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Introduction

History of the Project

University of Missouri-Columbia affirms that diversity and inclusion are crucial to the intellectual vitality of the campus community, and that they engender academic engagement where teaching, working, learning, and living take place in pluralistic communities of mutual respect. Free exchange of different ideas and viewpoints in supportive environments encourage students, faculty, and staff to develop the critical thinking and citizenship skills that will benefit them throughout their lives.

University of Missouri-Columbia also is committed to fostering a caring community that provides leadership for constructive participation in a diverse, multicultural world. As noted in University of Missouri-Columbia’s mission statement, “Our distinct mission, as Missouri’s only state-supported member of the Association of American Universities, is to provide all Missourians the benefits of a world-class research university. We are stewards and builders of a priceless state resource, a unique physical infrastructure and scholarly environment in which our tightly interlocked missions of teaching, research, service and economic development work together on behalf of all citizens. Students work side by side with some of the world’s best faculty to advance the arts and humanities, the sciences and the professions. Scholarship and teaching are daily driven by a commitment to public service — the obligation to produce and disseminate knowledge that will improve the quality of life in the state, the nation and the world.”

To better understand the campus climate, the senior administration at University of Missouri-Columbia recognized the need for a comprehensive tool that would provide campus climate metrics for the experiences and perceptions of its students, faculty, and staff. During the fall 2016 semester, University of Missouri-Columbia conducted a comprehensive survey of all students, faculty, and staff to develop a better understanding of the learning, living, and working environment on campus.

1 http://missouri.edu/about/mission.php
In May 2016, members of University of Missouri-Columbia worked with the University of Missouri System to form the Systemwide Climate Study Team (SCST). The SCST was composed of faculty, staff, and administrators across the entire University of Missouri System. Ultimately, the University of Missouri System contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to conduct a campus-wide study entitled “University of Missouri – Columbia Climate for Learning, Living, and Working.” Data gathered via reviews of relevant University of Missouri-Columbia literature and a campus-wide survey addressing the experiences and perceptions of various constituent groups will be presented to the University of Missouri-Columbia community. The community, upon receiving the report, will then come together to develop and complete two or three action items by spring 2018.

**Project Design and Campus Involvement**

The conceptual model used as the foundation for University of Missouri-Columbia’s assessment of campus climate was developed by Smith et al. (1997) and modified by Rankin (2003). A power and privilege perspective informs the model, one grounded in critical theory, which establishes that power differentials, both earned and unearned, are central to all human interactions (Brookfield, 2005). Unearned power and privilege are associated with membership in dominant social groups (Johnson, 2005) and influence systems of differentiation that reproduce unequal outcomes. University of Missouri-Columbia’s assessment was the result of a comprehensive process to identify the strengths and challenges of campus climate, with a specific focus on the distribution of power and privilege among differing social groups. This report provides an overview of the results of the campus-wide survey.

In total, 9,952 people completed the survey. In the end, the University of Missouri-Columbia’s assessment was the result of a comprehensive process to identify the strengths and challenges of the campus climate, with a specific focus on the distribution of power and privilege among differing social groups at University of Missouri-Columbia.
University of Missouri-Columbia Participants

University of Missouri-Columbia community members completed 9,952 surveys for an overall response rate of 22%. Only surveys that were at least 50% completed were included in the final data set for analyses. Forty-nine percent (n = 4,859) of the sample were Undergraduate Students, 14% (n = 1,367) were Graduate/Professional Students, 1% (n = 59) were Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Residents, 10% (n = 995) were Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist members, 26% (n = 2,601) were Staff/Senior Administrators without Faculty Rank members, and 1% (n = 71) were Senior Administrators with Faculty Rank. 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 each demographic characteristic.

