



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Assessment • Planning • Interventions

Shippensburg University

Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working Executive Summary

April 2019



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Executive Summary

About Shippensburg University

Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania is a regional master's comprehensive university enrolling approximately 5,500 undergraduates and 900 graduate students, and is one of 14 institutions of the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE). Founded in 1871, Shippensburg University serves the educational, social, and cultural needs of students primarily from south central Pennsylvania. The University also serves students from throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Mid-Atlantic region, the United States, and abroad.

Comprised of three academic colleges - Arts and Sciences, Business, and Education and Human Services - Shippensburg confers baccalaureate degrees, master's degrees, and professional doctoral degrees. In fall 2018, the university announced the creation of the School of Engineering to be housed in the College of Arts and Sciences. University curricula enable students to develop their intellectual abilities and obtain professional training in a variety of fields. The foundation of the undergraduate curriculum, the General Education Program, is a required core of courses, historically in the Arts and Sciences and now also in Business and Education and Human Services, designed to develop competencies in oral and written communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and historical knowledge. In fall 2018, a new General Education Program was implemented, and a key element of the program is the First-Year Experience (FYE). The FYE focuses on academic success, personal wellness, an understanding of diversity, and community engagement and social responsibility. Faculty teaching the First-Year seminar, UNIV 101, partner with the staff in the divisions of Enrollment Management and Student Success as well as Student Affairs to provide out-of-classroom experiences and support. Additionally, students in a UNIV 101 section also registered for a section of Human Communication Studies or Writing-Intensive First Year Seminar. The new General Education program includes courses designed to help students recognize interconnections among diverse populations within the United States and among various global cultures. The curriculum also considers the importance of citizenship and responsibility, the understanding of the natural world as well as technology, and the comprehension and analysis of creative expression in arts and literature.

Under the leadership of President Laurie Carter, the University has been re-organized to better provide the educational, administrative, and student support services necessary to foster the success of students, faculty, and staff, and to serve the region, Commonwealth, and beyond. University divisions now consist of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Enrollment Management and Student Success, Administration and Finance, External Relations, and Strategy, led by the university's first Chief Strategy Officer.

Shippensburg University remains primarily a residential institution, with most students living either on campus or in private off-campus housing located in the immediate vicinity of the university. The campus provides a wide array of student services and activities.

History of the Project

Shippensburg University seeks to create an environment characterized by openness, fairness, and equal access for all students, staff, and faculty. Creating and maintaining a welcoming community environment that respects individuals, their needs, abilities, and potential is critically important.

The University undertook the campus climate survey to evaluate the current campus climate as experienced and perceived by all members of the university community. The goals were multifold:

- Identify successful initiatives.
- Uncover any challenges facing members of the Shippensburg University community.
- Develop strategic initiatives to build on successes, address challenges, and create lasting positive change.

To ensure full transparency and to provide a more complete perspective, Shippensburg University contracted in 2017 with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to help lead this effort. Beginning on February 10, 2017, an R&A team worked with Shippensburg's Climate Study Working Group (CSWG) comprised of Shippensburg University students, staff, and faculty to develop an assessment and promote its administration between October 23, 2018 and November 30, 2018. Eight hundred fifty-two (852) members of the Shippensburg University

community completed the *Shippensburg University Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working* survey, which represented a 15% response rate.¹

Methodology

Focus Groups. The first phase of the climate assessment process was to conduct a series of focus groups at Shippensburg University to gather information from students, faculty, and staff about their perceptions of the campus climate. On October 9, 2017, 30 Shippensburg University students and 56 faculty and staff participated in 15 focus groups conducted by R&A facilitators. Feedback from these focus groups directly informed the CSWG’s survey item development, so that the assessment would provide the insight necessary for Shippensburg University to understand key elements of its learning, living, and working environment.

