

## **Executive Summary**

### **Introduction**

The University of Florida (UF) affirms that diversity and inclusion are crucial to the intellectual vitality of the campus community. It is through freedom of exchange over different ideas and viewpoints in supportive environments that individuals develop the critical thinking and citizenship skills that will benefit them throughout their lives. Diversity and inclusion engender academic engagement where teaching, working, learning, and living take place in pluralistic communities of mutual respect.

UF is dedicated to fostering a caring community that provides leadership for constructive participation in a diverse, multicultural world. As noted in UF's mission statement, "The University of Florida must create the broadly diverse environment necessary to foster multicultural skills and perspectives in its teaching and research for its students to contribute and succeed in the world of the 21st century."<sup>1</sup> In order to better understand the campus climate, the senior administration at the University of Florida recognized the need for a comprehensive tool that would provide campus climate metrics for UF faculty and staff.

To that end, members of the University of Florida formed the President's Council on Diversity Climate Study Working Group (CSWG) in 2015. The CSWG was composed of faculty, staff, and administrators. Ultimately, the University of Florida contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to conduct a campus-wide study entitled, "University of Florida Faculty and Staff Climate Survey." Data gathered via reviews of relevant UF literature and a campus-wide survey focused on the experiences and perceptions of various constituent groups. Based on the findings of this study, the University of Florida will develop action items to build on successful initiatives and address challenges.

---

<sup>1</sup><http://www.registrar.ufl.edu/catalog1011/administration/mission.html>

## **Project Design and Campus Involvement**

The CSWG collaborated with R&A to develop the survey instrument. The final survey instrument was completed in October 2015. The University of Florida's survey contained 79 items (17 qualitative and 62 quantitative) and was available via a secure online portal from October 27 to November 27, 2015. Confidential paper surveys were distributed to those individuals who did not have access to an Internet-connected computer or who preferred a paper survey.

The conceptual model used as the foundation for UF's assessment of campus climate was developed by Smith et al. (1997) and modified by Rankin (2003). A power and privilege perspective informs the model, one grounded in critical theory, which establishes that power differentials, both earned and unearned, are central to all human interactions (Brookfield, 2005). Unearned power and privilege are associated with membership in dominant social groups (Johnson, 2005) and influence systems of differentiation that reproduce unequal outcomes. The CSWG implemented participatory and community-based processes to generate survey questions as a means to capture the various dimensions of power and privilege that shape the campus experience. In this way, the University of Florida's assessment was the result of a comprehensive process to identify the strengths and challenges of campus climate, with a specific focus on the distribution of power and privilege among differing social groups. This report provides an overview of the results of the campus-wide survey.

## **The University of Florida Participants**

UF community members completed 5,590 surveys for an overall response rate of 36%. Only surveys that were at least 50% completed were included in the final data set for analyses.<sup>2</sup> Response rates by constituent group varied: 36% ( $n = 2,037$ ) for Faculty, 19% ( $n = 117$ ) for Postdoctoral Associates, 37% ( $n = 3,277$ ) for Staff/Administrators, and 40% ( $n = 159$ ) for University Athletic Association. Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic

---

<sup>2</sup>Fifty-eight were removed because they did not complete at least 50% of the survey. Surveys were also removed from the data file if the respondent did not provide consent ( $n = 48$ ).

characteristics of survey respondents. The percentages offered in Table 1 are based on the numbers of respondents in the sample (*n*) for each demographic characteristic.<sup>3</sup>

**Table 1. The University of Florida Sample Demographics**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Subgroup</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>% of Sample</b>
Position status	Faculty	2,037	36.4
	Postdoctoral Associate	117	2.1
	Staff	3,277	58.6
	University Athletic Association	159	2.8
Gender identity	Man	2,248	40.2
	Woman	3,277	58.0
Racial/Ethnic identity	Asian/Asian American	302	5.4
	Black/African American	358	6.4
	Latin@/Chican@/Hispanic	256	4.6
	Other People of Color	48	0.9
	White	4,213	75.4
	Multiracial	219	3.9
Sexual identity	LGBQ	366	6.5
	Heterosexual	4,890	87.5
	Other	53	0.9
Citizenship status	U.S. Citizen	4,679	83.7
	U.S. Citizen, naturalized	463	8.3
	Non-U.S. Citizen	319	5.7
	Multiple Citizenship	82	1.5
Disability status	Disability	511	9.1
	No Disability	5,060	90.5
Military status	Military Service	307	5.5
	No Military Service	5,210	93.2
Faith-based affiliation	Christian Affiliation	3,000	53.7
	Other Faith-Based Affiliation	333	6.0
	No Affiliation	1,802	32.3
	Multiple Affiliations	257	4.6

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

<sup>3</sup>The total *n* for each demographic characteristic may differ as a result of missing data.

