Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Assessment • Planning • Interventions

The College of Staten Island

Climate for Learning, Working, and Living Executive Summary

November 2016

Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Executive Summary

Introduction

The College of Staten Island (CSI) affirms that diversity and inclusion are crucial to the intellectual vitality of the campus community. It is through freedom of exchange over different ideas and viewpoints in supportive environments that individuals develop the critical thinking and citizenship skills that will benefit them throughout their lives. Diversity and inclusion engender academic engagement where teaching, working, learning, and living take place in pluralistic communities of mutual respect.

CSI is dedicated to fostering a caring community that provides leadership for constructive participation in a diverse, multicultural world. As noted in CSI's mission statement, "The College is dedicated to helping its students fulfill their creative, aesthetic, and educational aspirations through competitive and rigorous undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs. We embrace the strength of our diversity, foster civic mindedness, and nurture responsible citizens for our city, country, and the world."[1]

In order to better understand the campus climate, conducting a survey was first suggested in CSI's *Faculty Diversity Strategic Plan, 2013–2018*, which was developed by the College-wide Diversity Council and the Faculty Subcommittee. The senior administration at CSI recognized the need for a comprehensive tool that would provide campus climate metrics for CSI students, faculty, and staff. To that end, CSI contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to conduct a campus-wide study entitled, "College of Staten Island Climate Survey for Learning, Working, and Living" in 2015. CSI formed the Campus Study Working Group (CSWG). The CSWG's core membership was the College-wide Diversity Council and was composed of faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Data gathered via reviews of relevant CSI literature, focus groups, and a campus-wide survey focused on the experiences and perceptions of various constituent groups. Based on the findings of this study, community forums will develop and complete two to three action items by Spring 2017.

---

[1]http://www.csi.cuny.edu/presidentsoffice/mission.php

Project Design and Campus Involvement

The CSWG collaborated with R&A to develop the survey instrument. In the first phase, R&A conducted 19 focus groups, which were composed of 117 participants (81 women, 33 men, and three transgender individuals). In the second phase, the CSWG and R&A used data from the focus groups to co-construct questions for the campus-wide survey. The final survey instrument was completed in January 2016. CSI's survey contained 106 items (20 qualitative and 86 quantitative) and was available via a secure online portal from March 1 – April 8, 2016. Confidential paper surveys were made available to those individuals who did not have access to an internet-connected computer or who preferred a paper survey.

The conceptual model used as the foundation for CSI'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[2], 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 implemented participatory and community-based processes to generate survey questions as a means to capture the various dimensions of power and privilege that shape the campus experience. In this way, CSI'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.

CSI Participants

CSI community members completed 3,688 surveys for an overall response rate of 24.3%. Only surveys that were at least 50% completed were included in the final data set for analyses.[3] Response rates by constituent group varied: 22% (n = 2,621) for Undergraduate Students, 21% (n = 200) for Graduate Students, 84% (n = 16) for Executives (ECP), 49% (n = 529) for Staff, and

---

[2]Unearned privilege in this report is defined as entitlement based on group status when nothing was done to deserve such rewards..

[3]Sixty-eight (68) surveys were removed because they did not complete at least 50% of the survey, and 42 duplicate submissions were removed.

28% ($n = 322$) 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.[4]

---

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

Table 1. **CSI Sample Demographics**

Characteristic	Subgroup	*n*	% of Sample
Position status	Undergraduate Student	2,621	71.1
	Graduate Student	200	5.4
	Faculty	322	8.7
	Staff/Executive	545	14.8
Gender identity	Woman	2,357	63.9
	Man	1,271	34.5
	Transspectrum	38	1.0
Racial identity	White	1,630	44.2
	Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@	570	15.5
	Black/African American	445	12.1
	Asian/Asian American/South Asian	400	10.8
	Multiracial	304	8.2
	Other People of Color	134	3.6
Sexual identity	Heterosexual	2,817	76.4
	LGBQ	380	10.3
	Asexual/Other	364	9.9
Citizenship status	U.S. Citizen	2,789	75.6
	Non-U.S. Citizen/Naturalized Citizen	846	22.9
Disability status	No Disability	3,346	90.7
	Single Disability	226	6.1
	Multiple Disabilities	81	2.2
Military status	No Military Service	1,361	60.5
	Military Service	884	39.5
Faith-based affiliation	Christian Affiliation	1,881	51.0
	No Affiliation	979	26.5
	Other Faith-Based Affiliation	546	14.8
	Multiple Affiliations	149	4.0

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 CSI**

   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."[5] The level of comfort experienced by faculty, staff, and students is one indicator of campus climate.

