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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

How does it feel to be at Bloomsburg University? That basic question about campus climate is what Bloomsburg University’s 2012 campus climate survey and this report seek to answer. The campus climate informs the experiences of all who live and work here and, to borrow language from the University of Illinois, “is reflected in its structures, policies, and practices; the demographics of its members; the attitudes and values of its members and leaders; and the quality of personal interactions” (Anand, Owens, & Kelly-Wilson, 2012, p. A-2). In the spring of 2012, Bloomsburg University asked its community members — students, faculty and staff — to describe their perceptions of the campus climate by responding to the following:

- Is the campus climate comfortable?
- Is it friendly? Supportive? Fair?
- Do you feel included while you are here? Have you been excluded?
- What are your concerns about the climate?

A total of 2,711 members of the campus community responded and answers suggest most are comfortable here, both in general and in the classroom. When asked How comfortable are you with the climate at Bloomsburg University, more than 82 percent (n = 1,548) of all respondents reported being Very comfortable or Comfortable.1 A higher proportion of students — 86 percent (n = 1,301) — reported being Very comfortable or Comfortable with the climate in the classroom. Respondents also rated the campus as friendly (81 percent, n = 1,592) and welcoming (78 percent, n = 1,526). Most respondents — 85 percent (n = 1,597) — reported they have not experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct that interfered with their ability to work or learn here. Students often identify role models; 70 percent (n = 505) of undergraduates in their third and fourth years identified faculty role models they could relate to and 60 percent (n = 429) identified role models among staff.

Such data are particularly heartening as the campus is increasingly healthy demographically. Bloomsburg University, particularly at the undergraduate level, is more diverse than it has been at any time in its history, as a short demographic sketch below illustrates and survey responses confirm. Any social organism is diverse, reflecting differences that characterize the world, society, and local context. For Bloomsburg’s students and the entire BU community, Bloomsburg’s diversity is increasingly complex, valued, and visible.

Nurturing diversity is important for ethical reasons: people from a range of identities and backgrounds must be given equal access to higher education as a place of learning and as a place of employment and must be supported when they get here.

---

1 Percentages characterizing survey responses throughout reflect the number of respondents answering a particular question, which was usually fewer than the total number of respondents taking the survey. Respondents were allowed to skip questions and some did not complete the entire survey. See p. 78.
Diversity is also important educationally. Education, specifically higher education, increasingly recognizes that important learning happens when diverse people interact with each other in ways that matter (see Clarke & Antonio, 2012; Zepeda, 2010). As an institution whose mission centers on training the next generation to understand the complexities of the diverse modern world and to be civically engaged, it is imperative that we create and maintain a climate that serves as a model our students can take into their professional lives. Diversity of perspectives, identities, and backgrounds teaches critical thinking, ethics, and empathy in ways that homogeneity cannot. The goal of creating a healthy diversity has implications for all sectors of the campus community.

Just as diversity affects and reflects everyone, so does campus climate. A positive campus climate contributes to the willingness of diverse students, faculty, staff, and administrators to come to Bloomsburg University and in their willingness to stay. A positive campus climate enables all constituencies to appreciate and leverage the significant advantages a diverse community provides. As Clarke and Antonio (2012) explain in the case of racial diversity, it is the experience of cross-race interaction that matters. The availability of such interactions due to demographic changes does not matter if people are not talking to each other; campus climate plays a role in the likelihood that they will. According to Clarke and Antonio, “the impact of increased structural diversity…has been found to be contingent on campus racial climate” (2012, p. 27).

Campus climate is created not only by individual community member’s attitudes, but by what community members do, from interactions between individuals and classroom instruction to policy decisions made at all levels. Fostering a warm, equitable, healthy, and honest campus climate requires administrative leadership: the articulation of statements regarding the mission, operating vision, values and related academic and social priorities; corresponding policies and procedures; and a commitment to action (see Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005, for discussion). It requires diversity in the curriculum, equitable tenure policies, and transparent governance procedures. It is influenced by student groups and all staff, faculty, and administrators, as well as by history and demographics.

The goal of this study is to examine attitudes and perspectives from all members of the campus community to create a snapshot of how we appear today and the basis of efforts to improve the campus climate, as needed. Some respondents, for example, believe faculty and staff do not reflect society as a whole, leading them to doubt the university’s commitment to diversity. About half of respondents believe improvements are needed in the relationship between Bloomsburg University and the Town of Bloomsburg. And some students reported concerns about the relationship between students and the Bloomsburg Police Department.
The survey points to areas that are important for creating healthy diversity. Differences in history, culture and experiences must be respected, appreciated, and accommodated; differences in power must be acknowledged. In-groups — those privileged by history, culture, and our economic structure — and out-groups — those marginalized by those same structures — have different levels of power, as well as different experiences (see Glossary, p. 90). While respondents of all genders, races, socioeconomic backgrounds, veteran status, religions, and sexual orientations generally agree in their perception of the campus climate, in-group perceptions tend to be more positive than out-group perceptions. An inclusive campus must be welcoming to all and seek to understand the nature of these diverse experiences, using that understanding to foster future action. It should also be acknowledged that considerable diversity may exist within groups, but this diversity has not been analyzed in the current study.

The crucial questions of Why do people stay? and What makes people feel connected? cannot be answered using these data. It will be important as we move forward to answer these questions and use what we learn to identify actions that empower all constituencies. We must be willing to examine all programs honestly and critically, hold all accountable for creating an inclusive climate and educational context, and discontinue or modify efforts that have not proven successful.

Bloomsburg in General Context: National and State Trends

It is well documented that individuals experience campuses differently, often on the basis of their racial and ethnic backgrounds, sexual orientation, or gender (e.g., Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Rankin & Reason, 2005). These experiences can influence perceptions of climate, which have been shown to affect educational outcomes. Perceptions of hostility or discrimination on campus, for example, have been connected to depression among students and lower institutional commitment (e.g., Nora & Cabrera, 1996), as well as a lower sense of belonging to the campus community (e.g., Locks, Hurtado, Bowman, & Oseguera, 2008).

As the demographic composition of society continues to change, the need to understand issues related to diversity grows. Over the past few decades, the number of non-White students seeking postsecondary degrees in the United States has increased dramatically. According to the U.S. Department of Education, the number of African American\(^2\) students enrolled in postsecondary degree-granting institutions increased nearly 80 percent between 2000 and 2010, while

\(^2\) A note about terminology: federal and PASSHE demographics use the term *African American*, not the term *Black*, and do not include *African* as a response option. In the BU climate survey, respondents were able to choose *African American/Black*, or *African*, or both, or other combinations. *African American* is not synonymous with *Black* or with *African*. For instance, African and Caribbean respondents may identify as Black but not American, and thus may not identify themselves as *African American*. While not all Africans are Black, the overwhelming majority of survey respondents selecting *African* also selected other non-White racial designations; only one respondent chose only *African and European/White*, with no other racial designation. Since experiences of campus climate are shaped by the attitudes of others, attitudes frequently based on appearance, this report combines the responses of African American/Black respondents with those of African respondents, and uses the term *Black* to identify this group.
enrollment of Latino students increased more than 90 percent. White students account for approximately 62 percent of total college enrollment but from 2000 to 2010 enrollment of White students increased by less than 25 percent (United States Department of Education, 2012).

These national trends are apparent within the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE). Between 2000 and 2010, total enrollment in all PASSHE institutions increased approximately 24 percent, to nearly 120,000 students. The total number of students of color increased nearly 90 percent and enrollment of White students grew by approximately 13 percent. Non-White students accounted for nearly 13.5 percent of all PASSHE enrollment in 2010, up from 8.4 percent in 2000.

Enrollment of undergraduate students at BU has increased at a greater rate than most PASSHE institutions. Total enrollment of undergraduate students increased nearly 34 percent between 2000 and 2010, from 6,843 to 9,136. The proportion of students of color grew from about 5.5 percent ($n = 373$) to 13 percent ($n = 1,104$) during this period. Enrollment of African American and Latino undergraduate students more than tripled, from 307 in 2000 to 933 in 2010 and enrollment of White undergraduate students increased by 18 percent.

National and local trends show increasing student body diversity in other areas. Measures of student diversity with respect to sexual orientation and gender expression are more difficult to document as data are not collected on these measures. Anecdotal local evidence and national trends, however, show an increased campus presence of openly gay, lesbian, and transgender students, and a growing acceptance of lesbian, gay, transgender, bisexual, and queer identities by the population as a whole. At Bloomsburg University, one measure of this is the successful Mid-Atlantic LGBTA Conference,3 organized by BU and held annually on campus since 2009.

Access to higher education by students with disabilities has increased since enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990. At Bloomsburg University, the number of students receiving services through the Office of Accommodative Services has nearly doubled in the last decade, from 213 students in 2001-02 to 419 in 2011-12. According to the ADA compliance director, employee need for deaf and hard of hearing interpreting services has been increasing modestly, with faculty requests for adaptive equipment averaging five to seven per year.

Although increasing the diversity of students, staff and faculty is instrumental in developing a welcoming and inclusive community, this act alone will not necessarily translate into educational gains for students (see Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005). In addition to providing equitable access to students from a range of economic, racial, ethnic, and other backgrounds and identities,

---

3 “Mid-Atlantic LGBTA Conference” is the official conference title; LGBTA stands for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Allies.
institutions of higher learning must also address discrepancies in the academic success rates of
different demographic student populations.

For example, the national rate is about 58 percent for the 2005 cohort of students completing a
bachelor’s degree within six years. Among White students, the national rate is slightly more than
62 percent, while for Latino and Black students the graduation rates are about 51 percent and 40
percent, respectively. Similarly, among BU students starting their bachelor’s degrees in 2004,
nearly 63 percent completed degrees within six years: 66 percent of White students, about 40
percent of Black students and 42 percent of Latino students. Low socioeconomic status is
correlated with lower graduation rates. Among students admitted as part of Act 101, a program
designed to increase access to higher education for students at a financial, cultural, social, or
educational disadvantage, graduation rates were less than 38 percent.

According to Harvard’s National Campus Diversity Project (2004) a gap of even 10 percent
between students overall and non-privileged groups is an indicator of a systemic problem. The
gaps in graduation rates at BU (about 23 percent for African American students compared to
White students and about 25 percent for Act 101 students compared to all students) are likely
influenced to some degree by the campus climate at BU.

The Local Context

Bloomsburg University is committed to building and supporting a strong, inclusive, diverse
community. BU lists collaboration, community, diversity, and respect as values held by its
students, faculty, and staff; includes among its six vision statements the aspiration to be a diverse
community that produces positive change; and includes among its four strategic goals both
enhancing academic excellence and developing a strong sense of community.

As a predominately White institution (PWI) situated in an overwhelmingly White geographic
area, Bloomsburg faces the challenge of making these concepts realities for all students, faculty,
and staff. Positive steps include establishment of the Town of Bloomsburg’s Community Task
Force on Racial Equity in response to a 1992 incident in which a cross was burned on the steps
of Carver Hall. 4 Still in existence today, the university/community entity offers a variety of
services, including educational presentations, mediation, a diversity summit for regional high
schools, and an annual Martin Luther King Jr. dinner. While many Task Force members believe
the community climate and community efforts around diversity, particularly racism, have
improved, further change is needed (Feldhaus, Young-Harrison, Meyers, Jarvis, & McMillan,
2012).

4 Details of the incident, its antecedents, and BU’s response can be found in Bloomsburg University Archives,
Likewise, the Town of Bloomsburg has been designated a “No Place for Hate” community since 2004. The Anti-Defamation League, which grants the designation, requested increased Town-University collaboration in 2008 after an incident at the homecoming dance. Increased collaboration has included recent diversity training provided by the Department of Justice, sponsored by Town police, and attended by Bloomsburg University and local State police. Jim Hollister, BU’s assistant vice president for external relations, considers communication and collaboration between the Town of Bloomsburg and BU to be at its most constructive since his arrival in 1980.

A roadblock to inclusion can occur when external opposition combines with internal resistance to change and a lack of awareness in the ways the experiences of minority groups differ from the experiences of the majority (see Rankin & Reason, 2005). This lack of awareness stems from the misconception that the groups enjoying greater power are homogenous, and diversity is an issue pertinent only to out-groups. In general, raising the level of cultural awareness for all groups is necessary to help campus community members more fully appreciate the experiences of their own groups, other groups, and the interactions within and between groups.

An example from 2008 illustrates both the challenges of Bloomsburg’s geographical context and the appearance of biases. Bloomsburg Police sent an estimated 30 to 40 town, regional, and State Police officers to campus in response to an incident before a dance where the majority of participants were Black students. When the officers arrived, some were on horses, some handling dogs, and most wearing riot gear, the dance had not begun. Students were waiting outside, and the wait was particularly long due to an elaborate security procedure that had been put in place for this dance. A disturbance near the front of the line prompted university police to request assistance from Bloomsburg Police, and during the effort to disperse the crowd, pepper spray and batons were used, and some students were knocked down (Jones, Sablo, & Dowling, 2009). The students involved, along with others on campus, perceived the incident as evidence of racial tension, stereotyping, and racist double standards. Other students, some BU faculty and staff, and commentary in the local paper, blamed the students. Comments published anonymously in the local newspaper’s “30 Seconds” opinions column and on the non-university-affiliated online information source, BloomToday.com, were overtly racist (e.g., Press Enterprise, November 11, 2008, p. 23).

The university has worked to foster a diverse and inclusive community through strong support of programs that make higher education accessible to students from a range of socioeconomic groups and levels of academic preparation, including Act 101, TRiO Upward Bound, University Tutorial Services, and TRiO Student Support Services, and through diversity-related events, such as the President’s Conversation on Diversity (2005-2009). It has established offices charged with serving particular out-groups, such as the Multicultural Center, the Women’s Resource Center, and the LGBT Resource Center. The university also established bodies focused on meaningful
inclusion and diversity, including the Protected Class Committee, Commission on the Status of Women, Human Relations Committee, and, most recently, the Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion. It has supported the Task Force on Racial Equity and sponsored research in support its mission. These groups, however, often function separately, duplicate services, and lack coordination.

The Climate Survey

Background

The 2008 homecoming incident prompted a chain of events leading to BU’s 2012 campus climate survey. BU enlisted an external panel to help facilitate community dialogue and full institutional understanding of the incident. The panel, made up of higher education administrators (a dean of Student Life and a provost for educational equity) and a higher education security professional (a security consultant) met with groups of students at an open forum, interviewed other members of the campus community, reviewed documents, and wrote a 23-page final report that concluded with 42 recommendations, finalizing it in February 2009 (Jones, Sablo, & Dowling, 2009). The report topped its list of recommendations with this one: “University leadership must do much more to strengthen the climate for diversity and student engagement.” It identified nine “recurring patterns and issues common to White institutions of higher education” which the panel viewed as relevant to Bloomsburg, including research showing gaps in satisfaction by race and a tendency of the majority to overestimate minority group satisfaction.

In the summer of 2009 the university established the Diversity and Inclusion Task Force, a large group of faculty, staff, and students (see footnote, p. 83) appointed by the president and charged with developing a diversity and inclusion strategic plan that would move BU forward. The Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion presented its plan to the administration in June 2010 (see Appendix C, p. 82). The process of developing a campus climate survey for Bloomsburg University began in summer 2011, with the aim of gathering data that would enable the institution to understand its strengths and weaknesses with respect to its campus climate, and help it prioritize and implement the Diversity Strategic Plan articulated by the Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion.

The survey itself

In order to make full use of the existing research on campus diversity while being cognizant of the unique needs and culture of this specific campus, the Diversity and Inclusion Survey Leadership Team designed a multiphase study that included focus groups with key populations, a campus-wide survey, and follow-up meeting with campus community members. Focus groups provided a more detailed understanding of the specific experiences of different populations on campus and helped the team to refine the survey before its dissemination. The focus groups
included faculty, staff, and students and sought information on gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality, veteran status, employment status, and national origin. The online survey was distributed to a wide range of campus groups in spring 2012 to gather data and test patterns identified in the focus groups. In all, 2,711 students, faculty, staff, and administrators responded to the survey.

Details on the survey methodology may be found in Appendix A, on page 75. The survey instrument may be viewed at http://bloomu.edu/climate_survey.

**Opportunities for further analysis**

This report is intended as a summary of survey data. The results presented here, based on analytical procedures, offer insight into the perspectives and experiences of the dynamic community that is Bloomsburg University. They will provide a foundation as BU strengthens and develops structures, policies, and programs that will foster an increasingly inclusive and diverse community.

The survey has provided a set of quantitative and qualitative data and gives an overview of key findings. However, this report does not analyze diversity within groups or examine overlapping identities. It does very little to analyze the role of religion in perceptions of campus climate and it does not examine caregiver status or opinions about leave.

The data may be used in conjunction with other available institutional data, such as results of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) which asks students how often they have interracial/intercultural interactions. The available data may be used to explore these and other important topics, yielding further insight into how BU can better support and develop its campus as a place of diversity and inclusion.
Key Findings

- All constituencies report comfort with the climate at Bloomsburg University, both in general and in the classroom, far more often than they report discomfort. In general, all groups rate Bloomsburg University as Friendly and Welcoming (see p. 27).

- While most are comfortable at BU, the institution needs to be aware of a persistent gap between in-group and out-group perceptions and experiences. For instance, the data show that non-White, non-heterosexual, and disabled members of the Bloomsburg University community perceive aspects of the campus climate less positively than their in-group peers (see p. 30), and those out-groups have noteworthy experiences of exclusion more often (see pp. 30, 42).

- Employees of color perceive a less positive, equitable and supportive workplace climate than do their coworkers (see p. 62).

- Female employees, both faculty and staff, report higher levels of inequity, stress, and lack of support (see p. 62).

- A portion of employees, as well as some students, express concern about the institutional commitment to diversity; they also believe that the institution does not always follow its own policies (see pp. 34, 47).

- Faculty and staff express concern that hiring and promotion procedures are inequitable or inconsistent with stated policy (see pp. 65-66).

- All groups express concern about a lack of communication between the university and the Town of Bloomsburg, and see Bloomsburg Police Department treatment of BU students as a problem, with particular concern among some sub-groups (see pp. 68, 70 for a focus on Bloomsburg Police).
Recommendations

Recommendations are based on the data analysis combined with the survey report team’s academic expertise, prior research, and knowledge of the BU campus. Recommendations are included throughout the report, concluding each section. An overview is given here.

I. Institutional structures to support a diverse, inclusive climate:

A. The university should take a proactive approach to developing a truly diverse, inclusive community (see p. 33). While the university has often responded to incidents, it must be willing to look for areas of concern before incidents bring them to their attention.

Action items:
- Continue institutional research around questions of inclusion.
- Conduct follow-up climate study in fall of 2015 so results are available for consideration when developing the new strategic plan.
- Encourage greater integration among the various efforts to improve campus climate: greater visibility of efforts, a clarification of roles and relationships, clear communication, and complementary and coordinated services.

B. Given the perception of some members of the campus community that BU’s institutional commitment to diversity exists largely at the level of policy and is difficult to enforce at the level of day-to-day practice (see p. 34), more must be done to follow through.

Action items:
- The university must follow up on efforts to recruit diverse faculty and staff candidates with serious efforts to hire such candidates, and to mentor and support them once they are hired.
- Active efforts should be made to recruit a diverse pool of students to be offered admission, in addition to diversifying the pool of students admitted through particular programs, such as Act 101.

C. Demographic diversity has little meaning for learning if community members rarely interact with people they perceive to be different. While some difference between in-group and out-group perceptions of bias are likely inevitable (see p. 38), the goal should be to have as little difference between groups as possible.

Action items:
- Increase inter-group interaction through programs such as living and learning communities, first-year experiences, and community learning.
- Raise awareness of the challenges faced by each group and increase levels of empathy across groups through both education and structured, shared experiences.
D. Faculty perceptions of bias are worth further analysis (see p. 37). A variety of factors may explain faculty’s increased perception of bias, including contact with others through classes, mentoring, and advising. Formal efforts to address bias often focus on helping those against whom the bias is directed and occur as reaction to specific incidents. Proactive, shared efforts will help alleviate the stress and exhaustion cited by those most directly affected by bias.

