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Climate In Higher Education

Create and Distribute of Knowledge

Climate (Living, Working, Learning)

Community Members

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

K-State 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).

K-State 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
Project Overview

Phase I
• Focus Groups

Phase II
• Assessment Tool Development and Implementation

Phase III
• Data Analysis

Phase IV
• Final Report and Presentation
K-State created the University Climate Study Committee (UCSC; comprised of faculty, staff, students and administrators)

13 focus groups were conducted by R&A (comprised of 40 students, and 73 faculty/staff)

Data from the focus groups informed the UCSC and R&A in constructing questions for the campus-wide survey.
Meetings with the UCSC to develop the survey instrument

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

The final survey was distributed to the entire K-State community (students, faculty, staff, and administrators) via an invitation from President Schulz.
Instrument/Sample

Final instrument
• 100 questions and additional space for respondents to provide commentary (20 qualitative and 80 quantitative)
• On-line or paper & pencil options

Sample = Population
• All students, faculty, staff, and administrators of K-State’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 III
Fall 2014/Winter 2015

Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted
Phase IV
Spring 2015

Report draft reviewed by the UCSC

Final report submitted to K-State

Presentation to K-State campus community
Results

Response Rates
Who are the respondents?

7,411 people responded to the call to participate
25% overall response rate
Employee Response Rates

- Faculty ($n = 914$) 49%
- Staff ($n = 1,477$) 49%
- Administrators ($n = 215$) 55%
Student Response Rates

- **Undergraduate** ($n = 3,986$) - 20%
- **Graduate** ($n = 819$) - 19%
Results

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

- White: 85%
- Racial identity not listed: 1%
- Pacific Islander: 0%
- Native Hawaiian: 0%
- Middle Eastern: 1%
- Latino/Hispanic/Chicano: 5%
- Black/African/African American: 5%
- Asian/Asian American: 5%
- American Indian: 2%
- Alaskan Native: 0%
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Unduplicated Total)

- White: 81%
- Multiracial: 5%
- People of Color: 12%
- Race, Other/Missing/Unknown: 2%
Respondents by Position (%)

- Graduate: 11%
- Undergraduate: 54%
- Faculty: 12%
- Admin: 3%
- Staff: 20%
Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (%)

- **Admin**
  - Women: 53%
  - Men: 47%
  - Not listed: 0%
  - Genderqueer: 0%

- **Staff**
  - Not listed: 0%
  - Women: 66%
  - Men: 34%
  - Genderqueer: 0%

- **Faculty**
  - Not listed: 1%
  - Women: 44%
  - Men: 55%

- **Grad Stds**
  - Women: 64%
  - Men: 35%

- **Undergrads**
  - Not listed: 0%
  - Women: 61%
  - Transgender: 0%
  - Men: 38%
  - Genderqueer: 0%

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’ Primary K-State Geographic Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>6,904</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17% \((n = 1,256)\) of Respondents Identified as Having a Single Disability or Multiple Disabilities that Substantially Affected Major Life Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental health/psychological condition</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical condition</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive disability</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of hearing or deaf</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical disability</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vision or blind</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility impairment</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/communication disorders</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired/Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Religious/Spiritual Affiliation (%)

- Spiritual, No Affiliation: 7%
- Christian Affiliation: 69%
- No Affiliation: 19%
- Multiple Affiliations: 1%
- Other Faith-Based Affiliations: 3%
## Citizenship Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen</td>
<td>6,766</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visa holder (F-1, J-1, H1-B, A, L, G, E and TN)</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other legally documented status</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented resident</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Respondents by Age (n)

- Faculty
- Admin
- Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 or younger</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-34</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-48</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-67</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 and over</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Respondents’ Dependent Care Status by Position (%)
## Faculty Academic Department/Work Unit Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Division</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Human Ecology</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Technology and Aviation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-State Libraries</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business Administration</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-State Research and Extension</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Provost</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture, Planning and Design</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.1</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>Student Life</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Facilities</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Services</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Dining</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Finance</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-State Research and Extension</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A complete list can be found in the full report.*
# Administrator Academic Department/Work Unit Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Unit</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Provost</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Finance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-State Research and Extension</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Research</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A complete list can be found in the full report.*
Student Respondents by Age (n)

