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
What Are Students Demanding?

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’ behavioral 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.

Source: R&A, 2015; Rankin, et al., 2010; Strayhorn, 2012

Lack of Persistence

What do students offer as the main reason for their departure?
Suicidal Ideation/Self-Harm

Experienced Victimization

Lack of Social Support

Feelings of hopelessness

Suicidal Ideation or Self-Harm

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
Project Overview

**Phase I**
- 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 Climate Study Steering Committee (CSSC; comprised of students, faculty, staff, and administrators) was created.

17 focus groups were conducted at Kent State’s campus by R&A (87 participants in total – 44 students and 43 faculty and staff)

Data from the focus groups informed the CSSC and R&A in constructing questions for the campus-wide survey.
Meetings with the CSSC to develop the survey instrument.

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

The final survey was distributed to the entire Kent State community (students, faculty, staff, and administrators) via an invitation from President Warren.
**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
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.
Phase III
Spring/Summer 2016

Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted
Phase IV
Fall 2016/Winter 2017

Report draft reviewed by the CSSC

Final report submitted to Kent State

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

6,867 people responded to the call to participate
21% overall response rate
Response Rates by Employee Position

- >100% • Administrator w/Faculty Rank ($n = 107$)
- 56% • Staff ($n = 1,366$)
- 37% • Faculty ($n = 640$)
Response Rates by Student Position

- Undergraduate ($n = 3,714$) - 18%
- Graduate/Professional ($n = 1,040$) - 16%
Response Rates by Gender Identity

- **23%**
  - Woman ($n = 4,482$)

- **18%**
  - Man ($n = 2,288$)

- **N/A**
  - Genderqueer ($n = 45$)

- **N/A**
  - Transgender ($n = 14$)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- 55% • Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander \((n = 11)\)
- 43% • Two or More \((n = 346)\)
- 22% • White/European American \((n = 5,176)\)
- 19% • Black/African American \((n = 471)\)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- 17% • International \( (n = 554) \)
- 17% • Asian/Asian American \( (n = 94) \)
- 12% • Alaskan/Native American \( (n = 6) \)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- 10% Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ (n = 93)
- N/A Middle Eastern (n = 22)
Response Rates by Citizenship Status

- **26%**
  - Permanent Resident ($n = 80$)

- **22%**
  - U.S. Citizen ($n = 6,272$)

- **15%**
  - Visa Holder ($n = 466$)

- **N/A**
  - Other Status ($n = 8$)
Additional Demographic Characteristics
86% \( (n = 5,882) \) were full-time in that primary position
### Undergraduate Student Respondents

#### Year Started @ Kent State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 or before</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Graduate Student Respondents’ Year in Graduate Career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master’s student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third (or more) year</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral student/Professional/Ed.S.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third (or more) year</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All but dissertation (ABD)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Duplicated Total)

- White: 75%
- International: 8%
- Black/African American: 7%
- Multiracial: 5%
- Asian/Asian American: 1%
- Hispanic/Latino/Chicano: 1%
- Middle Eastern: <1%
- Alaskan/Native American: <1%
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: <1%
- Missing/Unknown/Not Specified/Other: 1%
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Unduplicated Total)

- White: 76%
- Black/African American: 7%
- Asian/Asian American: 6%
- Multiracial: 5%
- Latin(a)/Hispanic/Chican(a): 2%
- Other People of Color: 2%
- Race, Other/Missing/Unknown: 2%
Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (%)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Respondents by Sexual Identity and Position Status ($n$)

- **LGBQ**
  - Undergraduate Students: 414
  - Graduate/Professional Student: 144
  - Faculty: 52
  - Administrator with Faculty Rank: 10
  - Staff: 80

- **Heterosexual**
  - Undergraduate Students: 3,023
  - Graduate/Professional Student: 777
  - Faculty: 546
  - Administrator with Faculty Rank: 90
  - Staff: 1,200

- **Asexual**
  - Undergraduate Students: 216
  - Graduate/Professional Student: 69
  - Faculty: 11
  - Administrator with Faculty Rank: 0
  - Staff: 35
11% \((n = 726)\) of Respondents Had Conditions 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/Psychological Condition</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Diagnosis or Medical Condition</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Mobility condition that affects walking</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Mobility condition that does not affect walking</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf/Hard of Hearing</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asperger's/Autism Spectrum</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind/Visually Impaired</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired/Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/Communication Condition</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A disability/condition not listed here</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Religious/Spiritual Affiliation (%)

