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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
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

² Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Hagedron, 1999; Feagin, Vera & Imani, 1996; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005
The personal and professional development of employees including faculty members, administrators, and staff members are impacted by campus climate.¹

Faculty members who judge their campus climate more positively are more likely to feel personally supported and perceive their work unit as more supportive.²

Research underscores the relationships between (1) workplace discrimination and negative job/career attitudes and (2) workplace encounters with prejudice and lower health/well-being.³

---

¹Settles, Cortina, Malley, and Stewart, 2006; Gardner, S. 2013; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, J. 2009
²Costello, 2012; Sears, 2002; Kaminski, & Geisler, 2012; Griffin, Pérez, Holmes, & Mayo 2010
³Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2007; Waldo, 1999
Climate Matters
Student Activism in 2016
Climate Matters
Student Activism in 2016
While the demands vary by institutional context, a qualitative analysis reveals similar themes across the 76 institutions and organizations (representing 73 U.S. colleges and universities, three Canadian universities, one coalition of universities and one consortium of Atlanta HBCUs.) Chessman & Wayt explore these overarching themes in an effort to provide collective insight into what is important to today’s students in the heated context of racial or other bias-related incidents on college and university campuses.

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016 ; http://www.thedemands.org/
Seven Major Themes

Policy (91%)
Leadership (89%)
Resources (88%)
Increased Diversity (86%)
Training (71%)
Curriculum (68%)
Support (61%)

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016; http://www.thedemands.org/
Responses to Unwelcoming Campus Climates

What are students’ behavioral responses?
30% of 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
University of Missouri - Columbia (MU) 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).

MU 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
Transformational Tapestry Model ©

Assessment

Baseline Organizational Challenges
Systems Analysis
Local / State / Regional Environments

Contextualized Campus Wide Assessment

Advanced Organizational Challenges
Consultant Recommendations

External Relations

15
Project Overview

Phase I
- Review of Institutional Data
- Assessment Tool Development and Implementation

Phase II
- Data Analysis

Phase III
- Final Report and Presentation
In collaboration with R&A, the Systemwide Climate Study Team (SCST; composed of faculty, staff, and administrators across the UM System) was created.

In meetings, the SCST developed the survey instrument; reviewed multiple drafts; and approved the final survey instrument.
The final survey was distributed to the entire MU community via an invitation from Interim Chancellor Henry “Hank” Foley.

The survey was available from October 4th to November 4th.
Instrument/Sample

Final instrument
• 120 questions including space for respondents to provide commentary
• On-line or paper & pencil options

Sample = Population
• All community members were invited to take the survey
• The survey was available from October 4 to November 4, 2016
Survey Limitations

- Self-selection bias
- Response rates
- Social desirability
- Caution in generalizing results for constituent groups with low response rates
Phase II
Spring 2017

Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted
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
Summer/Fall 2017

Report draft reviewed by the SCST

Final report submitted to MU

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

9,952 surveys were returned for a 22% overall response rate
Response Rates by Staff/Administrator Position

- Administrator without Faculty Rank ($n = 72$)
  - 76%

- Administrator with Faculty Rank ($n = 71$)
  - 45%

- Staff – Salary ($n = 1,119$)
  - 45%

- Staff – Hourly ($n = 1,317$)
  - 34%
Response Rates by Staff/Administrator Position

- 7% • Staff – Union ($n = 827$)
- 5% • Research Scientist ($n = 43$)
- N/A • Staff – Contract ($n = 33$)
## Response Rates by Faculty Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Tenure-Track</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Tenured</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Non-Tenure-Track</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus Faculty</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response Rates by Student Position

- **25%**
  - Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident ($n = 59$)

- **18%**
  - Undergraduate ($n = 4,859$)

- **18%**
  - Graduate/Professional ($n = 1,367$)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Woman ((n = 6,099))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Man ((n = 3,629))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Binary ((n = 34))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Genderqueer ((n = 31))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Transgender ((n = 15))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- 57% • Multiracial \((n = 582)\)
- 39% • Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander \((n = 10)\)
- 30% • Asian/Asian American \((n = 462)\)
- 23% • White \((n = 7,851)\)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- 21% • Alaska Native/American Indian/Native (n = 23)
- 17% • African/Black/African American (n = 501)
- 12% • Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ (n = 171)
- N/A • Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian (n = 54)
Response Rates by Citizenship Status