- 22 and younger: 3,369
- 23-34: 511
- 35-48: 592
- 49-67: 80
- 68 and over: 82
- Undergraduate Students: 19

Total: 4,222
## Student Respondents’ Residence

**Campus Housing (27%, \( n = 1,274 \))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jardine Apartment Complex</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnow Hall</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlatt Hall</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Hall</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore Hall</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haymaker Hall</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd Hall</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam Hall</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hall</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment with University housing contract</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors House</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Zile Hall</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smurthwaite House</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Residence

**Non-Campus Housing (73%, \( n = 3,482 \))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independently in an apartment/house</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorority housing</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity housing</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with family member/guardian</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing transient (e.g., couch surfing, etc.)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Income by Dependency Status and Position (%)
48% ($n = 2,325$) of Student Respondents Reported Experiencing Financial Hardship…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty affording tuition</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in affording housing</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty purchasing my books</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty affording food</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty participating in social events</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty participating in co-curricular events or activities</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty traveling home during breaks</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in affording other campus or program fees</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in affording health care</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty participating in academic or professional organizations</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty commuting to campus</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in affording child care</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes Student respondents who reported having experienced financial hardship ($n = 2,325$) only. Sum does not total 100% as a result of multiple response choices.
### How Student Respondents Were Paying For College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student loans</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family contribution</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contribution/job</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-need based scholarship</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent loans</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need-based scholarship</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs or Organizations at K-State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clubs and activities</td>
<td>2,382</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and recreation</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not participate in any clubs/organizations</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School spirit/philanthropy clubs</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor societies</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PanHellenic</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural student organizations</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student governance</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic competition teams</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A complete list can be found in the full report.*
Student Respondents’ Cumulative G.P.A. (n)

- Less than 2.0: 65
- 2.0-.2.4: 253
- 2.5-2.9: 661
- 3.0-3.4: 1,275
- 3.5-4.0: 2,472
Findings
“Comfortable”/“Very Comfortable” with:

- Overall Campus Climate (84%)
- Department/Work Unit Climate (69%)
- Classroom Climate
  (Undergraduate, 85%; Graduate, 79%; Faculty, 72%)
Comfort With Overall Climate

Differences

• Staff and Faculty respondents less comfortable than Administrator respondents
• Women respondents less comfortable than Men respondents
• Respondents of Color and Multiple Race respondents less comfortable than White respondents
• Respondents with Multiple Affiliations, No Affiliation, Spiritual Affiliations, and Other Faith-Based Affiliations less comfortable than respondents with Christian Affiliations.
• LGBQ respondents less comfortable than Heterosexual and Asexual/Other respondents
Comfort With Overall Climate

Differences

- Respondents with Multiple Disabilities and a Single Disability less comfortable than those with No Disabilities
- Non-U.S. Citizen respondents were less comfortable than U.S. Citizen respondents
- Low-Income Student respondents less comfortable than No Low-Income Student respondents
- First Generation Student respondents less comfortable than Not First-Generation Student respondents
- Respondents with Military Service less comfortable than respondents with No Military Service
Comfort With Department/Work Unit Climate

Differences

• Women respondents less comfortable than Men respondents
• Respondents of Color and Multiple Race respondents less comfortable than White respondents
## Comfort With Classroom Climate

### Differences

- Faculty respondents less comfortable than Undergraduate and Graduate Student respondents
- Women Faculty and Student respondents less comfortable than Men Faculty and Student respondents
- Faculty and Student Respondents of Color and Multiple Race Faculty and Student respondents less comfortable than White Faculty and Student respondents
- LGBQ Faculty and Student respondents less comfortable than Heterosexual and Asexual/Other Faculty and Student respondents
Comfort With Classroom Climate

Differences

• Faculty and Student respondents with Multiple Affiliations, No Affiliation, Spiritual Affiliations, and Other Faith-Based Affiliations less comfortable than Faculty and Student respondents with Christian Affiliations