Table 1. University of Missouri-Columbia Sample Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position status</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>4,859</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate/Professional Student</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Resident</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty (Tenured)</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty (Tenure-Track)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty (Non-Tenure-Track)</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emeritus faculty</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research scientist</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff/Senior Administrator without Faculty Rank</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2One hundred six surveys were removed because the respondents did not complete at least 50% of the survey. Surveys were also removed from the data file if the respondent did not provide consent (n = 0). Any additional responses (n = 1) were removed because they were judged to have been problematic (i.e., the respondent did not complete the survey in good faith).

3Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Fellow/Residents respondents are grouped as Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral respondents for analyses (also referred to as Graduate/Professional Student for brevity).

4Senior administrators with faculty rank members were given a distinct category for analyses by position or are excluded when noted.

5Senior administrators without faculty rank members are grouped with Staff for analyses.

6The total n for each demographic characteristic may differ as a result of missing data.
### Table 1. University of Missouri-Columbia Sample Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>6,099</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transspectrum</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic identity</td>
<td>African/Black/African American</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alaska Native/American Indian/Native</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Asian American</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other People of Color</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White/European American</td>
<td>7,851</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual identity</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>8,698</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGBQ</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship status</td>
<td>U.S. Citizen</td>
<td>8,988</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-U.S. Citizen</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing/Unknown</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability status</td>
<td>Single Disability</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Disability</td>
<td>8,770</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious/spiritual identity</td>
<td>Christian Religious/Spiritual Identity</td>
<td>5,868</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Religious/Spiritual Identity</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Religious/Spiritual Identity</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Religious/Spiritual Identity</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total n for each demographic characteristic may differ as a result of missing data.
Key Findings – Areas of Strength

1. High levels of comfort with the climate at University of Missouri-Columbia

Climate is defined as the “current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of employees and students concerning the access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and potential.” The survey asked about level of comfort at three different levels: all respondents’ perceptions of the University of Missouri-Columbia climate, employee respondents’ perceptions of primary work area climate, and student and faculty respondents’ perceptions of classroom climate. The level of comfort experienced by faculty, staff, and students is one indicator of campus climate.

- 84% of Student and Faculty respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their classes.
  - 85% of Men Faculty and Student respondents, 84% of Women Faculty and Student respondents, and 72% of Transspectrum Faculty and Student respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their classes.

- 77% of Employee respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their primary work areas.
  - 77% of Men Employee respondents, 78% of Women Employee respondents, and 67% of Transspectrum Employee respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their primary work areas.

---

7 Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 264
8 Student and Faculty respondents refer to Undergraduate Student respondents, Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral respondents, and Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist respondents, Senior Administrators with Faculty Rank respondents.
9 Employee respondents refer to Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist and Staff/Senior Administrators with or without Faculty Rank.
2. Faculty Respondents\(^{10}\) – Positive attitudes about faculty work
   - 91% of Non-Tenure-Track respondents felt that research was valued by University of Missouri-Columbia.
   - 82% of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that research was valued by University of Missouri-Columbia.

3. Staff Respondents\(^{11}\) – Positive attitudes about staff work
   - 86% of Staff respondents thought their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance.
   - 84% of Staff respondents thought that they had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it and 76% thought that they had supervisors and who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.
   - 85% of Staff respondents believed that they were given a reasonable time frame to complete assigned responsibilities.
   - 84% of Staff respondents believed that they had adequate resources to perform their job duties.

4. Student\(^{12}\) Respondents – Positive attitudes about academic experiences
   The way students perceive and experience their campus climate influences their performance and success in college.\(^{13}\) Research also supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for improving learning outcomes.\(^{14}\) Attitudes toward academic pursuits are one indicator of campus climate.

\(^{10}\) Faculty respondents refer to Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist respondents and Senior Administrators with Faculty Rank respondents.

\(^{11}\) Staff respondents refer to Staff/Senior Administrators without Faculty Rank respondents.

\(^{12}\) Student respondents refer to Undergraduate Student respondents and Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral respondents.

