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Climate In Higher Education

Community Members

Create and Distribute Knowledge

Climate (Living, Working, Learning)

Assessing Campus Climate

What is it?
• Campus Climate is a construct

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

How is it measured?
• Personal Experiences
• Perceptions
• Institutional Efforts
Campus Climate & Students

How students experience their campus environment influences both learning and developmental outcomes.1

Discriminatory environments have a negative effect on student learning.2

Research supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty on enhancing learning outcomes.3

2 Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Hagedron, 1999; Feagin, Vera & Imani, 1996; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005
The personal and professional development of employees including faculty members, administrators, and staff members are impacted by campus climate.¹

Faculty members who judge their campus climate more positively are more likely to feel personally supported and perceive their work unit as more supportive.²

Research underscores the relationships between (1) workplace discrimination and negative job/career attitudes and (2) workplace encounters with prejudice and lower health/well-being.³

¹Settles, Cortina, Malley, and Stewart, 2006, Gardner, S. (2013); Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, J. 2009
²Costello, 2012; Sears, 2002; Kaminski, & Geisler, 2012; Griffin, Pérez, Holmes, & Mayo 2010
³Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2007; Waldo, 1999
Climate Matters
Student Activism in 2016
Climate Matters

Student Activism in 2016
While the demands vary by institutional context, a qualitative analysis reveals similar themes across the 76 institutions and organizations (representing 73 U.S. colleges and universities, three Canadian universities, one coalition of universities and one consortium of Atlanta HBCUs.)

Chessman & Wayt explore these overarching themes in an effort to provide collective insight into what is important to today’s students in the heated context of racial or other bias-related incidents on college and university campuses.

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016; http://www.thedemands.org/
Seven Major Themes

- Policy (91 percent)
- Leadership (89 percent)
- Resources (88 percent)
- Increased Diversity (86 percent)
- Training (71 percent)
- Curriculum (68 percent)
- Support (61 percent)

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016; http://www.thedemands.org/
Revising policies

- Faculty review
- Climate assessments
- Advocating beyond students*
- Affordability
- Student oversight
- Protocols (hate speech, bias)
- Policy review
- Transparency

One or more appeared on 91% of lists posted on www.Thedemands.org

* Includes demands for campuses to divest from prisons and adjust human resources practices for specific campus employees (e.g., lower wage, temporary/season staff)
Rankin & Associates

Demands for leadership

- Articulate role of police on campus
- Serve as diversity advocate in community
- Devise transparent plan to address demands
- Serve as diversity advocate on campus
- Acknowledge history of racism

One or more appeared on 89% of lists posted on www.Thedemands.org

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016; http://www.thedemands.org/
Rankin & Associates

Increasing resources

- New or remodeled facilities (e.g., multicultural centers)
- Programs that serve diverse student groups
- Increased staff to serve a diverse student population
- More campus diversity programming

One or more appeared on 88% of lists posted on www.TheDemands.org

Increasing diversity

- Staff & administration
- Students
- Faculty

One or more appeared on 85% of lists posted on www.TheDemands.org

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016 ; http://www.thedemands.org/
Rankin & Associates

**Revising the curriculum**

- Requirements
- Development

---

**Diversity training**

- Police
- Administration
- Students
- Staff
- Faculty

---

One or more appeared on 68% of lists posted on www.TheDemands.org

---

**Increasing support services**

- Legal
- Career
- Campus activities
- Academic
- Mental health

---

One or more appeared on 61% of lists posted on www.TheDemands.org

---

Chessman & Wayt, 2016; http://www.thedemands.org/
Climate Issues Influencing Student Success

Retaining “at-risk” students

Serving “invisible” students

Addressing physical sexual misconduct
59% of students who began seeking a bachelor's degree at a 4-year institution in fall 2007 completed that degree within 6 years.

The graduation rate for females (62%) was higher than the rate for males (56%).
Who are the “at-risk” students?

- **First generation**
  - First-generation students who come from families where neither parent has earned a bachelor’s degree or higher
- **Low socio-economic status**
  - Low-income - student’s family income falling at or below $29,999
- **African-American**
- **Latino@/Hispanic/Chicano@**
- **Native American**
- **Women in STEM**
- **Queer spectrum/trans spectrum**
- **Veterans**
- **Etc….**

Source: National Reports:
Source: Peer-Reviewed Articles:
### First Generation/Low Income Students Retention Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Attained bachelor’s degree</th>
<th>Attained associate’s degree or other credentials</th>
<th>Still enrolled</th>
<th>Dropped out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-income, first-generation</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income, not first-generation</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-generation, not low-income</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not low income and not first- generation</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retention Rates by Race Degree in 6 years

1996

- 58% White
- 39% African American
- 46% Latin@/Hispanic

2010

- 62% White
- 40% African American
- 51% Latin@/Hispanic

## African American Retention Rates

Blacks are more likely than whites to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th></th>
<th>Blacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... attend a two-year college (2011)</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... go to school part-time (2011)</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... take remedial classes (2007-08)</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And are less likely than whites to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th></th>
<th>Blacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... graduate in six years (2005)</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6-year Graduation Rates

6-Year Graduation Rates for Students Enrolling at 4-Year Institutions in 2004, by Type of Institution and Race

Asian students at four-year private nonprofit colleges had the highest graduation rates, while multiracial students at for-profit colleges fared the worst.

