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Climate In Higher Education

Assessing Campus Climate

What is it?
- Campus Climate is a construct

Definition?
- Current attitudes, behaviors, and standards and practices of employees and students of an institution

How is it measured?
- Personal Experiences
- Perceptions
- Institutional Efforts

Rankin & Reason, 2008
Campus Climate & Students

1. How students experience their campus environment influences both learning and developmental outcomes.¹

2. Discriminatory environments have a negative effect on student learning.²

3. Research supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty on enhancing learning outcomes.³


² Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Hagedron, 1999; Feagin, Vera & Imani, 1996; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005

The personal and professional development of employees including faculty members, administrators, and staff members are impacted by campus climate.¹

Faculty members who judge their campus climate more positively are more likely to feel personally supported and perceive their work unit as more supportive.²

Research underscores the relationships between (1) workplace discrimination and negative job/career attitudes and (2) workplace encounters with prejudice and lower health/well-being.³

¹Settles, Cortina, Malley, and Stewart, 2006, Gardner, S. (2013); Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, J. 2009
²Costello, 2012; Sears, 2002; Kaminski, & Geisler, 2012; Griffin, Pérez, Holmes, & Mayo, 2010
³Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2007; Waldo, 1999
Projected Outcomes

Seattle University will add to their knowledge base with regard to how constituent groups currently feel about their particular campus climate and how the community responds to them (e.g., work-life issues, curricular integration, inter-group/intra-group relations, respect issues).

Seattle University will use the results of the assessment to inform current/on-going work.
Setting the Context for Beginning the Work

Examine the Research
  • Review work already completed

Preparation
  • Readiness of each campus

Assessment
  • Examine the climate

Follow-up
  • Building on the successes and addressing the challenges
Transformational Tapestry Model©
Project Overview

Phase I
• Assessment Tool Development and Implementation

Phase II
• Data Analysis

Phase III
• Final Report and Presentation
Phase I
Summer/Fall 2014 – Winter 2015

Meetings with the CSWG to develop the survey instrument

The CSWG reviewed multiple drafts of the survey, and approved the final survey instrument.

The final survey was distributed to the entire SU community via an invitation from President Sundborg.
**Final instrument**

- 102 questions and additional space for respondents to provide commentary (21 qualitative and 81 quantitative)
- On-line or paper & pencil options

**Sample = Population**

- All students, faculty, staff, and administrators of SU’s community received an invitation to participate.
Survey Limitations

- Self-selection bias
- Response rates
- Social desirability
- Caution in generalizing results for constituent groups with low response rates
Method Limitation

Data were not reported for groups of fewer than 5 individuals where identity could be compromised.

Instead, small groups were combined to eliminate possibility of identifying individuals.
Phase II
Spring/Summer 2015

Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted.
Phase III
Summer/Fall 2015

Report draft reviewed by the CSWG

Final report submitted to Seattle University

Presentation to SU campus community
Results

Response Rates
Who are the respondents?

2,634 people responded to the call to participate
29% overall response rate
Employee Response Rates

- Faculty ($n = 340$) 46%
- Staff/Administrator ($n = 566$) 49%
Student Response Rates

- **24%**  
  Undergraduate ($n = 1,081$)

- **18%**  
  Graduate ($n = 362$)

- **36%**  
  Law ($n = 285$)
Response Rates by Gender

- Woman ($n = 1,713$)
- Man ($n = 863$)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- **28%** • American Indian/Alaskan Native ($n = 14$)
- **21%** • Asian/Asian American ($n = 341$)
- **23%** • African American/Black ($n = 78$)
- **14%** • Hispanic/Latino(a)/Chicano(a) ($n = 110$)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- Middle Eastern ($n = 17$)  (n/a)
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander ($n = 19$)  (32%)
- White ($n = 1,666$)  (36%)
- Multiracial ($n = 320$)  (67%)
Results

Additional Demographic Characteristics
Respondents by Position (%)
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Duplicated Total)

- White: 74%
- Asian/Asian American: 17%
- Hispanic/Latino/Chicano: 8%
- Black/African/African American: 5%
- American Indian: 3%
- Middle Eastern: 2%
- Pacific Islander: 2%
- Native Hawaiian: <1%
- Alaskan Native: <1%
- Racial Identity Not Listed: 2%
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%) (Unduplicated Total)

