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Assessing College Climate

Why Assess Climate?
What was the Process?
Why conduct a climate assessment?

- To foster a caring University community that provides leadership for constructive participation in a diverse, multicultural world.
- To open the doors wider for underrepresented groups is to create a welcoming environment.
- To improve the environment for working and learning on campus.
Project Objectives

Provide MU with information, analysis, and recommendations as they relate to campus climate.

This information will be used in conjunction with other data to provide MU with an inclusive view of campus.
Projected Outcomes

MU will add to their knowledge base with regard to how constituent groups currently feel about their campus climate and how the community responds to them (e.g., pedagogy, curricular issues, professional development, inter-group/intra-group relations, respect issues).

MU will use the results of the assessment to inform current/on-going work regarding campus climate.
Setting the Context

- Examine the Research
  - Review work already completed
- Preparation
  - Readiness of the campus
- Assessment
  - Examine the climate
- Follow-up
  - Building on the successes and addressing the challenges
Research on Climate In Higher Education

College campus climate not only affects creating knowledge, but also impacts members of academic community who, in turn, contribute to creating campus environment (Hurtado, 2003; Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005).

Preserving climate that offers equal learning opportunities for all students and academic freedom for all faculty – an environment free from discrimination – is a primary responsibility of educational institutions.
Value of Campus Climate on Enhancing Learning Outcomes

Numerous studies and publications have confirmed the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty on enhancing learning outcomes.

Selected research references include:

Transformational Tapestry Model ©

- Access Retention
- Research Scholarship
- Current Campus Climate
- University Policies/Service
- Curriculum Pedagogy
- External Relations
- Intergroup & Intragroup Relations
- Symbolic Actions
- Transformation via Intervention
- Educational Actions
- Administrative Actions
- Fiscal Actions
- Baseline Organizational Challenges
- Systems Analysis
- Local / State / Regional Environments
- Contextualized Campus Wide Assessment
- Advanced Organizational Challenges
- Consultant Recommendations
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Millersville University of Pennsylvania
Commitment to an Inclusive Community

MU of Pennsylvania is firmly committed to supporting and advancing the diversity of its campus community. We see diversity as being a characteristic of the community and all its constituents, rather than representing an individual deviation from society’s perceived historical norms. We believe that the University is enhanced by fostering a diverse community of students, faculty, staff and friends. It is part of the University’s mission to provide its members with the skills, awareness, and understandings of different backgrounds that are necessary to cultivate a diverse and inclusive community.

To that end, MU of Pennsylvania prohibits discrimination and harassment of any person or group by any member of its community on the basis of: race or ethnicity; gender; sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression; campus status (i.e., student, faculty, or staff); marital status; age; religion or belief system; persons with disabilities; or national background or origin.

-- Approved by President’s Commission on Cultural Diversity, June 5, 2007
History of the Project

- In 2002, the Social Equity Committee (SEC) with the full support of the President’s Advisory Council (PAC) embarked on the initial campus climate project.
- In 2009, the Social Equity Strategic Planning Advisory Committee (SESPAC) requested a follow-up assessment to examine the current climate at MU. Rankin & Associates (R&A) was again retained to assist in the assessment process as an identified leader in conducting multiple identity studies in higher education.
Highlighted Accomplishments
Goal 1: Institutional Commitment

To promote and foster an environment in which the quality of life is affirming and nurturing and strives for the emotional safety of all students, faculty, and staff.

- Implementation of outcomes assessment and continuous improvement strategies and processes.
- Development of Inclusion Statement.
- Development of Office of Social Equity & Diversity webpage
- Restructured the duties and responsibilities of Social Equity staff.
Goal 2: Research & Scholarship

*To create an academic environment that appreciates cultural/social differences.*

- Provided opportunities for MU faculty to highlight and share scholarly research through the Social Equity Cultural Education Series programs.
Goal 3: Curriculum & Pedagogy

To develop a curriculum that guides students to think critically about diversity.

