



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Assessment • Planning • Interventions

University of Missouri -
System Offices

Campus Climate
Research Study
Executive Summary

September 2017



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Executive Summary

Introduction

History of the Project

The University of Missouri System Office (UM System Offices) 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.

The UM System Offices also is committed to fostering a caring community that provides leadership for constructive participation in a diverse, multicultural world. As noted in UM System Offices' mission statement, "The university promotes learning by its students and lifelong learning by Missouri's citizens, fosters innovation to support economic development, and advances the health, cultural, and social interests of the people of Missouri, the nation, and the world."¹ To better understand the campus climate, the senior administration at UM System Offices 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, the UM System Offices conducted a comprehensive survey of all staff to develop a better understanding of the learning, living, and working environment on campus.

In May 2016, members of UM System Offices worked with the University of Missouri System to form 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 study entitled "University of Missouri System Office Climate for Learning, Living, and Working." Data gathered via reviews of relevant literature and a campus-wide survey addressing the experiences and perceptions of various constituent groups will be presented to the UM System Offices community. The community, upon receiving the report, will then come together to develop and complete two or three action items by spring 2018.

¹<https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/about/mission>

Project Design and Campus Involvement

The conceptual model used as the foundation for the UM System Offices' 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. UM System Offices' 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.

The SCST collaborated with R&A to develop the survey instrument. Together, they implemented a participatory process to review tested survey questions from the R&A question bank and develop a survey instrument for UM System Offices that would reveal the various dimensions of power and privilege that shape the campus experience. The final UM System Offices survey queried various campus constituent groups about their experiences and perceptions regarding the academic environment for students, the workplace environment for faculty and staff, employee benefits, sexual harassment and sexual violence, racial and ethnic identity, gender identity and gender expression, sexual identity, accessibility and disability services, and other topics. The UM System Offices received a tailored version of that survey that focused distinctly on the experiences of UM System Offices employees.

In total, 142 people completed the survey. In the end, the UM System Offices assessment was the result of a comprehensive process to identify the strengths and challenges of the climate, with a specific focus on the distribution of power and privilege among differing social groups at the UM System Offices.

UM System Offices Participants

UM System Offices community members completed 142 surveys for an overall response rate of 27%.² Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic characteristics of survey

²Three surveys were removed because the respondents did not give consent to participate in the survey.

respondents. The percentages offered in Table 1 are based on the numbers of respondents in the sample (*n*) for each demographic characteristic.

Table 1. UM System Offices Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Subgroup	Sample	
		<i>n</i>	%
Gender identity	Woman	80	56.3
	Man	57	40.1
	Transpectrum	0	0.0
	Other/Missing/Not Reported	5	3.5
Racial/ethnic identity	American Indian/Alaska Native	< 5	---
	Asian/Asian American	< 5	---
	Black/African American	6	4.2
	Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@	< 5	---
	Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian	0	0.0
	Multiracial	5	3.5
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0.0
	White/European American	116	81.7
	Missing/Unknown/Other	9	6.3
Position status	Administrator with Faculty Rank	< 5	---
	Administrator without Faculty Rank	9	6.3
	Staff – Hourly	37	26.1
	Staff - Salary	94	66.2
Citizenship status	U.S. Citizen	133	93.7
	Non-U.S. Citizen	6	4.2
	Missing/Unknown	< 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 UM System Offices

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.”³ The level of comfort experienced by staff, faculty, and students is one indicator of campus climate.

- 80% of respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their primary work area.

2. Positive attitudes about staff work

- 94% believed their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance.
- 86% of respondents believed that vacation and personal time packages were competitive and 82% believed that health insurance benefits were competitive.
- 86% of respondents believed that their supervisors were supportive of their taking leave (e.g., vacation, parental, personal, short-term disability).
- 83% of respondents felt valued by coworkers and 82% felt valued by their supervisors/managers.

3. Positive attitudes about UM System Offices practices

- 83% of respondents believed that they were given a reasonable time frame to complete assigned responsibilities.
- 81% of respondents believed that they had supervisors and 79% believed they had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.
- 75% of respondents reported that they were able to complete their assigned duties during scheduled hours.

³Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 264

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.⁴ Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.⁵ 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.⁶
 - 22% of respondents each indicated that the conduct was based on their gender/gender identity or position status, while 19% of respondents noted that the conduct was based on their age.
 - 48% of the respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct identified coworkers and/or colleagues as the source of the conduct; 37% identified their supervisor or manager.
 - 85% of respondents did not report the conduct.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct at UM System Offices. Twelve respondents contributed comments regarding these personal experiences. A primary theme among the respondents who elaborated on their personal experience was that they elected to not report harassment because of perceived barriers, such as a fear of retaliation.

⁴Aguirre & Messineo, 1997; Flowers & Pascarella, 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001

⁵Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008; Waldo, 1999

⁶The 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).

2. Constituent groups indicated that they were less comfortable with aspects of the climate.

Prior research on campus climate had 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).⁷ Women Staff respondents and Hourly Staff respondents at the UM System Offices indicated that they were less comfortable than were their colleagues with aspects of the campus climate.

- 27% of Women Staff respondents reported observing unjust behavior, procedures, or employment practices related to promotion, tenure, reappointment, and/or reclassification compared to 13% of Men Staff respondents.
- 45% of Salary Staff respondents and 17% of Hourly Staff respondents “agreed” that they felt positive about their career opportunities at the UM System Offices.
- 43% percent of Salary Staff respondents and 19% of Hourly Staff respondents “agreed” that their department/program encouraged free and open discussion of difficult topics.

3. Staff Respondents – Challenges with work-life issues

- 50% ($n = 71$) of Staff respondents had seriously considered leaving UM System Offices in the past year.
 - Low salary/pay rate (52%), limited opportunities for advancement (48%), and a lack of a sense of belonging (38%) were the top three reasons given for seriously considering leaving the UM System Offices.
- UM System Offices employees had observed unfair or unjust hiring practices (18%, $n = 25$), unfair or unjust disciplinary actions (6%, $n = 9$), or unfair or unjust promotion, tenure, reappointment, and/or reclassification (22%, $n = 31$).
 - Age, gender identity, nepotism/cronyism, racial identity, ethnicity, and position status were the top perceived bases for many of the reported discriminatory employment practices.

⁷Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hart & Fellabaum, 2008; Norris, 1992; Rankin, 2003; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart, 2008

4. Staff Respondents – Challenges with workplace climate

- 62% of Staff respondents believed that a hierarchy existed within staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than others.
- 32% of Staff respondents believed that staff salaries were competitive and 23% indicated that child care benefits were competitive.
- 25% of Staff respondents believed that staff opinions were valued by UM System Offices/University of Missouri faculty.
- 32% of Staff respondents thought that senior administrators had taken direct actions to address the needs of at-risk/underserved students; 25% ($n = 34$) indicated the same of faculty and 24% ($n = 32$) of students.

Eighteen Staff respondents elaborated on their responses to the survey questions regarding benefits, salary, professional development, leave, and staff opinions. The single greatest concern expressed in regard to their experiences as a University of Missouri staff member related to a perceived lack of job security.

Conclusion

UM System Offices climate findings⁸ were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.⁹ For example, 70% to 80% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be “very comfortable” or “comfortable.” At the UM System Offices, 63% of respondents reported that they were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate at UM System Offices and 80% of respondents reported that they were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their primary work area. Likewise, 20% to 25% of respondents in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At the UM System Offices, a similar percentage of respondents (19%) indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. The results also

⁸Additional findings disaggregated by position status and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.

⁹[Rankin & Associates Consulting, 2015](#)

paralleled the findings of other climate studies of specific constituent groups offered in the literature.¹⁰

The UM System Offices' climate assessment report provides baseline data on diversity and inclusion, and addresses the UM System Offices' mission and goals. While the findings may guide decision-making in regard to policies and practices at the UM System Offices, 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 deliberating additional action items based on these findings. The climate assessment findings provide the UM System Offices community with an opportunity to build upon its strengths and to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. The UM System Offices, with support from senior administrators and collaborative leadership, is in a prime position to actualize its commitment to promote an inclusive campus and to institute organizational structures that respond to the needs of its dynamic campus community.

¹⁰Guiffreda, 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

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.