- White: 63%
- People of Color: 22%
- Multiracial: 12%
- Race, Other/Missing/Unknown: 3%
Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (%)
Respondents by Sexual Identity and Position Status ($n$)

- LGBQ: 221
  - Undergraduate Students: 45
  - Graduate Students: 32
  - Law Students: 36
  - Faculty: 72
  - Staff/Admin: 46

- Heterosexual: 811
  - Undergraduate Students: 301
  - Graduate Students: 245
  - Law Students: 284
  - Faculty: 46
  - Staff/Admin: 10

- Asexual/Other: 462
  - Undergraduate Students: 10
  - Graduate Students: 6
  - Law Students: 8
  - Staff/Admin: 14

Legend:
- Undergraduate Students
- Graduate Students
- Law Students
- Faculty
- Staff/Admin
30% ($n = 779$) of Respondents Identified as Having a Single Disability or Multiple Disabilities that Substantially Affected Major Life Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental health/psychological condition</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disability</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic diagnosis or medical condition</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating disorder</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of hearing or deaf</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/mobility condition that affects walking</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/mobility condition that does not affect walking</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vision or blind</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired/Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A disability/condition not listed here</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/communication condition</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Faith-Based Affiliation (%)

- No Affiliation: 40%
- Catholic: 21%
- Christian/Not Catholic: 21%
- Multiple Affiliations: 7%
- Other Faith-Based Affiliations: 8%
## Citizenship Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen</td>
<td>2,387</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visa holder (F-1, J-1, H1-B, A, L, G, E, or TN)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other legally documented status</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented resident</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Military Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have not been in the military</td>
<td>2,504</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservist/National Guard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active military</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Respondents by Age (n)

- 23-34: Staff/Admin 177, Faculty 23
- 35-48: Staff/Admin 200, Faculty 132
- 49-67: Staff/Admin 170, Faculty 148
- 68 and over: Staff/Admin 8, Faculty 24
Employee Respondents’ Dependent Care Status by Position (%)

- No depend care: 63% (Staff/Admin), 51% (Faculty)
- Children under 18 yrs: 27% (Staff/Admin), 36% (Faculty)
- Dependent child 18 yrs or older: 6% (Staff/Admin), 10% (Faculty)
- Independent child 18+ years: 3% (Staff/Admin), 4% (Faculty)
- Sick/disabled partner: 1% (Staff/Admin), 2% (Faculty)
- Senior/Other: 9% (Staff/Admin), 13% (Faculty)
Student Respondents by Age ($n$)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure
# Student Respondents’ Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>671</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes, I work on campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes, I work off campus</strong></td>
<td>589</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Student Respondents’ Residence
### On-Campus Housing (33%, \( n = 575 \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bellarmine Hall</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion Hall</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chardin Hall</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Apartments</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolvenbach Homes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Court</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Apartments</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier Global House</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Student Respondents’ Residence

### Off-Campus Housing (66%, \( n = 1,141 \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independently in an apartment/house</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with family member/guardian</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Income by Dependency Status and Position (%)

- Undergrad Dependent
  - Below $40K: 13%
  - $40K - $79,999: 22%
  - $80K-$124,999: 29%
  - $125K-$249K: 36%
  - $250K or more: 36%

- Grad Dependent
  - Below $40K: 19%
  - $40K - $79,999: 21%
  - $80K-$124,999: 43%
  - $125K-$249K: 23%
  - $250K or more: 38%

- Law Student Dependent
  - Below $40K: 9%
  - $40K - $79,999: 21%
  - $80K-$124,999: 31%
  - $125K-$249K: 39%
  - $250K or more: 39%

- Undergrad Independent
  - Below $40K: 2%
  - $40K - $79,999: 7%
  - $80K-$124,999: 15%
  - $125K-$249K: 53%
  - $250K or more: 75%

- Grad Independent
  - Below $40K: 10%
  - $40K - $79,999: 16%
  - $80K-$124,999: 21%
  - $125K-$249K: 18%
  - $250K or more: 11%

- Law Student Independent
  - Below $40K: 9%
  - $40K - $79,999: 16%
  - $80K-$124,999: 16%
  - $125K-$249K: 18%
  - $250K or more: 11%

