

Executive Summary

History of the Project

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

The university undertook the "One Miami" Campus Climate Survey to evaluate the current campus climate as experienced and perceived by all members of the university community. The goals are multifold:

1. Identify successful initiatives.
2. Uncover any challenges facing members of our community.
3. Develop strategic initiatives to build on successes, address challenges and create lasting positive change.

To ensure full transparency and to provide a more complete perspective, in December 2016 Miami contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting to help lead this effort. An agency team worked with a Climate Study Work Group of Miami students, staff, and faculty since February 2017 to develop and implement the assessment.

Following focus groups and campus discussions, the survey was distributed in fall 2017. Overall, 24% percent of Miami students, faculty and staff took the survey.

Results will be presented at community forums during the first week of May 2018. This summer, President Crawford will appoint a task force to develop action items stemming from analysis of results.

The final Miami University survey queried various campus constituent groups about their experiences and perceptions regarding the academic environment for students; the workplace environment for faculty, staff and administrators; employee benefits; sexual harassment and sexual violence; racial and ethnic identity; gender identity and gender expression; sexual identity; accessibility and disability services; and other topics.

Only surveys that were at least 50% completed were included in the final data set for analysis. Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic characteristics of the survey respondents. Breakdowns of groups and their responses are among numerous data in the over 500 page full report from Rankin & Associates Consulting.

Quantitative Data Analysis.¹

The data were first analyzed to tabulate individual responses to each of the questions in the survey.² Descriptive statistics were calculated by salient group memberships (e.g., gender identity, racial identity, primary position) to provide additional information regarding participant responses.³ Throughout the report, information is presented using valid percentages.⁴ Actual percentages⁵ with missing or “no response” information may be found in the survey data tables in Appendix B. The purpose for this discrepancy in reporting is to note the missing or “no response” data in the appendices for institutional information while removing such data within the report for subsequent cross tabulations and significance testing using the chi-square test for independence. Chi-square tests identify that significant differences exist but does not specify if differences exist between specific groups. Therefore, these analyses included post-hoc investigations of statistically significant findings by conducting z-tests between column proportions for each row in the chi-square contingency table, with a Bonferroni adjustment for larger contingency tables. This approach is useful because it compares individual cells to each other to determine if they are statistically different. Thus, the data may be interpreted more precisely by showing the source of the greatest discrepancies. The statistically significant distinctions between groups are offered throughout the report. For groups with response rates less than 30%, caution is recommended when generalizing to the entire constituent group.

¹More details on the quantitative and qualitative methods are provided in the methods section of the full report.

²Readers are directed to Appendix B for a complete review of the responses for each question offered in the survey.

³Analyses were performed to explore how survey responses differed based on selected demographic characteristics. All of the findings are presented as percentages of the entire sample or of the subgroups being examined. The percentages in these figures and tables do not always add up to 100% due to respondents being able to select more than one answer to a question (“mark all that apply”) or due to rounding. Where the n’s were considered small enough to compromise the identity of the respondent, $n < 5$ is reported.

⁴Valid percentages were derived using the total number of respondents to a particular item (i.e., missing data were excluded).

⁵Actual percentages were derived using the total number of survey respondents.

Table 1. Miami University Demographics of Population and Sample

Characteristic	Subgroup	Population		Sample		Response
		N	%	n	%	rate
Primary position	Undergraduate Student	21,783	76.6	3,750	56.0	17.2
	Graduate Student	2,539	8.9	455	6.8	17.9
	Faculty	1,494	5.2	865	12.9	59.1
	Administrator with Faculty Rank (e.g., Dean, Provost)	30	0.1	53	0.8	> 100.0
	Administrator without Faculty Rank (e.g., VP, AVP)	11	0.0	88	1.3	> 100.0
	Staff	2598	9.1	1,491	22.2	57.4
Gender identity	Woman	15,027	52.9	4,149	61.9	27.6
	Man	13,398	47.1	2,394	35.7	17.9
	Transpectrum	ND*	ND	75	1.1	N/D
	Other/Missing/Not Reported	ND	ND	84	1.3	N/D
Racial/ethnic identity	American Indian/Alaska Native	61	0.2	20	0.3	32.8
	Black/African American	1,189	4.2	287	4.3	24.1
	Asian/Asian American	737	2.6	472	7.0	64.0
	Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@	1,109	3.9	113	1.7	10.2
	Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian	ND	ND	24	0.4	ND
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	21	0.1	5	0.1	23.8
	White/European American	21,132	74.3	5,135	76.6	24.3
	Multiracial	825	2.9	435	6.5	52.7
Missing/Other/Unknown	3351	11.8	211	3.1	6.3	
Citizenship status	U.S. Citizen	ND	ND	5,760	85.9	ND
	Non-U.S. Citizen/Multiple Citizenships	ND	ND	864	12.9	ND
	Missing/Unknown	ND	ND	78	1.2	ND
Disability status	Single Disability	ND	ND	555	8.3	ND
	No Disability	ND	ND	5,810	86.7	ND
	Multiple Disabilities	ND	ND	260	3.9	ND
	Missing	ND	ND	77	1.1	ND
Religious affiliation	Christian Religious Affiliation	ND	ND	3,651	54.5	ND
	Other Religious Affiliation	ND	ND	381	5.7	ND
	No Religious Affiliation	ND	ND	2,197	32.8	ND
	Multiple Religious Affiliations	ND	ND	277	4.1	ND
	Missing	ND	ND	196	2.9	ND

