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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
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

¹Settles, Cortina, Malley, and Stewart, 2006; Gardner, S. 2013; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, J. 2009
²Costello, 2012; Sears, 2002; Kaminski, & Geisler, 2012; Griffin, Pérez, Holmes, & Mayo 2010
³Silverschanz, 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/
What are students’ behavioural responses?
30% of respondents have seriously considered leaving their institution due to the challenging climate.

Similarly, 33% of Queer spectrum and 38% of Transspectrum 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

Source: Liu & Mustanski 2012
Projected Outcomes

Kent State 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).

Kent State 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
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Project Overview

Phase I
• Focus Groups

Phase II
• Assessment Tool Development and Implementation

Phase III
• Data Analysis

Phase IV
• Final Report and Presentation
**Instrument/Sample**

**Final instrument**
- 104 questions and additional space for respondents to provide commentary (20 qualitative, 84 quantitative)
- On-line or paper & pencil options

**Sample = Population**
- All community members were invited to take the survey.
- The survey was available from March 8 to April 8, 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.
Results: Response Rates
Overall Response Rates

Kent Campus
21%
n = 6,867

Regional Campuses
13%
n = 1,587
Student Response Rates

Kent Campus

- Undergraduate: 18%, \( n = 3,714 \)
- Graduate: 16%, \( n = 1,040 \)

Regional Campuses

- Undergraduate: 9%, \( n = 971 \)
- Graduate: 80%, \( n = 16 \)
Faculty/Staff Response Rates

Kent Campus
- Admin Faculty rank >100% ($n=107$)
- Staff 56% ($n=1,366$)
- Faculty 37% ($n=640$)

Regional Campuses
- Admin Faculty rank >100% ($n=34$)
- Staff 50% ($n=266$)
- Faculty 35% ($n=300$)
Findings
Comfort Levels
“Very Comfortable”/“Comfortable”

Overall Campus Climate
Kent: 79%
Regional: 79%

Department/Work Unit Climate
Kent: 68%
Regional: 73%

Classroom Climate
Kent: 83%
Regional: 86%
Challenges and Opportunities
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

Kent Campus
- 17%, n = 1,150

Regional Campuses
- 16%, n = 258
Top Bases for Personal Experiences with Exclusionary Conduct

Kent Campus
- Position
- Gender
- Age
- Ethnicity
- Racial Identity

Regional Campuses
- Position
- Faculty Status
- Age
- Gender
- Philosophical Views
Top Forms of Personal Experiences with Exclusionary Conduct

- Disrespected
- Ignored or excluded
- Isolated or left out
- Intimidated or bullied
What did you do?
Emotional Responses

- Felt uncomfortable
- Felt angry
- Felt embarrassed
What did you do?
Actions

- Told a family member
- Told a friend
- Avoided the harasser
- Didn’t report it for fear that complaint would not be taken seriously
- Reported it to or sought support from an online resource
  - Kent Campus: Senior administration
  - Regional Campuses: Faculty member
Kent Campus Source of Experienced Conduct by Student Position (%)

- **Grad/Prof Student respondents**
  - Coworker: 14%
  - Academic Adviser: 16%
  - Student: 40%
  - Faculty: 45%

- **Undergraduate Student respondents**
  - Stranger: 16%
  - Faculty Member: 23%
  - Friend: 27%
  - Student: 57%

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct at Kent campus (n = 1,150). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Kent Campus Source of Experienced Conduct by Faculty Position (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents</th>
<th>Sr Admin</th>
<th>Dept Chair/Head/Director</th>
<th>Coworker</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure-Track Faculty respondents</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Coworker</th>
<th>Dept Chair/Head/Director</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct at Kent campus (n = 1,150). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Kent Campus Source of Experienced Conduct by Staff Position (%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct at Kent campus ($n = 1,150$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Kent Campus Source of Experienced Conduct by Administrator with Faculty Rank Position (%)

