Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Assessment • Planning • Interventions

The University of Kansas
Lawrence & Edwards Campuses

Campus Climate
Research Study
Executive Summary

March 2017

Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Executive Summary

Introduction

The University of Kansas (KU) affirms that diversity and inclusion are crucial to the intellectual vitality of the campus communities. It is through freedom of exchange over different ideas and viewpoints in supportive environments that individuals develop the critical thinking and citizenship skills that will benefit them throughout their lives. Diversity and inclusion engender academic engagement where teaching, working, learning, and living take place in pluralistic communities of mutual respect.

The University of Kansas is dedicated to fostering caring communities that provide leadership for constructive participation in a diverse and multicultural world. As noted in the University of Kansas' mission statement, "The university is committed to excellence. It fosters a multicultural environment in which the dignity and rights of the individual are respected. Intellectual diversity, integrity, and disciplined inquiry in the search for knowledge are of paramount importance."[1] To better understand the campus climate, the senior administration at KU recognized the need for a comprehensive tool that would provide campus climate metrics for its students, faculty, and staff.

To that end, members of KU formed the Campus Climate Steering Committee (CCSC) in November 2015. The CCSC was composed of faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Ultimately, KU contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to conduct a campus-wide study entitled, "University of Kansas: Climate Study for Learning, Working, & Living." Data gathered via reviews of relevant University of Kansas literature, focus groups, and a campus-wide survey centered on the experiences and perceptions of various constituent groups. Based on the findings of this study, campus units will have the opportunity to develop two to three action items by spring 2018 to improve KU's learning, working, and living environment.

Project Design and Campus Involvement

The CCSC collaborated with R&A to develop the survey instrument. In the first phase, R&A conducted 23 focus groups comprised of 212 participants (63 students, 130 faculty, staff, or administrators, and 19 participants who did not identify their position status). In the second

---

[1] http://www.ku.edu/about/mission/

phase, the CCSC and R&A used data from the focus groups to co-construct questions for the campus-wide survey. The final survey instrument was completed on August 8, 2016. The University's survey contained 112 items (30 qualitative and 82 quantitative) and was available via a secure online portal from September 13 to October 14, 2016. Confidential paper surveys were distributed to those individuals who did not have access to an internet-connected computer or who preferred a paper survey.

The conceptual model used as the foundation for KU'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. The CCSC implemented participatory and community-based processes to generate survey questions as a means to capture the various dimensions of power and privilege that shape the campus experience. In this way, KU'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.

The University of Kansas - Lawrence and Edwards Campuses' Participants

The University of Kansas - Lawrence and Edwards Campuses' community members completed 6,774 surveys for an overall response rate of 22%. Only surveys that were at least 50% completed were included in the final data set for analyses.[2] Fifty-nine percent (*n* = 3,997) were Students, 12% (*n* = 786) were Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents, and 29% (*n* = 1,991) were Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank. Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic characteristics of survey

---

[2]One-hundred five (105) surveys were removed because they did not complete at least 50% of the survey, and 57 duplicate submissions were removed. Surveys were also removed from the data file if the respondent did not provide consent. Any additional responses were removed because they were judged to have been problematic (i.e., the respondent did not complete the survey in good faith).

respondents. The percentages offered in Table 1 are based on the numbers of respondents in the sample (n) for each demographic characteristic.[3]

Table 1. **University of Kansas - Lawrence and Edwards Sample Demographics**

Characteristic	Subgroup	*n*	% of Sample
Position status	Undergraduate Student	2,731	40.3
	Graduate/Professional Student	1,247	18.4
	Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident	19	0.3
	Tenure-Track Faculty	565	8.3
	Non-Tenure-Track Faculty/Academic Staff	191	2.8
	Research Scientist/Engineer	61	0.9
	Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank	30	0.4
	Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank	48	0.7
	Staff	1,882	27.8
Gender identity	Woman	3,871	57.1
	Man	2,757	40.7
	Genderqueer	44	0.6
	Non-Binary	51	0.8
	Transgender	22	0.3
	Other/Not Reported	36	0.5
Racial/ethnic identity	Alaska Native	< 5	---
	American Indian/Native	50	0.7
	Asian/Asian American	451	6.7
	Black/African American	235	3.5
	Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@	242	3.6
	Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian	95	1.4
	Multiracial	495	7.3
	Native Hawaiian	< 5	---
	Pacific Islander	5	0.1
	White/European American	5,017	74.1
	Missing/Unknown/Other	181	2.7
Sexual identity	LGBQ	741	10.9
	Heterosexual	5,734	84.6
	Asexual	35	0.5
	Missing/Unknown/Other	73	1.1
Citizenship status	A Visa Holder (such as F-1, J-1, H1-B, and U)	44	0.6
	Currently Under a Withholding of Removal Status	ND*	ND
	DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival)	ND	ND

[3]The total *n* for each demographic characteristic may differ as a result of missing data.

