Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working

Kent State University
Regional Campuses
January 24, 2017
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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
Campus Climate & Faculty/Staff

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/
Responses to Unwelcoming Campus Climates

What are students’ behavioral responses?
Lack of Persistence

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

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/ongoing work.
Setting the Context for Beginning the Work

Examine the Research
• Review work already completed

Preparation
• Readiness of each campus

Assessment
• Examine the climate

Follow-up
• Building on the successes and addressing the challenges
Transformational Tapestry Model ©
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
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.
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?

1,587 people responded to the call to participate
13% overall response rate
Response Rates by Student Position

- Undergraduate ($n = 971$) [9%]
- Graduate/Professional ($n = 16$) [80%]
Response Rates by Employee Position

- >100%: Administrator w/Faculty Rank ($n = 34$)
- 50%: Staff ($n = 266$)
- 35%: Faculty ($n = 300$)
Response Rates by Gender Identity

14% • Woman ($n = 1,088$)

10% • Man ($n = 463$)

N/A • Genderqueer ($n = 10$)

N/A • Transgender ($n < 5$)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- **35%** • International \((n = 21)\)
- **26%** • Two or More \((n = 75)\)
- **16%** • Asian/Asian American \((n = 21)\)
- **13%** • White/European American \((n = 1,353)\)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- 8% • Black/African American \((n = 54)\)
- 6% • Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ \((n = 17)\)
- • Alaskan/Native American \((n < 5)\)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander \((n < 5)\)
- Middle Eastern \((n < 5)\)
- N/A
Response Rates by Citizenship Status

- **19%**
  - Visa Holder \((n = 8)\)

- **15%**
  - Permanent Resident \((n = 12)\)

- **13%**
  - U.S. Citizen \((n = 1,558)\)

- **N/A**
  - Other Status \((n < 5)\)
Additional Demographic Characteristics
70% \((n = 1,114)\) 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>81</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>39.2</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>Master’s student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third (or more) year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral student/Professional/Ed.S.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third (or more) year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All but dissertation (ABD)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Duplicated Total)

- White: 90%
- Black/African/African American: 5%
- American Indian: 3%
- Asian/Asian American: 2%
- Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ or Latin American: 2%
- Racial Identity Not Listed: 1%
- Middle Eastern: < 1%
- Pacific Islander: < 1%
- Alaska Native: 
- Native Hawaiian: 
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Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%) (Unduplicated Total)

White: 86%
People of Color: 7%
Multiracial: 5%
Race, Other/Missing/Unknown: 3%
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Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (%)

- **Staff**
  - Men: 27%
  - Women: 73%

- **Faculty**
  - Men: 37%
  - Women: 62%

- **Students**
  - Transspectrum: 2%
  - Men: 28%
  - Women: 70%

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Respondents by Sexual Identity and Position Status ($n$)
13% ($n = 210$) 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>73</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Diagnosis or Medical Condition</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Mobility condition that affects walking</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Mobility condition that does not affect walking</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf/Hard of Hearing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired/Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asperger's/Autism Spectrum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind/Visually Impaired</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/Communication Condition</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A disability/condition not listed here</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Religious/Spiritual Affiliation (%)

- Christian Affiliation: 62%
- No Affiliation: 29%
- Multiple Affiliations: 4%
- Other Religious/Spiritual Affiliation: 3%
- 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>1,558</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visa holder (F-1, J-1, H1-B, A, L, G, E, and TN)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other legally documented status</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</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>1,485</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservist/National Guard</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active military</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Age ($n$)

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

- Children under 18: 21% Students, 34% Faculty, 33% Staff
- Dependent child 18 yrs or older: 4% Students, 14% Faculty, 12% Staff
- Independent child 18 yrs or older: 3% Students, 6% Faculty, 5% Staff
- Sick/disabled partner: 1% Students, 4% Faculty, 2% Staff
- Senior/other: 5% Students, 16% Faculty, 12% Staff
## Student Respondents’ Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes, I work on-campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes, I work off-campus</strong></td>
<td>610</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Residence

Campus Housing
(n < 5)

Non-Campus Housing
(99%, n = 972)

8 respondents indicated that they were housing insecure (e.g., couch surfing, sleeping in car, shelter)
# Student Respondents’ Non-Campus Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-campus housing</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with family member/guardian</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independently in an apartment/house</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity/Sorority housing</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Income by Dependency Status (%)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.

