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Climate In Higher Education

Assessing Campus Climate

What is it?
- Campus Climate is a construct

Definition?
- Current attitudes, behaviors, and standards and practices of employees and students of an institution

How is it measured?
- Personal Experiences
- Perceptions
- Institutional Efforts

Rankin & Reason, 2008
Campus Climate & Students

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

¹ Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005
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
²Sears, 2002
³Costello, 2012; Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2007;
Projected Outcomes

Marquette University 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).

Marquette 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
Marquette created the Climate Study Working Group (CSWG; comprised of faculty, staff, students and administrators) in April 2014.

15 focus groups were conducted by R&A (127 participants – 50 students; 77 faculty, staff, and administrators) on October 16, 2014.

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

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

The final survey was distributed to the entire Marquette community (students, faculty, staff, and administrators) via an invitation from President Michael R. Lovell.
Instrument/Sample

Final instrument
• 99 questions and additional space for respondents to provide commentary (21 qualitative, 78 quantitative)
• On-line or paper & pencil options

Sample = Population
• All students, faculty, staff, and administration of Marquette’s community received an invitation to participate.
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 2015

Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted
Phase IV
Summer/Early Fall 2015

Report draft reviewed by the CSWG

Final report submitted to Marquette

Presentation to Marquette campus community
Results

Response Rates
Who are the respondents?

4,293 people responded to the call to participate
31% overall response rate
Student Response Rates

31%
• Undergraduate \((n = 2,491)\)

21%
• Graduate \((n = 661)\)
Employee Response Rates

34%

- Faculty \((n = 420)\)

48%

- Staff/Administration \((n = 721)\)

Administration is inclusive of senior administration respondents (e.g., president, provost, dean, vice provost, vice president \((n = 10)\)
Response Rates by Gender

- **Women** ($n = 2,680$) ($37\%$)
- **Men** ($n = 1,578$) ($24\%$)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- **21%**
  - American Indian/Alaskan Native ($n = 8$)

- **27%**
  - Asian/Asian American ($n = 269$)

- **31%**
  - African American/Black ($n = 197$)

- **21%**
  - Hispanic/Latino(a)/Chicano(a) ($n = 210$)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- 27% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (n < 5)
- 32% White (n = 3,265)
- 69% Two or More (n = 252)
- 9% Other/Unknown/Not Reported (n = 54)
Results

Additional Demographic Characteristics
Respondents by Position (%)

- Undergraduate: 58%
- Graduate: 15%
- Faculty: 10%
- Staff/Administration: 17%
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Duplicated Total)

- White: 81%
- Asian/Asian American: 8%
- Latino(a)/Chicano(a)/Hispanic: 8%
- Black/African American: 6%
- Middle Eastern: 1%
- American Indian/First Nation: 1%
- Racial identity not listed: 1%
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: <1%
- Alaskan Native: <1%
Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (%)
Respondents by Sexual Identity and Position Status ($n$)

- **LGBQ**
  - Undergraduate Students: 187
  - Graduate Students: 51
  - Faculty: 30
  - Staff/Administration: 52

- **Heterosexual**
  - Undergraduate Students: 2,206
  - Graduate Students: 592
  - Faculty: 372
  - Staff/Administration: 620

- **Asexual/Other**
  - Undergraduate Students: 94
  - Graduate Students: 12
  - Faculty: 5
  - Staff/Administration: 20
13% \((n = 433)\) of Respondents Identified as Having a Single Disability or Multiple Disabilities that Substantially Affected Major Life Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Medical</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention disorders</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A disability/condition not listed here</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Religious/Spiritual Affiliation (%)

- Catholic/Roman Catholic: 46%
- Christian: 22%
- Other Faith-Based: 4%
- No Affiliation: 21%
- Multiple: 6%
# Citizenship Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visa holder (F-1, J-1, H1-B, A, L, G, E, or TN)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented resident</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other legally documented status</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2</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>4,120</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active military</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservist/National Guard</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Respondents by Age ($n$)

Note: Responses with $n$’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure.
Employee Respondents’ Dependent Care Status by Position (%)

