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Create and Distribute Knowledge

Climate (Living, Working, Learning)

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

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

Discriminatory environments have a negative effect on student learning.²

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, 2013; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009
²Costello, 2012; Sears, 2002; Kaminski & Geisler, 2012; Griffin, Pérez, Holmes, & Mayo, 2010
³Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2007; Waldo, 1999
Climate Matters
Climate Matters
Academic Freedom

Hate Speech
While the demands vary by institutional context, a qualitative analysis reveals similar themes across the 76 institutions and organizations (representing 73 U.S. colleges and universities, three Canadian universities, one coalition of universities and one consortium of Atlanta HBCUs.) Chessman & Wayt explore these overarching themes in an effort to provide collective insight into what is important to today’s students in the heated context of racial or other bias-related incidents on college and university campuses.

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016; http://www.thedemands.org/
Seven Major Themes

Policy (91%)

Leadership (89%)

Resources (88%)

Increased Diversity (86%)

Training (71%)

Curriculum (68%)

Support (61%)

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016; http://www.thedemands.org/
Responses to Unwelcoming Campus Climates

What are students’ behavioral responses?
Lack of Persistence

30% of respondents have seriously considered leaving their institution

What do students offer as the main reason for their departure?

Source: R&A, 2015; Rankin et al., 2010; Strayhorn, 2012
Student Departure

- Experienced Harassment/Victimization
- Lack of Social Support
- Feelings of Hopelessness
- Suicidal Ideation or Self-Harm

Source: Liu & Mustanski, 2012
Projected Outcomes

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

Shippensburg will use the results of the survey to inform current/ongoing work.
Setting the Context for Beginning the Work

- Examine the Research
  - Review work already completed
- Preparation
  - Readiness of campus
- Survey
  - Examine the climate
- Follow-up
  - Building on the successes and addressing the challenges
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Project Overview

Phase I
- Initial Proposal Meetings
- Focus Groups
- Outreach Plan

Phase II
- Survey Tool Development and Implementation

Phase III
- Data Analysis

Phase IV
- Final Report and Presentation
Phase I - 2017

The Climate Study Working Group (CSWG; includes students, staff, and faculty) was created.

15 focus groups (30 students and 56 faculty and staff) were conducted on October 9th, 2017

Data from the focus groups informed the CSWG and R&A in constructing questions for the campus-wide survey.
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 all eligible members of the Shippensburg community via an invitation from President Laurie A. Carter.
Phase III – Winter 2019

Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted
Phase IV - Spring 2019

Report draft reviewed by the CSWG

Final report submitted to Shippensburg

Presentation to Shippensburg campus community
Instrument/Sample

- **Survey Instrument**
  - 118 questions including space for respondents to provide commentary
  - Online or paper & pencil options

- **Sample = Population**
  - All Shippensburg community members were invited to take the survey.
  - Available from October 23 through November 30, 2018
## Structure of the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Personal Experiences of Campus Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Workplace Climate for Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demographic Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perceptions of Campus Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional Actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Limitations

Self-selection bias

Response rates

Social desirability

Caution in generalizing results for constituent groups with low response rates
Methods Limitation

Data analyses were not reported for groups where identity could be compromised.

Instead, small groups were combined to eliminate possibility of identifying individuals.
Results: Response Rates
Who are the respondents?

852 surveys were returned for a 15% overall response rate.
Response Rates by Employee Position

- 36% Staff (n = 161)
- 35% Tenure-Track Faculty (n = 105)
- 12% Non-Tenure-Track Academic Appointment (n = 17)
Response Rates by Student Position

- Undergraduate ($n = 490$) 9%
- Graduate/Graduate Non-Degree ($n = 79$) 9%
Response Rates by Gender Identity

- **15%**
  - Women ($n = 558$)

- **8%**
  - Men ($n = 267$)