Survey Instrument Development.² Over the course of a year, the CSWG reviewed several drafts of the initial survey that R&A proposed and then vetted the questions to be contextually appropriate for Shippensburg University. The working group also reviewed the final focus group report and revised/added questions to the survey based on the themes that emerged from the focus groups. The final university-wide survey instrument contained 118 questions,³ including 97 quantitative questions and 21 open-ended questions for respondents to provide commentary. Respondents had 53 opportunities to “write-in” a response should the list of response choices not include the specific response they wished to offer.

Incentives. As an incentive for completing the assessment, eligible members of the Shippensburg University community were offered the opportunity to enter random drawings for students, and for faculty and staff. Student respondents who opted to enter the drawing were entered to win the following prizes: Sheetz gift cards, GoPro Hero3+ Silver Edition, iPad Mini 32G, Amazon gift cards, University Bookstore Credit 2, Cap and Gown incentive, paid parking, Flex Dollars, t-shirts, and Shippensburg athletic gear. Faculty and staff respondents were eligible

¹ The response rates by position included: 9% of Undergraduate Students, 9% of Graduate/Graduate Non-Degree Students, 12% of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, 35% of Tenure-Track Faculty, and 36% of Staff.

² The full assessment is available in Appendix D in the full report.

³ To ensure reliability, evaluators must ensure that instruments are properly structured (questions and response choices must be worded in such a way that they elicit consistent responses) and administered in a consistent manner. The instrument was revised numerous times, defined critical terms, underwent expert evaluation of items, and checked for internal consistency.

to win “a night out” (voucher for LPAC show and local restaurant gift certificate) or Shippensburg athletic gear.

Institutional Review. The study was vetted through an Institutional Review Board (IRB) process, which is meant to ensure confidentiality and protect the rights and welfare of individuals participating in a research study. The Committee on Research with Human Subjects reviewed the survey and processes. The IRB approved the project on June 6, 2018.

Sample Construction. All faculty, staff, students, and administrators of the Shippensburg University community were invited to participate in the assessment.⁴ Prospective respondents received an invitation from President Laurie A. Carter that contained the URL link to the survey instrument. The assessment working group’s marketing subcommittee worked with Shippensburg University’s communications team to create inclusive, thoughtful, and tailored messaging for email distribution, social media platforms, and items including posters, t-shirts, and digital screens. Eight hundred fifty-two (852) surveys were returned for a 15% overall response rate.⁵ Of respondents, 58% ($n = 490$) of the sample were Undergraduate Students, 9% ($n = 79$) were Graduate Students, 12% ($n = 105$) were Tenure-Track Faculty, 2% ($n = 17$) were Non-Tenure-Track Academic Appointment Faculty members, and 19% ($n = 161$) were Staff members. Primary status data for respondents were collapsed into the following categories for analyses: Undergraduate Student respondents, Graduate Student respondents, Faculty respondents, and Staff respondents. Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic characteristics of respondents.

Quantitative Data Analysis.⁶ The data first were analyzed to tabulate responses to each of the questions in the survey.⁷ Descriptive statistics were calculated by salient group memberships (e.g., gender identity, racial identity, primary position) to provide additional information

⁴ A detailed presentation of sample characteristics is offered later in the full report.

⁵ The response rates by position included 9% of Undergraduate Students, 9% of Graduate/Graduate Non-Degree Students, 12% of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, 35% of Tenure-Track Faculty, and 36% of Staff. See Table 3 on page 18 of the full report for response rates by selected demographic characteristics.

⁶ More details on the quantitative and qualitative methods are provided later in the methods section of the full report.

⁷ For a complete review of the responses for each question offered in the survey, refer to Appendix B.

regarding participant responses.⁸ This report presents data using valid percentages.⁹ Actual percentages¹⁰ with missing or “no response” information may be found in the frequency analyses tables in Appendix B. The purpose for this difference in reporting was to note the missing or “no response” data in the appendices for institutional information, while removing such data within the report for subsequent cross tabulations and significance testing using the chi-square test for independence. Chi-square tests identify that significant differences exist but do not specify if differences exist between specific groups. Therefore, these analyses included post hoc investigations of statistically significant findings by conducting *z*-tests between column proportions for each row in the chi-square contingency table, with a Bonferroni adjustment for larger contingency tables. This statistical approach is useful because it compares individual cells to each other to determine if they are statistically different. Thus, the data may be interpreted more precisely by showing the source of the greatest discrepancies.