• Faculty and Student respondents with Multiple Disabilities and a Single Disability less comfortable than those with No Disabilities

• Non-U.S. Citizen Faculty and Student respondents were less comfortable than U.S. Citizen Faculty and Student respondents
Comfort With Classroom Climate

Differences

- Low-Income Student respondents less comfortable than Not Low-Income Student respondents
- First-Generation Student respondents less comfortable than Not First-Generation Student respondents
Challenges and Opportunities
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

19%

- 1,400 respondents indicated that they had personally experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct at K-State in the past year.
Personally Experienced Based on…(%)
Forms of Experienced Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliberately ignored or excluded</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated or left out</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment (n = 1,400). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct Due to Position (%)

- Overall experienced conduct¹
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of position²

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 Age (%)

- Overall experienced conduct¹
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their age²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Conduct Due to Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 and under</td>
<td>13 (n = 469)¹</td>
<td>15 (n = 69)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-34</td>
<td>20 (n = 327)¹</td>
<td>28 (n = 92)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-48</td>
<td>25 (n = 327)¹</td>
<td>15 (n = 32)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 and over</td>
<td>27 (n = 327)¹</td>
<td>19 (n = 70)²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Overall experienced conduct¹**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience Conduct</td>
<td>(n = 466)¹</td>
<td>(n = 900)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 40)²</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 190)²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages are based on total n split by group.
² Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While working at a K-State job</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at K-State</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a K-State administrative office</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment (n = 1,400). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Position Status (%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment (n = 1,400). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?

Personal responses:
- Was angry (53%)
- Felt embarrassed (38%)
- Told a family member (37%)
- Told a friend (36%)
- Ignored it (30%)

Reporting responses:
- Didn’t report it for fear the complaint wouldn’t be taken seriously (16%)
- Didn’t know to whom to go (12%)
- Reported it to a K-State employee/official (9%)
- Did report it but did not feel the complaint was taken seriously (8%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced harassment (n = 1,400). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Theme

Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Ignored
(by peers, professors, instructors)

Public forms of harassing conduct
(verbal harassment in a public setting)
Unwanted Sexual Contact at K-State

198 respondents (3%) experienced unwanted sexual contact at K-State
159 respondents were Undergraduate Students (4% of all Undergraduate respondents)

Subsequent results relate to their experiences
Undergraduate Student Respondents
Unwanted Sexual Contact

Women respondents
(6%, n = 138)

Multiple Race respondents
(8%, n = 20)

Respondents with Multiple Disabilities
(13%, n = 20)

LGBQ respondents
(12%, n = 30)
Undergraduate Student Respondents’ Experiences of Unwanted Sexual Contact by Select Demographics

- 127 Transfer Students
- 121 White Undergrads
- 138 Multiple Race Students
- 16 Men
- 30 LGBQ Students
- 121 Heterosexual Students
- 40 Multiple Disabilities
- 82 No Disability
Semester in Which Undergraduate Student Respondents Experienced Unwanted Sexual Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After eighth semester</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Undergraduate Student respondents who indicated that they experienced wanted sexual contact (n = 158).
Location of Unwanted Sexual Contact

Off Campus (135 respondents)

On Campus (48 respondents)
Source of Unwanted Sexual Contact

Acquaintance/Friend
(54%, n = 96)

Student
(39%, n = 70)
Response to Unwanted Sexual Contact

I told a friend 63%

I felt embarrassed 52%

I felt somehow responsible 48%

I did nothing 41%

I was angry 45%

I was afraid 34%

I ignored it 31%
Qualitative Themes
Why Unwanted Sexual Contact Was Unreported

- Felt responsible
- Not that serious
- Alcohol was involved
- No clear support
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving K-State

- 61% of Faculty ($n = 557$)
- 56% of Staff ($n = 823$)
- 60% of Administrators ($n = 128$)
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving K-State

By Staff Position Status
- 59% of Unclassified Professional Staff
- 53% of University Support Staff

By Faculty Position Status
- 65% of Tenure-Track/Tenured Faculty
- 54% of Non-Tenure Track Faculty
- 59% of Non-Tenure Track (Term) Faculty