- Faculty: 32%
- Senior Administrator: 29%
- Coworker: 29%
- Dept Chair/Head/Director: 23%
- Staff: 23%

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct at Kent campus (n = 1,150). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Regional Campuses Source of Experienced Conduct by Student Position (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Student respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct at Regional campuses (n = 258). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Regional Campuses Source of Experienced Conduct by Faculty Position (%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct at Regional campuses (n = 258). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
# Regional Campuses Source of Experienced Conduct by Staff Position (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unclassified respondents</th>
<th>Classified respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker</td>
<td>Coworker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr Admin</td>
<td>Sr Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker</td>
<td>Coworker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct at Regional campuses (n = 258). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Themes
Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Bullying and intimidation

Employees: Supervisor, administrator, and coworker conduct

Students: Chilly classroom and housing environment
Unwanted Sexual Contact

Kent Campus: 290 respondents (4%)  
258 Undergraduate Students

Regional Campuses: 14 respondents (1%)  
10 Undergraduate Students
When did it occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kent Campus</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; year, first and second semesters</td>
<td>• 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; year, first and second semesters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perpetrator of Unwanted Sexual Contact

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 304).
Emotional Responses to Unwanted Sexual Contact

Felt uncomfortable
74%

Was afraid
40%

Was angry
42%

Felt embarrassed
47%

Felt somehow responsible
43%

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 304).
Actions in Response to Unwanted Sexual Contact

Told a friend
57%

Didn’t report for fear my complaint would not be taken seriously
22%

Avoided the harasser
40%

Left the situation immediately
22%

Did nothing
31%

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 304).
Qualitative Themes for Respondents: Unwanted Sexual Contact

Fear of repercussions

University responded appropriately

No response/unsatisfactory response
Employee Respondents Who *Seriously Considered Leaving*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kent Campus</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53% of Faculty</td>
<td>45% of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52% of Staff</td>
<td>55% of Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reasons Employees Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving

All Campuses

- Financial reasons
- Limited opportunities for advancement
- Tension with supervisor/manager
Qualitative Themes for Employee Respondents

Why Considered leaving…

Lack of advancement opportunities

Compensation

Workload
Qualitative Themes for Employee Respondents
Why Considered leaving…

Supervisor concerns

Incidents of bias and discrimination
Student Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving

- Kent Campus
  - Undergraduate: 32% (n = 1,170)
  - Graduate: 21% (n = 221)

- Regional Campuses
  - Students: 25% (n = 244)
Reasons Why Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving

Kent Campus
- Lack of sense of belonging
- Financial reasons
- Homesick
- Lack of support group

Regional Campuses
- Financial reasons
- Personal reasons
- Lack of sense of belonging
- Didn’t like major
Qualitative Themes for Student Respondents

Why Considered leaving…

- Sense of belonging
- Cost
- Discrimination
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…

Kent Campus: 24% (n = 1,613)

Regional Campuses: 16% (n = 262)
Perceived Conduct Based on:

Kent Campus
• Ethnicity
• Gender Identity
• Racial Identity

Regional Campuses
• Position
• Faculty Status
• Don’t Know
Form of Observed Exclusionary Conduct

• Person was disrespected
• Person was intimidated/bullied
• Person was ignored or excluded
• Person isolated or left out
Response to Observed Exclusionary Conduct

Felt uncomfortable
63%

Felt angry
47%

Felt embarrassed
26%

Told a friend
22%

Told a family member
16%

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct (n = 1,875). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Themes

Observed Exclusionary Conduct

Bullying

Power differential

Discrimination/prejudice based on gender, sexual, or racial identity
The majority of employee respondents expressed positive views of campus climate.
Staff Respondents

Kent State was supportive of them taking leave
Kent Campus: 88%
Regional Campuses: 94%

Colleagues/coworkers who provided them with job/career advice or guidance when they needed it
Kent Campus: 76%
Regional Campuses: 77%