Note: Responses with n’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure.
46% \((n = 801)\) of Student Respondents Reported Experiencing Financial Hardship…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affording tuition</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing my books and other course supplies</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording housing</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording other campus fees</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in co-curricular events or activities</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording transportation</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording food</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in social events</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling home during Seattle University breaks</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording health care</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording professional development</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording child care</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes Student respondents who reported having experienced financial hardship \((n = 801)\) only. Sum does not total 100% as a result of multiple response choices.
How Student Respondents Were Paying For College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family contribution</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal loans</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-need based scholarship/grants</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contribution/job</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need-based scholarship</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private loans</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit card</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Student Respondents Were Paying For College (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Study</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government program</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate assistantship</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition remission</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed education tuition program</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident assistant</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Government Sponsored Grants</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs or Organizations at SU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not participate in any clubs/organizations</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service/engagement</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural heritage</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellness</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor societies</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletics</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs or Organizations (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and social justice</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious, spiritual</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/community building</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special interest</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and recreation</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Cumulative G.P.A. (n)

1.5-1.99
2.0-.2.49
2.5-2.99
3.0-3.49
3.5-4.0

12
55
162
503
979

Note: Responses with n < 5 are not presented in the figure
Findings
“Comfortable”/“Very Comfortable” with:

- Overall Campus Climate (76%)
- Department/Work Unit Climate (78%)
- Classroom Climate (Students & Faculty, 81%)
Comfort With Overall Climate

Differences

- Graduate Student respondents more comfortable than Staff/Administrator respondents, Faculty respondents, Law Student respondents, and Undergraduate Student respondents
- Women respondents and Men respondents more comfortable than Transgender/Genderqueer/Other respondents
- Heterosexual respondents more comfortable than LGBQ and Asexual/Other respondents
- Respondents with No Disability or a Single Disability more comfortable than respondents with Multiple Disabilities
Comfort With Department/Work Unit Climate

Differences

- Faculty respondents more comfortable than Staff/Administrator respondents
- Exempt Professional Staff/Administrator – Staff respondents more comfortable than Non-Exempt Staff/Vendor respondents
- Men Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents more comfortable than Women Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents
- Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents with Military Service more comfortable than Non-Military Service Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents
### Comfort With Classroom Climate

**Differences**

- Undergraduate Student respondents, Graduate Student respondents, and Faculty respondents more comfortable than Law Student respondents.
- Men Faculty and Student respondents more comfortable than Women and Transgender/Genderqueer/Other Faculty and Student respondents.
- White Faculty and Student respondents more comfortable than Multiracial Faculty and Student respondents and Faculty and Student Respondents of Color.
Comfort With Classroom Climate

Differences

• Heterosexual Faculty and Student respondents more comfortable than LGBQ and Asexual/Other Faculty and Student respondents
• Faculty and Student respondents with No Disability or a Single Disability more comfortable than Faculty and Student respondents with Multiple Disabilities
• U.S. Citizen Faculty and Student respondents more comfortable than Non-U.S. Citizen Faculty and Student respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Not Low-Income Student respondents more comfortable than Low-Income Student respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not First-Generation Student respondents more comfortable than First-Generation Student respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges and Opportunities
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

- 728 respondents indicated that they had personally experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct at Seattle University in the past year.
Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 728). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
## Forms of Experienced Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignored or excluded</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated or left out</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of derogatory verbal remarks</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced a hostile classroom environment</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct \((n = 728)\). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Gender Identity (%)

- Overall experienced conduct¹

- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their gender identity²

¹ Percentages are based on total n split by group.
² Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Age (%)

- Overall experienced conduct
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Experienced Due to Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 and under</td>
<td>27% (n = 264)</td>
<td>18% (n = 47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-34</td>
<td>25% (n = 187)</td>
<td>28% (n = 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-48</td>
<td>32% (n = 141)</td>
<td>26% (n = 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-67</td>
<td>31% (n = 118)</td>
<td>20% (n = 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 and over</td>
<td>57% (n = 7)</td>
<td>19% (n &lt; 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percentages are based on total n split by group.
2 Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Racial Identity (%)