   - 21% (*n* = 790) of the survey respondents were "very comfortable" and 52% (*n* = 1,919) were "comfortable" with the climate at CSI.
   - 33% (*n* = 286) of Faculty and Staff/Executive respondents were "very comfortable" and 38% (*n* = 326) were "comfortable" with the climate in their departments/work units.
   - 23% (*n* = 715) of Student and Faculty respondents were "very comfortable" and 54% (*n* = 1,673) were "comfortable" with the climate in their classes.

2. **Faculty Respondents[6] – Positive attitudes about faculty work**

   - 86% (*n* = 269) of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt valued by students in the classroom.
   - 75% (*n* = 242) of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt valued by faculty in their department/program.
   - 76% (*n* = 243) of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt valued by their department/program chairs.
   - 72% (*n* = 166) of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that faculty opinions were valued at CSI.
   - 70% (*n* = 214) of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that teaching was valued by CSI.
   - 68% (*n* = 148) of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they were supported and mentored during the tenure-track years.
   - 66% (*n* = 210) of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that their teaching was valued.

---

[5]Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 264
[6]Percentages are based on *n*'s for each item, not overall *n*'s for all Faculty respondents.

- 65% (*n* = 176) of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that their service contributions were valued by CSI.

3. **Staff/Executive Respondents**[7] **– Positive attitudes about staff work**

- 86% (*n* = 443) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that their supervisors were supportive of their taking leave.

- 83% (*n* = 442) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.

- 82% (*n* = 435) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance

- 81% (*n* = 434) of Staff/Executive respondents felt valued by coworkers in their department.

- 81% (*n* = 429) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they were given a reasonable time frame to complete assigned responsibilities.

- 80% (*n* = 418) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that there were clear expectations of their responsibilities.

- 78% (*n* = 360) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" agreed that CSI policies (e.g., FMLA) were fairly applied across CSI.

- 78% (*n* = 380) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that CSI was supportive of taking extended leave.

- 76% (*n* = 403) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the performance evaluation process was clear.

- 75% (*n* = 405) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they had supervisors who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.

---

[7]Percentages are based on *n*'s for each item, not overall *n*'s for all Staff/Executive respondents.

4. **Student Respondents – Positive attitudes about academic experiences**

The way students perceive and experience their campus climate influences their performance and success in college.[8] Research also supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for improving learning outcomes.[9] Attitudes toward academic pursuits are one indicator of campus climate.

- More than half of Student respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt valued by faculty in the classroom (68%, $n = 1,894$), CSI faculty (62%, $n = 1,727$), other students in the classroom (59%, $n = 1,630$), CSI staff (56%, $n = 1,559$), and students outside of the classroom (52%, $n = 1,441$).
- 56% ($n = 1,575$) of Student respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they had faculty 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:

- Black/African American Undergraduate Student respondents have less *Perceived Academic Success* than Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ and White Undergraduate Student respondents.
- Multiple Race Undergraduate Student respondents have less *Perceived Academic Success* than White Undergraduate Student respondents.