\(^{13}\) Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005

Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents

- 73% of Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents felt valued by University of Missouri-Columbia faculty while 71% felt valued by campus staff.
- 77% of Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents felt valued by faculty in the classroom.
- 70% of Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents had faculty whom they perceived as role models and 70% had other students whom they perceived as role models.

Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents

- 95% of Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents thought that department staff members (other than advisors) responded to emails, calls, or voicemails in a prompt manner.
- 92% of Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents felt that they received due credit for their research, writing, and publishing (e.g., authorship order in published articles).
- 88% of Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents felt they had adequate access to their advisors.
- 80% of Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents were satisfied with the quality of advising they have received from their departments.
Key Findings – Opportunities for Improvement

1. Members of several constituent groups indicated that they experienced 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.\textsuperscript{15} Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.\textsuperscript{16} The survey requested information on experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

- 19% of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.\textsuperscript{17}
  - 26% noted that the conduct was based on their gender/gender identity, 23% felt that it was based on their ethnicity, 21% felt that it was based on their position status, and 20% felt that it was based on their racial identity.

- Differences emerged based on gender/gender identity, position status, and ethnicity:
  - By gender identity, a higher percentage of Transspectrum respondents (36%) and Women respondents (20%) than Men respondents (16%) indicated that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.
    - 61% of Transspectrum respondents, 32% of Women respondents, and 12% of Men respondents who indicated that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct indicated that the conduct was based on their gender identity.
  - By position status\textsuperscript{18}, 29% of Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents, 24% of Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist

\textsuperscript{15}Aguirre & Messineo, 1997; Flowers & Pascarella, 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001
\textsuperscript{16}Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008; Waldo, 1999
\textsuperscript{17}The literature on microaggressions is clear that this type of conduct has a negative influence on people who experience the conduct, even if they feel at the time that it had no impact (Sue, 2010; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009).
\textsuperscript{18}Use of the word position, refers to position at the University of Missouri - Columbia
respondents, 23% of Staff respondents, 20% of Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral respondents, and 16% of Undergraduate Student respondents indicated that they had experienced this conduct.

- Of those respondents who noted that they had experienced this conduct, 40% of Staff/respondents, 25% of Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents, 23% of Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist respondents, 23% of Graduate/Professional Student/Postdoctoral respondents, and 4% of Undergraduate Student respondents thought that the conduct was based on their position status.

  o By ethnicity, significant differences were noted in the percentages of African/Black/African American (39%, n = 196), Asian/Asian American (21%, n = 96), Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ (25%, n = 43), Multiracial\(^{19}\) Respondents (27%, n = 156), Other Respondents of Color (24%, n = 21), and White respondents (16%, n = 1,276) who believed that they had experienced this conduct.

  - Of those respondents who noted that they believed that they had experienced this conduct, larger percentages of African/Black/African American respondents (55%, n = 108), Asian/Asian American respondents (68%, n = 65), Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ respondents (61%, n = 26), Other Respondents of Color (43%, n = 9), and Multiracial respondents (39%, n = 60) than White respondents (12%, n = 149) thought that the conduct was based on their ethnicity/race.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct at University of Missouri-Columbia. Eight hundred thirty-two respondents contributed comments regarding these personal experiences. Four themes emerged from their narratives: 1) racial issues/racism/reverse racism/protests, 2)  

\(^{19}\)Per the LCST (see footnote 45 for a complete understanding of the acronym LCST), respondents who identified as a person of color and white or more than one racial identity were recoded as Multiracial.
inclusion concerns for women and LGBTQ people, 3) unhealthy and hostile dynamics, and 4) fear of consequences/retaliation. Many respondents reported disrespect and exclusion with issues related to harassment or exclusionary conduct. Several respondents from all constituent groups noted concerns regarding incidents of diversity and inclusion. For Student respondents, student conduct emerged as a theme. Student respondents described issues related to harassment or exclusionary conduct, where there are derogatory remarks, and slander, and sexual harassment.