- **61%** • Permanent Resident ($n = 220$)
- **39%** • U.S. Citizen, Naturalized ($n = 318$)
- **22%** • U.S. Citizen, Birth ($n = 8,988$)
- **13%** • A Visa Holder (such as F-1, J-1, H1-B, and U) ($n = 343$)
Response Rates by Citizenship Status

- **12%**
  - Other Legally Documented Status ($n = 5$)

- **N/A**
  - Undocumented Resident ($n < 5$)

- **N/A**
  - Refugee Status ($n < 5$)
Additional Demographic Characteristics
Respondents by Position (%)

- Staff/Admin w/o Faculty Rank (n = 2,601)
- Faculty/Emeritus/R Scientist/Admin w/Faculty Rank (n = 1,038)
- Grad/Professional Std/Post-doc/Fellow/Resident (n = 1,426)
- Undergrad Std (n = 4,859)
95% \((n = 9,240)\) were full-time in their primary positions

Note: For a complete list of Staff respondents’ academic divisions/work units, please see Table B20 in Appendix B.
Note: For a complete list of Faculty respondents’ schools/colleges, please see Table B19 in Appendix B.
Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (%)
Respondents by Sexual Identity and Position Status (n)

- LGBQ
  - Undergraduate: 461
  - Graduate Student: 151
  - Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist: 55
  - Staff/Sen. Admin. w/o Fac. Rank: 5
  - Sen. Admin. w/ Fac. Rank: 185

- Heterosexual
  - Undergraduate: 4,286
  - Graduate Student: 1,206
  - Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist: 869
  - Staff/Sen. Admin. w/o Fac. Rank: 64
  - Sen. Admin. w/ Fac. Rank: 20

- Asexual
  - Undergraduate: 9
  - Graduate Student: 0
  - Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist: 0
  - Staff/Sen. Admin. w/o Fac. Rank: 0
  - Sen. Admin. w/ Fac. Rank: 0
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Duplicated Total)

- White/European American: 84%
- African/Black/African American: 6%
- Asian/Asian American: 6%
- Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@: 4%
- American Indian/Native/Alaska Native: 2%
- Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian: 1%
- Pacific Islander: < 1%
- Native Hawaiian: < 1%
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Unduplicated Total)

- White: 81%
- African/Black/African American: 5%
- Asian/Asian American: 5%
- Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@: 2%
- American Indian/Native/Alaskan Native: < 1%
- Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian: 1%
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: < 1%
- Multiracial: 6%
12% ($n = 1,156$) of Respondents Had a Condition/Disability 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>547</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental/learning difference/disability</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic diagnosis or medical condition</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/mobility condition that affects walking</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of hearing or deaf</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired/neurological/traumatic brain injury</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/mobility condition that does not affect walking</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vision or blind</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/communication condition</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A disability/condition not listed here</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents with a Disability - Accommodations

30% \((n = 233)\) of Student respondents with a disability were registered with MU Disability and Support Services

33% \((n = 121)\) of Employee respondents were receiving accommodations for their condition
Respondents by Religious/Spiritual Identity (%)
## Citizenship/Immigration Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen, birth</td>
<td>8,988</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visa holder (such as F-1, J-1, H1-B, and U)</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen, naturalized</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other legally documented status</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never served in the military</td>
<td>9,301</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now on active duty (including Reserves or National Guard)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On active duty in the past but not now</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents by Age ($n$)

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

- Staff/Sen. Admin. w/o Fac. Rank
- Sen. Admin. w/ Fac. Rank
- Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online coursework</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% - 99%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 75%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% - 50%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% - 25%</td>
<td>5,776</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a complete list of Undergraduate Student respondents’ majors, please see Table B21 in Appendix B.
Note: For a complete list of Graduate/Professional Student respondents’ academic programs, please see Table B22 in Appendix B.
# Undergraduate Student Respondents’ Semester in College Career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 4</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 6</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 8</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – 10</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 or more</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Student Respondents’ Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>2,616</td>
<td>41.6</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>781</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes, I work off campus</strong></td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Residence

Non-campus housing (75%, \( n = 4,700 \))

Campus housing (21%, \( n = 1,290 \))