- N/A
  - Trans-spectrum/Not Listed ($n = 19$)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- **18%** • Multiracial ($n = 43$)
- **12%** • White/European American ($n = 691$)
- **5%** • Black/African American ($n = 35$)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- 3% • Asian/Asian American/South Asian (n < 5)
- 3% • Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ (n = 10)
- 0% • American Indian/Native/Alaska Native (n = 0)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- Middle Eastern \((n = 0)\)
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander \((n = 0)\)
Sample Characteristics
Respondents’ Full-Time Status in Primary Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (\%)
Respondents by Sexual Identity and Position Status \((n)\)
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Duplicated Total)

- White/European American: 84%
- Multiracial: 5%
- Black/African American: 5%
- Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@: 2%
- Asian/Asian American: 2%
- Middle Eastern: <5%
- American Indian/Alaska Native: <5%
- South Asian: <5%
- Missing/Other: 3%

Note: Responses with \( n < 5 \) are not presented in the figure.
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Unduplicated Total)

- White: 84%
- People of Color: 9%
- Multiracial: 5%
- Missing: 3%
15% \((n = 128)\) of Respondents Had a Condition that Influenced Their Learning, Living, or Working Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top conditions</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental health/psychological condition</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning difference/disability</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic diagnosis or medical condition</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Religious Affiliation (%)

- Christian Affiliation: 59%
- No Affiliation: 31%
- Multiple Affiliations: 5%
- Other Religious Affiliation: 3%
# Citizenship Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen, birth</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen, naturalized</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visa holder (such as F-1, J-1, H1-B, U)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Military Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have never served in the U.S. Armed Forces.</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a child, spouse, or domestic partner of a currently serving or former member of the U.S. Armed Forces.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not currently serving, but have served (e.g., retired/veteran).</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in ROTC.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am currently a member of the Reserves (but not in ROTC).</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am currently a member of the National Guard (but not in ROTC).</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am currently on active duty.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents by Age (n)

Note: Responses with \( n < 5 \) are not presented in the figure.
Employee Respondents by Age ($n$)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Student Respondents by Caregiving Responsibilities (%)

- Children less than 5 yrs: 33% (Undergrad) 26% (Grad)
- Children 6-18 yrs: 42% (Grad)
- Dependent child 18 yrs or older: 0%
- Independent child 18 yrs or older: 33%
- Sick/disabled partner: 0%
- Senior/other: 33%

Note: Percentages are based on respondents who indicated that they had caregiving responsibilities. Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Employee Respondents by Caregiving Responsibilities (%)

Note: Percentages are based on respondents who indicated that they had caregiving responsibilities. Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
## Employee Respondents’ Length of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Online Classes Taken by Student Status

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
### Undergraduate Student Respondents’ Year at Shippensburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth year</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth year</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth year (or more)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a list of Undergraduate Student respondents current or intended majors, please see Table 12 in full report.
# Graduate Student Respondents’ Year at Shippensburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Master’s degree students</th>
<th>Doctoral degree students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth year</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a list of Graduate Student respondents academic programs, please see Table 14 in full report.
## Student Respondents’ Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus housing</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-campus housing</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing insecure (e.g., couch surfing, sleeping in car, sleeping in campus office/lab)</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Campus Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harley Hall</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieffer Hall</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackhove Hall</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCune Hall</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naugle Hall</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seavers Hall</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Student Respondents’ Non-Campus Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity/sorority housing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independently in an apartment/house</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with family member/guardian</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs/Organizations at Shippensburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top clubs/organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not participate in any clubs or organizations.</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and academic honorary organizations</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletic team</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek letter organization</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational organization</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club sport</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a complete list of Student respondents’ participant in clubs/organizations, please see Table 19 in full report.
Student Respondents’ Income by Dependency Status (%)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
40% \((n = 226)\) of Student respondents experienced financial hardship while attending Shippensburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top financial hardships</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books/course materials</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a complete list of how Student respondents experienced financial hardship, please see Table 16 in full report.
How Student Respondents Were Paying For Shippensburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Sources of funding</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$%$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family contribution</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant (e.g., Pell)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contribution/job</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a complete list of how Student respondents were paying for college, please see Table 17 in full report.
## Student Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I work on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I work off campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ G.P.A. at the End of Last Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75 – 4.00</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 – 3.74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25 – 3.49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 – 3.24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75 - 2.99</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 – 2.74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 – 2.49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 2.24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.99 and below</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Respondents’ One-Way Commute Time to Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Student respondents</th>
<th>Faculty respondents</th>
<th>Staff respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or less</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or more</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings
Comfort with Climate Examples