**Action items:**
- Create a formal, shared structural support for creating an inclusive environment for all community members, a structure to which constituencies across the institution are committed.

**II. Preventing and responding to inappropriate conduct:**

The relatively high proportion of respondents reporting having observed and experienced inappropriate conduct (see p. 40), particularly among staff and faculty, indicate a need for better prevention of and responses to such incidents (see p. 47).

**Action items:**
- Raise awareness among all constituencies of what behaviors are inappropriate.
- Make clear the official means of addressing such behaviors.
- Assure that official procedures are not unduly burdensome or intimidating to victims.
- Assure that services for victims, such as those provided by the Women’s Resource Center, are well advertised and readily available.

**III. The curriculum and the co-curriculum:**

Many students seem to be unaware of the diversity of contemporary U.S. society (see p. 33). The university should reinforce student awareness of patterns outside BU and the local region.

**Action items:**
- Requirements of MyCore, the new general education model, may contribute to students’ diversity awareness. Specific to diversity are the requirements for citizenship skills (Goal 10: Exhibit responsible citizenship) and an understanding of diversity (Goal 4: Apply knowledge from the humanities and other disciplines to analyze the implications of diversity among human groups, their histories, cultures, and the plurality of human experiences).
- Extend efforts to identify where racial tension is present, where students, staff, and faculty perceive and experience tension, and what can be done to alleviate the tension (see p. 39).
- Provide professional development to prepare faculty for classroom discussions on sensitive topics and to manage tension that results from frank discussions of issues of diversity that ultimately lead to productive dialogue and change.
• Identify, understand, and intervene in racial tension in the residence halls or other social areas.

**IV. Instructional practice:**

A. Students report inappropriate behavior occurs in relatively controlled settings, such as classrooms (see p. 44). This suggests a need and an opportunity for faculty leadership and professional development.

**Action items:**

• Provide faculty professional development on how to organize group work and other classroom activities in inclusive ways.

B. The significant demographic differences among students in the four academic colleges warrant further study (see p. 53). For example, African American undergraduates are nearly three times better represented among undergraduates as a whole than they are in majors within the College of Science and Technology.

**Action items:**

• Review each college’s “gateway” courses (the introductory-level courses required for admission to majors in that college).
• Review methods of making discipline-specific academic support available to students interested in all majors.
• Review admissions criteria to:
  o assure that admitted students are academically qualified for college-level work.
  o identify those worthy of admission but in need of timely, adequate, discipline-specific remedial preparation, ideally embedded in their pre-college educational experience (e.g., summer institutes, and partnerships with secondary schools).

**V. Student support:**

A. The university should continue to support programs with proven success in improving retention rates.

**Action items:**

• Support and extend programs supporting first-year students (e.g., living and learning communities and first-year seminars).
• Continue to emphasize high-impact practices (see comment below).
• Foster student relationships with role models and mentors (see p. 57).
  o Assure a diverse faculty and staff; continue and extend programs offering support to particular student groups. Such institutional supports have an effect, as may be seen in Black students’ high rates of role model identification among staff, and
lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning (LGBTQ) student identification of faculty role models.

- Foster connections between faculty, staff and students that transcend group boundaries through established methods such as small class sizes, mentoring, and research partnerships (see comment about high-impact practices, below).
- BU should consider expanding establishing mechanisms for offering funds to students in financial crisis (for instance, see pp. 28, 32).

B. Bloomsburg’s emphasis on high-impact educational practices coincides with the development of an inclusive campus climate, as many of these practices support student retention; foster interactions among students and between students, faculty, and staff; and provide knowledge about and experiences with diversity. Of the 10 high-impact practices identified by the Association of American of Colleges and Universities, seven are likely to improve the climate on and off campus climate:

- First-year seminars and experiences
- Learning communities
- Collaborative assignments and projects (if well structured for inclusion—see comment above about group work, as well as p. 42)
- Undergraduate research
- Diversity/global learning
- Service learning, community-based learning
- Internships

Hurtado and DeAngelo emphasize the value of many of these measures for the development of mature, informed, thinking on social topics:

Curricular-based initiatives — including ethnic and women’s studies, study abroad, and community service as part of a class — are associated with higher scores in civic awareness and complex thinking skills for a diverse democracy. In the past, these initiatives have not been tied together, because they have different historical origins and are even coordinated in different campus units that often do not communicate with each other… The examination of student outcomes, however, helps us begin to identify that not only do different initiatives on campus produce similarly desirable outcomes among college students, but they also share important elements that expose students to diverse perspectives and ways of life and that challenge students to set aside their own embedded worldviews to consider those of another. (2012, p. 22).

Coordinating curricular and co-curricular educational opportunities and recognizing their potential to be mutually reinforcing can help solidify BU’s commitment to and understanding of their value.
VI. Workplace equity:

Data suggest female employees and employees of color experience the workplace as less supportive, less respectful, and more pressure-filled (see p. 62). This pattern has negative implications for BU’s ability to recruit and retain employees in these groups. More effort is necessary to help ensure equal treatment of all groups.

Action items.

- Clarify the promotion process and help candidates effectively document teaching efforts. Align the promotion process to the collective bargaining agreement with fidelity. Provide guidance to departments and promotion committees regarding the consideration of teaching documentation (see p. 66).
- Monitor hiring and disciplinary procedures carefully to assure equity and to encourage those who witness unfair actions to come forward (see p. 65).
- Examine gender dynamics in staff assignments and treatment to assure equity.
- Conduct exit interviews with faculty and staff who choose to leave the university (see p. 49) to help the institution understand why some community members choose to leave and to gain insight into how better to retain people in the future.

VII. Community relationships:

A. Bloomsburg’s ability to recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff are dependent in large part on the Town of Bloomsburg being a good place to live. BU’s ability to effectively pursue Strategic Issue 4 in the strategic plan, Impact 2015: Building on the Past, Leading for the Future, is contingent on positive collaborative relationships between these two entities. Strategic Issue 4 focuses on: Fostering and developing a strong sense of community. Respondents believe better communication and collaboration between the university and town would enhance the interactions of all (see p. 68).

Action items:

- Continue, support, and extend positive Town-University interactions through formal relationships with Town-based entities, such as the relationship with the Moose Exchange as a home for the College of Liberal Arts’ Center for Visual and Performing Arts, and the development of the Bloomsburg University Foundation’s home, The Greenly Center, downtown.
- Support and extend programs that involve students in the community, both one-time events like The Big Event and through more extended interactions, such as internships, community-based research, service learning, and community service (again, see high impact practices, above).
- Continue current efforts to revitalize the Task Force on Racial Equity as a vehicle for improvement in the off-campus climate.
• Relationships between students and Bloomsburg Police should be improved (see p. 70).

**Action item:**
• Consider additional and/or alternative processes for addressing incidents involving members of the Bloomsburg Police Department and students. At present, signed complaints about a Bloomsburg Police Department action must be presented directly to the Police Chief or designee. The Bloomsburg Police Department website does not include a formal mechanism for review of complaints.

**VIII. The Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:**

In addition to specific recommendations growing from the findings, this report cites relevant recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan (Appendix C, p. 82).

The Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan, submitted to the president in June 2010, recommends action in five broad areas:

1. Increase recruitment, retention, and graduation rates for historically underrepresented and underserved students.
2. Improve recruitment and retention for a diverse administration, faculty, and staff.
3. Strive to improve inclusivity in teaching and to incorporate diversity and inclusion in significant ways in teaching, learning, and research.
4. Work on campus and in local communities to develop partnerships, establish programs, and plan events that create an environment that supports diversity and inclusion.
5. Develop and maintain a permanent system of accountability and responsibility involving all campus entities to ensure diversity and inclusion. This system should exist independent of, but work with, University Planning and Assessment.

The findings of this report and the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan’s specific suggestions of actions support these broad recommendations. In referring to the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan, this report does not enumerate the Strategic Plan’s most detailed suggestions, which may be found in the referenced section of the Strategic Plan.
2. SURVEY RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

Total Survey Respondents

In spring 2012, the total population of the BU campus community was 10,740. Approximately 25 percent of the BU community participated in the climate survey, providing 2,711 usable responses. 5

Primary Position

Although most of the respondents were students, they are slightly underrepresented in our sample: 23 percent of students overall took the survey. Faculty and staff were better represented in our sample, with more than 40 percent of each taking the survey. The highest response rates were among administrators: more than 60 percent of administrators took the survey.

Table 2.1 Population and Sample Respondents, by Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Population (N)</th>
<th>Population %</th>
<th>Sample (n)</th>
<th>Sample %</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>9,611</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty</td>
<td>346 b</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Faculty</td>
<td>190 b</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>513 c</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators/Directors</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Percentages characterizing survey responses throughout reflect the number of respondents answering a particular question, which was usually fewer than the total number of respondents taking the survey. Respondents were allowed to skip questions and some did not complete the entire survey. See p. 71.
**Race and Ethnicity**

After considerable discussion, the diversity leadership team decided to use the term *race* as a descriptor of different groups denoting phenotypical distinctions rather than *ethnicity*. While these terms are sometimes used interchangeably, *ethnicity* technically refers to distinct cultural groups. It was the sense of the team that the term *race* enables a broad reference to groups and individuals based on their physical appearance. While the term *race* used in this fashion is not scientifically acceptable in the disciplines of biology or anthropology, it has been used as a social construct to manage and regulate human and social intercourse and to confer value, worthiness and privilege. Therefore, because race as a socially constructed term has been central to the American experience, it is useful to the purposes of this survey. The 2,543 respondents who provided data for race (ethnicity) are detailed below in Table 2.2. Race data specific to faculty respondents are provided in Table 2.3. Respondents were instructed to indicate all categories that apply.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Population (N)</th>
<th>Population %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Sample (n)</th>
<th>Sample %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European-American/White</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>7,963</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Native Hawaiian,</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern, African,</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean/West Indian, Indian</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subcontinent</td>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or Unknown</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Categories for race/ethnicity provided in the survey differed slightly than those used by the institution. Some categories provided in the survey are not reported by the institution.

<sup>a</sup> Based on the total BU community population for which race/ethnicity data are available (N = 10,573).

<sup>b</sup> Based on the number of survey respondents who provided race/ethnicity data (n = 2,543).
Table 2.3  Population and Sample Respondents, Faculty Only by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Population ((N))</th>
<th>Population (%) (a)</th>
<th>Sample ((n))</th>
<th>Sample (%) (b)</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European-American/White</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern, African, Caribbean/West Indian, Indian subcontinent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Categories for race/ethnicity provided in the survey differed slightly than those used by the institution. Some categories provided in the survey are not reported by the institution.

\(a\) Based on the total BU faculty population for which race/ethnicity data are available (\(N = 523\)).

\(b\) Based on the number of faculty survey respondents who provided race/ethnicity data (\(n = 195\)).

**Gender Identification**

The 2,576 respondents who provided data for gender identification are detailed in Table 2.4. Of our respondents, 66 percent (\(n = 1,693\)) self-identified as women. Fourteen individuals identified as intersex, five as transgender, four as “other,” and the remaining 33 percent (\(n = 860\)) as men. Of the students, about 67 percent (\(n = 1,435\)) were women and about 32 percent were men (\(n = 691\)). Five respondents who selected transgender and the four who selected “other” identified themselves as students. Twelve students identified themselves as intersex. According to the Office of Institutional Research, women make up about 57 percent (\(n = 6,140\)) of the campus community, yet account for approximately 66 percent (\(n = 1,693\)) of the survey sample; thus, women in general were slightly oversampled. Among employees, 54 percent (\(n = 100\)) of faculty respondents identified as women, as did about 47 percent (\(n = 22\)) of administrator respondents. Nearly 70 percent (\(n = 136\)) of staff respondents identified as women.

---

6 Respondents were given four gender identification options: man, woman, intersex, and transgender. **Intersex** was defined for survey takers as “A person born with reproductive organs or sexual anatomy that does not fit typical definitions of female or male.” **Transgender** was defined for survey takers as “Someone whose gender identity does not conform to traditional ideas about how males and females present themselves.”
### Table 2.4 Population and Sample Respondents, by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Population (N)</th>
<th>Population %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Sample (n)</th>
<th>Sample %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>5,552</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4,059</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersex</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Categories for gender identification provided in the survey differed than those used by the institution. Some categories provided in the survey are not reported by the institution.

<sup>a</sup> Based on the total BU community population (N = 10,740).

<sup>b</sup> Based on the number of survey respondents who provided gender identification data (n = 2,576).
**Sexual Orientation**

The majority of respondents identified themselves as heterosexual, with a larger majority among faculty and staff. This report uses *LGBTQ* as an acronym to designate those who chose *lesbian, gay, bisexual,* or *questioning,* as well as those who in their comments identified their sexual orientation as *transgender, queer,* or other clearly non-heterosexual designations.\(^7\) A large number of respondents — 381 — selected *asexual* as their sexual orientation; given this unexpectedly high number, and some of the comments, we hypothesize that respondents, particularly student respondents, may have been understanding the term *asexual* in ways other than as a descriptor for sexual orientation (perhaps as a descriptor of behavior). When analyzing trends based on sexual orientation later in this report, comparisons are made between heterosexual and LGBTQ respondents; respondents identifying themselves as *asexual* are not considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation Subgroup</th>
<th>Sample (n)</th>
<th>Sample %(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual(^b)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Data regarding sexual orientation are not reported by the institution.

\(^a\) Based on the number of survey respondents who provided sexual orientation data (n = 2,533).

\(^b\) Respondents selecting only *Asexual* to identify their sexual orientation.

Among the 152 LGBTQ respondents, 45 percent (n = 68) identified as bisexual, 21 percent (n = 32) as gay, 16 percent (n = 25) as lesbian, and 18 percent (n = 27) as questioning. Institutional data are not available for sexual orientation.

\(^7\) Survey respondents were asked, “Which term best describes your sexual orientation,” and the response options were *Bisexual, Gay, Heterosexual, Lesbian, Questioning, Other,* and *Asexual.* No definition of *asexual* was offered. Multiple responses were permitted. Those choosing *asexual* and another term were included based on the other term or terms. Those choosing *asexual* and *other* who clarified in their comments with responses like “straight,” “queer,” “transgender” or “I’m a man who likes women” were added to either the LGBTQ or the heterosexual category based on their comment.
**Disability**

Among all respondents, 10.6 percent \((n = 251)\) identified themselves as having a life-affecting disability. Respondents were able to choose multiple responses for any life-affecting disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Status Subgroup</th>
<th>Population ((N))</th>
<th>Population % (^a)</th>
<th>Sample ((n))</th>
<th>Sample % (^b)</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without Disability</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,118</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Disability</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Institutional data on disabilities are available only for students.

\(^a\) Based on the total BU community population \((N = 10,740)\).

\(^b\) Based on the number of survey respondents who provided disability status data \((n = 2,369)\).

The higher percentage of student survey respondents reporting disabilities than institutional data would predict may indicate that students with disabilities responded to the survey at disproportionately high levels, but it may also reflect the fact that many respondents with disabilities do not identify them in an official way. Frequencies of cited disabilities among student respondents are provided in Table 2.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Disability</th>
<th>((n))</th>
<th>Disability % (^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADHD</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional/psychological</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asperger’s</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic brain injury</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/mobility ambulatory</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/mobility non-ambulatory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Based on the number of student survey respondents who reported having a disability \((n = 210)\).
Among the 210 students reporting having a disability, the most commonly cited disabilities were ADHA (34.8 percent, \( n = 73 \)), emotional/psychological (22.4 percent, \( n = 47 \)), and learning (14.3 percent, \( n = 30 \)). Among the 41 employees reporting having a disability, 56 percent (\( n = 23 \)) were faculty, about 42 percent (\( n = 17 \)) were staff and one was an administrator (\( n = 1 \)). The most commonly cited disabilities among employees were hearing (26.8 percent, \( n = 11 \)), medical/health (22 percent, \( n = 9 \)), and physical/ambulatory and “other” (both 17.1 percent, \( n = 7 \)).

**Religion**

Of the 2,494 respondents that provided their religious affiliation, the majority identified themselves as Christian, with large proportions identifying themselves as agnostic, not religious, or uncertain. Smaller percentages identified themselves with non-Christian religions. Respondents were able to select multiple affiliations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation Subgroup</th>
<th>Sample ((n))</th>
<th>Sample %(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehovah’s Witness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox Christian</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic, Atheist, Not Religious, Uncertain</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Based on the number of survey respondents who provided religious affiliation data \((n = 2,494)\).
Financial Hardship

Due to the impact financial struggles can have on educational experience and attainment, this study asked respondents to identify experiences of financial hardship while at Bloomsburg.

At BU, as in the United States generally, poverty is associated with not being White. Proportionally, more students of color, and particularly Black students, experience financial hardship than do White students. While 45 percent \( (n = 547) \) of White students report financial hardship, 52 percent \( (n = 175) \) of students of color do so. The proportion is higher among African American/Black/African students, with 67 percent \( (n = 65) \) reporting financial hardship. According to the Office of Institutional Research, 2,586 (27 percent) of our spring 2012 students received need-based Pell Grants, and 2,932 (31 percent) are first-generation college students.

When asked if they experienced financial hardship while studying at BU, 41 percent \( (n = 725) \) of students reported that they did. A smaller proportion of students identified their own or, if they were still dependents, their family’s income as being $34,500 or below, with 27 percent \( (n = 558) \) giving this low estimate.

Veterans

Seventy-four veterans responded to the survey, representing 2.9 percent of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Population (N)</th>
<th>Population % ( a )</th>
<th>Sample (n)</th>
<th>Sample % ( b )</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Institutional data on veteran status are available only for students.

\( a \) Based on the total BU community population \( (N = 10,740) \).

\( b \) Based on the number of survey respondents who provided veteran status data \( (n = 2,568) \).
Caregiving

Many members of the campus community report caregiving responsibilities. Table 2.10 provides the frequencies of cited caregiving responsibilities among respondents. Parenting responsibilities among student respondents are detailed in Table 2.11.

Table 2.10 Sample Respondents, by Caregiving Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Caregiver Type</th>
<th>Sample (n)</th>
<th>Sample %a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Pregnant</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool children</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School-aged children</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary caregiver for elderly family member</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary caregiver for person with significant disability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older children not at home</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older children at home</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Pregnant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool children</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School-aged children</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary caregiver for elderly family member</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary caregiver for person with significant disability</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older children not at home</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older children at home</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Based on the number of survey respondents who provided caregiving responsibilities data (n = 2,550).

Table 2.11 Parenting Responsibilities Among Student Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Responsibility</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>Responsibility %a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent with another adult in household</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent with another adult not in household</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Based on the number of student survey respondents who reported having parenting responsibilities (n = 143).
Citizenship Status

The vast majority of BU students, faculty, and staff are citizens born in the United States. Trends among non-citizens, naturalized or dual citizens, permanent residents and internationals are among those that this summary report does not analyze.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Citizenship Status</th>
<th>Sample (n)</th>
<th>Sample %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>U.S. Citizen</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Citizen – Naturalized</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Citizen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent Resident</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>U.S. Citizen</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Citizen – Naturalized</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Citizen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent Resident</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on the number of survey respondents who provided citizenship status data (n = 2,500).*
3. THE CAMPUS CLIMATE AT BLOOMSBURG UNIVERSITY

Overall Comfort with the Climate at Bloomsburg University

Respondents were asked to rate their level of comfort with the climate at Bloomsburg University, with options of Very comfortable, Comfortable, neutral (Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable), Uncomfortable, or Very uncomfortable. The survey did not offer an explanation of what was intended by “comfort.”

About 82 percent ($n = 1,548$) of respondents reported being Comfortable or Very comfortable with the climate at BU. Only 6 percent ($n = 115$) report any level of discomfort with the climate, and less than 1 percent ($n = 12$) reporting being Very uncomfortable with the climate.\(^8\)

- In their department/division/unit: 84 percent ($n = 1,574$)
- In their classes: 81 percent ($n = 1,485$)

Respondents overall rated the campus as Friendly (81 percent, $n = 1,541$), Welcoming (78 percent, $n = 1,481$), Cooperative (71 percent, $n = 1,340$), Respectful (70 percent, $n = 1,324$), and Improving (65 percent, $n = 1,219$). Fewer than 10 percent of respondents gave negative ratings in these areas. The highest negative rating was for Disrespectful, with 9 percent ($n = 169$) choosing this rating. The statistical analysis below offers further insight into the way various groups differed in their ratings of the campus climate on these scales, and confirms the general trend of in-group perceptions differing from those of out-groups.