Housing insecure (1%, \( n = 33 \))
### Non-Campus Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where live</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-campus housing</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-University affiliated apartment/house</td>
<td>3,507</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University affiliated apartment/house</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorority or fraternity</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with family member/guardian</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other organizational/group housing</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Campus Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where live</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus housing</strong></td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schurz Hall</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Twain Hall</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch Hall</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Hall</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillett Hall</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Avenue Hall</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolpers Hall</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston Hall</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a complete list of Student Respondents’ campus housing, please see Table B31 in Appendix B.
Undergraduate Student Respondents’ Income by Dependency Status (%)
43% \( (n = 2,076) \) of Student Respondents Reported Experiencing Financial Hardship…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial hardship</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affording tuition</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing my books/course materials</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording housing</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording food</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in social events</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording academic related activities</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording other campus fees</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording co-curricular events or activities</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes Student respondents who reported having experienced financial hardship \( (n = 2,076) \) only.
### Financial Hardship Cont’d…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial hardship</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affording unpaid internships/research opportunities</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording health care</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording travel to and from MU</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording commuting to campus (e.g., transportation, parking)</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording alternative spring breaks</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding employment</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording childcare</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes Student respondents who reported having experienced financial hardship ($n = 2,076$) only.
# How Student Respondents Were Paying For College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family contribution</td>
<td>3,383</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-need-based scholarship (e.g., Curators, Chancellor’s Scholar Award)</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus employment</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contribution</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus employment</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant (e.g., Pell)</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need-based scholarship (e.g., Access Missouri)</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## How Student Respondents Were Paying For College Cont’d…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/research assistantship</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit card</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate fellowship</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI Bill/veterans benefits</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent tuition (e.g., family member works at MU)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money from home country</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident assistant</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs or Organizations at MU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek letter organization</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and academic honorary organizations</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional or pre-professional organization</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service or philanthropic organization</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith or spirituality-based organization</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not participate in any clubs or organizations at MU</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational organization</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>16.7</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>Governance organization (e.g., SGA, SFC, Councils)</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political or issue-oriented organization</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellness organization</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture-specific organization</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication/media organization</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletic team</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75 – 4.00</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 – 3.74</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25 – 3.49</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 – 3.24</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75 – 2.99</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 – 2.74</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 – 2.49</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 2.24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.99 and below</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings
Comfort Levels

Overall Campus Climate (66%)

Work Areas* (77%)

Classroom Climate** (84%)

*Faculty and Staff responses (n = 3,667) only
** Faculty and Student responses (n = 7,351) only.
Comfort With Overall Climate

Undergraduate Student and Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents more comfortable than were Graduate Student and Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist and Staff respondents

First-Year Student respondents more comfortable than were Transfer Student respondents

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents more comfortable than were Tenured Faculty and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents

Note: These figures present examples of findings. Please visit the report for a full presentation of significant findings.
Comfort With Overall Climate

Master Degree Candidate and Professional Degree Candidate respondents more comfortable than were Doctoral Degree Candidate respondents

Men respondents more comfortable than were Women and Transspectrum respondents

White respondents, Other Respondents of Color, and Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ respondents more comfortable than were other racial groups
Comfort With Overall Climate

- Heterosexual respondents more comfortable than were LGBQ respondents
- Respondents with Christian Religious/Spiritual Identities more comfortable than were other religious/spiritual groups
- Respondents with No Disability more comfortable than were respondents with a Single Disability and Multiple Disabilities
Comfort With Overall Climate

- Non-U.S. Citizen respondents more comfortable than were U.S. Citizen respondents
- Non-Military respondents more comfortable than were Military respondents
- Not-Low-Income Student respondents more comfortable than were Low-Income Student respondents
Comfort With Overall Climate

Not-First-Generation Student respondents more comfortable than were First-Generation Student respondents

Not-Employed Student respondents more comfortable than were Employed Student respondents
Comfort With Primary Work Areas

Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents more comfortable than were Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist and Staff respondents.

Men Employee respondents more comfortable than were Women and Transspectrum Employee respondents.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents more comfortable than were Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty respondents.