- Implementation of General Education Diversity Requirement
Goal 4: Recruitment & Retention of Underrepresented Students, Faculty, and Staff

- Faculty Recruitment – Creation of Faculty Recruiter position and attendance at special recruitment programs (i.e., doctoral student conferences).
- Implementation of Collegiate Leadership Development Program (CLDP) and other student leadership and graduate opportunities conferences.
- Implementation of diversity education programs, *Building a High Performance Community*, for faculty, staff, and administrators. Successful incorporation of diversity education component within the New Student Orientation.
Goal 5: Inter-group & Intra-group Relations

- Creation of a Mediation & Conflict Resolution Program
- Campus Programming – Japanese Internment and Humanity Interrupted symposiums, Dialogues on Race, Gender, and Ethnicity, Creating Caring Communities programs, Interfaith Banquet, Black and Latino Cultural Celebrations, LGBT programming, Cultural Education Series
- Expansion of Community Outreach and Linkages – Developed partnerships with Crispus Attucks Community Center, Lancaster Branch - NAACP, Spanish American Civic Association, Urban League of Lancaster County, Bethel AME Underground Railroad Conference, Lancaster Human Relations Commission, PA Dutch Convention & Visitors Bureau Multicultural Advisory Committee, Puerto Rican Cultural Center, Lancaster Mediation Center and Brightside Opportunities Center.
Process to Date – Phase I

Initial Proposal Meeting

October 2, 2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESPAC Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ansar Ahmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean of School of Humanities &amp; Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jose Aviles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Gallo <em>(Student)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President of SOLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sherlynn Bessick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Learning Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rian Reed <em>(Student)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President of NAACP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Aminta Breaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dr. Doyin Coker-Kolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean of School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Melanie DeSantis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Professional Development &amp; Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cheryl Desmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Educational Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Mimi Durenberger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Shannon Farley <em>(Student)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former President of Student Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Chris Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President of Black Student Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Fred Foster-Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor of Psychology Coordinator of General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert “Chip” German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Anthony Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director of Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dr. Christopher Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor of Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Natoshia Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Intramurals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ms. Patricia Hopson-Shelton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the President for Social Equity &amp; Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dr. Lisa Shibley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President for Planning, Assessment &amp; Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dr. Delray Shultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor/Assistant Chair of Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sue Rankin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant, Rankin &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lisa Schreiber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor of Communication &amp; Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Aminta Breaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dr. Rita Smith Wade-El</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jeremiah Mbinding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ms. Patricia Hopson-Shelton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the President for Social Equity &amp; Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jeremiah Mbinding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor of Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair of Commission on Cultural Diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dr. Rita Smith Wade-El
Professor of Psychology
Director of African American Studies

Dr. Jeremiah Mbinding
Director of Admissions
Co-Chair of Commission on Cultural Diversity
Survey Development Team

Dr. Doyin Coker-Kolo
Dr. Christopher Hardy
Ms. Patricia Hopson-Shelton
Mr. Hiram G. Martinez
Dr. Sue Rankin, Consultant
Dr. Lisa Shibley
Dr. Delray Shultz
Dr. Rita Smith Wade-El
Process to Date – Phase II

Assessment Tool
Development and Implementation
October – December 2008

- The survey questions were constructed based on the work of Rankin (2003) and informed by the results of the 2002 assessment and subsequent initiatives
- SESPAC committee members reviewed the survey template and revised the instrument to better match the current campus context at MU
- IRB approval was granted by Millersville Internal Review Board in December, 2008
Process to Date Phase II and III

- **February 2009**
  - Survey administration

- **March – June 2009**
  - Data Analysis
Process to Date
Phase IV

**July 2009**
- Draft report reviewed by SESPAC committee members

**August 2009**
- Final report forwarded to SESPAC representatives and President from MU

**September 2009**
- Presentation of survey results to the campus community
Assessment Methods

Research Model
Survey Instrument
Limitations
Survey Instrument

- Final instrument
  - 103 questions and additional space for respondents to provide commentary
  - On-line or paper & pencil options

