

Executive Summary

Introduction

Marquette University affirms that diversity and inclusion are crucial to the intellectual vitality of the campus community. It is through freedom of exchange over different ideas and viewpoints in supportive environments that individuals develop the critical thinking and citizenship skills that will benefit them throughout their lives. Diversity and inclusion engender academic engagement where teaching, working, learning, and living take place in pluralistic communities of mutual respect.

Marquette University is dedicated to fostering a caring community that provides leadership for constructive participation in a diverse, multicultural world. As noted in Marquette University's mission statement, Marquette University "...aspires to be, and to be recognized, among the most innovative and accomplished Catholic and Jesuit universities in the world, promoting the greater glory of God and the well-being of humankind."¹ Further, Marquette's *Statement on Human Dignity & Diversity* states, "As a Catholic, Jesuit university, Marquette recognizes and cherishes the dignity of each individual regardless of age, culture, faith, ethnicity, race, gender, sexual orientation, language, disability or social class."² In order to better understand the campus climate, Marquette University recognized the need for a comprehensive tool that would provide campus climate metrics for students, faculty, and staff across Marquette University.

To that end, members of Marquette University formed the Climate Study Working Group (CSWG) in 2014. The CSWG was composed of faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Ultimately, Marquette University contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to conduct a campus-wide study entitled, "Marquette University Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working." Data gathering focused on the experiences and perceptions of various constituent groups. Based on the findings, two to three action items will be developed through community forums and completed by fall 2016.

¹<http://www.marquette.edu/about/mission.php>

²<http://www.marquette.edu/diversity/statement.shtml>

Project Design and Campus Involvement

The CSWG collaborated with R&A to develop the survey instrument. On October 6, 2014, R&A conducted 15 focus groups comprised of 127 participants (50 students; 77 faculty, staff, and administrators). Data from the focus groups informed the CSWG and R&A in constructing questions for the campus-wide survey.

Marquette University's survey contained 99 items (21 qualitative and 78 quantitative) and was available via a secure online portal from February 3 through February 27, 2015. Confidential paper surveys were available for individuals who did not have access to an Internet-connected computer or who preferred a paper survey.

Marquette University Participants

Marquette University community members completed 4,293 surveys for an overall response rate of 31%. Only surveys that were at least 50% completed were included in the final data set for analyses.³ Response rates by constituent group varied: 31% ($n = 2,491$) for Undergraduate Students, 21% ($n = 661$) for Graduate Students, 48% ($n = 721$) for Staff/Administrators, and 34% ($n = 420$) for Faculty.⁴ Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic characteristics of survey respondents. The percentages offered in Table 1 are based on the numbers of respondents in the sample (n) for specific demographic characteristics.⁵

³One hundred forty-six respondents were removed because they did not complete at least 50% of the survey.

⁴The wording of several survey items indicated that they were for "Faculty and Staff only." These questions also were answered by Administrators, because the CSWG intended for Administrators to be directed to respond to Staff questions in the survey.

⁵The total n for each demographic characteristic will differ as a result of missing data.

Table 1. Marquette University Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Subgroup	<i>n</i>	% of Sample
Position Status	Undergraduate Student	2,491	58.0
	Graduate Student	661	15.4
	Faculty	420	9.8
	Staff/Administrator	721	16.8
Gender Identity	Man	1,578	36.8
	Woman	2,680	62.4
	Transgender/Genderqueer	20	0.5
	Other	15	0.3
Racial Identity	White	3,265	76.1
	Person of Color	315	7.3
	Black/African American	197	4.6
	Latino(a)/Chicano(a)/Hispanic	210	4.9
	Multiracial	252	5.9
Sexual Identity	LGBQ	320	7.5
	Heterosexual	3,790	88.3
	Asexual	118	2.7
	Other	13	0.3
Citizenship Status	U.S. Citizen	3,778	88.0
	Non-U.S. Citizen	359	8.4
	Undocumented Resident	9	0.2
	Multiple Citizenships	123	2.9
Disability Status	Single Disability	259	6.0
	No Disability	3,896	90.8
	Multiple Disabilities	101	2.4
Military Status	Military Service	129	3.0
	No Military Service	4,120	96.0
Religious/Spiritual Affiliation	Catholic/Roman Catholic	1,966	45.8
	Christian Affiliation Other than Catholic/Roman Catholic	951	22.2
	Other Faith-Based Affiliation	166	3.9
	No Affiliation	882	20.5
	Multiple Affiliations	257	6.0
	Other	30	0.7

Note: The total *n* for each demographic characteristic differs as a result of missing data. Due to small sample sizes for other individual race categories included as response choices in the survey, “Person of Color” was determined by the CSWG to include Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, Middle Eastern, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander.