## Key Findings – Areas of Strength

### 1. High levels of comfort with the climate at the University of Florida

Climate is defined as the “current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of employees and students concerning the access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and potential.”<sup>4</sup> The level of comfort experienced by faculty, staff, and students is one indicator of campus climate.

- 73% ( $n = 4,106$ ) of the survey respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate at UF.
- 70% ( $n = 3,912$ ) of all respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate in their departments/work units.
- 62% ( $n = 2,049$ ) of all respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes/learning environment.
  - 83% of Faculty respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the classroom climate, compared to 60% of Postdoctoral Associate respondents and 35% of Staff respondents.

### 2. Respondents – Positive attitudes about work-life issues

Campus climate<sup>5</sup> is constituted in part by perceptions of work, sense of balance between work and home life, and opportunities for personal and professional development throughout the span of one’s career. Work-life balance is one indicator of campus climate.

- 84% ( $n = 2,865$ ) of Staff<sup>6</sup> respondents felt that they were given a reasonable time frame to complete assigned responsibilities.
- 72% ( $n = 2,429$ ) of Staff<sup>6</sup> respondents felt that UF and their supervisors provided resources to pursue training/professional development opportunities. Among Faculty respondents, 64% ( $n = 1,261$ ) felt that UF provided these resources.
- 73% ( $n = 2,264$ ) of Staff<sup>6</sup> respondents found UF supportive of flexible work schedules.

---

<sup>4</sup>Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 264

<sup>5</sup>Settles, Cortina, Malley, & Stewart, 2006

<sup>6</sup> Staff responses include University Athletic Association Staff

- The majority of Staff<sup>7</sup> indicated that they had supervisors (75%,  $n = 2,548$ ) and colleagues/coworkers (83%,  $n = 2,797$ ) at UF who gave them career advice or guidance when they needed it.
- 65% ( $n = 2,073$ ) of Staff<sup>7</sup> respondents indicated that their supervisors and UF (64%,  $n = 2,073$ ) provided them with adequate resources to manage work/life balance.

### **3. Faculty Respondents – Positive attitudes about faculty work**

- Tenured and Tenure-Accruing respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that the criteria for tenure were clear (75%,  $n = 829$ ), and standards were applied equally to faculty in their school/division (60%,  $n = 667$ ).
- 52% ( $n = 1,094$ ) of Faculty and Postdoctoral Associate respondents felt that their service contributions were valued.
- 71% ( $n = 629$ ) of Non-Tenure-Accruing, Permanent Status, Permanent Status Accruing, and Adjunct Faculty respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that the criteria used for job retention was clear.

---

<sup>7</sup> Staff responses include University Athletic Association Staff

## Key Findings – Opportunities for Improvement

### 1. Members of several constituent groups were differentially affected by 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.<sup>8</sup> Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.<sup>9</sup> The survey requested information on experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

- 24% ( $n = 1,325$ ) of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile (bullying, harassing) conduct at UF within the past year.<sup>10</sup>
  - 36% ( $n = 470$ ) indicated that the conduct was based on their position status, 21% ( $n = 275$ ) noted that the conduct was based on their educational credentials, 20% ( $n = 259$ ) felt that it was based on their age, and 19% ( $n = 248$ ) felt that it was based on their gender/gender identity.
- Differences emerged based on various demographic characteristics, including position status, gender identity, age, and ethnicity. For example:
  - A significantly higher percentage of respondents who completed a high school/GED or completed some college felt that the conduct was based on their educational attainment.
  - Significantly higher percentages of respondents ages 22 through 24 years and ages 65 and over felt that the conduct was based on their age when compared to the other age groups (25-64 years of age).

---

<sup>8</sup>Aguirre & Messineo, 1997; Flowers & Pascarella, 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001

<sup>9</sup>Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008; Waldo, 1999

<sup>10</sup>The literature on microaggressions is clear that this type of conduct has a negative influence on people who experience the conduct, even if they feel at the time that it had no impact (Sue, 2010; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009).