- Sample = Population
  - All members of the MU community were invited to participate

- Results include information regarding:
  - Respondents’ personal experiences at MU
  - Respondents’ perceptions of climate at MU
  - Respondents’ perceptions of institutional actions
  - Respondents’ input into recommendations for change
Survey Assessment
Limitations

✓ Self-selection bias
✓ Response rates
✓ Caution in generalizing results for constituent groups with significantly lower response rates
Method Limitation

✓ Data were not reported for groups of fewer than 5 individuals so as not to compromise identity.

✓ Instead, small groups were combined to eliminate possibility of identifying individuals.
Results

Response Rates
Who are the respondents?

- 775 people responded to the call to participate (8% response rate overall).

- Several respondents contributed remarks to the open-ended questions.
Employee Response Rates

Non-School Faculty (42%, n = 13)
Teaching Faculty (21%, n = 90)
Staff (24%, n = 96)
Administrator/Manager (31%, n = 73)
Department Chair (27%, n = 7)
Student Response Rates

Undergraduate Student  (7%, n = 479)
  First Year (n = 104)
  Second Year (n = 101)
  Third Year (n = 150)
  Fourth Year (n = 86)
  Fifth Year (n = 35)

Graduate Student  (1%, n = 13)
Student Response Rates

Students  (n = 492)

Students of Color = 3% (n = 25)
White Students = 7%  (n = 455)
Women Students = 9%  (n = 351)
Men Students = 4%  (n = 128)
Results

Demographic Characteristics
Student Respondents by Class Standing (n)

- First-year: 150
- Second-year: 104
- Third-year: 101
- Fourth-year: 86
- Fifth-year or higher: 35
- Graduate student: 11
Student Residence

53% of student respondents lived with in off-campus housing

36% of student respondents lived in residence halls

11% of student respondents lived in affiliate housing
Income by Student Status (n)

- Undergrads - Independent
- Undergrads - Dependent
- Graduate students

- Below $29K: 30 (70), 2 (83), 13 (136), 5 (64), 1 (39)
- $30K - $59,999: 2 (30), 2 (83), 2 (136), 1 (64), 1 (39)
- $60K - $99,999: 1 (30), 3 (83), 1 (136), 1 (64), 1 (39)
- $100K - $149K: 1 (30), 1 (83), 1 (136), 1 (64), 1 (39)
- $150K or above: 1 (30), 1 (83), 1 (136), 1 (64), 1 (39)
Employee Respondents by Position Status (n)

- Non-school Faculty
- Instructor/Lecturer
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor
- Teaching Faculty
- Adjunct Faculty
- Administrator/Manager
- Department Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Status</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-school Faculty</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor/Lecturer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator/Manager</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collapsed Employee Status (n)

- Non-school Faculty: 13
- Teaching Faculty: 90
- Staff: 96
- Admin/Mgr/Dept Chair: 80
There were 11 respondents who identified as transgender
Respondents by Sexual Orientation & MU Status (n)
Respondents by Racial Identity (Duplicated Total)

- African
- African American/Black
- Alaskan Native
- Asian
- Caribbean/West Indian
- European American/White
- Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
- Middle Eastern
- Native American
- Pacific Islander
- Other

Numbers:
- African: 7
- African American/Black: 51
- Alaskan Native: 0
- Asian: 17
- Caribbean/West Indian: 3
- European American/White: 649
- Spanish/Hispanic/Latino: 42
- Middle Eastern: 5
- Native American: 12
- Pacific Islander: 3
- Other: 25
Respondents by Racial Identity (Unduplicated Total)

- People of Color: 35
- White: 711
Respondents by Spiritual Affiliation (n)

- Christian: 445
- Other than Christian: 50
- No Affiliation: 167
- Other: 36

Rankin & Associates, Consulting
Respondents with Conditions that Substantially Affect Major Life Activities (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Admin/Mgr/Dept Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Condition</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Students
- Faculty
- Staff
- Admin/Mgr/Dept Chair
## Citizenship Status by Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship Status</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US citizen</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US citizen – naturalized</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual citizenship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident (immigrant)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (F-1, J-1, or H1-B, or other visa)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data is missing due to n < 5
Findings
72% of respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate at MU.

