



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Assessment • Planning • Interventions

University of
Georgia

Campus Climate
Research Study
Executive Summary

July 2016



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Executive Summary

Introduction

UGA is dedicated to fostering a caring community that provides leadership for constructive participation in a diverse, multicultural world. As noted in UGA’s mission statement, “the University of Georgia endeavors to prepare the University community and the state for full participation in the global society of the twenty-first century. Through its programs and practices, it seeks to foster the understanding of and respect for cultural differences necessary for an enlightened and educated citizenry. It further provides for cultural, ethnic, gender and racial diversity in the faculty, staff and student body. The University is committed to preparing the University community to appreciate the critical importance of a quality environment to an interdependent global society.”¹ In order to better understand the campus climate, the senior administration at UGA recognized the need for a comprehensive tool that would provide campus climate metrics for UGA students, faculty and staff.

To that end, UGA formed the Climate Study Working Group (CSWG) in 2015. The CSWG was composed of faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Ultimately, UGA contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to conduct a campus-wide study entitled, “University of Georgia – A Research Study of Climate for Learning, Living and Working.” Subsequently, the University of Georgia will develop strategic action initiatives based on the findings of this research.

Project Design and Campus Involvement

The CSWG collaborated with R&A to develop the survey instrument. After reviewing existing data, the CSWG and R&A constructed questions for the campus-wide survey. The final survey instrument was completed in August 2015. UGA’s survey contained 109 items (21 qualitative and 88 quantitative) and was available via a secure online portal from October 20, 2015 through November 20, 2015. Confidential paper surveys were distributed to those individuals who did not have access to an Internet-connected computer or who preferred a paper survey.

¹<http://www.uga.edu/profile/mission>

The conceptual model used as the foundation for UGA'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. The CSWG, in consultation with the consultant, selected, contextualized, and crafted survey questions as a means to capture the various dimensions of power and privilege that shape the campus experience. In this way, UGA's assessment was the result of a comprehensive process to identify the strengths and challenges of campus climate. This report provides an overview of the results of the campus-wide survey.

UGA Participants

UGA community members completed 10,539 surveys for an overall response rate of 23%. Only surveys that were at least 50% complete were included in the final data set for analyses.²

Response rates by constituent group varied: 52% ($n = 5,478$) for Undergraduate Students, 17% ($n = 1,765$) for Graduate Students, 1% ($n = 58$) for Post-Doctoral Students, 23% ($n = 2,398$) for Staff, and 8% ($n = 840$) for Faculty. 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.³

²Eighty-eight (88) surveys were removed because they did not complete at least 50% of the survey and 497 duplicate responses were removed. Surveys were also removed from the data file if the respondent did not provide consent ($n = 86$).

³The total n for each demographic characteristic may differ as a result of missing data.

Table 1. UGA Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Subgroup	<i>n</i>	% of Sample
Position status	Undergraduate Student	5,478	52.0
	Graduate Student	1,765	16.7
	Post-Doctoral Student	58	0.6
	Faculty	840	8.0
	Staff	2,398	22.8
Gender identity	Man	3,344	31.7
	Woman	7,053	66.9
	Transgender	16	0.2
	Genderqueer	50	0.5
	Other/Missing/Not Reported	76	0.7
Racial identity	American Indian/Alaskan Native	19	0.2
	Asian/Asian American	811	7.7
	Black/African American	1,174	11.1
	Hispanic/Latino(a)/Chicano(a)	297	2.8
	Middle Eastern	67	0.6
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	10	0.1
	White	7,393	70.1
	Two or More	597	5.7
	Other/Unknown/Not Reported	171	1.6
Sexual identity	LGBQ	1,058	10.0
	Heterosexual	9,241	87.7
	Asexual	23	0.2
	Other/Missing/Not Reported	217	2.1
Citizenship status	U.S. Citizen, birth	9,400	86.2
	U.S. Citizen, naturalized	509	4.7
	Permanent Resident	507	4.7
	Visa Holder	425	3.9
	Undocumented Resident	5	0.0
	Other Citizenship	24	0.2
	Missing/Unknown/Not Reported	29	0.3

Table 1 (cont.)

