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Climate In Higher Education

Assessing Campus Climate

What is it?
• Campus Climate is a construct

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

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

---

¹ Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005
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
²Sears, 2002
³Costello, 2012; Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2007;
Projected Outcomes

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

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

Examine the Research
- Review work already completed

Preparation
- Readiness of each campus

Assessment
- Examine the climate

Follow-up
- Building on the successes and addressing the challenges
Transformational Tapestry Model

Current Campus Climate

Access Retention
Research Scholarship
Curriculum Pedagogy
Intergroup & Intragroup Relations
External Relations
University Policies/Service

Assessment

Baseline Organizational Challenges
Systems Analysis
Local / State / Regional Environments
Contextualized Campus Wide Assessment
Advanced Organizational Challenges
Consultant Recommendations

Transformation via Intervention

Symbolic Actions
Fiscal Actions
Educational Actions
Administrative Actions

Transformation!

Access Retention
Research Scholarship
Curriculum Pedagogy
Intergroup & Intragroup Relations
External Relations
University Policies/Service
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Overview of the Project

- Phase I
  - Assessment Tool Development and Implementation

- Phase II
  - Data Analysis

- Phase III
  - Final Report and Presentation
Phase I
Spring 2012-Summer 2013

Meetings with TCNJ’s Climate Study Working Group (CSWG) to develop the survey instrument.

The CSGW (which comprised faculty, staff, students and administrators) reviewed multiple drafts of the survey and approved the final survey instrument.

The final survey was distributed to the entire TCNJ community (students, faculty, and staff) from October 20, 2013 – January 30, 2014.
Instrument/Sample

Final instrument
- 88 questions and additional space for respondents to provide commentary
- On-line or paper & pencil options

Sample = Population
- All students, faculty and staff of TCNJ’s community received an invitation to participate.
Survey Limitations

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

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

Instead, small groups were combined to eliminate possibility of identifying individuals.
Phase II
Spring 2014

Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted
Phase III
Summer/Fall 2014

Report draft reviewed by the CSWG.

Final report submitted to TCNJ.

Presentation to TCNJ campus community.
Results
Who are the respondents?

939 people responded to the call to participate
(11% overall response rate*)

* There is a participation bias for the Student group. The low response rates or Students limits TCNJ’s ability to generalize the findings.
Response Rates

- Students \((n = 582)\): 8%
- Staff \((n = 212)\): 31%
- Faculty \((n = 145)\): 38%
Results

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

- European/European American/White: 76%
- Asian/Asian American: 6%
- Hispanic/Latino/Latin American: 8%
- African American/African/Black: 8%
- Middle Eastern/Southeast Asian: 3%
- Native American Indian: 1%
- Indian subcontinent: 1%
- Caribbean/West Indian: 2%
- Other: 2%
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Unduplicated Total)

- White: 62%
- People of Color: 23%
- Multiracial: 7%
Employee Respondents by Position (%)

- Students: 62%
- Faculty: 15%
- Staff: 23%
Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (%)

Note: Responses with n’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure
Respondents by Sexual Identity and Position Status ($n$)

Note: Responses with $n$’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure.
Respondents with Conditions that Substantially Affect Major Life Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquired/Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asperger’s/Autism Spectrum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vision</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of hearing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disability</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical condition</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health/psychological condition</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Mobility condition that affects walking</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Mobility condition that does not affect walking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/Communication</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Religious/Spiritual Affiliation (%)

- No Affiliation: 30%
- Christian: 51%
- Multiple Affiliations: 4%
- Other Faith-Based Affiliations: 9%
# Citizenship Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen - naturalized</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual citizenship</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Resident – immigrant</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Resident - refugee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (F-1, J-1, H1-B, A, L, G, E, and TN)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented Resident</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Respondents by Age (n)

- **Staff**
  - 24-29: 14
  - 30-39: 42
  - 40-49: 44
  - 50-59: 57
  - 60 and over: 17

