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/
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 participants.

---

2One-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

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

3The total n for each demographic characteristic may differ as a result of missing data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>ND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAPA (Deferred Action for Parental Accountability)</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Legally Documented Status</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Resident</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Status</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented Resident</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Citizen, Birth</td>
<td>5,743</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Citizen, Naturalized</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Disability</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Disability</td>
<td>6,033</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing/Unknown/Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious/Spiritual affiliation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>3,188</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Religious/Spiritual Affiliation</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>2,612</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Affiliation</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing/Unknown/Other</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.” 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.

---

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

---

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

8Silverschanz, 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.\(^9\)
  
  o 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:
  
  o 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.
  
  o 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.

- 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.

- 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).

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@/Chicano@ 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.
- 14% \((n = 106)\) of Faculty/Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that salaries for non-tenure-track faculty were competitive.
- 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.

---

13Guiffrida, 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
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