Note: These figures present examples of findings. Please visit the report for a full presentation of significant findings.
Comfort With Primary Work Areas

- White Employee respondents, Other Employee Respondents of Color, and Multiracial Employee respondents more comfortable than were other racial groups
- Employee respondents with No Disability or a Single Disability more comfortable than were Employee respondents with Multiple Disabilities
- Heterosexual Employee respondents more comfortable than were LGBQ Employee respondents
Employee respondents with Christian Religious/Spiritual Identities more comfortable than were other religious/spiritual groups

Non-Military Employee respondents more comfortable than were Military Employee respondents

U.S. Citizen Employee respondents more comfortable than were Non-U.S. Citizen Employee respondents
Comfort With Classroom Climate

Undergraduate Student respondents more comfortable than were Graduate, Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist and Senior Administrator w/Faculty Rank respondents

Men Faculty and Student respondents more comfortable than were Women and Transspectrum Faculty and Student respondents

Tenured Faculty respondents more comfortable than were Tenure-Track or Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents

Note: These figures present examples of findings. Please visit the report for a full presentation of significant findings.
Comfort With Classroom Climate

- White Faculty and Student respondents more comfortable than were other racial groups
- Faculty and Student respondents with No Disability more comfortable than were Faculty and Student respondents with a Single Disability or Multiple Disabilities
- Heterosexual Faculty and Student respondents more comfortable than were LGBQ Faculty and Student respondents
Comfort With Classroom Climate

Faculty and Student respondents with Christian Religious/Spiritual Identities more comfortable than were other religious/spiritual groups

Military Faculty and Student respondents more comfortable than were Non-Military Faculty and Student respondents

U.S. Citizen Faculty and Student respondents more comfortable than were Non-U.S. Citizen Faculty and Student respondents
Comfort With Classroom Climate

Not-Low-Income Student respondents more comfortable than were Low-Income Student respondents

Not-Employed Student respondents more comfortable than were Employed Student respondents

Not-First-Generation Student respondents more comfortable than were First-Generation Student respondents
Challenges and Opportunities
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

• 1,876 respondents indicated that they had personally experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct at MU within the past year

19%
Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 1,876). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Top 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 ignored or excluded.</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was intimidated/bullied.</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was isolated or left out.</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was the target of derogatory verbal remarks.</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced a hostile work environment.</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 1,876).
Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Gender Identity (%)

- **Overall experienced conduct**¹
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their gender identity²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Transpectrum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>16 (n = 592)¹</td>
<td>20 (n = 1,202)¹</td>
<td>36 (n = 51)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampled</td>
<td>12 (n = 69)²</td>
<td>32 (n = 388)²</td>
<td>61 (n = 31)²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- Overall experienced conduct¹
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of ethnicity²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct¹</th>
<th>Excluded Conduct as a Result of Ethnicity²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African/Black/African American</td>
<td>(n = 196)¹</td>
<td>(n = 92)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Respondents of Color</td>
<td>(n = 108)²</td>
<td>(n = 49)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian American</td>
<td>(n = 96)¹</td>
<td>(n = 65)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>(n = 156)¹</td>
<td>(n = 60)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@</td>
<td>(n = 43)¹</td>
<td>(n = 26)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>(n = 1,276)¹</td>
<td>(n = 149)²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- **Overall experienced conduct**: Blue bars
- **Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of position status**: Orange bars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Conduct as a Result of Position Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrads</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad./Prof. Stds. Students</td>
<td>20 (n = 279)</td>
<td>23 (n = 63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Admin. w/ Fac. Rank</td>
<td>29 (n = 20)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/ Emeritus/R. Scientist</td>
<td>24 (n = 239)</td>
<td>23 (n = 56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Sen. Admin. w/o Fac. Rank</td>
<td>23 (n = 587)</td>
<td>60 (n = 235)</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.
## Top Locations of Experienced Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In other public spaces at MU</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While working at a MU job</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a staff office</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While walking on campus</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n = 1,876$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Student Position (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grad/Professional Stds. Postdoctoral respondents</th>
<th>Undergrad. Student respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>45% (n = 1,876)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 1,876). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Employee Status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Conduct</th>
<th>Sr. admin</th>
<th>Dept. chair</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff member</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Coworker/colleague</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 1,876). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?

Emotional Responses

- Felt angry (67%)
- Felt embarrassed (41%)
- Was afraid (30%)
- Ignored it (28%)
- Felt somehow responsible (16%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 1,876). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?