By Gender Identity
- 62% of Men respondents
- 55% of Women respondents

By Racial Identity
- 70% of Multiple Race respondents
- 61% of Respondents of Color
- 56% of White respondents
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving K-State

By Sexual Identity
- 66% of LGBQ respondents
- 61% of Asexual/Other respondents
- 58% of Heterosexual respondents

By Disability Status
- 72% of respondents with Multiple Disabilities
- 64% of respondents with Single Disabilities
- 55% of respondents with No Disabilities

By Citizenship Status
- 58% of U.S. Citizen respondents
- 56% of Non-U.S. Citizen respondents
- 48% of respondents with Multiple Citizenships
## Reasons Employee Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving K-State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of salary/benefits</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension in department/work unit</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension in department/work unit with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position at another institution</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Faculty and Staff/Administrator respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 1,508).
Qualitative Themes
Why Considered leaving...

Poor salaries/lack of raises
Experiences of bullying
Supervisor difficult to work for
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…

22%  \( (n = 1,638) \)
Form of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Conduct</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory verbal remarks</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person felt isolated or left out</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberately ignored or excluded</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic profiling</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace incivility</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption that someone was admitted/hired/promoted based on his/her identity</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 1,638). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct Based on…(%)
Source of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct (%)

- Student (41%)
- Faculty Member (20%)
- Coworkers (15%)
- Strangers (13%)
- Department Chairs/Heads/Directors (12%)
- Staff Members (10%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment ($n = 1,638$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
### Location of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at K-State</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While working at a K-State job</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab/clinical setting</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 1,638). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)

- Multiple Affiliations (n = 19): 31%
- No Affiliation (n = 366): 26%
- Spiritual (n = 160): 30%
- Other Faith-Based (n = 48): 21%
- Christian (n = 1,006): 20%
- Staff (n = 398): 27%
- Admin (n = 68): 32%
- Faculty (n = 265): 29%
- Grad Students (n = 176): 22%
- Undergrads (n = 731): 18%
- Gender Not Listed (n = 14): 48%
- Women (n = 1,003): 23%
- Men (n = 590): 21%
- Genderqueer (n = 11): 50%
- Multiple Race (n = 106): 28%
- White (n = 1,259): 21%
- People of Color (n = 225): 26%
Qualitative Themes

Observed Conduct

Discrimination

(Largely based on race)
Employee Perceptions
Faculty Perceptions of Campus Climate

Majority of Faculty respondents felt valued by other faculty (75%), by their department heads/chairs (73%), and by students in the classroom (78%)

Faculty respondents felt that K-State college-level administrators (51%) and K-State university-level administrators (34%) were genuinely concerned with their welfare
Faculty Perceptions of Campus Climate

Faculty respondents felt faculty in their department (25%) and department heads/chairs (18%) pre-judged their abilities based on their identities/backgrounds.

38% of Faculty respondents felt that the campus climate encouraged free and open discussion of difficult topics.

The majority of all Faculty respondents felt their teaching (67%) and service contributions (62%) were valued.
Staff Perceptions of Campus Climate

Majority of Staff respondents felt valued by co-workers in their work units (80%) and by their supervisors/managers (73%).

Staff respondents felt that K-State unit/division-level administrators (58%) and K-State university-level administrators (41%) were genuinely concerned with their welfare.
Staff Perceptions of Campus Climate

Staff respondents felt coworkers in their department (22%) and their supervisors/managers (20%) pre-judged their abilities based on their identities/backgrounds.

52% of Staff respondents felt that their work units encouraged free and open discussion of difficult topics.