Note: Responses with n’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure
## Faculty Academic Division/Department Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Division</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Klingler College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business Administration</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diederich College of Communication</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus College of Engineering</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Sciences</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Professional Studies</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School, Law Library</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Provost; Office of International Education</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raynor and Memorial Libraries</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dentistry</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Staff/Administration Primary Work-Unit Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Unit</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Custodians represented by the union</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Student Affairs units/departments</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics; Spirit Shop</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Finance units/departments</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the General Counsel; Human Resources</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Marketing and Communication</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Mission and Ministry; Campus Ministry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the President staff</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Provost area: Colleges, Schools and Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support units</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs; Special Events</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Advancement</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents by Age ($n$)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure
Undergraduate Student Academic Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Klingler College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business Administration</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diederich College of Communication</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus College of Engineering</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Sciences</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Professional Studies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Graduate Student Academic Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences programs</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication programs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education programs</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering programs</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences programs</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing programs</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Studies programs</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School programs</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Management</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dentistry</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I work on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 hours/week</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I work off campus</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Student Respondents’ Residence

Non-Campus Housing (51%, $n = 1,619$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independently in an apartment/house</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with family member/guardian</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity/Sorority housing</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeless (e.g., couch surfing, sleeping in car,)</strong></td>
<td>$&lt; 5$</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Residence

**Residence Hall (38%, \( n = 1,204 \))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford Hall</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter Tower</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobeen Hall</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashuda Hall</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCabe Hall</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick Hall</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Donnel Hall</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder Hall</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straz Tower</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Residence

University-Owned Apartment (10%, \(n = 322\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Town East</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Town West</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilman Building</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenn Building</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey Hall</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Student Respondents’ Residence in a Living/Learning Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I did not live in a living/learning community</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Leadership CommUNITY (McCormick Hall)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Community (Carpenter Tower)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Community (Straz Tower)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Community (Cobeen Hall)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Day Social Justice Community (Straz Tower)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Village (Campus Town East)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Income by Dependency Status and Position (%)

- Undergrad Dependent:
  - Below $30K: 7%
  - $30K - $99,999: 16%
  - $100K-$149,999: 26%
  - $150K-$249,999: 38%

- Grad Dependent:
  - Below $30K: 10%
  - $30K - $99,999: 15%
  - $100K-$149,999: 28%
  - $150K-$249,999: 34%

- Undergrad Independent:
  - Below $30K: 5%
  - $30K - $99,999: 2%
  - $100K-$149,999: 1%
  - $150K-$249,999: 32%
  - $250K-399,999: 58%

- Grad Independent:
  - Below $30K: 3%
  - $30K - $99,999: 6%
  - $100K-$149,999: 1%
  - $150K-$249,999: 32%
  - $250K-399,999: 58%

Note: Responses with n’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure.
## 3,152 Student Respondents Reported Experiencing Financial Hardship…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affording tuition</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing my books</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording housing</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in social events</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in co-curricular events or activities</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in study abroad programs</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording food</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording other campus fees</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling home during Marquette University breaks</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording health care</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting to campus</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording child care</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A financial hardship not listed here</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes Student respondents who reported having experienced financial hardship (n = 3,152) only. Sum does not total 100% as a result of multiple response choices.
## How Student Respondents Were Paying For College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marquette scholarship</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family contribution</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contribution/job</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and/or federal grant</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette grant</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work study</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Marquette scholarship</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit card</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate assistantship</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee/Spousal or dependent tuition remission</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident assistantship</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate fellowship</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A method of payment not listed here</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs or Organizations at Marquette

<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>653</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Mentorship</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity/Sorority</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student government</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer mentor</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer educator</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs or Organizations (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clubs &amp; Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and professional</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special interest</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual &amp; religious</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social awareness</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student media &amp; publications</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs or Organizations (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports &amp; recreation</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural sports</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club sports</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics (NCAA varsity teams)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An organization not listed here</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Cumulative G.P.A. ($n$)

- Less than 2.0
- 2.0-.2.49
- 2.5-2.99
- 3.0-3.49
- 3.5-4.0
- No GPA yet (first semester)
Findings
“Comfortable”/“Very Comfortable” with:

Overall Campus Climate (74%)

Department/Work Unit Climate (68%)

Classroom Climate
(Undergraduate, 81%; Graduate, 88%; Faculty, 87%)
Comfort With Overall Climate

Differences

• Faculty respondents and Staff/Administration respondents less comfortable than Student respondents
• Women respondents less comfortable than Men respondents
• Black/African American Respondents, Multiracial respondents, Latino(a)/Chicano(a)/Hispanic respondents, and Respondents of Color less comfortable than White respondents
• Respondents with other religious/spiritual affiliations or no affiliation less comfortable than Catholic/Roman Catholic respondents
Comfort With Overall Climate

Differences

• LGBQ respondents and Asexual respondents less comfortable than Heterosexual respondents
• Respondents with Multiple Disabilities and a Single Disability less comfortable than respondents with No Disability
• U.S. Citizen respondents and respondents with Multiple Citizenships less comfortable than Non-U.S. Citizen respondents
• Low-Income Student respondents less comfortable than Not Low-Income Student respondents
• First-Generation Student respondents less comfortable than Not First-Generation Student Respondents
Comfort With Department/Work Unit Climate

Differences

- Staff/Administration respondents less comfortable than Faculty respondents
- Tenure-Track Faculty respondents less comfortable than Participating/Non–Tenure Track Faculty respondents
- Black/African American Employee respondents less comfortable than other Employee respondents
- Employee respondents with Multiple Disabilities and with a Single Disability less comfortable than Employee respondents with No Disabilities
## Comfort With Classroom Climate

### Differences

- Women Faculty and Student respondents less comfortable than Men Faculty and Student respondents
- Black/African American Faculty and Student Respondents less comfortable than other Faculty and Student respondents by racial identity
- Faculty and Student respondents with other religious/spiritual affiliations or no affiliation less comfortable than Catholic/Roman Catholic Faculty and Student respondents
Comfort With Classroom Climate

Differences

• LGBQ Faculty and Student respondents less comfortable than Heterosexual Faculty and Student respondents and Asexual Faculty and Student respondents
• Low-Income Student respondents less comfortable than Not Low-Income Student respondents
• First-Generation Student respondents less comfortable than Not First-Generation Student Respondents
Challenges and Opportunities
• 791 respondents indicated that they had personally experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct at Marquette in the past year
Personally Experienced Based on…(%)
Forms of Experienced Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disrespected</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignored or excluded</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated or left out</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of derogatory verbal remarks</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed others staring at me</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment (n = 791). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Racial Identity (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct¹</th>
<th>Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their racial identity²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lat/Chic/Hispanic</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 61)¹</td>
<td>(n = 87)¹</td>
<td>(n = 59)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Afr Amer</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 25)²</td>
<td>(n = 59)²</td>
<td>(n = 87)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 24)²</td>
<td>(n = 492)¹</td>
<td>(n = 14)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 71)¹</td>
<td>(n = 20)²</td>
<td>(n = 25)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</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

- **Men**
  - Overall: 15% (n = 229)
  - Exclusionary: 9% (n = 20)

- **Women**
  - Overall: 21% (n = 549)
  - Exclusionary: 26% (n = 145)

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 Position (%)

- Overall experienced conduct¹
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of position²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct¹</th>
<th>Conduct As a Result of Position²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 450)¹</td>
<td>(n = 37)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 80)¹</td>
<td>(n = 17)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 115)¹</td>
<td>(n = 21)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Admin</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 146)¹</td>
<td>(n = 67)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.
## Location of Experienced Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at Marquette</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While working at a Marquette job</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In campus housing</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment (n = 791). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Position Status (%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment (n = 791).
Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?
Personal Responses

- Was uncomfortable (79%)
- Angry (62%)
- Told a friend (47%)
- Felt embarrassed (45%)
- Told a family member (42%)
- Avoided the harasser (32%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment ($n = 791$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?
Reporting Responses