The report offers statistically significant distinctions between groups. For groups with response rates less than 30%, caution is recommended when generalizing to the entire constituent group. Where sample sizes were small, certain responses were combined into categories to make comparisons between groups and to ensure respondents’ confidentiality.

Factor Analysis¹¹

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on one scale embedded in Question 12 of the assessment. The factor score for *Perceived Academic Success* was created by taking the average of the scores for the first six sub-questions in the factor. Each respondent who answered all the questions included in the given factor was given a score on a five-point scale. The factor score for *Perceived Academic Success* was created by taking the average of the scores for the six sub-questions in the factor. The score was then reverse-coded so higher scores on Perceived

⁸ Analyses were performed to explore how survey responses differed based on selected demographic characteristics. All the findings are presented as percentages of the entire sample or of the subgroups being examined. The percentages in these figures and tables do not always add up to 100% because of rounding or because respondents can select more than one answer to a question (“mark all that apply”). Where the *n*’s were considered small enough to compromise the identity of the respondent, *n* < 5 is reported.

⁹ Valid percentages were derived using the total number of respondents to an item (i.e., missing data were excluded).

¹⁰ Actual percentages were derived using the total number of survey respondents.

¹¹ A more detailed review of the factor analysis methodology is offered later in the full report.

Academic Success factor suggest a student or constituent group perceives themselves as more academically successful.

Means Testing

When only two categories existed for the specified demographic variable (e.g., sexual identity recoded to Heterosexual and LGBTQ) in the factor analysis, a *t*-test for difference of means was used. If the difference in means was significant, effect size was calculated using Cohen’s *d*. Any moderate-to-large effects were noted. When the specific variable of interest had more than two categories (e.g., racial identity), ANOVAs were run to determine whether any differences existed. If the ANOVA was significant, post hoc tests were run to determine which differences between pairs of means were significant. Additionally, if the difference in means was significant, effect size was calculated using Eta² and any moderate-to-large effects were noted.

Limitations. Two limitations existed in this project that may have influenced the representativeness of the sample. Respondents “self-selected” to participate in the study. This type of bias can occur when an individual’s decision to participate is correlated with experiences and concerns being measured by the study, causing a type of non-representativeness known as selection bias. The second limitation may have occurred where response rates were less than 30% for some groups. For groups with response rates less than 30%, caution should be used when generalizing the results to the entire constituent group.¹²

Table 1. Population Demographics

Characteristics	Subgroup	Sample <i>n</i>	%
Position status ^a	Undergraduate Student	490	57.5
	Graduate/Graduate Non-Degree Student	79	9.3
	Tenure-Track Faculty	105	12.3
	Non-Tenure-Track Academic Appointment	17	2.0
	Staff	161	18.9
Gender identity ^b	Women	558	65.5
	Men	267	31.3
	Trans-spectrum/Not Listed	19	2.2
	Missing/Not Declared	8	0.9

¹² The response rates by position were 9% of Undergraduate Students, 9% of Graduate/Graduate Non-Degree Students, 12% of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, 35% of Tenure-Track Faculty, and 36% of Staff. See Table 3 on page 18 of this report for response rates by selected demographic characteristics