The majority of all Staff respondents (68%) felt their skills were valued.
Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Hiring Practices

27% \((n = 59)\) of Administrator respondents
22% \((n = 332)\) of Staff respondents
20% \((n = 181)\) of Faculty respondents
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Hiring Practices by Select Demographics

By Age
- 20% ages 23-34 years
- 23% ages 35-48 years
- 23% ages 49-67 years
- 14% ages 68 years and older

By Gender Identity
- 23% of Women
- 20% of Men
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Hiring Practices by Select Demographics

By Racial Identity
- 36% of Respondents of Color
- 33% of Multiple Race respondents
- 20% of White respondents

By Sexual Identity
- 35% of LGBQ respondents
- 28% of Asexual/Other respondents
- 21% of Heterosexual respondents
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions Practices by Select Demographics

18% \((n = 38)\) of Administrator respondents
15% \((n = 213)\) of Staff respondents
12% \((n = 106)\) of Faculty respondents
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions Practices by Select Demographics

By Age
- 9% ages 23-34 years
- 12% ages 35-48 years
- 17% ages 49-67 years
- 11% ages 68 years and older

By Racial Identity
- 19% of Respondents of Color
- 15% of Multiple Race respondents
- 13% of White respondents
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions Practices by Select Demographics

By Sexual Identity

- 24% of Asexual/Other respondents
- 14% of LGBQ respondents
- 13% of Heterosexual respondents
25% \((n = 54)\) of Administrator respondents

26% \((n = 385)\) of Staff respondents

22% \((n = 200)\) of Faculty respondents

Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Practices Related to Promotion
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Practices Related to Promotion by Select Demographics

**By Age**
- 18% ages 23-34 years
- 26% ages 35-48 years
- 27% ages 49-67 years
- 21% ages 68 years and older

**By Gender Identity**
- 25% of Women
- 23% of Men
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Practices Related to Promotion by Select Demographics

By Racial Identity
- 31% of Respondents of Color
- 35% of Multiple Race respondents
- 23% of White respondents

By Sexual Identity
- 33% of LGBQ respondents
- 29% of Asexual/Other respondents
- 24% of Heterosexual respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Employment Practices

Nepotism

Favoritism

Employees forced out of their positions

Non-reappointment
The majority of employee respondents expressed positive attitudes about work-life issues.
Examples of Successes

86% of Faculty believed K-State was supportive of faculty taking sabbatical/faculty enhancement leave.

85% found K-State supportive of taking leave

76% had colleagues/coworkers at K-State who gave them career advice or guidance
Examples of Challenges

Only 38% of Faculty, Staff, and Administrator respondents believed that salary determinations were clear.

38% felt they had to work harder than their colleagues/coworkers did to achieve the same recognition.

35% noted they were reluctant to bring up issues that concerned them for fear it would affect their performance evaluations or tenure/merit/promotion decisions.

30% indicated that their colleagues/coworkers expect them to represent “the point of view” of their identities.
Work-Life Issues Employee Respondents

Successes

- 86% of Faculty, Staff, and Administrator respondents reported believing that K-State was supportive of faculty taking sabbatical/faculty enhancement leave
- 85% found K-State supportive of taking leave
- 77% were comfortable taking leave that they were entitled to without fear that it may affect their job/careers
- 76% indicated that they had colleagues/coworkers at K-State who gave them career advice or guidance when they needed it
- 73% found K-State supportive of flexible work schedules
- 72% acknowledged that K-State provided them with resources to pursue professional development opportunities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72% of Faculty, Staff, and Administrator respondents reported believing that tenure/promotion standards were reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68% agreed that their supervisors provided ongoing feedback to help improve their performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68% acknowledged that their supervisors provided them with resources to pursue professional development opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66% indicated that they had supervisors at K-State who gave them career advice or guidance when they needed it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66% agreed that the annual performance evaluation process is fair and clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53% suggested that K-State provides resources to help employees balance work-life needs, such as childcare and elder care.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges

• Only 38% of Faculty, Staff, and Administrator respondents believed that salary determinations were clear.
• 38% reported feeling that they had to work harder than their colleagues/coworkers did to achieve the same recognition.
• 35% noted that they were reluctant to bring up issues that concerned them for fear it would affect their performance evaluations or tenure/merit/promotion decisions.
• 30% indicated that their colleagues/coworkers expect them to represent “the point of view” of their identities.
• 24% agreed that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities (e.g., stay late, off-hour work, work weekends) beyond those who do have children.
Qualitative Themes
Employee’s Work-Life Attitudes

Lack of salary clarity
Ability to take leave - disparate
Flexible work schedules - disparate
Childcare resources limited
Tenure/Teaching Issues – Faculty Respondents