Note: Figures are for students who first enrolled in 2004 seeking a bachelor’s or equivalent degree from a four-year institution. The Education Department’s racial/ethnic categories are mutually exclusive.

Source: U.S. Education Department
Gender/Race in STEM Fields Retention Rates

LGBTQ Retention Rates

Unknown, but do know...

2003

- Feared for their physical safety
  - LGBQ - 20%
- Concealed their identity to avoid intimidation
  - LGBQ - 51%

2010

- Feared for physical safety
  - Queer spectrum - 13%
  - Trans spectrum – 43%
- Concealed their identity to avoid intimidation
  - Queer spectrum - 43%
  - Trans spectrum - 63%

Source: Rankin, 2003; Rankin, et al., 2010
“It’s remarkable for undocumented students to even apply to college. I mean, we come from another country; we have to learn English; we face a lot of adversity; and we still graduate from high school and apply to college. Who would be a better candidate for a scholarship? If we get just a little help, then I think we’ll become some of the strongest students and most successful people. I don’t see us as risks; I think of us as smart investments.”

---Irving Pineda, profiled in E4FC’s film, American Dream Seekers (2007), and now a graduate of UC Merced (2010)
Campus Climate & Sexual Misconduct

*Not Alone: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault*

The report highlights that one in five women is sexually assaulted while in college.

R&A climate assessments indicate that 3-5% of undergraduate women are sexually assaulted while in college.

84% of the women experienced the incident during their first four semesters on campus.¹,²

80% of the women knew the offender (e.g., friend, acquaintance).²

---

¹Source: Krebs, et al., 2010
²Source: http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5176
Sexual Misconduct on College Campuses

23.1% of women undergraduate students experienced sexual assault and sexual misconduct due to physical force, threats of physical force, or incapacitation; 10.8% experienced penetration.

Overall rates of reporting to campus officials and law enforcement or others were low, ranging from 5% to 28%.

Most common reason for not reporting “not considered serious enough”. Other reasons: “embarrassed,” “ashamed”, “emotionally difficult,” “did not think anything would be done about it.”

63.3% believe that a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct would be taken seriously by campus officials.

Source: AAU Campus Survey On Sexual Assault And Sexual Misconduct
Responses to Unwelcoming Campus Climates

What are students behavioral responses?
30% of respondents have seriously considered leaving their institution due to the challenging climate.

Similarly, 33% of Queer spectrum and 38% of Trans-spectrum respondents have seriously considered leaving their institution due to the challenging climate.

What do students offer as the main reason for their departure?

Source: R&A, 2015; Rankin, et al., 2010; Strayhorn, 2012
Suicidal Ideation/Self-Harm

- Experienced Victimization
- Lack of Social Support
- Feelings of hopelessness
- Suicidal Ideation or Self-Harm

Source: Liu & Mustanski 2012
Student Activism

University Of Tennessee Condoned Football Rape Culture, Lawsuit Alleges

Six arrested by UGA police after staging a sit-in at UGA’s New College to protest the Georgia Board of Regents policies regarding undocumented students
Student Activism

Christian students protest Title IX waivers, allege anti-LGBT discrimination

Protests over campus race relations spread to more campuses
Projected Outcomes

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

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

Examine the Research
- Review work already completed

Preparation
- Readiness of each campus

Assessment
- Examine the climate

Follow-up
- Building on the successes and addressing the challenges
Project Overview

Phase I
- Focus Groups

Phase II
- Assessment Tool Development and Implementation

Phase III
- Data Analysis

Phase IV
- Final Report and Presentation
Dartmouth created the Climate Study Working Group (CSWG; comprised of faculty, staff, students and administrators). 19 focus groups were conducted by R&A (157 participants – 72 students; 77 faculty and staff; 8 graduate students/professional school/post-docs/research associates) on May 18th, 2015. Data from the focus groups informed the CSWG and R&A in constructing questions for the campus-wide survey.
Meetings with the CSWG to develop the survey instrument

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

The final survey was distributed to the entire Dartmouth community (students, faculty, staff, and administrators) via an invitation from Provost Dever.
Final instrument
- 110 questions and additional space for respondents to provide commentary (21 qualitative, 89 quantitative)
- On-line or paper & pencil options

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

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

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

Instead, small groups were combined to eliminate possibility of identifying individuals.
Phase III
Winter 2016/Spring 2016

Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted
Phase IV
Spring 2016

Report draft reviewed by the CSWG

Final report submitted to Dartmouth

Presentation to Dartmouth campus community
Results

Response Rates
Who are the respondents?