The highest levels of comfort were reported by Whites, with 83 percent ($n = 1,231$) reporting high levels of comfort and 5 percent ($n = 80$) reporting low levels. Eighty-two percent of women ($n = 992$) reported comfort, compared with 84 percent ($n = 542$) of men. The number of respondents who answered this question and chose neither man nor woman as their gender identification was too small to be predictive (16 respondents), but suggests higher levels of neutrality and discomfort with the overall climate, although they do not report discomfort within their departments/units/divisions. Latino/Hispanic respondents indicated slightly higher levels of comfort (85 percent, $n = 46$), with just 5 percent ($n = 3$) reporting discomfort.

Levels of comfort are lower for non-White groups other than Latinos. Overall, 79 percent ($n = 310$) of non-Whites reported comfort and 9 percent ($n = 36$) reported discomfort. Among BU’s largest single non-White group, Blacks, comfort levels were lower; 77 percent of respondents ($n = 69$) reported comfort with the climate at BU, while 9 percent ($n = 8$) reported discomfort. Comfort was lower still for the small number of Native American respondents and respondents choosing “other” to describe their race or ethnicity.

---

\(^8\) Percentages characterizing survey responses throughout reflect the number of respondents answering a particular question. Respondents were allowed to skip questions and some did not complete the entire survey. See p. 71.
Students

As a group, students were the most comfortable with BU’s climate overall, with 85 percent \( (n = 1,295) \) reporting comfort and 4 percent \( (n = 63) \) reporting discomfort. They were more comfortable still with the climate in their own department/division/unit, with 86 percent \( (n = 1,307) \) reporting comfort and 3 percent \( (n = 44) \) reporting discomfort. Male and female students reported similar levels of comfort overall (men, 87 percent \( n = 434 \); women, 85 percent, \( n = 849 \)). Men were slightly more comfortable than women with the climate within their department/division/unit (men, 88 percent, \( n = 440 \); women, 85 percent, \( n = 855 \)). Men were more likely than women to say they were Very comfortable with the climate, both at BU and within departments, (men, overall 37 percent, \( n = 185 \), within department, 46 percent, \( n = 228 \); women, overall 32 percent, \( n = 316 \), within department, 40 percent, \( n = 403 \)).

White students reported somewhat higher levels of comfort than students of color, with a greater discrepancy at the department/division/unit level. When asked about their comfort level with the overall climate at BU, 87 percent \( (n = 996) \) of White students reported comfort, compared with 82 percent \( (n = 263) \) of non-White students. When asked about their comfort level within their department/division/unit, 88 percent \( (n = 1012) \) of White students reported comfort, compared with 80 percent \( (n = 257) \) of non-White students.

LGBTQ students’ reports of comfort levels were slightly lower (overall climate, comfort: 75 percent, \( n = 64 \); discomfort, 8 percent, \( n = 7 \)), with higher ratings in their departments/divisions/units (climate in division/department/unit, comfort: 80 percent, \( n = 70 \); discomfort, 5 percent, \( n = 4 \))

Among students with disabilities, 76 percent \( (n = 79) \) reported being either Comfortable or Very comfortable with the climate at BU, while 87 percent \( (n = 1,093) \) of students without disabilities reported such levels of comfort. Respondents were asked to rate the accessibility of a wide range of campus locations for individuals with disabilities. The campus library was viewed as the most accommodating of the facilities rated, with fewer than 4 percent \( (n = 69) \) of respondents declaring it not very accommodating. On-campus transportation was viewed as the least accommodating to those with disabilities (16 percent, \( n = 310 \)), followed by computer labs (9 percent, \( n = 179 \)).

Student experiences of financial hardship were correlated to lower levels of comfort with BU’s campus climate. While 39 percent \( (n = 312) \) of students who have not experienced financial hardship while studying at BU report being Very comfortable, 27 percent \( (n = 193) \) of students experiencing financial hardship report such high levels of comfort. These students also rate the campus climate as less friendly, less cooperative, less welcoming, and less respectful than their better-funded peers.
Interestingly, first- and second-year undergraduate students rate the campus as more cooperative and as improving more than third- and fourth-year students. Graduate students’ opinions on these measures resemble those of first- and second-year students (see the statistical analysis of campus climate scales, below).

Employees

Employees reported lower levels of comfort than did students. Among employees as a group, 70 percent \((n = 253)\) reported comfort and 14 percent \((n = 52)\) reported discomfort. While staff ratings of overall comfort are similar to the ratings given by students overall, temporary faculty, administrators, and faculty give considerably lower ratings.

Staff reported being Comfortable or Very comfortable at nearly the rates of students, 83 percent \((n = 135)\), and the same percentage of staff as of students reported discomfort (for staff, 4 percent, \(n = 6\)). Male staff reported higher levels of comfort within departments/divisions/units than with campus climate overall with 85 percent of male staff reporting comfort overall \((n = 47)\), 89 percent reporting comfort within unit \((n = 49)\), and 3 percent reporting discomfort \((n = 2)\). Female staff reported lower levels of comfort within departments/units/divisions with 81 percent of female staff reporting comfort overall \((n = 87)\), 77 percent reporting comfort within unit \((n = 82)\), and 10 percent reporting discomfort \((n = 14)\). The number of non-White staff responding was small, but the sample suggests little differences in levels of comfort with the overall climate at BU (88 percent, \(n = 104\), of White staff reporting comfort compared with 92 percent, \(n = 23\), of staff of color), but somewhat lower levels of comfort with the climate within departments/divisions/units reported by non-White staff (84 percent, \(n = 107\), of White staff reporting comfort in department/division/unit, compared with 72 percent, \(n = 18\), of non-White staff).

Permanent faculty and, to a lesser extent, administrators reported both lower levels of comfort and considerably higher levels of discomfort. Among administrators, 64 percent \((n = 28)\) reported comfort with the climate overall, and 16 percent \((n = 7)\) reported discomfort. Among permanent faculty overall, 58 percent \((n = 64)\) reported comfort and 30 percent \((n = 36)\) reported discomfort.

Tenure-track faculty (those not yet tenured, but eligible to apply) reported higher levels of comfort than did full-time tenured faculty. In the small tenure-track faculty sample, 58 percent \((n = 15)\) reported comfort, and 23 percent \((n = 6)\) reported discomfort. Women reported higher levels of comfort than did men.

Among full-time tenured faculty, 52 percent \((n = 47)\) reported comfort and 32 percent \((n = 29)\) reported discomfort. Full-time tenured faculty reported slightly greater levels of comfort with the
climate in their departments, with 61 percent \((n = 55)\) reporting comfort and 27 percent \((n = 24)\) reporting discomfort.

While 69 percent \((n = 29)\) of full-time tenured male faculty reported comfort, 37 percent \((n = 17)\) of their female counterparts reported comfort. Among tenured female faculty, 38 percent \((n = 18)\) reported discomfort with the overall climate at BU. At the unit/department level, 69 percent \((n = 29)\) of full-time tenured male faculty and 63 percent \((n = 26)\) of full-time tenured female faculty reported comfort with the climate in their department/unit, while 24 percent \((n = 10)\) of men and 26 percent \((n = 13)\) of women full-time tenured faculty reported discomfort.

Temporary faculty responded to the survey at rates lower than permanent faculty, and the sample was small. Temporary faculty reported higher levels of overall comfort, with 72 percent \((n = 26)\) reporting comfort and 8 percent \((n = 3)\) reporting discomfort, and reported higher levels of comfort in their division/units, 83 percent \((n = 30)\) reporting comfort and 6 percent \((n = 2)\) discomfort.

**Statistical Analysis: Campus Climate Scales**

As a general measure of the campus climate, a scale was created based on measures of five different dimensions of campus climate \((\alpha = 0.91)\). These Likert-type items asked respondents to rate the campus climate on scales of hostile-friendly, uncooperative-cooperative, regressing-improving, not welcoming-welcoming and disrespectful-respectful. Analysis of variance procedures were then used to analyze how the demographic groups of interest differ in their overall perceptions of the campus climate.

This analysis shows that students and staff perceive campus climate more positively than do faculty, with administrators falling in between. It also shows that non-majority, or out-group, respondents view campus climate less positively than do majority, or in-group, respondents.

In terms of positions within the university, significant differences exist between the overall perceptions of students, faculty, staff and administrators \((p < .001)\). In particular, the overall perceptions of students and staff were similar, but differed significantly from those of faculty members, who generally perceived campus climate less positively than others \((p < .001)\). Interestingly, this relationship also appeared within each individual campus climate dimension. For each dimension, students and staff members consistently perceived the climate more positively than did faculty members, who consistently had the least positive perception of the climate dimensions \((p < .001)\). Administrators tended to perceive each dimension more moderately with ratings that typically scored between those of faculty and those of students and staff.
Differences also existed between student groups. In terms of the overall measure of campus climate, freshmen/sophomores differed significantly from juniors/seniors ($p < .001$). The greatest differences between these groups existed in measures of how cooperative the university is and how much it is improving, with freshmen/sophomores rating these dimensions more positively than juniors/seniors. Measures of campus climate dimensions for graduate students were, in general, similar to those of freshmen/sophomores. Overall, these students groups gave positive ratings for each dimension of campus climate.

Among the other demographic cohorts, the majority group of each perceived the overall campus climate significantly more positively than their minority counterparts. The greatest differences existed between abled/disabled respondents and heterosexual/non-heterosexual respondents ($p < .001$ and $p < .01$, respectively). Disabled respondents rated the climate significantly less positively on every dimension, with the greatest differences in how welcoming ($p < .001$), friendly ($p < .01$) and cooperative ($p < .01$) they perceived the campus to be. Non-heterosexual respondents also differed most from their counterparts in how welcoming ($p < .01$) and friendly ($p < .01$) they perceived campus, as well as how the campus is improving ($p < .01$).

Significant differences also existed between White/non-White and Christian/non-Christian respondents ($p < .05$ each). The differences in these last two groups were largely driven by their perceptions of how friendly the campus is, with White/Christian respondents rating the dimension much more positively than non-White/non-Christian respondents. It is interesting to note that no significant difference was found among their perceptions of how the campus is improving/regressing.

Results from this analysis suggest that, in general, majority groups tend to perceive the campus climate much more positively than minority groups. Whether based on race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation or disability, minorities generally have less positive perceptions of the campus climate. Although this may be expected, it is interesting to consider how the groups differ in their perceptions of each dimension. For instance, White and non-White respondents had similar perceptions of how well the campus climate was improving, yet disabled respondents and non-heterosexual respondents had significantly less positive perceptions of this dimension than their respective majority counterparts.
**Recommendations**

Based on these findings, the Diversity and Inclusion Survey Leadership Team recommends additional efforts to increase comfort levels for Blacks and other non-Whites and for low-income students. Particularly low ratings for friendliness, cooperation, and respect among students who experienced financial hardship suggest difficulties making connections with others and finding a support network. Action is needed to examine ways to facilitate meaningful positive connections between these students, their peers, mentors, and role models. Developing better understandings of structural and cultural impediments to these relationships is an important step in this process. The team recommends additional assessment of the specific accessibility issues with regard to campus transit and computer labs identified by disabled respondents, and efforts to improve in these areas.

These findings suggest that Bloomsburg University should continue to increase efforts to make the campus climate more comfortable for members of the community who are part of any minority group. They also suggest that members of campus majority groups should be encouraged to better understand the perspectives of minority group members. The disparity between the perceptions of the two groups suggests that there could be a lack of empathy between in-group and out-group community members. Given the ways in which privilege bestows a sense of normalcy on in-groups, increasing awareness of that privilege and enabling experiences with diverse kinds of “normal” must be part of a college education.

**Relevant recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:**

**Goal/Direction #1 (p. 84):** Increase recruitment, retention, and graduation rates for historically underrepresented and underserved students.

1. Increase student populations from historically underrepresented and underserved groups.
2. Promote an inclusive, supportive environment for all underrepresented and underserved populations.

**Goal/Direction #3 (p. 87):** Strive to improve inclusivity in teaching and to incorporate diversity and inclusion in significant ways in teaching, learning, and research.

2. Assure that each student’s educational experience significantly address diversity, inclusion, and global perspectives, and expand opportunities to deepen student engagement in these areas.

**Goal/Direction #4 (p. 89):** Work on campus and in local communities to develop partnerships, establish programs, and plan events that create an environment that supports diversity and inclusion.
Perceptions of Diversity: Is Bloomsburg University Diverse?

The BU community is divided on the question of whether the employees at BU reflect the diversity of society as a whole, although a majority of students believe that their classroom instructors do.

Half of faculty, staff, and managerial responders \((n = 210)\) do not agree that the composition of their department/division/unit reflects the diversity of society at large. Similarly, among faculty considering classroom instructors, 52 percent \((n = 74)\) do not agree that instructors reflect the diversity of society as a whole, while 27 percent \((n = 38)\) believe that they do.

Students of color were less convinced than White students that their classroom instructors reflected the diversity in society at large. Half of students of color \((n = 161)\) reported their classroom instructors were as diverse as society at large, while 61 percent \((n = 736)\) of White students did. Among Black students, 19 percent \((n = 17)\) did not perceive representative diversity, compared with 10 percent \((n = 120)\) of White students. A smaller disparity in perception emerged between LGBTQ students \((16 \text{ percent}, n = 15, \text{ doubting})\) and heterosexual students \((11 \text{ percent}, n = 123, \text{ doubting})\), with smaller disparities still between other minority groups and their majority group counterparts.

Milem and colleagues explain the important role a diverse faculty plays in fostering a positive campus climate:

A particularly important area of institutional policy for diversity is the recruitment and retention of faculty of color. Faculty, along with staff, serve as an institution’s front-line representatives, and in the academic realm, faculty are also the embodiment of authority on campus. Students are painfully aware when there is discrepancy in diversity between the faculty and student bodies on their campus, and failure to actively and publicly pursue a more diverse faculty sends a message of insincere commitment to diversity. (2005, pp. 23-24).

Recommendations

Perception of how well our existing classroom instructors reflect the diversity of society at large raises concern about differences in perception between in-groups and out-groups. Institutional data confirm that the diversity of BU’s teaching faculty does not match that of society at large. The fact that so many students see this as an accurate reflection of society indicates that students need a greater awareness of patterns outside BU and the local region. The new general education plan, MyCore, requirement for citizenship skills (Goal 10: Exhibit responsible citizenship) and an understanding of diversity as articulated in Goal 4 (Apply knowledge from the humanities and other disciplines to analyze the implications of diversity among human groups, their histories, cultures, and the plurality of human experiences) may be of use.
Relevant recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:

Goal/Direction #2 (p. 85): Improve recruitment and retention for a diverse administration, faculty and staff.
   1. Recruit a diverse administration, faculty, and staff.
Goal/Direction #3 (p. 87): Strive to improve inclusivity in teaching and to incorporate diversity and inclusion in significant ways in teaching, learning, and research.
   2. Assure that each student’s educational experience significantly addresses diversity, inclusion, and global perspectives, and expands opportunities to deepen student engagement in these areas.

Perception of Institutional Commitment to Diversity

Just over half of respondents think that the university understands the value of a diverse faculty and staff (faculty, 54 percent, \( n = 408 \); staff, 54 percent, \( n = 410 \)). However, more than one in five, 21 percent of faculty (\( n = 162 \)), and 22 percent (\( n = 166 \)) of staff disagrees.

People of color are considerably less confident. Fewer than half of non-White respondents see diversity in faculty as an institutional value (46 percent, \( n = 37 \)), or see diversity in staff as an institutional value (47 percent, \( n = 37 \)). Nearly a third doubt that the university values a diverse faculty and staff: 29 percent (\( n = 23 \)) doubt the university values a diverse faculty, and 33 percent (\( n = 26 \)) doubt it values a diverse staff.

Women were less convinced than men of the institution’s valuing of a diverse faculty and staff, but reported less skepticism than people of color.

Recommendations

Focus group findings suggest some members of the campus community feel that Bloomsburg’s institutional commitment to diversity exists at the policy level, but is difficult to enforce in day-to-day practice. For instance, while the Frederick Douglass Scholars program provides a mechanism to bring visiting faculty from diverse backgrounds to campus, the program is unevenly used. Additionally, BU may attempt to recruit diverse faculty and staff, but fail to follow through with sufficient effort to hire diverse candidates, or to mentor and support these community members once they are hired. Further research should seek to better understand what can be done to help create a better match between institutional values and the way campus community members experience and perceive BU practices.

Relevant recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:

Goal/Direction #1 (p. 84): Increase recruitment, retention, and graduation rates for historically underrepresented and underserved students.
1. Increase student populations from historically underrepresented and underserved groups.
2. Promote an inclusive, supportive environment for all underrepresented and underserved populations.

Goal/Direction #2 (p. 85): Improve recruitment and retention for a diverse administration, faculty and staff.
   1. Recruit a diverse administration, faculty, and staff.
   2. Retain a diverse administration, faculty, and staff.
   3. Establish professional development that engages faculty, administrators, and staff to exchange knowledge and experiences for reflecting on the challenges and value of diversity from multiple perspectives.

Goal/Direction #3 (p. 87): Strive to improve inclusivity in teaching and to incorporate diversity and inclusion in significant ways in teaching, learning, and research.
   3. Support scholarly activity that broadens understandings of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Goal/Direction #4 (p. 89): Work on campus and in local communities to develop partnerships, establish programs, and plan events that create an environment that supports diversity and inclusion.

Goal/Direction #5 (p. 89): Develop and maintain a permanent system of accountability and responsibility involving all campus entities to ensure diversity and inclusion.

Initiatives/Actions and supporting strategies:
   1. Establish a reporting and accountability structure to examine inclusivity and diversity practices.

Perceptions of Respect

Respondent perceptions for different groups suggest that the climate is perceived to be least respectful toward LGBTQ individuals, religious minorities, and immigrants.

Respondents were most in agreement that veterans are respected, with 77 percent \( (n = 1,262) \) giving ratings of the climate as Respectful or Moderately respectful of veterans. Respondents also rated the campus as respectful of both women and men, and of those affected by physical health issues and the physically disabled.

Ratings showed a strong perception of disrespect for transgender and intersexed people (15 percent, \( n = 216 \), giving ratings of Moderately disrespectful or Very disrespectful); gay, lesbian, and bisexual people (12 percent, \( n = 209 \)); non-native speakers of English (11 percent, \( n = 185 \)); Christian affiliations (10 percent, \( n = 160 \)) and Muslim affiliations (10 percent, \( n = 154 \)). Some respondents perceived disrespect for African Americans (10 percent, \( n = 175 \)), international students, staff, and faculty (9 percent, \( n = 143 \)), immigrants (9 percent, \( n = 135 \)), and Jews (7 percent, \( n = 101 \)).
Recommendations

These findings suggest the institution should foster inter-group interactions and identify, create, and sustain initiatives to raise understanding of and respect for groups seen as less respected, as well as providing safe spaces for all constituencies.

Relevant recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:

Goal/Direction #1 (p. 84): Increase recruitment, retention, and graduation rates for historically underrepresented and underserved students.

1. Promote an inclusive, supportive environment for all underrepresented and underserved populations.

Goal/Direction #3 (p. 87): Strive to improve inclusivity in teaching and to incorporate diversity and inclusion in significant ways in teaching, learning, and research.

1. Improve the effectiveness of teaching to all constituencies.

2. Support scholarly activity that broadens understandings of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Goal/Direction #4 (p. 89): Work on campus and in local communities to develop partnerships, establish programs, and plan events that create an environment that supports diversity and inclusion.

Perceptions of Racial Tension

A fifth of student respondents (20 percent, \( n = 318 \)) and a third of faculty respondents (33 percent, \( n = 52 \)) perceive racial tension on campus. As in other areas, perception is markedly different for White students and for students of color. While 18 percent (\( n = 218 \)) of White students perceive racial tension on campus, 28 percent (\( n = 90 \)) of students of color perceive such tension.