---

[8]Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005
[9]Hale, 2004; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2004

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.[10] Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.[11] The survey requested information on experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

   - 13% ($n = 467$) of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.[12]
     - 27% ($n = 124$) noted that the conduct was based on their position, 23% ($n = 109$) on their ethnicity, 20% ($n = 92$) on their age, and 18% ($n = 83$) on gender identity.
   - Differences emerged based on various demographic characteristics, including gender identity, ethnicity, and age. For example:
     - Undergraduate Student respondents 9% ($n = 228$) were significantly less likely than Staff/Executive respondents (25%, $n = 135$), Graduate Student respondents (21%, $n = 42$), and Faculty respondents (19%, $n = 62$) to indicate that they had experienced exclusionary conduct.
       - Of these respondents, Staff/Executive respondents (47%, $n = 64$) were more likely than Faculty respondents (34%, $n = 21$), Undergraduate Student respondents (15%, $n = 34$), and Graduate Student respondents (12%, $n = 5$) to indicate that the conduct was based on their position status.
     - Respondents aged 19 Years or Younger (6%, $n = 73$) and 20-21 Years (11%, $n = 78$) were significantly less likely than respondents aged 22-24 Years (13%, $n = 60$), respondents aged 25-34 Years (15%, $n = 65$),

---

[10]Aguirre & Messineo, 1997; Flowers & Pascarella, 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001

[11]Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008; Waldo, 1999

[12]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).

respondents aged 35-44 Years (22%, $n = 52$), respondents aged 45-54 Years (24%, $n = 56$), respondents aged 55-64 Years (18%, $n = 37$), and respondents aged 65 Years and older (8%, $n = 5$) to indicate that they had experienced exclusionary conduct.

o A lower percentage of Men respondents (10%, $n = 128$) than Transpectrum[13] respondents (26%, $n = 10$) and Women respondents (14%, $n = 322$) indicated that they had experienced exclusionary conduct.

▪ Men respondents (13%, $n = 16$) who indicated that they had experienced exclusionary conduct[14] were least likely to indicate that the conduct was based on their gender identity.

Respondents were given the option to elaborate on their personal experiences with exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct. One hundred sixty-five respondents provided their additional commentary. Amongst all respondents, two themes emerged: reporting process and student behavior. Many respondents felt that the reporting process was not effective for dealing with issues related to harassment or exclusionary conduct. A few respondents shared instances when they had reported an issue and it was handled appropriately. Some respondents discussed student behavior as a whole (e.g., "many students have poor manners"), while others focused on the actions of specific students (e.g., "I was ridiculed," "cursed at," "called names"). Two themes specific to Student (Undergraduate and Graduate) respondents were identified: unwelcoming professors and staff mistreatment. Student respondents described rude professors, favoritism, and unfair distribution of grades as concerns with faculty as well as less than favorable interactions with staff members (e.g., not providing services when they should be available). For Employee respondents (Faculty, Staff, and Executive), hostile colleagues and role of administration emerged as themes. Many Employee respondents identified supervisors as the source of the hostility (e.g., lack of appreciation, recognition, or favoritism), and described, in detail, specific

---

[13] The category "Transspectrum" includes respondents who indicated on the survey that they were Genderqueer or Transgender.

[14] This report uses the phrase "exclusionary conduct" as a shortened version of conduct that someone has "personally experienced" including "exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile (bullying, harassing) conduct."

instances where they felt undervalued. Administration was described as "rude," "disrespectful," "irrational," "unwelcoming," and "inadequate."

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).[15] Several groups at CSI indicated that they were less comfortable than their majority counterparts with the overall climate, department/workplace climate, and classroom climate.

   Overall Climate[16] at CSI

   - A smaller proportion of Staff/Executive respondents (11%, $n = 60$) were "very comfortable" with the climate at CSI than were Faculty respondents (20%, $n = 64$), Graduate Student respondents (23%, $n = 45$), or Undergraduate Student respondents (24%, $n = 621$).

   - A smaller group of Women respondents (20%, $n = 470$) than Men respondents (25%, $n = 317$) felt "very comfortable" with the overall climate at CSI.

   - White respondents (8%, $n = 130$) were more likely to be "uncomfortable" with the overall climate at CSI than were Black/African American respondents (5%, $n = 24$), Multiracial respondents (5%, $n = 15$), Other People of Color respondents (4%, $n = 5$), Asian/Asian American/South Asian respondents (4%, $n = 17$), and Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ respondents (4%, $n = 23$).