2,753 people responded to the call to participate
26% overall response rate
Response Rates by Student Position

- Post-Doc/Research Associates ($n = 25$) 28%
- Undergraduate Student ($n = 781$) 18%
- Graduate Student ($n = 336$) 17%
Response Rates by Employee Position

- Staff (n = 1,243) - 37%
- Faculty (n = 368) - 35%
Response Rates by Gender Identity

- **29%**
  - Woman \((n = 1,587)\)

- **21%**
  - Man \((n = 1,127)\)

- **N/A**
  - Transgender \((n = 27)\)

- **N/A**
  - Genderqueer \((n = 42)\)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- 53% Multiple Race ($n = 158$)
- 29% White ($n = 2,044$)
- 27% Asian/Asian American ($n = 251$)
- 19% American Indian/Alaskan Native ($n = 24$)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- **18%**
  - African American/Black ($n = 71$)

- **13%**
  - Hispanic/Latino(a)/Chicano(a) ($n = 63$)

- **N/A**
  - Middle Eastern ($n = 32$)

- **N/A**
  - Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander ($n < 5$)
Results

Additional Demographic Characteristics
Respondents by Position (%)

- Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: 4
- Tenure-Track Faculty: 9
- Graduate/Post-Doc/Research Assoc: 13
- Undergraduates: 28
- Staff: 45
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic division</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geisel School of Medicine</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuck School of Business</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thayer School of Engineering</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Staff Respondents by Academic Division/Work Unit (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic division/Work unit</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provost’s Division</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geisel School of Medicine (including TDI, NCCC)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Services</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences/Dean of the Faculty of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Administration</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuck School of Business</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Division</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thayer School of Engineering</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Undergraduate Student Respondents by Academic Major (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Major</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared Major</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thayer School of Engineering</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Fellow</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Graduate Student Respondents by Academic Division (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic division</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geisel School of Medicine</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuck School of Business</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thayer School of Engineering</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%) (Duplicated Total)

- White: 80%
- Asian/Asian American: 11%
- Hispanic/Latino/Chicano: 4%
- Black/African/African American: 4%
- American Indian/Native: 3%
- Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian: 2%
- Racial Identity Not Listed: 1%
- Pacific Islander: <1%
- Alaska Native: <1%
- Native Hawaiian: 0%

Note: Responses with n < 5 are not presented in the figure.
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Unduplicated Total)

- White: 74%
- People of Color: 16%
- Multiracial: 6%
- Race, Other/Missing/Unknown: 4%
Rankin & Associates

Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Non-Tenure-Track Faculty</th>
<th>Tenure-Track Faculty</th>
<th>Graduate/Post-Doc/RA</th>
<th>Undergrad Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Multiple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Respondents by Sexual Identity and Position Status ($n$)

- **Undergraduate Students**
- **Graduate/Post-Doc/Research Assoc**
- **Tenure-Track Faculty**
- **Non-Tenure-Track Faculty**
- **Staff**

### LGBQ
- Undergraduate Students: 127
- Graduate/Post-Doc/Research Assoc: 45
- Tenure-Track Faculty: 16
- Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: 6

### Heterosexual
- Undergraduate Students: 633
- Graduate/Post-Doc/Research Assoc: 305
- Tenure-Track Faculty: 218
- Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: 105

### Asexual/Other
- Undergraduate Students: 18
- Graduate/Post-Doc/Research Assoc: 5
- Tenure-Track Faculty: 5
- Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: 0
- Staff: 29

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
10% ($n = 279$) of Respondents Had Disabilities that Substantially Affected Learning, Working, or Living Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental health/psychological condition</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic health or medical condition</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Deficit Disorder</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disability</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/mobility condition that affects walking</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing impaired or deaf</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually-impaired or blind</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asperger's/autism spectrum</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/mobility condition that does not affect walking</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired/Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/communication condition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual dexterity impairment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A disability/condition not listed here</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Faith-Based Affiliation (%)
## Citizenship Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen, birth</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visa holder (F-1, J-1, H1-B, A, L, G, E or TN visa holder)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen, naturalized</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented resident</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee status</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other legally documented status</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently under a “withholding of removal” status</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAPA (Deferred Action for Parental Accountability)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Military Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never served in the military</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now on active duty</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On active duty in the past, but not now</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Respondents by Age ($n$)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Employee Respondents’ Dependent Care Status by Position (%)