- **Faculty**
  - 24-29: 30
  - 30-39: 30
  - 40-49: 29
  - 50-59: 35
  - 60 and over: 17
## Faculty Academic Department/Work Unit Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Division/Department</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Staff Academic Department/Work Unit Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Unit</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gitenstein</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuring</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricketts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donohue</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angeloni</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hecht</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pogue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undergraduate Students by Current Year ($n$)

- First-Year/Freshman: 122
- Second-Year/Sophomore: 97
- Third-Year/Junior: 120
- Fourth-Year/Senior: 133
Student Respondents by Age ($n$)

- Undergraduate Students:
  - Younger than 21: 308
  - 21-23: 161
  - 24-29: 6

- Graduate Students:
  - 24-29: 9
Students’ Family Income by Dependency Status (%)

- Below $30K: 10%
- $30K - $99,999: 24%
- $100K-$149,999: 16%
- $150K - $250K: 8%
- $250K or more: 38%

Note: Responses with n’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure
### Student Respondents’ One-Way Commute to TCNJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commute</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live on campus</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 miles</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–9 miles</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–19 miles</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29 miles</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39 miles</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–80 miles</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 and over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Students’ Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Housing</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Campus Housing</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless (e.g. couch surfing, sleeping in car,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleeping in campus office/lab)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes student respondents ($n = 582$).
# Student Participation in Clubs or Organizations at TCNJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic/Professional Organizations</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest Organizations</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Societies</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Recreation</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Letter Social Organization</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Organizations/Civic Engagement</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not participate in any student organizations</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Student Participation in Clubs (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious/Spiritual Organizations</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Organizations</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Organization</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Arts Organizations</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Organizations</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Media Organization</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students’ Cumulative G.P.A. ($n$)

- Less than 2.0
- 2.00-2.50
- 2.51-3.00
- 3.01-3.50

Bar chart showing:
- 0 students with G.P.A. less than 2.0
- 17 students with G.P.A. 2.00-2.50
- 84 students with G.P.A. 2.51-3.00
- 191 students with G.P.A. 3.01-3.50
Findings
“Comfortable”/ “Very Comfortable” with:

- Overall Campus Climate (82%)
- Department/Work Unit Climate (79%)
- Classroom Climate (Students, 82%)
- Classroom Climate (Faculty, 88%)
**Comfort With Overall Climate**

**Differences**

- Faculty and Staff respondents less comfortable than Student respondents
- People of Color respondents less comfortable than White respondents and Multiracial respondents
- LGBQ and Asexual/Other respondents less comfortable than Heterosexual respondents
- Respondents with Disabilities less comfortable than respondents with No Disabilities
- Low-Income Student respondents less comfortable than Not-Low-Income Student respondents
Comfort With Department/Work Unit Climate

Differences

• LGBQ and Asexual/Other respondents less comfortable than Heterosexual respondents
• Respondents with Disabilities less comfortable than respondents with No Disabilities
• Low-Income Student respondents less comfortable than Not-Low-Income Student respondents
## Comfort with Classroom Climate

### Differences

- Student respondents less comfortable than Faculty respondents
- Women Student respondents less comfortable than Men Student respondents
- Multiracial Student respondents and People of Color Student Respondents less comfortable than White Student respondents
Comfort with Classroom Climate

Differences

• LGBQ Student respondents and Asexual/Other Student respondents less comfortable than Heterosexual Student respondents
• Student respondents with Disabilities less comfortable than Student respondents with No Disabilities
• Low-Income Student respondents less comfortable than Not-Low-Income Student respondents
Challenges and Opportunities
Experiences with Exclusionary Conduct

- 226 respondents indicated that they had personally experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct at TCNJ
Experiences with Exclusionary Conduct

- 89 of those respondents said the conduct interfered with their ability to work or learn at TCNJ (39%)
- 137 of those respondents said the conduct did not interfere with their ability to work or learn at TCNJ (61%)
Top Three Forms of Experienced Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliberately ignored or excluded</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated or left out</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment (n = 226). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Personally Experienced Based on…(%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment (n = 226). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct Due to Position Status (%)