Key Findings – Areas of Strength

1. High levels of comfort with the climate at Marquette University

Climate is defined as “the current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of faculty, staff, administrators, and students concerning the level of respect for individual needs, abilities, and potential.”⁶ The level of comfort experienced by faculty, staff/administrators, and students is one indicator of campus climate.

- 74% ($n = 3,161$) of the survey respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate at Marquette University.
 - Undergraduate Student respondents (76%, $n = 1,886$) and Graduate Student respondents (75%, $n = 496$) were significantly more comfortable with the overall climate at Marquette University than were Staff/Administrator respondents (70%, $n = 501$) and Faculty respondents (66%, $n = 278$).
- 68% ($n = 779$) of Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate in their departments/work units.
- 81% ($n = 2,011$) of Undergraduate Student respondents and 88% ($n = 579$) of Graduate Student respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes.
- 87% ($n = 352$) of Faculty respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes.

2. Faculty and Staff/Administrator Respondents – Positive attitudes about work-life issues⁷

Campus climate⁸ is constituted in part by perceptions of work, sense of balance between work and home life, and opportunities for personal and professional development throughout the span of one’s career. Work-life balance is one indicator of campus climate.

⁶Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 264

⁷Percentages in this section are based on unique response totals for each item; therefore, percentages and corresponding n 's may be inconsistent.

⁸Settles, Cortina, Malley, & Stewart, 2006

- 88% ($n = 979$) of Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents found Marquette supportive of taking leave.
- 87% ($n = 964$) of Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents agreed that their work unit/department was supportive of participation in service/spiritual opportunities that Marquette supports (e.g., community service, Faber Center activities).
- 87% ($n = 617$) of Staff/Administrator respondents agreed that their supervisors were supportive of flexible work schedules.
- 81% ($n = 898$) of Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents noted that Marquette provided resources to help employees balance work-life needs, such as childcare and elder care.
- 81% ($n = 892$) of Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents indicated that they had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.
- 78% ($n = 798$) of Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents reported believing that the parental leave policy was clear and easy to understand at Marquette.
- 78% ($n = 747$) of Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents reported believing that the parental leave policy was applied consistently across individuals.
- 75% ($n = 700$) of Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents reported believing that the parental leave policy was applied consistently across departments.
- 75% ($n = 838$) of Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents were comfortable taking leave that they were entitled to without fear that it may affect their jobs/careers.
- The majority (68%, $n = 761$) of Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents indicated that they had supervisors who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.

3. Faculty Respondents – Positive attitudes about faculty work

- The majority of Faculty respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that the tenure/promotion process was clear (71%, $n = 278$) and standards were reasonable (78%, $n = 303$).
- 68% ($n = 268$) of Faculty respondents reported believing that the person to whom they report was appropriately trained as a supervisor.
- 66% ($n = 261$) of Faculty respondents reported that Marquette provided them with resources to pursue professional development opportunities.
- Less than one-quarter of Faculty respondents felt pressured to change their research agendas (21%, $n = 77$) or their teaching pedagogy (23%, $n = 85$) to achieve tenure/promotion/renewal.
- 54% ($n = 202$) of Faculty respondents felt that their service contributions were important to tenure/promotion/renewal.
- 52% ($n = 197$) of Faculty respondents reported feeling that tenure standards/promotion standards were applied equally to all Marquette faculty.
- 52% ($n = 201$) of Faculty respondents felt that they performed more work to help students than did their colleagues.

4. Student Respondents – Positive attitudes about academic experiences

The way students perceive and experience their campus climate influences their performance and success in college.⁹ Research also supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for improving learning outcomes.¹⁰ Attitudes toward academic pursuits are one indicator of campus climate.