- No dependent care: 98 Undergraduate Students, 90 Graduate Students
- Children under 18 yrs: 1 Undergraduate Students, 8 Graduate Students
- Depend. child 18 yrs or older: 1 Undergraduate Students, 1 Graduate Students
- Independent child 18 yrs or older: 1 Undergraduate Students, 1 Graduate Students
- Sick/disabled partner: 1 Undergraduate Students, 1 Graduate Students
- Senior/other: 1 Undergraduate Students, 1 Graduate Students

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
## Student Respondents’ Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I work on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I work off campus</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 hours/week</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours/week</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours/week</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours/week</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Residence

- Campus housing (61%, n = 694)
- Non-campus housing (37%, n = 425)
## Student Respondents’ Residence
### Campus Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence hall</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affinity house/Living, learning community</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek letter organization or society house</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Residence

#### Non-campus housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College-owned housing</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independently in an apartment/house</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with family member/guardian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transient</strong> <em>(e.g., couch surfing, sleeping in car, sleeping in campus office/lab)</em></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Respondents’ Income by Dependency Status and Position (%)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
30% \((n = 339)\) of Student Respondents Reported Experiencing Financial Hardship…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affording tuition</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing my books/course materials</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in social events</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording unpaid internships/research opportunities</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording travel to and from Dartmouth</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording housing</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording health care</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording co-curricular events or activities</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording alternative spring breaks</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording food</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording other campus fees</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording commuting to campus</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording child care</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes Student respondents who reported having experienced financial hardship \((n = 339)\) only. Sum does not total 100% as a result of multiple response choices.
# How Student Respondents Were Paying For College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family contribution</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need-based Dartmouth scholarship/aid</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contribution/job</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dartmouth grant/scholarship</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Study job</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit card</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs or Organizations at Dartmouth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreational organization</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek letter organization, Undergraduate Society, or Senior Society</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club sport</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service or philanthropic organization</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional or pre-professional organization</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith or spirituality-based organization</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political or issue-oriented organization</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Respondents’ Participation in Clubs or Organizations (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture-specific organization</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication/media organization</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or academic competition organization</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance organization</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic team</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not participate in any clubs or organizations</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellness organization</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance organization</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student organization not listed above</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comfort Levels

Overall Campus Climate (70%)

Department/Work Unit Climate (73%)

Classroom Climate (85%)
Comfort With Overall Climate

- Undergraduate Student and Graduate Student/Post-Doc/Research Associate respondents more comfortable than Staff, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents
- Men respondents more comfortable than Women and Other/Multiple Gender Identity respondents
- White respondents more comfortable than Multiracial respondents and Respondents of Color
- Heterosexual respondents more comfortable than Asexual/Other and LGBQ respondents
Comfort With Overall Climate

- Respondents from Christian Affiliations and from Other Faith-Based Affiliations more comfortable than respondents with No Affiliation and with Multiple Affiliations
- Respondents with No Disabilities more comfortable than respondents with a Single Disability or Multiple Disabilities
- Military Service respondents more comfortable than Non-Military Service respondents
- Not-First-Generation Student respondents more comfortable than First-Generation Student respondents
Comfort With Department/Work Unit Climate

Men Faculty and Staff respondents more comfortable than Women Faculty and Staff respondents

Multiracial and White Faculty and Staff respondents more comfortable than Faculty and Staff Respondents of Color
Comfort With Classroom Climate

- Men Faculty and Student respondents more comfortable than Women Faculty and Student respondents
- White Faculty and Student respondents more comfortable than Faculty and Student Respondents of Color and Multiracial Faculty and Student respondents
- Heterosexual Faculty and Student respondents more comfortable than LGBQ Faculty and Student respondents
- Faculty and Students respondents with Military Service more comfortable than Non-Military Service Faculty and Student respondents
Comfort With Classroom Climate

- Faculty and Student respondents with a Single Disability and No Disability more comfortable than Faculty and Student respondents with Multiple Disabilities
- Not-First-Generation Student respondents more comfortable than First-Generation Student respondents
- Not-Low-Income Student respondents more comfortable than Low-Income Student respondents
Challenges and Opportunities
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

21%

- 565 respondents indicated that they had personally experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct at Dartmouth College in the past year.
Personally Experienced Based on…(%)

- Position (n=185): 33%
- Gender/Gender Identity (n=160): 28%
- Ethnicity (n=90): 16%
- Age (n=79): 14%
- Philosophical Views (n=75): 13%