Characteristic	Subgroup	<i>n</i>	% of Sample
Disability status	Single Disability	793	7.5
	No Disability	9,463	89.8
	Multiple Disabilities	235	2.2
Faith-Based affiliation	Christian Affiliation	6,190	58.7
	Other Faith-Based Affiliation	640	6.1
	No Affiliation	3,047	28.9
	Multiple Affiliations	507	4.8
Military status	Military Service	231	2.2
	No Military Service	10,539	97.2
	Missing/Unknown	155	1.5

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 UGA

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.”⁴ The level of comfort experienced by faculty, staff, and students is one indicator of the campus climate.

- 81% (*n* = 8,532) of the survey respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate at UGA.
- 75% (*n* = 2,474) of Faculty/Post-Doctoral Students and Staff respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate in their departments/work units.
- 84% (*n* = 6,779) of Student and Faculty/Post-Doctoral Student respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes.
- 85% (*n* = 6,259) of White respondents were “very comfortable”/“comfortable” with the overall climate at UGA as were 82% (*n* = 662) of Asian/Asian American respondents, 78% (*n* = 308) of Other People of Color respondents, 78% (*n* = 467) of Multiracial respondents, and 62% (*n* = 723) of Black/African American respondents.

⁴Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 264

- 84% ($n = 5,613$) of Not-First-Generation Student respondents were “very comfortable”/“comfortable” with the climate in their classes as were 81% ($n = 458$) of First-Generation Student respondents.
- 84% ($n = 5,213$) of Christian Affiliation respondents were “very comfortable”/“comfortable” with the overall climate as were 80% ($n = 514$) of Other Faith-based Affiliation respondents, 76% ($n = 2,322$) of No Affiliation respondents, and 75% ($n = 379$) of Multiple Affiliation respondents.

2. Faculty Respondents – Positive attitudes about faculty work

- 90% ($n = 476$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that research was valued by UGA.
- The majority of Non-Tenure-Track/Adjunct Faculty respondents (93%, $n = 309$) also “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that research was valued by UGA.
- 88% ($n = 379$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents indicated that they had access to graduate student advisees.
- 84% ($n = 446$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that the criteria for tenure were clear.

3. Staff Respondents – Positive attitudes about staff work

- 90% ($n = 2,114$) of Staff respondents felt that their supervisors were supportive of their taking leave (e.g., vacation, parental, personal, short-term disability).
- 87% ($n = 2080$) of Staff respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that UGA provided them with adequate resources to pursue professional development.
- 84% ($n = 2,015$) of Staff respondents thought that they had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.
- 83% ($n = 2,002$) of Staff respondents felt valued by coworkers in their department.

4. Student Respondents⁵ – Positive attitudes about academic experiences

The way students perceive and experience their campus climate influences their performance and success in college.⁶ Research also supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for improving learning outcomes.⁷ Attitudes toward academic pursuits are one indicator of campus climate.

- 73% ($n = 5,261$) of Student respondents felt valued by UGA faculty; 72% ($n = 5,168$) felt valued by UGA staff; and 47% ($n = 3,380$) felt valued by UGA senior administrators (e.g., president, provost, dean, vice provost, vice president).
- 75% ($n = 5,395$) of Student respondents felt valued by faculty in the classroom and 65% ($n = 4,663$) felt valued by other students in the classroom.
- 73% ($n = 5,219$) of Student respondents had faculty whom they perceived as role models and 56% ($n = 3,994$) had staff whom they perceived as role models.

5. Student Respondents – Perceptions of *Academic Success*

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the scale, *Perceived Academic Success*, derived from Question 12 on the survey.

- Analyses using these scales revealed:
 - White Undergraduate Student respondents have greater *Perceived Academic Success* than Undergraduate Student respondents of other racial groups other than Other People of Color.⁸
 - Other People of Color Undergraduate respondents and Multiracial Undergraduate respondents have greater *Perceived Academic Success* than Asian/Asian American and Black/African American Undergraduate Student respondents.

⁵Throughout the report, the term “Student respondents” refers to all Undergraduate and Graduate/Professional Student respondents.