74% of respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their department/work unit.

79% of student/faculty respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their classes.
Aggregate Findings

77% of respondents have not personally experienced any exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct that has interfered with their ability to work or learn at MU.

79% of MU employee respondents were “highly satisfied” or “satisfied” with their jobs at MU.

62% of MU employees were “highly satisfied” or “satisfied” with the way their careers have progressed at MU.
Challenges and Opportunities
Personally experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct that interfered with one’s ability to work or learn at MU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personally Experienced Based on…(%)
Overall Personal Experiences of Perceived Offensive, Hostile, or Intimidating Conduct and, of that Conduct, the Percent Due to Gender Identity (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall experienced conduct¹</th>
<th>Experienced conduct due to gender²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=119)¹</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=26)²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=55)¹</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=7)²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages are based on total n split by group.
² Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
### Overall Personal Experiences of Perceived Offensive, Hostile, or Intimidating Conduct and, of that Conduct, the Percent Due to Position Status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Experienced</th>
<th>Experienced Due to Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students (n=105)</td>
<td>21 (3)</td>
<td>3 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-school Faculty (n=6)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Faculty (n=18)</td>
<td>20 (17)</td>
<td>17 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (n=27)</td>
<td>29 (15)</td>
<td>15 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin/Mgr/Dept Chair (n=19)</td>
<td>24 (16)</td>
<td>16 (3)</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.
Overall Personal Experiences of Perceived Offensive, Hostile, or Intimidating Conduct and, of that Conduct, the Percent Due to Race (%)

Overall experienced conduct¹

- People of Color: 20%
- White: 23%

Experienced conduct due to race²

- People of Color: 14%
- White: 15%

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.
Overall Personal Experiences of Perceived Offensive, Hostile, or Intimidating Conduct and, of that Conduct, the Percent Due to Sexual Orientation (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall experienced conduct¹</th>
<th>Experienced conduct due to sexual orientation²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBQ respondents</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual respondents</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual respondents</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</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.
Overall Personal Experiences of Perceived Offensive, Hostile, or Intimidating Conduct and, of that Conduct, the Percent Due to Disability (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Type</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Experienced Conduct Due to Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No disability</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=145)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=13)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=17)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Condition</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=13)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Percentages are based on total n split by group.

<sup>2</sup> Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
### Form of Experienced Offensive, Hostile, or Intimidating Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was deliberately ignored or excluded</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation/bullying</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was isolated or left</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of derogatory remarks</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was isolated or left out when working in groups</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stares</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received a low performance evaluation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feared getting a poor grade because of hostile classroom environment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory written comments</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Form of Experienced Offensive, Hostile, or Intimidating Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feared for my physical safety</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of racial/ethnic profiling</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption that I was admitted or hired because of my identity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory phone calls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was singled out as the “resident authority” regarding their identity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory/unsolicited e-mails</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of physical violence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where Did The Perceived Conduct Occur?

