

# IUP Campus Climate Final Report

**By Dr. Melanie Hildebrandt and Dr. Melissa Swauger**

**Fall 2016**

## Table of Contents

List of Tables	2
Research Team and Acknowledgements	6
Introduction	7
Summary of Key Findings	9
Recommendations	10
Procedures and Survey Respondent Demographics	11
General Climate	23
Recommendations	29
Student Experiences and Perceptions of Bias and Diversity	32
Recommendations	47
Classrooms and Student Faculty Relations	51
Recommendations	57
Workplace Climate and Career/Life Balance	60
Recommendations	71
Conclusion and Reflections	74
References	76
Appendix A-Interview Guide	78
Appendix B-Additional Tables	79
Appendix C-Examples of Diversity Plans and Climate Study Reports from PASSHE Schools	82

## List of Tables

Table 2.1	2015 IUP Campus Climate Study Phase 1 Total Population and Response Rates by Position	12
Table 2.2	2015 IUP Climate Survey Responses by Gender and Position	13
Table 2.3	Percentage of Respondents by Gender compared to the Percentage of Fall Population	13
Table 2.4	Climate Survey Responses by Race/Ethnicity and Position	14
Table 2.5	Percentage of Student Respondents by Race/Ethnicity Compared to the Percentage of 2014 Fall Student Respondents	14
Table 2.6	Percentage of Staff Respondents by Race/Ethnicity Compared to the Percentage of Fall 2014 Staff Race/Ethnicity	15
Table 2.7	Percentage of Faculty Respondents by Race/Ethnicity Compared to the Percentage of Fall 2015 Faculty Race/Ethnicity	16
Table 2.8	Sample Respondents by Sexual Orientation	17
Table 2.9	Sample Respondents by Religion	17
Table 2.10	Percent of Sample Respondents indicating Disability compared to Percent of Students indicating Disability	18
Table 2.11	Percent of Sample Respondents indicating receipt of Pell Grants compared to Percent of Students indicating receipt of Pell Grants	18
Table 3.1	Students During the past year, overall how comfortable are you with the climate at IUP?	23
Table 3.2	Faculty During the past year, overall how comfortable are you with the climate at IUP?	24
Table 3.3	Staff During the past year, overall how comfortable are you with the climate at IUP?	24
Table 3.4	Students- Rate the overall campus climate as Friendly/Hostile	Appendix B

Table 3.5	Faculty- Rate the overall campus climate as Friendly/Hostile	Appendix B
Table 3.6	Staff - Rate the overall campus climate as Friendly/Hostile	Appendix B
Table 3.7	Students- Rate the overall campus climate on encounters with racism	Appendix B
Table 3.8	Faculty- Rate the overall campus climate on encounters with racism	Appendix B
Table 3.9	Staff- Rate the overall campus climate on encounters with racism	Appendix B
Table 3.10	Faculty and staff: How would each of the following affect the climate for diversity at IUP?	Appendix B
Table 4.1	Students by Race: I Perceive Tension in Residence Hall Discussions with Regard to a Person's Race	35
Table 4.2	Students by Race: I Believe The Campus Climate Encourages Free and Open Discussion of Difficult Topics	35
Table 4.3	Students experiences of harassment or exclusionary conduct by Citizenship Status	Appendix B
Table 4.4	Student experiences with exclusionary conduct or harassment by race and gender	41
Table 4.5	Student observations of exclusionary conduct or harassment by race and gender	41
Table 4.6	Student experiences with exclusionary conduct or harassment by sexual orientation	42
Table 4.7	Student 2nd and 3rd year retention rates by branch campus (Main and Punxsutawney)	46
Table 5.1	Table 5.1 Student-Classroom Climate is welcoming for students based on gender	51
Table 5.2	Student-Classroom Climate is welcoming for students based on race	51
Table 5.3	Student-Classroom Climate is welcoming for students based on sexual orientation	52

Table 5.4	Student response to “I think IUP faculty are genuinely concerned with my welfare.”	53
Table 5.5	Student response to “To what extent do you agree that your courses at IUP include sufficient materials, perspectives and/or experiences of people based on their gender?”	54
Table 5.6	Student response to “To what extent do you agree that your courses at IUP include sufficient materials, perspectives and/or experiences of people based on their race?”	55
Table 5.7	Faculty response to “I perceive tension in classroom discussion with regard to a person’s gender”	55
Table 5.8	Faculty response to “I perceive tension in classroom discussion with regard to a person’s race”	56
Table 5.9	Faculty response to “I perceive tension in classroom discussion with regard to a person’s sexual orientation”	56
Table 6.1	Faculty/staff response to “I think the workplace climate is welcoming for faculty/staff based on their gender.”	61
Table 6.2	Faculty/staff response to “I think the workplace climate is welcoming for faculty/staff based on their race.”	61
Table 6.3	Faculty/staff response to “I think the workplace climate is welcoming for faculty/staff based on their sexual orientation.”	61
Table 6.4	Faculty response to “I think the university understand the value of a diverse faculty”	62
Table 6.5	Faculty response to “As a faculty member I have to work harder that I believe my colleagues do to achieve the same recognition” by race	63
Table 6.6	Faculty response to “As a faculty member I believe the promotion process is clear”	65
Table 6.7	Staff response to “As a staff member I believe salary determinations are fair.”	67
Table 6.8	Staff responses to “I feel that a more flexible work arrangement would be helpful in my employment here at IUP.”	68

Table 6.9	Faculty response to “As a faculty member I feel that I am burdened by service responsibilities (committees, advising, student groups, etc.) beyond those of my colleagues.”	69
Table 6.10	Faculty and staff response to, “As a faculty/staff member, I find it difficult to balance childcare with my responsibilities.”	70

## **Research Team and Acknowledgements**

### **Campus Climate Phase 1 Survey Team**

Dr. Pablo Mendoza, Office of Social Equity

Dr. Alex Heckert, Sociology

Chris Kitas, Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment

### **Campus Climate Phase 2 Research Team**

Dr. Melanie Hildebrandt, Sociology

Dr. Melissa Swauger, Sociology

Sam Frye, Graduate Assistant, Sociology

Karen Eash, Graduate Assistant, Clinical Psychology

### **Acknowledgements**

A special thank you to members of the IUP community who shared their experiences. We also appreciate individuals who reviewed and offered feedback on the report.

### **Special thanks to:**

Dr. Yaw Asamoah, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

President Michael Driscoll

Provost Timothy Moerland

Anne Genreux, Applied Research Lab

Christoph Maier, Applied Research Lab

## 1. Introduction

Most college and university mission and vision statements acknowledge the value of creating positive, multicultural environments and diverse learning opportunities for their students. Post-secondary institutions invest considerable money and resources into evaluating their climates to improve the educational achievements of an increasingly diverse student body. Research shows clear links between key educational outcomes and campus climate (Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano, & Cuellar, 2008), and there is strong evidence of the benefits of multiculturalism for preparing students for a diverse world and global future (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, and Gurin, 2002). Institutional efforts to enhance multicultural understanding can reduce prejudice and improve academic, interpersonal, and cognitive outcomes for college students (Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2014) and there are a wide variety of individual, institutional, and societal benefits from diversity experiences (King and Shuford, 1996; Williams, 2013).

Indiana University of Pennsylvania claims to be committed to the mission of preparing and empowering a diverse body of students to work and live in a culturally diverse and global future. In order for the university to achieve those goals, there has been a growing awareness of the need to address serious and long-standing campus-wide climate issues at IUP. As the following report will explain, IUP has a dubious history with efforts to assess and address the campus climate for respect, inclusion, and multiculturalism. Previous climate study efforts were focused on the experiences of racial minority students and LGBT students and faculty, and the recommendations made by these studies have not been implemented.

In 2014-15, President Michael Driscoll commissioned the Office of Social Equity to conduct a Campus Climate Study (CCS). The objectives of the current project were to give everyone at IUP a chance to weigh in on matters of inclusion and equity and help us identify what has worked on our campus and what can be replicated or expanded. In this report, we first want to recognize that important and valuable first steps are underway across campus. These new(er) undertakings in the Colleges of Education and Education Technology and Natural Science and Mathematics, put diversity at the center and promise to challenge the status quo and transform approaches to faculty development, hiring, and curriculum offerings. The approval of the new minor in LGBT+Q Studies, combined with ongoing faculty-led initiatives such as B.L.E.N.D (Belonging, Learning and Exploring New Directions) and other initiatives of the Frederick Douglass Institute, provide important opportunities to educate students about and support faculty around issues related to diversity. Additionally, the Diversity and Inclusion Symposium held in April 2016 was an important first step in creating spaces for much-needed conversations about power, privilege, and difference and hosting the 2016 PASSHE Diversity Summit illustrates IUP's commitment to institutional be a leader in campus climate reflection and change.

Nevertheless, there are numerous cultural and structural deficiencies at IUP that need to be addressed to achieve an institutional environment that is not only diverse, but equitable, engaged, and inclusive. Failure to address these issues directly affects the creation and transmission of knowledge, and limits learning opportunities and academic freedom while systematically participating in the reproduction of privilege and disadvantage. The study findings include recommendations that, if implemented, will begin to make Indiana University of Pennsylvania a better place for all to work, learn, and thrive.



We are pleased to share with you the final report of the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Campus Climate Study, Phases 1 and 2. The quantitative survey (Phase 1) conducted in Spring 2015 was led by Dr. Pablo Mendoza of the Office of Social Equity and Mr. Chris Kitas of the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment, with analytical assistance from Dr. Alex Heckert of Sociology and Phase 2 (qualitative) was conducted in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 by Dr. Melanie Hildebrandt and Dr. Melissa Swauger, both of Sociology, and graduate research assistants Samuel L. Frye and Karen M. Eash.

## Summary of Key Findings

- All groups on campus report being comfortable with the campus climate at Indiana University of Pennsylvania more often than they report discomfort, but there are significant differences in how comfort is defined and experienced by different groups on campus.
- Respondents report concern with institutional commitment to diversity. There is a sense that IUP lacks a clear vision and skilled leadership across all divisions and colleges for ways to make the cultural and structural changes necessary over the long term.
- Social justice and equity efforts are individually spearheaded and institutional support is limited in terms of consistent funding, physical space, and verbal and visual commitments. Members of majority populations are either resistant to or noticeably absent from such conversations.
- Employees observe and feel discomfort with a lack of diversity in the university's leadership and decision-making processes.
- Faculty, staff and students from underrepresented groups on campus (LGBTQIA, people with disabilities, racial, ethnic, and religious minorities) perceive a less welcoming and supportive environment in IUP classrooms and workspaces, and in some instances feel unsafe.
- Many women and minority faculty express frustration with the lack of formal recognition given for the kinds of "invisible" service work that they perform in support of students and student organizations. A great deal of work in support of diversity issues and student needs (mentoring, counseling, advising, etc.) is performed by a subset of faculty, but such work is difficult to quantify and ultimately devalued in the promotion and tenure process.
- The staff members feel there are limited opportunities for professional development planning and they express feeling vulnerable when seeking a job reclassification or promotion.
- There is disconnect between how the students and the faculty see the campus and classrooms; students see a great deal more segregation and discrimination, and so they leave, change majors, and/or disengage in campus life because they feel they aren't understood or nurtured by faculty.
- Campus space, both physical and symbolic, can either encourage or discourage interactions among diverse groups of people.
- The university's concerns with legally protecting itself creates ambiguity around how people can resolve conflict and report instances of discrimination.
- In-group populations (White, abled, heterosexual, from southwest Pennsylvania) perceive and experience IUP differently than out-group populations (non-White, disabled, LGBTQIA, from

places outside southwest Pennsylvania), having an impact on their comfort, success, retention, and integration into IUP.