- Dependent:
  - Below $30K: 19$
  - $30K - $49,999: 21$
  - $50K-$69,999: 22$
  - $70K-$99,999: 9$
  - $100K-$149,999: 20$
  - $150K - $199,999: 19$
  - $200K-$249,999: 7$
  - $250K-$499,999: 2$
  - $500K or more: 1$

- Independent:
  - Below $30K: 4$
  - $30K - $49,999: 19$
  - $50K-$69,999: 19$
  - $70K-$99,999: 9$
  - $100K-$149,999: 7$
  - $150K - $199,999: 2$
  - $200K-$249,999: 1$
  - $250K-$499,999: 0$
  - $500K or more: 0
54% \((n = 529)\) of Student Respondents Reported Experiencing Financial Hardship…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial hardship</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing my books</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording tuition</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording educational materials</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording food</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording housing</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording health care</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting to campus</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording other campus fees</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in social events</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in co-curricular events or activities</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording childcare</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording professional association fees/conferences</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording study abroad</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling home during Kent State breaks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A financial hardship not listed above</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes Student respondents who reported having experienced financial hardship \((n = 529)\) 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>
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# 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>719</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary/Academic/Professional/Educational</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Government</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs/Organizations</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/International</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A type of club/organization not listed here</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11.6</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>369</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 – 3.49</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 – 2.99</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 2.49</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50 – 1.99</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 – 1.49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00 – 0.99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings
## Comfort Levels

“Very Comfortable”/“Comfortable”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Campus Climate</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Work Unit Climate</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Climate</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comfort With Overall Climate

Faculty and Staff respondents less comfortable than were Student respondents
Comfort With Department/Work Unit Climate

No significant differences by select demographics
Comfort With Classroom Climate

Low-Income Student respondents less comfortable than were Not-Low-Income Student respondents
Challenges and Opportunities
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

- 258 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.

16%
Personally Experienced Based on…(%) 

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 258). 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>I was disrespected.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was intimidated/bullied.</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was ignored or excluded.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was isolated or left out.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was the target of workplace incivility.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was the target of derogatory verbal remarks.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 258). 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 (%)

- Overall experienced conduct
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of position status

Student: (n = 92) 1
(n = 14) 2

Faculty: (n = 93) 1
(n = 31) 2

Staff: (n = 73) 1
(n = 30) 2

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

- **Overall experienced conduct**
  - Tenure-Track: $31 \%$ \((n = 33)^1\)
  - Non-Tenure-Track: $53 \%$ \((n = 40)^1\)
  - Adjunct/Part-Time: $60 \%$ \((n = 10)^1\)

- **Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their faculty status**
  - Tenure-Track: $27 \%$ \((n = 9)^2\)
  - Non-Tenure-Track: $39 \%$ \((n = 21)^2\)
  - Adjunct/Part-Time: $11 \%$ \((n = 6)^2\)

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct ¹</th>
<th>Of Those Who Experienced Exclusionary Conduct, Said They Experienced Conduct as a Result of Their Age ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 and under</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 29)</td>
<td>(n = 7)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 58)</td>
<td>(n = 17)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 63)</td>
<td>(n = 10)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 95)</td>
<td>(n = 15)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n &lt; 5)</td>
<td>(n &lt; 5)²</td>
<td></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 conduct¹
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their gender identity²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 64¹</td>
<td>14 (n = 64)¹</td>
<td>17 (n = 183)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n &lt; 5²</td>
<td>5 (n &lt; 5²)</td>
<td>18 (n = 33²)</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.
<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>84</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at Kent State</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a Kent State administrative office</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- Stranger: 1
- Staff: 1
- Faculty: 3
- Student: 5

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

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

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n = 258$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?
Emotional Responses

- Felt uncomfortable (69%)
- Was angry (57%)
- Felt embarrassed (41%)
- Ignored it (19%)
- Felt somehow responsible (14%)
- Was afraid (14%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n = 258$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?