- Christian Affiliation: 54%
- No Affiliation: 31%
- Other Religious/Spiritual Affiliations: 8%
- Multiple Affiliations: 5%
- Missing/Unknown: 2%
## Citizenship Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen</td>
<td>6,272</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visa holder (F-1, J-1, H1-B, A, L, G, E, and TN)</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other legally documented status</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Military Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have not been in the military</td>
<td>6,551</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservist/National Guard</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active military</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Respondents by Age (n)

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

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

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

- **No dependent care**: 50 Faculty, 56 Administrator with Faculty Rank, 46 Staff
- **Children under 18 yrs**: 39 Faculty, 34 Administrator with Faculty Rank, 34 Staff
- **Dependent child 18 yrs or older**: 11 Faculty, 17 Administrator with Faculty Rank, 10 Staff
- **Independent child 18 yrs or older**: 4 Faculty, 4 Administrator with Faculty Rank, 2 Staff
- **Sick/disabled partner**: 2 Faculty, 2 Administrator with Faculty Rank, 2 Staff
- **Senior/other**: 14 Faculty, 20 Administrator with Faculty Rank, 13 Staff

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
## Student Respondents’ Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I work on-campus</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I work off-campus</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Residence

Campus Housing (34%, n = 1,597)

Non-Campus Housing (65%, n = 3,108)

12 respondents indicated that they were housing insecure (e.g., couch surfing, sleeping in car, shelter)
Student Respondents’ Income by Dependency Status (%)

- Undergrad Dependent
  - Below $30K: 10
  - $30K - $49,999: 12
  - $50K - $69,999: 16
  - $70K - $99,999: 22
- Grad/Prof Dependent
  - Below $30K: 2
  - $30K - $49,999: 25
  - $50K - $69,999: 16
- Undergrad Independent
  - Below $30K: 5
  - $30K - $49,999: 12
  - $50K - $69,999: 2
- Grad/Prof Independent
  - Below $30K: 3

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
50% \( (n = 2,390) \) of Student Respondents Reported Experiencing Financial Hardship…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial hardship</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty affording tuition</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty purchasing my books</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty affording housing</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty affording educational materials</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty affording other campus fees</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty affording food</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty participating in social events</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty affording health care</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty participating in co-curricular events or activities</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty affording study abroad</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty commuting to campus</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty traveling home during Kent State breaks</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty affording professional association fees/conferences</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty affording child care</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A financial hardship not listed above</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes Student respondents who reported having experienced financial hardship \( (n = 2,390) \) 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>2,725</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family contribution</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit based scholarship</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/need based scholarships (Pell, etc.)</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job/personal contribution</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit card</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate assistantship/fellowship</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU Tuition waiver</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Study</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI Bill</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident assistant</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency/Employer reimbursement (non-KSU)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International government scholarship</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A method of payment not listed here</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs or Organizations at Kent State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not participate in any clubs/organizations</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary/Academic/Professional/Educational</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs or Organizations at Kent State

Cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/International</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Government</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A type of club/organization not listed here</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Student Respondents’ Cumulative G.P.A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G.P.A.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.50 - 4.00</td>
<td>2,328</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 – 3.49</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 – 2.99</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 2.49</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50 – 1.99</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 – 1.49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0 – 0.99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comfort Levels
“Very Comfortable”/“Comfortable”

Overall Campus Climate (79%)

Department/Work Unit Climate (68%)

Classroom Climate (83%)
Comfort With Overall Climate

- Faculty and Staff respondents less comfortable than were other respondents by position
- Non-Military Service respondents less comfortable than were Military Service respondents
- Black/African American and Latin@/Hispanic/Chican@ respondents less comfortable than were other respondents by racial identity
Comfort With Overall Climate

Respondents with a Single Disability or Multiple Disabilities less comfortable than were respondents with No Disability

Low-Income Student respondents less comfortable than were Not-Low-Income Student respondents
Comfort With Department/Work Unit Climate

- Faculty and Staff respondents less comfortable than were Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents.
- Tenure Track Faculty respondents less comfortable than were Adjunct/Part-Time Faculty and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents.
- Women Faculty and Staff respondents slightly less comfortable than were Men Faculty and Staff respondents.
Comfort With Department/Work Unit Climate