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). Several groups at University of Missouri-Columbia indicated that they were less comfortable than were their majority counterparts with the climates of the campus, workplace, and classroom.

Campus Climate

• By position status: Graduate/Professional/Post-Doctoral Student respondents (19%), Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist respondents (15%) and Staff respondents (15%) were less “very comfortable” than Undergraduate Student respondents (20%) and Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents (21%) with the overall climate at University-Missouri-Columbia.

• By racial identity: African/Black/African American (10%), Asian/Asian American (12%), and Multiracial respondents (13%) were less “very comfortable” than White respondents (19%), Other Respondents of Color (18%), and Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ (17%) with the overall climate at University-Missouri-Columbia.

---

• By sexual identity: LGBQ respondents (11%) were less “very comfortable” than Heterosexual respondents (19%) with the overall climate at University-Missouri-Columbia.

**Workplace Climate**

• By gender identity: Women Employee respondents (37%) and Transsspectrum Employee respondents (25%) were less “very comfortable” than Men Employee respondents (51%) with the workplace climate at UM-Columbia.

• By racial identity: White Employee respondents (40%), Other Employee Respondents of Color (32%), and Multiracial Employee respondents (33%) were more “very comfortable” than African/Black/African American Employee respondents (23%), Asian/Asian American Employee respondents (29%), and Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ Employee respondents (26%) with the climate in their primary work areas at University-Missouri-Columbia.

• By citizenship status: Employee respondents who were U.S. Citizens (39%) were more “very comfortable” than Employee respondents who were Non-U.S. Citizens (29%) with the workplace climate at University-Missouri-Columbia.

**Classroom Climate**

• By gender identity: Women Faculty and Student respondents (31%) and Transsspectrum Faculty and Student respondents (28%) were less “very comfortable” than Men Faculty and Student respondents (42%) with the climate in their classes at University-Missouri-Columbia.

• By racial identity: White Faculty and Students respondents (39%) were more “very comfortable” than Multiracial Faculty and Student respondents (26%), Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ Faculty and Student respondents (25%), and Other Faculty and Student Respondents of Color (22%). However, these groups were more likely to be “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes than were African/Black/African American Faculty and Student respondents (13%) and Asian/Asian American Faculty and Student respondents (19%).
• By sexual identity: LGBQ respondents (25%) were less “very comfortable” than Heterosexual respondents (36%) with the climate in their classes at University-Missouri-Columbia.
• By undergraduate student entry status: Transfer Student respondents (49%) were less “comfortable” than First-Year Student respondents (52%) with the climate in their classes at University-Missouri-Columbia.

3. Employee Respondents – Challenges with work-life issues

• 60% of Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist respondents, 52% of Senior Administrators with Faculty Rank, and 52% of Staff respondents had seriously considered leaving University of Missouri-Columbia in the past year.
  o 58% of those Faculty and Staff respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of financial reasons.
  o 48% of those Faculty and Staff respondents who seriously considered leaving indicated that they did so because of limited opportunities for advancement.
• 27% observed unfair or unjust promotion, tenure, and/or reclassification, 20% of Faculty and Staff respondents observed unjust hiring, and 14% observed unfair/unjust disciplinary actions.
• 50% of Faculty respondents and 39% of Staff respondents noted that they believed that people who have children or elder care were burdened with balancing work and family responsibilities (e.g., evening and evenings programming, workload brought home, University of Missouri-Columbia breaks not scheduled with school district breaks).
• 55% of Staff respondents felt that a hierarchy existed within staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than others.

---

21 Employee respondents refer to Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist and Staff/Senior Administrators with or without Faculty Rank.
4. Faculty\textsuperscript{22} Respondents – Challenges with faculty work

- 54\% of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents believed that they performed more work to help students than did their colleagues.
- 46\% of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt pressured to do extra work that was uncompensated.
- 45\% of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents noted that they believed that they were burdened by service responsibilities (e.g., committee memberships, departmental/program work assignments) beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations.
- 31\% of Faculty respondents felt valued by University of Missouri-Columbia senior administrators.
- 29\% of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents believed that they were pressured to change their research/scholarship agenda to achieve tenure/promotion.