## **Recommendations**

### **I. Develop, Implement and Assess Progress Toward an IUP Diversity Action Plan**

Description: Establish a Diversity Task Force to define goals, actions, expected outcomes and permanent accountability measures that distribute not only the commitment but the responsibility for carrying out specific measures aimed at improving the climate across all divisions, colleges, and departments at the university.

Among these tasks, we recommend including:

- A. Create a Diversity and Equity Mission Statement.
- B. Encourage professional development opportunities to improve effectiveness of teaching to, working with, and serving diverse populations of students.
  1. Create diversity-focused trainings to engage faculty, staff, and administrators in opportunities to reflect on the challenges and value of diversity.
  2. Institutionalize mechanisms and funding to require Safe Zone and Diversity training for faculty, staff, and administration.
  3. Develop faculty competencies in teaching students from diverse backgrounds.
- C. Provide support (communication and funding) to develop partnerships between student, university, and community organizations to foster intercultural experiences and appreciation for diversity.
- D. Increase recruitment and retention of diverse faculty, students, administrators, and staff.
- E. Develop curriculum that supports global engagement and cross cultural competencies
- F. Establish spaces and structures that expand opportunities for full inclusion (multi-faith prayer space, ADA compliance, culturally appropriate dining options, etc.).
- G. Conduct on-going assessments of the campus climate, using survey every two years, and qualitative study every five years.

### **II. Acknowledge and address discriminatory practices at the Punxsutawney Campus and surrounding community**

### **III. Create a Multicultural Center administered jointly by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs**

### **IV. Create a Women's Center**

### **V. Institute an Office of the Ombudsman**

### **VI. Create venues for regular discussions and dialogues about equity and inclusion, at all levels—town meetings, Council of Chairs, cabinet, senate, union meetings, etc.**

### **VII. Recognize and Reward Diversity and Social Justice Work as part of University Service and Scholarship**

### **VIII. Assess work-life balance issues for staff and faculty, including leave policies, flex time options and inconsistencies across divisions and departments.**

### **IX. Create shared principles and equitable expectations for faculty work and establish appropriate consistency for how that work will be evaluated.**

## 2. Procedures and Survey Respondent Demographics

The design of the IUP Campus Climate Study is based on the framework developed by Rankin and Associates, leading experts in research-based campus climate assessments. Using the Rankin model, we define the campus climate as “the current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of practice of employees and students of an institution” with particular focus on the “standards/practices that concern the access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and potential” (Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 264). In other words, we explore the formal and informal ways of doing business and interacting at IUP from a multitude of standpoints. Additionally, we include an assessment of the expectations and perceptions around issues of diversity because they have been found to play significant roles in shaping the internal culture of an institution (Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano, & Cuellar, 2008; Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller, 2014).

In 2014, Dr. Pablo Mendoza, Director of the Office of Social Equity, assembled an advisory team to determine the procedures for the IUP Campus Climate Study. After exploring several models, the team decided to use a survey instrument developed by Rankin and Associates, a company that assists universities and organizations in assessing their climates for learning and working. The Rankin survey instrument was chosen because it was previously used by several PASSHE institutions and more than 100 campuses nationwide, and it was economically feasible, if implemented by IUP faculty and staff. IUP purchased the nationally validated survey instrument, and a small team of quantitative researchers filtered questions appropriate for IUP, developed sampling and analysis strategies. Dr. Dante Mancini was tasked with transferring the questions into a Qualtrics format, and once completed, the team administered the surveys in the Spring of 2015 (IUP Campus Climate Study Phase 1) to gather quantitative data to establish a baseline understanding of the current campus climate.

Early into the IUP Campus Climate Survey implementation, the committee recognized that the numeric survey data could not stand alone if we were to fully understand how individuals experience IUP. For example, the survey could tell us the number and characteristics of students who experience discomfort at IUP, but could not tell us what that discomfort looks like, how it feels, and how the students negotiate the discomfort. The committee proposed a second phase of the study which would give meaning to the survey data by utilizing qualitative methodologies to systematically gather, record, and organize narratives from IUP community members so that we could more thoroughly and intricately understand their complex experiences, interactions, and behaviors.

The team determined to employ a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design. This method integrates quantitative and qualitative data collection analysis strategies “for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of the research problem” (Ivankova, et. al., 2006, p. 3). The rationale for this approach is “grounded in the fact that neither quantitative nor qualitative methods are sufficient, by themselves, to capture the trends and details of a situation” (p. 3). Instead, the methods are used in combination to complement each other and offer a more robust understanding. A mixed-methods sequential explanatory design happens in two phases, the first being a quantitative approach followed by qualitative inquiry. The sequential mixed-methods approach is essentially used to 1) gather numbers and 2) give meaning to or help explain the quantitative result by exploring participants’ perceptions in greater depth.

### Phase 1: Recruitment and Sample

The Rankin survey was implemented in the Spring of 2015 when the total population of the IUP community was 17,230. The survey was administered to all staff, faculty, contracted employees, and Board of Trustee members as well as half of the study body. Only half of the student body was sampled because other campus-wide surveys were simultaneously being administered, and the committee wanted to maximize the number of student participants. Approximately 11.8 percent of the IUP community participated in the survey.

Although most of the respondents were students, they are underrepresented in the sample (7.80 percent response rate). As indicated in Table 2.1, faculty and staff (which includes administrators) were better represented in the sample, with a faculty response rate of 36.53 percent and a staff response rate of 31.33 percent.

*Table 2.1 2015 IUP Campus Climate Study Phase 1 Total Population and Response Rates by Position*

Subgroup	Population Number (2015)	Percentage of IUP Population (2015)	Number of Surveys Sent	Number of Responses	Response Rate
<b>Students</b>					
Undergraduate	12,922	75.00 %	6,341	449	7.08%
Graduate	2,423	14.06%	1,334	150	11.24%
<b>Student Overall</b>	<b>15,345</b>	<b>89.06%</b>	<b>7,675</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>7.80%</b>
<b>Faculty</b>					
Tenured/Tenure track faculty	571	3.31%	571	238	41.68%
Temporary Faculty	138	0.80%	138	21	15.22%
<b>Faculty Overall</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>4.11%</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>36.53%</b>
<b>Staff</b>					
Staff	636	3.69%	636	174	27.36%
Managers/Executives	181	1.05%	181	82	45.30%
<b>Overall Staff</b>	<b>817</b>	<b>4.74%</b>	<b>817</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>31.33%</b>
Other/Affiliate/Contractors	359	2.08%	359	14	3.90%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>17,230</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>9,560</b>	<b>1,128</b>	<b>11.80%</b>

### Gender Identification

Table 2.2 explains the climate survey respondents' gender identification. Of the 1,114 total respondents 296 were male, 595 were female, and 223 were unknown. Of the student participants, 31.0 percent were

male and 69.0 percent were female. Of the staff participants, 32.9 percent were male and 67.1 percent were female. Finally, of the faculty participants, 38.3 percent were male and 61.7 percent were female.

*Table 2.2 2015 IUP Climate Survey Responses by Gender and Position*

Position	Male	Female	Total
<b>Students n=467</b>	31.0%	69.0%	100%
<b>Staff n=210</b>	32.9%	67.1%	100%
<b>Faculty n=214</b>	38.3%	61.7%	100%
<b>Total</b>	N=296	N=595	N=891

Table 2.3 explains participation by gender as it compares to the larger IUP population. Women in all positions were more likely to participate in the survey than men. According to the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment female students made up about 56 percent of the student body and 69 percent of student survey respondents. Female staff made up 55.6 percent of staff employees and 67.1 percent of survey respondents, and female faculty made up 49.5 percent of faculty and 61.7 percent of faculty survey respondents. However, for men, while male students make up about 44.3 percent of the student population only 31.0 percent of students responding to the survey were male. Male staff are about 44.4 percent of the staff population but were only 32.9 percent of the staff survey respondents. About 50.5 percent of faculty are men, but only 38.3 percent of faculty respondents were men.

*Table 2.3 Percentage of Respondents by Gender compared to the Percentage of Fall Population*

Position	Gender	Percentage of Respondents	Percentage of Fall 2014 Population
<b>Students</b>	Male	31.0%	44.3%
	Female	69.0%	55.7%
<b>Staff</b>	Male	32.9%	44.4%
	Female	67.1%	55.6%
<b>Faculty</b>	Male	38.3%	50.5%
	Female	61.7%	49.5%

### **Racial/Ethnic Identification**

Table 2.4 explains the climate survey respondents' racial/ethnic identification by collapsing racial/ethnic categories to a White/non-White comparison. A more detailed depiction of participants racial/ethnic breakdown is presented below, however, much of the analysis we provide throughout the document has

been collapsed to White/non-White groupings because the number of non-White respondents in each racial/ethnic category is so small that reporting the data could reveal individual identities. Of the 1,114 total respondents 722 were White, 133 were non-White, and the race/ethnicity of 259 were unknown. Of the student participants, 81.8 percent identified White and 18.2 percent identified non-White. For staff, 91.5 percent were White and 8.5 percent were non-White. Finally, among faculty participants, 83.3 percent identified White and 16.7 percent identified as non-White.

*Table 2.4 Climate Survey Respondents by Race/Ethnicity and Position*

<b>Position</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Non-White</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Students n=451</b>	81.8%	18.2%	100%
<b>Staff n=201</b>	91.5%	8.5%	100%
<b>Faculty n=203</b>	83.3%	16.7%	100%
<b>Total</b>	N=722	N=133	N=855

Tables 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 explain survey participation by race/ethnicity as it compares to the larger IUP population for students (Table 2.5), staff (Table 2.6), and faculty (Table 2.7). According to the IUP Office of Institutional Research, the racial/ethnic makeup for the student population was 74.7 percent White while 61.3 percent of student survey respondents were White. While Black students make up 10.1 percent of the student population, they only comprised 4 percent of the student survey population. International students comprise 6.2 percent of the total student population and were 3.0 percent of the student survey participants. Hispanic students make up 3.3 percent of the total student population and comprised 2.7 percent of student survey respondents. A small number of the total student population identify as multiracial, 2.9 percent, and multiracial students were 2.8 percent of the student survey participants. About 1.0 percent of students identify as Asian and about 1.0 percent of student survey respondents were also Asian. Only 0.1 percent of students identify as American Indian and 0.2 percent made up the student survey population. Finally, 0 percent of students identify as Middle Eastern but 0.3 percent of student survey participants identified as Middle Eastern.

*Table 2.5 Percentage of Student Respondents by Race/Ethnicity Compared to the Percentage of 2014 Fall Student Respondents*

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Percentage of Student Respondents by Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Percentage of Fall 2014 Student Population</b>
<b>White</b>	61.3%	74.7%
<b>Black</b>	4.0%	10.1%
<b>International</b>	3.0%	6.2%
<b>Hispanic</b>	2.7%	3.3%

<b>Multiracial</b>	2.8%	2.9%
<b>Asian</b>	1.0%	1.0%
<b>American Indian</b>	0.2%	0.1%
<b>Pacific Islander</b>	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Middle Eastern</b>	0.3%	0.0%

Table 2.6 shows percentage of staff respondents (including administrators, managers and all non-faculty employees) by race/ethnicity against the percentage of the Fall 2014 staff population. According to the IUP Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment, the racial/ethnic makeup for the staff population was 94.7 percent White while 71.5 percent of staff survey respondents were White. Black staff make up 2.7 percent of the staff population, and comprised 3.1 percent of the staff survey population. International staff comprise 0 percent of the total staff population and were 0.8 percent of the staff survey participants. Hispanic staff make up 1.3 percent of the total staff population and comprised 1.6 percent of staff survey respondents. A small number of the total staff population identify as multiracial, 0.5 percent, and multiracial staff were 0.5 percent of the staff survey participants. About 0.5 percent of staff identify as Asian and about 0.4 percent of staff survey respondents were also Asian. Only 0 percent of staff identify as Pacific Islander and 0.4 percent made up the staff survey population. Finally, 0 percent of staff identify as Middle Eastern or American Indian.

