contacted a KU resource (40%)
  - Faculty member \((n = 7)\)
  - Office of Human Resources \((n = 5)\)
  - Supervisor \((n = 5)\)
- Avoided the person/venue (32%)
- Didn’t do anything (32%)
- Submitted a bias incident report or a report through the hotline (26%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct \((n = 220)\).
Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
27% (n = 58) of Respondents who Experienced Conduct Reported It

Felt that it was not responded to appropriately (56%)

While the outcome was not what I had hoped for, I felt as though my complaint was responded to appropriately (17%)

Felt satisfied with the outcome (28%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 220). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Themes
Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Frustrations with reporting process

Challenges in making a report

Behavior of colleagues
5% ($n = 76$) of All Respondents Experienced Unwanted Sexual Conduct

- <1% (7 respondents) – Relationship Violence
- 1% (14 respondents) – Stalking
- 3% (52 respondents) – Sexual Interaction
- 1% (17 respondents) – Unwanted Sexual Contact
Respondents’ Experiences of Unwanted Sexual Conduct (n)

- Relationship violence
- Stalking
- Unwanted sexual interaction
- Unwanted sexual contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The numbers represent the count of each type of experience.*
Student Respondents’ Alcohol/Drug Involvement in Stalking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol only</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both alcohol and drugs</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced stalking (n = 11).
# When Stalking Occurred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 years ago</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years ago</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years ago</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years ago</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced stalking ($n = 14$).
Location of Stalking

On Campus (50%, n = 7)

Off Campus (86%, n = 12)

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced stalking (n = 14).
### Perpetrator of Stalking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KU student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced stalking ($n = 14$).
Emotional Response to Stalking

- Felt embarrassed: 50%
- Felt afraid: 57%
- Felt somehow responsible: 50%
- Felt angry: 43%

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced stalking (n = 14).
Actions in Response to Stalking

- Avoided the person/venue: 93%
- Told a friend: 86%
- Told a family member: 50%

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced stalking ($n = 14$).
Qualitative Themes for Respondents: Stalking

Fear of consequences
Not a big deal
Respondents who Experienced Unwanted Sexual Interaction ($n$)
### Student Respondents’ Alcohol/Drug Involvement in Unwanted Sexual Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol only</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both alcohol and drugs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual interaction ($n = 39$).
# When Unwanted Sexual Interaction Occurred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 months</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 years ago</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years ago</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years ago</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years ago</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual interaction ($n = 52$).
Location of Unwanted Sexual Interaction

On Campus (54%, $n = 28$)

Off Campus (60%, $n = 31$)

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual interaction ($n = 52$).
## Perpetrator of Unwanted Sexual Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role/Relationship</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KU faculty member</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KU student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other role/relationship not listed above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance/friend</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual interaction (n = 52).
Emotional Response to Unwanted Sexual Interaction

- Felt angry 48%
- Ignored it 48%
- Felt afraid 42%
- Felt embarrassed 39%

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual interaction (n = 52).
Actions in Response to Unwanted Sexual Interaction

- Told a friend: 48%
- Avoided the person/venue: 40%
- Didn’t do anything: 40%
- Told a family member: 21%

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual interaction (n = 52).
10% ($n = 5$) of Respondents who Experienced Unwanted Sexual Interaction Reported It

- Felt that it was not responded to appropriately ($n < 5$)
- While the outcome was not what I had hoped for, I felt as though my complaint was responded to appropriately ($n < 5$)
- Felt satisfied with the outcome ($n < 5$)

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual interaction ($n = 52$).
Qualitative Themes for Respondents: Unwanted Sexual Interaction

- Nothing could/would be done
- Fear of consequences
- Not substantial enough
- I handled it
Student Respondents who Experienced Unwanted Sexual Contact ($n$)
Student Respondents’ Alcohol/Drug Involvement in Unwanted Sexual Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both alcohol and drugs</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact ($n = 14$).
When Unwanted Sexual Contact Occurred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 months</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 years ago</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years ago</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years ago</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years ago</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 17).
### Year/Semester in Which Student Respondents Experienced Unwanted Sexual Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Semester in Which Student Respondents Experienced Unwanted Sexual Contact</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During my time as a graduate/medical student at KU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate first year</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall semester</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring semester</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer semester</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate second year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall semester</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring semester</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer semester</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 14).
Location of Unwanted Sexual Contact

On Campus ($n < 5$)

Off Campus ($77\%, n = 13$)

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact ($n = 17$).
Perpetrator of Unwanted Sexual Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance/friend</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 17).
Emotional Response to Unwanted Sexual Contact