- 33 percent (n = 58) said it happened in a class
- 25 percent (n = 45) said it happened while working at a campus job
- 22 percent (n = 39) said it happened in a public space on campus
- 22 percent (n = 38) said it happened in a meeting with a group of people
Source of Experienced Conduct by Position Status (n)

- Source = Student
- Source = Faculty
- Source = Staff
- Source = Administrator
- Source = Supervisor

- Student Respondents: 71
- Faculty Respondents: 29
- Staff Respondents: 12
- Admin/Mgr/Dept Chair Respondents: 10
What did you do?\(^1\)

**Personal responses:**
- Was angry (60%)
- Told a friend (41%)
- Avoided the harasser (38%)
- Felt embarrassed (36%)
- Ignored it (31%)

**Reporting responses:**
- Did not report the incident for fear of retaliation (21%)
- Made a complaint to a MU employee/official (18%)
- Didn’t know who to go to (18%)
- Didn’t report it for fear my complaint would not be taken seriously (14%)
- Did report it but my complaint was not taken seriously (9%)

\(^1\)Respondents could mark more than one response
The survey defined sexual harassment as “A repeated course of conduct whereby one person engages in verbal or physical behavior of a sexual nature, that is unwelcome, serves no legitimate purpose, intimidates another person, and has the effect of creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work or classroom environment.”

The survey defined sexual assault as “Intentional physical contact, such as sexual intercourse or touching, of a person’s intimate body parts by someone who did not have permission to make such contact.”
Respondents Who Believed They Have Personally Been a Victim of Sexual Harassment by Primary Status and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sexual Harassment at Millersville

- 15% (n = 116) of respondents believed that sexual harassment was a problem at MU.
- 71% (n = 551) said they would know where to go if they or their friends were sexually harassed.
- 51% (n = 392) understood MU’s policy for reporting sexual harassment.
- 57% (n = 433) had confidence that MU implements its sexual harassment policy.
Respondents Who Believed That They Had Been The Victim of Sexual Assault While at MU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents were women; 7 were in their third year

10 were students, 11 were White, and 11 were heterosexual
Respondents Who Believed That They Had Been The Victim of Sexual Assault

Where did it occur?
- On-campus (n = 9)

Who were the offenders against students?*
- Students (n = 9)

What did you do¹?
- Did nothing (50%)
- Told a friend (42%)

¹Respondents could mark more than one response
Sexual Assault at Millersville

- 14% (n = 105) thought sexual assault was a problem at the University
- 73% (n = 557) said they would know where to go for help if they were sexually assaulted
Satisfaction with Millersville University

Employees
Employee Satisfaction with Their Jobs at MU

- 79% (n = 216) percent of MU faculty and staff were “highly satisfied” or “satisfied” with their jobs at MU.
  - Some differences were found between demographic categories:
    - A higher percentage of Employee Respondents of Color were satisfied.
    - Non-school faculty members were more satisfied with their jobs than were other employees.
Employee Satisfaction with Their Jobs by Selected Demographic Categories (%)

- **Satisfied***:
  - Women: 80%
  - Men: 77%
  - People of Color: 100%
  - White: 78%
  - LGBQ: 75%
  - Heterosexual: 79%

- **Dissatisfied**
  - Women: 11%
  - Men: 8%
  - People of Color: 0%
  - White: 10%
  - LGBQ: 6%
  - Heterosexual: 10%

* Highly Satisfied and Satisfied collapsed into one category.
** Highly Dissatisfied and Dissatisfied collapsed into one category.
Faculty and Staff Members’ Satisfaction with Their Jobs (%)

- **Non-school Faculty**: Satisfied 85, Dissatisfied 8
- **Teaching Faculty**: Satisfied 79, Dissatisfied 9
- **Staff**: Satisfied 78, Dissatisfied 10
- **Admin/Mgr/Dept Chairs**: Satisfied 78, Dissatisfied 10

* Highly Satisfied and Satisfied collapsed into one category.
** Highly Dissatisfied and Dissatisfied collapsed into one category.
Employee Satisfaction with the Way Their Careers have Progressed at MU

- 62% (n = 216) were “highly satisfied” or “satisfied” with the way their careers have progressed at MU.
  - Sexual minority employees were much less satisfied with the way their careers have progressed at MU than were other groups.
  - Staff members were less satisfied with the way their careers have progressed.
Employee Satisfaction with the Way Their Careers Have Progressed by Selected Demographic Categories (%)