*Table 2.6 Percentage of Staff Respondents by Race/Ethnicity Compared to the Percentage of Fall 2014 Staff Race/Ethnicity*

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Percentage of Staff Respondents by Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Percentage of Fall 2014 Staff Population</b>
<b>White</b>	71.5%	94.7%
<b>Black</b>	3.1%	2.7%
<b>International</b>	0.8%	0.0%
<b>Hispanic</b>	1.6%	1.3%
<b>Multiracial</b>	0.8%	0.5%
<b>Asian</b>	0.4%	0.5%
<b>American Indian</b>	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Pacific Islander</b>	0.4%	0.0%
<b>Middle Eastern</b>	0.0%	0.0%



Table 2.7 shows the percentage of faculty respondents by race/ethnicity compared to the percentage of the Fall 2014 faculty population. According to the IUP Office of Institutional Research, the racial/ethnic makeup for the faculty population was 81.9 percent White while 65.3 percent of faculty survey respondents were White. About 7.4 percent of faculty identify as Asian and about 5.4 percent of faculty survey respondents were Asian. Black faculty make up 3.3 percent of the faculty population, and comprised 2.3 percent of the faculty survey respondents. Hispanic faculty make up 1.5 percent of the total faculty population and comprised 1.5 percent of faculty survey respondents. International faculty comprise .9% percent of the total faculty population and were 1.2 percent of the faculty survey participants. A small number of the total faculty population identify as multiracial, .5 percent, and multiracial faculty were 0.8 percent of the faculty survey participants. Only 0.5 percent of faculty identify as American Indian and 0.4 percent made up the faculty survey population. Finally, 0 percent of faculty identify as Pacific Islander or Middle Eastern but 0.4 percent of faculty survey respondents identified as Pacific Islander and 1.5 percent identified as Middle Eastern.

*Table 2.7 Percentage of Faculty Respondents by Race/Ethnicity Compared to the Percentage of Fall 2015 Faculty Race/Ethnicity*

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Percentage of Faculty Respondents by Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Percentage of Fall 2015 Faculty Population</b>
<b>White</b>	65.3%	81.9%
<b>Asian</b>	5.4%	7.4%
<b>Black</b>	2.3%	3.3%
<b>Latino/Hispanic</b>	1.5%	1.5%
<b>International</b>	1.2%	0.9%
<b>Multiracial</b>	0.8%	0.5%
<b>American Indian</b>	0.4%	0.5%
<b>Pacific Islander</b>	0.4%	0.0%
<b>Middle Eastern</b>	1.5%	0.0%

### **LGBTQIA Participants**

The majority of respondents identified as heterosexual, and there were also a large number of “Missing” responses. In qualitative interviews, several LGBTQIA identifying individuals revealed that they did not identify their sexual orientation on the survey because they believed their confidentiality would be breached. Of those survey respondents who did identify sexual orientation, 59 percent of students identified as heterosexual and 17.3 percent identified as LGBTQIA. Among staff survey respondents, 73.4 percent identified as heterosexual and 6.3 percent of staff identified as LGBTQIA. Among faculty

survey respondents, 70.2 percent identified as heterosexual and 8.1 percent of faculty respondents identified as LGBTQIA.

*Table 2.8 Sample Respondents by Sexual Orientation*

<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	<b>Students N=599</b>	<b>Staff N=256</b>	<b>Faculty N=259</b>
<b>Heterosexual</b>	59.0%	73.4%	70.2%
<b>LGBTQIA</b>	17.3%	6.3%	8.1%
<b>Missing</b>	23.7%	20.3%	21.6%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	99.9%

### **Participants' Religion**

The majority of respondents identified as Christian (42.6 percent of students, 63.3 percent of staff, and 43.2 percent of faculty). As Table 2.9 indicates, among student respondents, 2.3 percent identified as other faith, 0.8 percent identified as spiritual but not faith based, 0.6 percent identified as Jewish, 1.3 percent also identified as Islam/Muslim, 0.6 percent identified as Buddhist, 19.7 percent had no affiliation, and 32.1 percent did not respond. Among staff respondents, 1.6 percent identified as other faith, 0 percent identified as spiritual but not faith based, 0 percent identified as Jewish, 0 percent also identified as Islam/Muslim, 0 percent identified as Buddhist, 8.2 percent had no affiliation, and 27 percent did not respond. Among faculty respondents, 3.5 percent identified as other faith, 0.4 percent identified as spiritual but not faith based, 0.4 percent identified as Jewish, 1.2 percent also identified as Islam/Muslim, 0 percent identified as Buddhist, 0.19 percent had no affiliation, and 32 percent did not respond.

*Table 2.9 Sample Respondents by Religion*

<b>Religion</b>	<b>Students N=599</b>	<b>Staff N=256</b>	<b>Faculty N=259</b>
<b>Christian</b>	42.6%	63.3%	43.2%
<b>Other Faith Based</b>	2.3%	1.6%	3.5%
<b>Spiritual not Faith Based</b>	.8%	0%	.4%
<b>Jewish</b>	.6%	0%	.4%
<b>Islam/Muslim</b>	1.3%	0%	1.2%
<b>Buddhist</b>	.6%	0%	0%
<b>No Affiliation</b>	19.7%	8.2%	1.9%

<b>Missing</b>	32.1%	27.0%	32%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100.1%	100%

## Disability

Table 2.10 compares the percent of student respondents who indicated they had a disability compared to the percent of total IUP students who identify as having a disability. Many more survey respondents indicated a disability than have been identified in the IUP population, 23.4 percent of student survey respondents compared to 4.5 percent of the total student population. This large discrepancy might indicate that students with disabilities disproportionately responded to the survey but may also reflect that many respondents with disabilities do not identify them in an official way.

*Table 2.10 Percent of Sample Respondents indicating Disability compared to Percent of Students indicating Disability*

	Percentage of Student Respondents	Percentage of Students
<b>Disability</b>	23.4%	4.5%

## Financial Hardship

Table 2.11 summarizes the number of survey respondents who indicated they received Pell grants compared to the overall student population who received Pell grants, a marker often used to determine financial hardship. Student respondents appeared to less likely to face financial hardship than students in the overall population. As Table 2.11 indicates 17.0 percent of student respondents indicated receiving Pell Grants while 33.9 percent of the total IUP student population receive Pell Grants.

*Table 2.11 Percent of Sample Respondents indicating receipt of Pell Grants compared to Percent of Students indicating receipt of Pell Grants*

	Percentage of Student Respondents	Percentage of Students
<b>PELL</b>	17.0%	33.9%

### *Phase 1: Data Collection and Analysis*

A small team of quantitative researchers sorted through the Rankin Survey Instrument to choose a sample of questions that pertained to IUP. These survey questions were put into a Qualtrics survey, an online survey platform for which IUP has licensure. Prior to implementation, President Driscoll also sent an e-mail endorsing the study and encouraging potential participants to complete the survey (March 15, 2015). The surveys were sent to the sample through the IUP e-mail system March 17, 2015 and available for completion through May 15, 2015. A reminder survey was sent March 25, 2015. At the end of the

selected time period, the survey was closed, and survey response data were imported into SPSS, a software package used for statistical analysis.

The survey also contained numerous open-ended questions which were analyzed by both the quantitative (Phase 1) and qualitative (Phase 2) research teams. Specifically, the teams conducted content analyses of the open-ended questions to 1) examine patterns in responses, 2) determine if the text responses were congruent with data collected in interviews and focus groups, 3) assess additional themes that may have not been revealed in the survey or interviews and focus groups. These data are integrated into the findings in the next section and when used in the analyses, are labeled simply as “Survey text box.” We were not provided the demographic information that corresponded with survey text box responses.

Due to the small survey response rate for individuals of all positions, several variables had to be collapsed and recoded to protect the identities of participants. This simply means that individuals were grouped into a category, i.e., “Non-White tenured faculty” because a more descriptive category, i.e., “African American, female, tenured faculty” could expose the identity of participants. All of this “recoding” was done in a manner that never changed the original data and is consistent with standard qualitative data analysis practices.

#### *Phase 1: Limitations*

Low survey response rates were likely attributable to several factors, including a basic lack of understanding about what the survey measured and poor publicity, especially for students who we learned are less likely to use e-mail, our main recruitment mechanism, and more likely to participate if heard through word-of-mouth or social media. Once the survey closed, we learned that the title “Campus Climate” evoked thoughts of weather, climate change, etc. and this may have contributed to the low response rates among students, staff, and faculty alike. Additionally, the high number of incomplete surveys is likely attributable to the length of the survey instrument (more than 90 questions) and the identifying nature of the survey questions, indicating possible survey fatigue, a lack of time to complete the full survey, frustration and confusion over poorly worded questions, and a concern that confidentiality would be breached (all of these limitations were indicated in survey text boxes as well as in qualitative interviews).

#### *Phase 2: Recruitment and Sample*

To supplement the survey data, we conducted individual interviews and focus groups for which we employed purposive recruitment strategies commonly used in qualitative research to solicit participants. Following the precedents established by other institutions that have followed the Rankin model, Phase 2 of the IUP Campus Climate Study was designed to gather data from a series of approximately 30 focus groups. The IUP Institutional Review Board approved Phase 2 and recruitment for data collection began in October 2015.

All members of the IUP community were invited to participate in Phase 2. Recruitment methods were extensive and varied, including personal letters of invitation to Council of Trustees and upper level administrators, personally addressed e-mails with a flyer to the Chairpersons/Presidents of all campus

commissions and student groups that serve underrepresented populations, e.g., the President's Commission on the Status of Women, LGBT Commission, Native American Awareness Council, Latin American Student Organization asking that the information be forwarded to members of their groups. We also posted recruitment flyers around campus, attended department and student group meetings to introduce the study, provided managers with a recruitment letter via e-mail to send to their employees, and made use of campus media and social media forums to announce the study and post the recruitment flyer.

After nearly one month of recruiting efforts and lackluster responses, we learned that many individuals were reluctant to participate due to the focus group format. Students were comfortable with group interviews, but employees were concerned the focus group method did not afford a level of privacy and confidentiality desired in order to share sensitive information. In response, we modified data collection strategies and obtained IRB approval to include individual interviews and recorded self-administered questionnaires. Students and employees were solicited to participate through personal and campus-wide e-mails, advertisements in the IUP Daily and The Beak, and direct outreach. Interested participants contacted the research assistants who administered an identity questionnaire and were asked which interview method they preferred: a 30- to 60-minute focus group, a 30- to 45-minute individual interview with a member of the research team, or a self-administered, audio recorded, questionnaire which could take anywhere from 15 to 45 minutes. No individuals chose the self-administered questionnaire. Those choosing to participate in a focus group were assigned to focus groups that were homogeneous based on a common demographic that the participant felt was most salient to their experience at IUP (e.g. gender, race, sexuality, etc.), while also separating participants by status (administrator, faculty, staff, student) whenever possible. We also used a more purposive approach in our recruitment. That is, we deliberately recruited individuals from underrepresented groups by contacting student group leaders, commission chairs, and organization advisors. Purposive sampling relies on finding individuals who share specific characteristics (in this case, underrepresented group characteristics) who are likely to provide data relevant to research questions (Patton, 2015). It is necessary to sample individuals from these groups who can most likely provide practical experiences and rich information about diversity and discrimination on campus. Patton (2015) asserts, "What would be bias in statistical sampling, and therefore a weakness, becomes intended focus in qualitative sampling, and therefore a strength" (p. 264).