Actions

- Told a friend (42%)
- Avoided the person/venue (40%)
- Didn’t do anything (36%)
- Told a family member (34%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 1,876). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
12% \( (n = 217) \) of Respondents who Experienced Conduct Reported It

- Felt that it was not responded to appropriately (68%)
- While the outcome was not what I had hoped for, I felt as though my complaint was responded to appropriately (17%)
- Felt satisfied with the outcome (15%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct \( (n = 1,876) \). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Themes
Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Racism, reverse racism, and protests

Inclusion concerns for women & LGBTQ People

Unhealthy and unpleasant relationship dynamics

Fear of retaliation and reporting
Top Facilities Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom buildings</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus transportation/parking</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms, labs (including computer labs)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling services</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office furniture (e.g., chair, desk)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary barriers due to construction or maintenance</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways, pedestrian paths, crosswalks</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they had a disability (n = 1,156).
## Top Technology/Online Environment Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible electronic format</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment (e.g., screens, mouse, keyboard)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they had a disability ($n = 1,156$).
Top Identity Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intake forms (e.g., Student Health, Counseling, Disability Support, Registrar)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning technology</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic databases (e.g., PeopleSoft, myLearn, myPerformance, Pathway)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they had a disability (n = 1,156).
### Top Instructional/Campus Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food menus</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video-closed captioning and text description</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabi</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they had a disability \((n = 1,156)\).
Qualitative Themes for Respondents with Disabilities: Accessibility of MU Campus

Challenges seeking mental health support

Physical accessibility barriers and challenges

Lack of support for testing and course material accommodations
### Top Facilities Barriers for Transspectrum Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic and recreational facilities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other campus buildings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing rooms/locker rooms</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University housing (e.g., residence halls)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student health center</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studios/performing arts spaces</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus transportation/parking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that their gender identity was Transgender \((n = 87)\).
## Top Identity Accuracy Barriers for Transspectrum Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MU college ID card</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic databases (e.g., PeopleSoft, myLearn, myPerformance, Pathway)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake forms (e.g., student health)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodle/Blackboard</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning technology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email account</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that their gender identity was Transgender (n = 87).
### Top Instructional/Campus Materials Barriers for Transspectrum Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that their gender identity was Transgender \((n = 87)\).
Qualitative Themes for Transspectrum Respondents: Accessibility of MU Campus

Frustration and disapproval towards genderqueer, gender non-binary, or trans questions (by those who were not transspectrum)
Intent to Persist
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving MU

- All Respondents (n = 3,753): 38%
- Staff/Sen. Admin w/o Fac. Rank (n = 1,338): 52%
- Sen. Admin. w/ Fac. Rank (n = 37): 52%
- Faculty/Emeritus/Research Scientist (n = 598): 60%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low salary/pay rate</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position at another institution</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of institutional support (e.g., tech support, lab space/equipment)</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate was not welcoming</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Employee respondents who indicated that they considered leaving ($n = 1,973$).
### Top Reasons Faculty Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving MU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low salary/pay rate</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of institutional support</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position at another institution</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate was not welcoming</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited or offered a position at another institution</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of professional development opportunities</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with colleague/co-worker</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of benefits</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Faculty respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 635).
Top Reasons Staff Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving MU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low salary/pay rate</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position at another institution</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of professional development opportunities</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate was not welcoming</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with colleague/co-worker</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of institutional support</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited or offered a position at another institution</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of benefits</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Staff respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 1,338).
Qualitative Themes for Staff Respondents

Why Considered leaving...

- Concerns with leadership
- Dissatisfaction with their salaries
- Lack of opportunity for advancement
Qualitative Themes for Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist Respondents

Why Considered leaving…

- Low sense of belonging
- Leadership concerns
- Low pay and no raises
Qualitative Themes for Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank Respondents

Why Considered leaving...

Leadership concerns

Low pay
Student Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving MU

- All Respondents (n = 3,753): 38%
- Grad./Prof. Stds (n = 360): 25%
- Undergrads. (n = 1,420): 29%
Undergraduate Student Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving MU by Gender Identity, Racial Identity, and Sexual Identity (%)

Note: These are examples of findings. For all findings, please see the full report.
Graduate Student Respondents Who *Seriously Considered Leaving* MU by Income Status, Disability Status, and Employment Status (%)

Note: These are examples of findings. For all findings, please see the full report.
When Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving MU

40% in their first year
44% in their second year
20% in their third year
7% in their fourth year
5% in their fifth + year

Note: Table includes answers from only Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 1,780).
Top Reasons Why Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving MU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate was not welcoming</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of social life</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homesick</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support group</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons (e.g., medical, mental health, family emergencies)</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 1,780).
Qualitative Themes for Undergraduate Student Respondents

Why Considered leaving…

Academic concerns

Experiences of the protests during the Fall of 2015

Identity-based exclusion and hostility

General challenges sense of belonging
Qualitative Themes for Graduate Student Respondents