Faculty and Staff Respondents with a Single Disability or Multiple Disabilities less comfortable than were Faculty and Staff respondents with No Disability
Comfort With Classroom Climate

- Undergraduate Student respondents less comfortable than were other respondents by position
- LGBQ Faculty and Student respondents less comfortable than were Heterosexual and Asexual/Other Faculty and Student respondents
- Women and Transspectrum Faculty and Student respondents less comfortable than were Men Faculty and Student respondents
Challenges and Opportunities
1,150 respondents indicated that they had personally experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile (bullying, harassing) conduct at Kent State within the past year.
Personally Experienced Based on…(%) 

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 1,150). 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>Disrespected</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignored or excluded</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated or left out</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of derogatory verbal remarks</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of workplace incivility</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed others staring at me</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n = 1,150$). 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>Role</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Of Those Who Experienced Exclusionary Conduct, Said They Experienced Conduct as a Result of Position Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>13 (n = 468)</td>
<td>9 (n = 43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/Prof</td>
<td>23 (n = 140)</td>
<td>14 (n = 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>22 (n = 142)</td>
<td>18 (n = 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin w/Fac Rank</td>
<td>29 (n = 31)</td>
<td>29 (n = 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>27 (n = 369)</td>
<td>38 (n = 141)</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 Gender Identity (%)

- Overall experienced conduct
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their gender identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Transspectrum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>(n = 354)</td>
<td>(n = 757)</td>
<td>(n = 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>(n = 41)</td>
<td>(n = 162)</td>
<td>(n = 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>16 (12)</td>
<td>17 (21)</td>
<td>58 (42)</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 (%)

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.

Overall experienced conduct

Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their age

22 and under
(n = 398)
(n = 48)
23-34
(n = 265)
(n = 68)
35-48
(n = 197)
(n = 32)
49-65
(n = 261)
(n = 52)
66 and older
(n = 17)
(n = 5)
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>Overall Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Experienced Conduct as a Result of Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/Latin@</td>
<td>21% (n = 128)¹</td>
<td>51% (n = 65)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Person of Color</td>
<td>16% (n = 85)¹</td>
<td>38% (n = 32)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16% (n = 828)¹</td>
<td>4% (n = 32)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>21% (n = 75)¹</td>
<td>31% (n = 23)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 Kent State job</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a Kent State administrative office</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at Kent State</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with one other person</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents
- Sr Admin: 25%
- Dept Chair/Head/Director: 36%
- Coworker: 46%
- Faculty: 55%

Tenure-Track Faculty respondents
- Student: 15%
- Coworker: 47%
- Dept Chair/Head/Director: 47%
- Faculty: 65%

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Position</th>
<th>Classified Staff Respondents</th>
<th>Unclassified Staff Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Chair/Head/Director</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 1,150). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?

Emotional Responses

- Felt uncomfortable (70%)
- Was angry (55%)
- Felt embarrassed (40%)
- Ignored it (23%)
- Felt somehow responsible (18%)
- Was afraid (17%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n = 1,150$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do? Actions

- Told a family member or a friend (36%)
- Avoided the harasser (32%)
- Didn’t report it for fear that complaint would not be taken seriously (19%)
- Reported it to or sought support from an on-campus resource (17%)
  - Senior administration (36%)
  - Staff person (25%)
  - Faculty member (23%)
  - Dean of Students or Student Ombuds (20%)
  - Center for Adult and Veteran Services (16%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 1,150). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Themes

Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Conduct was based on bias and discrimination

Bullying and intimidation

Employees: Supervisor/Administrative conduct
Qualitative Themes

Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Employees: Coworker conduct

Students: Conduct in the classroom/academic environment

Students: Housing
Unwanted Sexual Contact at Kent State

4% (290 respondents)
Undergraduate Student Respondents’ Experiences of Unwanted Sexual Contact by Select Demographics (n)
### Semester in Which Undergraduate Student Respondents Experienced Unwanted Sexual Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After eighth semester</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by Undergraduate Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 258).
Location of Unwanted Sexual Contact

On Campus (49%, n = 142)

Off Campus (54%, n = 157)

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 290).
Perpetrator of Unwanted Sexual Contact

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 290).
Emotional Responses to Unwanted Sexual Contact