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 565). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignored or excluded.</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated or left out.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated or bullied.</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced a hostile work environment.</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of derogatory verbal remarks.</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of workplace incivility.</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singled out as the spokesperson for my identity group.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 565). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Position Status (%)

- Overall experienced conduct\(^1\)
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of position status\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Position Status Result of Conduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>19 (n = 147)</td>
<td>5 (n = 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/Post-Doc/RA</td>
<td>16 (n = 56) (^1)</td>
<td>23 (n = 13) (^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Faculty</td>
<td>20 (n = 51) (^1)</td>
<td>18 (n = 9) (^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure-Track</td>
<td>14 (n = 17) (^1)</td>
<td>47 (n = 8) (^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>24 (n = 294) (^1)</td>
<td>50 (n = 147) (^2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of their gender identity

**Overall experienced conduct**

1. **Men**
   - Overall: 17 (n = 184)
   - Men: 22 (n = 40)

2. **Women**
   - Overall: 22 (n = 345)
   - Women: 28 (n = 98)

3. **Transspectrum**
   - Overall: 53 (n = 10)
   - Transspectrum: 40 (n < 5)

4. **Other/Multiple**
   - Overall: 53 (n = 20)
   - Other/Multiple: 80 (n = 16)

---

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

- Overall experienced conduct¹
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, said they experienced conduct as a result of ethnicity²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Experienced as a Result of Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>(n = 38)¹</td>
<td>(n = 13)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>(n = 99)¹</td>
<td>(n = 45)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>(n = 394)¹</td>
<td>(n = 26)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Excluded as a Result of Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 and under</td>
<td>16 (n = 110)¹</td>
<td>7 (n = 8)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>24 (n = 49)¹</td>
<td>14 (n = 7)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>18 (n = 88)¹</td>
<td>26 (n = 23)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>25 (n = 87)¹</td>
<td>10 (n = 9)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>21 (n = 95)¹</td>
<td>10 (n = 9)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>21 (n = 72)¹</td>
<td>15 (n = 11)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>21 (n = 17)¹</td>
<td>21 (n = 7)²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While working at a Dartmouth job</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a Dartmouth administrative office</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with one other person</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other public spaces at Dartmouth</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a Dartmouth event/program</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n = 565$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Student Position Status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Student respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Student respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 565). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Faculty Position Status (%)

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents
- Dept/Program Chair: 24%
- Sr Admin: 24%
- Staff: 0%
- Faculty: 53%
- Student: 6%

Tenure-Track Faculty respondents
- Dept/Program Chair: 29%
- Sr Admin: 16%
- Staff: 8%
- Faculty: 35%
- Student: 12%

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 565). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Staff Position Status (%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 565). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?

Emotional Responses

- Angry (67%)
- Felt embarrassed (45%)
- Ignored it (27%)
- Was afraid (26%)
- Felt somehow responsible (22%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 565). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?

- Told a friend (43%)
- Avoided the person/venue (38%)
- Told a family member (35%)
- Didn’t do anything (34%)
- Contacted a Dartmouth resource (21%)
  - Office of Human Resources (35%)
  - Employee Assistance Program (24%)
  - Ombudsperson (23%)
  - Staff person (22%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 565). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
20% of Respondents who Experienced Conduct Reported It

- Felt that it was not responded to appropriately (40%)
- While the outcome was not what I had hoped for, I felt as though my complaint was responded to appropriately (15%)
- Felt satisfied with the outcome. (5%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n = 565$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Theme
Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Hostility

Perceived efficacy of reporting

Harassment in more detail
144 respondents (5%) experienced unwanted sexual contact at Dartmouth College
Unwanted Sexual Contact at Dartmouth College

- **Women respondents** (6%, n = 97)
- **Undergraduate Student respondents** (13%, n = 102)
- **Multiracial respondents** (17%, n = 26)
- **LGBQ respondents** (13%, n = 41)
Location of Unwanted Sexual Contact

- On Campus (76%, $n = 110$)
- Off Campus (28%, $n = 40$)
Perpetrator of Unwanted Sexual Contact

- Dartmouth student (n = 84) - 58
- Acquaintance/friend (n = 60) - 42
- Student (n = 39) - 27
- Dartmouth faculty (n = 17) - 12
- Dartmouth staff (n = 19) - 13
- Alumnus/a (n = 16) - 11
- Family member (n = 8) - 6
- Person not listed (n = 10) - 7

Dartmouth student (n = 84)
### Undergraduate Students: Year in Which Unwanted Sexual Contact Occurred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in Which Contact Occurred</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014 to Summer 2015</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013 to Summer 2014</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012 to Summer 2013</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Fall 2012</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by Students who indicated on the survey that they experienced unwanted sexual contact (n = 102).
Emotional Reactions to Unwanted Sexual Contact