A greater percentage of faculty than students perceive such tensions, with 34 percent (\( n = 53 \)) of faculty perceiving racial tension and 28 percent (\( n = 40 \)) perceiving ethnic tension.

Students who have experienced financial hardship are more likely to perceive racial tension on campus (24 percent, \( n = 174 \)) than are students who have not experienced financial hardship (18 percent, \( n = 142 \)). The same pattern holds for perceptions of ethnic tension with 21 percent (\( n = 146 \)) of those who have experienced financial hardship perceiving this tension, compared with 15 percent (\( n = 121 \)) of those who have not.

Recommendations

BU should gain a better understanding of where perceptions of racial tension originate and their impact. The institution should further identify where racial tensions exist, where students and faculty perceive and experience tension, and what can be done to alleviate it. It is also useful to understand the nature of the tension. For example, in some courses, racial tension could result
from frank discussions of racial issues that ultimately lead to productive dialogue and change. Tension in the residence halls or other social areas likely take a different form and have different outcomes that require intervention.

**Relevant recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:**
Goal/Direction #4 (p. 89): Work on campus and in local communities to develop partnerships, establish programs, and plan events that create an environment that supports diversity and inclusion.

**Perceptions of Bias**

Respondents were asked to characterize generally whether they perceived BU to be biased based on several characteristics; these questions did not specify the institutional location of these biases, or the ways in which these biases were expressed, but aimed only to elicit a general sense of respondents’ feelings about institutional fairness in these areas. The questions were structured as statements of agreement, *I believe that Bloomsburg University is...*, followed by various endings for the statement: biased based on race; biased based on socioeconomic status; sexist, homophobic, age-biased; and biased based on disability (two other endings were given, but are not analyzed here: biased based on ethnicity and biased based on position). The following paragraphs give an overview of responses to these items, with the results as expressed through percentages. The statistical analysis that follows (see box, p. 38) offers a more nuanced examination of the results.

**Racism:** The majority of respondents, 59 percent \((n = 1,115)\), do not agree that BU is biased based on race \((\text{disagree or strongly disagree})\); 16 percent \((n = 308)\) agree that it is biased based on race \((\text{agree or strongly agree})\). However, 23 percent of respondents of color \((n = 90)\) agreed that BU was biased based on race, while 48 percent \((n = 185)\) disagreed. These perceptions differed greatly from those of White respondents. Among White respondents, only 14 percent \((n = 205)\) agreed BU was biased based on race, while over 62 percent \((n = 896)\) disagreed.

**Classism:** The majority of respondents, 60 percent \((n = 1,123)\), do not agree that BU is biased based on socioeconomic status; 12 percent \((n = 230)\) believe that it is. Among respondents who reported experiencing financial hardship while at BU, 17 percent \((n = 131)\) agree that BU is biased based on socioeconomic status, compared to only 9 percent \((n = 99)\) of respondents that have not experienced financial hardship.

**Sexism, Homophobia, and Ageism:** A majority of respondents do not agree that BU is biased based on gender \((64\% \text{, } n = 1,213)\), sexual orientation \((64\% \text{, } n = 1,201)\), or age \((63\% \text{, } n = 1,179)\). About 11 percent of respondents agreed that BU was biased based on gender \((n = 200)\), sexual orientation \((n = 201)\), or age \((n = 214)\). More LGBTQ respondents than heterosexual respondents agreed that BU was homophobic. Fifteen percent of LGBTQ
respondents \((n = 55)\) agreed that BU was homophobic, compared with 10 percent \((n = 141)\) of heterosexual respondents. Women and men largely agreed in their assessments of sexism.

**Disability Bias:** Sixty-six percent \((n = 1,221)\) do not agree that BU is biased based on disabilities; 8 percent \((n = 140)\) agreed that BU is biased based on disabilities. A larger proportion of employees \((9\%\), \(n = 32)\) than students \((7\%\), \(n = 108)\) agreed that BU was biased in this way. Among disabled respondents, however, 22 percent \((n = 42)\) agreed that BU was biased based on disability, compared with only 6 percent \((n = 91)\) of non-disabled respondents. Among respondents with physical disabilities specifically, the proportion that agreed this bias exists was even greater \((31\%\), \(n = 16)\).

**Statistical Analysis: Perceptions of Bias**

As a general measure of bias at Bloomsburg University, a scale was created based on measures of eight different forms of bias \((\alpha = 0.93)\). These Likert-type items asked respondents to rate their level of agreement regarding the existence of various forms of bias at the university. Analysis of variance procedures were then used to analyze how the demographic groups of interest differ in their overall perceptions of bias at Bloomsburg University.

As was the case with the campus climate measures, faculty members seem to have the least positive perception of the University in regards to bias. In addition to the overall measure of bias, faculty members were also significantly more likely than others to believe that the university is biased \((p. 37)\) in seven of eight areas \((\text{ranging from } p < .001 \text{ to } p < .05)\). The only area in which significant differences between administration, faculty, staff and students did not occur was in regards to University bias based on socioeconomic status.

Unlike campus climate, it seems both administration and students generally perceived the university most positively in regards to bias. Administration was least likely to perceive the university as being homophobic or age-biased, but was more likely than both students and staff to perceive racial bias. Students were least likely to perceive the university as sexist, as well as biased based on an individual’s position \((\text{faculty, staff, administration or student})\).

As already mentioned, faculty consistently perceived the university as more biased in all areas. In particular, faculty were significantly more likely to believe the university as sexist and homophobic. Staff were relatively moderate in their perceptions of university bias.

Just as with campus climate, the majority within each demographic group perceived the university more positively than their minority counterparts. In this case, the majority perceived the university as less biased. Non-White respondents and disabled respondents were both significantly less likely than their majority counterparts to perceive the university as unbiased in all eight areas \((\text{ranging from } p < .001 \text{ to } p < .01)\).
Christians and non-Christians did not differ in their perceptions of university bias based on ethnicity, but differed significantly in their perceptions of the university as homophobic \((p < .001)\), with Christians perceiving less homophobia. Non-heterosexuals were also significantly more likely to perceive the university as homophobic \((p < .001)\), as well as sexist \((p < .001)\). Although those differences may be somewhat expected, it is interesting to note that non-heterosexuals also differed significantly from heterosexuals in their perceptions of university bias based on socioeconomic status and on disabilities \((p < .001 \text{ and } p < .01, \text{ respectively})\).

Results from this analysis show some similarities to those of the analysis on campus climate. First, faculty are significantly less likely than students to perceive the university as unbiased. Second, minorities generally have less positive overall perceptions of the university in regards to bias. Finally, major differences exist between the perceptions of White and non-White respondents, as well as between nondonable and disabled respondents, in regards to university bias of every form.

Another noteworthy result is that the highest composite score for each form of bias among all subgroups was perception of bias against or favoring an individual because of their position within the university, and the relative power and prestige of that position. For instance, students are perceived to be treated differently (and probably less fairly) because they are students. This may suggest that, among all forms of university bias, bias based on an individual’s position could be most prevalent since its mean score (ranging from \(x = 2.50\) to \(x = 3.18\)) is greater than all other forms of bias regardless of respondent demographics.

**Recommendations**

While some difference between in-group and out-group perceptions of bias are likely inevitable, the goal should be to have as little difference between groups as possible by increasing inter-group interaction, helping raise awareness of the challenges faced by each group, and generally increasing levels of empathy across groups.

The recurring pattern of faculty perceptions of bias is worth further analysis. A variety of factors may explain faculty’s increased perception of bias, including their high rate of contact with others through classes, mentoring, and advising. In the focus groups several faculty noted that they actively combat biases they see among their students and expressed pride in their ability to create positive change, but also exhaustion, frustration, and sometimes fear at the levels of ignorance that they must combat. Formal efforts to address bias often focus on helping those against whom the bias is directed and reacting as incidents arise. Shared structural support for creating an inclusive environment for all community members, a structure to which constituencies across the institution are committed, is a more proactive way of addressing bias.
and should help to alleviate the exhaustion cited by those most directly concerned with and affected by bias.

**Relevant recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:**

**Goal/Direction #3 (p. 87):** Strive to improve inclusivity in teaching and to incorporate diversity and inclusion in significant ways in teaching, learning, and research.

1. Improve the effectiveness of teaching to all constituencies.
2. Support scholarly activity that broadens understandings of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

**Goal/Direction #4 (p. 89):** Work on campus and in local communities to develop partnerships, establish programs, and plan events that create an environment that supports diversity and inclusion.

1. Strengthen commitment to diversity initiatives on campus.

**Goal/Direction #5 (p. 899):** Develop and maintain a permanent system of accountability and responsibility involving all campus entities to ensure diversity and inclusion.

**Initiatives/Actions and supporting strategies:**

2. Establish a reporting and accountability structure to examine inclusivity and diversity practices.

---

**Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct**

Seventy-one respondents reported experiences of sexual assault or sexual harassment, with 21 respondents (1 percent) reporting sexual assault, and 50 (3 percent) reporting sexual harassment.

Asked if they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct that interfered with their ability to work or learn here, 283 respondents overall (15 percent) reported having had such negative experiences, with 12 percent \( n = 185 \) of students reporting experiences of such conduct.

The data confirm that such experiences are disproportionately experienced by some groups within the community, notably people of color, and more especially Blacks; women; LGBTQ individuals; and people with disabilities.

**Observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct**

Respondents were also asked if they had observed such conduct. Nearly 30 percent \( n = 739 \) of respondents reported having seen conduct toward another on campus that created an exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile working or learning environment.

Respondents of color, men, LGBTQ respondents, and those with disabilities were more likely than others to report having observed these kinds of conduct. Faculty members were more likely to have observed these behaviors than students, staff, or administrators and tenured faculty were more likely to have observed them than non-tenured faculty.
Among those reporting having observed such conduct, the most commonly cited form of inappropriate behaviors were derogatory remarks, received verbally, in writing, or electronically (55 percent, \( n = 406 \)) and bullying/intimidation (46 percent, \( n = 337 \)). Of all observed inappropriate, offensive or hostile conduct, 32 percent \( (n = 238) \) occurred in a public space on campus, while 25 percent \( (n = 186) \) occurred in class.

More subtle types of observed exclusion were common, including deliberately ignoring someone (32 percent, \( n = 234 \)) and isolation or leaving someone out (20 percent, \( n = 151 \)). Nearly one-fifth of respondents reported observing inappropriate conduct in the form of racial profiling (20 percent, \( n = 150 \)) and homophobic behavior (19 percent, \( n = 140 \)).

The most common targets of the observed conduct were a student (49 percent, \( n = 364 \)) or a group or category of people (33 percent, \( n = 246 \)). The most commonly cited bases for this behavior were sexual orientation (23 percent, \( n = 166 \)), race (22 percent, \( n = 163 \)), gender (20 percent, \( n = 151 \)), ethnicity (20 percent, \( n = 150 \)), and religion (16 percent, \( n = 121 \)).

**Experience with exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct**

Fifteen percent of all respondents \( (n = 283) \) reported having personally experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct that interfered with their ability to work or learn here. In addition to concerns about derogatory remarks and discriminatory behavior based on race, sexual orientation or gender expression, and disability, written comments from responders indicate experiences with derogatory remarks based on body type, concerns about abusive or disrespectful language used in emails sent to “Everyone” by faculty or staff, and remarks indicating intolerance of positions held due to religious conviction.

Peers are most often the source of such conduct. Among the 185 students reporting having experienced exclusionary, discriminatory, or offensive conduct, the most common harassers identified were other students (48 percent, \( n = 89 \)), with groups of students also often cited (32 percent, \( n = 59 \)). Similarly, the 48 faculty reporting having experienced such exclusionary conduct most often cited peers as sources, with 60 percent \( (n = 29) \) reporting such conduct coming from fellow faculty and 31 percent \( (n = 15) \) citing coworkers. This trend held among the 41 staff reporting such experiences, with 34 percent \( (n = 14) \) citing coworkers and 17 percent \( (n = 7) \) citing other staff as the source. Multiple responses were permitted.

However, those who experienced such conduct also frequently cited people with power over them as sources. Among students, 28 percent \( (n = 52) \) identified faculty members as sources of exclusionary conduct, 9 percent \( (n = 17) \) cited administrators, and 9 percent \( (n = 16) \) cited staff. Among faculty, 35 percent \( (n = 17) \) cited administrators. Notable was the proportion of staff reporting exclusionary conduct by someone in a supervisory or more prestigious position: 24
percent \((n = 10)\) of staff cited an administrator, 24 percent \((n = 10)\) cited a supervisor, and 27 percent \((n = 11)\) cited a faculty member.

**BU Employees:** Employees reported experiencing exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct that interfered with their ability to work or learn here at double the rate of students: 27 percent of employees \((n = 98)\), compared with 12 percent of students \((n = 185)\). Employees are particularly likely to report having been intimidated or bullied, or to report receiving derogatory messages or comments. Among this portion of employees, 20 percent \((n = 65)\) reported being intimidated or bullied, compared with 6 percent of students \((n = 84)\). Among respondents reporting experiences of offensive/hostile conduct, similar discrepancies emerged in reports of being intimidated or bullied, 25 percent of faculty \((n = 36)\) and 6 percent of students \((n = 84)\), and reports of receiving derogatory messages or comments, 18 percent of faculty \((n = 24)\) and 4 percent of students \((n = 62)\).

**Students:** Among all student respondents, 12 percent \((n = 185)\) reported an experience of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct that interfered with their ability to work or study at BU. The most frequently reported hostile conduct (8 percent, \(n = 116\)) was exclusion (being deliberately ignored or excluded, being isolated or left out, or being stared at), followed by intimidation or bullying (6 percent, \(n = 84\)) and exclusionary conduct in a classroom (5 percent, \(n = 64\)), which led students to fear receiving a bad grade because of a hostile classroom environment, discriminatory grading policies, or feeling isolated/left out during group work.

Some students report experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct that interfered with their ability to work or study at BU more than others, but low numbers of incidents make the statistical validity of these reports uncertain. However, groups reporting disproportionate experiences of such conduct, include students with disabilities; LGBTQ students; non-White students overall, and specifically African Americans/Blacks; and, to a lesser extent, female students.

Twenty-seven percent of students with disabilities \((n = 42)\) reported an experience with this type of conduct. Among the 185 students reporting such experiences, 23 percent \((n = 42)\) had disabilities, though 11 percent of student respondents reported having a disability. This group was most likely to report experiences of exclusion (being deliberately ignored or excluded, isolated or left out, stared at), and 19 percent of disabled respondents \((n = 27)\) reported having such an experience. Also reported at elevated rates by disabled students were exclusionary classroom experiences: fearing a bad grade because of a hostile classroom environment or discriminatory grading policies, or feeling isolated/left out during group work (17 percent, \(n = 23\)), receiving derogatory messages (14 percent, \(n = 18\)), and being intimidated or bullied (14 percent, \(n = 18\)).
LGBTQ students also reported experiences with exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct at notable rates, with 23 percent \((n = 20)\) of LGBTQ respondents reporting experience with such conduct. This group, too, reported high levels of experiences of exclusion (being deliberately ignored or excluded, isolated or left out, stared at), 18 percent \((n = 15)\); being intimidated or bullied, 16 percent \((n = 13)\); receiving derogatory messages, 15 percent \((n = 12)\); and fearing for physical safety, 14 percent \((n = 11)\), which led students to fear for their own personal safety or a family member’s safety, receive threats of physical violence, or be the target of physical violence.

Non-White students, particularly Black students, experienced such conduct at disproportionate rates, with 15 percent \((n = 47)\) of non-White and 17 percent \((n = 16)\) of Black students reporting such experiences, compared with 11 percent \((n = 129)\) of White students. Non-White students, and particularly Black students, were most likely to report experiences of exclusion: 9 percent \((n = 26)\) for non-Whites, 12 percent \((n = 10)\) for Black students.

A breakdown of the 185 reports underscores the disproportionate experience of such conduct by non-Whites, particularly Blacks, especially in the crucial areas of fearing for physical safety and exclusionary experiences within the classroom. Among students reporting experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct, 25 percent \((n = 47)\) were not White, although only 18 percent of respondents overall identified as not White, and 11 percent \((n = 5)\) were African American/Black or African, although only 5 percent of respondents overall identified themselves as African American/Black or African.

Twenty-seven percent \((n = 12)\) of student reports of fearing for physical safety (fearing for their own personal safety or a family member’s safety, receiving threats of physical violence, or being the target of physical violence) came from non-White students; 11 percent \((n = 5)\) came from Black students. More than a quarter \((28 percent, \(n = 18)\) of exclusionary classroom experiences (fearing a bad grade because of a hostile classroom environment or discriminatory grading policies, feeling isolated/left out during group work) were reported by non-White students, with 9 percent \((n = 6)\) by Black students. A disproportionate number of reports of being excluded (being deliberately ignored or excluded, isolated or left out, stared at) came from non-White students \((22 percent, \(n = 26)\) generally, and from Black students \((9 percent, \(n = 10)\), as did reports of being intimidated or bullied from non-Whites \((20 percent, \(n = 17)\), with 10 percent \((n = 5)\) from Black students).

Female respondents were more likely than males to report experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct that interfered with their ability to work or study at BU; 10 percent \((n = 50)\) of males and 13 percent \((n = 132)\) of females reported such an experience. Females reported bullying or intimidation disproportionately to males, with 7 percent \((n = 68)\) reporting such an experience, but were most likely to report an experience of exclusion...
(being deliberately ignored or excluded; isolated or left out; stared at, with 9 percent \( n = 87 \) of female student respondents reporting such an experience.

**Locations of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct**

Respondents reporting experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct were asked where the experience took place. They were able to select multiple locations. Many students cited fairly controlled campus locations, such as classrooms and faculty and campus offices, as the locations of their experience of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct. Campus offices were cited as the location of such inappropriate conduct by 10 percent \( n = 18 \) of the student respondents, and faculty offices by 8 percent \( n = 15 \). The most commonly cited location was a class, with 37 percent \( n = 68 \) of the 185 student respondents reporting such behavior occurred in a class. Among students who reported having received derogatory remarks or comments, 65 percent \( n = 28 \) reported experiencing this conduct in class. Students also commonly cited other on-campus locations where they experienced negative conduct, such as public spaces on campus (28 percent, \( n = 51 \)), campus housing (20 percent, \( n = 36 \)), and walking on campus (17 percent, \( n = 32 \)).

Over all, on-campus locations were cited more often than off-campus ones, with 19 percent \( n = 34 \) citing off-campus locations generally and 11 percent \( n = 20 \) citing off-campus housing.

**Recommendations**

Reports of inappropriate conduct from students indicate a need to do a better job of socializing students regarding appropriate ways to interact. Goal 10 in the new general education structure, MyCore, which requires students to “exhibit responsible citizenship,” may be one avenue for providing such socialization. Others may be co-curricular efforts, community educational programs, and campus-wide initiatives/campaigns about collegiality and citizenship.

The fact that inappropriate behavior occurs in relatively controlled settings such as classrooms suggests a need and an opportunity for faculty leadership. During focus groups, students cited group work as an example of a classroom dynamic that often produces problem interactions. Minority students in particular noted that dividing into groups creates stress for them. Focus group members reported when several identifiable minority group members are in one class, they often are grouped together, which highlights their minority status and can make them feel ostracized. When there are few minority group members in a class, they often are not invited to join a group and feel less welcome asking to join a group, so the professor assigns them a group, thereby singling them out and highlighting their situation. Minority faculty specifically mentioned this problem during focus groups. They noted the same patterns described by the students and said, for this reason, they either do not use group work or they randomly pre-assign students to groups. Educating a wider range of faculty about these kinds of patterns might reduce problem behaviors in some settings.
The relatively high rates of witnessed and experienced inappropriate conduct reported by staff and faculty indicates a need for better prevention and management of such incidents.