Actions

- Told a family member (38%)
- Told a friend (34%)
- Avoided the harasser (33%)
- Reported it to or sought support from an on-campus resource (25%)
  - Faculty member (37%)
  - Senior administration (31%)
  - Staff person (29%)
  - Center for Adult and Veteran Services (11%)
  - My supervisor (9%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct \((n = 258)\). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Themes

Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Public bullying

Hostility and intimidation
Unwanted Sexual Contact at Kent State

1% (14 respondents)
Location of Unwanted Sexual Contact

On Campus (64%, n = 9)

Off Campus (36%, n = 5)

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

- Felt uncomfortable 64%
- Felt embarrassed 43%
- Was afraid 50%

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 14).
## 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>29</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways, pedestrian paths, crosswalks</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms, labs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining facilities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer labs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom buildings</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevators/Lifts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency preparedness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they had a disability (n = 210).
# 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>ALEKS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackboard</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible electronic format</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-curriculum (curriculum software)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library database</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATM machines</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic forms</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic surveys (including this one)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clickers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they had a disability ($n = 210$).
# 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>24</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams/quizzes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal articles</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food menus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library books</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video-closed captioning and text description</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events/Exhibits/Movies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they had a disability (n = 210).
Qualitative Themes for Respondents:
Accessibility of Kent State Regional Campuses

Dissatisfaction with academic technology systems
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Kent State

55% of Staff respondents

45% of Faculty respondents
### 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>166</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate was unwelcoming</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position at another institution</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with co-workers</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Employee respondents who indicated that they considered leaving ($n = 297$).
Qualitative Themes for Employee Respondents

Why Considered leaving...

Salary and advancement opportunities
Student Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Kent State

25% of Student respondents
Undergraduate Student Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Kent State by Undergraduate Student Status, Gender Identity, and Racial Identity (%)
Undergraduate Student Respondents Who *Seriously Considered Leaving* Kent State by Military Status and Disability Status (%)
When Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Kent State

- 50% in their first year
- 33% in their second year
- 23% in their third year
- 9% in their fourth year
- 8% in their fifth year and after

Note: Table includes answers from only Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 244).
### 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>Financial reasons</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t like major</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate was not welcoming</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework was too difficult</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never intended to graduate from Kent State</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving ($n = 244$).
Qualitative Themes for Student Respondents

Why Considered leaving…

- Sense of belonging
- Cost
- General discrimination
Student Respondents Who Were Considering Transferring to Another Institution for Academic Reasons

15% of Student respondents
Student Respondents Who Were Considering Transferring to Another Institution for Academic Reasons by Sexual Identity, Racial Identity, and Gender Identity (%)

- Asexual (n = 22): 27%
- Heterosexual (n = 105): 13%
- LGBQ (n = 11): 11%
- Multiracial (n = 14): 26%
- White (n = 110): 13%
- People of Color (n = 16): 21%
- Man (n = 48): 18%
- Woman (n = 91): 13%
Student Respondents Who *Intended to Graduate* from Kent State

87% of Student respondents
Student Respondents Who *Intended to Graduate* from Kent State by Gender Identity (%)
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…

16%  \( (n = 262) \)
### Top Forms of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person was disrespected.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was intimidated/bullied.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was ignored or excluded.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was isolated or left out.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person was the target of workplace incivility.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person was the target of derogatory verbal remarks.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I observed others staring at the person.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct \( n = 262 \). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct Based on…(%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position (n=56)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty status (n=46)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know (n=44)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Gender identity (n=36)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct (n = 262). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