- Felt uncomfortable: 75%
- Ignored it: 32%
- Was afraid: 40%
- Was angry: 43%
- Felt embarrassed: 47%
- Felt somehow responsible: 45%

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 290).
Actions in Response to Unwanted Sexual Contact

- Told a friend: 57%
- Told a family member: 19%
- Avoided the harasser: 40%
- Didn’t report for fear my complaint would not be taken seriously: 21%
- Did nothing: 32%
- Left the situation immediately: 22%

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 290).
Qualitative Themes for Respondents: Unwanted Sexual Contact

Desire not to report

Fear of repercussions

University responded appropriately

Negative response or lack of response
## Facilities Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-campus transportation/parking</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways, pedestrian paths, crosswalks</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom buildings</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms, labs</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevators/Lifts</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Health Services (health center)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College housing</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining facilities</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they had a disability (n = 726).
# 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>Blackboard</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible electronic format</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATM machines</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEKS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-curriculum (curriculum software)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clickers</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic forms</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library database</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they had a disability (n = 726).
## Instructional Campus Materials
### Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional materials</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams/quizzes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food menus</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events/Exhibits/Movies</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal articles</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library books</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video-closed captioning and text description</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other publications</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they had a disability ($n = 726$).
Qualitative Themes for Respondents: Accessibility of Kent State Campus

Facility accessibility on campus

Lack of adequate transportation and parking

Use of technology
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Kent State

- 55% of Administrator w/Faculty Rank respondents
- 53% of Faculty respondents
- 52% of Staff respondents
Employee Respondents Who *Seriously Considered Leaving* Kent State by Staff Status, Faculty Status, and Sexual Identity (%)
Employee Respondents Who *Seriously Considered Leaving* Kent State by Disability Status and Religious/Spiritual Affiliation (%)
### Reasons Employee Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Kent State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons (e.g., salary, resources)</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position at another institution</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with co-workers</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate was unwelcoming</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited or offered a position at another institution</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Employee respondents who indicated that they considered leaving ($n = 1,106$).
Qualitative Themes for Employee Respondents

Why Considered leaving…

Lack of advancement opportunities

Workload

Compensation
Qualitative Themes for Employee Respondents
Why Considered leaving…

Concerns about supervisor

Bias and discrimination
Student Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Kent State

32% of Undergraduate Student respondents

21% of Graduate/Professional Student respondents
# Undergraduate Student Respondents Who *Seriously Considered Leaving* Kent State by Racial Identity, Disability Status, and Income Status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bl/Af Am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat/His/Chic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oth POC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing Dis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Dis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only Undergraduate Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (*n* = 1,170).
Graduate Student Respondents Who *Seriously Considered Leaving* Kent State by Disability Status and Income Status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Status</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing Dis</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Dis</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dis</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Inc</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-Low-Inc</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only Graduate Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving *(n = 221).*
When Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Kent State

- 69% in their first year
- 39% in their second year
- 16% in their third year
- 7% in their fourth year

Note: Table includes answers from only Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving ($n = 1,391$).
### Top Reasons Why Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Kent State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homesick</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support group</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate was not welcoming</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t like major</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving ($n = 1,391$).
Qualitative Themes for Student Respondents
Why Considered leaving…

Academics (e.g., advising and unwelcoming professors)

Cost

Sense of belonging

General discrimination
Student Respondents Who Were Considering Transferring to Another Institution for Academic Reasons

- 10% of Undergraduate Student respondents
- 8% of Graduate/Professional Student respondents
Student Respondents Who Were Considering Transferring to Another Institution for Academic Reasons (%)

- Not-Low-Income (n = 323): 9%
- Low-Income (n = 132): 12%
- Not-First-Generation (n = 279): 9%
- First-Generation (n = 179): 12%
- Asexual/Other (n = 53): 19%
- Heterosexual (n = 321): 9%
- LGBQ (n = 69): 12%
- Multiracial (n = 33): 12%
- White (n = 279): 8%
- Other Persons of Color (n = 87): 18%
- Black/Latin@ (n = 50): 11%
- Transspectrum (n = 9): 13%
- Man (n = 189): 13%
- Woman (n = 281): 8%
- Grad/Prof (n = 79): 8%
- Undergraduate (n = 380): 10%
Student Respondents Who Intended to Graduate from Kent State

93% of Undergraduate Student respondents

96% of Graduate/Professional Student respondents
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…