In total, we conducted 52 individual interviews and 25 focus groups of between 2-10 participants, representing the voices of 178 stakeholders in the IUP community. Of those participating in Phase 2 of the Campus Climate Study, 55 percent were undergraduate students, 6 percent graduate students, 17 percent faculty, and 22 percent were staff and administrators. The racial and gender composition of our sample was 47 percent White, 53 percent people of color (Black, Latino, international, Asian American, and mixed race), 73 percent women, and 23 percent men. A few participants identified as LGBTQIA but because we did not ask participants specifically, we cannot provide specific percentages around gender identity.

### *Phase 2: Data Collection Methods and Analysis*

As the goal of Phase 2 was to expand on the quantitative findings and gather a more thorough understanding of participants' lived experience, we used two methods, focus group and interviews, because they employ inclusive, personal, and empathetic techniques that provide a "safe environment" so that participants feel more open to sharing their thoughts and experiences (Madriz, 2003, p. 371). The focus groups were comprised of an average of 4 to 8 participants, so that participants not only felt comfortable and accountable to contribute to the discussion, but their individual responses stimulated discussion and contributions from other participants (Berg, 2001). We employed Bruce Berg's (2001) guide for creating questions and conducting focus groups, which includes several steps to gain rapport and ensure participation. As Berg suggests, we used the introduction to establish rapport, introduce the project, reiterate consent, privacy, and confidentiality issues, and discuss the basic rules and guidelines which included our intentions to "have a conversation about the campus climate." We stressed that responses may differ and that there were no right or wrong answers. We also told participants the interviews would be recorded. As suggested by Berg (2001), we developed a set of semi-structured questions but built-in flexibility for probing and deviation.

Interviewing, as a method, provides a window into participants' thoughts. According to Earl Babbie (2004), in-depth interviews permit a more meticulous solicitation of responses and Kathleen Blee (2002) suggests that individual interviews allow autonomy in how respondents talk about their lives; being able to tell their story as they see it reveals how participants make sense of the world. All participants were asked the same interview questions regardless of interview technique (see Appendix A: Interview Guide). The focus groups and interviews were semi-structured, using a technique that relies on prompting questions, with a subsequent conversational-style interview in which the interviewer followed the line of narrative established by the participants.

The total number of focus groups/interviews conducted were determined by the project calendar (per the IRB protocol, data collection was required to be completed by March 2016) and the saturation of concepts, in accordance with standard qualitative social science methodology (Denzin, 2003). Interviews took place in private conference rooms and researchers' offices. Focus groups were held in classrooms, conference rooms, and community spaces in residence halls. The consent process was explained thoroughly and all participants signed the consent form, except one whose interview data is not included in this report.

Data generated using qualitative research methods (in this case interviews and focus groups) can be endlessly "creative and interpretive" (Denzin, 2003, p. 37). That is, qualitative research yields a vast amount of data for which there is no single interpretive truth. Instead, the researcher sifts through data interpreting, checking, and verifying, to find common themes and patterns. The data analysis process resembled the constant comparative method (Boeije, 2002). This method involves comparing and contrasting the transcripts to determine and assess the array of themes that emerge from various participants around different questions. All four of the research team members each independently generated a list of themes that emerged from a subset of data/transcripts that they read and re-read closely. The team then compared the themes and evaluated those themes as a group. Finding consistent patterns in their coding, the team generated a codebook. This codebook was used to guide the coding of all transcripts, fitting quotes from various groups (students, faculty, staff, etc.) and various identity groups

(women, men, White, Black, Latino, LGBT, etc.) into the code or codes that seemed most suitable. Comparisons then could be made within the codes of the different experiences of the various groups. Through thorough, reflective, and repetitive analyses of data, researchers can be fair, call their preconceptions into question, and take a “critical stance toward data” (Charmaz, 2007). The overall goals of coding were to “identify the range and salience of key items and concepts, discover the relationships among these items and concepts, and build and test models linking these concepts together” (Ryan and Bernard, 2003, p. 274). Several leaders of underrepresented groups at IUP were asked to review the executive summary draft to ensure methodological rigor and a fair representation of participants; their feedback has been incorporated into this final report.

The study was approved by the IUP Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects as were modifications to data collection strategies. All interviews were recorded, with four exceptions, and transcribed by an external transcriptionist who signed a confidentiality agreement. Interview and focus group data were coded and analyzed by hand, with research team members responsible for coding subsets of interviews. All information is being reported and shared in an aggregated manner to protect the confidentiality of participants and we are obscuring identifiable characteristics because of the small IUP population of staff, faculty, and administrators from underrepresented groups.

#### *Phase 2: Limitations*

Time constraints are often limiting in qualitative studies and with an initial reluctance of IUP community members to participate, we recognize that our sample is limited. Certain racial/ethnic populations are missing from the study as are specific groups of employees. For example, administrative and secretarial staff were much more likely to participate in interviews and focus groups than were facilities and maintenance staff. Faculty from Colleges of Humanities and Social Sciences, Education, Health and Human Services, and Natural Sciences and Mathematics, were much more likely to participate than those in the College of Business and Information Technology and the College of Fine Arts. While highly publicized on IUP social media outlets, at the Council of Deans, and in the University Senate, our ability to recruit faculty and staff from areas where we have fewer personal connections would have required more time and resources than we had available. As social scientists with expertise in social inequality and equity issues, as well as activists, our connections to students and faculty (as part of our activism) gave us valuable entrees into underrepresented groups, but no doubt, some constituencies may have been overlooked. To ensure accurate representation of participants, we employed techniques commonly utilized in qualitative research including triangulation-using more than one research method to validate data, inter-coder reliability-using multiple coders to ensure we were reaching the same conclusion in data interpretation, and member checking-having a sample of participants read a draft of the document to ensure interpretive and narrative accuracy.

### 3. General Climate

Because of low survey response rates and the potential for participants to be identified by survey responses, this section relies heavily on findings derived from the interviews and focus groups conducted in Phase 2 of the study and is supplemented with quantitative survey data and patterns emerging from open ended survey questions. Five major themes arose in the interpretation of participants' shared perceptions and experiences. Below, we discuss these themes which include (1) sentiments about IUP's general climate, (2) student participants' experiences and perceptions of bias and diversity, (3) participants' perceptions of IUP's classrooms as they relate to diversity and relationships between students and faculty, (4) participants' perceptions of the IUP workplace environment and how they confront and negotiate career/life balance, and (5) participants' perceptions of what has worked in the past and what can work in the future to improve the IUP campus climate. We are using these themes to structure our presentation of the findings from both the Phase 1 survey and the Phase 2 interviews. At the end of each thematic section, we also offer recommendations that emerged from the data and are supported by the scholarly literature on campus climates.

In this section we present respondents' views on the overall campus climate for diversity at IUP.

A majority of survey respondents rated IUP's campus climate favorably (Tables 3.1, 3.2, 3.3). At least 50 percent of respondents in each category (faculty, staff, student, male, female, White, non-White), indicated that they were either very comfortable or comfortable with the climate at IUP, with the greatest levels of comfort expressed by male staff and faculty and the lowest levels expressed by female faculty and non-White faculty and staff. Survey respondents were also asked to rate the overall climate along a continuum for friendliness/hostility (Appendix B: Tables 3.4, 3.5, 3.6), and similar response patterns emerged. When asked to evaluate the campus climate on a continuum measuring respondents' encounters with racism, the respondents were evenly split between those who experience the campus as mostly or completely free of racism, and those who encounter racism occasionally, regularly, or almost never. (See Appendix B: Tables 3.7, 3.8, 3.9). A notable exception to this pattern was among non-White staff who reported encountering racism with much more regularity than respondents in any other category.

*Table 3.1 Students During the past year, overall how comfortable are you with the climate at IUP?*

Student Responses	Total (n=557)	Male (n=145)	Female (n=321)	White (n=369)	Non-White (n=82)
<b>Comfortable</b>	67.1%	75.2%	66.0%	69.6%	65.8%
<b>Neutral</b>	15.6%	11.7%	17.8%	14.9%	18.3%
<b>Uncomfortable</b>	17.3%	13.1%	16.2%	15.5%	15.8%
<b>Total</b>	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%



Table 3.2 Faculty During the past year, overall how comfortable are you with the climate at IUP?

Faculty Responses	Total (n=246)	Male (n=82)	Female (n=130)	White (n=168)	Non-White (n=34)
Comfortable	65.1%	78.0%	60.0%	69.0%	64.7%
Neutral	18.7%	11.0%	19.2%	15.5%	11.8%
Uncomfortable	16.3%	11.0%	20.8%	15.5%	23.5%
Total	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 3.3 Staff During the past year, overall how comfortable are you with the climate at IUP?

Staff/Admn/Mgr Responses	Total (n=243)	Male (n=69)	Female (n=139)	White (n=184)	Non-White (n=16)
Comfortable	76.1%	84.1%	77.7%	82.1%	56.3%
Neutral	15.2%	10.1%	12.9%	10.9%	25.0%
Uncomfortable	8.7%	5.7%	9.4%	7.1%	18.8%
Total	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%

From the open-ended survey questions, favorable remarks about IUP's general climate reflected appreciation for finding support, recognition, opportunities to succeed, and community as an employee or student at IUP. For example, respondents wrote:

*I am satisfied with my job and the way my job has progressed because I have had the support of many of the people I've worked with to help me remain at IUP.*

*I feel very fortunate to have my job here at IUP. And, I was able to earn my undergrad degree thru the staff waiver benefit.*

*I think IUP supports those who work hard. I like to think I work hard but I do feel I have been recognized for my work. ... I have found the people I work with are willing to say nice job which makes a difference.*

*I love this campus and its climate. I hope that it continues to progress rather than regressing.*

While a majority of survey respondents from each constituency (67.5 percent of students, 69.1 percent of faculty, 79.2 percent of staff) experience the campus climate as friendly and welcoming (Appendix B: Tables 3.4, 3.5, 3.6), women and non-White members of the IUP community report higher levels of

discomfort across the board. In response to survey questions about encounters with racism, a majority of students and faculty report that they encounter racism on campus at least occasionally (52.4 percent of students, 55.5 percent of faculty), while 75.6 percent of staff of color encounter racism with regularity. These results raise additional questions about what constitutes “comfort” and further suggest that gender and race and status/position interact to influence how diverse groups experience the campus differently. The interview data sheds light on these and other dynamics.

Several interview and survey questions explored what it means to be comfortable at IUP and how multiculturalism, diversity and inclusion are experienced at the university. Our findings reveal that respondents drew a distinction between feeling “comfortable” and feeling safe, included, and able to realize one’s full potential. These distinctions varied by racial group, gender identity, and position at the university among other things. For example, when asked whether they were comfortable at IUP, faculty, administrators/staff offered these types of responses:

1. *I’m fairly comfortable here... but do I think this is an inclusive environment? Heck no. (African-American faculty member)*
2. *Yeah. I’m hearing from students that they do not feel safe on campus. And that has changed. That’s particularly this semester. I just spent a weekend with several (name of student organization redacted) students (at a conference) and heard from a number of them. That there is — and it’s not just LGBTQIA students, but in general, students are not feeling safe. (White faculty member)*
3. *My hope is that you ensure that the voices of marginalized students are heard. This survey cannot even begin to reflect the experiences that our students face on a daily basis. If you are not a White, Christian, straight male on this campus, you will face discrimination and from my communication with students, they feel as if the IUP administration does not care. (survey text box)*
4. *I’m pretty comfortable, but if I were just coming on this campus ... thinking back to my early years, it was only because people took me by the hand and made those connections that I think I have the level of comfort that I do now. Most people don’t get that because we’re much more isolated. We’re much more individualistic. Much less likely to recognize the need of someone and to kind of reach out and pull them into something. There’s less to pull them into because we don’t have those communities and networks as informally even as we once did. So I think it’s just a whole lot harder to figure out how to get things done. And for me, that’s a big part of what it means to be comfortable. (African-American faculty member)*

Students also spoke in qualified ways about what it means to be comfortable. When asked, “Are there things that IUP does to exhibit a positive and welcoming environment?” student focus group participants often responded with noticeable silence and blank stares. Some students noted that they felt fine about going to class or moving around campus, and they consistently enjoy events such as Unity Day and IUP Day or Homecoming. Such campuswide events were frequently seen as positive because, as one student put it “you get a chance to see the different clubs ... and no other times do you really see those organizations all in one spot.” All student participants (regardless of race, gender identity, class, sexual

orientation, ability) desired more opportunities to experience cultural exchanges and to have positive interactions across racial, cultural, or linguistic lines.