**Overall Climate (73%)**
- Faculty or Staff respondents less comfortable than Undergraduate Students
- Low-Income Students respondents less comfortable than Not-Low-Income Students

**Department/Program/Work Unit (70%)**
- Staff respondents less comfortable than Faculty respondents

**Classroom (85%)**
- No statistical differences by various demographics existed
Comfort With Overall Campus Climate

Faculty or Staff respondents less comfortable than Undergraduate Students

Low-Income less comfortable than Not-Low-Income Student respondents

Note: Answered by all respondents. Item was analyzed by various demographics and differences were reported in the full report. This presentation includes only statistical differences.
Comfort With Department/Program or Work Unit

Staff respondents less comfortable than Faculty respondents

Note: Answered by Faculty and Staff respondents. Item was analyzed by various demographics and differences were reported in the full report. This presentation includes only statistical differences.
Comfort With Classroom Climate

No statistical differences existed by various demographics.

Note: Answered by Student and Faculty respondents. Item was analyzed by various demographics and differences were reported in the full report. This presentation includes only statistical differences.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

19% (n = 162) indicated that they had experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct at Shippensburg within the past year.
Respondents’ Top Bases of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct (%)

- Gender/gender identity (n=30) - 19%
- Position (n=30) - 19%
- Age (n=29) - 18%

Note: Table reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 162). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
**Staff Respondents’ Top Bases of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position status</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical views</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from Staff respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct ($n = 37$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
## Faculty Respondents’ Top Bases of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender/gender identity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position status</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational credentials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical views</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from Faculty respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct ($n = 34$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
Student Respondents’ Top Bases of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/gender identity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 91). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary Conduct as a Result of Gender Identity (%)

- Overall experienced conduct:
  - Women: 20%
  - Men: 14%

- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, believed that they experienced conduct as a result of their gender identity:
  - Women: 20%
  - Men: 20%

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure. This finding was not statistically significant.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary Conduct as a Result of Position Status (%)

Overall experienced conduct:
- Undergrad Student: 16%
- Grad Student: 19%
- Faculty: 28%
- Staff: 23%

Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, believed that they experienced conduct as a result of their position status:
- Undergrad Student: 3%
- Grad Student: 33%
- Faculty: 18%
- Staff: 46%

Note: This finding was not statistically significant.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary Conduct as a Result of Age (%)

Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, believed that they experienced conduct as a result of their age

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure. This finding was not statistically significant.
## Top Forms of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was ignored or excluded.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was intimidated/bullied.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was isolated or left out.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced a hostile work environment.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was the target of derogatory verbal remarks.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct ($n = 162$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
Staff Respondents’ Top Forms of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

- Target of workplace incivility: 32%
- Derogatory verbal remarks: 32%
- Intimidated/bullied: 49%
- Hostile work environment: 51%
- Ignored/excluded: 51%