Felt valued by coworkers in their work unit
Kent Campus: 80%
Regional Campuses: 78%

Kent State provided them with resources to pursue professional development opportunities
Kent Campus: 82%
Regional Campuses: 76%
Qualitative Themes
Staff Respondents Work-Life Attitudes
Aggregate

Lack of flex time

Maternity leave/child care

Professional development opportunities
Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents

- Department was supportive of taking leave
  - Kent Campus: 79%
  - Regional Campuses: 86%

- Burdened by service responsibilities
  - Kent Campus: 51%
  - Regional Campuses: 45%

- Kent State was supportive of the use of sabbatical/faculty professional improvement leave
  - Kent Campus: 75%
  - Regional Campuses: 81%

- Point of view was taken into account for course assignments and scheduling
  - Kent Campus: 78%
  - Regional Campuses: 79%
Qualitative Themes

Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents Work-Life Attitudes
Aggregate

Maternity leave

Issues around service

Tenure inconsistencies

Concerns regarding leadership
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents

- Process for obtaining professional development funds was fair and accessible
  - Kent Campus: 70%
  - Regional Campuses: 67%

- Point of view was taken into account for course assignments and scheduling
  - Kent Campus: 80%
  - Regional Campuses: 75%

- Pressured to do work and/or service without compensation
  - Kent Campus: 57%
  - Regional Campuses: 66%
Qualitative Themes
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes
Aggregate

Workload

Mistreatment of non-tenure-track faculty
All Faculty Respondents

Felt valued by students in the classroom
Kent Campus: 83%
Regional Campuses: 89%

Kent State senior administration was genuinely concerned with their welfare
Kent Campus: 36%
Regional Campuses: 40%

Peers/mentors provided them career advice or guidance when they needed it
Kent Campus: 72%
Regional Campuses: 72%

Performed more work to help students beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations
Kent Campus: 54%
Regional Campuses: 53%
Qualitative Themes
All Faculty Respondents Work-Life Attitudes
Aggregate

Unreasonable workload

Limited institutional support

Child care
All Employee Respondents

Had to work harder than they believe their colleagues/ coworkers did to achieve the same recognition

Kent Campus: 38%
Regional Campuses: 38%

Colleagues/coworkers expected them to represent “the point of view” of their identity

Kent Campus: 32%
Regional Campuses: 31%

Reluctant to bring up issues that concerned them for fear that doing so would affect their performance evaluation/review or tenure/merit/ promotion decision

Kent Campus: 36%
Regional Campuses: 37%
Qualitative Themes

All Employee Respondents Work-Life Attitudes
Aggregate

Merit pay and raises

Inequitable treatment in the workplace

Lack of comfort to take leave and vacation
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success
Students’ Perceived Academic Success Significant Differences

**Kent Campus**
- Men less than Women
- Black/African American less than other racial identities
- LGBQ less than Heterosexual
- Students with disabilities less than students with no disability

**Regional Campuses**
- Men less than Women
- Students with disabilities less than students with no disabilities
Institutional Actions
Top Three Available Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Faculty Respondents

- Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Mentorship for new faculty
Qualitative Themes

Campus Initiatives – Faculty Respondents

Aggregate

Mixed views on diversity

No knowledge of institutional actions

Child care
Top Three Available Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Staff Respondents

Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment

Career development opportunities for staff

Diversity and equity training for staff
Qualitative Themes

Campus Initiatives – Staff Respondents

Aggregate

Lack of voice in decision-making

Child care
Top Three Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Student Respondents

Effective academic advising

Diversity and equity training for faculty

Effective faculty mentorship of students
Qualitative Themes

Campus Initiatives – Student Respondents

Aggregate

Academic advising

Child care
Next Steps
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.

Sharing the Report with the Community

Executive Summary, Full Report, and Presentation available at http://www.kent.edu/voices

Hard copies available for review in the Office of the Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
Questions and Discussion

Kent State University
Climate Study

Our Voices Count