- I felt uncomfortable: 83%
- I was afraid: 32%
- I felt embarrassed: 54%
- I felt somehow responsible: 43%
- I ignored it: 34%
- I was angry: 43%
Actions in Response to Unwanted Sexual Contact

- I avoided the person/venue: 61%
- I didn’t know who to go to: 19%
- I confronted the person(s) later: 19%
- I didn’t do anything: 39%
- I confronted the person(s) at the time: 21%
- I told a friend: 49%
Qualitative Themes for Respondents: Why they did not report the unwanted sexual contact

- **Negative perceptions about reporting**
  - Reluctance to report
  - Gender bias

- **Confusion**
  - What is reportable?
  - Not a big deal
Qualitative Themes for Respondents: Why they did not report the unwanted sexual contact

Faculty and Staff: Lack of institutional support
- Response invalidating
- Concerns were low priority

Students: Disregard of our needs
- Survivor shaming
- Blaming, invalidating, and dismissive
Qualitative Themes for Respondents:
Their reports were not responded to appropriately

Supported
- Handled appropriately
- Campus official or staff member showed genuine concern

Not supported
- Not handled appropriately
- Investigation too long and inadequate
## Top Facilities Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary barriers due to construction or maintenance</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus transportation/parking</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building where I work</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways, pedestrian paths, crosswalks</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Top Technology/Online Environment Barriers by Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology/Online</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible electronic format</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Top Identity Accuracy Barriers by Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Accuracy</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic databases (e.g., Banner)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email account</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning technology</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Top Instructional Campus Materials Barriers by Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Campus Materials</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food menus</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Dartmouth College

- 69% of Tenure-Track Faculty respondents ($n = 173$)
- 53% of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents ($n = 62$)
- 59% of Staff respondents ($n = 726$)
### Reasons Employee Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Dartmouth College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons (e.g., salary, resources)</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position elsewhere</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of sense of belonging</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working relationship with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Faculty and Staff respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 961).
Qualitative Themes for Employee Respondents

Why Considered leaving... 

Negative microclimates

Advancement
Student Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving Dartmouth College

24% of Undergraduate Student respondents
\((n = 188)\)

20% of Graduate Student/Post-Doc/Research Associate respondents
\((n = 72)\)
When Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Dartmouth College

- 75% in their first year
- 48% in their second year
- 24% in their third year
- 9% in their fourth year
# Top Reasons Why Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving Dartmouth College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate was not welcoming</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a support group</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homesick</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework too difficult</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those Student respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 260).
Qualitative Themes
Why Considered leaving...

Sense of belonging

Inclusion
Student Respondents Who Agreed That They Would Recommend Dartmouth

- Not-First-Generation (n = 643) 81%
- First-Generation (n = 229) 73%
- Not-Low-income (n = 643) 81%
- Low-Income (n = 229) 73%
- Multiple Disability (n = 26) 61%
- Single Disability (n = 66) 70%
- No Disability (n = 804) 81%
- Heterosexual (n = 763) 82%
- LGBQ (n = 120) 70%
- Multiracial (n = 83) 75%
- White (n = 526) 81%
- Students of Color (n = 270) 79%
- Man (n = 431) 83%
- Woman (n = 441) 12%
- Grad/Post-Doc/RA (n = 281) 79%
- Undergraduate (n = 618) 79%
Perceptions
Respondents who observed conduct or communications directed towards a person/group of people that created an exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile working or learning environment...

30% ($n = 810$)
### Form of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory verbal remarks</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person ignored or excluded</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person isolated or left out</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person experienced a hostile work environment</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was the target of workplace incivility</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic profiling</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption that someone was admitted/hired/promoted based on his/her identity</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory/unsolicited messages online</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory written comments</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person experiences a hostile classroom environment</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 810). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct Based on…(%)
**Source of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct (%)**

- Student (52%)
- Faculty member/instructional staff (19%)
- Coworker/colleague (16%)
- Supervisor/manager (11%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment ($n = 810$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Target of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct (%)

- Student (57%)
- Coworker (27%)
- Friend (23%)
- Staff member (18%)
- Faculty member/instructional staff (11%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 810). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
# Location of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at Dartmouth College</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>n = 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>n = 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While working at a Dartmouth job</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>n = 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a class/lab</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>n = 150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 810). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)

- LGBQ (n = 143): 45%
- Heterosexual (n = 629): 28%
- Asexual/Other (n = 20): 35%
- Multiracial (n = 63): 40%
- White (n = 560): 28%
- People of Color (n = 159): 36%
- Other/Multiple Gender (n = 23): 59%
- Transspectrum (n = 11): 58%
- Men (n = 297): 27%
- Women (n = 472): 30%
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)