- **Satisfied***
- **Dissatisfied**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Satisfied*</th>
<th>Dissatisfied**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBQ</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Highly Satisfied and Satisfied collapsed into one category.
** Highly Dissatisfied and Dissatisfied collapsed into one category.
Employee Satisfaction with the Way Their Careers Have Progressed By Position Status (%)

- **Satisfied***
- **Dissatisfied**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Status</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-school Faculty</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Faculty</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin/Mgr/Dept Chairs</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Highly Satisfied and Satisfied collapsed into one category.
** Highly Dissatisfied and Dissatisfied collapsed into one category.
Employee Comments with Regard to the Way Their Careers Have Progressed

Employees who were satisfied attributed their successes to their own hard work, the freedom to “make the job [their] own” or pursue their own research and teaching agendas. They commented that they had supportive departments and/or supervisors. Other respondents indicated they loved their jobs and the people with whom they work.

A number of staff members who were dissatisfied with their career progression (but not necessarily their jobs) said that staff members had few opportunities to advance or be compensated for their level of responsibility. Dissatisfied faculty said that service responsibilities precluded them from making adequate progress in their scholarly and teaching activities. Some employees said their departments and colleagues were not “good fits” for them, and several indicated that they have received few pay raises.
Have You *Seriously Considered* Leaving MU?

41% Of All Respondents

Students (37%); Non-School Faculty (31%); Teaching Faculty (48%); Staff (48%); Administrators/Managers/Dept Chairs (56%)
Have You *Seriously Considered* Leaving MU?

**Among Employees:**
- Men (45%); Women (52%)
- Employees of Color (50%); White Employees (50%)
- LGBQ Employees (63%); Heterosexual Employees (49%)

**Among Students:**
- Men (40%); Women (35%)
- Students of Color (40%); White Students (37%)
- LGBQ Students (39%); Heterosexual Students (38%)
Have You Felt *Pressured* to Leave MU?

10% Of All Respondents

Students (8%); Non-School Faculty (8%); Teaching Faculty (14%); Staff (12%); Administrators/Managers/Dept Chairs (14%)
Have You Felt *Pressured* to Leave MU?

**Among Employees:**
- Men (13%); Women (13%)
- Employees of Color (30%); White Employees (11%)
- LGBQ Employees (31%); Heterosexual Employees (12%)

**Among Students:**
- Men (7%); Women (9%)
- Students of Color (8%); White Students (8%)
- LGBQ Students (12%); Heterosexual Students (8%)
Perceptions
Employees Who Observed or Were Personally Made Aware of Conduct That Created an Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive and/or Hostile Working or Learning Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Race* (%)

- **White** (n=103)
- **People of Color** (n=4)

41
40

* Employees only
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Gender* (%)
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Sexual Orientation* (%)
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Position Status (%)

- Non-school Faculty (n=7) 54
- Teaching Faculty (n=35) 39
- Staff (n=33) 35
- Admin/Mgr/Dept Chair (n=36) 45
## Form of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Conduct</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory remarks</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone being deliberately ignored or excluded</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation/bullying</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic profiling</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory written comments</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stares</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone receiving a low performance evaluation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone isolated or left out when working in groups</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory/unsolicited e-mails</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Form of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumption that someone was admitted or hired because of their identity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone fearing for their physical safety</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone singled out as the “resident authority” regarding their identity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats of physical violence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory phone calls</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone isolated or left out because of their socioeconomic status</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct (%)

- Students (32%)
- Administrators (32%)
- Faculty Members (22%)
- Colleagues (22%)
- Staff Members (18%)
- Supervisors (14%)
Where Did the Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct Occur?