   - Respondents from Multiple Faith-Based Affiliations (13%, $n = 19$) were less likely to be "very comfortable" with the overall climate than were respondents with Other Faith-Based Affiliations (29%, $n = 157$), respondents with Christian Affiliations (22%, $n = 411$), and respondents with No Affiliation (18%, $n = 177$).

---

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

[16]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."

- A smaller proportion of respondents with a Single Disability (14%, $n = 31$) were "very comfortable" with the overall climate than were respondents with No Disability (22%, $n = 740$) or Multiple Disabilities (16%, $n = 13$).

- A smaller amount of Student respondents who lived in Campus Housing (16%, $n = 22$) felt "very comfortable" with the overall climate than Student respondents who lived in Non-Campus Housing (24%, $n = 632$).

Department/Work Unit Climate

- Respondents with At Least One Disability[17] (12%, $n = 8$) were significantly more likely to feel "very uncomfortable" with the climate in their departments/work units than respondents with No Disability (4%, $n = 34$).

Classroom Climate

- A smaller proportion of Women Faculty and Student respondents (21%, $n = 418$) than Men Faculty and Student respondents (26%, $n = 293$) felt "very comfortable" in their classes.

- Faculty and Student respondents with At Least One Disability (17%, $n = 46$) were significantly less likely to feel "very comfortable" with the climate in their classes than were Faculty and Student respondents with No Disability (23%, $n = 663$).

- A larger percentage of Student respondents who lived in Campus Housing (4%, $n = 5$) felt "very uncomfortable" with the classroom climate than Student respondents who lived in Non-Campus Housing (1%, $n = 21$).

3. **Faculty and Staff/Executive Respondents**[18] **– Challenges with work-life issues**

- 44% ($n = 142$) of Faculty respondents and 49% ($n = 267$) of Staff/Executive respondents had seriously considered leaving CSI in the past year.
    - By staff status, 44% ($n = 86$) of Hourly Staff respondents and 53% ($n = 174$) of Salary Staff respondents seriously considered leaving the College.
    - By faculty status, 60% each of Associate Professor respondents ($n = 33$) and Professor respondents ($n = 27$), 53% ($n = 31$) of Assistant Professor

---

[17]Owing to low numbers of respondents with Multiple Disabilities, a new category that combined respondents with a Single Disability and Multiple Disabilities was created and named "At Least One Disability." This variable is used throughout the report when the original variable cannot be used due to the aforementioned.

[18]Percentages are based on n's for each item, not overall n's for all Faculty and Staff/Executive respondents.

respondents, and 31% (*n* = 51) of Adjunct/Lecturer respondents seriously considered leaving the College.

  o 61% (*n* = 249) of Faculty and Staff/Executive respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of financial reasons and 50% (*n* = 206) did so because of limited opportunities for advancement.

- CSI Faculty and Staff/Executive respondents had observed unfair or unjust hiring (22%), unfair or unjust disciplinary actions (30%), or unfair or unjust promotion, tenure, and/or reclassification (13%).

- 52% (*n* = 108) of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that people who had children or elder care were burdened with balancing work and family responsibilities (e.g., evening and evenings programing, workload brought home, CSI breaks not scheduled with school district breaks).

- Fewer than one-third of Faculty respondents (29%, *n* = 63) "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that CSI provided adequate resources to help them manage work-life balance (e.g., child care, wellness services, elder care, housing location assistance, transportation).

Staff/Executive Respondents[19] – Challenges with feeling supported and valued

- 56% (*n* = 297) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that their workload was permanently increased without additional compensation as a result of other staff departures.

- 28% (*n* = 150) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they were pressured by departmental/program work requirements that occur outside of normally scheduled hours.

- Only 38% (*n* = 194) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they thought procedures on how they could advance at CSI were clear.

- 62% (*n* = 328) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that a hierarchy existed within staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than others.

---

[19]Percentages are based on *n*'s for each item, not overall *n*'s for all Faculty respondents.

- 27% (n = 139) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they were burdened by work responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations (e.g., committee memberships, departmental/program work assignments).
- 43% (n = 227) of Staff/Executive respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they performed more work than colleagues with similar performance expectations.