⁶Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005

⁷Hale, 2004; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2004

⁸The term “Other People of Color” refers to a category created by the CSWG which represents respondents who identified on the survey as “Alaskan Native,” First Nation/American Indian/Indigenous,” “Latin@/Chican@/Hispanic,” “Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian,” “Native Hawaiian,” and “Pacific Islander.”

- And, Asian/Asian American Undergraduate Student respondents have greater *Perceived Academic Success* than Black/African American Undergraduate Student respondents.
- Heterosexual Undergraduate Student respondents have greater *Perceived Academic Success* than LGBTQ Undergraduate Student respondents.
- Undergraduate Student respondents with No Disability have greater *Perceived Academic Success* than Undergraduate Students with Single or Multiple Disabilities.

Key Findings – Opportunities for Improvement

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

Several empirical studies reinforce the importance of the perception of non-discriminatory environments for positive learning and developmental outcomes.⁹ Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.¹⁰ The survey requested information on experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

- 16% ($n = 1,650$) of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.¹¹
 - 26% ($n = 433$) of these respondents indicated that the conduct was based on their gender/gender identity; 23% ($n = 384$) felt that it was based on their ethnicity; 22% ($n = 355$) indicated that it was based on their position status at the institution; and 19% ($n = 320$) felt that it was based on their racial identity.
- Differences emerged based on various demographic characteristics, including gender identity, age, and ethnicity. For example:

⁹Aguirre & Messineo, 1997; Flowers & Pascarella, 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001

¹⁰Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008; Waldo, 1999

¹¹The 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).

- A higher percentage of Transspectrum respondents (47%, $n = 31$) experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct compared to Women respondents (16%, $n = 1,155$) and Men respondents (13%, $n = 434$).
- Significantly¹² greater percentages of Black/African American respondents (27%, $n = 319$) and Alaskan Native/American Indian respondents (26%, $n = 5$) indicated that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct, compared to other racial identity groups.
- Higher percentages of respondents ages 55 through 64 years (28%, $n = 39$) and ages 45 through 54 years (33%, $n = 6$) indicated that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct than did other respondents based on age.
- Undergraduate Student respondents (12%, $n = 642$) were significantly less likely than other respondents to indicate that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. More than 700 respondents from all constituent groups contributed further data regarding their personal experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct at UGA. Two themes emerged from narratives provided in this data: discrimination and hostile work environment. Students described discrimination in the form of racism and homophobia. Faculty and Staff respondents elaborated on the hostile working environments they experienced from interactions with both their supervisors and their colleagues. The qualitative data for students and employees who have personally experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct at UGA suggested that how they are treated, in their respective environments, does not seem to matter to anyone.

¹² The word “significantly” references a chi-square analyses wherein significance was determined beyond the $p < .05$ significance level.

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

Prior research on campus climate has focused on the experiences of faculty, staff, and students associated with historically underserved social/community/affinity groups (e.g., women, people of color, people with disabilities, first-generation students, veterans).¹³

Several groups indicated that they were less comfortable than their majority counterparts with the climates of the campus, workplace, and classroom.

- Differences by gender identity:
 - 55% ($n = 36$) of Transspectrum respondents were significantly less likely to indicate that they were “very comfortable”/“comfortable” with the overall climate at UGA compared to other gender/gender identity groups
 - 80% ($n = 5,647$) of Women respondents
 - 84% ($n = 2,818$) of Men respondents.
- Differences by racial identity:
 - 65% ($n = 608$) of Black/African American Faculty/Post-Doctoral Student and Student respondents were significantly less likely to indicate they were “very comfortable”/“comfortable” with the climate in their classes compared to other racial identity groups.
 - 78% ($n = 412$) of Multiracial Faculty/Post-Doctoral Student and Undergraduate Student respondents,
 - 79% ($n = 278$) of Other Persons of Color Faculty/Post-Doctoral Student and Undergraduate Student respondents,
 - 80% ($n = 607$) of Asian/Asian American Faculty/Post-Doctoral Student and Undergraduate Student respondents,
 - And, 80%, ($n = 4,785$) of White Faculty/Post-Doctoral Student and Undergraduate Student respondents.