Note: Table reports only responses from Staff respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 37). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
Faculty Respondents’ Top Forms of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Note: Table reports only responses from Faculty respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct ($n = 34$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
**Student Respondents’ Top Forms of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Exclusionary Conduct</th>
<th>Undergraduate Respondents</th>
<th>Graduate/Non-Degree Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory verbal remarks</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt others staring</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated/left out</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignored/excluded</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 91). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
Top Locations of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While working at a Shippensburg University job</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/laboratory</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a Shippensburg University event/program</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with one other person</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 162). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
### Staff Respondents’ Top Locations of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While working at a Shippensburg University job</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a Shippensburg University administrative office</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with one other person</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a Shippensburg University event/program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from Staff respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct ($n = 37$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
### Faculty Respondents’ Top Locations of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a faculty office</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with one other person</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While working at a Shippensburg University job</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a Shippensburg University event/program</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from Faculty respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct ($n = 34$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
### Student Respondents’ Top Locations of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a class/laboratory</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a Shippensburg University event/program</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On phone calls/text messages/email</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other public spaces at Shippensburg University</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 91). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
Top Sources of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct for Staff Respondents (%)

- Coworker/colleague: 43%
- Senior administrator: 38%
- Supervisor/manager: 24%
- Staff member: 22%
- Other: 14%

Note: Figure reports only responses from Staff respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct ($n = 37$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
Top Sources of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct for Faculty Respondents (%)

- Coworker/colleague: 59%
- Faculty/instruct staff: 38%
- Department/program chair: 32%
- Staff member: 15%

Note: Figure reports only responses from Faculty respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 34). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
Top Sources of Experienced Exclusionary Conduct for Student Respondents (%)

- Student: 66%
- Friend: 26%
- Faculty: 12%
- Stranger: 11%
- Other: 11%

Note: Figure reports only responses from Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 91). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
How did you feel? Top Emotional Responses

Felt angry (57%)

Felt distressed (56%)

Note: Figure reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 162). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
What did you do – Did you seek support?
Top Actions

- Told a friend (47%)
- Avoided the person/venue (39%)
- Told a family member (43%)

Note: Figure reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct ($n = 162$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
26% (n = 41) reported the conduct

- Satisfied with the outcome (34%)
- While the outcome was not what I had hoped for, I felt as though my complaint was addressed appropriately (20%)
- Felt that it was not addressed appropriately (37%)

Note: Figure reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 162). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
Qualitative Themes
Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Hostile verbal remarks
Accessibility
# Top Facilities Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom buildings</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus transportation/parking</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevators/lifts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms, laboratories (including computer labs)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary barriers because of construction or maintenance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways, pedestrian paths, crosswalks</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they had a condition/disability (n = 128).
### Top Technology/Online Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology/online</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible electronic format</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software (e.g., voice recognition/audiobooks)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they had a condition/disability ($n = 128$).
### Top Identity Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intake forms (e.g., Etter Health Center)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they had a condition/disability (n = 128).
# Top Instructional/Campus Materials Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional/campus materials</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal articles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they had a condition/disability (n = 128).
Qualitative Themes for Respondents with Disabilities: Accessibility of Shippensburg Campus

Facilities
Unwanted Sexual Conduct/Contact
11% \( (n = 96) \) of Respondents Experienced Unwanted Sexual Contact/Conduct

- 2% \( (n = 16) \) → Relationship Violence
- 2% \( (n = 19) \) → Stalking
- 8% \( (n = 65) \) → Unwanted Sexual Interaction
- 3% \( (n = 27) \) → Unwanted Sexual Contact
Unwanted Sexual Experiences by Position Status ($n$)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
### Semester in Which Student Respondents Experienced Unwanted Sexual Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year experience occurred</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate first year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall semester</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring semester</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer semester</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate second year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall semester</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring semester</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer semester</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 27).
Location of Unwanted Sexual Contact

On Campus (59%, $n = 16$)

Off Campus (44%, $n = 12$)

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact ($n = 27$).
### Perpetrator of Unwanted Sexual Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance/friend</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shippensburg student</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current or former dating/intimate partner</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact ($n = 27$).
Top Emotional Response to Unwanted Sexual Contact

