Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Assessment • Planning • Interventions

Kent State University

Campus Climate Research Study Executive Summary

January 2017

Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Executive Summary

Introduction

Kent State University 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.

Kent State University is dedicated to fostering a caring community that provides leadership for constructive participation in a diverse, multicultural world. As noted in Kent State University's mission statement, "We transform lives and communities through the power of discovery, learning and creative expression in an inclusive environment."[1] In order to better understand the campus climate, the senior administration at Kent State University recognized the need for a comprehensive tool that would provide campus climate metrics for Kent State students, faculty, and staff.

To that end, members of Kent State University formed the Climate Study Steering Committee (CSSC) in 2014. The CSSC was composed of faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Ultimately, Kent State contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to conduct a campus-wide study entitled, "Kent State University Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working." Data gathered via reviews of relevant Kent State 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, strategic action initiatives will be developed.

---

[1]http://www.kent.edu/strategicvisioning#mission

Project Design and Campus Involvement

The CSSC collaborated with R&A to develop the survey instrument. In the first phase, R&A conducted 17 focus groups, comprised of 87 participants (44 students; 43 faculty and staff). In the second phase, the CSSC 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 November 2015. Kent State's survey contained 104 items (20 qualitative and 84 quantitative) and was available through a secure online portal from March 8 to April 8, 2016. Confidential paper surveys were distributed 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 Kent State University's assessment of campus climate was developed by Smith et al. (1997) and modified by Rankin (2003). A power and privilege perspective informs the model, one grounded in critical theory, which establishes that power differentials, both earned and unearned, are central to all human interactions (Brookfield, 2005). Unearned power and privilege are associated with membership in dominant social groups (Johnson, 2005) and influence systems of differentiation that reproduce unequal outcomes. The CSSC 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, Kent State University'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.

Kent State University Participants

Kent State University community members completed 8,454 surveys for an overall response rate of 19%. Only surveys that were at least 50% completed were included in the final data set for analyses.[2] Response rates by constituent group varied: 14% ($n = 4,685$) for Undergraduate Students, 16% ($n = 1,056$) for Graduate/Professional Students, 55% ($n = 1,632$) for Staff, 34% (n

---

[2]Seventy-nine surveys were removed because they did not complete at least 50% of the survey, and 81 duplicate submissions were removed. Surveys were also removed from the data file if the respondent did not provide consent ($n = 80$). An additional 3 responses were removed due to illogical responses.

= 940) for Faculty, and > 100% ($n = 141$) for Administrators with Faculty rank.[3] 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]

---

[3]Respondents were provided the opportunity to self-select their position status, as such the sample n may not reflect the overall N of the Kent State University population.
[4]The total n for each demographic characteristic may differ as a result of missing data.

Table 1. Kent State University Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Subgroup	Population N	%	Sample n	%	Response Rate
Gender Identity[a]	Woman	27,006	60.5	5,570	65.9	20.63
	Man	17,637	39.5	2,751	32.5	15.60
	Genderqueer			55	0.7	N/A
	Transgender			16	0.2	N/A
	Other/Missing/Unknown			62	0.7	N/A
Race/Ethnicity[b]	Alaskan/Native American	86	0.2	9	0.1	10.47
	Asian/Asian American	699	1.6	115	1.4	16.45
	Black/African American	3,197	7.2	525	6.2	16.42
	Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@	1,206	2.7	128	1.5	10.61
	Middle Eastern			24	0.3	N/A
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	30	0.1	12	0.1	40.00
	White/European American	33,722	75.5	6,529	77.1	19.36
	Two or More	1,088	2.4	421	5.0	38.69
	Missing/Unknown/Not Specified/Other	1,321	3.0	134	1.6	10.14
	International	3,294	7.4	575	6.8	17.46
Position Status[c]	Undergraduate Student	32,213	72.2	4,685	55.4	14.54
	Graduate/Professional Student	6,752	15.1	1,056	12.5	15.64
	Faculty	2,615	5.9	940	11.1	35.95
	Administrator with Faculty rank	109	0.2	141	1.7	>100.0
	Staff	2,954	6.6	1,632	19.3	55.25
Citizenship[d]	U.S. Citizen	40,810	91.4	7,830	92.6	19.19
	Permanent Resident	394	0.9	92	1.1	23.35
	Visa Holder	3,209	7.2	474	5.6	14.77
	Other Status			9	0.1	N/A
	Unreported/Missing	230	0.5	49	0.6	21.30

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

[a] χ^2 (1, $N = 8{,}321$) = 144.1, $p < .001$

[b] χ^2 (7, $N = 8{,}436$) = 361.32, $p < .001$

[c] χ^2 (4, $N = 8{,}454$) = 3736.36, $p < .001$

[d] χ^2 (3, $N = 8{,}445$) = 35.61, $p < .001$

Key Findings – Areas of Strength

1. **High levels of comfort with the climate at Kent State University**

   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.