The role of perception must be addressed when these kinds of interactions are examined. Much is unspoken when students are dividing into groups for a class project, choosing a lunch table, or interacting off campus. Research suggests that perceptions are complex and dependent in part on factors such as the racial identity of those perceiving a situation. For example, one study found that Asian American students’ perceptions of racism among African American students were influenced by the Asian American students’ own sense of racial identity (Kohatsu, Dulay, Lam, Concepción, Pérez, López, & Euler, 2000). This study suggests that an important part of changing cross group perceptions is helping each group develop a positive and constructive sense of their own racial identity.

**Relevant recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:**

Goal/Direction #3 (p. 87): Strive to improve inclusivity in teaching and to incorporate diversity and inclusion in significant ways in teaching, learning, and research.

1. Improve the effectiveness of teaching to all constituencies.
2. Support scholarly activity that broadens understandings of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Goal/Direction #4 (p. 89): Work on campus and in local communities to develop partnerships, establish programs, and plan events that create an environment that supports diversity and inclusion.

2. Strengthen commitment to diversity initiatives on campus.

**Sexual Harassment**

Fifteen percent of respondents \( (n = 273) \) reported knowing someone who they believe has been a victim of sexual harassment at BU, while 3 percent \( (n = 50) \) reported having experienced sexual harassment at BU themselves.

More than one in five faculty report knowing someone who had been sexually harassed (21 percent, \( n = 32 \)), and staff and administrators were almost as likely (19 percent, \( n = 39 \)). Students were less likely to know someone who had been sexually harassed (13 percent, \( n = 202 \)).

About 16 percent of respondents \( (n = 381) \) view harassment as a problem at BU. Faculty (32 percent, \( n = 56 \)) see it as somewhat more of a problem than students (14 percent, \( n = 289 \)), staff (15 percent, \( n = 184 \)), or administrators (20 percent, \( n = 9 \)).
Despite the gap in concern about sexual harassment and acquaintance with someone who had been sexually harassed, proportions reporting having personally been sexually harassed were constant across the three groups, with 3 percent of students ($n = 41$), 3 percent of faculty ($n = 5$), and 2 percent of staff and administration ($n = 4$) reporting having been sexually harassed themselves. Some subgroups reported experiences of sexual harassment at much higher rates. Campus-wide, 4 percent of females ($n = 43$) reported having personally experienced sexual harassment, 7 percent ($n = 7$) of LGBTQ individuals, and 3 percent ($n = 12$) of people of color.

Of those reporting experiences of harassment, 50 percent ($n = 25$) reported an on-campus location, while 60 percent ($n = 30$) identified a location off campus. Multiple responses were allowed.

**Sexual Assault**

Eleven percent of respondents ($n = 202$), reported knowing a BU community member who had been sexually assaulted. Faculty were mostly likely to report knowing a sexual assault victim (16 percent, $n = 25$), followed by administrators and staff (12 percent, $n = 24$) and students (10 percent, $n = 153$).

A third of respondents (33 percent, $n = 804$) believe assault is a problem at BU, with students (37 percent, $n = 739$) more likely than faculty (17 percent, $n = 30$), staff (16 percent, $n = 29$), or administrators (13 percent, $n = 6$) to agree that assault is a problem. LGBTQ members of the campus community perceive assault to be more of a problem, with 43 percent ($n = 58$) agreeing it is a problem, compared with 32 percent ($n = 602$) of heterosexual respondents. White and non-White respondents did not differ much in their perception of the problem; nor did male and female respondents.

Among all respondents, 1 percent ($n = 21$) reported personally being a victim of sexual assault at BU. People of color, LGBTQ individuals, and women were more likely to report having been sexually assaulted, with 2 percent of people of color ($n = 7$) and 2 percent of LGBTQ ($n = 7$) respondents reporting sexual assault, and just over 1 percent of females ($n = 15$) and less than 1 percent of males ($n = 6$). However, given the small sample size, these data are not conclusive.

Sexual assaults were more likely to have occurred off campus: 52 percent ($n = 11$) of respondents said the incident(s) happened off-campus, and 29 percent ($n = 6$) indicated on-campus sexual assault. Not all respondents who reported being sexually assaulted provided information regarding the location of the assault.
Recommendations

The rates of sexual harassment and assault indicate a need for continued efforts to prevent these actions and support those who have these experiences. Particularly given the well documented reluctance of many people to report these kinds of problems, continued outreach and education are necessary, particularly for those groups identified as the most likely targets of such behaviors. Community awareness of available resources for reporting and for support must be increased.

Responses to Inappropriate Conduct

In general, responses to inappropriate conduct of all types were informal and personal. Institutional reporting was rarely cited as a response.

Observed hostile, discriminatory, or inappropriate conduct: Of respondents who observed hostile, exclusionary, or discriminatory behavior, 57 percent (n = 421) reported feeling anger, 34 percent (n = 249) reported feeling embarrassed, and 14 percent ignored it (n = 106) or feared consequences from their observations, such as bad grades or losing their jobs (n = 105). The most common responses to witnessing these behaviors were to tell a friend (26 percent, n = 189), avoid the harasser (22 percent, n = 165), and leave the situation immediately (23 percent, n = 167). Fifteen percent (n = 114) of those who witnessed these behaviors say that they confronted the harasser at the time of the observed conduct.

Few of those who witnessed such behavior reported it. Some (13 percent, n = 96) cited fear that the complaint would not be taken seriously, 11 percent (n = 81) did not know where to report the incident, and 11 percent (n = 78) did nothing out of fear of retaliation.

Experienced hostile, discriminatory, or inappropriate conduct: Among those experiencing such conduct personally, the most common reaction was anger (62 percent, n = 169) followed by embarrassment (36 percent, n = 99), telling a friend (31 percent, n = 86), avoiding the perpetrator (28 percent, n = 77), ignoring the behavior (26 percent, n = 72), and fear (20 percent, n = 56).

Few reported the incident, with 18 percent (n = 50) of respondents stating that they did not report the behavior for fear of retaliation.

Experienced sexual harassment: The majority of respondents reporting experiences of sexual harassment responded to the incident by telling a friend (52 percent, n = 26) or family member (28 percent, n = 14) or doing nothing (26 percent, n = 13), although 54 percent (n = 1,300) reported knowing where to go for help if they were harassed and 43 percent (n = 1027) reported that they understand BU’s formal procedures for complaints of harassment.
Experienced sexual assault: The most common responses were to tell a friend (52 percent, \(n = 11\)) or family member (38 percent, \(n = 8\)), or do nothing (19 percent, \(n = 4\)), although high percentages of respondents report knowing how to get help if assaulted: 68 percent (\(n = 1,627\)) said that they would know where to go for help if they were assaulted, and 41 percent (\(n = 998\)) said they understood the formal procedures for complaints of assault.

About half of respondents (52 percent, \(n = 1,247\)) reported having confidence that BU fairly administers the formal procedures to address complaints of harassment and assault.

Recommendations
The fact that a large proportion of those who witness or experience these problem behaviors do not report them in any formal way makes it very difficult for our campus to effectively police the behaviors and assist victims. There is a clear need to raise awareness of what behaviors are inappropriate, make clear the official means of addressing such behaviors, be sure that official procedures are not unduly burdensome or intimidating to victims, and be sure that services for victims are well advertised and readily available. While it is difficult to have an open process given the need for confidentiality, efforts to increase faith in the process are likely to result in victims feeling more comfortable and confident seeking help. It is therefore important to assure the campus community that complaints will be taken seriously and procedures will be carefully followed.

Relevant recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:

Goal/Direction #4 (p. 89): Work on campus and in local communities to develop partnerships, establish programs, and plan events that create an environment that supports diversity and inclusion.

1. Strengthen commitment to diversity initiatives on campus.
Contemplating Leaving Bloomsburg University Due to Climate Issues

Despite the high level of comfort with BU’s climate reported above, nearly a fifth of respondents (19 percent, \( n = 349 \)) reported having seriously considered leaving BU due to its climate.

**Students:** Students are least likely to have seriously considered leaving because of BU’s climate, with 17 percent (\( n = 247 \)) reporting having done so. However, discrepancies among subgroups are significant.

Nearly a quarter of students of color (24 percent, \( n = 80 \)) reported having seriously considered leaving due to BU’s climate, compared with 15 percent (\( n = 173 \)) of White students.

Nearly double the proportion of students experiencing financial hardship seriously considered leaving than their better-off peers: 22 percent (\( n = 156 \)) of students experiencing financial hardship, reported having seriously considered leaving compared with 11 percent (\( n = 90 \)) of students who have not experienced financial hardship.

LGBTQ students were more likely to report having seriously considered leaving due to climate than their heterosexual peers: 21 percent (\( n = 71 \)) of LGBTQ students, compared with 15 percent (\( n = 178 \)) of heterosexual students.

More students reported having seriously contemplating leaving in their first year at BU than in their second, more in their second year than in their third, and so on. During their first year, 10 percent (\( n = 36 \)) of students of color seriously considered leaving BU because of its climate, compared with 6 percent (\( n = 85 \)) of White students.

**Faculty and staff:** Nearly a third (29 percent, \( n = 103 \)) of BU’s faculty, staff, and administrators reported having seriously considered leaving due to the climate. Faculty were most likely to have seriously considered leaving due to BU’s climate, with more than a third, 36 percent (\( n = 55 \)) having done so.

Employees of color were more likely than their White colleagues to have seriously contemplated leaving due to the climate: 34 percent (\( n = 21 \)) of non-White faculty, staff, and administration had seriously considered leaving because of BU’s climate, compared with 28 percent (\( n = 78 \)) of White employees. Faculty of color were slightly more likely than staff of color to have seriously considered leaving due to climate, with 30 percent (\( n = 9 \)) of faculty of color reporting such a consideration, compared to 28 percent (\( n = 8 \)) of staff of color.

Notably, female staff respondents were more than twice as likely to have seriously considered leaving due to climate than their men counterparts, with 28 percent (\( n = 29 \)) reporting having considered leaving, compared with 14 percent (\( n = 7 \)) of male staff. The gender gap was less...
pronounced among faculty. Female faculty members were slightly more likely than male coworkers to have considered leaving: 38 percent \((n = 32)\) of female faculty, compared with 33 percent \((n = 23)\) of male faculty.

**Recommendations**

Findings suggest a need to examine gender dynamics in staff assignments and treatment. In other areas, these data support recommendations made in the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan, particularly the need to support programs with proven success in improving retention rates, particularly for first-year students and the need to retain diverse faculty and staff. Additionally, BU might consider establishing a way to offer funds to students in financial crisis. As the Diversity and Inclusion Plan suggests, exit interviews with employees and others who choose to leave the university, as well as interviews with alumni, may help the institution understand why some community members choose to leave, lending insight into how better to retain people in the future.

**Relevant Recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:**

**Goal/Direction #1 (p. 84):** Increase recruitment, retention, and graduation rates for historically underrepresented and underserved students.

#2. Promote an inclusive, supportive environment for all underrepresented and underserved populations.

**Goal/Direction #2 (p. 85):** Improve recruitment and retention for a diverse administration, faculty and staff.

**Goal/Direction #3 (p. 87):** Strive to improve inclusivity in teaching and to incorporate diversity and inclusion in significant ways in teaching, learning, and research.
4. CLASSROOM CLIMATE & STUDENT SENSE OF CONNECTION

Perceptions of Classroom Climate

A majority of students surveyed, 86 percent \((n = 1,301)\), reported that they are \textit{Very comfortable} or \textit{Comfortable} with the climate in their classes, while only 3 percent \((n = 52)\) indicated that they were uncomfortable with the classroom climate. Most students report feeling valued by faculty in the classroom \((68\%\), \(n = 1,049)\), although 11 percent \((n = 164)\) do not. Most students \((57\%\), \(n = 874)\) also report feeling valued by other students in the classroom, although 11 percent \((n = 174)\) reported that they do not feel valued by their classmates.

Among European Americans/Whites, 88 percent \((n = 1,005)\) indicated being either \textit{Very comfortable} or \textit{Comfortable} with the climate in the classroom, compared with 80 percent \((n = 254)\) of students of color. Male and female students reported similar feelings to these general trends and to each other: 87 percent \((n = 433)\) of men reported feeling comfort, as did 86 percent \((n = 855)\) of women. Men reported being \textit{Very comfortable} in classes more often than women and stated faculty prejudged their abilities based on perceived identity more often than they prejudged female students.

The lowest levels of comfort were reported by students with disabilities, particularly learning disabilities. While 73 percent \((n = 114)\) of students with all disabilities reported comfort, and students with hearing, visual, or physical disabilities reported comfort at the same rate, only 66 percent \((n = 69)\) of students with ADD/ADHD, Asperger’s, a psychological or emotional disability, a learning disability, or a traumatic brain injury reported comfort with the climate in their classes. This is in contrast to 88 percent \((n = 1,099)\) of students without a disability. In keeping with these perceptions, disabled respondents rated classes less welcoming to disabled students, particularly students with learning disabilities, than did respondents overall. Among students with disabilities, less than half \((47\%\), \(n = 72)\) agree that the classroom is welcoming for students with learning disabilities, whereas 61 percent \((n = 759)\) of students without disabilities agree. In response to how welcoming the classroom is for students with physical disabilities, 53 percent \((n = 81)\) of disabled students agreed whereas 66 percent \((n = 803)\) of nondisabled students agreed. Thirty-six percent of students with a hearing, visual, or physical disability \((n = 12)\) felt their abilities are prejudged by faculty compared with 27 percent \((n = 342)\) of students without a disability.

Non-White students as a whole reported lower levels of comfort with the classroom climate than White students, with 80 percent \((n = 254)\) reporting comfort, compared with 88 percent \((n = 1,005)\) of White students. Black students report comfort levels 16 percentage points lower than White students, with 72 percent \((n = 65)\) of Black students reporting being comfortable with the climate in their classes. Six percent \((n = 5)\) reported being uncomfortable, a higher percentage
than any of the groups listed above. Comfort levels were lower still for the small sample of Native American respondents.

Students of color, particularly Black students, reported a perception that faculty prejudge their abilities based on perceived identity at disproportionate rates, with 39 percent (n = 35) of Black students feeling prejudged and 35 percent (n = 110) of students of color, compared with 26 percent (n = 269) of White students. More than a quarter of students of color (25 percent, n = 81), and nearly a third of Black students (32 percent, n = 28) perceived racial and/or ethnic tensions in classroom discussion, compared with 15 percent (n = 176) of White students.

Students reporting financial hardship were slightly less comfortable with the classroom climate overall, with 79 percent (n = 593) reporting comfort, compared with 83 percent (n = 997) for those not reporting financial hardship. Other measures of discomfort were also elevated for students reporting financial hardship. For instance, 14 percent (n = 101) reported not feeling valued by faculty in the classroom, compared with 8 percent (n = 164) for students who do not report financial hardship. Lower income students also feel their abilities are prejudged by faculty more often than their better-off peers, with 32 percent (n = 223) reporting being prejudged, compared with 24 percent (n = 194) of higher income students.

Among LGBTQ student respondents, 74 percent (n = 64) reported comfort with the classroom climate. However, 14 percent (n = 13) of this group did not agree that the classroom climate was welcoming for students based on their biological sex, double the rate at which heterosexual students did not agree, and 24 percent (n = 22) of this group did not agree that it was welcoming for students based on their gender expression, compared with 9 percent (n = 100) for heterosexual students.

In general, students were moderately in agreement in their perception that the classroom is welcoming to students based on their race (67 percent, n = 1,009), sexual orientation (63 percent, n = 931), or Act 101 participation (61 percent, n = 815), with few disagreeing (7 percent (n =11) for race, 9 percent (n = 137) for sexual orientation, and 8 percent (n = 103) for Act 101 participation).

As mentioned earlier, when asked whether they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct that interfered with their ability to work or learn at Bloomsburg University, 5 percent (n = 64) of students reported classroom experiences: feared receiving a bad grade due to a hostile classroom environment, feared a bad grade because of discriminatory grading policies, or felt isolated or left out during group work. This is discussed in more detail above (p. 42).
Differences Among Colleges

Disparities in representation of some groups in some fields are relevant to a discussion of classroom climate. It is important to examine reasons for underrepresentation and to develop programs to support meaningful diversity in every academic area. Survey data suggest significant demographic differences among undeclared students and among undergraduates in Bloomsburg University’s four colleges (the College of Business, the College of Education, the College of Liberal Arts, and the College of Science and Technology).  

Data from Bloomsburg University’s Office of Institutional Research from spring 2012 (Table 4.1), and survey responses from undergraduate majors (Table 4.2), suggest several trends. The College of Liberal Arts, BU’s largest college, attracts majors from non-majority groups at higher rates than do the other colleges. The College of Science and Technology, BU’s second-largest college, falls below the overall sample in all areas examined. Tables 4.1 and 4.2 show more detail, illustrating these trends:

- Undeclared students are disproportionately non-White, African American, experiencing financial hardship, and disabled. They are less likely than the overall sample to be women or LGBTQ.
- In the College of Liberal Arts, in all areas examined, minority groups are represented at rates above the overall sample.
- In the College of Business, women are underrepresented, as are poorer students and LGBTQ students. African American students are represented at rates above the overall sample.
- In the College of Education, non-Whites, African Americans, and students with disabilities are underrepresented. Women are notably overrepresented.
- In the College of Science and Technology, in every area, minority group members are underrepresented.

---

9 Student respondents were able to choose more than one major. In order to avoid double counting, for purposes of this analysis students were assigned to just one college. In the case of secondary and middle level education majors, it was to the College of Education, rather than to the college relevant to their area of specialization.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Student Cohort</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Cohort (N)</th>
<th>Cohort %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Degree Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,614</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-White&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4,889</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared Majors</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,322</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science and Technology&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Based on the total population (N) of the particular student cohort.

<sup>b</sup> Non-White: African American, Hispanic, Native American, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, or two or more races.

<sup>c</sup> Includes only undergraduate students with declared majors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Student Cohort</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Sample (n)</th>
<th>Sample % (^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Degree Students</td>
<td>Family income &lt;$34,500</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced financial hardship</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared Majors</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family income &lt;$34,500</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced financial hardship</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts (^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>535</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family income &lt;$34,500</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced financial hardship</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business (^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family income &lt;$34,500</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced financial hardship</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education (^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>489</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family income &lt;$34,500</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced financial hardship</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science and Technology (^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>577</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family income &lt;$34,500</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced financial hardship</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Based on the total sample (n) of the particular student cohort.

\(^b\) Includes only undergraduate students with declared majors.
The colleges differ in ways other than demographic composition. Majors in the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Education were most likely to identify faculty role models, with 67 percent of student respondents reporting faculty role models in both the College of Liberal Arts \((n = 256)\) and the College of Education \((n = 258)\). In the College of Science and Technology, 64 percent \((n = 268)\) reported such faculty role models, while in the College of Business, 55 percent \((n = 129)\) did so.

In all four colleges, similar proportions of students reported being comfortable with the climate in classes; proportions in all four colleges were within 4 percentage points of the 86 percent average cited above. Undeclared students were less likely to report being comfortable (79 percent, \(n = 86)\).

Students majoring in the College of Business were least likely to feel valued by faculty in the classroom, with 14 percent \((n = 34)\) not feeling valued by faculty, followed by students with majors in the College of Science and Technology (13 percent, \(n = 56)\). Students were least likely to feel valued by other students if their major was in the College of Science and Technology (14 percent, \(n = 58)\).

Undeclared students, and to a lesser extent students with a major in the College of Science and Technology, were more likely to report that the classroom is not welcoming to students based on their race, sexual orientation, or Act 101 status. Among undeclared students, 11 percent \((n = 11)\) perceived the classroom as not welcoming for students based on race (compared with 7 percent \((n = 111)\) of all students; 9 percent \((n = 37)\) of COST majors), 12 percent \((n = 12)\) perceived it as not welcoming based on sexual orientation (compared to 9 percent \((n = 137)\) of all students; 11 percent \((n = 42)\) of COST majors), and 10 percent \((n = 9)\) perceived it as not welcoming based on Act 101 participation (compared to 8 percent \((n = 103)\) of all students; 9 percent \((n = 33)\) of COST majors).