- Felt somehow responsible: 70%
- Felt embarrassed: 70%
- Felt angry: 59%

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 27).
Top Actions in Response to Unwanted Sexual Contact

Told a friend 59%
Avoided the person/venue 56%
Did nothing 37%

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact \((n = 27)\).
6 Students Reported Unwanted Sexual Contact

- Felt satisfied with the outcome \( (n = 0) \)
- Felt as though my complaint was responded to appropriately \( (n < 5) \)
- Felt that it was not responded to appropriately \( (<5\%) \)
- Outcome is still pending \( (n < 5) \)

Note: Only answered by respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact \( (n = 27) \).
Knowledge of Unwanted Sexual Contact/Conduct Definitions, Policies, and Resources

- 93% were aware of the definition of Affirmative Consent
- 81% knew how and where to report such incidents
- 90% were generally aware of the role of Shippensburg Title IX Coordinators
Knowledge of Unwanted Sexual Contact/Conduct Definitions, Policies, and Resources

85% were familiar with the campus policies on addressing sexual misconduct, domestic/dating violence, and stalking.

84% had a responsibility to report such incidents when they saw them occurring on campus or off campus.

84% were generally aware of the campus resources listed on the survey.
Knowledge of Unwanted Sexual Contact/Conduct Definitions, Policies, and Resources

94% understood that Shippensburg standards of conduct/penalties differed from standards of conduct/penalties under the criminal law.

82% knew that Shippensburg University sends an Emergency Alert to the campus community when such an incident occurs.
Knowledge of Unwanted Sexual Contact/Conduct Definitions, Policies, and Resources

84% knew that information about the prevalence of sex offenses was available in the Shippensburg University Campus Safety & Security/Fire Statistics Report (Safety Report)
Intent to Persist
Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Shippensburg (%)
Top Reasons Staff Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Shippensburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited advancement opportunities</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low salary/pay rate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate unwelcoming</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position at another institution</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of professional development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from Staff respondents who indicated on the survey that they had seriously considered leaving Shippensburg (n = 88).
Top Reasons Faculty Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Shippensburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position at another institution</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community did not meet my (my family) needs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community not welcoming</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with coworkers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate unwelcoming</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from Faculty respondents who indicated on the survey that they had seriously considered leaving Shippensburg (n = 64).
Qualitative Themes for Respondents
Why Considered Leaving…

Faculty and Staff: Excessive workload

Faculty: Experienced bullying

Staff: Poor institutional leadership
Top Reasons Undergraduate Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Shippensburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of social life</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homesick</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support group</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate not welcoming</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from Undergraduate Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they had seriously considered leaving Shippensburg (n = 159).
### Top Reasons Graduate Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Shippensburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a social life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate not welcoming</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports responses for Graduate Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving Shippensburg ($n = 20$).
When Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Shippensburg

- 70% in their first year
- 41% in their second year
- 21% in their third year
- 6% in their fourth year

Note: Includes answers from only Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving.
Undergraduate Student Respondents Retention

8% stated it was likely that they will leave Shippensburg before meeting their academic goal.

92% intend to graduate from Shippensburg.

* 6% of Undergraduate Student respondents indicated “neither agree nor disagree” for this item.
Qualitative Themes for Undergraduate Student Respondents
Why Considered Leaving…

Academic interest not offered at Shippensburg

Homesick

Lack of sense of community or 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...

30% (n = 250)
Top Bases of Observed Exclusionary Conduct (%)

- Gender/gender identity (n=100)
- Gender expression (n=78)
- Sexual identity (n=78)
- Ethnicity (n=50)
- Racial identity (n=50)

Note: Figure reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 250). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
# Top Forms of Observed Exclusionary Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory verbal remarks</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person intimidated or bullied</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person ignored or excluded</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person isolated or left out</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person experienced a hostile work environment</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory written comments</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct \((n = 250)\). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
Top Targets of Observed Exclusionary Conduct

Student (58%)

Friend (17%)