24%  ($n = 1,613$)
Top Forms of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conduct</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person was disrespected.</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was intimidated/bullied.</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was ignored or excluded.</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was isolated or left out.</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was the target of derogatory verbal remarks.</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was the target of racial/ethnic profiling.</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was the target of workplace incivility.</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct ($n = 1,613$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct Based on…(%)
Source of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

- Students (38%)
- Faculty members (21%)
- Strangers (14%)
- Coworkers (13%)
- Supervisors (13%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct (n = 1,613). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Target of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

- Students (52%)
- Coworkers (23%)
- Friends (20%)
- Staff members (13%)
- Faculty members (13%)
- Strangers (13%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct ($n = 1,613$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Location of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Incident</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at Kent State</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While working at a Kent State job</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct (n = 1,613). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
## Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBQ (n = 251)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual (n = 1,255)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual/Other (n = 63)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial (n = 115)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (n = 1,198)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Persons of Color (n = 72)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Latin@ (n = 187)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transspectrum (n = 44)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (n = 522)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (n = 1,044)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Position Status (%)
Response to Observed Conduct

Felt uncomfortable
62%

Felt angry
47%

Felt embarrassed
26%

Told a family member
15%

Told a friend
23%

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct ($n = 1,613$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Themes

Observed Conduct

Discrimination (based on gender, sexual or racial identity)

Differences in power or status
Employee Perceptions
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Hiring Practices

- 23% ($n = 143$) of Faculty respondents
- 28% ($n = 378$) of Staff respondents
- 30% ($n = 32$) of Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Hiring Process

Cronyism and nepotism

Issues regarding diversity
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

- 14% (n = 87) of Faculty respondents
- 12% (n = 162) of Staff respondents
- 12% (n = 13) of Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

- Unknown or unclear reasons
- Personality differences
- Harassment
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Practices Related to Promotion

38% ($n = 237$) of Faculty respondents

29% ($n = 395$) of Staff respondents

23% ($n = 24$) of Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Practices Related to Promotion

Identity-based promotion and tenure decisions
Most Common Bases for Discriminatory Employment Practices

- Ethnicity
- Nepotism
- Age
- Race
- Don’t know
- Position
- Gender
- Race
The majority of employee respondents expressed positive views of campus climate.
Staff Respondents
Examples of Successes

- 88% felt Kent State and their supervisors were supportive of them taking leave.
- 76% had colleagues/coworkers who provided them with job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.
- 82% indicated that Kent State provided them with resources to pursue professional development opportunities.
Staff Respondents
Examples of Successes

80% felt valued by coworkers in their work unit

76% had adequate access to administrative support to do their job

76% indicated Kent State provided them with adequate resources to help them manage work life balance
Staff Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 37% Felt that staff opinions were taken seriously by senior administrators
- 21% People who did not have children were burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who did have children
Qualitative Themes

Staff Respondents

Work-Life Attitudes

Lack of flex time

Maternity leave and child care

Professional development opportunities
Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

79% found that their department was supportive of them taking leave

75% found that Kent State was supportive of the use of sabbatical/faculty professional improvement leave

78% felt that their point of view was taken into account for course assignments and scheduling
Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

- 72% felt that the tenure/promotion process was clear
- 71% felt that their teaching load was equitable compared to their colleagues
Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents Examples of Challenges

- 51% Burdened by service responsibilities
- 42% Burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations
- 36% Pressured to change their research agenda to achieve tenure/promotion
Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- **48%** Believed that the tenure standards/promotion standards were applied equally to all faculty
- **42%** Believed that Faculty Excellence Awards (merit raises) were awarded fairly
Qualitative Themes
Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

- Maternity leave
- Issues around service
- Tenure inconsistencies
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

80% felt their points of view were taken into account for course assignment and scheduling

70% believed that the process for obtaining professional development funds was fair and accessible
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 57% Pressured to do work and/or service without compensation
- 49% Pressured to do service and research
- 43% Believed that their workload was equitable compared to their tenured or tenure-track colleagues
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 38% Felt that their tenured and tenure-track colleagues understood the nature of their work
- 36% Burdened by service responsibilities
- 27% Burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar expectation
Qualitative Themes
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Workload
Mistreatment of non-tenure-track faculty
All Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

83% felt valued by students in the classroom

72% had peers/mentors who provided them career advice or guidance when they needed it