- Felt angry: 59%
- Felt somehow responsible: 59%
- Felt afraid: 53%
- Felt embarrassed: 53%
- Ignored it: 47%

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 17).
Actions in Response to Unwanted Sexual Contact

- Avoided the person/venue: 59%
- Didn’t do anything: 53%
- Told a friend: 35%

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 17).
Qualitative Themes for Respondents: Unwanted Sexual Contact

Fear of consequences
Blamed themselves
## Top Facilities Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus transportation/parking</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways, pedestrian paths, crosswalks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom buildings</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary barriers due to construction or maintenance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms, labs (including computer labs)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office furniture (e.g., chair, desk)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other campus buildings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevators/lifts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they had a disability ($n = 129$).
## Top Technology/Online Environment Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology/Online</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning management system (e.g., Blackboard/Canvas/My Talent/MySuccess/JayDocs)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible electronic format</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment (e.g., screens, mouse, keyboard)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic forms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/phone equipment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video/video audio description (e.g., ITV, TechSmith Relay/Camtasia Relay, Adobe Connect)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they had a disability (n = 129).
Top Reasonable Accommodations Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasonable Accommodation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace accommodations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic accommodations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event accommodations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they had a disability (n = 129).
Qualitative Themes for Respondents with Disabilities: Accessibility of KUMC Campus

Parking concerns

Facilities

Workplace support
Intent to Persist
33% \( (n = 532) \) of Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving KUMC
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving KUMC

55% of Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents \((n = 148)\)

49% of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents \((n = 294)\)
# Top Reasons Employee Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving KUMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low salary/pay rate</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position at another institution/organization</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of professional development opportunities</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reason not listed above</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Employee respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 442).
Qualitative Themes for Employee Respondents

Why Considered leaving...

Compensation

Negative workplace environment

Management/leadership
Student Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving KUMC

10% of Undergraduate Student respondents
(n = 14)

13% of Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident respondents
(n = 76)
When Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Residents Seriously Considered Leaving KUMC

- 57% in their first year
- 29% in their second year
- 21% in their third year
- 7% in their fourth year

Note: Table includes answers from only Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving ($n = 79$).
Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Residents Who * Seriously Considered Leaving KUMC by Racial Identity (%)*

Note: Table includes answers from only Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 79).
Top Reasons Why Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Residents Seriously Considered Leaving KUMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reason not listed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate was not welcoming</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons (e.g., medical, mental health, family emergencies)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 79).
Qualitative Themes for Student Respondents
Why Considered leaving…

Lack of support from Faculty/Advisors
Perceptions
Respondents who observed conduct or communications directed towards a person/group of people that created an exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile working or learning environment…

17% (n = 268)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Forms of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory verbal remarks</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person ignored or excluded</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person isolated or left out</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person experienced a hostile work environment</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct ($n = 268$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct Based on…(%)

- Gender/gender identity (n=58)
- Do not know (n=54)
- Ethnicity (n=50)
- Racial identity (n=47)
- Position (n=45)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct (n = 268). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

- Student (24%)
- Faculty member/other instructional staff (23%)
- Supervisor or manager (13%)
- Coworker/colleague (12%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct (n = 268). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Target of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

- Student (36%)
- Staff member (24%)
- Coworker/colleague (19%)
- Faculty member/other instructional staff (15%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct ($n = 268$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Location of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While working at a KU job</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct (n = 268). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Position (%)

- Staff/Res Sci/Eng/Senior Admin w/o Fac Rank (n = 101) - 17%
- Fac/Senior Admin w/ Fac Rank (n = 58) - 22%
- Grad/Prof/Post-Doc/Fel/Res (n = 83) - 14%
- Undergrad (n = 26) - 18%
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)

- Women (n = 186): 17%
- Men (n = 72): 14%
- Multiracial (n = 20): 23%
- People of Color (n = 40): 15%
- White (n = 199): 16%
- LGBQ (n = 27): 26%
- Heterosexual (n = 230): 16%
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)

- No Military Service (n = 249): 16%
- Military Service (n = 16): 26%
- Disability (n = 34): 28%
- No Disability (n = 233): 16%
Actions in Response to Observed Conduct

- Did nothing: 36%
- Told a family member: 24%
- Submitted a bias incident report or a report through the hotline: 19%
- Avoided the person/venue: 15%

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct ($n = 268$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
15% \((n = 40)\) of Respondents who Observed Conduct Reported It

- Felt that it was not responded to appropriately \((50\%)\)
- While the outcome was not what I had hoped for, I felt as though my complaint was responded to appropriately \((29\%)\)
- Felt satisfied with the outcome \((21\%)\)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct \((n = 268)\).
Qualitative Themes