**Recommendations**

The BU campus would benefit from efforts to improve the classroom climate, particularly for students of color, lower income students, LGBTQ students, and students with learning disabilities. Faculty bias and prejudging student ability based on membership in a group is unacceptable, and efforts to educate faculty, sanction inappropriate behavior, and assist students who have experienced these behaviors are crucial.

More research to help us better understand the nature of the differences between the colleges is important. A review of each college’s “gateway” courses, the introductory level courses required for admission to majors in that college, is also recommended.
Additionally, a review of admissions criteria may be warranted, to assure that admitted students are academically qualified for college-level work, and to identify those worthy of admission but in need of timely, adequate, discipline-specific remedial preparation, ideally embedded in their pre-college educational experience (e.g., summer institutes and partnerships with secondary schools). Active efforts should be made to recruit a diverse pool of students offered admission as general admits, in addition to diversifying the pool of students admitted through particular programs, such as Act 101. The Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan points to timely notification of financial aid opportunities as one way to assist in this effort.

**Relevant Recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:**

**Goal/Direction #1 (p. 84):** Increase recruitment, retention, and graduation rates for historically underrepresented and underserved students.

**Goal/Direction #3 (p. 87):** Strive to improve inclusivity in teaching and to incorporate diversity and inclusion in significant ways in teaching, learning, and research.

2. Improve the effectiveness of teaching to all constituencies.

4. Support scholarly activity that broadens understandings of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

**Role Models and Student Sense of Support**

Just over half of students agree that “BU employees are genuinely concerned with my welfare,” with 56 percent \((n = 856)\) of students agreeing or agreeing strongly, and 16 percent \((n = 245)\) disagreeing or disagreeing strongly. Among students of color, only 48 percent \((n = 154)\) agree with this statement, compared with 58 percent \((n = 676)\) of White students. Nearly one-fifth (19 percent, \(n = 60\)) of students of color disagree, compared with 15 percent \((n = 174)\) of White students. Large differences also exist between those who have and have not experienced financial hardship. Among those students who have, 20 percent \((n = 145)\) disagree that BU employees are genuinely concerned with their welfare, while only 12 percent \((n = 99)\) of students who have not experienced financial hardship disagree.

In general, students were less likely to agree that administrators are genuinely concerned with their welfare, with 50 percent \((n = 749)\) agreeing and 21 percent \((n = 322)\) disagreeing. Among students who have experienced financial hardship, only 43 percent \((n = 305)\) agree while over a quarter disagree (26 percent, \(n = 182\)). These proportions differ from those of students who have not experienced such hardships, of whom 55 percent \((n = 437)\) agree that administrators are genuinely concerned with their welfare, while only 17 percent \((n = 139)\) disagree.

One measure of institutional connectedness may be the degree to which students are able to identify role models on campus. Many students — 71 percent \((n = 1,535)\) — report having role models they can relate to, with 63 percent \((n = 975)\) identifying role models among faculty and
58 percent \((n = 886)\) among staff. Between demographic groups, the proportion of students able to identify role models on campus can differ substantially (see Table 4.3).

Students of color are less likely than White students to report having role models they relate to, with 72 percent \((n = 842)\) of White students reporting being able to identify such a role model, compared with 62 percent \((n = 203)\) of students of color. African American/Black/African students are slightly better connected to role models than non-White students as a whole.

Table 4.3 Comparing Student Responses, by Demographic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Agree Responses (^a)</th>
<th>Agree % (^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, African American, African</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White (^c)</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No financial hardship</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced financial hardship</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without disability</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disability</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Includes both “Agree” and “Strongly Agree”

\(^b\) Based on the total number of responses for each individual student group.

\(^c\) Non-White: African American, Hispanic, Native American, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, or two or more races.

Poorer students are also less likely to have identified role models, although the gap is smaller: 68 percent \((n = 486)\) of those who faced financial hardship say they have role models they can identify with, compared with 73 percent \((n = 590)\) of those without financial hardship. Again, a disproportionate number of students of color, particularly Black students, report financial hardship.

The gap between White students and students of color in the identification of role models is greater for faculty role models than for staff role models (see Tables 4.4 and 4.5). While White
students and students of color reported identifying role models among staff at nearly equal rates, 59 percent \((n = 684)\) for White students and 55 percent \((n = 176)\) for students of color, a greater proportion of White students reported identifying faculty role models, 65 percent \((n = 757)\), compared with 58 percent \((n = 186)\) for students of color. This is not the case with the gap between poorer and richer students: 62 percent \((n = 444)\) of those who experienced hardship report having faculty role models, compared with 65 percent \((n = 525)\) of students who have not experienced hardship; 55 percent \((n = 390)\) of those who have experienced hardship have staff role models, compared with 61 percent \((n = 492)\) who have not experienced hardship. This suggests stronger staff support for students of color as a group than for poor students as a group.

Table 4.4 Comparing Student Responses, by Demographic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Agree Responses</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, African American, African</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White c</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No financial hardship</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced financial hardship</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without disability</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disability</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Includes both “Agree” and “Strongly Agree”  
\(b\) Based on the total number of responses for each individual student group.  
\(c\) Non-White: African American, Hispanic, Native American, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, or two or more races.

Disabled students are somewhat less likely to identify role models they can relate to, particularly among faculty and staff, than their non-disabled peers, with 70 percent \((n = 112)\) finding role models they could relate to, compared with 71 percent \((n = 903)\) of their non-disabled peers; 58 percent \((n = 92)\) found faculty role models, compared with 65 percent \((n = 828)\) of their non-disabled peers, and 53 percent \((n = 84)\) found staff role models, compared with 59 percent \((n = 747)\) of their non-disabled peers.
Non-heterosexual students reported higher rates of having staff and faculty they perceive as role models they can relate to than did heterosexual students. Among non-heterosexual students, 71 percent \((n = 65)\) reported having faculty they perceive as role models, compared with 65 percent \((n = 760)\) of heterosexual students. They reported having identified staff role models at a slightly higher rate, 60 percent \((n = 55)\), compared with 58 percent \((n = 677)\) of heterosexual students, and role models in general as well, 73 percent \((n = 68)\) of non-heterosexual students compared with 71 percent \((n = 835)\) of heterosexual students.

Female students found more role models than male students, with 73 percent \((n = 745)\) finding role models they could relate to, compared with 65 percent \((n = 320)\) of male students; 66 percent \((n = 676)\) finding faculty role models, compared with 58 percent \((n = 283)\) of men students, and 61 percent \((n = 611)\) finding staff role models, compared with 54 percent \((n = 263)\) of male students.

### Table 4.5 Comparing Student Responses, by Demographic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Agree Responses a</th>
<th>Agree % b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, African American, African</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White c</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No financial hardship</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced financial hardship</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without disability</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disability</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Includes both “Agree” and “Strongly Agree”

b Based on the total number of responses for each individual student group.

c Non-White: African American, Hispanic, Native American, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, or two or more races.
**Recommendations**

These findings suggest that institutional supports have an effect. The fact that Black students identify staff role models at rates above the rate for White students is likely aided by a concerted effort to build relationships between staff and Black students through a variety of programs. Similarly, the high rate of identification of faculty role models among LGBTQ students is likely aided by high levels of faculty involvement with the LGBTQA Commission and the Gay Straight Alliance student group. These findings also suggest a need to help Black students better connect with faculty role models and to help students with disabilities and male students find faculty and staff role models. Part of the solution to matching more students with relatable role models is clearly to be sure that Bloomsburg University has a diverse faculty and staff. Another part of the solution is to foster connections between all faculty, staff and students that transcend group boundaries through established methods such as small class sizes, mentoring, and research partnerships.

High-impact educational practices, already a priority for Bloomsburg University, can also be helpful in improving the campus climate.

**Relevant recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:**

**Goal/Direction #1 (p. 84):** Increase recruitment, retention, and graduation rates for historically underrepresented and underserved students.

1. Promote an inclusive, supportive environment for all underrepresented and underserved populations.

**Goal/Direction #2 (p. 85):** Improve recruitment and retention for a diverse administration, faculty and staff.

**Goal/Direction #3 (p. 87):** Strive to improve inclusivity in teaching and to incorporate diversity and inclusion in significant ways in teaching, learning, and research.

1. Improve the effectiveness of teaching to all constituencies.
5. WORKPLACE CLIMATE

A higher percentage of employees responded to the survey than did students, but the number of responders was small. More than two-fifths (41 percent, \( n = 218 \)) of faculty responded; a quarter of those (\( n = 55 \)) were non-tenured or tenure-track faculty. Staff responded at a similar rate (43 percent, \( n = 513 \)), although it is possible that respondents do not include sufficient staff from non-office work locations, as computer access posed a barrier to survey completion. Administrators, on the other hand, are well represented in our sample, with 61 percent (\( n = 49 \)) of administrators responding.

Earlier analysis of employee perceptions of the overall climate at BU, as well as the climate within departments/divisions/units (p.29) may be useful in conjunction with this section. The earlier section demonstrates faculty’s lower levels of comfort with the overall climate at BU, with low levels of comfort and high levels of discomfort among full-time tenured faculty, particularly full-time tenured female faculty.

The section discussing respondents who have seriously considered leaving BU due to climate issues (p.49) may also be of interest when read alongside this section.

Career Satisfaction

Overall, 57 percent (\( n = 237 \)) of employee respondents report being satisfied or very satisfied with how their careers have progressed at BU. BU’s administrators reported the highest levels of satisfaction, with 70 percent (\( n = 32 \)) reporting satisfaction, compared with 58 percent (\( n = 106 \)) of faculty and 53 percent (\( n = 99 \)) of staff. Women reported lower levels of satisfaction (54 percent, \( n = 133 \)) than did men (62 percent, \( n = 101 \)). Non-heterosexual employees were less satisfied, with 50 percent (\( n = 10 \)) reporting satisfaction. People of color reported only slightly lower levels of satisfaction than the average (56 percent, \( n = 40 \)).

Support

Over half of employees (61 percent, \( n = 247 \)) reported having support from decision makers/colleagues/co-workers regarding their career advancement, but a smaller proportion of women (57 percent, \( n = 142 \)) felt supported than men (66 percent, \( n = 103 \)).

Respondents identified varying levels of support from colleagues. Women (70 percent, \( n = 174 \)) were slightly more likely than men (66 percent, \( n = 107 \)) to report having colleagues give them career advice or guidance when they need it. White employees (70 percent, \( n = 223 \)) were more likely than employees of color (63 percent, \( n = 45 \)) to report having such a mentor. Employees of color were considerably more likely than other groups to report not having such support: a fifth (20 percent, \( n = 14 \)) of employees of color reported having no such person, compared with 11 percent (\( n = 34 \)) of White employees.
Evidence suggests moderate satisfaction with the level of institutional support for continuing growth. Employees do, in general, feel they have the equipment and supplies they need to do their jobs (66 percent, \( n = 503 \)). Employee respondents were less convinced of adequate professional development opportunities, with 52 percent \( (n = 390) \) finding them adequate and 30 percent \( (n = 225) \) finding them inadequate. Rates of satisfaction with institutional support for continuing growth were highest among men (58 percent, \( n = 88 \)), and rates of satisfaction lowest (49 percent, \( n = 107 \)) and dissatisfaction highest among women (34 percent, \( n = 74 \)), compared with 25 percent \( (n = 38) \) dissatisfaction among men.

BU employees also report moderate satisfaction with institutional support for research and creative projects, with 52 percent \( (n = 343) \) reporting satisfaction with their level of support compared with that of their colleagues and 32 percent \( (n = 106) \) reporting dissatisfaction. Men and Whites were more likely to be satisfied with support (59 percent, \( n = 83 \) and 54 percent, \( n = 138 \), respectively) than women and people of color (47 percent, \( n = 88 \) and 47 percent, \( n = 34 \), respectively).

**Climate among Colleagues**

Responses reveal differences in perceptions of expectations, with some groups feeling that different standards are applied to them than to their colleagues. Among employees as a whole, 26 percent \( (n = 110) \) believe they must work harder to be perceived as legitimate, 28 percent \( (n = 120) \) believe they must work harder to achieve the same recognition, and 26 percent \( (n = 108) \) believe others have higher expectations of them.

Perceptions of unequal expectations are higher among employees of color. More than a third of employees of color reported feeling that they have to work harder than their colleagues to be perceived as legitimate (38 percent, \( n = 27 \)), compared with 24 percent \( (n = 78) \) of White employees. A larger proportion of employees of color also felt they needed to work harder to achieve the same recognition (41 percent, \( n = 29 \)) than did White employees (26 percent, \( n = 86 \)). These groups also differed in their perceived expectations, with 30 percent \( (n = 21) \) of employees of color reporting that they feel their colleagues have higher expectations of them, compared with 25 percent \( (n = 81) \) of White employees. Employees of color also feel far more scrutinized than do their colleagues, with more than a quarter (27 percent, \( n = 19 \)) reporting this feeling, compared with 16 percent \( (n = 52) \) of White employees.

Women, too, feel they must meet different standards, with 28 percent \( (n = 70) \) of women employees reporting a need to work harder to be perceived as legitimate (compared with 23 percent \( (n = 38) \) of men) and nearly a third of women (31 percent, \( n = 77 \)) reporting feeling this need to work harder to be recognized, compared with 25 percent \( (n = 41) \) of men. A smaller
proportion of women (24 percent, \( n = 59 \)) than men (29 percent, \( n = 47 \)) perceive their colleagues as having higher expectations of them than of other faculty/staff.

Some groups of employees felt less respected than others. A quarter of employees of color (25 percent, \( n = 18 \)) reported being treated less respectfully than their colleagues, compared to only 13 percent \( (n = 41) \) of White employees. A larger proportion of women (16 percent, \( n = 40 \)) than men (13 percent, \( n = 21 \)) felt they received less respect than their colleagues.

Of faculty, a third (33 percent, \( n = 60 \)), believe that what is expected of them professionally is similar to what is expected of colleagues in other divisions, but differences in perception between women and men is notable. Among female faculty, only 28 percent \( (n = 27) \) agreed that expectations were similar, compared with 40 percent \( (n = 32) \) of male faculty. Nearly half (49 percent, \( n = 81 \)), of all faculty feel they are burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues. The proportion of female faculty (50 percent, \( n = 42 \)) and male faculty (49 percent, \( n = 39 \)) feeling burdened by service responsibilities were very similar. Perceptions of being more heavily burdened are greatest among faculty in the College of Liberal Arts (52 percent, \( n = 30 \)) and the College of Science of Technology (51 percent, \( n = 23 \)), and lowest in Academic Affairs (31 percent, \( n = 4 \)) and the College of Education (38 percent, \( n = 11 \)).

A slight majority of faculty, 55 percent \( (n = 97) \), feel their research interests are valued by their colleagues. However, 20 percent \( (n = 6) \) of untenured faculty reported feeling pressured to change their research agenda to achieve tenure, while 36 percent \( (n = 45) \) of faculty eligible for promotion reported similar feelings in regards to achieving promotion. Among faculty eligible for tenure or promotion, 31 percent \( (n = 37) \) say that they feel pressure to change their teaching methods to achieve tenure or promotion.

Female employees (21 percent, \( n = 48 \)) and employees of color (22 percent, \( n = 16 \)) were more likely than male employees (19 percent, \( n = 30 \)) and White employees (20 percent, \( n = 58 \)) to report feeling that their colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view of my identity.”

Nearly a third (30 percent, \( n = 124 \)) of the BU employees report they are reluctant to bring up issues that concern them for fear that it might affect their performance evaluation or tenure decision; employees of color expressed slightly more concern about this than White faculty, with 31 percent \( (n = 22) \) of employees of color reporting reluctance, compared to 28 percent \( (n = 90) \) of White employees.
**Recommendations**

These data suggest that the workplace is experienced as less supportive, less respectful, and more pressure-filled by employees of color and women. This pattern has clear negative implications for BU’s ability to recruit and retain employees in these groups. More effort is necessary to help ensure equal treatment of all groups.

**Relevant recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:**

Goal/Direction #2 (p. 85): Improve recruitment and retention for a diverse administration, faculty and staff.
Retain a diverse administration, faculty and staff.

**Institutional Policies Regarding Employment**

Of the faculty, staff, and managers who responded, fewer than half (45 percent, \(n = 192\)) agreed or strongly agreed that supervisors or managers consistently communicate, interpret, and implement BU policies, while more than a third (34 percent, \(n = 145\)), disagreed or strongly disagreed. The one-third reporting disagreement was quite stable across subgroups of gender and race. Male employees (46 percent, \(n = 75\)) and White employees (46 percent, \(n = 153\)) were more likely to believe that policy is communicated, interpreted, and implemented consistently; female employees (44 percent, \(n = 113\)) and employees of color (36 percent, \(n = 26\)) were less convinced.

Nearly half of BU employees (48 percent, \(n = 201\)) do not believe that salary determinations are fair, and 35 percent (\(n = 147\)) expressed concern regarding the clarity of salary determinations. Female employees (49 percent, \(n = 123\)) and White employees (48 percent, \(n = 157\)) expressed more concern regarding salary fairness than male employees (46 percent, \(n = 75\)) and employees of color (45 percent, \(n = 33\)). Less than half (46 percent, \(n = 187\)) of employees reported being satisfied with their level of compensation compared with peers at BU with similar levels of experience. White employees (46 percent, \(n = 150\)) and male employees (47 percent, \(n = 76\)) were more satisfied with their compensation than were female employees (43 percent, \(n = 108\)) and employees of color (36 percent, \(n = 25\)).

Less than 40 percent (\(n = 162\)) agree that BU treats salaried and hourly staff equitably. Among male employees, 45 percent (\(n = 73\)) agree that salaried and hourly staff are treated equitably, compared with 35 percent (\(n = 87\)) of female employees.

Many employees (43 percent, \(n = 146\)) reported having observed unfair or unjust conduct related to promotion, tenure, or reappointment/reclassification at BU. Women (49 percent, \(n = 98\)) were more likely than men (35 percent, \(n = 47\)) to report having witnessed this type of conduct. The
most common causes for these practices were cited as BU position (faculty, staff, student) (32 percent, \(n = 46\)) and preference given to friends and family (25 percent, \(n = 36\)).

Nearly a third of employees (32 percent, \(n = 110\)) reported having observed unfair or unjust hiring practices, with larger percentages of employees of color (38 percent, \(n = 23\)) and female employees (34 percent, \(n = 68\)) reporting having seen this, compared with 30 percent (\(n = 80\)) of White employees and 28 percent (\(n = 40\)) of male employees. The most common basis perceived for this unjust/unfair procedure was “preference to friends and family” (36 percent, \(n = 40\)) followed by “race” (29 percent, \(n = 32\)).

Fewer employees report having observed unfair or unjust disciplinary actions related to employment, with 15 percent (\(n = 51\)) of respondents reporting have seen such injustice. Again, observations of such unfairness were significantly higher among non-majority respondents than among majority respondents, with employees of color (22 percent, \(n = 13\)) in particular, as well as female employees (17 percent, \(n = 33\)) reporting having observed such fairness, compared with 12 percent (\(n = 33\)) of White employees and 12 percent (\(n = 17\)) of men employees.

**Recommendations**

These findings suggest a need to clarify and standardize the communication, interpretation, and implementation of policies. Lack of faith that policies can be counted upon to guide workplace rules and experiences introduces undue stress and frustration.

The number of employees who report having witnessed unfair or unjust hiring or disciplinary action suggests a need to better monitor these practices and to encourage those who witness such action to come forward.

**Faculty: The Tenure and Promotion Process**

Faculty perceive the promotion process less favorably than the tenure process. While 66 percent (\(n = 103\)) of faculty believe the tenure process is clear and 68 percent (\(n = 106\)) of faculty believe tenure standards are reasonable, 41 percent (\(n = 64\)) of faculty feel the promotion process is clear, and only 29 percent (\(n = 46\)) believe promotion standards are reasonable.