Six hundred twenty-eight Staff respondents contributed comments regarding their employment-related experiences. The themes that emerged from these comments were overwhelming workload, dissatisfaction with salary & benefits, and lack of professional development support. Narratives made mention of inequity concerns regarding pay, more work and job responsibilities without compensation or reclassification, and lack of a link between evaluation scores and pay raises. Child care support was said to be wholly lacking or unfairly expensive.

Faculty respondents were provided the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences regarding workplace climate. One hundred forty-one Faculty respondents elaborated on their survey responses related to their sense of value at University of Missouri-Columbia. The themes that emerged from their comments were input concerns and leadership. Faculty respondents noted inclusion concerns for women, people with disabilities, and other minorities. Reflections on leadership pointed to a general sense of disconnect and disapproval with current leaders. Respondents were discouraged by the current leadership practices which were noted as lacking vision and commitment to truly change the culture at University of Missouri-Columbia.

\textsuperscript{22}Faculty respondents refer to Senior Administrators with Faculty Rank and Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist respondents.
Additional Key Findings – Student Respondents *Perceived Academic Success*

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the scale *Perceived Academic Success*, derived from Question 15 on the survey. Analyses using this scale revealed:

- A significant difference existed in the overall test for means for Undergraduate and Graduate students\(^{23}\) by racial identity, gender identity, sexual identity, disability status, income status, and first-generation status on *Perceived Academic Success*.
  
  - Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar 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.
    - Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents with a single disability and those with multiple disabilities have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Graduate/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral Scholar respondents who have no disability.
    - 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.
  
  - Undergraduate Student respondents
    - Men Undergraduate Student respondents have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Women Undergraduate Student respondents.
    - African/Black/African American Undergraduate respondents have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than White/European, Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@, and Multiracial Undergraduate Student respondents.
    - LGBQ Undergraduate Student respondents have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Heterosexual Undergraduate Student respondents.

---

\(^{23}\) Student respondents refer to Undergraduate Student respondents and Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral respondents.
Low-Income Undergraduate Student respondents have lower *Perceived Academic Success* than Not-Low-Income Undergraduate Student respondents.

**Conclusion**

University of Missouri-Columbia climate findings\(^{24}\) were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.\(^{25}\) For example, 70% to 80% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” A lower percentage (66%) of University of Missouri-Columbia respondents reported that they were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the overall climate at University of Missouri-Columbia. Likewise, 20% to 25% of respondents in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At University of Missouri-Columbia, a lower percentage of respondents (19%) 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.\(^{26}\)

University of Missouri-Columbia’s climate assessment report provides baseline data on diversity and inclusion, and addresses University of Missouri-Columbia’s mission and goals. While the findings may guide decision-making regarding policies and practices at University of Missouri-Columbia, it is important to note that the cultural fabric of any university 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 University of Missouri-Columbia community with an opportunity to build upon its strengths and to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. University of Missouri-Columbia, with support from senior administrators and collaborative leadership, is in a prime position to actualize its

\(^{24}\)Additional findings disaggregated by position status and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.

\(^{25}\)Rankin & Associates Consulting, 2015

\(^{26}\)Guiffrida, Gouveia, Wall, & Seward, 2008; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2004; Hurtado & Ponjuan, 2005; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Sears, 2002; Settles, Cortina, Malley, & Stewart, 2006; Silverschanz et al., 2008; Yosso et al., 2009
commitment to promote an inclusive campus and to institute organizational structures that respond to the needs of its dynamic campus community.
References


Bureau of Justice Statistics Research and Development Series (pp. 1-193).