Table 1. Population Demographics

Characteristics	Subgroup	Sample	
		<i>n</i>	%
Racial/ethnic identity ^c	Asian/Asian American/South Asian	< 5	---
	Black/African American	35	4.1
	Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@	10	1.2
	White/European American	691	81.1
	Middle Eastern	0	0.0
	American Indian/Native/Alaska Native	0	0.0
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0.0
	Multiracial	43	5.0
	Missing/Not Listed/Unknown	19	2.2
Sexual identity	Queer-spectrum	91	10.7
	Heterosexual	718	84.3
	Missing/Not Listed	43	5.0
Citizenship status	U.S. Citizen, Birth	793	93.1
	Non-U.S. Citizen/U.S. Citizen Naturalized	50	5.9
	Missing	9	1.1
Disability status	Single Disability	79	9.3
	No Disability	718	84.3
	Multiple Disabilities	43	5.0
	Missing	12	1.4
Religious affiliation	Christian Religious Affiliation	501	58.8
	Other Religious Affiliation	24	2.8
	No Religious Affiliation including Not Listed	261	30.6
	Multiple Religious Affiliations	41	4.8
	Missing	25	2.9

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

^aX² (4, *N* = 7,294) = 412.19, *p* < .001

^bX² (1, *N* = 7,294) = 71.91, *p* < .001

^cX² (8, *N* = 7,296) = 297.32, *p* < .001

Key Findings – Areas of Strength

1. High Levels of Comfort With the Climate at Shippensburg University

Climate was defined as the current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of faculty, staff, administrators, and students – as well as the campus environment and university policies – that influence the level of respect for individual needs, abilities, and potential.¹³ The level of comfort experienced by faculty, staff, and students is one indicator of campus climate.

- 73% ($n = 620$) of the survey respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate at Shippensburg University.
- 70% ($n = 199$) of Faculty and Staff respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their departments/programs or work units.
- 85% ($n = 492$) of Student and Faculty respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their classes.

2. Staff Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Staff Work

- 85% ($n = 64$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that staff salaries were competitive.
- 79% ($n = 127$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their supervisors were supportive of their taking leave.
- 77% ($n = 124$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.
- 77% ($n = 123$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by their supervisors/managers.

3. Faculty Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Faculty Work

Tenured and Tenure-Track

- 83% ($n = 86$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that teaching was valued by Shippensburg University.
- 77% ($n = 81$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the criteria for tenure were clear.

¹³ Rankin & Reason (2008)

- 71% ($n = 74$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly disagreed” or “disagreed” that they were pressured to change their research/scholarship agenda to achieve tenure.

Non-Tenure-Track

- 77% ($n = 13$) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that teaching was valued by Shippensburg University.
- 71% ($n = 12$) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly disagreed” or “disagreed” that they felt burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations.

All Faculty

- 85% percent ($n = 98$) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by students in the classroom.
- 82% percent ($n = 64$) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that Shippensburg University provided them with resources to pursue professional development.
- 81% ($n = 98$) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by their department/program chairs.

4. Student Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Academic Experiences

The way students perceive and experience their campus climate influences their performance and success in college.¹⁴ Research also supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for improving learning outcomes.¹⁵ Attitudes toward academic pursuits are one indicator of campus climate.

- 82% ($n = 467$) of Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by Shippensburg University faculty in the classroom.
- 82% ($n = 462$) of Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by Shippensburg University faculty.

¹⁴ Pascarella & Terenzini (2005)

¹⁵ Hale (2004); Harper & Hurtado (2007); Harper & Quaye (2004)

5. Student Respondents' *Perceived Academic Success*

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the *Perceived Academic Success* scale derived from Question 12 on the survey. Using this scale, analyses revealed:

- A significant difference existed in the overall test for means for Graduate Student respondents by racial identity on *Perceived Academic Success*.
- Graduate Student Respondents of Color had less *Perceived Academic Success* than did White Graduate Student respondents.
- Undergraduate Student respondents with No Disability had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than did Undergraduate Student respondents with Disability/Multiple Disabilities.
- Not-Low-Income Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than did Low-Income Undergraduate Student respondents.