*ND: No Data Available

Overall Findings

Miami University climate findings⁶ were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.⁷ For example, 70% to 80% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be “very comfortable” or “comfortable.” Similarly, 69% of Miami University respondents indicated that they were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate at Miami University. Twenty to 25% of respondents in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At Miami University, a slightly lower percentage of respondents (17%) 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.⁸

Key Findings – Areas of Strength

1. High levels of comfort with the climate at Miami University

Climate is defined as the “current attitudes, behaviors, and standard of faculty, staff, administrators, and students – as well as the campus environment and university policies – that influence the level of respect for individual needs, abilities, and potential.”⁹ The level of comfort experienced by faculty, staff, and students is one indicator of campus climate.

- 69% of survey respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate at Miami University (Table 20 in full report).
- 68% of Faculty, Staff, and Administrator respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their departments/work units (Table 20 in full report).
- 85% of Student and Faculty respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their classes (Table 20 in full report).

⁶Additional findings disaggregated by primary position and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.

⁷Rankin & Associates Consulting (2016)

⁸Guiffrida, Gouveia, Wall, & Seward (2002); Harper & Hurtado (2007); Harper & Quaye (2004); Hurtado & Ponjuan (2005); Rankin & Reason (2005); Sears (2002); Settles, Cortina, Malley, & Stewart (2006); Silverschanz et al.(2008); Yosso et al. (2009)

⁹Rankin & Reason (2008)

2. Faculty Respondents – Positive attitudes about faculty work

Tenured and Tenure-Track

- 84% of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that teaching was valued by Miami University (Table 70 in full report).

Non-Tenure-Track

- 73% of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that expectations of their responsibilities were clear (Table 73 in full report).
- 84% of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that teaching was valued by Miami University (Table 74 in full report).
- 75% of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that research was valued by Miami University (Table 74 in full report).

All Faculty and Administrators with Faculty Rank

- 75% of Faculty and Administrators with Faculty Rank respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by faculty in their department/program (Table 79 in full report).
- 78% of Faculty and Administrators with Faculty Rank respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by their department chair/program director (Table 79 in full report).
- 86% of Faculty and Administrators with Faculty Rank respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by students in the classroom at Miami University (Table 79 in full report).

3. Staff and Administrators without Faculty Rank Respondents – Positive attitudes about staff work

- 72% of Staff and Administrators without Faculty Rank respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance (Table 61 in full report).
- 71% of Staff and Administrators without Faculty Rank respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that Miami University provided them with resources to pursue training/professional development opportunities (Table 63 in full report).

- 78% of Staff and Administrators without Faculty Rank respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their supervisors were supportive of their taking leave (e.g., vacation, parental, personal, short-term disability) (Table 63 in full report).

4. Student Respondents – Positive attitudes about academic experiences

The way students perceive and experience their campus climate influences their performance and success in college.¹⁰ Research also supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for improving learning outcomes.¹¹ Attitudes toward academic pursuits are one indicator of campus climate.

- 81% of Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by Miami University faculty (Table 99 in full report).
- 75% of Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by campus staff (Table 99 in full report).
- 84% of Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by faculty in the classroom (Table 100 in full report).
- 75% of Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they had faculty whom they perceived as role models and 56% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they had staff whom they perceived as role models (Table 101 in full report).

5. Student Respondents Perceived Academic Success

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the scale, *Perceived Academic Success*. Analyses using this scale revealed: (Tables 84 – 98 in full report)

- A significant difference existed in the overall test for means for Student respondents by gender identity, racial identity, sexual identity, disability status, and income status on *Perceived Academic Success*.

Examples of Findings

- Women Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than did Men Undergraduate Student respondents (Table 85 in full report).