	DAPA (Deferred Action for Parental Accountability)	ND	ND
	Other Legally Documented Status	< 5	---
	Permanent Resident	399	5.9
	Refugee Status	ND	ND
	Undocumented Resident	ND	ND
	U.S. Citizen, Birth	5,743	84.8
	U.S. Citizen, Naturalized	450	6.6
Disability status	Single Disability	454	6.7
	No Disability	6,033	89.1
	Multiple Disabilities	261	3.9
	Missing/Unknown/Other	26	0.4
Religious/Spiritual affiliation	Christian	3,188	47.1
	Additional Religious/Spiritual Affiliation	463	6.8
	No Affiliation	2,612	38.6
	Multiple Affiliation	350	5.2
	Missing/Unknown/Other	161	2.4

*ND: No Data available

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 The University of Kansas - Lawrence and Edwards Campuses**

   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."[4] The level of comfort experienced by faculty, staff, and students is one indicator of campus climate.

   - 71% (n = 4,814) of the survey respondents were "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the climate at KU.
   - 71% (n = 1,987) of Employee (including Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident) respondents were "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the climate in their departments/work units.
   - 84% (n = 3,975) of Student and Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents were "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the climate in their classes.
   - 75% (n = 2,053) of Men respondents, 70% (n = 2,669) of Women respondents, and 47% (n = 33) of Transspectrum respondents were "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the overall climate on campus.

2. **Faculty Respondents – Positive attitudes about faculty work**
   - 70% (n = 394) of Tenure and Tenure-Track/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the criteria for tenure were clear.
   - 83% (n = 468) of Tenure and Tenure-Track/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that research was valued by KU.
   - 86% (n = 160) of Non-Tenure-Track/Academic Staff Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that research was valued by KU.
   - 84% (n = 642) of Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt valued by students in the classroom.

---

[4]Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 264

3. **Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents –Positive attitudes about staff work**

    - 78% (*n* = 1,537) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance.

    - 71% (*n* = 1,385) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they are given a reasonable time frame to complete assigned responsibilities.

    - 82% (*n* = 1,622) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they believed that their supervisors were supportive of their taking leave.

    - 77% (*n* = 1,515) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents reported that they believed that vacation and personal time benefits were competitive.

    - 84% (*n* = 1,668) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt valued by coworkers in their department.

4. **Student Respondents – Positive attitudes about academic experiences**

    The way students perceive and experience their campus climate influences their performance and success in college.[5] Research also supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for improving learning outcomes.[6] Attitudes toward academic pursuits are one indicator of campus climate.

    - **Students Respondents' Perceptions of Campus Climate**
        - 76% (*n* = 3,025) of Student respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt valued by KU faculty.
        - 74% (*n* = 2,909) of Student respondents felt valued by KU staff.
        - 79% (*n* = 3,140) of Student respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt valued by KU faculty in the classroom.

---

[5]Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005
[6]Hale, 2004; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2004

o 75% (*n* = 2,934) of Student respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt that their opinions were considered as valid as other students' opinions.

- **Student Respondents *Perceived Academic Success***

    A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the scale, *Perceived Academic Success*, derived from Question 13 on the survey. Analyses using these scales revealed:

    o A significant difference existed in the overall test for means for Students by gender identity, sexual identity, disability status, and income status on *Perceived Academic Success*.

    ▪ Heterosexual Undergraduate Student respondents have greater *Perceived Academic Success* than LGBQ Undergraduate Student respondents.

    ▪ White Undergraduate Student respondents have greater *Perceived Academic Success* than Black/African American and Multiracial Undergraduate Student respondents.