Student organization (16%)

Note: Figure reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct ($n = 250$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
Top Sources of Observed Exclusionary Conduct

Student (44%)

Stranger (16%)

Faculty member/other instruct staff (16%)

Note: Figure reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct ($n = 250$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
## Top Locations of Observed Exclusionary Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In other public spaces at Shippensburg</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While walking on campus</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/laboratory</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figure reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct ($n = 250$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
Observed Exclusionary Conduct by Respondents’ Position (%)

- Undergraduate Student: 27%
- Graduate Student: 32%
- Faculty: 40%
- Staff: 28%
Observed Exclusionary Conduct by Gender Identity (%)
Observed Exclusionary Conduct by Military Status (%)

- Military: 18%
- Non-Military: 30%
What did you do?
Observed Exclusionary Conduct

- Did nothing: 27%
- Avoided the person/venue: 22%
- Told a family member: 21%

Note: Figure reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct ($n = 250$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
10\% \ (n = 24) \ reported \ the \ conduct

Satisfied with the outcome (35\%)

While the outcome was not what I had hoped for, I felt as though my complaint was addressed appropriately (n < 5)

Felt that it was not addressed appropriately (35\%)

Note: Figure reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 250). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple response choices.
Qualitative Themes
Observed Exclusionary Conduct

Hostile speech by outside speakers and demonstrators

Hostile verbal remarks by Shippensburg community members
Employee Perceptions
## Employee Perceptions of Unjust Hiring Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 21% of Faculty respondents
- 42% of Staff respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Hiring Process

Cronyism/nepotism

Recommendations of hiring committee ignored

Job qualifications altered or ignored
Employee Perceptions of Unjust Practices Related to Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and/or Reclassification

43% of Faculty respondents

33% of Staff respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Practices Related to Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and/or Reclassification

Staff: Critiques of promotion practices

Faculty: Critiques of promotion processes
Employee Perceptions of Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

10% of Faculty respondents

31% of Staff respondents
Qualitative Themes
Discriminatory Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

Unjust firing practices
Most Common Perceived Bases for Discriminatory Employment Practices

Nepotism/cronyism

Length of service

Ethnicity

Gender identity

Age

Educational credentials
The majority of employee respondents expressed positive views of campus climate.
Staff Respondents
Examples of Successes

- Majority felt valued by coworkers (86%), supervisors/managers (77%), and students (75%)

- 79% had supervisors who were supportive of their taking leave

- 77% had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it
Staff Respondents
Examples of Successes

- 75% had supervisors who provided adequate support to manage work-life balance
- 71% agreed that all staff members were held equally accountable to perform their job duties
- 70% agreed that their supervisors were supportive of flexible work schedules
Staff Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- **54%**
  - Burdened by work responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations

- **34%**
  - Hierarchy existed within staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than others

- **30%**
  - Staff opinions were valued by Shippensburg University faculty and administration
Staff Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 26% Clear procedures existed on how staff could advance at Shippensburg University
- 37% Felt positive about their career opportunities at Shippensburg University
- 41% Felt valued by Shippensburg University senior administrators
Qualitative Themes
Staff Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Disparities in staff expectations
Burdensome workloads
Lack of job security
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% who agreed</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83%</td>
<td>Teaching was valued by Shippensburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td>Criteria for tenure were clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Tenure standards were applied equally to faculty in their schools/division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents

Examples of Challenges

- 55% Burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations
- 55% Performed more work to help students than did their colleagues
Qualitative Themes
Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Faculty Work

Promotion process flaws

Concerns regarding the promotion committee
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Example of Success

77% agreed that teaching was valued by Shippensburg University
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents Example of Challenge

53%

• Felt pressured to do extra work that was uncompensated
All Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

82% agreed that Shippensburg University provided them with resources to pursue professional development.

77% agreed that they had job security.