Key Findings – Opportunities for Improvement

1. Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

Several empirical studies reinforce the importance of the perception of non-discriminatory environments for positive learning and developmental outcomes.¹⁶ Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.¹⁷ The survey requested information on experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

- 19% ($n = 162$) of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.¹⁸
 - 19% each indicated that the conduct was based on their position status ($n = 30$) and/or their gender/gender identity ($n = 30$).

¹⁶ Aguirre & Messineo (1997); Flowers & Pascarella (1999); Pascarella & Terenzini (2005); Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora (2011)

¹⁷ Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley (2008); Waldo (1998)

¹⁸ The literature on microaggressions is clear that this type of conduct has a negative influence on people who experience the conduct, even if they feel at the time that it had no impact (Sue, 2010; Yosso et al., 2009).

- 30% ($n = 250$) of survey respondents observed conduct directed toward a person or group of people on campus that they believed created an exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and hostile working or learning environment at Shippensburg University within the past year.
 - 40% ($n = 100$) of the observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct was based on gender/gender identity.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct at Shippensburg University. Sixty-seven respondents elaborated on experiences with this conduct. In the one theme present, respondents described their experiences of being the target of inappropriate or hostile verbal remarks. Eighty-five respondents elaborated on their observations of conduct directed toward a person or group of people on campus that they believed created an exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile working or learning environment. Two themes emerged: hostile speech by outside speakers and demonstrators and hostile verbal remarks by Shippensburg community members.

2. Less Comfort With Campus, Workplace, and Classroom Climates

Prior research on campus climate has focused on the experiences of faculty, staff, and students associated with historically underserved social/community/affinity groups (e.g., women, People of Color, people with disabilities, first-generation students, and veterans).¹⁹ Several groups at Shippensburg University indicated that they were less comfortable than their majority counterparts with the climates of the campus, workplace, and classroom.

- 62% ($n = 350$) of Student respondents felt “comfortable” with the overall climate at Shippensburg University compared with 47% ($n = 57$) of Faculty respondents and 39% ($n = 62$) of Staff respondents.

¹⁹ Harper & Hurtado (2007); Hart & Fellabaum (2008); Rankin (2003); Rankin & Reason (2005); Worthington, et al. (2008)

- 63% ($n = 298$) of Not-Low-Income Student respondents compared with 51% ($n = 40$) of Low-Income Student respondents were “comfortable” with the overall campus climate.
- 44% ($n = 54$) of Faculty respondents compared with 27% ($n = 44$) of Staff respondents were “very comfortable” with the climate in their department/program or work unit.

3. Seriously Considered Leaving Shippensburg University

- 39% ($n = 331$) of respondents had seriously considered leaving Shippensburg University.
- 53% ($n = 64$) of Faculty respondents and 55% ($n = 88$) of Staff respondents had seriously considered leaving Shippensburg University in the past year.
 - 47% ($n = 41$) of Staff respondents and 42% ($n = 27$) of Faculty respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of increased workloads.
- 33% ($n = 159$) of Undergraduate Student respondents and 25% ($n = 20$) of Graduate Student respondents had seriously considered leaving Shippensburg University.
 - 48% ($n = 86$) of Student respondents indicated that a lack of a sense of belonging was the reason that they had seriously considered leaving Shippensburg University.

One hundred ninety-four respondents elaborated on why they had seriously considered leaving Shippensburg University. Of note, both Faculty respondents and Staff respondents shared a theme describing excessive workloads that negatively impacted their work-life and caused them to seriously consider leaving Shippensburg University. In addition to the excessive workload theme, Faculty respondents described experiences with bullying and Staff respondents described institutional leadership as reasons why they had seriously considered leaving.

4. Staff Respondents – Challenges With Work-Life Issues

- 26% ($n = 40$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that child care benefits were competitive.