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.[7] Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.[8] The survey requested information on experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

---

[7]Aguirre & Messineo, 1997; Flowers & Pascarella, 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001

[8]Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008; Waldo, 1999

- 18% (n = 1,209) of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.[9]
  - 27% (n = 328) noted that the conduct was based on their gender/gender identity, 24% (n = 288) felt that it was based on their position status, 19% (n = 229) felt that it was based on their age, and 17% (n = 201) felt that it was based on their ethnicity.
- Differences emerged based on gender identity, position status, age, and ethnicity/racial identity:
  - By gender identity, a higher percentage of Transspectrum respondents (37%, n = 26) than Women respondents (20%, n = 748) and Men respondents (14%, n = 384) indicated that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.
    - 46% (n = 12) of Transspectrum respondents, 35% (n = 263) of Women respondents, and 10% (n = 38) 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.
  - By position status, Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents (26%, n = 206) and Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents (22%, n = 427) were significantly more likely than other respondents to indicate that they had experienced this conduct.
    - Of those respondents who noted that they had experienced this conduct, 39% (n = 167) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents, 25% (n = 52) Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents, 21% (n = 42) of Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident respondents, and

---

[9]The 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).

7% (*n* = 27) of Undergraduate Student respondents thought that the conduct was based on their position status.

- o By age, a greater percentage of respondents between 35 and 44 years old (22%, *n* = 173) and respondents between 45 and 54 years old (22%, *n* = 13) noted they had experienced exclusionary conduct.

  - ▪ Of those respondents who noted that they believed they had experienced this conduct, a significantly greater percentage of respondents between 55 and 64 years old (27%, *n* = 30) and respondents between 25 and 34 years old (25%, *n* = 64) thought that the conduct was based on their age.

- o By ethnic/racial identity, significant differences were noted in the percentages of American Indian/Native/Alaskan Native respondents (34%, *n* = 17), Black/African American respondents (26%, *n* = 60), Hispanic/Latino@/Chicano@ respondents (24%, *n* = 58), and Multiracial respondents (25%, *n* = 123) than White respondents (16%, *n* = 807) who noted that they believed that they had experienced this conduct.

  - ▪ Of those respondents who noted that they believed that they had experienced this conduct, a significantly greater percentage of Additional People of Color respondents (63%, *n* = 10), Black/African American respondents (58%, *n* = 35), Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ respondents (55%, *n* = 32), American Indian/Native/Alaskan Native (53%, *n* = 9), Asian/Asian American respondents (40%, *n* = 27), and Multiracial respondents (33%, *n* = 40) than White respondents (4%, *n* = 33) thought that the conduct was based on their ethnic/racial identity.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct at The University of Kansas - Lawrence and Edwards Campuses. 546 respondents contributed comments regarding their personal experiences. Two themes emerged from their narratives: (1) exclusionary conduct was often

based on demographic identity and (2) concerns regarding the mechanisms to report exclusionary conduct work.

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).[10] Several groups at KU indicated that they were less comfortable than their majority counterparts with the climates of the campus, workplace, and classroom.

   - By gender identity: Men respondents (29%, $n = 777$) were significantly more likely to indicate they were "very comfortable" than Women respondents (17%, $n = 635$) and Transspectrum respondents (9%, $n = 6$) with the overall climate at KU.
     - Men Student and Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents (39%, $n = 780$) were significantly more likely to indicate they were "very comfortable" with the classroom climate at KU than Women Student and Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents (26%, $n = 671$) and Transspectrum Student and Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents (23%, $n = 14$).
   - By sexual identity: Heterosexual respondents (23%, $n = 1,293$) were significantly more likely to be "very comfortable" with the overall campus climate at KU than LGBQ respondents (13%, $n = 96$).
     - Heterosexual Student and Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents (33%, n = 1,306) were significantly more likely to be "very comfortable" with the classroom climate at KU than LGBQ Student and Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents (24%, $n = 138$).
   - By religious/spiritual affiliation: Christian respondents (24%, $n = 762$) were significantly more likely to feel "very comfortable" with the overall climate at KU than were No Affiliation respondents (19%, $n = 484$).

---

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

3. **Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank and Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents – Challenges with work-life issues**

- 64% (n = 501) of Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents and 55% (n = 1,099) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents had seriously considered leaving KU in the past year.
    - 61% (n = 971) of those Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents and Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents who seriously considered leaving did so for low salary/pay rate.
    - 43% (n = 691) of those Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents and Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents who seriously considered leaving indicated that they did so because of limited opportunities for advancement.
    - 71% (n = 419) of Tenure-Track and Tenured/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents and 43% (n = 82) of Non-Tenure-Track/Academic Staff Faculty respondents seriously considered leaving KU.
    - 75% (n = 6) of Additional People of Color Employee respondents, 68% (n = 13) of American Indian/Native/Alaskan Native Employee respondents, 68% (n = 43) of Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ Employee respondents, 67% (n = 89) of Multiracial Employee respondents, 57% (n = 1,300) of White Employee respondents, 49% (n = 36) of Black/African American Employee respondents, and 42% (n = 32) of Asian/Asian American Employee respondents seriously considered leaving KU.
    - 73% (n = 59) of Multiple Disabilities Employee respondents, 70% (n = 111) of Single Disability Employee respondents, and 56% (n = 1,421) of No Disability Employee respondents seriously considered leaving KU.