Nearly every respondent emphasized that being comfortable is not the same as seeing IUP as an “inclusive environment that is welcoming to all.” People looked at comfort in a variety of ways. For faculty of color, comfort was described as having the ability to pursue your own research interests without interference, and coming to work every day in what one individual described as a “pleasant, cordial environment (with) no depth.” African-American, Latino/a and international faculty all noted that the overall social, teaching, and service environments were not generally comfortable, for a variety of reasons (see sections on Faculty and Student Relationships and Workplace Climate). The treatment of (predominantly White) female administrators/staff was often described as being like “second class citizens” with limited opportunities for advancement or voicing their concerns (see section on Workplace Climate and Career/Life Balance). Staff/administrators of color spoke of their own encounters with both subtle and overt forms of racism, as well as those of the students they know. A close look at the survey data suggest that many employees at various levels feel silenced, discouraged, or fearful that reporting discomfort could affect their performance evaluation or possibilities for promotion.<sup>1</sup>

Concomitantly, Black, Latino/a, LGBTQIA students and students with disabilities expressed feelings of alienation, frustration, and even a lack of safety in certain social spheres. Respondents perceived a lack of interest or concern, a willful ignorance if not downright hostility, coming from both people in authority positions, including some upper level administrators and faculty, as well as majority groups on campus. The word “segregation” was often used to describe campus life, with words like “insincere” or “fragmented” used to describe diversity efforts. Many student respondents perceived hostility (based on race, gender, sexuality, and religion) just beneath the surface. Students noted that social media is a significant source of racist, Islamophobic, homophobic and misogynistic targeting, but biased comments, microaggressions, and indifference to their experiences cause discomfort and alienation as well. As one student put it, “Racism is still around us, even if we don't hear about it every day. I see it on social media all the time.”

Two other interview questions explored the overall climate at IUP: “What grade would you give IUP for its multicultural climate or climate for diversity?” and “In what ways does the university work to exhibit a positive and welcoming atmosphere to all people?” The responses to these questions reinforce the themes described above. When offering a grade for IUP's climate, the overall average was a C-/D+, with a fair amount of variation depending on the aspect of campus being considered and the social location of the respondent. The campus climate earned higher grades (A-/B+) principally from those respondents who heard about diversity issues from third-party sources, such as official reports or enrollment management documents. For instance, among members of the Council of Trustees who participated in a focus group, there was a sense that there “must be something that's being done right” citing evidence that IUP is a diverse and “very welcoming campus” because IUP has “the largest number of international students of any state school.” This view contrasted to the average grades (B-/C+/C) that IUP earned from many

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a great deal of data from the survey pointing to workplace inequities and poor management in the Eberly College of Business and suggests that a more detailed study of that College might be warranted.

faculty, staff and administrators (White male and female, LGBT, and some international), as well as many female White students, who note specific and persistent areas of dissatisfaction.

The December 9 racist Snapchat incident<sup>2</sup> raised the consciousness of many who, as one White administrator put it, previously “would have thought we were a welcoming community.” Nevertheless, both before and after the December 9 incident, students, faculty, staff and administrators of color, some LGBTQIA students, handfuls of White faculty and students, as well as people with disabilities, gave IUP the lowest grades (C-/D/F) for multicultural climate and inclusion.

There was a range of perspectives on how and where issues related to diversity, equity and inclusion should be handled at the university. Among some White respondents, diversity is viewed as “social stuff” that is (or should be) separate and apart from the educational mission of the university. One survey respondent wrote:

*The way the climate needs to improve is academically, not with sensitivity. I find that the undergraduate students at IUP do not take things seriously and slack because they are not met with enough rigor or academic consequences for performing inadequately.*

However, the vast majority of survey and interview participants agreed (both before and after the December 9 incident) that 1) the campus climate for diversity needs improvement; 2) while there have been well-meaning individual or small group efforts, there is significant frustration with the lack of institutional investment, long-term vision, and structural coordination of diversity efforts; 3) IUP’s approach has primarily been one of “diversity by the numbers,” using a business model of “bean counting” to measure success, and treating diversity as an “add-on” or a marginal issue of concern only to minorities.

Respondents consistently noted the absence of a sustained, intentional commitment to structural equity and cultural inclusion at IUP. Below are some of the specific comments gleaned from the open-ended survey responses and face-to-face interviews.

1. *... I don’t really know what we’re doing really well. Okay, we do have some faculty that are trying. I’m not sure that the administration has made diversity a significant issue or significant focus. Not a very high priority for them. (interview with White faculty member)*
2. *I don’t really hear IUP talk about diversity. They try to include it in some things but it’s included as if they would say something about athletics. Like they want diversity here, but they don’t do the measures in order to get it up. They only care about numbers. (focus group with Latina undergraduate students)*

---

<sup>2</sup> On December 9, 2015, a photo was taken of a group of African American male students who were standing together in the Stapleton Library and posted by a White female student on social media. The post contained a racist caption (“Monkeys stick together”), and subsequently went viral, circulating throughout social media across campus and beyond. Dr. Driscoll called an emergency meeting to address the issue, and while that meeting was taking place, students staged a march to demand a response from IUP administration.

3. *The department, college or division that one works in has a huge impact on whether or not there is a welcoming climate. Working in the Division of Student Affairs, there is absolutely a welcoming climate for diversity. However, there are departments on campus that have a history of being less welcoming, both to employees and students. This would include Athletics, Computer Science and Eberly College of Business. (survey text box)*
4. *We need to stop looking at numbers and start looking at attitudes. (survey text box)*
5. *Faculty commitment to diversity issues is very evident if you go to a campus event organized by a minority group. You can literally count the number of White people there. A couple of years ago the Provost addressed students at a gathering organized by the AACC. He talked about how committed he was to diversity issues. It was rather amusing because, from the racial/ethnic composition of the room, it seemed like IUP was a Black college. This to me is a perfect example of lip service. Faculty do not walk the talk here. Neither do administrators. (survey text box)*
6. *The current administration is overwhelmingly White and male. In fact, the standing joke for the last couple of years is: How to succeed at IUP? Be a White, male, over 40! But in all seriousness, there does seem to be a grain of truth in all of that. (survey text box)*

For students of color, the climate was characterized powerfully by this participant in an African-American undergraduate focus group:

*[Concerning segregation] ...I look at it as... here's say IUP for White people and IUP for Black people. IUP for White people kind of have the mainstream IUP. The Black people get second or third, whatever the case may be. ... I always see it. I'm like there is some type of divide. And I think it goes within all aspects of what's going on at IUP. It must be the climate of IUP. It must be how IUP is.*

As will be discussed further, Black and Latino/a students described their experiences at IUP in terms of “sinking or swimming,” using words like “getting by” and “isolated” which indicated that their connections to the university itself were not strong and they felt unsupported.<sup>3</sup> By contrast, a White administrator summarized how the university looks and feels to members of the majority: “The general White male who has grown up in suburbia and the whole shot is fitting right in here... (but) they don't understand the experience other people have, and have gone through, and they just go on their merry little way.”

While participants gave IUP poor marks on the current climate, it should be noted that there is cautious optimism that the IUP climate may have recently shifted, and that recommendations made by this report will be taken seriously. Among study participants, there is hope for and readiness to begin transformative change at IUP. Overcoming the different ways IUP is experienced by members of in-groups- those privileged by history, institutional structures, and culture- and out-groups - those marginalized by the same structures-- requires understanding how student, faculty and staff experiences are bifurcated by access to power and privilege. Creating an inclusive institution requires first seeking to understand the

---

<sup>3</sup> This is an important thing to note for alumni relations!

lived experiences of respondents across all genders, races, religions, sexual orientations, status groups, and socio-economic backgrounds and then using that understanding as the basis for transformative action.

## **Recommendations to Address Issues related to General Climate**

### **I. Develop, Implement, and Assess Progress Toward and IUP Diversity Action Plan**

Description: Establish a Diversity Task Force to define goals, action items, expected outcomes, and permanent accountability measures that distribute not only the commitment but also the responsibility for improving the climate across all divisions, colleges, and departments at the university campus. *For examples of University Diversity Action Plans, see Appendix G.*

Numerous respondents, students and faculty alike, repeatedly lamented that part of IUP's culture is to let diversity and social equity initiatives "die on the vine," "take a back seat," get "add(ed) on as an afterthought," or get "pushed under the rug." Rather than continuing this historical pattern, we recommend transparency and accountability throughout the process, openly vetting ideas and adopting plans that will move the institution forward and better serve our staff, faculty, students, and surrounding community.

This kind of change will require transformation of the decision-making process to one that is more transparent and inclusive, and it cannot be relegated to a single Director or Office of Social Equity. The process of diversity work needs to be central and inclusive, and the goal of the Task Force itself needs to be inclusion.

According to respondents, some elements of this Diversity Action Plan should include:

- A. **Create a Diversity and Equity Mission statement** to increase the visibility of IUP's commitment to equitable practices and the full inclusion of diverse cultures, perspectives, experiences at all levels and spaces across campus. Include this diversity mission statement on all materials, newsletters, magazines, awards, and social media publicity venues.

Several respondents conveyed disappointment in the way previous unflattering findings about IUP's climate have been watered down, buried, or completely ignored. Some individuals noted that the most recent Middle States data was "sterilized" of any indication that racism exists at IUP, and others noted that the language in the Strategic Plan vis-a-vis diversity is inadequate. As one White faculty member put it, this is an historical pattern that inhibits change: "The administration, and it's not just this administration, the administration at IUP seems to have always been not terribly concerned with enhancing diversity. Even the language in the five-year plan was softer than one would have hoped."

A number of the students, faculty, and administrators who were interviewed were aware of--or directly participated in--committees, commissions, and collaborative teams that have done research, written reports, published books, attended professional trainings, led workshops, and invested considerable time

and energy evaluating IUP's climate for equity and inclusion. While this is the first comprehensive climate study completed at IUP, prior efforts that have led to many specific, well-informed, recommendations on strengths to be enhanced, and weaknesses to be addressed. Among these are the 2007 Study for Campus Climate for GLBT Students and Employees, the 2008 Race Relations Study at Punxsutawney and Main Campus, the 2011-12 Equity and Excellent Team on Recruitment and Retention, the Middle States Steering and subcommittees, to name a few. For those invested in diversity, inclusion, and equity, there is a real concern that this climate study will, like previous efforts, "get put on a shelf."

**B. Encourage professional development opportunities** to enhance the effectiveness of serving and teaching to all student populations, such as

1. Create diversity focused trainings to engage faculty, staff, and administrators in opportunities to reflect on the challenges and value of diversity. Establish ongoing professional development and diversity-focused trainings to engage faculty, administrators and staff in opportunities to reflect on the challenges and value of diversity.