- 26% ($n = 40$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that clear procedures existed on how they could advance at Shippensburg University.
- 30% ($n = 46$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that Shippensburg University policies (e.g., FMLA) were applied fairly across Shippensburg University.
- 30% ($n = 47$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that staff opinions were valued by Shippensburg University faculty and administration.
- 31% ($n = 49$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that Shippensburg University provided adequate resources to help them manage their work-life balance.

Forty Staff respondents elaborated on their workplace climate experiences. Respondents described disparities in staff expectations and burdensome workloads as challenges in their work at Shippensburg University. Additionally, 42 Staff respondents elaborated on their views on the workplace climate. One theme emerged from the responses, a lack of job security.

5. Faculty Respondents – Challenges With Faculty Work

- 14% ($n = 15$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that Shippensburg University faculty who qualify for delaying their tenure clock felt empowered to do so.
- 22% ($n = 26$) of Faculty respondents “strongly disagreed” or “disagreed” that child care benefits were competitive.
- 39% ($n = 40$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly disagreed” or “disagreed” that faculty members in their departments who used family accommodation policies were disadvantaged in promotion and tenure.
- 38% ($n = 40$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly disagreed” or “disagreed” that faculty opinions were taken seriously by senior administrators.

Forty-nine Faculty Tenure-Track respondents elaborated on their responses regarding their perceptions of the workplace climate. Two themes emerged from their responses: flaws in the promotion process and concerns regarding the promotion committee.

6. Meaningful Percentage of Respondents Experienced Unwanted Sexual Conduct

In 2014, *Not Alone: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault* indicated that sexual assault is a substantial issue for colleges and universities nationwide, affecting the physical health, mental health, and academic success of students. The report highlights that one in five women is sexually assaulted while in college. One section of the Shippensburg University survey requested information regarding sexual assault.

- 11% ($n = 96$) of respondents indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact/conduct while at Shippensburg University.
 - 2% ($n = 16$) experienced relationship violence (e.g., ridiculed, controlling, hitting).
 - 2% ($n = 19$) experienced stalking (e.g., following me, on social media, texting, phone calls).
 - 8% ($n = 65$) experienced sexual interaction (e.g., catcalling, repeated sexual advances, sexual harassment).
 - 3% ($n = 27$) experienced unwanted sexual contact (e.g., fondling, rape, sexual assault, penetration without consent).
- Respondents identified fellow Shippensburg University students, coworkers/colleagues, and faculty members/other instructional staff as sources of unwanted sexual contact/conduct.
- Most respondents did not report the unwanted sexual contact/conduct.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on why they did not report unwanted sexual contact/conduct. The primary rationale cited for not reporting these incidents was that the incidents did not feel serious enough to report or that their reports would not have been believed.

Conclusion

Shippensburg University climate assessment findings²⁰ were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.²¹ For example, 70% to 80% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be “very comfortable” or “comfortable,” and 73% of Shippensburg University respondents indicated that they were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate at Shippensburg University. Twenty percent to 25% of respondents in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At Shippensburg University, a slightly lower percentage of respondents (19%) indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. The results also paralleled the findings of other climate studies of specific constituent groups offered in the literature.²²

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

²⁰ Additional findings disaggregated by position status and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.

²¹ Rankin & Associates Consulting (2016)

²² Guiffrida, Gouveia, Wall, & Seward (2002); Harper & Hurtado (2007); Harper & Quayle (2004); Hurtado & Ponjuan (2005); Rankin & Reason (2005); Sears (2002); Settles, Cortina, Malley, & Stewart (2006); Silverschanz et al. (2008); Yosso et al. (2009)