- o 58% (*n* = 1,460) of U.S. Citizen Employee respondents and 50% (*n* = 115) of Non-U.S. Citizens/U.S. Citizen, Naturalized Employee respondents seriously considered leaving KU.

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

   - 22% (*n* = 170) of Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that salaries for tenure-track faculty positions were competitive.
     - o 14% (*n* = 106) of Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that salaries for non-tenure-track faculty were competitive.
     - o 11% (*n* = 80) of Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that salaries for academic staff professors were competitive.
   - 19% (*n* = 147) of Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that KU provided adequate resources to help them manage work-life balance (e.g., child care, wellness services, elder care, housing location assistance, transportation).
   - 58% (*n* = 451) of Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that their research/scholarship was valued.

5. **Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents – Challenges with faculty work**

   - 32% (*n* = 633) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that KU policies (e.g., FMLA) were fairly applied across KU.
   - 22% (*n* = 431) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that staff salaries were competitive.
   - 31% (*n* = 606) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents reported that they believed that staff opinions were valued by KU faculty and administration.

- 38% (n = 738) of Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt valued by KU senior administrators (e.g., chancellor, provost, vice chancellors, dean).

537 Staff/Research Scientist/Engineer/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents contributed comments regarding their workplace climate related experiences. Five themes emerged from these comments: fewer staff leading to an overwhelming workload, critiques of the evaluation process, issues of inequity in scheduling and workload, quality and consistency of supervision, and concerns with family related issues.

226 Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents were provided the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences regarding workplace climate. Five themes also emerged from their comments: concerns regarding salaries for faculty, perceived dearth in professional development opportunities and funding, general concerns with the evaluation process, KU benefits for Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank, and the increasing presence of the state government in managing the institution.

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 KU survey requested information regarding sexual misconduct.

   - 9% of respondents indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual conduct while at KU.
     - i. 1% (n = 75) of respondents experienced relationship violence (e.g., ridiculed, controlling, hitting) while a member of the KU community.

ii.   2% (n = 104) of respondents experienced stalking (e.g., physical following, on social media, texting, phone calls) while a member of the KU community.

iii.   6% (n = 413) of respondents experienced unwanted sexual interaction (e.g., cat-calling, repeated sexual advances, sexual harassment) while a member of the KU community.

iv.   2% (n = 157) of respondents experienced unwanted sexual contact (e.g., fondling, rape, sexual assault, penetration without consent) while a member of the KU community.

- Undergraduate Student respondents, Women respondents, LGBQ respondents, and respondents with a Disability more often reported unwanted sexual experiences than their majority counterparts.

- 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. Four themes emerged from KU respondents who explained why they did not report unwanted sexual contact. One rationale cited for not reporting these incidents was that respondents did not believe a positive response would arise from reporting or that they would not be taken seriously. Other rationales provided for not reporting unwanted sexual contact was that either the perpetrator was not that bad of a person, alcohol was involved and they did not want to get into trouble, or that it was the victim's fault it happened because of what they wore or because they put themselves in that situation.

Conclusion

The University of Kansas - Lawrence and Edwards Campuses' climate findings[11] were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.[12] For example, 70% to 80% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be "very comfortable" or "comfortable." A similar percentage (71%) of KU

---

[11]Additional findings disaggregated by position status and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.
[12]Rankin & Associates Consulting, 2015

respondents reported that they were "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the climate at KU. Likewise, 20% to 25% of respondents in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At KU, a similar, albeit 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.[13]

KU's climate assessment report provides baseline data on diversity and inclusion, and addresses KU's mission and goals. While the findings may guide decision-making in regard to policies and practices at KU, it is important to note that the cultural fabric of any institution 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 KU communities with an opportunity to build upon its strengths and to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. KU, 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.

---

[13]Guiffrida, 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 (*n*RC-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., & Quaye, 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 educations*. 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.