Responses with n’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall experienced conduct¹</th>
<th>Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of gender identity²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 68)¹</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 20)²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 152)¹</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 67)²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses with n’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Of Those Who Experienced Exclusionary Conduct, Said They Experienced Conduct as a Result of Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 128)¹</td>
<td>(n = 36)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 63)¹</td>
<td>(n = 43)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 12)¹</td>
<td>(n = 7)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

![Bar chart showing personal experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct due to sexual orientation.](chart)

- **Overall experienced conduct**:
  - LGBQ Respondents: 34% (n = 27)¹
  - Heterosexual Respondents: 23% (n = 184)¹
  - Asexual/Other: 26% (n = 10)¹

- **Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of sexual orientation**:
  - LGBQ Respondents: 85% (n = 23)²
  - Heterosexual Respondents: 21% (n = 39)²
  - Asexual/Other: 50% (n = 5)²

¹ Percentages are based on total n split by group.
² Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct Due to Religious/Spiritual Affiliation (%)

- **Overall experienced conduct¹**
- **Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of religious/spiritual affiliation²**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Christian (n = 107)¹</th>
<th>Other Faith-Based Affiliations (n = 15)¹</th>
<th>No Affiliation (n = 74)¹</th>
<th>Multiple Affiliations (n = 10)¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 40)²</td>
<td>(n = 6)²</td>
<td>(n = 19)²</td>
<td>(n = 5)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While working at a TCNJ job</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at TCNJ</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a TCNJ event</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment ($n = 226$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Position Status (%)
What did you do?

Personal responses:
- Was angry (50%)
- Felt embarrassed (44%)
- Told a friend (42%)
- Told a family member (35%)
- Ignored it (32%)

Reporting responses:
- Didn’t know to whom to go (14%)
- Didn’t report it for fear the complaint wouldn’t be taken seriously (12%)
- Did report it but did not feel the complaint was taken seriously (10%)
- Reported it to a TCNJ employee/official (9%)
Unwanted Sexual Contact at TCNJ

45 respondents (5%) experienced unwanted physical sexual contact at TCNJ
Unwanted Sexual Contact at TCNJ

Undergraduate Students (7%, n = 39)

Women (6%, n = 35)

LGBQ respondents (15%, n = 12)

Respondents with disabilities (11%, n = 22)
Employees Who
_Seriously Considered Leaving TCNJ_

43% of Staff
respondents \((n = 89)\)

37% of Faculty
respondents \((n = 54)\)
Faculty & Staff Who Seriously Considered Leaving TCNJ

- **By Gender Identity**
  - 50% of Men respondents
  - 35% of Women respondents

- **By Racial Identity**
  - 46% of People of Color respondents
  - 38% of White respondents

- **By Sexual Identity**
  - 56% of LGBQ respondents
  - 39% of Heterosexual respondents

- **By Disability Status**
  - 43% of respondents With Disability
  - 33% of respondents Without Disability
Why employees considered leaving … and why they stayed…

- **Why considered leaving:**
  - “outside circumstances,” such as “to be near spouse’s employment,” and “husband may have the opportunity to relocate.”
  - Adjunct faculty and temporary or part-time employees, sought full-time employment elsewhere.
  - Others were dissatisfied with the climate.

- **Why stayed:**
  - “benefits,” “lack of opportunities elsewhere,” “tenure, familiarity, location,” and “tough economic times.”
  - “because of the students” and “enjoyed working around and with them.”
  - “close to retirement” or that “the bond between myself and my co-workers kept me from leaving.”
19% (n = 109) of Students Seriously Considered Leaving TCNJ

By Gender Identity
- 21% of Women Student respondents
- 14% of Men Student respondents

By Racial Identity
- 25% of Multiracial Student respondents
- 23% of People of Color Student respondents
- 16% of White Student respondents

By Sexual Identity
- 31% of LGBQ Student respondents
- 17% of Heterosexual Student respondents

By Disability Status
- 30% of Student respondents With Disability
- 14% of Student respondents Without Disability

By Citizenship Status
- 29% of Non-U.S. Citizen Student respondents
- 18% of U.S. Citizen Student respondents
Why students considered leaving and why they stayed...