- 85% ($n = 2,653$) of Student respondents were satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling at Marquette University.
- 84% ($n = 2,651$) of Student respondents reported that their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth and interest in ideas.

⁹Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005

¹⁰Hale, 2004; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2004

- 83% ($n = 2,602$) of Student respondents indicated that their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to Marquette University.
- 81% ($n = 2,531$) of Student respondents indicated that they were satisfied with their academic experience at Marquette University.
- 79% ($n = 2,482$) of Student respondents reported that they were performing up to their full academic potential.

5. Students – *Academic Success and Intent to Persist*

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on two scales embedded in Question 11 of the survey. The first scale, termed “Academic Success” for the purposes of this project, was developed using Pascarella and Terenzini’s (1980) *Academic and Intellectual Development Scale*. This scale has been used in a variety of studies examining undergraduate student learning. The first seven items reflect the questions on this scale. The second scale, termed “Intent to Persist” for this project, was based on the *Persistence at the Institution* subscale of *The Undergraduate Persistence Intentions Measure (UPI)* (Gloria & Kurpius, 1996; Robinson, 2003). This scale has been used in several studies to examine undergraduate student persistence. The final two items reflect the questions on this scale. Based on the analyses, the following significant differences were found:

- Women Undergraduate Student respondents perceived greater academic success than did Men Undergraduate Student respondents.
- White Student respondents perceived greater 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 perceived greater academic success than Student Respondents of Color; and Multiracial Student respondents perceived greater academic success than Black/African American Student respondents.

- Heterosexual Student respondents perceived greater academic success than LGBTQ Student respondents.
- Undergraduate Student respondents with No Disability perceived greater academic success than Undergraduate Student respondents with a Single Disability.
- Graduate Student respondents with No Disability perceived greater academic success than Graduate Student respondents with a Single Disability.
- Not First-Generation/Low-Income Student respondents perceived greater academic success than First-Generation/Low-Income Student respondents.
- Non-U.S. Citizen Graduate Student respondents perceived greater academic success than U.S. Citizen Graduate Student respondents.

Key Findings – Opportunities for Improvement

1. Members of several constituent groups were differentially affected by exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

Several empirical studies reinforce the importance of the perception of non-discriminatory environments for positive learning and developmental outcomes.¹¹ Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.¹² The survey requested information on experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

- 19% ($n = 791$) of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.
- Of those respondents who reported having experienced such conduct, 22% ($n = 171$) indicated that the conduct was based on their gender/gender identity, 19% ($n = 146$) on their racial identity, 18% ($n = 142$) on their position, and 17% ($n = 138$) on their political views; 15% each felt that it

¹¹Aguirre & Messineo, 1997; Flowers & Pascarella, 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001

¹²Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008; Waldo, 1999

was based on their age ($n = 119$) and on their religious/spiritual views ($n = 116$).

- Differences emerged based on various demographic characteristics, including gender identity, position status, age, sexual identity, and racial identity. For example:
 - Higher percentages of Black/African American respondents (44%, $n = 87$), Latino(a)/Chicano(a)/Hispanic respondents (29%, $n = 61$), Multiracial respondents (24%, $n = 61$), and Respondents of Color (23%, $n = 71$) than White respondents (15%, $n = 492$) indicated that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.
 - A higher percentage of Women respondents (21%, $n = 549$) than Men respondents (15%, $n = 229$) indicated that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.
 - A lower percentage of Graduate Student respondents (12%, $n = 80$) than Undergraduate Student respondents (18%, $n = 450$), Staff/Administrator respondents (20%, $n = 146$), and Faculty respondents (27%, $n = 115$) reported having experienced this conduct.
 - A higher percentage of respondents with Other Faith-Based Affiliations (29%, $n = 48$) than all other respondents by religious/spiritual affiliation indicated that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. Three hundred-fifty respondents elaborated on their experiences regarding how they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile behavior at Marquette University. Common themes included: (1) *Discrimination*, respondents indicated that the exclusionary behavior they experienced was through discrimination. Many respondents discussed sexism, homophobia, racism, ableism, and other forms of oppression experienced through offensive behaviors; and (2) *Hostility*, respondents indicated that the exclusionary behavior they

experienced at Marquette was through some form of hostility such as faculty having aggressive interactions with students or faculty having hostile interactions with academic colleagues and leadership.