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

- Differences by sexual identity:
 - 68% ($n = 721$) of LGBQ respondents were significantly less likely to indicate that they were “very comfortable”/“comfortable” with the overall climate compared to other sexual identity groups.
 - 78% ($n = 18$) of Asexual/Other respondents
 - And 83% ($n = 7,638$) of Heterosexual respondents.

3. Faculty/Post-Doctoral Student and Staff Respondents – Challenges with work-life issues

- 57% ($n = 1,873$) of Faculty/Post-Doctoral Student and Staff respondents noted that they had seriously considered leaving UGA in the past year.
 - 64% ($n = 1,201$) of those Faculty/Post-Doctoral Student and Staff respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of financial reasons (e.g., salary, resources).
- 22% ($n = 706$) of Faculty/Post-Doctoral Student and Staff respondents observed unjust hiring practices, 11% ($n = 369$) observed unfair or unjust disciplinary actions, and 29% ($n = 932$) observed unfair or unjust promotion, tenure, or reclassification practices.
- 54% ($n = 124$) of Women Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents and 37% ($n = 103$) of Men Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that they were burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations.
- 55% ($n = 1,260$) of Staff respondents felt that UGA provided adequate resources to help them manage work-life balance.
- 36% ($n = 274$) of Faculty/Post-Doctoral Students respondents thought UGA provided adequate resources to help them manage work-life balance.

Faculty/Post-Doctoral Student and Staff respondents were provided the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences with work-life issues. Both Faculty/Post-Doctoral Students and Staff respondents overwhelmingly suggested that a major challenge with work-life balance was related to salaries. Respondents articulated that they did not believe salaries

were competitive with either peer institutions or private sector work near UGA. Additional mention of the lack of raises over the past several years was also raised when discussing salary concerns.

4. Faculty Respondents – Challenges with faculty work

- Two-thirds (66%, $n = 345$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that tenure standards/promotion standards are applied equally to all faculty.
- 26% ($n = 130$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt pressured to change their research/scholarship agenda to achieve tenure/promotion.
- 40% ($n = 208$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that faculty opinions were taken seriously by senior administrators (e.g., president, provost, dean, vice provost, vice president).

Faculty respondents were provided the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences regarding faculty work. Faculty expressed concerns with the administration at UGA, drawing specific attention to faculty governance issues as well as being fearful of members of the administration. Faculty also indicated that they felt as if their opinions were not welcomed by members of the administration and some noted the backlash they have received from supervisors when attempts to provide feedback have been made.

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

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

- 6% ($n = 577$) of respondents indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact while at UGA.
- 524 of the 577 respondents who experienced unwanted sexual contact were Students; 516 were Women.

- Only 8% ($n = 45$) of these respondents reported to anyone at UGA that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on why they did not report unwanted sexual misconduct. Two themes emerged from respondents who explained why they did not report unwanted sexual misconduct. The primary reason respondents offered indicated that they did not perceive the sexual misconduct as that big of a deal. It was suggested that the type of conduct they had experienced was a regular occurrence for these respondents. The second reason respondents offered for not reporting the sexual misconduct was related to the perceived level of support they would receive from the institution. Respondents suggested that they often did not believe the support they needed was available after experiencing the unwanted sexual misconduct.

Conclusion

UGA campus climate findings¹⁴ were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.¹⁵ For example, 70% to 80% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” A slightly higher percentage (81%) of all UGA respondents reported that they were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate at UGA. Likewise, 20% to 25% in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At UGA, a lower percentage of respondents (16%) indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. The results, though slightly different, parallel the findings of other climate studies of specific constituent groups offered in the literature.¹⁶

UGA’s climate assessment report provides baseline data on diversity and inclusion, and addresses UGA’s mission and goals. While the findings may guide decision-making in regard to policies and practices at UGA, it is important to note that the cultural fabric of any institution and unique aspects of each campus’s environment must be taken into consideration when

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

¹⁵Rankin & Associates Consulting, 2015

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

deliberating additional action items based on these findings. The climate assessment findings provide the UGA community with an opportunity to build upon its strengths and to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. The University of Georgia, with support from senior administrators and collaborative leadership, is in a prime position to actualize its commitment to an inclusive campus and to institute organizational structures that respond to the needs of its dynamic campus community.