Why Considered leaving…

Advisors and faculty

Inclusion concerns

Experiences and perceived impact of the protests
Undergraduate Student Respondents Who Agreed It Was Likely They Will Leave MU Without Meeting Their Academic Goal (%)

- Woman (n = 340): 9%
- Man (n = 227): 10%
- Transspectrum (n = 15): 14%
- Multiracial (n = 39): 10%
- White (n = 409): 9%
- People of Color (n = 123): 14%
- LGBQ (n = 52): 12%
- Heterosexual (n = 488): 9%
- Multiple Religious/Spiritual Identity (n = 22): 11%
- No Religious/Spiritual Identity (n = 194): 10%
- Other Religious/Spiritual Identity (n = 56): 16%
- Christian Religious/Spiritual Identity (n = 305): 8%
Graduate Student Respondents Who Agreed It Was Likely They Will Leave MU Without Meeting Their Academic Goal (%)

- Non-US Citizen (n = 81): 15%
- US Citizen (n = 499): 9%
- Non Military (n = 537): 9%
- Military (n = 18): 10%
- Multiple Disability (n = 31): 15%
- Single Disability (n = 61): 11%
- No Disability (n = 491): 9%
- Not-First Generation (n = 538): 9%
- First-Generation (n = 49): 11%
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…

33% \( (n = 3,299) \)
Top Forms of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Form</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory verbal remarks</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic profiling</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person ignored or excluded</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person isolated or left out</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct ($n = 3,299$). 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 (55%)
- Stranger (20%)
- Faculty member/other instructional staff (14%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct ($n = 3,299$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Target of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

- Student (63%)
- Friend (20%)
- Stranger (17%)
- Coworker/colleague (14%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct ($n = 3,299$). 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>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In other public spaces at MU</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While walking on campus</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On social media</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct \((n = 3,299)\). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Position (%)

- Staff (n = 794): 31%
- Graduate/Prof./Post-doc Students (n = 462): 33%
- Undergraduate Students (n = 1668): 34%
- Faculty Emeritus/R. Scientist (n = 347): 35%
- Sen. Admin. w/ Faculty Rank (n = 28): 39%
- Transfer Students (n = 153): 28%
- First-Year Students (n = 1515): 35%
- Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (n = 132): 29%
- Tenure-Track Faculty (n = 49): 42%
- Tenured Faculty (n = 134): 42%
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Gender and Sexual Identity (%)
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Racial Identity (%)

- African/Black/African American (n = 258): 52%
- American Indian/Native/Alaska Native (n = 11): 48%
- Multiracial (n = 272): 47%
- Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ (n = 72): 43%
- White (n = 2,428): 31%
- Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian (n = 16): 30%
- Asian/Asian American (n = 125): 27%
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (n < 5): ...
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Disability Status and Religious/Spiritual Identity (%)
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Age (%)

- 19 or younger (n = 527): 27%
- 20-21 years (n = 832): 32%
- 22-24 years (n = 369): 32%
- 25-34 years (n = 471): 34%
- 35-44 years (n = 299): 33%
- 45-54 years (n = 279): 30%
- 55-64 years (n = 216): 28%
- 65-74 years (n = 46): 30%
- 75 and older (n < 5): 30%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not-Low-Income (n = 1670)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income (n = 419)</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Generation (n = 987)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-First-Generation (n = 2,296)</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Employment and Housing Status (%)
Actions in Response to Observed Conduct

Did nothing: 34%
Told a friend: 31%
Avoided the person/venue: 21%
Told a family member: 18%

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct (n = 3,299). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
8% \( (n = 238) \) of Respondents who Observed Conduct Reported It

- Felt that it was not responded to appropriately (44%)
- While the outcome was not what I had hoped for, I felt as though my complaint was responded to appropriately (28%)
- Felt satisfied with the outcome (28%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct \( (n = 3,299) \). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Themes
Observed Conduct

Exclusionary behavior based on race

Challenges with reporting/fear of retaliation

Student respondents concerns of conduct observed during the Fall 2015 protest

Observations of hostility among faculty members and within Greek organizations
Employee Perceptions
Employee Perceptions of Unjust Hiring Practices

21% \((n = 207)\) of Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist respondents

24% \((n = 17)\) of Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents

20% \((n = 514)\) of Staff /Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Hiring Process

Inclusion concerns

Nepotism and cronyism

Perceived reverse discrimination
Employee Perceptions of Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