Faculty Respondents[20] – Challenges with faculty work

- 51% (n = 126) of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they performed more work to help students than did their colleagues.
- 43% (n = 100) of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that tenure standards/promotion standards were applied equally to all faculty in their college.
- 43% (n = 97) of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they were burdened by service responsibilities (e.g., committee memberships, departmental/program work assignments) beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations.
- Fewer than one-third of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that salaries for Tenure-Track faculty positions (29%, n = 64) and salaries for Non-Tenure-Track faculty positions (26%, n = 52) were competitive.
- 24% (n = 50) of Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they were pressured to change their research/scholarship agenda to achieve tenure/promotion.

Faculty respondents were provided the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences regarding faculty work. The most prominent concern for all Faculty respondents was job security; in particular, adjuncts were never assured of what their position status would be, were "paid poorly and ignored", and "taken for granted." Low, noncompetitive salaries for all Faculty respondents were also discussed as a concern. Some Faculty respondents

---

[20]Percentages are based on n's for each item, not overall n's for all Faculty respondents.

commented on the amount of support they received from CSI, focusing specifically on resources for research and travel funds. Junior faculty members are expected to pursue research, yet there are limited resources provided by the CSI. Inconsistent tenure and promotion criteria were also emphasized by some Faculty respondents, with research weighing more heavily than teaching, yet CSI is a teaching institution. Questions around how much CSI values service contributions for faculty also emerged as a theme. Further, Faculty respondents expressed disappointment with the lack of participation of faculty in the decision-making process of administration (e.g., "decision-making power has been taken out of the hands of faculty.")

4. **A small but 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 an important 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 CSI survey requested information regarding sexual misconduct.

   - 4% ($n = 136$) of respondents indicated on the survey that they had experienced a form of unwanted sexual misconduct.[21]
     - 20% ($n = 27$) of those respondents experienced relationship violence (e.g., ridiculed, controlling, hitting), 32% ($n = 44$) experienced stalking (e.g., following me, on social media, texting, phone calls), 41% ($n = 56$) experienced unwanted sexual interaction (e.g., cat-calling, repeated sexual advances, sexual harassment), and 10% ($n = 13$) experienced sexual contact (e.g. fondling, rape, sexual assault, penetration without consent, or gang rape.)

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on why they did not report unwanted sexual misconduct. Concerns about the consequences if they had reported the misconduct were

---

[21]The survey used the term "sexual misconduct" or "unwanted sexual contact" to depict any unwanted sexual experiences and defined it as "sexual harassment, gender-based harassment, or a form of sexual violence (sexual assault, stalking, or dating/domestic/intimate partner violence)."

addressed (e.g., "I didn't want to go through law enforcement.") Others indicated that they didn't report the conduct because the incident was not "a big deal." Common personal feelings such as "nervous" or "embarrassed" were attributed as barriers to reporting. Others indicated fears that "nothing would be done" if they reported the conduct.

Conclusion

CSI campus climate findings[22] were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.[23] For example, 70% to 80% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be "comfortable" or "very comfortable." Similar percentages (71-77%) of CSI respondents reported that they were "comfortable" or "very comfortable" with the overall climate, department/work unit climate, and classroom climate at CSI. Likewise, 20% to 25% in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At CSI, a much lower percentage of respondents (13%) indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. These results did parallel the findings of other climate studies of specific constituent groups offered in the literature, where generally members of historically underrepresented and underserved groups were slightly more likely to believe that they had experienced various forms of exclusionary conduct and discrimination than those in the majority (Guiffrida et al., 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).

CSI's climate assessment report provides baseline data on diversity and inclusion and addresses CSI's mission and goals. While the findings may guide decision-making in regard to policies and practices at CSI, 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 CSI community with an opportunity to build upon its strengths and to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. CSI, with support from senior administrators and collaborative leadership,

---

[22]Additional findings disaggregated by position status and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.
[23]Rankin & Associates Consulting, 2015

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 (*n*RC-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., & Quaye, 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 educations*. 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.