Successes

- 83% of Faculty respondents felt their research contributions have been/will be valued for tenure and promotion.
- 76% felt their teaching contributions have been/will be valued for tenure and promotion.
- The majority felt that the tenure/promotion process was clear (71%) and reasonable (79%).
- 73% believed their colleagues included them in opportunities that will help their careers as much as they do others in their position.
Successes

- 63% of Faculty respondents felt their international-related activities have been/ will be valued for promotion or tenure
- 57% felt their diversity-related activities have been/will be valued for promotion or tenure
- 57% reported feeling that tenure standards/promotion standards were applied equally to all K-State faculty
Tenure/Teaching Issues – Faculty Respondents

Challenges

• 46% of Faculty respondents felt they performed more work to help students than did their colleagues
• 38% felt burdened by service responsibilities (e.g., committee memberships, departmental work assignments) beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations
• 27% felt pressured to change their research agendas to achieve tenure/promotion
• 11% reported feeling that, in their departments, faculty members who use family accommodation (FMLA) policies were disadvantaged in promotion and tenure
Tenure/Promotion Standards were Applied Equally to All K-State Faculty by Select Demographics (%)
Qualitative Themes
Tenure/Teaching Issues - Faculty

Tenure/promotion standards are not applied equally

Tenure/promotion process is not clear
Student Respondents’ Perceptions
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Majority of Student respondents felt valued by faculty (90%) and other students (87%) in the classroom.

Majority of Student respondents reported that K-State faculty (85%), staff (86%), and administrators (80%) were genuinely concerned with their welfare.

Majority of Student respondents had faculty (85%) and staff (74%) who they perceived as role models.
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

45% of Student respondents felt faculty/instructors prejudged their abilities based on their identities/ backgrounds.

93% of Student respondents indicated that they had opportunities for academic success that were similar to those of their classmates.
Student Respondents Who Did Not See Enough Faculty/Instructors and Staff with Whom They Identified by Select Demographics (%)

* Agree and strongly agree collapsed into one category.
** Disagree and strongly disagree collapsed into one category.
Qualitative Themes
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Faculty concern for their success is disparate
Student Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving K-State

- 22% of Undergraduate Students ($n = 881$)
- 20% of Graduate Students ($n = 167$)
When Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving K-State

- 63% in their first year
- 42% in their second year
- 23% in their third year
## Top Reasons Why Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving K-State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a support group</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homesick</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate was not welcoming</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not like major</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving ($n = 1,048$).
Student Respondents’ Academic Success

Graduate Student respondents perceived greater academic success than did Undergraduate Student respondents.

Women Student respondents perceived greater academic success than did Men Student respondents.
Student respondents who were not Low-Income/First-Generation Students perceived greater academic success than did Student Respondents of Color or Multiple Race Student respondents.
Institutional Actions
Campus Initiatives
FACULTY RESPONDENTS

Many Faculty respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Providing a clear and fair process to resolve conflict
- Providing flexibility for computing the probationary period for tenure (e.g., family leave)
- Providing mentorship for new faculty
Many Faculty respondents thought the following **WOULD POSITIVELY INFLUENCE** the climate:

- Providing salary increases comparable to those offered at other Big 12 institutions
- Providing career span development opportunities for faculty
Many Staff/Administrator respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing diversity training for staff
- Providing career development opportunities for staff was available at K-State
- Providing mentorship for new staff
Many Staff/Administrator respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Providing a clear and fair process to resolve conflicts
- Providing salary increases comparable to peers
Qualitative Themes
Institutional Actions - Employees

Lack of salary increases affects morale

Divergent views on diversity training
Many Student respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing diversity training for students, staff, and faculty
- Providing a person to address student complaints of classroom inequity
- Incorporating issues of diversity and cross-cultural competence more effectively into the curriculum
- Increasing opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue
Many Student respondents thought the following POSITIVELY INFLUENCED the climate:

- Providing effective faculty mentorship of students
- Providing effective career counseling
- Providing more effective academic advisement
Qualitative Themes