- Multiple Disabilities (n = 35): 47%
- Disability (n = 82): 44%
- No Disability (n = 683): 28%
- Multiple Affiliations (n = 94): 42%
- No Affiliation (n = 360): 29%
- Other Faith-Based Affiliation (n = 82): 32%
- Christian Affiliation (n = 245): 27%
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Position (%)

- Undergraduate Students (n = 310)
- Graduate/Post-Doc/RA (n = 93)
- Tenure-Track Faculty (n = 78)
- Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (n = 24)
- Staff (n = 305)
Qualitative Themes
Observed Conduct

Hostility and intimidation

Students: Racially biased exclusion

Staff: Observing offensive language
Employee Perceptions
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Hiring Practices

22% Staff respondents

32% Tenure-Track Faculty respondents

21% Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Hiring Practices

Lack of commitment to diversity

Nepotism and cronyism
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

- 15% Staff respondents
- 14% Tenure-Track Faculty respondents
- 13% Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

Perceived inconsistency

Observations of abuse
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Practices Related to Promotion

- 21% Staff respondents
- 35% Tenure-Track Faculty respondents
- 27% Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Practices Related to Promotion

Desire for more transparent processes

Exclusion
Most Common Bases for Discriminatory Employment Practices

- Nepotism/Cronyism
- Gender/Gender Identity
- Ethnicity
- Racial Identity
- Age
- Learning Disability
- Position
Positive views of campus climate were held by the majority of employees.
72% of Staff respondents believed that expectations of their responsibilities were clear.

68% thought that they had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.
Staff Respondents
Examples of Successes

65% believed that Dartmouth provided them with resources to pursue training/professional development opportunities

63% indicated that they would recommend Dartmouth College as a good place to work
Staff Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- Hierarchy existed within staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than others (58%)
- Performed more work than colleagues with similar performance expectations (33%)
- Staff salaries were competitive (27%)
Staff Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 31% Felt positively about their career opportunities at Dartmouth College.
- 25% Staff opinions were valued on Dartmouth College committees.
- 23% Staff opinions were valued by Dartmouth College administration.
Qualitative Themes
Staff Work-Life Attitudes

Workload

Family related issues

Power dynamics
Qualitative Themes
Staff Work-Life Attitudes

Inclusion concerns of perceived minorities

Professional growth, advancement, and review

Social hierarchy
Qualitative Themes
Staff Work-Life Attitudes

Job security concerns
Positive reflections on leadership
Desire for consistency from leadership
74% of Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that teaching was valued by Dartmouth College.

62% felt criteria for tenure were clear.
Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents

Examples of Challenges

- **47%**
  - Performed more work to help students than did their colleagues

- **38%**
  - Burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations

- **18%**
  - Pressured to change their research/scholarship agenda to achieve tenure/promotion.
Qualitative Themes

Tenure-Track Faculty Work-Life Attitudes

Value of research versus teaching

Perception of tenure-related inconsistencies
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

74% of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that teaching was valued by Dartmouth College

62% believed that expectations of their responsibilities were clear

70% felt that research was valued by Dartmouth College
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- **35%**
  - Believed that they performed more work to help students than did their colleagues

- **27%**
  - Felt pressured to do extra work that was uncompensated

- **20%**
  - Felt burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 31% believed that Non-Tenure-Track Faculty opinions were taken seriously by senior administrators.
- 24% felt that they had job security.
- 21% indicated that the criteria used for contract renewal was applied equally to all positions.
Qualitative Themes
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Work-Life Attitudes

- Questionable hiring practices
- Job security/feeling vulnerable
- Appropriate compensation for workload
All Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

65% of Faculty respondents thought that Dartmouth College provided them with resources to pursue professional development.

57% felt positive about their career opportunities at Dartmouth College.

64% would recommend Dartmouth College as a good place to work.
All Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

17%
• Believed that child care benefits were competitive

24%
• Indicated that Dartmouth College provided adequate resources to help them manage work-life balance

34%
• Thought that salaries for adjunct professors were competitive.
Qualitative Themes

All Faculty Work-Life Attitudes

Salary and benefits not competitive

Perceptions of administrative inconsistencies

Minority inclusion and equity
Student Respondents’ Perceptions
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Majority of Student respondents felt valued by faculty (83%) and other students (72%) in the classroom.

Majority felt valued by Dartmouth faculty (81%), staff (75%), and senior administrators (46%).
Student Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Climate

Many had faculty (76%) and less had staff (52%) who they perceived as role models.