- Students (41%)
- Faculty members (33%)
- Coworkers (26%)
- Friends (14%)
- Staff members (12%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct (n = 262). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Target of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

- Faculty members (38%)
- Students (28%)
- Staff members (13%)
- Senior administrators (13%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct ($n = 262$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Location of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at Kent State</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct (n = 262). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Sexual Identity and Racial Identity (%)

- LGBQ (n = 39): 33%
- Heterosexual (n = 202): 16%
- Multiracial (n = 20): 26%
- White (n = 225): 17%
- People of Color (n = 8): 7%
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Disability Status and Religious/Spiritual Affiliation (%)
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Position Status (%)
Response to Observed Conduct

- Felt uncomfortable: 66%
- Felt angry: 47%
- Felt embarrassed: 26%
- Avoided the harasser: 18%
- Told a family member: 18%
- Told a friend: 18%

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct \((n = 262)\). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Themes

Observed Conduct

Bullying

Prejudicial exclusion
Employee Perceptions
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Hiring Practices

16% \((n = 53)\) of Faculty respondents

21% \((n = 55)\) of Staff respondents
Qualitative Themes
Discriminatory Hiring Process

Nepotism and cronyism
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

11% \((n = 36)\) of Faculty respondents

8% \((n = 20)\) of Staff respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

Lack of due process in employment related decisions
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Practices Related to Promotion

33% \( (n = 109) \) of Faculty respondents

23% \( (n = 61) \) of Staff respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Practices Related to Promotion

Demographic barriers
Most Common Bases for Discriminatory Employment Practices

- Nepotism
  - Ethnicity
  - Faculty status
  - Age
- Educational credentials
  - Position status
- Gender/gender identity
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The majority of employee respondents expressed positive views of campus climate.
Staff Respondents
Examples of Successes

Majority thought Kent State (94%) and their supervisors (92%) were supportive of them taking leave.

78% indicated that their supervisors were supportive of flexible work schedules.

82% indicated that they had adequate access to administrative support to do their job.
Staff Respondents
Examples of Successes

78% felt valued by coworkers in their work unit

77% indicated that they had colleagues/coworkers who provided them with job/career advice or guidance when they need it
Staff Respondents
Examples of Successes

76% indicated that Kent State provided them with resources to pursue professional development opportunities.

73% indicated that Kent State provided them with adequate resources to help them manage work-life balance.

74% indicated that they felt valued by their supervisors or managers.
Staff Respondents
Examples of Challenges

39%
A minority thought that Kent State senior administration was genuinely concerned with their welfare

34%
A minority thought that staff opinions were taken seriously by senior administrators
Qualitative Themes
Staff Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Flexible work schedules
Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

86% found that their department was supportive of them taking leave

79% felt that their point of view was taken into account for course assignments and scheduling

81% found that Kent State was supportive of the use of sabbatical/faculty professional improvement leave
Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 47% Pressured to change their research agenda to achieve tenure/promotion
- 45% Burdened by service responsibilities
- 40% Burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations
Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

30%

• A minority believed that Faculty Excellence Awards (merit raises) were awarded fairly
Qualitative Themes
Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Concerns regarding leadership
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents

Examples of Successes

75% felt their points of view were taken into account for course assignment and scheduling

67% believed that the process for obtaining professional development funds was fair and accessible
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 66% • Pressured to do work and/or service without compensation
- 48% • Pressured to do service and research
- 39% • A minority believed that their workload was equitable compared to their tenured or tenure-track colleagues
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 36% • A minority felt that their tenured and tenure-track colleagues understood the nature of their work
- 26% • Burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar expectation
- 21% • Burdened by service responsibilities
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- A minority felt that full-time non-tenure track faculty were equitably represented at the departmental level (35%)
- A minority felt that FTNTTs were equitably represented at the university level (25%)
Qualitative Themes
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Perceived lack of respect for work
All Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