16% ($n = 153$) of Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist respondents

13% ($n = 9$) of Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents

13% ($n = 337$) of Staff /Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

Lack of due process/adherence to policy

Identity based targeting and discrimination
Employee Perceptions of Unjust Practices Related to Promotion

29% \((n = 286)\) of Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist respondents

29% \((n = 20)\) of Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents

26% \((n = 668)\) of Staff/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Practices Related to Promotion

Nepotism, cronyism, and favoritism

Racism and sexism
Most Common Bases for Discriminatory Employment Practices

- Gender identity
- Position
- Job duties
- Nepotism/cronyism
- Age
- Racial identity
The majority of employee respondents expressed positive views of campus climate.
86% agreed that their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance.

A majority felt valued by coworkers in their department (82%) and supervisors/managers (76%).

84% had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.
84% had adequate resources to perform their job duties

80% believed that their supervisors were supportive of their taking leave
Staff/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- Hierarchy existed within staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than others (65%)
- Performed more work than colleagues with similar performance expectations (40%)
- People who have children or elder care were burdened with balancing work and family responsibilities (39%)
Examples of Challenges

- Pressured by departmental work requirements that occurred outside of normally scheduled hours (26%)
- There were clear procedures on how they could advance at MU (26%)
- Staff opinions were valued by University of Missouri-Columbia faculty (24%)
Qualitative Themes
Staff/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents

Work-Life Attitudes

Workload

Salary and benefits

Positive reflections

Concerns about professional development and performance evaluations
Qualitative Themes
Staff/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents
Professional Development, Leave, Flexible Work Schedule, Salary, Benefits

Lack of support for family-related leave

Leadership changes and impacts

Inadequate compensation
Qualitative Themes

Staff/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank Respondents

Sense of Value

Lack of feeling valued

Reverse discrimination

Concern for underserved communities and minorities
83% agreed that research was valued by University of Missouri-Columbia
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Rank Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 54% • Performed more work to help students than did their colleagues

- 45% • Burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations

- 29% • Felt pressured to change their research/scholarship agenda to achieve tenure/promotion
Qualitative Themes
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Rank Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Desire for more influence in decision-making

Inconsistencies in workplace practice
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

91% agreed that research was valued by University of Missouri-Columbia

78% agreed that teaching was valued by University of Missouri-Columbia
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 46% Felt pressured to do extra work that was uncompensated
- 44% Performed more work to help students than did their colleagues
- 34% Felt burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations
Qualitative Themes
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Concerns about job security

Low sense of belonging and value
Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

72% believed that their colleagues included them in opportunities that will help their career as much as they do others in their position.

65% agreed that MU provided them with resources to pursue professional development.

69% agreed that they had job security.
Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

A majority felt valued by students in the classroom (78%) and faculty in their department/program (70%),
Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- People who have children or elder care were burdened with balancing work and family responsibilities (50%)
- Felt valued by University of Missouri-Columbia senior administrators (31%)
- People who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children (20%)
Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- Salaries for adjunct faculty were competitive (39%)
- Faculty in their departments/programs pre-judged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background (25%)
Qualitative Themes
Faculty Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Dissatisfaction with salary

Lack of financial resources and grant support

Low morale
Qualitative Themes
Faculty Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Inclusion concern for a range of identities

Leadership concerns
Student Respondents’ Perceptions
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Majority felt valued by MU faculty (73%) and staff (71%)

Many felt valued by MU faculty in the classroom (77%), other students in the classroom (68%), and other students outside of the classroom (64%)

49% felt valued by MU senior administrators
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Many had faculty (70%), other students (70%) or staff (59%) whom they perceived as role models.

31% felt faculty and 28% felt staff pre-judged their abilities based on their perception of their identities/backgrounds.

54% felt that campus climate encourages free and open discussion of difficult topics.
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

About half felt that senior administrators (46%), faculty (53%), and students (56%) had taken direct actions to address the needs of at-risk/underserved students.
Qualitative Themes
Student Respondents
Sense of Value

Positive reflections

Desire for sincere, authentic dialogue on campus climate issues, particularly race

Inclusion concerns for underrepresented groups
Qualitative Themes
Student Respondents
Sense of Value

“Reverse discrimination” of White people

Low sense of belonging
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success
### Undergraduate Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>&lt; Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African/Black/African American</strong></td>
<td>&lt; White or Hispanic/Latino@/Chicano@ or Multiracial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian/Asian American</strong></td>
<td>&lt; White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBQ</strong></td>
<td>&lt; Heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single Disability and Multiple disability</strong></td>
<td>&lt; No disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-Generation</strong></td>
<td>&lt; Not-First-Generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low-Income</strong></td>
<td>&lt; Not-Low-Income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate/Professional/Post-Doctoral Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success

Single Disability and Multiple disability < No disability

Low-Income < Not-Low-Income

Transspectrum < Women or Men
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success

Men Undergraduate Student respondents have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Women Undergraduate Student respondents.