- 38 percent (n = 43) said it happened while working at a campus job
- 27 percent (n = 31) said it happened in a meeting with a group of people
- 25 percent (n = 28) said it happened in campus office
- 19 percent (n = 22) said it happened in a public space on campus
Perceived Discriminatory Practices

Perceived Discriminatory Hiring (22%)
- Due to race (44%)
- Due to ethnicity (29%)
- Due to position status (26%)
- Due to gender (24%)

Perceived Discriminatory Firing (14%)
- Due to position status (35%)
- Due to gender (20%)
- Due to race (18%)
- Due to ethnicity (15%)

Perceived Discriminatory Promotion (17%)
- Due to position status (38%)
- Due to gender (27%)
- Due to race (27%)
- Due to ethnicity (21%)
Work-Life Issues

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

There were, however, responses that demonstrated less positive attitudes towards respondents’ work unit, the clarity of tenure/promotion, and the clarity and fairness of salary determinations.
Work-Life Issues

70% (n = 197) of respondents “strongly agree/agree” that they were comfortable asking questions about performance expectations.

38% (n = 102) of respondents “strongly agree/agree” that there are many unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with colleagues in their work units.

35% (n = 94) of respondents “strongly agree/agree” that they were reluctant to bring up issues that concern them for fear than it will affect their performance evaluation or tenure decision.
44% (n = 119) find that MU is supportive of family leave.

40% (n = 107) of faculty and staff members have to miss out on important things in their personal lives because of professional responsibilities.

16% (n = 43) of respondents felt that employees who have children were considered less committed to their careers.

23% (n = 61) of respondents felt that employees who do not have children were often burdened with work responsibilities.
27% (n = 71) “strongly agree/agree” that they have equitable access to domestic partner benefits.

72% (n = 192) of employee respondents believe that they have colleagues or peers at MU who gave them career advice or guidance when they need it.

60% (n = 161) of employee respondents believe that they have support from decision makers/colleagues who support their career advancement.

71% (n = 192) of employee respondents felt they had equipment and supplies they need to adequately perform their work.
Work-Life Issues

36% (n = 239) of employee respondents reported that their compensation was equitable to their peers with similar levels of experience.

50% (n = 133) of employee respondents thought their compensation was equitable to their peers with similar levels of experience.

33% (n = 89) of employee respondents thought the University treated exempt and non-exempt staff equitably.
Institutional Actions

Respondents were also asked to rate on a scale from “very positive impact” to “very negative impact” their perceptions of the effects of a number of initiatives MU has undertaken since 2002.

Substantial numbers of respondents do not know how the initiatives have affected the climate at MU.

The following initiatives had the strongest impact.
Campus Initiatives with Strongest Impact Since 2002

- Campus programming
- Expansion of community outreach and linkages
- Successful incorporation of diversity education component within the New Student Orientation
- Performance Community for faculty, staff, and administrators
- Cultural Education Series programs
Campus Initiatives That Would Positively Affect MU

- Providing diversity training for students (61%, n = 297), staff (75%, n = 364), and faculty (76%, n = 368).
- Providing an advocate to mediate student complaints of classroom inequity (75%, n = 368).
- Increasing opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among students (67%, 328), and between faculty, staff, and students (68%, n = 332).
- Incorporating issues of diversity and cross-cultural competence more effectively into the curriculum (63%, n = 311).
- Providing more effective faculty mentorship of students (79%, n = 390).
Campus Initiatives That Would Positively Affect MU

• Less than half of student respondents thought increasing the diversity of the faculty and staff (48%, n = 235) and student body (48%, n = 232) would positively affect the climate.
Inclusive Curriculum

- More than half of all students and faculty felt the courses they took or taught included materials, perspectives, and/or experiences of people based on “difference.”

- The exceptions included gender expression, learning disability, physical ability or disability, physical characteristics, psychological health, religious/spiritual views, sexual orientation, and veteran/military status.
Welcoming Classroom Climate

The majority of faculty and students strongly agreed or agreed that the classroom climate was welcoming of “difference” across all dimensions.