2. Several constituent groups indicated that they were less comfortable with the overall campus climate, workplace climate, and classroom climate.

Prior research on campus climate has focused on the experiences of faculty, staff, and students associated with historically underserved social/community/affinity groups (e.g., women, people of color, people with disabilities, first-generation students, veterans).¹³ Several groups indicated that they were less comfortable than their majority counterparts with the climates of the campus, workplace, and classroom.

- Differences by Faculty Position:
 - Staff/Administrator respondents (27%, $n = 197$) were less likely than Faculty respondents (34%, $n = 142$) to feel “very comfortable” with the climate in their departments/work units at Marquette University.
 - Tenure-Track Faculty respondents (64%, $n = 129$) were less comfortable than Participating/Non Tenure Track Faculty respondents (74%, $n = 110$) with the climate in their department/work units.
- Differences by Racial Identity:
 - Lower percentages of Black/African American Respondents (6%, $n = 11$), Multiracial respondents (16%, $n = 39$), Latino(a)/Chicano(a)/Hispanic respondents (17%, $n = 36$), and Respondents of Color (18%, $n = 56$) than White respondents (23%, $n = 733$) were “very comfortable” with the overall climate at Marquette University.

¹³Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hart & Fellabaum, 2008; Norris, 1992; Rankin, 2003; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart, 2008

- A lower percentage of Black/African American respondents (47%, $n = 23$) than Latino(a)/Chicano(a)/Hispanic respondents (74%, $n = 17$), White respondents (70%, $n = 685$), Multiracial respondents (69%, $n = 18$), and Respondents of Color (67%, $n = 22$) was comfortable with the overall climate at Marquette University.
- Differences by Sexual Identity:
 - LGBQ respondents (56%, $n = 179$) were less comfortable with the overall climate than were Heterosexual respondents (76%, $n = 2,868$) and Asexual respondents (63%, $n = 78$).
 - LGBQ Faculty and Student respondents (72%, $n = 194$) were less comfortable with the climate in their classes than were Heterosexual Faculty and Student respondents (84%, $n = 2,645$) and Asexual Faculty and Student respondents (78%, $n = 77$).
- Differences by Gender Identity:
 - Women respondents (18%, $n = 492$) were less comfortable than Men respondents (25%, $n = 386$) with the overall climate.
 - Women Faculty and Student respondents (81%, $n = 1,786$) were less likely to feel comfortable than Men Faculty and Student respondents (86%, $n = 1,141$) with the climate in their classes.
- Differences by Disability Status:
 - Respondents with Multiple Disabilities (59%, $n = 60$) and those with a Single Disability (68%, $n = 176$) indicated being less comfortable with the overall climate than were respondents with No Disabilities (75%, $n = 2,898$).
 - Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents with Multiple Disabilities (33%, $n = 5$) and those with a Single Disability (52%, $n = 25$) indicated being less comfortable with the climate in their departments/work units than were Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents with No Disabilities (70%, $n = 742$).

- Differences by Religious/Spiritual Affiliation:
 - Respondents from all religious/spiritual groups, including those with no affiliation, were less comfortable with the overall climate than Catholic/Roman Catholic respondents (82%, $n = 1,612$).
 - Faculty and Student respondents from all religious/spiritual groups, including those with no affiliation, were less comfortable with the climate in their classes than Catholic Faculty and Student respondents (88%, $n = 1,429$).

- Differences by Citizenship Status:
 - U.S. Citizen respondents (20%, $n = 757$) and respondents with Multiple Citizenships (19%, $n = 23$) were less likely to feel “very comfortable” with the overall climate than were Non-U.S. Citizen respondents (26%, $n = 95$).

- Differences by Income Status (Student respondents only):
 - Low-Income Student respondents (63%, $n = 317$) were less comfortable with the overall climate than were Not Low-Income Student respondents (78%, $n = 1,981$).
 - Low-Income Student respondents (71%, $n = 359$) also were less comfortable with the climate in their classes than were Not Low-Income Student respondents (85%, $n = 2,140$).

- Differences by First-Generation Status (Student respondents only):
 - First-Generation Student respondents (60%, $n = 173$) were less comfortable with the overall climate than were Not First-Generation Student Respondents (77%, $n = 2,207$).
 - First-Generation Student respondents (63%, $n = 182$) were less comfortable with the climate in their classes than Not First-Generation Student Respondents (84%, $n = 2,405$).