Transspectrum Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Woman and Man Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents.
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success

African/Black/African American Undergraduate respondents have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than White, Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@, and Multiracial Undergraduate Student respondents.

Asian/Asian American Undergraduate Student respondents have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than White Undergraduate Student respondents.
Student Respondents’
Perceived Academic Success

LGBQ Undergraduate Student respondents have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Heterosexual Undergraduate Student respondents.

Undergraduate Student respondents with a single disability have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Undergraduate Student respondents who have no disability.
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success

Undergraduate Student respondents with multiple disabilities have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Undergraduate Student respondents who have no disability.

Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents with a single disability have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents who have no disability.
Undergraduate Student respondents with multiple disabilities have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Undergraduate Student respondents who have no disability.

Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents with multiple disabilities have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents who have no disability.
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success

First-Generation Undergraduate Student respondents have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Not-First-Generation Undergraduate Student respondents.

Low-Income Undergraduate Student respondents have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Not-Low-Income Undergraduate Student respondents.
Low-Income Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Not-Low-Income Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents.
80% were satisfied with the quality of advising they have received from their departments.

A majority had adequate access to their advisors (88%) and had advisors who provided clear expectations (81%).

A majority had advisors (89%), department faculty members (93%), and department staff members (95%) respond to emails, calls, or voicemails in a prompt manner.
Graduate Student Respondents’ Views on Advising and Departmental Support

- 68% had adequate opportunities for them to interact with other university faculty outside of their departments
- 83% received support from their adviser to pursue research interests
- 92% received due credit for their research, writing, and publishing
83% had department faculty members encourage them to produce publications and present research

75% indicated that their department has provided them opportunities to serve the department or university in various capacities outside of teaching or research

90% felt comfortable sharing their professional goals with their advisor
Qualitative Themes
Graduate Student Respondents
Experiences with Faculty, Advising, Teaching, and Research

Positive reflections

Challenges with support, particularly advising
Institutional Actions
Top Five Available Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Faculty Respondents

- Mentorship for new faculty
- Career span development opportunities for faculty at all ranks
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
Top Five Unavailable Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate for Faculty Respondents

- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Support/resources for spouse/partner employment
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
- Career span development opportunities for faculty at all ranks
- Mentorship for new faculty
Qualitative Themes
Campus Initiatives – Faculty Respondents

Critiques of diversity training
Reverse discrimination
Top Five Available Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Staff Respondents

1. Career development opportunities for staff
2. Clear process to resolve conflicts
3. Mentorship for new staff
4. Fair process to resolve conflicts
5. Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
Top Five Unavailable Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate for Staff Respondents

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

Critiques of diversity training

Less focus on diversity and perceived minorities
Top Five Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Student Respondents

- Effective academic advising
- Effective faculty mentorship of students
- Adequate social space
- Cross-cultural dialogue among faculty, staff, and students
- Cross-cultural dialogue among students
Top Five Unavailable Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate for Student Respondents

- Effective faculty mentorship of students
- Adequate childcare resources
- Effective academic advising
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among students
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among faculty, staff, and students
Qualitative Themes
Campus Initiatives – Student Respondents

Concerns about diversity training

Perceived lack of effectiveness in current support systems
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

84% of Student and Faculty respondents were comfortable with the classroom climate

77% of Employee respondents were comfortable with the climate in their primary work areas

86% of Staff respondents felt that supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance

77% of Student respondents felt valued by faculty in the classroom
Overall Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement

- **33%** observed exclusionary conduct within the last year at MU
- **19%** personally experienced exclusionary conduct within the last year at MU
- **52%** of Staff respondents seriously considered leaving MU
- Only **31%** of Faculty respondents felt valued by MU senior administrators.
Sharing the Report with the Community

Executive Summary, Full Report, and Power Point will be available at http://missouri.edu/climatesurvey/
Questions and Discussion