- Sought support from a faculty member (16%)
- Didn’t report it for fear the complaint would not be taken seriously (15%)
- Sought support from a staff person (13%)
- Didn’t know to whom to go (13%)
- Sought support from a Marquette resource (12%)
- Reported it to an Marquette employee/official (6%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment (n = 791). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Theme

Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Discrimination

Hostility
Unwanted Sexual Contact at Marquette

186 respondents (4%) experienced unwanted sexual contact at Marquette University
Unwanted Sexual Contact at Marquette by Selected Demographics

Undergraduate Student respondents (7%, n = 164)

Women respondents (6%, n = 164)

LGBQ respondents (9%, n = 30)

Respondents with Multiple Disabilities (13%, n = 13)
Students - Location of Unwanted Sexual Contact

On Campus (54%, \( n = 101 \))

Off Campus (49%, \( n = 91 \))
Students - Source of Unwanted Sexual Contact

Acquaintance/Friend
(48%, n = 89)

Student
(51%, n = 94)
Student Responses to Unwanted Sexual Contact

- I felt uncomfortable: 72%
- I did nothing: 36%
- I was afraid: 36%
- I felt somehow responsible: 51%
- I felt embarrassed: 48%
- I was angry: 39%
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Marquette

- 54% of Faculty respondents (n = 228)
- 57% of Staff/Administration respondents (n = 408)
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Marquette

- **By Staff Position Status**
  - 60% of Non-Exempt Staff
  - 54% of Exempt Staff

- **By Faculty Position Status**
  - 67% of Tenure-Track Faculty
  - 39% of Participating/Non-Tenure Track

- **By Gender Identity**
  - 56% of Women respondents
  - 55% of Men respondents
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Marquette

By Racial Identity

- 70% of Multiracial respondents
- 63% of Black/African American respondents
- 57% of Latino(a)/Chicano(a)/Hispanic respondents
- 55% of Employee Respondents of Color
- 54% of White respondents
### Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Marquette

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Sexual Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBQ respondents</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual respondents</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual/Other respondents</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Disability Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents with Single Disabilities</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents with No Disability</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Military Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Military Service</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Service</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Citizen Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Citizens</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-U.S. Citizens</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Respondents Who *Seriously Considered Leaving* Marquette

By Religious/Spiritual Affiliation

- 76% with Multiple Affiliations
- 63% with Other Faith-Based Affiliations
- 62% with No Affiliations
- 52% with Christian Affiliations
- 51% with Catholic/Roman Catholic Affiliations
## Reasons Employee Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Marquette

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position at another institution</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate was unwelcoming</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited or offered a position at another institution</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with coworkers</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Faculty and Staff/Administration respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 636).
Qualitative Themes
Why Considered leaving...

Campus climate
Inclusion/Exclusion
Salary/Raises
Student Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Marquette

37% of responding Undergraduate Students (n = 915)

24% of responding Graduate Students (n = 155)
When Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Marquette

78% in their first year
41% in their second year
13% in their third year
### Top Reasons Why Student Respondents *Seriously Considered Leaving Marquette*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate was not welcoming</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a support group</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homesick</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving ($n = 1,070$).
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…

34% \ (n = 1,461)
Form of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignored or excluded.</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied.</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated or left out.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of derogatory verbal remarks.</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of racial/ethnic profiling.</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singled out as the spokesperson for his/her identity group.</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others staring at the person.</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 1,461). 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 (%)

- Student (61%)
- Faculty Member (26%)
- Stranger (16%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment \((n = 1,461)\).
Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
**Target** of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct (%)

- Stranger (67%)
- Friend (27%)
- Student (17%)
- Faculty Member (16%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 1,461). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
## Location of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at Marquette</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On social networking sites/Facebook/Twitter</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In campus housing</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 1,461). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)

- LGBQ (n = 158): 49%
- Heterosexual (n = 1,242): 33%
- Asexual (n = 33): 28%
- Women (n = 927): 35%
- Men (n = 512): 33%
- Latino(a)/Chicano(a)/Hispanic (n = 104): 50%
- Black/African American (n = 109): 55%
- Multiracial (n = 107): 43%
- White (n = 1,003): 31%
- People of Color (n = 112): 36%
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)