- Why they considered leaving:
  - TCNJ did not offer the majors they sought
  - Slow in creating friendships or becoming involved in co-curricular activities at TCNJ
  - Faced medical or other personal issues

- Why they stayed:
  - Students decided to stay because they felt welcomed and comfortable at TCNJ
  - Liked the small class sizes and appreciated TCNJ’s academic reputation
  - Understood that they “need a college education and degree for future career goals”
  - “too lazy to transfer,” while others were planning on submitting applications to transfer in the coming months
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…

25%  \( (n = 233) \)
**Form of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory remarks</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberately ignored or excluded</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated or left out</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic profiling</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated or left out when work was required in groups</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption that someone was admitted/hired/promoted based on his/her identity</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory/unsolicited e-mails, text messages, Facebook posts, Twitter posts</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 233). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct Based on…

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 233).
Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct (%)

- Student (47%)
- Faculty Member (27%)
- Administrator (15%)
- Stranger (14%)
- Staff Member (9%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 233). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
### Location of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at TCNJ</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In campus housing</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 233). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Position Status (%)
20% \((n = 29)\) of Faculty respondents
16% \((n = 33)\) of Staff respondents
Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Employment Practices by Select Demographics

By Gender Identity
- 21% of Women Faculty and Staff respondents
- 12% of Men Faculty and Staff respondents

By Racial Identity
- 21% of Faculty and Staff People of Color respondents
- 16% of White Faculty and Staff respondents
The majority of employee respondents expressed positive attitudes about work-life issues.
# Work-Life Issues – All Employees

## Successes

- 70% of all Faculty and Staff respondents were satisfied with their jobs at TCNJ
- 70% were satisfied with the size and quality of their workspace
- 70% were comfortable asking questions about performance expectations
- 64% were satisfied with their health benefits package
- 61% found that their workloads were usually manageable
- More than half thought TCNJ demonstrated the value of a diverse faculty (56%) and staff (56%)
Work-Life Issues – All Employees

Successes

• 54% felt that they had colleagues or co-workers at TCNJ who gave them career advice or guidance when they needed it
• 52% felt that supervisors/managers consistently communicate, interpret, and implement TCNJ policies
• 47% had support from decision makers/colleagues/co-workers regarding their job/career advancement
• 46% were satisfied with their career progression
• 46% had access to funding for professional development opportunities
### Work-Life Issues – All Employees

#### Challenges

- Less than half (40%) of all Faculty and Staff respondents were satisfied with their compensation.
- Only 33% found that TCNJ was supportive of taking leave.
- Only 33% believed that TCNJ treats all Faculty and Staff equitably.
- Only 31% felt that their departments or colleagues actively mentor them.
Employees Who Believed TCNJ Treated all Faculty and Staff Equitably by Select Demographics (%)
Employees Who Believed that Department/Colleagues Actively Mentored Them by Select Demographics (%)

- White: Agree 36, Disagree 35
- People of Color: Agree 43, Disagree 18
- LGBQ: Agree 44, Disagree 24
- Heterosexual: Agree 31, Disagree 39
- Women: Agree 34, Disagree 37
- Men: Agree 24, Disagree 40
- No Disability: Agree 34, Disagree 33
- Disability: Agree 24, Disagree 48
Work-Life Issues – All Employees

Challenges

• 31% were reluctant to bring up issues that concern them for fear it would affect their performance evaluations/tenure decisions
• 29% often had to forgo professional development because of work responsibilities
• 21% believed that their colleagues expected them to represent the “point of view” of their identities
• 21% found that personal responsibilities and commitments have slowed down their job/career progression
Work-Life Issues – All Employees

Challenges

• 17% were reluctant to take leave that they were entitled to for fear that it may affect their jobs/careers
• 16% found it difficult to balance child care with their work responsibilities
• 16% felt that they often had to forgo professional activities because of personal responsibilities
• 15% believed that their colleagues treated them with less respect than other faculty/staff
• 15% indicated that they constantly felt under scrutiny by their colleagues
Tenure/Teaching Issues - Faculty