- A significantly higher percentage of Transgender/Genderqueer/Other respondents and Women respondents than Men respondents indicated that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. Respondents offered comments related to the conduct of supervisors, administrators, or other individuals with “power.” Other respondents described the incivility they had experienced from their supervisors including yelling, belittling, and intimidation. Still other respondents that oftentimes coworkers were the source of workplace incivility and commented on the overall workplace environment, where they felt that bullying, harassment, and/or other forms of intimidating and disrespectful behavior took place regularly. The largest shared theme among respondents was that of issues surrounding the process of, as well as the results of, reporting negative conduct. Many individuals were concerned about what would happen if they reported the behavior.

**2. Several constituent groups indicated that they were less comfortable with the overall campus climate, workplace climate, and classroom climate.**

Prior research on campus climate has focused on the experiences of faculty, staff, and students associated with historically underserved social/community/affinity groups (e.g., Women, People of Color, People with Disabilities, First-Generation Students, Veterans).<sup>11</sup> Several groups indicated that they were less comfortable than their majority counterparts with the climates of the campus, workplace, and classroom.

---

<sup>11</sup>Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hart & Fellabaum, 2008; Norris, 1992; Rankin, 2003; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart, 2008

- Differences by gender identity:
  - 75% of Women respondents, 72% of Men respondents, and 62% of Transgender/Genderqueer/Other respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the overall climate.
  - A significantly higher percentage of Men Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents (34%) than Women Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents (22%) felt “very comfortable” in their classes
  - 36% of overall Men respondents and 30% of Women respondents were “very comfortable” with the climate in their departments/work units.
- Differences by racial identity:
  - 66% of Black/African American and 62% of Multiracial respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the overall climate at UF versus 73% of Asian/Asian American respondents, 74% of Latin@/Chican@/Hispanic respondents, 75% of Other People of Color respondents, and 76% of White respondents.
  - A significantly lower percentage of Black/African American respondents (23%) were “very comfortable” with the climate in their departments/work units than were Asian/Asian American respondents (29%), Latin@/Chican@/Hispanic respondents (29%), Other People of Color respondents (31%), White respondents (34%), and Multiracial respondents (31%).
  - 25% of Asian/Asian American Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents, 12% of Black/African American Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents, 29% of Latin@/Chican@/Hispanic Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents, 36% of Other Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff Respondents of Color, 29% of White Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and 21% of Multiracial Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents were “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes/learning environment.

- Differences by disability:
  - Respondents with Disabilities (15%) were significantly less comfortable with the overall climate than were respondents with No Disability (24%).
  - Respondents with Disabilities (22%) were significantly less comfortable with the department/work unit climate than were respondents with No Disability (33%).
  - Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents with Disabilities (21%) were significantly less comfortable with the climate in their classes than were Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents with No Disability (28%).
- Differences by faith-based affiliation:
  - 75% of Christian-Affiliated respondents and 76% of Other Faith-Based respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the overall climate, compared to 72% of No Affiliation respondents and 73% of Multiple Affiliation respondents who were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the overall climate.
  - 70% of Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents with Other Faith-Based Affiliations, 64% of Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents with No Affiliation, and 72% of Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents with Multiple Affiliations were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in the classroom/learning environment, compared to 60% of Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents with Christian Affiliations.
- By citizenship status:
  - Naturalized U.S. Citizens (66%) were significantly less likely to feel “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the overall climate than U.S. Citizens (74%), Non-U.S. Citizens (77%), and respondents with Multiple Citizenships (83%).
  - Naturalized U.S. Citizens (66%) were significantly less likely to feel “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their department/work

unit than U.S. Citizens (70%), Non-U.S. Citizens (75%), and respondents with Multiple Citizenships (77%).

- Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents with Multiple Citizenships (51%) were significantly less likely to feel “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their department/work unit than U.S. Citizen (61%), Naturalized U.S. Citizen (68%), and Non-U.S. Citizen (71%) Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents.

### **3. Respondents – Challenges with work-life issues**

- 57% ( $n = 3,171$ ) of respondents noted that they had seriously considered leaving UF in the past year.
  - 53% ( $n = 1,684$ ) of those respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of financial reasons. Forty-three percent ( $n = 1,377$ ) of those respondents who seriously considered leaving indicated that they saw limited opportunities for advancement at UF.
- Respondents observed unjust hiring practices (23%,  $n = 1,249$ ), unfair or unjust disciplinary actions (14%,  $n = 749$ ), or unfair or unjust promotion/tenure/reclassification (28%,  $n = 1,512$ ).
- 24% ( $n = 87$ ) of Tenured and Tenure-Accruing Women respondents and 12% ( $n = 79$ ) of Tenured and Tenure-Accruing Men Faculty respondents felt that faculty members in their departments who use family accommodation (FMLA) policies were disadvantaged in promotion or tenure.
- A higher percentage of Men Staff<sup>12</sup> respondents (91%,  $n = 967$ ) versus Women Staff respondents (88%,  $n = 1,964$ ) felt that their supervisors were supportive of leave.
- Less than half of Staff<sup>12</sup> respondents (42%,  $n = 1,392$ ) “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that staff salaries were competitive.

