



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Assessment • Planning • Interventions

University of Missouri -  
Columbia

Campus Climate  
Research Study  
Executive Summary

September 2017



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

## **Executive Summary**

### **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.”<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> <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<sup>2</sup>. 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,<sup>3</sup> 10% ( $n = 995$ ) were Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist members,<sup>4</sup> 26% ( $n = 2,601$ ) were Staff/Senior Administrators without Faculty Rank members,<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup>

**Table 1. University of Missouri-Columbia Sample Demographics**

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

<sup>2</sup>One 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).

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

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

<sup>5</sup>Senior administrators without faculty rank members are grouped with Staff for analyses.

<sup>6</sup>The total  $n$  for each demographic characteristic may differ as a result of missing data.

**Table 1. University of Missouri-Columbia Sample Demographics**

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

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.”<sup>7</sup> 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<sup>8</sup> 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<sup>9</sup> 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.

---

<sup>7</sup>Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 264

<sup>8</sup>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.

<sup>9</sup>Employee respondents refer to Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist and Staff/Senior Administrators with or without Faculty Rank.

## **2. Faculty Respondents<sup>10</sup> – 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<sup>11</sup> – 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<sup>12</sup> Respondents – Positive attitudes about academic experiences**

The way students perceive and experience their campus climate influences their performance and success in college.<sup>13</sup> Research also supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for improving learning outcomes.<sup>14</sup> Attitudes toward academic pursuits are one indicator of campus climate.

---

<sup>10</sup> Faculty respondents refer to Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist respondents and Senior Administrators with Faculty Rank respondents.

<sup>11</sup> Staff respondents refer to Staff/Senior Administrators without Faculty Rank respondents.

<sup>12</sup> Student respondents refer to Undergraduate Student respondents and Graduate Student/Professional Student/Post-Doctoral respondents.

<sup>13</sup> Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005

<sup>14</sup> Hale, 2004; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2004

***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.<sup>15</sup> Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup>
  - 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<sup>18</sup>, 29% of Senior Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents, 24% of Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist

---

<sup>15</sup>Aguirre & Messineo, 1997; Flowers & Pascarella, 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001

<sup>16</sup>Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008; Waldo, 1999

<sup>17</sup>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).

<sup>18</sup>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.
- 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<sup>19</sup> 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)

---

<sup>19</sup>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).<sup>20</sup> 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.

---

<sup>20</sup>Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hart & Fellabaum, 2008; Norris, 1992; Rankin, 2003; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart, 2008

- By sexual identity: LGBTQ 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 Transspectrum 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 Transspectrum 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: LGBTQ 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<sup>21</sup> 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.
  - 58% of those Faculty and Staff respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of financial reasons.
  - 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.

---

<sup>21</sup> Employee respondents refer to Faculty/Emeritus Faculty/Research Scientist and Staff/Senior Administrators with or without Faculty Rank.

#### **4. Faculty<sup>22</sup> 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.

---

<sup>22</sup>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<sup>23</sup> 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.

---

<sup>23</sup> 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<sup>24</sup> were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup>

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

---

<sup>24</sup>Additional findings disaggregated by position status and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.

<sup>25</sup>Rankin & Associates Consulting, 2015

<sup>26</sup>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

- 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.