Psychological disability status, political views, and sexual orientation received the lowest agreement.
More than half of all employees strongly agreed or agreed that the workplace climate was welcoming of “difference.”

Exceptions include: learning disability status, political views, psychological disability status, and sexual orientation.

Women, heterosexual, and White respondents were least likely to believe the workplace climate was welcoming for employees based on gender.

Respondents of color were most likely to believe the workplace climate was welcoming for employees based on race and gender, but least likely to agree on the basis of sexual orientation.
Summary

Strengths and Successes
Challenges and Opportunities
Millersville Strengths and Successes

- High percentages of employees at MU were highly satisfied or satisfied with the way their jobs (79%) and the way their careers (62%) have progressed.
- Supportive departments and supervisors are major strengths of the University and important reasons why many employees felt satisfied with their jobs and the way their careers have progressed.
- Over 70% of respondents reported that they were very comfortable or comfortable with the overall climate at MU, climate in their departments or work unit, and climate in their classes.
Many respondents praised the institution’s efforts to create a welcoming atmosphere, asserted that the climate had improved in recent years, and suggested the campus would further benefit from future actions to promote diversity.

One respondent noted, “I feel that Millersville has come a LONG way regarding social equity and diversity since I started here. Thanks for this survey as a much-needed follow-up to what was done in 2001.”
Summary of Findings
Opportunities and Challenges

**Challenge 1:**
Homophobia and Heterosexism at MU

**Challenge 2:**
Exclusive and Less Welcoming Climate for People with Disabilities
Homophobia and Heterosexism at MU

- LGBQ employees more likely to seriously consider leaving MU than heterosexual employees.
- LGBQ students and employees felt more pressured to leave MU than their heterosexual counterparts.
- MU’s curriculum was not as inclusive for sexual orientation when compared with other demographics.
- Both the classroom and workplace climate were not as welcoming of difference regarding sexual orientation.
Homophobia and Heterosexism at MU

- Although LGBQ and heterosexual respondents were equally likely to experience harassment, the majority of LGBQ respondents attributed that conduct to sexual orientation while no heterosexual respondents did so.
- LGBQ employees were less satisfied with how their careers have progressed.
- One respondent underscored the exclusive nature of MU’s student discrimination statement:
  - This survey really made me feel like the university cares for and supports the GLBT. This...is not what I have experienced ...here at Millersville. A key example can be seen in MU's Student Discrimination Policy... note that discrimination does NOT include Gender Identity or Sexual Orientation.
Exclusive and Less Welcoming Climate for People with Disabilities

- People with disabilities were more likely to experience harassment than those without disabilities.
- MU’s curriculum was not as inclusive of people with disabilities when compared with other demographics.
- Both the classroom and workplace climate were not as welcoming of people with disabilities when compared with other demographics.
- Some respondents noted that the campus should do more to be truly accessible to people with disabilities and ADA compliant. Specific references were made to classrooms, library’s balconies, lack of elevator in Diehm Hall, sidewalks, and labs.
  - As one respondent noted, for “…a school with an extraordinary special education department, it is embarrassing that MU handicaps those with physical disabilities.”
Next Steps
Process Forward
Fall/Winter 2009/2010

- Share report results with community
  - Community dialogue regarding the assessment results
  - Community feedback on recommended actions
  - Executive Summary available at: http://www.millersville.edu/socialeq/
    - Full Report will be available at the Social Equity Office

- Recommended planning “advance” to begin a “call to action” regarding the challenges uncovered in the report
Tell Us What You Think…

- Additional questions/comments on results?
- Thoughts on process?
- Suggested actions?
Questions..?
Other Ideas..?
Last Thoughts

“Resistance begins with people confronting pain, whether it’s theirs or somebody else’s, and wanting to do something to change it”

--- bell hooks, “Yearning”