- Multiple Affiliations (n = 118): 46%
- No Affiliation (n = 367): 42%
- Other Faith-Based (n = 61): 37%
- Christian Affiliation (n = 298): 32%
- Catholic/Roman Catholic (n = 587): 30%
- Undergraduate (n = 903): 36%
- Graduate (n = 184): 28%
- Faculty (n = 153): 37%
- Staff/Admin (n = 221): 31%
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)

- Participating/Non Tenure-Track (n = 36) - 24%
- Tenure-Track (n = 94) - 47%
- Transfer Student (n = 276) - 33%
- Started as 1st Year Student (n = 572) - 38%
Qualitative Themes
Observed Conduct

Discrimination

McAdams/Abbate incident
Employee Perceptions
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Hiring Practices

21% ($n = 149$) of Staff/Administration respondents

21% ($n = 87$) of Faculty respondents
15% \((n = 109)\) of Staff/Administration respondents

15% \((n = 61)\) of Faculty respondents
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Practices Related to Promotion

20% \((n = 144)\) of Staff/Administration respondents

22% \((n = 93)\) of Faculty respondents
Most Common Bases for Discriminatory Employment Practices

- Nepotism/Cronyism
- Position
- Gender/Gender Identity
- Racial Identity/Ethnicity
- Age
- Political Views
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Employment Practices

Catholic/Conservative views not accepted

Discrimination based on gender, race, and sexual identity

Favoritism
The majority of Employee respondents expressed positive attitudes about work-life issues.
All Employee Respondents
Examples of Successes

88% found that Marquette University was supportive of taking leave

87% agreed that their work unit/department was supportive of participation in service/spiritual opportunities that Marquette supports

81% suggested that Marquette provided resources to help employees balance work-life needs, such as childcare and elder care
All Employee Respondents
Examples of Challenges

38% were reluctant to bring up issues that concerned them for fear that it would affect their performance evaluations or tenure/merit/promotion decisions

36% had to work harder than their colleagues/coworkers did to achieve the same recognition
All Employee Respondents

Other Successes

• 81% of Faculty and Staff/Administration respondents indicated that they had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it
• 78% reported believing that the parental leave policy was clear and easy to understand
• A majority reported believing that the parental leave policy was applied consistently across individuals (78%) and departments (75%)
• 75% of were comfortable taking leave that they were entitled to without fear that it may affect their job/careers
## All Employee Respondents

### Other Successes

- 75% agreed that they had adequate support (administrative staff, resources, etc.) to complete their assigned duties
- 68% indicated that they had supervisors who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it
Other Challenges

- Only 36% believed that the process for determining salaries was clear.
- 32% indicated that their colleagues/coworkers expected them to represent “the point of view” of their identities.
- 21% agreed that people who do not have children were burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children.
Qualitative Themes
All Employee’s Work-Life Attitudes

Taking leave

Children/Work-Life balance
Staff/Administration Respondents
Successes

- 87% agreed that their supervisors were supportive of flexible work schedules
- 82% agreed that Marquette provided them with resources to pursue professional development opportunities
- 77% agreed that their supervisors provided them with resources to pursue professional development opportunities
Staff/Administration Respondents Challenges

- 37% disagreed that they were able to complete their assigned duties during regular scheduled hours.
- 27% disagreed that the person to whom they report was appropriately trained as a supervisor.
- Less than half (46%) believed that the University Staff Assembly had an authentic impact on university governance.
Qualitative Themes
Staff/Administration
Work-Life Attitudes

University Staff Assembly

Professional development
Faculty Respondents
Tenure/Teaching Issues
Examples of Successes

81% found that Marquette was supportive of faculty taking sabbatical/faculty enhancement leave.

74% believed their colleagues included them in opportunities that will help their careers as much as they do others in their position.

The majority of Faculty respondents agreed that Marquette’s tenure/promotion process was clear (71%) and standards were reasonable (78%).
Faculty Respondents
Tenure/Teaching Issues
Challenges

52% felt they performed more work to help students than did their colleagues.

35% felt burdened by service responsibilities (e.g., committee memberships, departmental work assignments) beyond those of their colleagues.