Many respondents commented that administrators, staff, and faculty alike needed to be trained on matters of cultural competence, diversity, and ways to support students with different physical or learning abilities, so we recommend the creation of regular, ongoing professional workshops, trainings, and colloquia for faculty and others to gain expertise in diversity related issues.

**C. Provide support (communication, compensation and funding) to develop partnerships between student, university, and community organizations.**

Support these partnerships with a simplified communication and space-use apparatus to facilitate coordination, collaboration and programming and incentives for faculty and staff to lead these efforts.

**D. Conduct on-going assessments of Campus Climate.**

We recommend conducting a survey, with a revised instrument, every two years and a qualitative study every five years. A Climate study team should be established, and the team's work should be coordinated and managed by someone with competencies in social science research and project management/leadership who is not affiliated with the administration.

**VI. Create venues for regular discussions and dialogues about equity and inclusion-** at all levels, town meetings, Council of Chairs, cabinet, senate, union meetings, etc.

During data collection, the research team was struck by how many participants expressed a desire for more community dialogues about diversity and inclusion, and opportunities to create positive connections in their daily IUP lives. Students, faculty, and staff expressed frustration with the pace of work life, and the low quality of social interactions. There is a wish for more opportunities to have conversations, discuss issues, learn about and across differences, and build relationships. Minority faculty recalled with

great appreciation past “networking events” where minority faculty could gather, socialize and share their experiences in an informal but institutionally-supported event.

The desire for greater space and time to build community was reinforced by comments heard during and after the Diversity and Inclusion Symposium in April 2016, particularly from people who participated in the lunch-time Table Talks. The chance to sit at a table and have a focused, facilitated discussion about matters of importance to all was very much appreciated and enabled people to meet colleagues and students from different segments of the campus. In the words of a White Administrator:

*You know it's interesting because I think that IUP does have a positive and welcoming atmosphere in general. But because there aren't these open discussions and programming and the opportunity, because the opportunities are more (like) 'you can do this if you want to' rather than, 'this is really what our institution stands for,' I think there's a lot areas where things can go wrong.*

## **VII. Recognize and Reward Diversity and Social Justice Work as part of University Service and Scholarship**

Our findings demonstrate that there are IUP faculty, staff and administrators who dedicate considerable time and energy to supporting students from diverse backgrounds, but those efforts are typically unseen, unrecognized, and unrewarded within the formal structures of the university. These employees build relationships with students, help with problem-solving, emotional support, and academic advisement. A vast majority of this work is being shouldered by the faculty and staff who are, themselves, members of underrepresented groups, including women and LGBTQIA individuals. As the university moves forward to improve the campus climate for diversity, the unseen but essential labor of those who work with diverse populations should be acknowledged, rewarded, and counted towards promotion.

In similar fashion, the academic division, Research Institute, and School of Graduate Studies and Research should incentivize scholarly activity that expands our understanding of diversity, equity and inclusion. Respondents noted that their research on gender and diversity has been devalued and trivialized by colleagues. By setting aside a separate pool of internal funding for research or professional development in areas that stress diversity and inclusion, IUP can further cultivate the valuable work by the Frederick Douglass Institute, and support scholarly exchanges among those who study issues relevant to diversity.



## 4. Student Experiences and Perceptions of Bias and Diversity

A theme that emerged strongly throughout our interviews was that students, faculty, and others wish for greater celebration of diversity on IUP's campus but feel that the university, as a whole, only pays lip service to that idea. In addition to diversifying the faculty, students also wished to see continued, concerted efforts to attract and retain a more diverse student body. Speaking of the undergraduate experience, a faculty member of color summarized student sentiments by describing IUP as an "White space," with "so little here that reflects any cultural diversity, any ethnic diversity, or any awareness or recognition of any other experiences." This comment is indicative of a pattern found in the data. As the next section will discuss, for people of color, IUP is experienced as a "White space" with little pockets of carefully controlled diversity. Students of color and female students are less likely to feel that IUP faculty, staff and administrators are genuinely concerned with their welfare.

### Racial and Ethnic Minorities

We preface this section by noting that not all non-White populations experience IUP the same way. It is important to resist taking a "one size fits all" approach to understanding the experiences of "people of color" at IUP. Due to a small sample size and to protect confidentiality, some of the survey data on race/ethnicity was recoded into three categories: White, non-White, and unknown. However, in this report we have made an effort, where possible, to focus on the unique and specific experiences of the largest racial/ethnic minority groups participating in this study: faculty, staff and students who are African American, Latino/a, Muslim, and foreign-born. We regret that the experiences of Asian American, mixed race, Native American, and other non-White students are not represented in this report, but we had little to no data to work with from those populations. Below we are reporting on the major themes that emerged in the focus groups, interviews, and survey data.

#### Black/African-American students

Most of the 40 African-American students who participated in the qualitative portion of this study were part of focus groups that took place prior to the December 9, 2015 racism incident. They, along with approximately 25 Latino/a students, were the easiest groups to recruit and were eager to share their perspectives. When asked, "How do students like you experience IUP?" clear patterns emerged, mostly around matters of feeling unwelcome, unsafe, and invisible.

Many African-American students told us that they chose to attend IUP over other universities because they wanted to interact with different cultures and people different from themselves. To their dismay, students quickly find that the social life on campus is "very segregated" and everyone starts to hang out with people just like themselves. One way this segregation is experienced is in terms of "who shows up for events," i.e., the audiences at cultural or educational events hosted by or themed around a particular culture or identity group. Black and Latino/a students observe that very few White students or faculty attend events with the words "Black," "African American," "race," "diversity," "multicultural," or "Latino" in the title. IUP social media (e.g., Instagram and Twitter) tends to focus on athletics, academics, and the arts, and not on diversity related events. When it comes to receiving invitations to parties or social events hosted by White student groups, including Greek life, some African-American students report

feeling unwanted, invisible, or simply not invited. As one survey respondent noted, “IUP is a very liberal school...however, the fraternity and sororities tend to be very discriminating. A lot of harassment and negative behavior towards others comes especially from frat boys.”

An African-American male focus group participant explained that White students often see Black students as “unapproachable,” suggesting that White fears about Black bodies and negative stereotypes about African Americans are inhibiting intergroup contact. In this student’s words:

*Me personally, I don’t like it when people say (we) look unapproachable. ... What does that look like? It could be just my regular face. But to you that’s all in your head until you actually talk to me. ... Because I’m just me. I’m easy to talk to. You have to want to ask me something, just talk to me. I feel that should be your response if after we initiate a conversation that I seem like I don’t want to talk to you. I feel as though, OK you can use that. But just off the fact that I’m [opens arms to indicate his whole body].*

White and non-White students responded affirmatively at the same rates in answering the survey questions “within the past year have you experienced any exclusionary, intimidating offensive and/or hostile conduct?” and “what was this conduct based upon?” Many of the student responses focused on social events, and particularly on sororities and fraternities. It’s not possible to know the race of the respondent, but Greek life comes up as a recurrent problematic area.

Survey respondents were also asked to indicate which organizations enhanced the climate, and among them were organizations specifically focused on African-American students, including Black Student League, Black Emphasis Committee, and the African American Cultural Center (AACC). However, numerous respondents, faculty and students alike, lamented the changes they have witnessed at the AACC, including staff changes and the dismantling of retention programs such as R.O.C.S. that had specifically supported first year African-American students. There was no mention of current, universitywide programs or initiatives aimed at African-American student retention and the interview and survey data reveal overall mixed sentiments about the African American Cultural Center. Some students feel that it serves a positive function, as the single safe space on campus for Black students to gather, plan trips and events, etc. Other students feel that the AACC’s mission is unclear and confusing, and has been used by the university as both a multicultural center and a resource for African-American, Latino/a, and other minority students. Many make note that the physical space is “unwelcoming,” removed from the flow of campus traffic, and not easily accessible to the broader student population. A faculty member suggested the African American Cultural Center is the sole place for students of color to go, congregate, learn about, and celebrate their history, but implied the AACC is currently being dismantled. There was widespread concern that talk on campus of a Multicultural Center would mean the elimination of a designated space for African-American students to define for themselves.

Harassment is a widespread problem at IUP and students, both White and non-White, report experiencing or witnessing various forms of exclusionary or intimidating behavior on campus. For African-American students, racial harassment most frequently occurs at the hands of other students. In addition to hostile remarks or exclusionary treatment, social media platforms linked with IUP were also cited as extremely hostile environments for racial minority students. Yik Yak is known by the student body as host to

particularly virulent racism and Islamophobia, while Facebook, Instagram, and other platforms are places where students of color are targeted and feel unsafe. To be certain, the December 9, 2015, Snapchat incident was not the first time racist comments were brought to the attention of the IUP administration. African-American students we interviewed referenced a social media post made by a White male IUP student in Spring 2015 and their disappointment with the (lack of) institutional response. An African-American male focus group participant described the incident:

*Like last semester (Spring 2015), the Greek Life office was going on about this big thing like how that historically African-American fraternities and sororities and the multicultural sororities, we kind of stick to ourselves. Like we segregate ourselves. So we kind of took it as a point like, all right well, we're going to listen to what you're saying and see what we can do. So we started going to all the other Caucasian fraternities. And what happened was ... the semester was over, we were in group chat with one other (White) fraternity and one other (White) sorority. And this was around the time the Baltimore riots were happening. And our fraternity was founded in Baltimore. So what happened was—it was like everybody was randomly talking about it. And one (White fraternity) person was like (speaker makes texting motion), “Oh I want to go to Baltimore and try out my new guns.” This is annoying. So we could have got angry and just snapped out. But we were like (makes texting motion), “Oh, you forgot, we're in Indiana!” Like that's all we said. And ... everybody was all upset and got nervous and changed the subject.... So I was really offended. And then I felt like we went through the right proper channels. Because I mean we could have just screenshot it, put it on Instagram and let Black IUP go crazy. That frat house would have been trashed. I guarantee it. We actually went to the Greek Life office with photos of (the comment), saying we want something done about this. They were like, “Yeah.” We went through all the proper channels and the only thing we got was like- the same thing, the first climate [study] ... that was the solution.*

Student respondents pointed out that administrators in Student Affairs and the Office of Social Equity were made aware, but while a campus “Town Hall” meeting was proposed, nothing was ultimately done to address this issue as a community.

International students and students of color report feelings of isolation because of social media and living spaces. Students commented that not only does social media provide space for harassment and discriminatory behavior, it also allows students to disengage from university programs and face-to-face encounters with diverse people. A focus group with a combination of Black and Latino/a students talked about returning to more traditional dormitory living because the suites and private rooms enable students to “shut themselves off, even from their roommates.” As shown in Table 4.1, students of color are far more likely to perceive racial tensions in residence halls than are their White counterparts. They suggested living in shared spaces “automatically built a sense of community” and provided and promoted opportunities for the students to meet people of various backgrounds.

*Table 4.1 Students by Race: I Perceive Tension in Residence Hall Discussions with Regard to a Person's Race*

<b>I Perceive Tension in Residence Hall Discussions with Regard to a Person's Race</b>				
<b>Student Responses</b>	<b>White (n=242)</b>	<b>White (%)</b>	<b>Non-White (n=52)</b>	<b>Non-White (%)</b>
<b>Agree</b>	31	12.8 %	14	26.9%
<b>Neutral</b>	35	14.5%	9	17.3%
<b>Disagree</b>	59	24.4%	10	17.2%
<b>Don't Know<sup>4</sup></b>	117	48.3%	19	36.5%
<b>Total</b>	242	100.0%	52	100.0%

The pattern of silence from IUP authorities following racist incidents, at least until recently, is seen by African-American students as a sign that IUP is “sweeping it under the rug”. As indicated by Table 4.2, perceptions of the university’s willingness to engage around difficult issues vary greatly by race, with students of color perceiving the university less favorably than White students.