- Overall experienced conduct¹
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of racial identity²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Excluded Conduct as Result of Racial Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>31% (n = 100)¹</td>
<td>36% (n = 36)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>29% (n = 167)¹</td>
<td>53% (n = 88)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26% (n = 435)¹</td>
<td>5% (n = 20)²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages are based on total n split by group.
² Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Position (%)

- Overall experienced conduct¹

Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of position status²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>% Experienced</th>
<th>% Experienced as a Result of Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 290)¹</td>
<td>(n = 18)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Student</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 71)¹</td>
<td>(n = 12)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Student</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 93)¹</td>
<td>(n = 5)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 113)¹</td>
<td>(n = 34)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Admin</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 161)¹</td>
<td>(n = 77)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages are based on total n split by group.
² Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
# Location of Experienced Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at Seattle University</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While working at a Seattle University job</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In on-campus housing</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n = 728$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Student Position Status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Law Student</th>
<th>Graduate Student</th>
<th>Undergraduate Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr Admin</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 728). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Employee Position Status (%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct \((n = 728)\).
Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?

Personal Responses

- Angry (61%)
- Felt embarrassed (46%)
- Told a friend (40%)
- Told a family member (32%)
- Avoided the harasser (29%)
- Ignored it (29%)
- Felt somehow responsible (21%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n = 728$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?
Reporting Responses

- Didn’t know to whom to go (14%)
- Didn’t report it for fear the complaint would not be taken seriously (13%)
- Reported it to a SU employee/official (13%)
- Sought support from a SU resource (11%)
- Reported it but I did not feel the complaint was taken seriously (10%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 728). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Theme

Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Lack of support in addressing exclusionary behavior

Discriminatory environment
Unwanted Sexual Contact at Seattle University

75 respondents (3%) experienced unwanted sexual contact at Seattle University
Unwanted Sexual Contact at Seattle University by Selected Demographics

Undergraduate Student respondents (6%, n = 59)

Women respondents (4%, n = 62)

Transgender/Genderqueer/Other respondents (10%, n = 5)

Respondents with Multiple Disabilities (8%, n = 18)

Multiracial respondents (5%, n = 16)
On Campus (37%, n = 28)

Off Campus (64%, n = 48)
Students: Source of Unwanted Sexual Contact

Acquaintance/Friend (51%, n = 38)

Student (44%, n = 33)
### Students: When Unwanted Sexual Contact Occurred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First term</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second term</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third term</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth term</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth term</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth term</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh term</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth term or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students: Response to Unwanted Sexual Contact

- I told a friend: 75%
- I was angry: 55%
- I felt somehow responsible: 65%
- I was embarrassed: 60%
- I was afraid: 44%
- I did nothing: 33%
Qualitative Themes for Student Respondents: Why they did not report the unwanted sexual contact

Lack of awareness
- Unaware of what to do
- Unaware of whom they should go to

Fear of consequences
- Underage and drinking
- Re-victimization
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Seattle University

- 67% of Administrator – Academic respondents ($n = 14$)
- 59% of Administrator - Staff respondents ($n = 51$)
- 56% of Non-Exempt Staff respondents ($n = 112$)
- 57% of Exempt Professional Staff respondents ($n = 138$)

49% of Faculty respondents ($n = 156$)
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Seattle University

By Gender Identity
- 83% of Transgender/Genderqueer/Other respondents
- 56% of Women respondents
- 49% of Men respondents

By Citizenship Status
- 55% of U.S. Citizen respondents
- 32% of Non-U.S. Citizen respondents

By Age
- 60% of respondents between 35 and 48 years
- 52% of respondents between ages 23 and 34 years
- 47% of respondents between ages 49 and 67 years
- 38% of respondents ages 68 years and older
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Seattle University

By Religious/Spiritual Affiliation

- 60% of respondents with No Affiliation
- 59% of respondents with Multiple Affiliations
- 50% of Catholic respondents
- 46% of Christian (Not Catholic) respondents
- 46% of Other Faith-Based Affiliation respondents
### Reasons Employee Respondents *Seriously Considered Leaving* Seattle University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate salary</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Seattle University’s institutional culture</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position at another institution</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of mentoring/support</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension in department with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension in department/work unit</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (*n* = 482).
Qualitative Themes

Why Considered leaving...