¹⁰Pascarella & Terenzini (2005)

¹¹Hale (2004); Harper & Hurtado (2007); Harper & Quayle (2004)

- White Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than did Asian/Asian American, Black/African American, and Multiracial Undergraduate Student respondents (Table 88 in full report).¹²
- Heterosexual Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than did LGBQ Undergraduate Student respondents (Table 90 in full report).¹³
- No Disability Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than did both Single Disability and Multiple Disability Undergraduate Student respondents (Table 92 in full report).¹⁴
- Not-Low-Income Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than did Low-Income Undergraduate Student respondents (Table 95 in full report).¹⁵

¹²While recognizing the vastly different experiences of people of various racial identities (e.g., Chican@ versus African-American or Latin@ versus Asian-American), and those experiences within these identity categories (e.g., Hmong versus Chinese), Rankin and Associates found it necessary to collapse some of these categories to conduct the analyses as a result of the small numbers of respondents in the individual categories. Per the Climate Study Working Group respondents who identified as more than one racial identity were recoded as Multiracial. Further, the Other People of Color category included respondents who identified as Middle Eastern, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, American Indian/Native, and Alaskan Native. This group is used when Asian/Asian American, Black/African American, and Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ are also distinguished. When comparing significant differences, all racial minorities are grouped together when low numbers of respondents existed (referred to, in this report, as People of Color).

¹³This report collapses respondents who answered “other” in response to the question about their sexual identity and wrote “straight” or “heterosexual” in the adjoining text box as Heterosexual. Additionally, the terms “LGBQ” denotes individuals who self-identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, pansexual, queer, and questioning, as well as those who wrote in “other” terms such as “demisexual,” “asexual,” “biromantic,” and “homoromantic asexual.” Per the Climate Study Working Group for analyses, sexual identity was recoded into the categories LGBQ and Heterosexual to maintain response confidentiality.

¹⁴The Climate Study Working Group proposed three collapsed disability status categories (No Disability, Single Disability, and Multiple Disabilities). For the purposes of some analyses, this report further collapses disability status into two categories (No Disability and At Least One Disability), where Single Disability and Multiple Disabilities were collapsed into one At Least One Disability category.

¹⁵The Climate Study Working Group defined Low-Income Student respondents as those students whose families earned less than \$29,999 annually.

Key Findings – Opportunities for Improvement

1. Members of several constituent groups indicated that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

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

- 20% of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.¹⁸

- 26% noted that the conduct was based on their gender/gender identity, 18% on their political views, 17% on their ethnicity, and 17% on their primary position (Figures 28 – 30 in full report).

- By primary position, a higher percentage of Faculty respondents (24%), Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents (24%), Staff respondents (22%), and Graduate Student respondents (22%) than Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents (19%) and Undergraduate Student respondents (17%) noted that they believed that they had experienced this conduct (Figure 29 in full report).

- A higher percentage of Administrator without Faculty Rank respondents (48%), Staff respondents (34%), Faculty respondents (23%), and Graduate Student respondents (15%) than Administrator with Faculty Rank respondents ($n < 5$) and Undergraduate Student respondents (6%) thought that the conduct was based on their primary position (Figure 29 in full report).

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

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

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

- By gender identity, a higher percentage of Transspectrum respondents (44%), than Women respondents (21%) and Men respondents (17%) indicated that they had experienced this conduct (Figure 28 in full report).
 - A higher percentage of Transspectrum respondents (70%) compared with Women respondents (31%) and Men respondents (12%) who had experienced this conduct indicated that the conduct was based on their gender identity (Figure 28 in full report).
- By racial identity, higher percentages of Multiracial respondents (28%) and Respondents of Color (26%) than White respondents (17%) indicated that they had experienced this conduct (Figure 30 in full report).
 - Higher percentages of Respondents of Color (55%) and Multiracial respondents (39%) than White respondents (3%) who had experienced this conduct indicated that the conduct was based on their ethnic identity (Figure 30 in full report).

2. Several constituent groups – including Women respondents, Multiracial respondents and Respondents of Color, LGBQ respondents, and both Single Disability and Multiple Disabilities respondents – 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, and veterans).¹⁹ Various demographic groups at Miami University indicated that they were

¹⁹Harper & Hurtado (2007); Hart & Fellabaum (2008); Rankin (2003); Rankin & Reason (2005); Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart (2008)

less comfortable than their majority counterparts with the climates of the campus, workplace, and classroom.

Examples of Statistically Significant Findings for Overall Climate at Miami University²⁰

- 19% of Women respondents compared with 27% of Men respondents felt “very comfortable” with the overall climate (Figure 14 in full report).
- 18% of Respondents of Color and 16% of Multiracial respondents compared with 23% of White respondents were “very comfortable” with the overall climate (Figure 17 in full report).
- 12% of LGBTQ respondents compared with 23% of Heterosexual respondents felt “very comfortable” with the overall climate (Figure 20 in full report).
- 8% of Multiple Disability respondents and 16% of Single Disability respondents compared with 23% of No Disability respondents were “very comfortable” with the overall climate (Figure 23 in full report).