One-quarter of Faculty respondents felt pressured to change their research agendas (21%) or their teaching pedagogy (23%) to achieve tenure/promotion/renewal.
Faculty Respondents
Tenure/Teaching Issues

Other Successes

- 68% believed that the person to whom they report was appropriately trained as a supervisor.
- 66% reported that Marquette provided them with resources to pursue professional development opportunities.
- 54% of Faculty respondents felt that their service contributions were important to tenure/promotion/renewal.
- 52% reported feeling that tenure standards/promotion standards were applied equally to all Marquette faculty.
Qualitative Themes

Faculty Tenure/Teaching Issues

Tenure/Promotion standards applied equally (or unequally)

Resources/Support
Student Respondents’ Perceptions
Majority of Student respondents felt valued by faculty (81%) and other students (66%) in the classroom.

Majority reported that Marquette faculty (77%) and staff (72%) were genuinely concerned with their welfare.

Majority had faculty/instructors (80%) and staff (63%) who they perceived as role models.
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

The majority indicated that they had advisers who provided them with career advice (69%) and advisers who provided them with advice on core class selection (72%).

52% of Student respondents believed that the campus climate encourages free and open discussion of difficult topics.

35% reported feeling that faculty/instructors pre-judged their abilities based on their perception of students’ identities/backgrounds.
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Less Student respondents reported feeling Marquette University Student Government’s voice (29%) and the Graduate Student Organization’s voices are valued in campus dialogues (21%)
Student Respondents’ Academic Experiences
Student Respondents’ Academic Experiences

- **85%**
  - Satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling at Marquette

- **84%**
  - Academic experience had a positive influence on their intellectual growth and interest in ideas

- **83%**
  - Interest in ideas and intellectual matters had increased since coming to Marquette
Student Respondents’ Academic Experiences

- **95%** • Intended to graduate from Marquette

- **5%** • Considered transferring to another college or university due to academic reasons
Student Respondents’ Academic Success

Women Undergraduate Student respondents experienced greater academic success than did Men Undergraduate Student respondents.

Undergraduate Student respondents with No Disability had greater academic success than Undergraduate Student respondents with a Single Disability.

Graduate Student respondents with No Disability had greater academic success than Graduate Student respondents with a Single Disability.
Student Respondents’ Academic Success

- Heterosexual Student respondents had more academic success than LGBQ Student respondents.

- Not First-Generation/Low-Income Student respondents experienced greater academic success than First-Generation/Low-Income Student respondents.

- Non-U.S. Citizen Graduate Student respondents experienced greater academic success than U.S. Citizen Graduate Student respondents.
Student Respondents’ Academic Success by Racial Identity

White Student respondents had more academic success than Student Respondents of Color, Black/African American Student respondents, and Latino(a)/Chicano(a)/Hispanic Student respondents.

Black/African American Student respondents experienced greater academic success than Student Respondents of Color.

Multiracial Student respondents experienced greater academic success than Black/African American Student respondents.
Student Respondents’ Academic Experiences

- 79% performed up to their full academic potential
- 64% performed academically as well as they anticipated they would
- 37% few of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating
81% of Student Respondents were satisfied with their academic experience at Marquette…

- Asexual (n = 95): 69%
- Heterosexual (n = 2,785): 82%
- LGBQ (n = 238): 75%
- Latino(a)/Chicano(a)/Hispanic (n = 187): 75%
- Black/African American (n = 148): 67%
- Multiple (n = 224): 78%
- White (n = 2,278): 83%
- Students of Color (n = 281): 73%
- Men (n = 1,126): 83%
- Women (n = 1,991): 76%
81% of Student Respondents were satisfied with their academic experience at Marquette…

- Not Low Income (n = 2,523): 82%
- Low Income (n = 505): 75%
- No Disability (n = 2,822): 82%
- Disability (n = 313): 70%
Institutional Actions
 Campus Initiatives

FACULTY RESPONDENTS

Many Faculty respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Providing a clear and fair process to resolve conflict
Many Faculty respondents thought the following positively influenced the climate:

- Providing flexibility for computing the probationary period for tenure
- Providing mentorship for new faculty
Campus Initiatives
FACULTY RESPONDENTS

Many Faculty respondents thought the following WOULD POSITIVELY INFLUENCE the climate:

- Providing career-span development opportunities for faculty
- Providing equity and diversity training to search, promotion & tenure committees
- Providing recognition and rewards for including diversity issues in courses across the curriculum
Less Faculty respondents thought the followingPOSITIVELY INFLUENCED or WOULD POSITIVELY INFLUENCE the climate:

- Including diversity-related professional experiences as one of the criteria for hiring of staff/faculty
- Providing diversity and equity training for faculty
Qualitative Themes
Institutional Actions - Faculty

Diversity resources and training

Mixed perspectives
Many Staff/Administration respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing diversity and equity training for staff
- Providing access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
Many Staff/Administration respondents thought the following **POSITIVELY INFLUENCED** the climate:

- Providing a clear and fair process to resolve conflicts
- Providing career development opportunities for staff
Many Staff/Administration respondents thought the following WOULD POSITIVELY INFLUENCE the climate:

Providing mentorship for new staff
Less Staff/Administration respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED or WOULD POSITIVELY INFLUENCE the climate:

- Considering diversity-related professional experiences as one of the criteria for hiring of staff/faculty
Qualitative Themes

Institutional Actions - Staff/Administration

Diversity training (mixed views)
Many Student respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing diversity and equity training for staff, faculty, and student staff
- Providing effective faculty mentorship of students
- Providing effective academic advisement
Campus Initiatives
STUDENT RESPONDENTS

Student respondents thought the following WOULD POSITIVELY INFLUENCE the climate:

- Providing a person to address student complaints of classroom inequality
- Increasing opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among students, and between faculty, staff, and students
- Incorporating issues of diversity and cross-cultural competence more effectively into the curriculum
Less Student respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED or WOULD POSITIVELY INFLUENCE the climate:

Providing diversity and equity training for students
Qualitative Themes

Institutional Actions - Students

Diversity training (mixed views)

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 & Successes

The majority of student respondents thought positively about their academic experiences at Marquette.

The majority of employee respondents expressed positive attitudes about work-life issues at Marquette.

74% of respondents were comfortable with the overall climate.

81% of Undergraduate Student, 88% of Graduate Student, & 87% of Faculty respondents were comfortable with classroom climate.
Overall Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement

19% $(n = 791)$ had personally experienced exclusionary conduct within the last year

37% $(n = 915)$ of students seriously considered leaving Marquette – lack of sense of belonging #1 reason

57% $(n = 408)$ of Staff/Administration and 54% $(n = 228)$ of Faculty respondents seriously considered leaving Marquette

4% $(n = 186)$ of all respondents experienced unwanted sexual contact while at Marquette
Next Steps
Process Forward
Sharing the Report with the Community
Fall 2015

Full Power Point available on Marquette website
http://www.marquette.edu/provost/climate-welcome.php

Full Report available on Marquette website/hard copy in Library
Access to Data
Process Summary

Prospective investigator forwards one-page proposal to sub-committee (Alix Riley, Cheryl Maranto, Eva Martinez Powless, Jodi Blahnik)

Sub-committee reviews the proposal to see if the research question can be examined with the current data without compromising confidentiality

If approved by the sub-committee, the prospective researcher is contacted and advised to submit an IRB application requesting secondary use of the data set

If approved by the IRB, the researcher is provided only with the summarized data necessary to respond to the question

6 month moratorium on access to the data
Campus Community Forums

Purposes

- To solicit community input
- To offer “next steps” based on climate report results that will be used to inform actions
- To identify 3 specific actions that can be accomplished in the next 12-18 months

Sign-up for a forum or add your voice on the web site
Projected Calendar

Monday November 9 – Friday November 13

• Time: 8:00 am - 8:00 pm
• Locations: Will be posted on the climate project website
Can’t Attend a Forum?… We Still Need Your Voices!

Provide your suggestions for actions on the Climate Project Feedback site:

www.marquette.edu/provost/climate-feedback.php
Questions