Observed Conduct

Rave/ethnicity issues

Reporting process

Hostile behavior

Accountability
Employee Perceptions
Employee Perceptions of Unjust Hiring Practices

13% (n = 36) of Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents

13% (n = 79) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents
Qualitative Themes
Discriminatory Hiring Process

Favoritism

Lack of diversity

Disregarding hiring protocol

Age biases
Employee Perceptions of Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

9% \((n = 23)\) of Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents

11% \((n = 66)\) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

Age discrimination

Disciplined for expressing opinions

Unknown reasons
Employee Perceptions of Unjust Practices Related to Promotion

12% \((n = 32)\) of Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents

15% \((n = 37)\) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Practices Related to Promotion

Favoritism
Most Common Bases for Discriminatory Employment Practices

- Nepotism/cronyism
  - Gender/gender identity
  - Ethnicity
  - Did not know
  - Age
  - Position
The majority of employee respondents expressed positive views of campus climate.
Tenure and Tenure-Track/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank Respondents

Examples of Successes

- 90% felt research was valued by KU
- 85% felt that the criteria for tenure were clear
- 73% felt teaching was valued by KU
Tenure and Tenure-Track/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 53% Burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations
- 44% Performed more work to help students than did their colleagues
- 17% Felt pressured to change their research/scholarship agenda to achieve tenure/promotion
Qualitative Themes
Tenure and Tenure-Track/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Clearer expectations

Inequity Issues (workload distribution, research support, evaluation standards)
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty/Academic Staff

Respondents

Examples of Successes

Majority felt that research (85%) and teaching (81%) were valued

73% felt that expectations of their responsibilities were clear
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty/Academic Staff Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- Felt pressured to do extra work that was uncompensated (43%)
- Felt burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations (35%)
- Performed more work to help students than did their colleagues (31%)
Qualitative Themes
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty/Academic Staff Respondents

Work-Life Attitudes

- Clearer expectations (job responsibilities/contract renewal)
- Inequity issues (workload/support)
- Job security
- Balancing clinical and academic responsibilities
Staff/Research Scientist/ Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents

Examples of Successes

Majority felt valued by coworkers in their department (85%), coworkers outside of their unit (77%), and by their supervisors/ managers (80%)

Majority felt that their skills (77%) and work (76%) were valued
Examples of Successes

79% were given a reasonable time frame to complete assigned responsibilities

76% felt that there were clear expectations of their responsibilities

79% had supervisors who provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance
Examples of Successes

72% had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it

71% would recommend KU as a good place to work
Staff/Research Scientist/ Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents Examples of Challenges

- Pressured by work requirements that occurred outside of their normally scheduled hours (21%)
- Coworkers in their work units pre-judged their abilities based on their perceptions of their identity/background (20%)
- Faculty prejudged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background (18%)
Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents

Examples of Challenges

- Child care benefits were competitive (14%)
- There were clear procedures on how they could advance at KU (28%)
- Staff salaries were competitive (28%)
Staff/Research Scientist/ Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents

Examples of Challenges

35%

• KU provided adequate resources to help them manage work-life balance

39%

• Performance evaluation process was productive
Qualitative Themes
Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents

Work-Life Attitudes

- Lack of performance evaluations
- Overwhelming workloads
- Lack of Affordable Childcare
Qualitative Themes
Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents

Work-Life Attitudes

Job insecurity

Non-competitive salaries

Need for more professional development

Lack of advancement opportunities
Qualitative Themes
Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents

Work Life Attitudes

Need for more flexible scheduling

Use of leaves was difficult

Need for more professional development
Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank Respondents
Examples of Successes

Majority felt valued by faculty in their department/program (85%), department/program chairs (83%), other faculty at KU (81%), and students in the classroom (84%)
Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank Respondents
Examples of Successes

- Majority felt that their teaching (75%) and service contributions (72%) were valued
- 66% felt that they had job security
- 68% would recommend KU as a good place to work
Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank Respondents

Examples of Challenges

- 20% • Faculty in their departments/programs pre-judged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background

- 20% • Departments/program chairs pre-judged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background
Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- Child care benefits were competitive (9%)
- KU provided adequate resources to help them manage work-life balance (18%)
- Salaries for academic staff professors were competitive (20%)
- Salaries for non-tenure-track faculty were competitive (26%)
## Qualitative Themes

**Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank Respondents**

### Work-Life Attitudes

- **Salary/raise concerns**
- **Professional development opportunities**
- **Childcare issues**
- **Overall work environment**
Student Respondents’ Perceptions
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

- Majority felt valued by KU faculty (78%) and staff (78%)
- Majority felt valued by KU faculty in the classroom (82%), other students in the classroom (83%), and other students outside of the classroom (74%)
- 64% felt valued by KU senior administrators
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Many had faculty (85%) and less had staff (71%) whom they perceived as role models.