   - 79% ($n = 6,641$) of the survey respondents were "comfortable" or "very comfortable" with the climate at Kent State University.

   - 69% ($n = 1,871$) of Faculty, Staff, and Administrator with Faculty rank respondents were "comfortable" or "very comfortable" with the climate in their departments/work units.

   - 84% ($n = 5,578$) of Student and Faculty respondents were "comfortable" or "very comfortable" with the climate in their classes.

   - 80% ($n = 4,431$) of Women respondents, 77% ($n = 2,121$) of Men respondents, and 72% ($n = 72$) of Transspectrum respondents were "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the overall climate at Kent State University.

   - 79% ($n = 5,504$) of Heterosexual respondents, 78% ($n = 642$) of LGBQ respondents, and 76% ($n = 331$) of Asexual/Other respondents were "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the overall climate at Kent State University.

2. **Faculty Respondents – Positive attitudes about faculty work**

   - Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that the tenure/promotion process was clear (71%, $n = 301$).

   - 79% ($n = 322$) of Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that their point of view was taken into account for course assignments and scheduling.

   - 78% ($n = 212$) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that their point of view was taken into account for course assignments and scheduling.

   - Non-Tenure-Track respondents felt that the renewal of appointment/promotion was clear (68%, $n = 188$).

---

[5]Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 264

- 71% each of Faculty respondents felt valued by faculty in their department (n = 756) and their department head/chair (n = 740).

3. **Staff Respondents – Positive attitudes about staff work**

   - 89% (n = 1,433) of Staff respondents thought that Kent State University was supportive of staff taking leave.
   - 72% (n = 1,127) of Staff respondents thought that their supervisors were supportive of flexible work schedules.
   - 81% (n = 1,297) of Staff respondents indicated that Kent State University provides them with resources to pursue professional development.
   - 71% (n = 1,121) of Staff respondents noted that their supervisors provide them with ongoing feedback to help them improve their performance.
   - Staff respondents felt valued by coworkers in their work unit (77%, n = 1,299).

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

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

   - 77% (n = 4,377) of Student respondents felt valued by faculty in the classroom; 64% (n = 3,619) felt valued by other students in the classroom.
     - Additionally, 43% (n = 172) of Asian/Asian American Student respondents "strongly agreed" that they felt valued by faculty in the classroom.
   - 69% (n = 3,945) of Student respondents believed that the campus climate encouraged free and open discussion of difficult topics.
   - 72% (n = 4,121) of Student respondents indicated that they had faculty whom they perceived as role models.

---

[6]Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005
[7]Hale, 2004; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2004

5. **Student Respondents –** *Perceived 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:

- Woman Student respondents had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than Men Student respondents.

- Heterosexual Student respondents had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than LGBQ, including Pansexual, Student respondents.

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.[8] Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.[9] The survey requested information on experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

- 17% ($n = 1,408$) of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.[10]
  - o 23% ($n = 325$) noted that the conduct was based on their position status at Kent State, 19% ($n = 262$) felt that it was based on their gender/gender identity, and 19% ($n = 261$) felt that it was based on their age.

- Differences emerged based on various demographic characteristics, including position, race, gender identity, and age. For example:
  - o A higher percentage of Administrator with Faculty rank respondents (29%, $n = 41$) than Staff respondents (27%, $n = 442$), Faculty respondents (24%, $n = 225$), Graduate/Professional Student respondents (14%, $n = 142$), and Undergraduate Student respondents (12%, $n = 558$) indicated

---

[8]Aguirre & Messineo, 1997; Flowers & Pascarella, 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001
[9]Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008; Waldo, 1999
[10]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).

that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

- o Black/African American respondents (51%, $n = 58$) were significantly more likely, than all other ethnic identity respondents, to believe they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct because of their ethnicity.