3. Faculty and Staff/Administrator Respondents – Challenges with work-life issues

- 54% ($n = 228$) of Faculty respondents and 57% ($n = 408$) of Staff/Administrator respondents had seriously considered leaving Marquette University.
 - 52% ($n = 328$) of those Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents who seriously considered leaving did so for financial reasons.
- 38% ($n = 432$) of employee respondents noted that they were reluctant to bring up issues that concerned them for fear that it would affect their performance evaluations or tenure/merit/promotion decisions.
- 36% ($n = 405$) of Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents reported feeling that they had to work harder than their colleagues/coworkers did to achieve the same recognition.
- 36% ($n = 400$) of Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents believed that the process for determining salaries was clear.
- 32% ($n = 353$) of employee respondents indicated that their colleagues/coworkers expected them to represent “the point of view” of their identities.

Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents were provided the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences with work-life issues. Three hundred-thirty respondents provided written commentary. Common themes included: (1) *Taking leave*, respondents chose to elaborate specifically on the statement related to their comfort in taking leave. Some employees expressed satisfaction with Marquette’s support for taking leave and some employees were disgruntled with policies for taking leave, particularly for adjunct faculty and hourly staff; and (2) *Children/work-life balance*, respondents elaborated on the statement related to children and work-life balance, with views ranging from supportive of those with children to inequitable treatment of those without children.

4. Faculty Respondents – Challenges with faculty work

- 52% ($n = 201$) of Faculty respondents felt that they performed more work to help students than did their colleagues.
- 35% ($n = 139$) of Faculty respondents felt burdened by service responsibilities (e.g., committee memberships, departmental work assignments) beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations.
- Less than half (46%, $n = 166$) of Faculty respondents reported believing that the Academic Senate had an authentic impact on university governance.

Faculty respondents were provided the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences regarding faculty work. One-hundred Faculty respondents elaborated on their experience of work life related to tenure and advancement processes. Common themes included: (1) *Applied equally*, respondents drew particular attention to the statement related to tenure and promotion standards being applied equally to all faculty, with views ranging from the process as “biased” and “unclear” to differing from department to department; and (2) *Resources/support*, Faculty respondents provided detailed comments related to their experiences, with discussions of specific resource needs as well as how supportive supervisors have been.

5. A small but meaningful percentage of respondents experienced unwanted sexual contact.

In 2014, *Not Alone: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault* indicated that sexual assault is a significant issue for colleges and universities nationwide, affecting the physical health, mental health, and academic success of students. The report highlights that one in five women is sexually assaulted while in college. One section of the Marquette University survey requested information regarding sexual assault.

- 4% ($n = 186$) of respondents indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact while at Marquette University.

- These respondents rarely reported to anyone at Marquette University that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact.
 - A higher percentage of Women respondents (6%, $n = 164$) than Men respondents (1%, $n = 19$) reported having experienced unwanted sexual contact.
 - Additionally, higher percentages of Undergraduate Student respondents (7%, $n = 164$), LGBQ respondents (9%, $n = 30$), and respondents with Multiple Disabilities (13%, $n = 13$) than other groups reported having experienced unwanted sexual contact.
 - 58% ($n = 106$) of those respondents who reported having experienced unwanted sexual contact indicated that it happened within the past year, and 36% ($n = 65$) indicated that it happened one to four years ago.
 - Asked what they did in response to experiencing unwanted sexual contact, 72% ($n = 133$) noted that they felt uncomfortable, 51% ($n = 94$) felt somehow responsible, 48% ($n = 89$) felt embarrassed, 39% ($n = 73$) were angry, and 36% each were afraid ($n = 67$) and did nothing ($n = 66$). Eleven percent ($n = 20$) of respondents sought support from the MU Counseling Center.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on why they did not report unwanted sexual contact. Sixty-eight respondents provided written responses. Common themes included: (1) *Not that serious*, 60 respondents indicated that they did not report the unwanted sexual contact because for them it was not that serious; (2) *No clear support*, 50 respondents did not report the unwanted sexual contact because they were either anxious about whether somebody would believe them or were concerned that it would have no effect; (3) *Alcohol*, a small number of respondents did not report the incident because alcohol was involved; and (4) *Responsible*, 15 respondents did not report the unwanted sexual contact because they felt somehow responsible. The themes and selected comments that support each theme are provided in the full report.