References

- Aguirre, A., & Messineo, M. (1997). Racially motivated incidents in higher education: What do they say about the campus climate for minority students? *Equity & Excellence in Education, 30*(2), 26–30.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (1995). *The drama of diversity and democracy*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Bartz, A. E. (1988). *Basic statistical concepts*. New York: Macmillan.
- Bilimoria, D., & Stewart, A.J. (2009). "Don't ask, don't tell": The academic climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty in science and engineering. *National Women's Studies Association Journal, 21*(2), 85-103.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Campus life: In search of community*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Brookfield, S. D. (2005). *The Power of Critical Theory: Liberating Adult Learning and Teaching*. San Diego, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cantor, D., & Fisher, W. B. (2015). Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct: Rockville, MD: Westat.
- Chang, M.J. (2003). Racial differences in viewpoints about contemporary issues among entering college students: Fact or fiction? *NASPA Journal, 40*(5), 55-71.
- Chang, M. J., Denson, N., Sáenz, V., & Misa, K. (2006). The educational benefits of sustaining cross-racial interaction among undergraduates. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(3), 430–455.
- D'Augelli, A. R., & Hershberger, S. L. (1993). African American undergraduates on a predominantly White campus: Academic factors, social networks, and campus climate. *Journal of Negro Education, 62*(1), 67–81
- Flowers, L., & Pascarella, E. (1999). Cognitive effects of college racial composition on African American students after 3 years of college. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 669–677.
- Gardner, S. K. (2013). Women and faculty departures from a striving institution: Between a rock and a hard place. *The Review of Higher Education, 36*(3), 349-370.

- Griffin, K.A., Bennett, J.C., & Harris, J. (2011). Analyzing gender differences in Black faculty marginalization through a sequential mixed methods design. In S. Museus & K. Griffin, (Eds.), *New Directions for Institutional Research*, No. 151, (pp. 45-61). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Guiffrida, D., Gouveia, A., Wall, A., & Seward, D. (2008). Development and validation of the Need for Relatedness at College Questionnaire (nRC-Q). *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 251–261. doi: 10.1037/a0014051
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72, 330–365.
- Hale, F. W. (2004). What makes racial diversity work in higher education: Academic leaders present successful policies and strategies: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Harper, S., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2007(120), 7–24.
- Harper, S. R., & Quayle, S. J. (2004). Taking seriously the evidence regarding the effects of diversity on student learning in the college classroom: A call for faculty accountability. *UrbanEd*, 2(2), 43–47.
- Hart, J., & Fellabaum, J. (2008). Analyzing campus climate studies: Seeking to define and understand. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 222–234.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1998). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, vol. 26, no. 8. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Hurtado, S., & Ponjuan, L. (2005). Latino educational outcomes and the campus climate. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 4(3), 235–251. doi: 10.1177/1538192705276548
- Ingle, G. (2005). Will your campus diversity initiative work? *Academe*, 91(5), 6–10.
- Johnson, A. (2005). *Privilege, power, and difference* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Johnson, D. R., Soldner, M., Leonard, J., Alvarez, P., Inkelas, K. K., Rowan, K. H., & Longerbeam, S. (2007). Examining sense of belonging among first-year undergraduates from different racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(5), 525–542.