Majority felt valued by students in the classroom (85%), their department/program chairs (81%), and faculty in their department (77%).
Qualitative Themes
All Faculty Respondents
Faculty Work

Lack of professional development funds

Critiques of salary scale
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success

Graduate Student Respondents of Color perceived that they were less academically successful than White Graduate Student respondents perceived themselves to be.

Undergraduate Student Respondents with a Disability/Multiple Disabilities perceived that they were less academically successful than Undergraduate Student Respondents with No Disabilities perceived themselves to be.
Low-Income Undergraduate Student respondents perceived that they were less academically successful than Not-Low-Income Undergraduate Student respondents perceived themselves to be.
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Examples of Successes

- 82% felt valued by faculty in the classroom
- 75% felt valued by Shippensburg University staff
- 72% felt they had faculty whom they perceived as role models
Graduate Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Department/Program
85% felt comfortable sharing their professional goals with their advisors.

Majority agreed that department/program staff members (90%) (other than advisors) and their department/program faculty members (88%) responded to their emails, calls, or voicemails in a prompt manner.
Qualitative Themes
Graduate Student Respondents
Department/Program

Critiques of advising
Institutional Actions
Available Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Faculty Respondents

- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Affordable child care
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
- Mentorship for new faculty
Unavailable Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate for Faculty Respondents

- Affordable child care
- Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Tool-kits for faculty to create an inclusive classroom environment
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
Lack of affordable child care
Available Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Staff Respondents

- Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Mentorship for new staff
- Professional development opportunities for staff
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
Unavailable Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate for Staff Respondents

- Professional development opportunities for staff
- Affordable child care
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Supervisory training for faculty supervisors
- Supervisory training for supervisors/managers
Qualitative Themes
Campus Initiatives – Staff Respondents

No theme emerged
Available Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Student Respondents

Effective academic advising

Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among students

A person to address student complaints of bias by faculty/staff in cocurricular environments (e.g., residence halls, athletic/recreational facilities, student clubs/organizations)

Effective faculty mentorship of students

Diversity training for student staff (e.g., student workers, resident assistants, library/IT assistants)
Unavailable Campus Initiatives that Would Positively Influence Climate for Student Respondents

- Effective academic advising
- Issues of access and equity and cross-cultural competence incorporated more effectively into the curriculum
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among students
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among faculty, staff, and students
- Effective faculty mentorship of students
Qualitative Themes

Campus Initiatives – Undergraduate Student Respondents

Critiques of academic advising
Summary

Strengths and Successes

Opportunities for Improvement
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.

Successes:
The majority of...

Student respondents felt valued by faculty (82%)  
Student and Faculty respondents were comfortable with the climate in their classes (85%)  
Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty respondents agreed that the criteria for tenure were clear (77%)  
Staff respondents agreed that staff salaries were competitive (85%)
Overall Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement

- 19% of respondents experienced exclusionary conduct at Shippensburg
- 30% of respondents observed exclusionary conduct at Shippensburg
- 55% of Staff respondents seriously considered leaving Shippensburg
- 53% of Faculty respondents seriously considered leaving Shippensburg
Next Steps

Copies of the report will be made available in the library and on the campus intranet.

A website will be created with campus climate survey results (.pdfs of Exec Summary, report, and R&A presentation slides)
Two Stages for Developing Action Steps

Stage 1: Feedback Gathering Process

- Engage the various affinity groups in discussing their impressions of the report.
- Develop affinity group buy-in for working on the priorities identified in Stage 2.

Stage 2: Priority Setting Process

- Recommend three to five priorities to the President.
- The goal of selecting priorities is to ensure those priorities can be accomplished in the year ahead.
Data set will be delivered to Shippensburg Primary Investigator for the project

6-month moratorium on distribution of data (October 2019)

Ship's request link on the Institutional Research and Assessment website will be linked to the Climate Survey website.

Requests for data can be submitted during the moratorium period
Questions and Discussion

SPEAK UP, SHIP!
Shippensburg University Climate Survey