The collective bargaining agreement stipulates that teaching, scholarship, and service, in that order of priority, will be the basis of both tenure and promotion. Almost two-thirds of faculty respondents feel their service contributions are important for tenure (64 percent, \(n = 88\)) and promotion (61 percent, \(n = 90\)). However, while 84 percent (\(n = 116\)) feel their efforts to be an effective teacher are important for tenure, only 69 percent (\(n = 101\)) think their teaching efforts are important for promotion.
Recommendations

Faculty concerns surrounding the promotion process could have a negative impact on BU’s ability to recruit or retain talented faculty. The promotion process should be clarified. In addition, assistance should be made available to candidates to ensure teaching efforts are properly documented. Finally, guidance should be provided to departments and promotion committees regarding the consideration of teaching documentation.
6. THE CLIMATE OFF CAMPUS

Perceptions of the Off-Campus Community

Respondents were asked to identify whether they perceived the off-campus climate to be negative on 14 dimensions, ranging from housing discrimination to police treatment of BU students to level of cooperation between BU and the Town of Bloomsburg.

Among all respondents, perceptions of problems were highest for general BU-Town relations, with 53 percent \( (n = 995) \) of respondents identifying a lack of communication between BU and the Town of Bloomsburg as a problem (21 percent, \( n = 372 \) calling it a large problem), and 50 percent \( (n = 940) \) seeing a lack of BU-Town cooperation (20 percent, \( n = 371 \) calling it a large problem). Many respondents cited Town of Bloomsburg Police treatment of BU students as a problem (43 percent, \( n = 811 \)), with 17 percent \( (n = 310) \) seeing it as a large problem. Fifty-one percent of respondents \( (n = 964) \) called a general lack of understanding between groups of people as a problem off campus; 17 percent \( (n = 329) \) called it a big problem.

Respondents overall were concerned about racism and sexism off campus. Respondents identified as problems racist comments on the street (45 percent, \( n = 844 \)), with 12 percent \( (n = 234) \) calling it a large problem, and harassing comments based on gender (45 percent, \( n = 855 \)), again with 12 percent \( (n = 229) \) calling it a large problem. Respondents were not asked about off-campus harassment or discrimination based on perceived sexual orientation or on gender expression; therefore no data are available.

Student perceptions of racial and ethnic discrimination, discrimination against immigrants, and racist comments on the street:

When asked if discrimination against certain racial groups was a problem, 41 percent \( (n = 768) \) of all respondents said it was, with 11 percent \( (n = 200) \) reporting it to be a large problem. About 35 percent of respondents identified discrimination against certain ethnic or immigrant groups as a problem. Employees expressed notably higher levels of concern about racial discrimination off campus, with 52 percent \( (n = 191) \) reporting it to be a problem, and 20 percent \( (n = 72) \) seeing it as a large problem. Employees were also more concerned about discrimination based on ethnicity or against immigrants.

While 36 percent of White students \( (n = 110) \) consider racial discrimination off campus to be a problem, 45 percent of students of color \( (n = 153) \) reported it to be a problem. Nearly two-thirds of Black students \( (63 \text{ percent, } n = 60) \) perceive racial discrimination to be a problem off campus. Twenty-three percent \( (n = 22) \) of Black student respondents, and 12 percent \( (n = 39) \) of students of color consider racial discrimination to be a large problem off campus, compared with 10 percent \( (n = 113) \) of White students.
Fifty-one percent of employees consider racist comments to be a problem \((n = 188)\), with 16 percent \((n = 59)\) seeing it as a large problem. Noteworthy proportions of all student groups consider racist comments on the street to be a problem: 41 percent \((n = 484)\) of White students, 51 percent of students of color \((n = 170)\) and 56 percent of Black students \((n = 53)\), report that such comments are a problem. Nineteen percent \((n = 59)\) of non-White students, and 23 percent \((n = 22)\) of Black students, reported such racist comments to be a large problem, compared with 10 percent \((n = 113)\) of White students.

**Student perceptions of sexual harassment and gender-based comments on the street:**
Nearly a third also reported as problems discrimination against women \((32\%\), \(n = 602)\) and sexual harassment \((42\%\), \(n = 791)\). Women and other non-male respondents reported higher levels of concern than their male counterparts about gender-based street harassment, with 48 percent \((n = 631)\) of women and other non-males seeing it as a problem, compared with 39 percent \((n = 251)\) of males. Women and other non-males also see sexual harassment off campus as a problem more often than males \((44\%\), \(n = 550)\), with 13 percent \((n = 159)\) seeing it as a big problem), compared with 38 percent \((n = 240)\) of males. The same is true of perceptions of off-campus discrimination against women, with 35 percent \((n = 439)\) of women and other non-males seeing a problem, compared with 26 percent \((n = 163)\) of males.

**Perceptions of employment discrimination:**
Employment discrimination was perceived as a problem by 28 percent of all respondents \((n = 525)\). Employees perceived employment discrimination to be somewhat more severe than did students \((32\%\), \(n = 118)\), compared with 25 percent \((n = 419)\) of students, with 10 percent \((n = 35)\) employees seeing it as a large problem, compared with 5 percent \((n = 73)\) of students.

Nearly a quarter of White students \((24\%\), \(n = 281)\) reported employment discrimination to be a problem, while 39 percent \((n = 129)\) of student respondents of color did so. Black students were more concerned, with half \((50\%\), \(n = 48)\) seeing employment discrimination as a problem. Perceptions of employment discrimination as a large problem were higher among students of color and Black students in particular, with 10 percent \((n = 32)\) of students of color, and 12 percent \((n = 11)\) Black students, seeing it as a large problem, compared with 3 percent \((n = 39)\) of White students.

**Perceptions of housing discrimination:**
Housing discrimination was perceived a problem by 29 percent of all respondents \((n = 538)\). Disabled respondents reported higher levels of concern about housing discrimination than other respondents, with 42 percent \((n = 79)\) identifying it as a problem, and 15 percent \((n = 29)\) seeing it as a large problem. More than a third \((34\%\), \(n = 124)\) of employees reported housing discrimination to be a problem — compared with 27 percent \((n = 428)\) of students — with 13 percent \((n = 46)\) of employees perceiving it to be a large problem, compared with 7 percent of
students \((n = 107)\). The sample of LGBTQ employees answering the question about housing discrimination was small \((n = 18)\), but that sample reported higher levels of concern about housing discrimination than did their heterosexual colleagues: 45 percent \((n = 8)\) reported it to be a problem, with 28 percent \((n = 5)\) seeing it as a large problem.

More than a third of students of color \((34\% \text{, } n = 112)\) identified housing discrimination as a problem, with 9 percent \((n = 31)\) seeing it as a large problem. A quarter of White students \((25\% \text{, } n = 112)\) agreed, with 6 percent \((n = 74)\) seeing it as a large problem.

**Perceptions of treatment of BU students by the Bloomsburg Police Department:**
Some student respondents expressed concern about the treatment of BU students by Town Police. Forty-four percent \((n = 665)\) considered Town Police treatment of students to be a problem, with 17 percent \((n = 254)\) considering it to be a serious problem. Employees expressed lower levels of concern, with 39 percent \((n = 142)\) considering Town Police treatment of students to be a problem and 14 percent \((n = 50)\) seeing it as a large problem. Higher levels of concern were expressed by students of color \((49\% \text{, } n = 162)\), with 18 percent \((n = 61)\) seeing it as a large problem. Sixty percent of Black students \((n = 55)\) expressed concern, and 21 percent \((n = 20)\) see it as a large problem.

**Disability discrimination and discrimination based on sexual orientation:**
Disabled respondents reported higher levels of concern in most areas: housing discrimination \((15\% \text{ higher identification as a problem})\), age discrimination \((13\% \text{ higher})\), employment discrimination \((11\% \text{ higher})\), and discrimination against women \((11\% \text{ higher})\). The survey did not ask respondents to comment directly on discrimination or harassment based on perceived disability.

LGBTQ respondents expressed only slightly higher levels of concern than all respondents on these measures of off-campus climate, but the sample size was small, and the survey did not ask respondents to comment on harassment or discrimination based on sexual orientation.

**Recommendations**
BU’s ability to recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff are dependent in large part on Bloomsburg being a good place to live and work. The ability to effectively pursue Strategic Issue 4 in the strategic plan, *Impact 2015: Building on the Past, Leading for the Future*, is contingent on positive collaborative relationships between these two entities. Strategic Issue 4 focuses on: *Fostering and developing a strong sense of community*.

Positive Town-University interactions through formal relationships with Town-based entities, such as the relationship with the Moose Exchange as a home for the College of Liberal Arts’ Center for Visual and Performing Arts, and development of Bloomsburg University Foundation
office space downtown, should be continued and supported, and similar initiatives pursued. Programs that involve students in the community should also be supported and expanded, both through one-time events, like The Big Event, and through more extended interactions, such as internships, community-based research, service learning, and community service.

Current efforts to revitalize the Task Force on Racial Equity present an opportunity to enhance the off-campus climate and town-gown relationships, including the relationship between students and Town Police. Additional and/or alternative processes for addressing incidents involving members of the Bloomsburg Police Department and students should be considered. At present, signed complaints about a Bloomsburg Police Department action must be presented directly to the police chief or designee. The Bloomsburg Police Department website does not include a formal mechanism for review of complaints.

Relevant recommendations from the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:

Goal/Direction #4 (p. 89): Work on campus and in local communities to develop partnerships, establish programs, and plan events that create an environment that supports diversity and inclusion.

2. Provide greater visibility of commitment to diversity initiatives with regional public school systems.

3. Support a commitment to diversity initiatives within Town governance and in the community.
8. STUDENT VETERANS

Overview

Forty-two student veterans responded to the questionnaire — 35 undergraduate students and seven graduate students. The sample suggests that student veterans are represented in most majors on campus but are overrepresented in Criminal Justice. Most student veterans (79 percent) live off campus. While one might assume that the GI Bill covers college costs for veterans, BU’s veterans report paying for their education with loans, wages, and family contributions.

The student veteran sample included 33 men, eight women, and one intersex. Twenty-three were age 25 or younger, 13 were between ages 26 and 32, and five were between the ages of 43 and 51. The student veterans are a slightly more diverse group than the student body as a whole, with 69 percent reporting that they are European American/White, and 12 percent African or African American. They were similar to the general student population in their sexual orientation. Thirty-one percent of our student veterans reported at least one disability.

Twelve student veterans have children and two serve as the primary caregiver for someone with a disability. Of those who are parents, three are single parents and nine are parents with another adult who lives in their household.

Services for Veterans

When asked about services for veterans, 90 percent of veteran respondents said they know where to get answers to their questions about veteran’s benefits at BU. They report being neither particularly satisfied nor dissatisfied with specific services. This pattern likely has a great deal to do with the diverse experiences student veterans have. Students note in the comments section that they only have reasons to know about or have strong opinions regarding certain services due to their personal patterns of deployment and training before and during their time at BU. Student veterans are most satisfied with the process of working with financial aid to obtain their financial benefits, peer treatment of veteran students, and their ability to find housing near BU. Student veterans express the most dissatisfaction with the process of getting military credits transferred to BU, the number of military credits that transfer to BU, efforts to integrate veterans into the BU campus community, and the information on veteran’s benefits available on the BU web site.

In both the survey comments and in the student veterans focus group, students specifically mention that they feel deployment overseas should count as diversity experience, much like a study abroad experience, and that general communication regarding what will transfer to BU and why is slow and unclear. Several students also note that the process of separating from BU and then returning, as necessitated by a deployment during their education career, is arduous and makes a difficult situation more difficult. Finally, student veterans note that many veterans have
difficulty relating to nonveterans of their own age due to what they see as immaturity and
disrespect for others and that this creates challenges when veterans must live in close quarters
with nonveteran students and, sometimes, in classes.

The list of possible new services that student veterans were asked to evaluate was developed
based largely on the suggestions of students who participated in the student veterans focus group
in the fall of 2011. Students who participate in the campus climate survey express support for all
of the proposed programs, but are particularly enthusiastic about priority scheduling for returning
or deployed veterans, having an office staffed with student worker veterans who can answer
questions for their fellow student veterans, and a BU orientation specifically for student veterans.
The need for priority scheduling for veterans is substantiated in both student comments on the
survey and in the student veterans focus group data where students report that scheduling classes
while deployed can be extremely difficult and returning to campus after a deployment to find
that there are scheduling problems adds stress to what can be an already challenging time.
7. CONCLUSION

This report offers a snapshot of Bloomsburg University at a particularly moment in time, one nearly a year in the past. The patterns it reveals and its recommendations conform to patterns and strategies well documented at other universities, particularly other predominately White universities.

The findings are valuable. Campus climate is created by community attitudes; by policies; by the actions of leaders, teachers, staff at all levels, and students; by the very makeup of the community. All of these dimensions are under human control. If the institution takes action, it can realize the educational and social promise of Bloomsburg University’s increasing diversity.
Appendix A: METHODOLOGY

Overview

In order to make full use of the existing research on campus diversity while being cognizant of the unique needs and culture of this specific campus, we designed a multiphase study that included focus groups with key populations, a campus-wide survey, and follow-up meeting with campus community members. Sixteen focus groups, composed of 112 total members of the campus community, were used to gain a more detailed and nuanced understanding of the specific experiences of different populations on campus, to better understand the perspectives of these campus groups, and to refine the survey before its dissemination. A survey was then distributed to gather data from a very wide range of campus groups and to test the generalizability of patterns identified in the focus groups. Follow-up meetings to review findings with campus community members will be beneficial in further understanding the patterns identified in the study and to refine interpretations of the results.

FOCUS GROUPS

Focus Group Design

In consultation with the Bloomsburg University President’s Task Force on Diversity and Dr. Susan Rankin, Senior Research Associate for the Study of Higher Education, Associate Professor of Education, and principal of Rankin and Associates Consulting, a list of key campus groups was identified, whose experiences and perceptions would be crucial to understanding the campus diversity climate. A series of seven questions was developed to help understand participants’ perceptions of what diverse groups exist at BU, challenges related to diversity at BU, specific concerns related to diversity in the classroom or in their specific work environment, the causes of these problems, existing resources available to address problems, and additional resources that would be helpful. These questions were modeled on a series of similar focus group questions suggested by Dr. Rankin. The questions were ordered so that the groups began by describing and defining diversity at Bloomsburg as both a relatively nonthreatening icebreaker and as a means of clarifying the parameters of the study. The same set of questions was used for each group with the exception of one question, which asked students and faculty about their classroom experience and members of the staff about their specific work environment.
Focus Group Sampling

Multiple focus groups were conducted with the goal of gathering a representative sample of all university population groups based on a number of attributes (race/ethnicity, university status, gender, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, etc.). University data were used to draw samples of potential participants which were stratified according to subcategories in order to ensure the widest range of participants possible. For example, in selecting a sample of faculty women, effort was made to draw proportional numbers of potential participants from each college, faculty rank, and mix of racial and ethnic groups. The exception to this was for LGBTQ students, since no university listing of such students exists. In order to contact these potential respondents, a mass e-mail was sent inviting any LGBTQ students to attend the group, the campus student gay-straight alliance was asked to help recruit participants, and faculty advisors to the campus GSA were asked to alert and remind students about the group.

Potential participants were notified via e-mail that they had been selected for participation and asked to confirm their intent to attend by replying. They were also reminded of the invitation and of the upcoming group several times via e-mail and offered a $10 University Store gift certificate as an incentive to participate.

Focus Group Limitations

Despite these efforts, several focus groups drew very small numbers of participants and a group with faculty men was not conducted due to low attendance at the scheduled group. The focus groups with student veterans, African and African American students, male students, and racially and ethnically diverse students were eventually populated by simply inviting all students who fell into the relevant category to a focus group rather than attempting to sample from each population. Given the nature of qualitative research and the limitations stated above, caution should be exercised when interpreting results from this study.

Focus Group Analysis

All focus group notes were transcribed and analyzed using basic content analysis techniques (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). A list of major issues described by each specific group was developed, as well as a list of common concerns expressed by faculty, staff, and students from all groups.
**Survey Instrument**

The skeleton of the survey was based on the work of Rankin (2003). Survey questions were revised and developed by the Diversity and Inclusion Survey Leadership Team in January 2012 after a series of fact-finding meetings with several (16) focus groups on campus. The questions were revised numerous times for internal reliability, wording, consistency, and accurate definition of critical terms. The survey was reviewed by several expert colleagues and was presented to the President’s Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion for further feedback and comments. The final survey contained 116 questions and included open-ended questions for respondents to provide commentary. It was designed in such a way that the respondents would provide information on their personal campus experiences, their evaluation of the climate on campus, and their overall view of the conduct of the university regarding administrative policies and academic initiatives toward diversity concerns and issues. The survey was made available online and ample time was provided for response (the survey instrument may be viewed at http://bloomu.edu/climate_survey). All responses were entered into a secure database and tabulated for appropriate analysis. Respondents were offered small incentives for responding to the survey, such as credit at the University Store.

**Survey Sampling Procedure**

The proposal for the survey, including the instrument, was reviewed and approved by the Bloomsburg University Institutional Review Board (IRB) in March 2011. The confidentiality of each respondent’s identity for the purpose of data analysis was guaranteed in the proposal. The final draft was ready for disbursement in March 2012. It was released and distributed to the entire campus community including undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, staff, administrators and managers via an invitation of participation from President David Soltz. Several methods of publicizing through various media sources for mass communication and numerous incentives as well as weekly reminders were used to encourage participation in the survey.

The survey started by providing pertinent information to the respondents regarding the purpose and importance of the study, a description of the instrument, definition of the key terms and assuring the respondent of complete anonymity.
Survey Limitations

There are several inherent limitations in generalizations made from this study that should be pointed out. First, the voluntary and “self-selection” nature of the survey could naturally introduce bias. Since individuals had the choice and made a decision to participate, this could affect the outcome through self-selection bias. Additionally, the individual’s decision to participate may correlate with the individual’s personae, which could introduce further bias and make the sample non-representative. For example, people with stronger views, severe personal experiences, and better knowledge regarding climate issues may have had more inclination to participate.

Survey Data Analysis

Survey data were analyzed to compare the responses (in raw numbers and percentages) of various groups using Microsoft EXCEL and SPSS. Numbers and percentages were also calculated by relevant group membership to provide more information regarding responses. In this report, all information and numbers are calculated using valid percentages (i.e. missing data were excluded and the true total number of respondents were used). Open-ended questions were included in the survey to provide respondents the opportunity to comment, elaborate, and further express their views on campus climate. Responses from these open-ended questions were reviewed and a list of common themes was extracted based on the reviewer’s judgment.

Checking Reliability

Pearson’s r scores were calculated for a range of questions as a means of testing to see if the survey instrument is reliable. Collectively, these correlations suggest a strong reliability for the questions related to campus climate.

REPORT

Dissemination

This document has evolved in response to the dialogue it initiated and to feedback from its readers. The following is a list of venues in which the document and summary findings were presented. This document was initially disseminated to the campus community on March 27, 2013. Several methods for submitting comments in response to the report were made available. The comment period closed on May 24, 2013.

Many thanks to the community members who read with care and took the time to communicate their questions and comments about the report’s content.
March 25, 2013:
   Executive Council

March 27, 2013:
   University Forum

April 5, 2013:
   College of Liberal Arts (COLA)

April 8, 2013:
   Community Government Association (CGA)

April 9, 2013:
   Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties (APSCUF)

April 11, 2013:
   Academic Affairs Leadership Council

April 15, 2013:
   American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)

April 23, 2013:
   Student Affairs Directors
Appendix B: COMPARISON STUDIES

Campus climates are complex and multifaceted, influenced by myriad factors. They are also dynamic, always evolving as community members’ attitudes and perceptions regarding issues of diversity change. As such, the campus climate of every university is unique.

Despite these inherent differences, consideration of climate study results from other universities alongside results from BU can be constructive. Studies from other universities can be helpful in assessing the effectiveness of survey methodologies utilized at BU. They may also provide perspective for the evaluation and interpretation of the BU climate study results.

Comparing results of studies conducted at multiple universities should be done cautiously. As previously mentioned, every university’s climate is unique. Climate studies are typically cross-sectional, so results only describe conditions at a particular point in time. Finally, differing methodologies can make comparisons difficult. Survey instruments are often adapted to meet the needs of each particular institution, and so dissimilarities in diction and structure can limit the applicability of results.