*Table 4.2 Students by Race: I Believe The Campus Climate Encourages Free and Open Discussion of Difficult Topics*

<b>I Believe The Campus Climate Encourages Free and Open Discussion of Difficult Topics</b>				
<b>Student Responses</b>	<b>White (n=272)</b>	<b>White (%)</b>	<b>Non-White (n=60)</b>	<b>Non-White (%)</b>
<b>Agree</b>	175	64.4%	29	48.3%
<b>Neutral</b>	51	18.8%	17	28.3%
<b>Disagree</b>	43	15.8%	13	21.7%
<b>Don't Know</b>	3	1.1%	1	1.7%
<b>Total</b>	272	100.0%	60	100.0%

<sup>4</sup> The high percentage of Don't Know responses is likely a reflection of the proportion of student respondents who do not live on campus.

Racist incidents are witnessed or experienced by students in the dorms, classrooms, and dining halls, leading African-American students feeling unheard, unsafe and unprotected. This feeling of being in an unwelcoming, racist environment is exacerbated by their experiences in the community surrounding IUP, where students report being targeted by police, treated poorly in retail stores, and discriminated against when seeking employment or housing. The African-American student experience in the classroom and in relationships with faculty will be addressed more completely in a subsequent section of this report.

### Latino/a Students

A common sentiment and prevailing theme that surfaced when listening to Latino/a students and their mentors on campus is summarized by the words of a faculty member who works closely with Latino/a students, “When I think of multiculturalism and diversity, I think of another university. I don’t think of IUP.”

Social segregation was also an issue of distress and disappointment for Latino/a students. Like Black/African-American students, events that are hosted by LaSO, Ritmo Latino, Hispanic Heritage Society, and other organizations draw mostly minority students and few faculty. Some of the students interviewed felt that minority student organizations were competing with each other for a limited audience and pool of funds, with some of the larger budgets going to other groups. In a student focus group, Latino and African-American students said they felt like it was harder to reserve rooms and obtain resources as a minority group and they saw majority organizations getting these quickly and easily. Latino/a students expressed great appreciation for a handful of (less than 5) faculty and administrators who supported them and advised their organizations, but found it alienating that IUP is making a big effort to recruit Latino/a students, yet has invested few resources into retaining them. For example, several respondents noted that there is only one administrator who speaks Spanish and that individual is frequently asked to address Spanish-speaking parents’ questions or concerns about everything, from admissions to financial aid.

One issue that elicited much passion was the lack of physical space dedicated to the Latino/a students and their student organizations. Many noted that they do not feel that the AACC represents them, their cultures, interests or needs, and they resent being forced to fit into the Black/White racial binary. As one Latino student put it, “I’m Latino. A lot of people don’t accept that. They say I’m Black. You’re not White, therefore you’re Black. That’s an archaic concept.” The confusion surrounding the mission of the AACC vis-a-vis Latino students was unanimous among those interviewed and one survey respondent noted:

*My first day on campus I noticed there was an African American Cultural Center, and immediately asked the question, where's the Hispanic Cultural Center, where's the Asian Center or Where's the Multicultural Center for that matter? Going in the AACC felt very unwelcoming. As soon as you walk in, you're facing a locked door and a representative behind a glass window. Why would any student want to go there for cultural support or just to hang and be around people who are like them? If the campus truly valued diversity and multiculturalism you need a*

*space that can accommodate the entire school, especially being that we are one of the largest state system schools.*

Another survey respondent noted the social segregation perpetuated by institutional policies surrounding student organizations and resources assigned to them, including the Greek system:

*Since I have started at IUP, many new Latino/Multicultural based Greek and non-Greek organizations have arisen. There has been racial/ethnic discrimination against these new multicultural Greeks. The NPHC (predominantly Black affiliated Greek organizations) refused to include these new Greeks in their council. Because of this, the three new Greek organizations remain councils with no funds to have events and exclusion from performances and participation in Greek events. Because of this they were forced to start a Multicultural Greek Council which is coming into effect now where before this wasn't even an option because of the lack of resources. The Latino Population on campus is increasing but the campus needs to do a better job to help retain these students by providing the resources necessary for their advancement and participation on campus.*

On campus, in dorms and in classrooms, Latino/a students reported frequently dealing with negative or ignorant comments made to them about their ethnic heritage, their accents, English proficiency, or racial identity. One Latina student reported that she finds herself defending her right to attend IUP when she hears comments about minorities being given “free tuition” or scholarships just because they are Hispanic. “I have a scholarship, but it’s based on academics, not my ethnicity.” Latino/a students also talked about feeling intimidated by faculty, who are not sensitive to the fact that many minority students fear asking for help. They expressed concern that asking for help will make them appear to fit the “undeserving” or underprepared stereotype. For example, this was also a significant point brought up by African-American male students in a focus group who spoke about how they don’t feel comfortable asking for help (from faculty) because “Black men are supposed to be strong and self-sufficient.” In these and other ways, Latino/a students at IUP report that they are consistently reminded of their “difference” in a variety of ways, from experiencing the patronizing attitudes of well-meaning faculty, to being stared at in Walmart, to seeing swastikas paired with anti-Mexican, pro-Trump scrawlings on the Whiteboards in the IUP library.

### Muslim Students

There are significant numbers of students at IUP who identify as Muslim, Arab, and/or Middle Eastern. IUP has an active Muslim Student Association, and the members of that organization are divided along denominational, gender, nationality, and other lines and those divisions pose challenges for the student led group, their advisors, and the administration. Unfortunately, few students in our study identified themselves to us as Muslim. We made numerous and repeated efforts to gain the participation of this population, but we suspect that internal tensions and external fears may have been understandable inhibiting factors. What we were able to learn about the Muslim experience on campus was obtained from faculty and administrators who shared with us some of the challenges and issues facing Muslim and/or Arab students on campus.

Islamophobia and anti-Arab racism are widespread, on campus as elsewhere, and their expressions range from rude and relatively benign to overt and frightening acts of discrimination. For example, one half-White, half-Arab student disclosed that other students “make a face,” or walk away, or ask “ignorant questions” when they learn this student’s ethnic identity. In a more extreme case, a faculty member described learning of an occurrence in a class exercise when White and Black students openly refused to work with the Muslim students, referring to them terrorists. Another faculty member who was advertising a new course on Muslims in American society shared with us a hostile, stereotype-laden e-mail from a White male IUP student who objected to the existence of the course.

Paired with the unwelcoming climate on campus, Muslim students are marginalized by the fact that there is only a poorly maintained prayer space on campus (trash accumulates in their room), and the only alternative prayer space is a gender-segregated mosque in the community. Moreover, Muslim (and other non-majority students and faculty) felt frustrated with the lack of diverse and culturally compatible dining options on campus and in the community, and this is especially the case for students who follow more culturally strict eating habits. Also, there are limited on-campus housing options for Muslim students with families (as is the case with any student seeking family housing on campus). In sum, resources on campus and in the Indiana community are quite limited and students report having to travel to Pittsburgh to get food, clothing, and other needs met.

Although only a very small number of Muslim students responded to the survey (n=8), only one (1) student Agreed that the classroom climate was welcoming based on their religious or spiritual views, with 4 out of 8 Disagreeing and the rest (3 of 8) choosing Neither Agree nor Disagree. Just 25 percent of Muslim students in the survey felt classrooms were comfortable for students based on country of origin, race, gender, English language proficiency, political views and a variety of other criteria. On the survey, Muslim students indicate that when they experience exclusionary conduct at IUP, and they feel it is directed at them for based on their religion or ethnicity. As with much of the exclusionary conduct or harassment reported by all students taking the survey, the source is typically other students, faculty, or administrators.

### **International Students**

The experiences of international students vary widely depending on English language proficiency, college, program or department, and their personal interest in branching out and making friends. In one focus group, for instance, three students from the same country each shared very different experiences: a Eberly Business College student reported having very little contact with English-speakers and/or American-born students despite living in the Suites; a graduate student in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics was satisfied with the mentorship in his department, but wanted help with English proficiency as well as psychological support; an undergraduate in the College of Health and Human Services described having numerous domestic students as friends and was well-integrated the larger campus. These examples serve to illustrate that international students are as diverse in their needs, backgrounds, and experiences as any other group of IUP students and a “one-size fits all” approach to welcoming and supporting international students is insufficient.

Survey results indicate that international students (coded as Non-Resident Aliens or NRA in survey tables) are equally likely to experience harassment or exclusionary conduct (26.4 percent) as students who are US citizens (27.2 percent) (see Table 4.3 in Appendix B). However, they report that basis of such harassment is typically their country of origin, English language proficiency or accent, and/or ethnicity. While international students experience discrimination and harassment in the greater Indiana community, harassment also happens on campus by IUP students and employees. Staff advocating for international students suggested there is little interaction between international and American students unless it is structured. In general, American students can be either very interested and welcoming but some are very naive and reliant on stereotypes. For example, an international student from Africa said he was asked “if they have cell phones there.” Despite the fact that many international students would like to interact more with American students, they end up spending a lot of time with other international students, either out of comfort or because of their living environment. Many respondents expressed concern about the segregation of international students into one or two residence halls while others urged more contact with and diversity training for domestic students. A few survey text box comments (below) illustrate these sentiments:

1. *I think it would be a good idea to have more multicultural activities for international students to get involved in IUP and get to know more of the students in IUP. (survey text box)*
2. *Being an international student, ... I am not certain if American students (Domestic Students) receive diversity training, I think it would be highly beneficial to them in the present and future, in order to learn and deal with the many races, ethnicities, sexual identities, etc., that we have in the world today. (survey text box)*

Some international students had negative interactions with faculty and administrative offices on campus. International students in a focus group, and staff who spoke with us on behalf of international students, argued that faculty have been insensitive to their needs by speaking too quickly in class, using words with which they are unfamiliar, and citing lack of work ethic (on the part of the student) instead of lack of clarity (on the part of the professor) when international students misunderstand or do their assignments incorrectly. Some survey respondents expressed concerns about the way international students who are English language learners are disadvantaged in the classroom. As one respondent noted: “I worry about my international friends and their difficulties with English language. I have witnessed one professor just glazing over a paper done by international friend and my friend needed a lot of help. I realize that may not be job of professor but there were plenty of comments on my paper, none on hers.”

Another person noted that, “with the exception of the cultural/student affairs focused centers like the Office of Social Equity, AACC, International Education, OHRLD, Student Life,” IUP faculty and staff “have a negative bias toward international students. Offices like financial aid and the bursar, or particular academic departments seem hostile toward international students and automatically direct them to the OIE (Office of International Education) for assistance, rather than learn from these students and grow. “

Clearly, there is a need for diversity training and increased communication between the offices designated specifically to assist international students and other offices on campus so “everyone is upholding their own responsibilities and treating all students with respect and/or tolerance.” Moreover, faculty and



ancillary academic services such as the Writing Center, the Advising and Testing Center, and the Applied Research Lab could increase their capacity to work with and provide resources for those for whom English is not their primary language or who have diagnosed learning disabilities.