**Successes**

- 51% of all Faculty respondents felt that their workload expectations and requirements were similar to those of their colleagues/co-workers at TCNJ
- 49% agreed that their research interests were valued by their colleagues
- Few felt pressure to change their research agenda to achieve tenure (9%) or promotion (16%)
- Few (14%) felt pressure to change their methods of teaching to achieve tenure/promotion
## Tenure/Teaching Issues - Faculty

### Challenges

- Less than half of Faculty respondents felt the tenure or promotion process was clear (44%).
- Less than half felt tenure standards were used fairly and objectively by their tenure committees in determining whether they received tenure (43%) or promotions (29%).
- 33% felt burdened by college service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues.
- 33% believed that their service contributions were valued by their colleagues for tenure/promotion.
- 24% felt that they received constructive feedback on their progress toward tenure/promotion.
Welcoming Workplace Climate
Workplace Climate was Welcoming Based on Race

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.

Responses with n's less than 5 are not presented in the figure.
Workplace Climate was Welcoming Based on Gender

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.

Responses with n’s less than 5 are not presented in the figure.
Workplace Climate was Welcoming Based on Sexual Orientation

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.
Workplace Climate was Welcoming Based on Religious/Spiritual Affiliation

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.
Student Perceptions of Campus Climate
Majority of students felt valued by faculty (82%) and other students (68%) in the classroom.

Majority of students reported that TCNJ faculty (79%), staff (63%), and administrators (52%) were genuinely concerned with their welfare.

Majority of students had faculty (78%) and staff (54%) who they perceived as role models.
Student Perceptions of Campus Climate

34% of students felt faculty pre-judged their abilities based on their identities/backgrounds.

73% of students believed the campus climate encouraged free and open discussion of difficult topics.
Student Respondents Who Believed that Campus Climate Encouraged Free and Open Discussion of Difficult Topics by Gender and Sexual Identity (%)

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.
Student Respondents Who Believed that Campus Climate Encouraged Free and Open Discussion of Difficult Topics by Race and First Generation Status (%)

- * Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
- ** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.
Student Respondents Who Believed that Campus Climate Encouraged Free and Open Discussion of Difficult Topics by Socioeconomic and Disability Status (%)

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.
Institutional Actions
Campus Initiatives

Employees

More than half of Faculty and Staff thought the following positively influenced the climate:

- Providing access to counseling for people who have experienced exclusionary conduct
- Providing mentorship for new faculty and staff
- Providing a clear and fair process to resolve conflicts
- Increasing diversity of faculty, staff, administration, & student body
The majority of Students thought the following positively affected the climate:

- Providing diversity training for faculty, staff & students
- Providing a person to address student complaints of classroom inequity
- Providing effective faculty mentorship of students
The majority of Students thought the following positively affected the climate:

- Increasing diversity of the faculty, staff, & student body
- Incorporating issues of diversity & cross-cultural competence more effectively into the curriculum
- Increasing opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among students; between faculty, staff & students
Summary

Strengths and Successes
Opportunities for Improvement
Context
Interpreting the Summary

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

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

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

Overall Strengths & Successes

- The majority of students thought very positively about their academic experiences at TCNJ.
- 82% of respondents were comfortable with the overall climate, and 79% with dept/work unit climate.
- 82% of Students and 88% of Faculty were comfortable with the classroom climate.
- The majority of employees expressed positive attitudes about work-life issues at TCNJ.
Overall Opportunities for Improvement

- **24% (n = 315)** had personally **experienced** exclusionary conduct within the last year.
- **25% (n = 233)** had **observed** exclusionary conduct within the last year.
- **27% (n = 252)** seriously considered leaving TCNJ.
- **5% (n = 45)** experienced unwanted sexual contact while at TCNJ.
Next Steps
Process Forward
Sharing the Report with the Community
Fall 2014

Full Power Point available on TCNJ website

Full Report available on TCNJ website/hard copy in Library
Next Steps

• Develop strategic actions and a subsequent implementation plan.
• Use the assessment data to build on the successes and address the challenges uncovered in the report.
• Repeat the assessment process regularly to respond to an ever-changing climate and to assess the influence of the actions initiated as a result of the current assessment.
Questions and Discussion