Salary not commensurate with workload/cost of living
Student Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Seattle University

- 40% of responding Undergraduate Students ($n = 433$)
- 31% of responding Law Students ($n = 88$)
- 22% of responding Graduate Students ($n = 79$)
When Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Seattle University

76% in their first year
41% in their second year
13% in their third year
3% in their fourth year
### Top Reasons Why Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Seattle University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate was not welcoming</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a support group</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homesick</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of academic program</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 600).
Qualitative Themes for Student Respondents Why They Seriously Considered Leaving

Cost of tuition

Lack of sense of belonging
Perceptions
Respondents who observed conduct or communications directed towards a person/group of people that created an exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile working or learning environment…

31% \ (n = 811)
## Form of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person was ignored or excluded</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was the target of derogatory verbal remarks</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was isolated or left out</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person experienced a hostile classroom environment</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was stared at</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was the target of workplace incivility</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person experienced a hostile work environment</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment ($n = 811$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct Based on…(%)  

- Ethnicity (n=216) = 27%  
- Gender/Gender Identity (n=211) = 26%  
- Racial Identity (n=174) = 22%  
- Political Views (n=136) = 17%  

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 811). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
**Source** of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct (%)

- Student (51%)
- Faculty Member (28%)
- Staff Member (11%)
- Senior Administrator (9%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 811). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Target of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct (%)

- Student (62%)
- Friend (26%)
- Faculty Member (18%)
- Staff Member (12%)
- Coworker (12%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 811). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Location of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at Seattle University</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a Seattle University event</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 811). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)

- LGBQ (n = 183): 32%
- Heterosexual (n = 591): 28%
- Asexual/Other (n = 27): 45%
- Trans/Genderqueer/Other (n = 37): 76%
- Women (n = 543): 32%
- Men (n = 230): 27%
- Multiple Disability (n = 109): 48%
- No Disability (n = 259): 25%
- Single Disability (n = 216): 39%
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)

- Multiple Citizenships (n = 8): 15%
- Non-US Citizen (n = 49): 21%
- US Citizen (n = 750): 32%
- Multiple Affiliations (n = 80): 45%
- No Affiliation (n = 361): 34%
- Other Faith-Based Affiliation (n = 55): 26%
- Christian, Not Catholic (n = 137): 25%
- Catholic (n = 162): 30%
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Position (%)

- Undergraduate Students (n = 342)
- Graduate Students (n = 71)
- Law Students (n = 112)
- Faculty (n = 118)
- Staff/Admin (n = 168)
Qualitative Themes

Observed Conduct

Faculty are source of conduct

Discriminatory practices (e.g., gender, race, sexual orientation)
Employee Perceptions
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Hiring Practices

19% ($n = 105$) of Staff/Administrator respondents

19% ($n = 64$) of Faculty respondents
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

11% \( (n = 60) \) of Staff/Administrator respondents

15% \( (n = 48) \) of Faculty respondents
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Practices Related to Promotion

24% ($n = 135$) of Staff/Administrator respondents

33% ($n = 110$) of Faculty respondents
Most Common Bases for Discriminatory Employment Practices

- Ethnicity
- Racial Identity
- Gender Identity
- Age
- Position
- Nepotism
- Philosophical Views
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Employment Practices

Divergent views regarding “diversity”

Nepotism/Favoritism

Discrimination based on identity (e.g., denied advancement due gender or race)
The majority of Employee respondents expressed positive attitudes about work-life issues.
82% of employee respondents found SU supportive of taking leave

77% of employee respondents were comfortable taking leave that they were entitled to without fear that it may affect their job/careers
34% felt that they had to work harder than their colleagues/coworkers did to achieve the same recognition.

33% were reluctant to bring up issues that concerned them for fear that it would affect their performance evaluations or tenure/merit/promotion decisions.

30% indicated that their colleagues/coworkers expected them to represent “the point of view” of their identities.