Conclusion

Marquette University campus climate findings¹⁴ are consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.¹⁵ For example, 70% to 80% of all respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” Seventy-four percent of all Marquette University respondents reported that they were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate at Marquette University. Likewise, 20% to 25% in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At Marquette University, 19% of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. The results also paralleled the findings of other climate studies of specific constituent groups offered in the literature.¹⁶

Marquette University’s climate assessment report provides baseline data on equity and inclusion, addressing both Marquette University’s mission statement and its *Statement on Human Dignity & Diversity*. While the findings in and of themselves may guide decision-making in regard to policies and practices at Marquette University, it is important to note that the cultural fabric of an institution and unique aspects of each campus’s environment must be taken into consideration when deliberating additional action items based on these findings. The climate assessment findings provide the Marquette University community with an opportunity to build upon its strengths but also to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. Marquette University, with support from senior administrators and collaborative leadership, is in a prime position to actualize its commitment to an inclusive campus and to institute organizational structures that respond to the needs of its dynamic campus community.

¹⁴Additional findings disaggregated by position status and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.

¹⁵[Rankin & Associates Consulting, 2015 \(http://www.rankin-consulting.com/clients\)](http://www.rankin-consulting.com/clients)

¹⁶Guiffrida, Gouveia, Wall, & Seward, 2008; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2004; Hurtado & Ponjuan, 2005; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Sears, 2002; Settles et al., 2006; Silverschanz et al., 2008; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009.

References

- Aguirre, A., & Messineo, M. (1997). Racially motivated incidents in higher education: What do they say about the campus climate for minority students? *Equity & Excellence in Education, 30*(2), 26–30.
- Flowers, L., & Pascarella, E. (1999). Cognitive effects of college racial composition on African American students after 3 years of college. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 669–677.
- Guiffrida, D., Gouveia, A., Wall, A., & Seward, D. (2008). Development and validation of the Need for Relatedness at College Questionnaire (nRC-Q). *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(4), 251–261. doi: 10.1037/a0014051
- Hale, F. W. (2004). What makes racial diversity work in higher education: Academic leaders present successful policies and strategies: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Harper, S., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, no.120, p7–24.
- Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (2004). Taking seriously the evidence regarding the effects of diversity on student learning in the college classroom: A call for faculty accountability. *UrbanEd, 2*(2), 43–47.
- Hart, J., & Fellabaum, J. (2008). Analyzing campus climate studies: Seeking to define and understand. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(4), 222–234.
- Hurtado, S., & Ponjuan, L. (2005). Latino educational outcomes and the campus climate. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 4*(3), 235–251. doi: 10.1177/1538192705276548
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Diego: Jossey-Bass.
- Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of Student College Development, 46*(1), 43–61.
- Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2008). Transformational tapestry model: A comprehensive approach to transforming campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(4), 262–274. doi: 10.1037/a0014018

- Sears, J. T. (2002). The institutional climate for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual education faculty. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43(1), 11–37. doi: 10.1300/J082v43n01_02
- Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Malley, J., & Stewart, A. J. (2006). The climate for women in academic science: The good, the bad, and the changeable. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30(1), 47–58. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00261.x
- Silverschanz, P., Cortina, L., Konik, J., & Magley, V. (2008). Slurs, snubs, and queer jokes: Incidence and impact of heterosexist harassment in academia. *Sex Roles*, 58(3–4), 179–191. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9329-7
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Waldo, C. (1999). Out on campus: Sexual orientation and academic climate in a university context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 26, 745–774. doi: 10.1023/A:1022110031745
- Whitt, E. J., Edison, M. I., Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Nora, A. (2001). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the second and third years of college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 172–204.
- Worthington, R. L., Navarro, R. L., Loewy, M., & Hart, J. L. (2008). Color-blind racial attitudes, social dominance orientation, racial-ethnic group membership and college students' perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 1(1), 8–19.
- Yosso, T. J., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. G. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(4), 659–690, 781, 785–786.