- 89% felt valued by students in the classroom
- 77% had adequate access to administrative support to do their job
- 72% indicated that they had peers/mentors who provided them career advice or guidance when they needed it
All Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

Many felt valued by their department head/chair (70%) and faculty in their department (71%)
All Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- A minority thought that Kent State senior administration was genuinely concerned with their welfare (40%)
- A minority felt that faculty voices were valued in shared governance (38%)
All Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 35% • Faculty in their departments pre-judged their abilities based on their faculty status
- 33% • Research was valued
- 27% • Department chair/school director pre-judged their abilities based on their faculty status
Qualitative Themes
All Faculty Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Perceived unreasonable teaching loads
All Employee Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 38% Had to work harder than they believe their colleagues/coworkers did to achieve the same recognition
- 37% Reluctant to bring up issues that concerned them for fear that doing so would affect their performance evaluation/review or tenure/merit/promotion decision
- 31% Colleagues/coworkers expected them to represent “the point of view” of their identity
All Employee Respondents
Examples of Challenges

• Less than half felt the process for determining salaries/merit raises was clear
Qualitative Themes

All Employee Respondents

Work-Life Attitudes

Merit pay and raises
Student Respondents’ Perceptions
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

- Majority felt valued by faculty in the classroom (77%), and by other students in the classroom (64%)..
- 72% thought that Kent State faculty were genuinely concerned with their welfare.
- 62% thought that Kent State staff were genuinely concerned with their welfare.
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Many had faculty (73%) and less had staff (56%) whom they perceived as role models.

30% felt faculty pre-judged their abilities based on their perception of their identities/backgrounds.

72% felt that the campus climate encouraged free and open discussion of difficult topics.
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

- 75% had advisers who provided them with advice on core class selection
- 67% had advisers who provided them with career advice
- 55% indicated that their voice was valued in campus dialogues
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success

Woman Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than Men Undergraduate Student respondents.

No Disability Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than Single Disability Undergraduate Student respondents and Multiple Disabilities Undergraduate Student respondents.
Institutional Actions
Top Five Available Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Faculty Respondents

- Mentorship for new faculty
- Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Diversity and equity training for faculty
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
Top Five Unavailable Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate for Faculty Respondents

- Adequate childcare
- Career span development opportunities for faculty at all ranks
- Recognition and rewards for including diversity issues in courses across the curriculum
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
Qualitative Themes
Campus Initiatives – Faculty Respondents

Mixed views on diversity
Top Five Available Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Staff Respondents

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

1. Career development opportunities for staff
2. Diversity-related professional experiences as one of the criteria for hiring of staff/faculty
3. Adequate childcare
4. Diversity and equity training for staff
5. Access to counseling for people who have experienced counseling
Qualitative Themes
Campus Initiatives – Staff Respondents

Lack of value and voice in decision-making
Top Five Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Student Respondents

- Effective academic advising
- A person to address student complaints of classroom inequity
- Effective faculty mentorship of students
- 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

- Adequate child care
- Person to address student complaints of classroom inequity
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue between faculty, staff, and students
- Diversity training for student staff
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among students
Qualitative Themes

Campus Initiatives – Student Respondents

Child care on campus
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

86% of Student and Faculty respondents were comfortable with their classroom climate

79% of respondents were comfortable with the overall climate at Kent State – Regional Campuses

72% of Student respondents felt valued by faculty in the classroom

Employee respondents held positive attitudes about work-life issues at Kent State – Regional Campuses.
Overall Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement

16% observed exclusionary conduct within the last year at Kent State – Regional Campuses

16% personally experienced exclusionary conduct within the last year at Kent State – Regional Campuses

14 respondents experienced unwanted sexual contact while at Kent State – Regional Campuses

55% of Staff respondents seriously considered leaving Kent State – Regional Campuses
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 the Office of the Vice President for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
Questions and Discussion

Kent State University
Climate Study

Our Voices Count