Institutional Actions - Students

Divergent views on diversity initiatives

Divergent views on diversity training

Lack of academic advising
K-State 2025: A Visionary Plan for Kansas State University calls for “a work environment that encourages creativity, excellence, and high morale in faculty and staff, responds to changing needs, embraces diversity, values communication and collaboration, and is respectful, trusting, fair, and collegial for all.”
The K-State 2025 Vision and Plan Positively Contribute to…

- K-State’s Research Capacity: 78%
- K-State Identity: 76%
- K-State’s Fund-Raising Efforts: 75%
- The K-State Learning Environment: 74%

Note: Strongly Agree and Agree were collapsed into one category to produce these percentages
The K-State 2025 Vision and Plan Positively Contribute to…

- **71%** K-State Graduate Education
- **70%** K-State Undergraduate Education
- **70%** The Recruitment of Outstanding Talent to K-State
- **68%** K-State Morale

Note: Strongly Agree and Agree were collapsed into one category to produce these percentages
The K-State 2025 Vision and Plan Positively Contribute to…

- 67% • The K-State Living Environment
- 66% • The K-State Working Environment
- 65% • K-State’s Teaching Capacity
- 63% • K-State’s Service Capacity

Note: Strongly Agree and Agree were collapsed into one category to produce these percentages
Differences by Position

- Faculty respondents were less likely than Student, Staff, and Administrator respondents to “strongly agree” or “agree” to all of the items offered.
Qualitative Themes
K-State 2025

Unaware/uninformed of vision and plan

Focus on research over teaching
Summary

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

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

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

The majority of student respondents thought very positively about their academic experiences at K-State.

84% of respondents were comfortable with the overall climate, and 69% with dept/work unit climate.

The majority of employee respondents expressed positive attitudes about work-life issues at K-State.

85% of Undergraduate Student, 79% of Graduate Student, & 72% of Faculty respondents were comfortable with classroom climate.
Overall Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement

- **19% (n = 1,400)** had personally experienced exclusionary conduct within the last year.
- **22% (n = 1,638)** had observed exclusionary conduct within the last year.
- **60% (n = 128)** of Staff/Administrator and **61% (n = 557)** of Faculty respondents seriously considered leaving K-State.
- **3% (n = 198)** of all respondents experienced unwanted sexual contact while at K-State.
Next Steps
Summary Process for Data Access

Final data set to Dr. Dyer and Dr. Middendorf as K-State primary investigators

Prospective investigator forwards one-page proposal to sub-committee

Sub-committee reviews the proposal to see if the research question can be examined with the current data without compromising confidentiality

If approved by the sub-committee, the prospective researcher is contacted and advised to submit an IRB application for the project requesting secondary use of the data set

If approved by the IRB, the researcher is provided only with the data necessary to respond to the question

Data is provided in an aggregated format to ensure confidentiality of the respondents
Process Forward
Sharing the Report with the Community
Spring 2015

Full Power Point available on K-State website
k-state.edu/climatesurvey

Full Report available on K-State website/hard copy in Library
K-State Campus Community Fora

Purpose

• To solicit community input
• To offer “next steps” based on climate report results that will be used to inform actions
• To identify 3 specific actions that can be accomplished in the next 12-18 months
Projected Calendar

**Summer 2015**
- Community provide action items via the website k-state.edu/climatesurvey
- Offer action items by August 1

**Fall 2015**
- Sponsor series of community fora
- Develop 2-3 actions based on the fora

**Spring 2016**
- Distribute actions to the community
- Communicate updates on the progress of the action plan
Fall 2015 Action Plan Fora

- **Dates:** Monday, September 14 – Friday, September 18
- **When:** 8:00 am – 5:00 pm
- **Where:** K-State Student Union
- **Registration:** On-line sign-up

Information will be released on K-State Today and the Climate Survey Website regarding the action plan meetings.

- **Alternate dates for meetings:**
  - Monday, September 21 – Wednesday, September 23
Fall 2015 Action Plan
Forum Composition

1. Faculty
2. Staff
3. Student
4. Salina
5. Olathe
6. Requested Constituent Groups (by August 1)
Questions and Discussion