Examples of Statistically Significant Findings for Classroom Climate²¹

- 21% of Faculty and Student Respondents of Color and 26% of Multiracial Faculty and Student respondents compared with 34% of White Faculty and Student respondents were “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes (Figure 19 in full report).
- 21% of LGBTQ Faculty and Student respondents compared with 33% of Heterosexual Faculty and Student respondents felt “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes (Figure 22 in full report).
- 24% of Faculty and Student Respondents with a Single Disability and 15% of Faculty and Student Respondents with Multiple Disabilities compared with 32%

²⁰Only 1-scale from a 5-point scale is referenced due to post-hoc analysis testing which determines the statistical significance difference between demographic items. As such, significance was tested at individual points on the scale (i.e., “strongly agree” “agree”) as opposed to combinations of points on the scale (i.e. “strongly agree and agree”).

²¹Only 1-scale from a 5-point Likert Scale is referenced due to post-hoc analysis testing which determines the statistical significance difference between demographic items. As such, significance was tested at individual points on the scale (i.e., “strongly agree” “agree”) as opposed to combinations of points on the scale (i.e. “strongly agree and agree”).

of Faculty and Student Respondents with No Disability felt “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes (Figure 25 in full report).

- 25% of Low-Income Student respondents compared with 32% of Not-Low-Income Student respondents felt “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes (Figure 27 in full report).

3. Faculty and Administrators with Faculty Rank respondents and Staff and Administrators without Faculty Rank Respondents – Seriously Considered Leaving Miami University

- 54% of Faculty and Administrators with Faculty Rank respondents and 58% of Staff and Administrators without Faculty Rank respondents had seriously considered leaving Miami University in the past year (Figure 44 in full report).
 - 54% of those Faculty and Administrators with Faculty Rank respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of low salary/pay rate and 40% of those Faculty and Administrators with Faculty Rank respondents did so because of being interested in a position at another institution (Table 83 in full report).
 - 61% of those Staff and Administrators without Faculty Rank respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of low salary/pay rate and 50% of those Staff and Administrators without Faculty Rank respondents did so because of limited opportunities for advancement (Table 82 in full report).

4. Staff and Administrators without Faculty Rank Respondents – Challenges with work-life issues

- 56% of Staff and Administrators without Faculty Rank Staff and respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that a hierarchy existed within staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than others (Table 62 in full report).
- 52% of Staff and Administrators without Faculty Rank respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their workload increased without additional compensation as a result of other staff departures (Table 62 in full report).

- 25% of Staff and Administrators without Faculty Rank respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that clear procedures existed on how they could advance at Miami University (Table 65 in full report).
- 19% of Staff and Administrators without Faculty Rank respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that staff salaries were competitive (Table 64 in full report).

5. Faculty and Administrators with Faculty Rank Respondents – Challenges with faculty work

- 17% of Faculty and Administrators with Faculty Rank respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that salaries for non-tenure-track faculty were competitive (Table 76 in full report).
- 29% of Faculty and Administrators with Faculty Rank respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that Miami University provided adequate resources to help them manage work-life balance (e.g., child care, wellness services, elder care, housing location assistance, and transportation) (Table 77 in full report).

6. Respondents at Miami University experienced incidents related to unwanted sexual contact or conduct.

One section of the Miami University survey requested information from faculty, staff, and students regarding unwanted sexual contact/conduct.

- 13% of respondents indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact/conduct while at Miami University.
 - 1% experienced relationship violence (e.g., ridiculed, controlling, hitting) (Table B52 in Appendix B).
 - 2% experienced stalking (e.g., following me, on social media, texting, phone calls) (Table B52 in Appendix B).
 - 9% experienced sexual interaction (e.g., cat-calling, repeated sexual advances, sexual harassment) (Table B52 in Appendix B).
 - 4% experienced unwanted sexual contact (e.g. fondling, rape, sexual assault, penetration without consent) (Table B52 in Appendix B).

- The majority of respondents did not report the unwanted sexual contact/conduct.

Conclusion

Miami University's climate assessment report provides baseline data on diversity and inclusion, and addresses Miami University's mission and goals. While the findings may guide decision-making in regard to policies and practices at Miami University, 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 Miami University community with an opportunity to build upon its strengths and to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. Miami University, with support from senior administrators and collaborative leadership, is in a prime position to actualize its commitment to promote an inclusive campus and to institute organizational structures that respond to the needs of its dynamic campus community.