38% believed that the process for determining salaries was clear.
Qualitative Themes
All Employee’s Work-Life Attitudes

Disparate views on taking leave

Lack of childcare
Staff/Administrator Respondents

Examples of Successes

74% agreed that their supervisors provided ongoing feedback to help improve their performance

The majority had supervisors (71%) and colleagues/coworkers (78%) who gave them career advice or guidance when they needed it

72% found Seattle University supportive of flexible work schedules
Qualitative Themes

Staff/Administrator’s Work-Life Attitudes

Lack of support for professional development
Faculty Respondents
Tenure/Teaching Issues
Examples of Successes

72% felt that their service contributions were important to tenure/promotion/reappointment

70% felt that their diversity-related research/teaching/service contributions have been/will be valued for promotion or tenure

71% agreed that the tenure/promotion process standards were reasonable
Faculty Respondents
Tenure/Teaching Issues
Examples of Challenges

- 50% felt that they performed more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues with similar performance expectations.
- 44% felt burdened by service responsibilities.
- 41% felt burdened by teaching and curricular responsibilities.
Faculty Respondents
Tenure/Teaching Issues
Examples of Challenges

Less than half (44%) felt that tenure standards/promotion standards/reappointment standards were applied equally to all faculty

32% felt burdened by scholarship requirements

26% felt pressured to change their scholarship direction to achieve tenure or be promoted
Qualitative Themes
Faculty Respondents
Tenure/Teaching Issues

Excessive service requirements
Student Respondents’ Perceptions
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Majority of Student respondents felt valued by faculty (84%) and other students (67%) in the classroom.

Majority reported that SU faculty (78%) and staff (71%) were genuinely concerned with their welfare.
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Many students indicated that faculty (27%) and staff (23%) pre-judged their abilities based on their perception of their identities/backgrounds.

Majority had faculty (77%) and staff (53%) who they perceived as role models.
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Tension in Classroom Discussions Based On…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political views</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic performance</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical views</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English proficiency</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious views</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial identity</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Themes
Student Respondents
Perceptions of Campus Climate

Disparate views of faculty concern
Student Respondents’ Academic Experiences
Student Respondents’ Academic Experiences

86%
- Many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating

86%
- Academic experience had a positive influence on their intellectual growth and interest in ideas

84%
- Satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling at SU
Student Respondents’ Academic Experiences

- **80%**
  - Interest in ideas and intellectual matters had increased since coming to SU

- **79%**
  - Performed up to their full academic potential

- **70%**
  - Performed academically as well as they anticipated they would
80% of Student Respondents were satisfied with their academic experience at Seattle University…

- Multiple Disabilities (n = 125): 71%
- No Disability (n = 825): 83%
- Single Disability (n = 340): 79%
- Not Low-Income (n = 941): 81%
- Low-Income (n = 372): 77%
- Law Student (n = 216): 76%
- Graduate Student (n = 283): 79%
- Undergraduate Student (n = 873): 81%
- Trans/Genderqueer/Other (n = 27): 75%
- Women (n = 933): 79%
- Men (n = 412): 82%
- Multiracial (n = 208): 84%
- White (n = 816): 81%
- People of Color (n = 325): 75%
- Not First-Generation (n = 1,214): 81%
- First-Generation (n = 157): 77%
Student Respondents’ Academic Experiences
Student Respondents’ Academic Success

Undergraduate Student respondents with No Disability had greater Academic Success than both those with a Single Disability and those with Multiple Disabilities.

Undergraduate Student respondents with a Single Disability had more Academic Success than those with Multiple Disabilities.
Student Respondents’ Academic Success

Graduate/Law Student respondents with No Disability had greater Academic Success than both those with a Single Disability and those with Multiple Disabilities.

White Undergraduate Student respondents and Multiracial Undergraduate Student respondents experienced greater academic success than did Undergraduate Student Respondents of Color.
Institutional Actions
The majority of Faculty/Staff respondents thought that following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing mentorship for new faculty and new staff
- Providing access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Providing career-span development opportunities for faculty and professional development for staff
The majority of Faculty/Staff respondents thought that following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing mentorship for new faculty and new staff
- Providing access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Providing career-span development opportunities for faculty and professional development for staff
The majority of Faculty/Staff respondents thought that following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing mentorship for new faculty
- Providing access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Providing career-span development opportunities for faculty
The majority of Faculty/Staff respondents thought that following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing a clear and fair process to resolve conflicts
- Faculty - Providing flexibility for computing the probationary period for tenure
- Providing diversity training for faculty/staff
Less Faculty respondents thought the following positively influenced the climate:

- Including diversity-related professional experiences as one of the criteria for hiring of staff/faculty
- Providing recognition and rewards for including diversity issues in courses across the curriculum
- Providing equity and diversity training to search, promotion, & tenure committees
Qualitative Themes
Institutional Actions – Faculty

Don’t know if SU offers the initiative

Disparate view regarding diversity training
The majority of Staff/Administrator respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Providing career development opportunities for staff
- Providing a clear and fair process to resolve conflicts
Many Staff/Administrator respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing mentorship for new staff
- Providing diversity training for staff
Fewer Staff/Administrator respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Considering diversity-related professional experiences as one of the criteria for hiring of staff/faculty
- Providing recognition and rewards for including diversity as part of assigned work
Qualitative Themes

Institutional Actions - Staff/Administrators

Don’t know if SU offers the initiative

Need for more diversity training
Majority of Student respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing a person to address student complaints of classroom inequality
- Increasing opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among students, and between faculty, staff, and students
- Providing effective academic advisement
Campus Initiatives

STUDENT RESPONDENTS

Majority of Student respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing diversity training for faculty
- Providing effective faculty mentorship of students
Fewer Student respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing diversity training for students
- Providing diversity training for staff
- Incorporating issues of diversity and cross-cultural competence more effectively into the curriculum
Qualitative Themes

Institutional Actions - Students

Don’t know if SU offers the initiative
Summary

Strengths and Successes
Oppportunities for Improvement
Context
Interpreting the Summary

Although colleges and universities attempt to foster welcoming and inclusive environments, they are not immune to negative societal attitudes and discriminatory behaviors.

As a microcosm of the larger social environment, college and university campuses reflect the pervasive prejudices of society.

Classism, Racism, Sexism, Genderism, Heterosexism, etc.

Overall Strengths & Successes

76% of respondents were comfortable with the overall climate, and 78% with dept/work unit climate.

81% of Student and Faculty respondents were comfortable with classroom climate.

The majority of student respondents thought positively about their academic experiences at SU.

The majority of employee respondents expressed positive attitudes about work-life issues at SU.
Overall Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement

- **28%** (n = 728) had **experienced** exclusionary conduct within the last year at SU
- **40%** of undergraduate students and **31%** of law students had seriously considered leaving SU
- **>50%** of all faculty/staff had seriously considered leaving SU
- **3%** (n = 75) of respondents experienced unwanted sexual contact while at SU

>50% of all faculty/staff had seriously considered leaving SU

40% of undergraduate students and 31% of law students had seriously considered leaving SU

28% (n = 728) had personally experienced exclusionary conduct within the last year at SU

3% (n = 75) of respondents experienced unwanted sexual contact while at SU
Next Steps
Process Forward
Sharing the Report with the Community
Fall 2015

Full Power Point available on SU website
www.seattleu.edu/diversity/Survey/

Full Report available on SU website/hard copy in Library
Process for Accessing the Data

- **November 2015**
  SU Institutional Research will receive climate project data from Rankin & Associates

- **January 2016**
  Climate Project Data Access Committee will begin receiving requests to access data for research, class projects, and assessment that informs university policies or practices.
Process for Accessing the Data
January 2016

1. Online application will be available through Seattle University website

2. Applicants will be asked to provide the following:
   - Identify a Primary Investigator (CV/Resume)
   - Project Abstract/Purpose
   - Project Description, Timeline, Significance, and Benefits
   - Research Methods
   - Data Needed to Complete Project
   - Plan to Share Results
3. Committee will consider data parameters, confidentiality of respondents, and research purpose

4. IR will provide requested data for approved projects

5. Institutional Review Board available for consultation
The Task Force on Diversity and Inclusive Excellence, through the lens of each of its subcommittees, will review the findings of the Climate Study, along with the work of the subcommittees of the last two years, and identify strategic actions and recommendations to bring forward to University Leadership for consideration. The subcommittees include:
Action Steps

Task Force will compile and analyze the data.

Offer additional opportunities for community engagement.

Task Force will prepare a final report recommendations by January 2016.
Questions and Discussion