Although campus climate studies have been conducted at many universities, few meet the criteria of having been recently conducted, readily accessible, and directly comparable. To provide some context for evaluating results from the BU climate study, various summary level results of climate studies conducted at Millersville University and Carleton College are considered here. These studies were conducted relatively recently, have made results publically available, and utilized very similar survey instruments.

The campus climate study conducted in 2008 at Carleton, a small liberal arts college in Minnesota, achieved an impressive response rate of approximately 56 percent among all respondents and 53 percent specifically among students.10 An initial campus climate survey was administered at MU in Spring 2009.11 The overall response rate for this initial survey was low, particularly among students (approximately 7 percent), so the survey was re-administered to the student population the following year. The response rate among students in the 2010 climate survey at MU was 26 percent.12 In the BU study, the response rate was 25 percent among all respondents and 23 percent specifically among students. Wherever possible, MU data cited in this section refer to the 2010 study.

Although these studies differ in content, there are a number of common items that were similarly presented in the survey instruments. For example, 82 percent of all respondents at BU reported

10 See Rankin & Associates (2008) for Carleton College study
11 See Rankin & Associates (2009) for initial Millersville University study
12 See Millersville University (2010) for follow-up Millersville University study
being *Comfortable* or *Very comfortable* with the overall climate, compared with 85 percent at MU and 81 percent at Carleton. Regarding comfort in their department/division/unit, 84 percent of respondents at BU reported being *Comfortable* or *Very comfortable*, compared with 74 percent at MU and 75 percent at Carleton. Among students only, rates of comfort with the classroom climate were similar between comparable studies, with 86 percent of BU students, 87 percent of MU students, and 82 percent of Carleton students reporting feeling such levels of comfort.

In terms of career satisfaction, 57 percent of BU employee respondents reported satisfaction with how their careers have progressed, compared with 62 percent of MU and 66 percent of Carleton employee respondents. Nearly the same proportion of employees at BU and MU reported having support from decision makers regarding career advancement (61 percent and 60 percent, respectively). There were, however, large differences between the universities in the proportion of respondents that reported having seriously considered leaving. At BU, 19 percent of all respondents and 17 percent of students reported having seriously considered leaving the university. At MU, 41 percent of all respondents and 28 percent of students reported having seriously considered leaving, while at Carleton, 38 percent of all respondents and 35 percent of students reported doing so.

Finally, a smaller proportion of BU respondents (15 percent) than MU and Carleton respondents (both 23 percent) reported having personally experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct that interfered with their ability to work or learn. In terms of observing such conduct, 30 percent of BU respondents reported having done so, compared to 40 percent at MU and 46 percent at Carleton. At both BU and MU, the most commonly cited locations for the conduct were on campus.
Appendix C: DIVERSITY and INCLUSION STRATEGIC PLAN

Bloomsburg University of PA
Diversity and Inclusion Five-Year Strategic Plan

Vision Statement

Academic excellence at Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania requires reflective engagement with diversity. We take this as a call to transformative action as we go about our daily work in all aspects of campus life: recruitment, teaching, scholarship, learning in and out of the classroom, and with external constituencies. Through these pursuits, we will create an inclusive community that prepares all who come to the university to recognize and draw on the challenges and richness of diversity.

Executive Summary

Commitment:

Bloomsburg University shares the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education’s commitment to diversity, as articulated by the PASSHE Social Equity Council:

PASSHE must sustain each of its academic communities with a shared sense of purpose, core values, and respect for a diversity of cultures, perspectives, backgrounds and experiences. To that end, the members of these communities are expected to advance fair practices and the elimination of systemic practices that serve as barriers to the full inclusion of all university constituents, and above all preserve the dignity and safety of every person.

Bloomsburg University is committed to principles of excellence. In order to achieve these goals, the university must interweave diversity into all areas of the institution: the recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, students, and administration; a curriculum that reflects the dynamic, diversity of our world; and a supportive and inclusive environment that promotes the growth of all of its constituencies.

Defining Diversity:

Bloomsburg University takes its cue from PASSHE’s definition, recognizing with them that a definition is constantly evolving. For the purpose of the Bloomsburg University Strategic Plan, diversity encompasses the presence and participation of individuals who differ and are similar by characteristics such as, but not necessarily limited to, race, age, color, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, sexual orientation, national origin, religion, disability status and community affiliation. A diverse environment includes individuals from historically underrepresented populations, various socioeconomic backgrounds, and with a multitude of ideas, attitudes and beliefs.
Plan:

This Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan offers a sustained, collaborative approach to making diversity and meaningful inclusion a reality. It offers specific directions, initiatives, and strategies with the goal of meeting the promise of the university’s mission, values, and strategic plan. It was drafted in spring 2010 by a Diversity Task Force made up of faculty, staff, students and administrators appointed by the President and identifies five major directions. In establishing these goals, initiatives, and strategies, the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan aims to articulate engagement with diversity and inclusion as a responsibility of all campus constituencies. The plan identifies five priorities that will each have a series of measurable outcomes:

1. Increase recruitment, retention, and graduation rates for historically underrepresented and underserved students.
2. Improve recruitment and retention for a diverse administration, faculty, and staff.
3. Strive to improve inclusivity in teaching and to incorporate diversity and inclusion in significant ways in teaching, learning, and research.
4. Work on campus and in local communities to develop partnerships, establish programs, and plan events that create an environment that supports diversity and inclusion.
5. Develop and maintain a permanent system of accountability and responsibility involving all campus entities to ensure diversity and inclusion. This system should exist independent of, but work with, University Planning and Assessment.

We understand that diversity and retention require care and diligence in recruitment if the community of Bloomsburg University is to attract and select prospective students and job candidates from historically underrepresented groups. These groups may include persons from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds, historically underrepresented communities, and other legally protected groups. Our commitments to diversity and inclusion dictate the necessity of creating sustainable programs and initiatives to ensure retention of diverse peoples. This plan outlines goals and objectives for 2010 to 2015, but should be considered a living document, one that must be revisited as BU and the world change.

Bloomsburg University, like most institutions of higher education in the 21st century, recognizes the need to sustain and nurture a campus community that reflects U.S. society.

\footnote{Chair: Kambon Camara, Asst. Prof. of Psychology. Participants: Megan Acevedo, student; Gia Adornetto, student; Richard Baker, Prof. of Accounting; Jim Dalton, Prof. of Psychology; Belinda Deleon, Safety Administrator, Law Enforcement; Terrell Garrett, student; Maggie Gillespie-Hill, Protestant Campus Minister; Brian Johnson, ACT 101 Instructor; Dan Knorr, Mayor, Town of Bloomsburg; Jeffrey Long, Interim VP for Student Life; Cristina Mathews, Assoc. Prof. of English; Vickey Rainis, Admin. Asst. for Social Equity; Mehdi Razzaghi, Prof. of Mathematics, Statistics & Comp Sci; Madelyn Rodriguez, Dir. of Multicultural Center; Richard Rugen, VP for Finance; Rosalee Rush, Dir. Of Communications; Caryn Terwilliger, Asst. Prof. of Early Childhood & Elementary Ed.; Mark Usry, Assoc. Prof. of Finance & Legal Studies, Chair, LGBTI Commission; Julie Vandivere, Assoc. Prof. of English; Bob Wislock, Dir. of Social Equity; Irvin Wright, Asst. to Provost for Diversity Initiatives, Dir. of Act 101.}
Universities have recognized the causality between diversity and inclusion and the three central missions of the university: research, teaching, and community service.\(^\text{14}\)

Valuing and promoting diversity is difficult work that can hold different meanings for people in the same community. Due to the differences in how people discuss and define diversity, there is no “template” or “right” way to have such conversations or enact change. Complicating such conversations are concerns regarding inclusion and legal and financial obligations. With this in mind, we must better understand our perception of diversity and base these conversations on both general higher education and BU community contexts.

**Goals/Directions and Supporting Initiatives/Actions**

**Goal/Direction #1: Increase recruitment, retention and graduation rates for historically underrepresented and underserved students.**

Initiatives/Actions and supporting strategies:

1. **Increase student populations from historically underrepresented and underserved groups.**
   a. Review marketing materials to ensure they are inclusive and communicate BU’s commitment to recruiting and retaining underrepresented and underserved populations.
   b. Assess current recruitment plan.
   c. Review current and create new partnerships and outreach efforts with a greater range of middle, high school, and community colleges.
   d. Develop and create an awareness of a cohesive financial system that supports the educational access and options for underrepresented and underserved students. (i.e. identify scholarship money to attract better qualified students who compete in the same market as elite institutions, explore alternative strategies for lowering costs, provide preliminary award letters early in the recruitment process).

---


e. Continue to enhance, connect, and expand programs that support low-income and first-generation students (e.g., Act 101, TRiO Student Services, Living and Learning Communities, Board of Governors programs, Multicultural Center, Accommodative Services, ESL Program).

f. Create a technological feedback system to help track student progress towards graduation.

g. Assess essential programs such as academic advising, tutoring, and testing that lead to higher graduation rates.

2. **Promote an inclusive, supportive environment for all underrepresented and underserved populations.**

a. Emphasize various leadership opportunities available to historically underrepresented individuals to increase student involvement. Increase collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to provide opportunities for significant interactions across diverse populations (e.g., LLCs, concerts, lectures).

b. Establish spaces and structures/policies that expand opportunities for full inclusion (multi-faith prayer space, ADA compliance, culturally appropriate dining options to meet various dietary needs). Increase opportunities for faculty-student research and collaboration and mentoring.

c. Establish “pipeline to professions” programs that focus on recruitment, retention, graduation, and placement of historically underrepresented community members.

---

**Goal/Direction #2: Improve recruitment and retention for a diverse administration, faculty and staff.**

Initiatives/Actions and supporting strategies:

1. **Recruit a diverse administration, faculty and staff.**

a. Emphasize a candidate’s commitment to diversity as an important criterion for hiring.

b. Expand recruitment efforts at national and diversity-focused conferences to attract diverse faculty, staff, and administrators from historically underrepresented groups.

   i. Send recruitment teams to the annual Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) conference to make contact with and invite historically underrepresented individuals to apply for the Frederick Douglass Teaching Scholars Program and tenure-track faculty positions.

   ii. Create opportunities for scholars to visit campus.
iii. Expand opportunities for BU scholars and administrators to participate in a campus exchange with campuses focusing on diversity initiative implementation.

c. Provide professional development opportunities for individuals responsible for hiring (e.g., send BU representatives to attend SREB and PASSHE Social Equity and Human Resources Symposium).

d. Host forums on diversity that include strategies for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty and staff.

e. Promote Bloomsburg University’s commitment to diversity initiatives and services (e.g., ACT 101, Disability Services, LGBTA Resource Center, Women’s Resource Center) in orientation programs for new administration, faculty and staff.

f. Enhance partnerships with local organizations to provide information and community resource guide [online] to new faculty, administrators, and staff that may address the cultural needs of potential employees (e.g., employment opportunities in region for spouse/partner, housing, religious organizations, social integration in the region).

g. Include a diversity statement in all recruitment publications.

h. Develop a *Guide to Hiring for Diversity* for use in the search process, including interview questions focused on diversity.

i. Continue to allocate funding to advertise in publications widely read by underrepresented groups.

2. **Retain a diverse administration, faculty and staff.**

   a. Conduct faculty, staff, and administrators exit interviews to understand reasons for departure.

   b. Utilize information gathered in exit interviews to inform retention initiatives.

   c. Organize activities to welcome new faculty, staff, and administrators to the university.

   d. Provide mentoring opportunities for new employees.

      i. (Faculty) to include structures to ensure the professional success (tenure, promotion, etc.) of new employees.

      ii. (Staff) to include structures to ensure the professional success (professional development and promotion) of new employees.

   e. Develop a clear and consistent message to faculty, staff, and administration that diversity is an institutional priority and efforts to create and maintain an inclusive campus community include faculty, staff, and administrators, as well as students.

   f. Conduct a study to investigate the relationship between departmental and university climate and employee retention.

   g. Utilize data collected from climate study to develop retention initiatives.
h. Promote faculty-staff collaboration in the creation and implementation of diversity initiatives.

i. Develop assessment measures to ascertain the rate of retention of underrepresented faculty and staff.

j. Annually assess strategies that are being used to retain students, faculty and staff for their effectiveness.

3. **Establish professional development that engages faculty, administrators and staff to exchange knowledge and experiences for reflecting on the challenges and value of diversity from multiple perspectives.**

   a. Develop grants that encourage work on diversity and inclusion available for faculty, administrators, and staff.

   b. Invite more scholars and high-profile professionals who engage with diversity, providing role models and intellectual engagement and excitement on issues related to diversity and inclusion (e.g., Provost’s Lecture Series).

   c. Provide professional development opportunities for staff, faculty, and administrators to increase their understanding of diversity and create and implement initiatives on campus.

   d. Provide and encourage participation in professional development opportunities for individuals responsible for developing and implementing diversity-focused initiatives.

**Goal/Direction #3: Strive to improve inclusivity in teaching and to incorporate diversity and inclusion in significant ways in teaching, learning, and research.**

Initiatives/Actions and supporting strategies:

1. **Improve the effectiveness of teaching to all constituencies.**

   a. Provide ongoing professional development for creating inclusive classroom environments.

   b. Evaluate courses with high failures rates and work to improve student success through changes in pedagogy and other measures, such as support services, remedial or preparatory classes, summer institutes, and relationships with secondary schools.

   c. Expand English as a Second Language (ESL) services.

   d. Develop an online resource to share successful inclusive teaching and assessment strategies.

   e. Establish the Frederick Douglass Institute as a center of excellence on diversity initiatives in the curriculum and in faculty professional development.
2. **Assure that each student’s educational experience significantly addresses diversity, inclusion, and global perspectives, and expands opportunities to deepen student engagement in these areas.**
   a. In coursework:
      i. Modify general education diversity requirement so that it provides our students with the tools to interact with the variety of individuals in our current culture (including, but not limited to, definitions of gender, sexuality, race, nationality, and ethnicity). This diversity requirement should include significant content for understanding power and systematic oppression in all of its manifestations.
      ii. Integrate diversity and inclusion into the entire curriculum, across all colleges, departments, and programs, including majors, program curricula, and university seminars.
      iii. Provide expanded funding and support for existing minors focused on areas relevant to diversity and inclusion (e.g., Ethnic Studies in the U.S., Gender and Women’s Studies, and the Africana Studies Minor).
   b. Outside the classroom:
      i. Build alliances between Multicultural Center, Academic Affairs, and academic units.
      ii. Develop clear pathways for funding to support multiple diversity programs and initiatives (e.g. International Studies, LGBT&A Consortium, Commission on the Status of Women, Black History Month, Women’s History Month, and the summer Migrant Worker Program.)
      iii. Create a diverse body of freshmen across all of the Living and Learning Communities (LLCs). Integrate first-year courses in diversity into the first-year experience for the LLCs.

3. **Support scholarly activity that broadens understandings of diversity, equity, and inclusion.**
   a. Foster a research community on campus for faculty and administrators investigating issues relevant to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
   b. Establish a separate pool of competitive money for reassigned time and/or grants for research that stresses diversity and inclusion.
   c. Provide opportunities for staff to engage in professional education on topics of diversity and inclusion.
Goal/Direction #4: Work on campus and in local communities to develop partnerships, establish programs, and plan events that create an environment that supports diversity and inclusion.

Initiatives/Actions and strategies:

1. **Strengthen commitment to diversity initiatives on campus.**
   a. Determine effective methods and venues that support critical dialogue about policies and practices. Examine and align ongoing commitments to campus/community efforts to create an inclusive environment.
   b. Increase visibility of existing programs that support historically underrepresented populations on campus.

2. **Provide greater visibility of commitment to diversity initiatives with regional public school systems.**
   a. Create and support professional development opportunities for educators.
   b. Support diversity conferences at regional high schools.
   c. Develop and implement programs that support diversity initiatives in local schools.

3. **Support a commitment to diversity initiatives within Town governance and in the community.**
   a. Collaborate with community groups (e.g., Task Force on Racial Equity and local Chambers of Commerce, businesses, Town Police, and religious leaders) to develop a statement of values and/or anti-discrimination ordinance for the town.

Goal/Direction #5: Develop and maintain a permanent system of accountability and responsibility involving all campus entities to ensure diversity and inclusion.

Initiatives/Actions and supporting strategies:

1. **Establish a reporting and accountability structure to examine inclusivity and diversity practices.**
   a. Establish a University-Wide Council on Diversity and Inclusion with the mission of sharing ideas, reporting progress, and setting broad goals.
   b. Each university division develops a structure which meets the goals of this plan: to prioritize, to implement practices, to evaluate progress, and to report within the structure established within the Strategic Plan.

2. **Require that departmental five-year reviews include assessment of diversity and inclusion.**
Appendix D: GLOSSARY

**Classism:** a system of power and privilege based on the accumulation of economic wealth and social status. Classism is the mechanism by which certain groups of people, considered as a unit according to their economic, occupational, or social status, benefit at the expense of other groups.

**Difference:** a characteristic that distinguishes one person from another or from an assumed “norm,” or the state of being distinguished by such characteristics.

**Discrimination:** unequal treatment of people based on their membership in a group.

**Dominance:** the systematic attitudes and actions of prejudice, superiority, and self-righteousness of one group (a non-target group) in relation to another (a target group). *Internalized dominance* includes the inability of a group or individual to see privilege as a member of the non-target group.

**Gender:** a cultural notion of what it is to be a woman or a man; a construct based on the social shaping of femininity and masculinity. It usually includes identification with males as a class or with females as a class. Gender includes subjective concepts about character traits and expected behaviors that vary from place to place and person to person.

**Homophobia:** thoughts, feelings, or actions based on fear, dislike, judgment, or hatred of gay men and lesbians/of those who love and sexually desire those of the same sex. Homophobia has roots in sexism and can include prejudice, discrimination, harassment, and acts of violence.

**In-group** (non-target group): the people in each system or relation of oppression who are in power in that oppression. Members of non-target groups are socialized into the role of being oppressive, becoming perpetrators or perpetuators of the cycle of oppression, either actively or indirectly. A non-target group may retain its power through force, the threat of force, and/or misinformation about the target group. Members of non-target groups also have a history of resistance that usually is not recognized.

**Invisibility:** the absence of target groups from the media, policies, procedures, legislation, social activities, and other milieus, which reinforces the notion, conscious or unconscious, that non-target groups are the norm. Invisibility contributes to the disempowerment of target groups and the perpetuation of the cycle of oppression.
**Oppression**: the systematic, institutionalized mistreatment of one group of people by another for any reason. Oppression is based on a complicated and changing network of unequal power relations.

**Out-group** (target group): the people in each system or relation of oppression who are without power in that oppression. Members of target groups are socialized into the role of being oppressed, internalizing the mistreatment and misinformation about the group(s) to which they belong. Each target group usually also has a history of resistance, which may not be recognized by people outside the target group.

**Power**: generally, the accumulation of money, goods, authority, sway, or influence. Specifically, the differential ability, based on unequal distribution of wealth, influence, or, physical force, to control the economic, political, sexual, educational, and other important decisions of others.

**Prejudice**: an opinion, prejudgment, or attitude formed with the perception of sufficient knowledge about a group or its members.

**Privilege**: an invisible set of unearned rights, benefits, or assets that belong to certain individuals simply by virtue of their membership in a particular non-target group. Privilege is a dynamic system of overlapping benefits which may act to any particular individual’s benefit in one set of circumstances and to that person’s detriment in another.

**Racism**: the systematic mistreatment of people of color based on the belief in the inherent superiority of one race and thereby the right to dominance. Racism is one manifestation of institutionalized differences in economic, social, and political power in which members of some ethnic and cultural groups benefit at the expense of others.

**Sexism**: the systematic economic, sexual, educational, physical, and other oppression of women as a group; the exploitation and social dominance of members of one sex by another.

**Stereotype**: an exaggerated belief, image, or distorted truth about a person or group—a generalization that allows for little or no individual differences or social variation.

The above definitions appear in *Writing for Change: Raising Awareness of Difference, Power, and Discrimination*, a teaching kit from Teaching Tolerance, a project of the Southern Poverty Law Center (used with permission). For more information on Teaching Tolerance and its free resources for teachers and community leaders, please visit www.teachingtolerance.org.
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