- Krebs, C., Lindquist, C., Berzofsky, M., Shook-Sa, B., Peterson, K., Planty, M., Langton, L., Stroop, J. (2016). Campus Climate Survey Validation Study Final Technical Report *Bureau of Justice Statistics Research and Development Series* (pp. 1-193).
- Maramba, D.C. & Museus, S.D. (2011). The utility of using mixed-methods and intersectionality approaches in conducting research on Filipino American students' experiences with the campus climate and on sense of belonging. In S. Museus & K. Griffin, (Eds.), *New Directions for Institutional Research*, No. 151, (pp. 93-101). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Milem, J., Chang, M., & Antonio, A. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research based perspective*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Navarro, R.L., Worthington, R.L., Hart, J., & Khairallah, T. (2009). Liberal and conservative ideology, experiences with harassment, and perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 2(2), 78-90.
- Nelson Laird, T. & Niskodé-Dossett, A.S. (2010). How gender and race moderate the effect of interaction across difference on student perceptions of the campus environment. *The Review of Higher Education*, 33(3), 333-356.
- Norris, W. P. (1992). Liberal attitudes and homophobic acts: the paradoxes of homosexual experience in a liberal institution. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 22(3), 81-120.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1980). Predicting freshman persistence and voluntary dropout decisions from a theoretical model. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 51(1), 60-75.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Diego: Jossey-Bass.
- Patton, L. D., & Catching, C. (2009). Teaching while Black: Narratives of African American student affairs faculty. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22(6), 713-728.
- Patton, L.D. (2011). Perspectives on identity, disclosure, and the campus environment among African American gay and bisexual men at one historically Black college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 52(1), 77-100.
- Pittman, C.T. (2010). Race and gender oppression in the classroom. The experiences of women faculty of color with White male students. *Teaching Sociology*, 38(3), 183-196.

- Pike, G. R., & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Relationships among structural diversity, informal peer interactions, and perceptions of the campus environment.” *Review of Higher Education*, 29(4), 425–450.
- Rankin & Associates Consulting. (2016, May 15). Recent clients and reports. Retrieved from <http://www.rankin-consulting.com/clients>
- Rankin, S. (2003). *Campus climate for LGBT people: A national perspective*. New York: NGLTF Policy Institute.
- Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of Student College Development*, 46(1), 43–61.
- Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2008). Transformational tapestry model: A comprehensive approach to transforming campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 262–274. doi: 10.1037/a0014018
- Sáenz, V. B., Nagi, H. N., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Factors influencing positive interactions across race for African American, Asian American, Latino, and White college students.” *Research in Higher Education*, 48(1), 1–38.
- Sears, J. T. (2002). The institutional climate for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual education faculty. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43(1), 11–37. doi: 10.1300/J082v43n01_02
- Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Malley, J., & Stewart, A. J. (2006). The climate for women in academic science: The good, the bad, and the changeable. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30(1), 47–58. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00261.x
- Silverschanz, P., Cortina, L., Konik, J., & Magley, V. (2008). Slurs, snubs, and queer jokes: Incidence and impact of heterosexist harassment in academia. *Sex Roles*, 58(3–4), 179–191. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9329-7
- Smith, D. (2009). *Diversity’s promise for higher education: Making it work*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Smith, D. G., Gerbick, G. L., Figueroa, M. A., Watkins, G. H., Levitan, T., Moore, L. C., Figueroa, B. (1997). *Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

- Smith, E., & Witt, S. L. (1993). A comparative study of occupational stress among African American and White faculty: A research note. *Research in Higher Education, 34*(2), 229–241.
- Solórzano, D. G., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. J. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*(1), 60-73.
- Strayhorn, T.L. (2013). Measuring race and gender difference in undergraduate perceptions of campus climate and intentions to leave college: An analysis in Black and White. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 50*(2), 115-132.
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Trochim, W. (2000). *The research methods knowledge base* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog.
- Tynes, B.M., Rose, C.A., & Markoe, S.L. (2013). Extending campus life to the internet: Social media, discrimination, and perceptions of racial climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 6*(2), 102-114.
- Turner, C. S. V., Myers, S. L., & Creswell, J. W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation: The case of faculty of color in the Midwest. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*(1), 27–59.
- Villalpando, O., & Delgado Bernal, D. (2002). A critical race theory analysis of barriers that impede the success of faculty of color. In W. A. Smith, P. G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education: Continuing challenges for the twenty-first century*. (pp. 243–270). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Waldo, C. (1999). Out on campus: Sexual orientation and academic climate in a university context. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 26*, 745–774. doi: 10.1023/A:1022110031745
- Whitt, E. J., Edison, M. I., Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Nora, A. (2001). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the second and third years of college. *The Journal of Higher Education, 72*(2), 172–204.
- Worthington, R. L., Navarro, R. L., Loewy, M., & Hart, J. L. (2008). Color-blind racial attitudes, social dominance orientation, racial-ethnic group membership and college students' perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education 1*(1), 8–19.

Yosso, T. J., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. G. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(4), 659–690, 781, 785–786.