---

<sup>12</sup> Staff responses include University Athletic Association Staff

Respondents were provided the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences with work-life issues. Respondents offered that they felt their salary at the University of Florida was significantly lower than they would be able to earn at another job. Many respondents commented on various issues of inequity surrounding the fact that not everyone is treated the same. Respondents were concerned about different treatment between staff and faculty, new staff and old staff, part-time and full-time status, different departments and disciplines, and people with children and people without children. Respondents across various positions commented that high workload expectations were stressful.

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

- Tenured and Tenure-Accruing Women respondents (31%,  $n = 118$ ) were more likely than Men respondents (28%,  $n = 191$ ) to feel pressure to change their research/scholarship agenda to achieve tenure/promotion.
- Tenured and Tenure-Accruing Women respondents (51%,  $n = 202$ ) were more likely than Men respondents (36%,  $n = 253$ ) to feel burdened by service responsibilities (e.g., committee memberships, departmental/program work assignments) beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations.
- 50% ( $n = 555$ ) of Tenured and Tenure-Accruing Faculty respondents thought they performed more work to help students (e.g., formal and informal advising, thesis advising, helping with student groups and activities) than did their colleagues.
- Among Faculty respondents, 54% ( $n = 1,007$ ) felt that salaries for Tenure-Track Faculty positions were competitive, 44% ( $n = 702$ ) felt that salaries among Adjunct Professors were competitive, and 46% ( $n = 807$ ) felt that salaries for Tenure-Track Faculty position were competitive.
- 76% ( $n = 1,492$ ) of all Faculty respondents believed they had job security. Among faculty, 90% ( $n = 813$ ) of Tenured Faculty respondents, 60% ( $n = 125$ ) of Tenure-Accruing Faculty respondents, and 63% ( $n = 405$ ) of Non-Tenure-Accruing Faculty respondents felt this way.

Faculty respondents were provided the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences regarding faculty work. Most of the Tenured and Tenure-Accruing respondents were critical of the extent to which “shared governance” was actually implemented at the University of Florida. Faculty respondents expressed concern about professional development, especially travel funds for conferences; resources for research; and administrative support. Respondents also felt that salaries at UF were not competitive with other universities, especially for faculty who had been at UF for a long time and those outside tenure-track.

## Conclusion

The University of Florida campus climate findings<sup>13</sup> were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.<sup>14</sup> For example, 70% to 80% of all respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” A similar percentage (73%) of all the University of Florida respondents reported that they were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate at the University. Likewise, 20% to 25% in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At the University of Florida, a similar percentage of respondents (24%) 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.<sup>15</sup>

The University of Florida’s climate assessment report provides baseline data on diversity and inclusion, and addresses the University of Florida’s mission and the goals. While the findings may guide decision-making in regard to policies and practices at UF, it is important to note that the cultural fabric of any institution and unique aspects of each campus’s environment must be taken into consideration when deliberating additional action items based on these findings. The climate assessment findings provide the UF community with an opportunity to build upon its strengths and to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. UF, with support from

---

<sup>13</sup>Additional findings disaggregated by position and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.

<sup>14</sup>[Rankin & Associates Consulting, 2015](#)

<sup>15</sup>Guiffrida, Gouveia, Wall, & Seward, 2008; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Harper & Quaye, 2004; Hurtado & Ponjuan, 2005; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Sears, 2002; Settles et al., 2006; Silverschanz et al., 2008; Yosso et al., 2009

senior administrators and collaborative leadership, is in a prime position to actualize its commitment to an inclusive campus and to institute organizational structures that respond to the needs of its dynamic campus community.

## 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.
- 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.

- Johnsrud, L. K., & Sadao, K. C. (1998). The common experience of "otherness": Ethnic and racial minority faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(4), 315-342.
- 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. (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. (2015, January 5). Recent Clients. 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.