27% indicated that faculty pre-judged their abilities based on their perception of their identities/backgrounds.

53% felt that the campus climate encourages free and open discussion of difficult topics.
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success
Student Respondents’ Academic Success

White Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than Undergraduate Students of Color.

Undergraduate Students with No Disability had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than Students with a Single Disability and with Multiple Disabilities.

Undergraduate Student respondents who were Not-First-Generation/Low-Income had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than Undergraduate Student respondents who were First-Generation/Low-Income.
Student Respondents’ Academic Experiences

- 80% Satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling at Dartmouth

- 81% Academic experience had a positive influence on their intellectual growth and interest in ideas

- 81% Interest in ideas and intellectual matters had increased since coming to Dartmouth
Student Respondents’ Academic Experiences

- 82% Satisfied with their academic experience at Dartmouth
- 77% Performed up to their full academic potential
- 66% Performed academically as well as they anticipated they would
Institutional Actions
Faculty Perceptions of *Available* Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate

- Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment (66%)
- Mentorship for new faculty (62%)
- An inclusive classroom environment (57%)
- Flexibility for calculating the tenure clock or promotional period (52%)
- Clear and fair process to resolve conflicts (42%)
Faculty Perceptions of *Unavailable* Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate

- Support/resources for spouse/partner employment (55%)
- Affordable child care (55%)
- Support/resources for housing (40%)
- Career span development opportunities for faculty at all ranks (49%)
- Equity and diversity training to search, promotion, and tenure committees (40%)
Faculty Perceptions of *Unavailable* Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate

- Tool kit for faculty to create an inclusive classroom environment (44%)
- Fair process to resolve conflicts (43%)
- Clear process to resolve conflicts (41%)
- Supervisory training for faculty (40%)
- Sexual and gender-based awareness training for faculty (38%)
- Recognition and rewards for including diversity issues in courses across the curriculum (36%)
Qualitative Themes

Institutional Actions – Faculty

More affordable child care for faculty, lecturers, and adjunct professors
Staff Perceptions of Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate

- Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment (74%)
- Career development opportunities for staff (59%)
- Supervisory training to supervisors and managers (56%)
- Diversity, inclusivity, and equity training for staff (55%)
- Clear process to resolve conflicts (50%)
- Fair process to resolve conflicts (52%)
Staff Perceptions of Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate

- Support/resources for housing (49%)
- Adequate child care resources (48%)
- Support/resources for spouse/partner employment (47%)
- Supervisory training to faculty supervisors (47%)
- Mentorship for new staff (44%)
- Affordable child care (45%)
Staff Perceptions of *Unavailable* Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate

- Mentorship for new staff (43%)
- Supervisory training to faculty supervisors (38%)
- Affordable child care (42%)
- Adequate child care resources (38%)
Qualitative Themes

Institutional Actions - Staff

Desire for enhanced professional development

Local cost of housing

Cost of child care expenses
Student Perceptions of Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate

- Effective academic advising (63%)
- Effective faculty mentorship of students (57%)
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among students (55%)
- Support/resources for housing (48%)
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue between faculty, staff, and students (46%)
- Diversity training for student staff (47%)
Student Perceptions of Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate

- Diversity, inclusivity, and equity training for students (45%)
- Person to address student complaints of bias by faculty/staff in learning environments (44%)
- Adequate social space outside of Greek space (43%)
- A person to address student complaints of bias by other students in learning environments (44%)
- Diversity, inclusivity, and equity training for staff (43%)
- Diversity, inclusivity, and equity training for faculty (43%)
Student Perceptions of *Unavailable* Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate

- Adequate social space outside of Greek space (33%)
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue between faculty, staff, and students (29%)
- Adequate child care resources (33%)
- Support/resources for housing (31%)
- Affordable child care (33%)
Qualitative Themes

Institutional Actions - Students

Exclusion of perceived minorities

Perceived inclusion of minorities at the expense of others
Summary

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

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

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

Overall Strengths and Successes

- 70-73% of respondents were comfortable with the overall climate and department/work unit climate at Dartmouth.

- The majority of student respondents expressed positive attitudes about their academic experiences at Dartmouth.

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

- 85% of Faculty and Student respondents were comfortable with their classroom climate.
Overall Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement

- 30% had observed exclusionary conduct within the last year at Dartmouth
- 21% had personally experienced exclusionary conduct within the last year at Dartmouth
- 5% experienced unwanted sexual misconduct while at Dartmouth
- 59% of Staff and 69% of Faculty seriously considered leaving Dartmouth

Rankin & Associates
Next Steps
Process Forward
Sharing the Report with the Community

Full Power Point available on Dartmouth website

Full Report available on Dartmouth website/hard copy in Library
Questions and Discussion