References

- Aguirre, A., & Messineo, M. (1997). Racially motivated incidents in higher education: What do they say about the campus climate for minority students? *Equity & Excellence in Education, 30*(2), 26–30.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (1995). *The drama of diversity and democracy*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Bartz, A. E. (1988). *Basic statistical concepts*. New York: Macmillan.
- Bilimoria, D., & Stewart, A.J. (2009). "Don't ask, don't tell": The academic climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty in science and engineering. *National Women's Studies Association Journal, 21*(2), 85-103.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Campus life: In search of community*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Brookfield, S. D. (2005). *The Power of Critical Theory: Liberating Adult Learning and Teaching*. San Diego, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cantor, D., & Fisher, W. B. (2015). Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct: Rockville, MD: Westat.
- Chang, M.J. (2003). Racial differences in viewpoints about contemporary issues among entering college students: Fact or fiction? *NASPA Journal, 40*(5), 55-71.
- Chang, M. J., Denson, N., Sáenz, V., & Misa, K. (2006). The educational benefits of sustaining cross-racial interaction among undergraduates. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(3), 430–455.
- D'Augelli, A. R., & Hershberger, S. L. (1993). African American undergraduates on a predominantly White campus: Academic factors, social networks, and campus climate. *Journal of Negro Education, 62*(1), 67–81
- Flowers, L., & Pascarella, E. (1999). Cognitive effects of college racial composition on African American students after 3 years of college. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 669–677.

- Gardner, S. K. (2013). Women and faculty departures from a striving institution: Between a rock and a hard place. *The Review of Higher Education*, 36(3), 349-370.
- Griffin, K.A., Bennett, J.C., & Harris, J. (2011). Analyzing gender differences in Black faculty marginalization through a sequential mixed methods design. In S. Museus & K. Griffin, (Eds.), *New Directions for Institutional Research*, No. 151, (pp. 45-61). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Guiffrida, D., Gouveia, A., Wall, A., & Seward, D. (2008). Development and validation of the Need for Relatedness at College Questionnaire (nRC-Q). *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 251–261. doi: 10.1037/a0014051
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72, 330–365.
- Hale, F. W. (2004). What makes racial diversity work in higher education: Academic leaders present successful policies and strategies: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Harper, S., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2007(120), 7–24.
- Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (2004). Taking seriously the evidence regarding the effects of diversity on student learning in the college classroom: A call for faculty accountability. *UrbanEd*, 2(2), 43–47.
- Hart, J., & Fellabaum, J. (2008). Analyzing campus climate studies: Seeking to define and understand. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 222–234.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1998). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, vol. 26, no. 8. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Hurtado, S., & Ponjuan, L. (2005). Latino educational outcomes and the campus climate. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 4(3), 235–251. doi: 10.1177/1538192705276548
- Ingle, G. (2005). Will your campus diversity initiative work? *Academe*, 91(5), 6–10.

- Johnson, A. (2005). *Privilege, power, and difference* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Johnson, D. R., Soldner, M., Leonard, J., Alvarez, P., Inkelas, K. K., Rowan, K. H., & Longerbeam, S. (2007). Examining sense of belonging among first-year undergraduates from different racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(5), 525–542.
- Krebs, C., Lindquist, C., Berzofsky, M., Shook-Sa, B., Peterson, K., Planty, M., Langton, L., Stroop, J. (2016). Campus Climate Survey Validation Study Final Technical Report *Bureau of Justice Statistics Research and Development Series* (pp. 1-193).
- Maramba, D.C. & Museus, S.D. (2011). The utility of using mixed-methods and intersectionality approaches in conducting research on Filipino American students' experiences with the campus climate and on sense of belonging. In S. Museus & K. Griffin, (Eds.), *New Directions for Institutional Research*, No. 151, (pp. 93-101). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Milem, J., Chang, M., & Antonio, A. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research based perspective*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Navarro, R.L., Worthington, R.L., Hart, J., & Khairallah, T. (2009). Liberal and conservative ideology, experiences with harassment, and perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 2*(2), 78-90.
- Nelson Laird, T. & Niskodé-Dossett, A.S. (2010). How gender and race moderate the effect of interaction across difference on student perceptions of the campus environment. *The Review of Higher Education, 33*(3), 333-356.
- Norris, W. P. (1992). Liberal attitudes and homophobic acts: the paradoxes of homosexual experience in a liberal institution. *Journal of Homosexuality, 22*(3), 81–120.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1980). Predicting freshman persistence and voluntary dropout decisions from a theoretical model. *The Journal of Higher Education, 51*(1), 60–75.

- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Diego: Jossey-Bass.
- Patton, L. D., & Catching, C. (2009). Teaching while Black: Narratives of African American student affairs faculty. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22(6), 713-728.
- Patton, L.D. (2011). Perspectives on identity, disclosure, and the campus environment among African American gay and bisexual men at one historically Black college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 52(1), 77-100.
- Pittman, C.T. (2010). Race and gender oppression in the classroom. The experiences of women faculty of color with White male students. *Teaching Sociology*, 38(3), 183-196.
- Pike, G. R., & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Relationships among structural diversity, informal peer interactions, and perceptions of the campus environment.” *Review of Higher Education*, 29(4), 425–450.
- Rankin & Associates Consulting. (2016, May 15). Recent clients and reports. Retrieved from <http://www.rankin-consulting.com/clients>
- Rankin, S. (2003). *Campus climate for LGBT people: A national perspective*. New York: NGLTF Policy Institute.
- Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of Student College Development*, 46(1), 43–61.
- Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2008). Transformational tapestry model: A comprehensive approach to transforming campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 262–274. doi: 10.1037/a0014018
- Sáenz, V. B., Nagi, H. N., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Factors influencing positive interactions across race for African American, Asian American, Latino, and White college students.” *Research in Higher Education*, 48(1), 1–38.
- Sears, J. T. (2002). The institutional climate for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual education faculty. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43(1), 11–37. doi: 10.1300/J082v43n01_02

- Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Malley, J., & Stewart, A. J. (2006). The climate for women in academic science: The good, the bad, and the changeable. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*(1), 47–58. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00261.x
- Silverschanz, P., Cortina, L., Konik, J., & Magley, V. (2008). Slurs, snubs, and queer jokes: Incidence and impact of heterosexist harassment in academia. *Sex Roles, 58*(3–4), 179–191. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9329-7
- Smith, D. (2009). *Diversity's promise for higher education: Making it work*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Smith, D. G., Gerbick, G. L., Figueroa, M. A., Watkins, G. H., Levitan, T., Moore, L. C., Figueroa, B. (1997). *Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Smith, E., & Witt, S. L. (1993). A comparative study of occupational stress among African American and White faculty: A research note. *Research in Higher Education, 34*(2), 229–241.
- Solórzano, D. G., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. J. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*(1), 60-73.
- Strayhorn, T.L. (2013). Measuring race and gender difference in undergraduate perceptions of campus climate and intentions to leave college: An analysis in Black and White. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 50*(2), 115-132.
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Trochim, W. (2000). *The research methods knowledge base* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog.
- Tynes, B.M., Rose, C.A., & Markoe, S.L. (2013). Extending campus life to the internet: Social media, discrimination, and perceptions of racial climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 6*(2), 102-114.

- Turner, C. S. V., Myers, S. L., & Creswell, J. W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation: The case of faculty of color in the Midwest. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 70(1), 27–59.
- Villalpando, O., & Delgado Bernal, D. (2002). A critical race theory analysis of barriers that impede the success of faculty of color. In W. A. Smith, P. G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education: Continuing challenges for the twenty-first century*. (pp. 243–270). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Waldo, C. (1999). Out on campus: Sexual orientation and academic climate in a university context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 26, 745–774. doi: 10.1023/A:1022110031745
- Whitt, E. J., Edison, M. I., Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Nora, A. (2001). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the second and third years of college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 172–204.
- Worthington, R. L., Navarro, R. L., Loewy, M., & Hart, J. L. (2008). Color-blind racial attitudes, social dominance orientation, racial-ethnic group membership and college students' perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 1(1), 8–19.
- Yosso, T. J., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. G. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(4), 659–690, 781, 785–786.