76% believed that their colleagues included them in opportunities that would help their careers as much as their colleagues do others in their positions
All Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

72% felt valued by faculty in their department

71% felt valued by their department head/chair

71% had adequate access to administrative support to do their job
All Faculty Respondents Examples of Challenges

- 54% performed more work to help students beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations.
- 38% felt that faculty voices were valued in shared governance.
- 36% felt that Kent State senior administration was genuinely concerned with their welfare.
All Faculty Respondents Examples of Challenges

36%
- Faculty in their departments pre-judged their abilities based on their faculty status

23%
- People who did not have children were burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who did have children

21%
- Department chair/school director pre-judged their abilities based on their faculty status
Qualitative Themes
All Faculty Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Unreasonable workload

Limited institutional support for research and service, and professional development

Children and child care
All Employee Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- **38%**: Had to work harder than they believe their colleagues/coworkers did to achieve the same recognition
- **36%**: Reluctant to bring up issues that concerned them for fear that doing so would affect their performance evaluation/review or tenure/merit/promotion decision
- **32%**: Colleagues/coworkers expected them to represent “the point of view” of their identity
Qualitative Themes
All Employee Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

- Raises and equity
- Inequitable treatment in the workplace
- Lack of comfort to take leave and vacation
Student Respondents’ Perceptions
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Majority felt valued by faculty in the classroom (76%) and by other students in the classroom (63%)

66% thought that Kent State faculty were genuinely concerned with their welfare

61% thought that Kent State staff were genuinely concerned with their welfare
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Many had faculty (72%) and less had staff (57%) whom they perceived as role models.

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

69% felt that the campus climate encouraged free and open discussion of difficult topics.
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

- 73% had advisers who provided them with advice on core class selection
- 67% had advisers who provided them with career advice
- 52% indicated that their voice was valued in campus dialogues
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success

Men Student respondents had less *Perceived Academic Success* than Women Student respondents.

Black/African American Undergraduate Student respondents had less *Perceived Academic Success* than all other racial identities.
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success

- LGBQ respondents had less Perceived Academic Success than Heterosexual respondents.
- Respondents with Disabilities had less Perceived Academic Success than respondents with No Disability.
Institutional Actions
Top Five Available Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Faculty Respondents

Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment

Flexibility for computing the probationary period for tenure

Clear process to resolve conflicts

Fair process to resolve conflicts

Mentorship for new faculty
Top Five Unavailable Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate for Faculty Respondents

- Adequate childcare
- Career span development opportunities for faculty at all ranks
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
- Mentorship for new faculty
Qualitative Themes
Campus Initiatives – Faculty Respondents

Mixed views on diversity

Unaware of actions

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

- Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Diversity and equity training for staff
- Career development opportunities for staff
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
Top Five Unavailable Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate for Staff Respondents

- Mentorship for new staff
- Career development opportunities for staff
- Adequate child care
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
Qualitative Themes
Campus Initiatives – Staff Respondents

Mixed views on diversity

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

- Effective academic advising
- Effective faculty mentorship of students
- Diversity and equity training for student staff
- Diversity and equity training for staff
- Diversity and equity training for faculty
Top Five Unavailable Campus Initiatives that Would Positively Influence Climate for Student Respondents

- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue between faculty, staff, and students
- Issues of diversity and cross-cultural competence incorporated more effectively into the curriculum
- Adequate child care
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among students
- Person to address student complaints of classroom inequity
Qualitative Themes

Campus Initiatives – Student Respondents

Mixed views on diversity

Academic advising
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

- 83% of Student and Faculty respondents were comfortable with their classroom climate.
- 76% of Student respondents felt valued by faculty in the classroom.
- 79% of respondents were comfortable with the overall climate at Kent State.
- The majority of employee respondents expressed positive attitudes about work-life issues at Kent State.
Overall Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement

- 24% observed exclusionary conduct within the last year at Kent State
- 17% personally experienced exclusionary conduct within the last year at Kent State
- 32% of Undergraduate Student respondents seriously considered leaving Kent State
- 4% experienced unwanted sexual contact while at Kent State
- 4% experienced unwanted sexual contact while at Kent State
- 24% observed exclusionary conduct within the last year at Kent State
Next Steps
Sharing the Report with the Community

Executive Summary and Power Point available at http://www.kent.edu/voices

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