33% felt faculty pre-judged their abilities based on their perception of their identities/backgrounds.

80% felt that their opinions were considered as valid as other students’ opinions.
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

- Slightly more than half felt that senior administrators (50%), faculty (54%), and students (55%) had taken direct actions to address the needs of at-risk/underserved students.

- 72% felt that campus climate encourages free and open discussion of difficult topics.
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success

Graduate Student respondents with Multiple Disabilities have less Perceived Academic Success than Graduate Student respondents with No Disability.
Institutional Actions
Top Five Available Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank Respondents

- Mentorship for new faculty
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Paid family leave
- Career span development opportunities for faculty at all ranks
- Affordable child care
Top Five Unavailable Campus Initiatives that Would Positively Influence Climate for Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank Respondents

- Paid family leave
- Career span development opportunities for faculty at all ranks
- Affordable child care
- Mentorship for new faculty
- Tuition reimbursement/reduction
Top Five Available Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents

- Paid family leave
- Tuition reimbursement/reduction
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
- Career development opportunities for staff
- Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
Top Five Unavailable Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate for Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents

- Tuition reimbursement/reduction
- Supervisory training for supervisors/managers
- Affordable child care
- Career development opportunities for staff
- Mentorship for new staff
Qualitative Themes
Campus Initiatives – Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents

Tuition assistance
Family-related benefits
Training
Top Five Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Student Respondents

1. Effective faculty mentorship of students
2. Cross-cultural dialogue among faculty, staff, and students
3. Effective academic advising
4. A person to address student complaints of bias by faculty/staff in learning environments
5. Cross-cultural dialogue among students
Top Five Unavailable Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate for Student Respondents

- Effective faculty mentorship of students
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among faculty, staff, and students
- Adequate childcare resources
- Support/resources for spouse/partner employment
- Affordable child care
Qualitative Themes
Campus Initiatives – Student Respondents

Need for child care

Training

Importance of building relationships with faculty
Summary

Strengths and Successes

Opportunities for Improvement
Although colleges and universities attempt to foster welcoming and inclusive environments, they are not immune to negative societal attitudes and discriminatory behaviors.

As a microcosm of the larger social environment, college and university campuses reflect the pervasive prejudices of society.

Classism, Racism, Sexism, Genderism, Heterosexism, etc.

Overall Strengths and Successes

87% of Student and Faculty respondents were comfortable with the classroom climate.

81% of respondents were comfortable with the overall campus climate.

85% of Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty respondents thought the criteria for tenure were clear.

82% of Student respondents felt valued by faculty in the classroom.
Overall Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement

- **17% observed** exclusionary conduct within the last year at KUMC
- **14% personally experienced** exclusionary conduct within the last year at KUMC
- Only 28% of Staff respondents felt that staff salaries were competitive
- **55% of Faculty/Senior Administrator w/Faculty Rank respondents seriously considered leaving KUMC**
Sharing the Report with the Community

Executive Summary, Full Report, and Power Point available at https://climatestudy.ku.edu/reports

A hard copy is available for review in the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor
Next Steps
Climate Study

Next Steps

- Access to data, process to protect confidentiality
- Data set housed on Lawrence campus with Climate Study project Primary Investigator, Trina Ramirez
- Summary reports to schools and units
- Projected timeline for summary reports: Fall 2017
- 3-month moratorium on distribution of data
KUMC Strategic Planning

- KUMC Strategic Planning underway, full rollout coming in weeks
- Climate Study findings parallel KUMC goals

“PEOPLE: Identify, establish and model key practices that lead to a valued and respected workforce.

- Develop and deploy tools to assess what being valued and respected means to our workforce.
- Develop and deploy training, based on assessments, to promote the authentic application of these practices at all levels of the workforce.
- Establish a framework for ensuring accountability for these practices.”
Climate Study
Strategic Planning

- Review report and data in conjunction with Primary Investigator
- Diversity & Inclusion Cabinet Strategic Planning, August 24
  - Revise current Cabinet action items and develop new ones
  - Align and support KUMC Strategic Plan
  - Metrics & Best Practices dashboard, in development
Thank you!

For more information or to view the reports and presentation:
www.climatestudy.ku.edu

For information on the Diversity & Inclusion Cabinet:
Diversity.kumc.edu
Questions and Discussion