- o A higher percentage of Transspectrum respondents (39%, $n = 39$) than Women respondents (17%, $n = 940$) and Men respondents (15%, $n = 418$) indicated that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

- o Significantly higher percentages of respondents ages 49 through 65 years old (27%, $n = 356$) and 35 through 64 years old (22%, $n = 260$) indicated that they had experienced exclusionary conduct than did other respondents.

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).[11] Several groups at Kent State University indicated that they were less comfortable than their majority counterparts with the climates of the campus, workplace, and classroom.

   - Differences by racial identity:
       - o Black/African American respondents (68%, $n = 375$) were significantly least likely to be "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the overall climate at Kent State University than were Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ respondents (74%, $n = 95$), Multiracial respondents (76%, $n = 331$), Asian/Asian American respondents (77%, $n = 359$), Other People of Color respondents (77%, $n = 87$), and White respondents (81%, $n = 5,323$)

---

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

- Differences by disability status:
  - Multiple Disabilities respondents (63%, $n = 157$) were significantly least likely to be "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the overall climate at Kent State University than were both Single Disability respondents (74%, $n = 488$) and No Disability respondents (80%, $n = 5,958$).

3. **Faculty, Staff, and Administrator with Faculty rank Respondents – Challenges with work-life issues**

   - 62% ($n = 265$) of Tenure-Track Faculty respondents, 55% ($n = 593$) of Unclassified Staff respondents, 51% ($n = 72$) of Administrator with Faculty rank respondents, 47% ($n = 261$) of Classified Staff respondents, 47% ($n = 132$) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents, and 35% ($n = 80$) of Adjunct/Part-Time Faculty respondents had seriously considered leaving Kent State University in the past year.
     - 49% ($n = 681$) of those Faculty, Staff, and Administrator with Faculty rank respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of financial reasons (e.g., salary, resources).
   - Faculty and Staff respondents observed unjust hiring (25%, $n = 661$), unjust disciplinary actions (12%, $n = 318$), or unjust promotion, tenure, and/or reclassification practices (31%, $n = 826$).
   - Only 43% ($n = 585$) of Staff respondents and 38% ($n = 388$) of Faculty respondents felt that Kent State University senior administrators were genuinely concerned with their welfare.

4. **Faculty Respondents – Challenges with faculty work**

   - Less than half of Tenure-Track Faculty respondents (44%, $n = 179$) "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that tenure standards/promotion standards were applied equally to all faculty.
   - Just half (50%, $n = 210$) of Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that their service contributions were important to tenure/promotion.

- 49% ($n = 136$) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt pressured to do service and research.

- Less than half of Faculty respondents (44%, $n = 414$) "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that they felt that their research was valued.

5. **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 a significant issue for colleges and universities nationwide, affecting the physical health, mental health, and academic success of students. The report highlights that one in five women is sexually assaulted while in college. One section of the Kent State survey requested information regarding unwanted sexual contact.

   - 4% ($n = 304$) of respondents indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact while at Kent State University.

   - 251 of the 304 respondents who experienced unwanted sexual contact were Undergraduate Students

   - 216 of the respondents who experienced unwanted sexual contact were Undergraduate Women.

   - These respondents rarely reported to anyone at Kent State University that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact.

Conclusion

Kent State University campus climate findings[12] were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.[13] For example, 70% to 80% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be "comfortable" or "very comfortable." A similar percentage (79%) of all Kent State University respondents reported that they were "comfortable" or "very comfortable" with the climate at Kent State

---

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

University. Likewise, 20% to 25% in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At Kent State University, a smaller, but still meaningful, percentage of respondents (17%) 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.[14]

Kent State University's climate assessment report provides baseline data on diversity and inclusion, and addresses Kent State University's mission and goals. While the findings may guide decision-making in regard to policies and practices at Kent State University, it is important to note that the cultural fabric of any institution and unique aspects of each campus' environment must be taken into consideration when deliberating additional action items based on these findings. The climate assessment findings provide the Kent State University community with an opportunity to build upon its strengths and to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. Kent State University, with support from senior administrators and collaborative leadership, is in a prime position to actualize its commitment to an inclusive campus and to institute organizational structures that respond to the needs of its dynamic campus community.

---

[14]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

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.