Finally, respondents noted that international students experience both harassment and discrimination off campus, but those incidents go unreported because they believe nothing can be done. This statement from the survey describes some of those encounters:

*As a student advisor ... there is a difference in what students experience off-campus and it's usually worse. I don't think this is the norm - for the most part, International students/immigrants are fine. But I hear stories every week, probably from students who are yelled at as a car/truck passes by, called names, talked down to, followed by security guards in stores, based on their ethnic identity or religion. I've gotten phone calls from landlords or housing agencies, car dealerships in particular asking questions about int'l students. They seem to use different criteria for Americans and immigrants/international students. Agencies within Indiana, PA do sometimes misunderstand students. Often, if I help call an office with a student, they respond much more kindly to someone with a more "American" accent. (survey text box)*

### **Female Students**

Female students who were interviewed for this study concentrated their focus primarily on the issues of health and safety. Both graduate and undergraduate students felt strongly that resources to support women's health and well-being on campus were, at best, inadequate, and at worst, severely lacking. Students reported receiving little or no information about available gynecological services-- on campus or off. Several students indicated that the only information they received about resources for birth control and other sexual health services were from friends or acquaintances on campus. Given that undergraduate women are navigating these issues alone, and for the first time as adults, the dearth of information was frustrating to them. In fact, women felt that the absence of sanitary napkin disposal bins in women's restrooms was symbolic of the invisibility of women's needs on campus.

Female students in general also expressed deep disappointment with the amount and level of attention paid to sexual assault prevention and education on campus. Minority women in particular have less trust in the services and care providers than White students. In a female student focus group, women reported feeling upset and concerned over the reorganization of the Haven Project, and uneasy over the process of reporting sexual assault through the Office of Social Equity. They perceived the administration's decision to restructure the Center for Health and Well-Being as a lack of institutional commitment for sexual assault awareness raising and counter to victim's rights. Further, female students in a focus group spoke of a growing campus culture of victim blaming, leaving them feeling marginalized and silenced. A student summarized, "Like you go on Yik Yak and there is always something like, 'it's called wake up and regret, not rape' or whenever someone does advocate for sexual assault awareness they will be like, 'I wonder if you guys care about male victims'." Survey respondents who reported experiencing or observing gender-based harassment frequently cited the source of that harassment being other students, with Greek life (fraternities, in particular) as a frequently mentioned culprit.

As Tables 4.4 and 4.5 reveal, White and non-White women students both experience and witness considerably more harassing behavior than do their male counterparts, and the most common source of that behavior is other students.

*Table 4.4 Student experiences with exclusionary conduct or harassment by race and gender*

<b>Within the past year, have you personally experienced any exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct (bullying, harassing behavior) that has interfered with your ability to work or learn at IUP?</b>				
	<b>NO (n=327)</b>		<b>YES (n=121)</b>	
	<b>Male (n=107)</b>	<b>Female (n=220)</b>	<b>Male (n=29)</b>	<b>Female (n=92)</b>
<b>Non White (n=82)</b>	25.61%	42.68%	7.32%	24.39%
<b>White (n=366)</b>	23.50%	50.55%	6.29%	19.66%
<b>Total</b>	23.88%	49.11%	4.02%	14.51%

*Table 4.5 Student observations of exclusionary conduct or harassment by race and gender*

<b>Within the past year, have you observed any exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct (bullying, harassing behavior) that has interfered with your ability to work or learn at IUP?</b>				
	<b>NO (n=291)</b>		<b>YES (n=147)</b>	
	<b>Male (n=84)</b>	<b>Female (n=207)</b>	<b>Male (n=48)</b>	<b>Female (n=99)</b>
<b>Non White (n=80)</b>	18.75%	43.75%	15.00%	22.50%
<b>White (n=358)</b>	19.27%	48.04%	10.06%	22.63%
<b>Total</b>	19.18%	47.26%	10.96%	22.60%

The absence of a Women's Center where sexual assault awareness programs and the handling of sexual violence against women on campus was a major and primary concern for both graduate and undergraduate students at IUP. Through a Women's Center female students envisioned a space for women to congregate, raise awareness of women's issues, find resources, and share concerns. This call for a Women's Center was echoed by female faculty and staff whose experiences are further elaborated in later sections of this report.

### **LGBTQIA Students**

Although it is difficult to present one common experience among IUP LGBTQIA students, some themes did emerge from interviews. Many faculty and administrators said they have seen improvements in how LGBTQIA students are supported on campus especially with the creation of a minor and a dedicated

person to field LGBTQIA issues. But the small, ¼ dedicated staff time for that person, and few monetary resources and limited space, described by one faculty member as “a nearly invisible student-run book room in a locked off dorm,” implies a half-hearted commitment from administrators. One survey respondent put it this way:

I think that faculty, staff, and students are very accepting and open minded toward LGBT students; however, I feel a disconnect between the faculty/staff/student community and the university administration. If the university administration is open minded and accepting of LGBT students, faculty, and staff, I wish that they would be more vocal about their support. It does not have to be a constant thing, but little things like the President participating in LGBT events or making a statement recognizing nationwide events like LGBT pride or history month would drastically improve my perception of the administration and their support for the LGBT community. (survey text box)

LGBTQIA students also do not feel safe to be “out” in all parts of campus life due to the behavior of their peers. This is true across racial and ethnic lines, as well. Students feel that other students are the biggest source of discomfort and there needs to be more done to educate the student body. As one survey respondent noted, what may be experienced as “mildly disrespectful” behavior on campus, can transform into threatening, homophobic interactions off campus.

*The community is primarily students, so they aren't much different. Though I have noticed that the same students who are mildly disrespectful on campus are far worse when they think they are free of campus restraints in the town. For instance- last year, a man who jokingly threatened my friend on campus beat him up on Philadelphia Street for being gay. (survey text box)*

In fact, as Table 4.6 suggests, students who identify as LGBTQIA are more likely to experience harassment more than heterosexual students.

*Table 4.6 Student experiences with exclusionary conduct or harassment by sexual orientation*

<b>Within the Past Year Have You Personally Experienced any Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct That Has Interfered With Your Ability To Learn?</b>		
<b>Student Responses</b>	<b>Heterosexual (n=351)</b>	<b>LGBTQIA (n=103)</b>
<b>No</b>	74.9%	64.1%
<b>Yes</b>	25.0%	36.9%
<b>Total</b>	100.0%	100.0%

When asked “what do you believe this exclusionary conduct/harassment was based upon?” survey responses were concentrated around sexual orientation, ethnicity, and age and their status as students. One survey text box elaborated on the patterns found in the numerical data:

*During the academic year, the university makes up the community for the most part, so I would say that my experiences are the same (positive) [as for other students]. During the summer months, when all of the students go away, I feel a bit more vulnerable as an openly gay, cisgender man. I suppose this is due to my perceived age gap (that there are more senior citizens/older populations in Indiana than there are younger people during the summer), but I could be wrong. (survey text box)*

In terms of policies specifically, students were also troubled by IUP's current name-change policy which, when a transgender student's name is changed, requires the Registrar's office to retain the student's former name on the class roster, thus "outing" students when faculty call roll. Focus group participants called for greater training for administrators, as well as faculty and staff, about LGBTQIA issues, including language use. Focus group respondents noted that they spend a considerable amount of time educating others on appropriate terminology (e.g., cisgender, transgender, intersex, etc.) and sensitivity around pronoun assignment. All of these issues may explain why, when asked to respond to the statement: "The classroom climate is comfortable for students based on their sexual orientation," LGBTQIA survey respondents were less likely to Agree and more likely to Disagree than their heterosexual counterparts. As discussed further in the next section.

LGBTQIA students, and students and faculty advocating for them, desired diversity training for students and faculty, the integration of LGBTQIA content into courses, dedicated and highly visible safe space, and institutional support for reinstating and sustaining the Safe Zone program. The fact that Safe Zone currently "has no institutional support--though it's quality has made it a model taught to and followed by other institutions" was a significant, problematic issue mentioned by many LGBTQIA respondents and allies during these interviews.

### **People with Disabilities**

Both students and faculty with disabilities experience challenges and the most predominant themes we heard from students with disabilities and their advocates were that 1) physical spaces on campus are not easily accessible, particularly for those using wheelchairs or assistive walking devices; and 2) faculty would benefit from increased training around accommodating people with both visible and invisible disabilities in the classroom

Speaking about physical barriers, student respondents reported that designated accessible entrances were not all equipped with automatic doors (interior spaces particularly), limiting or preventing access for people in wheelchairs and/or with limited arm strength. The most frequent complaint concerned the poor timeliness of snow removal and de-icing of walkways. Even individuals without disabilities noted this as a problem. Below are some of the comments from the survey text boxes:

1. *One of the biggest problems I see is that the sidewalks are never clear during the winter, which makes it hard/unsafe for those with physical disabilities to travel around campus. Also, many of the accommodations made for students with physical disabilities are*

*placed in inconvenient places that require the person to travel a long distance to get there. (survey text box)*

2. *During the winters the walkways are absolutely awful and the parking situation is miserable. Anyone that relies on crutches or a wheelchair to move around is absolutely screwed during the winter months. Either the walkways need to be better maintained or classes need to be cancelled. (survey text box)*
3. *I know we got a lot of snow this winter and it is difficult to keep the paths through campus clear, but it was hard to walk the paths being fully able. I cannot imagine how difficult it would be in a wheelchair or crutches. (survey text box)*

Similarly, survey respondents commented on construction barricades on and around campus that limited access to classroom buildings and campus services, causing students with disabilities to be late to class, if they could make it at all. Parking on campus is widely described as “atrocious, particularly for handicapped people who should have better access to parking close to their classes” and the dining halls “are difficult to maneuver for the physically disabled.” For individuals with physical disabilities, and those who support them, IUP is not widely regarded as sufficiently conscious or accommodating of the needs of people with limited mobility. For example, the stage in the Ohio Room is not accessible, and as one survey respondent noted, “it is often unclear where the closest ADA compliant restroom is.” Several respondents commented that the IUP website is poorly designed and virtually inaccessible to individuals with vision impairment.

In terms of disabilities that are less visible or invisible, such as neurological and psychological disabilities, respondents noted that students fear being stigmatized or discriminated against, so they are disinclined to inform faculty members about their needs. Students noted that faculty often do not read the “Dear Professor” letters from the Office of Disability Services, leaving the student feeling awkward or uncomfortable in front the class. To this point, a survey respondent wrote, “Something needs to be done for students who have a mental disorder. I didn't feel welcome at disability services and my professors have been awful about helping me. I have felt alone my entire time at IUP. “

Individuals speaking on behalf of people with disabilities lament IUP's slow response to reconcile concerns and accommodate requests/needs. As one survey respondent commented, “We finally got doors that will open mechanically for those who need that. It took \*years\* to get that with many, many requests are made. We have not resolved the issue of fire alarms for a faculty person with hearing loss who cannot hear the fire alarm and that has been years of asking as well. That is a problem.” Hearing impairments were another area of concern, and students in particular would like more training for professors about using amplifying equipment and/or closed captioning in classes. In a focus group, undergraduate participant mentioned that students who have note takers through Disability Services receive all of the notes for the week from all of their classes on Fridays, which makes it difficult for students to keep up on the work during the week.

Survey responses on this issue were numerous and quite impassioned, with several comments echoing this one: “The campus community is just about equally racist, sexist, and ableist as that found off campus.” Whether the disability is physical, emotional, psychological or neurological, there is a sense that IUP, as an institution, could and should be doing much more to raise awareness, accommodate and to support members of the community who are living with disabilities.

### **Diversity Resources on Campus**

Student participants suggested that most racial, ethnic, and religious minority students, female students, LGBTQIA students, and students with disabilities remain unaware of and/or do not use the Office of Social Equity as a place to report harassment and discrimination. There is a great deal of confusion surrounding which office on campus is assigned to hear student complaints or concerns about harassment, discrimination or bias. As a female staff member summarized, “I just don’t think students are really aware of their rights or where they can go.” As such, the unclear role played by the Office of Social Equity on campus reinforces student perceptions that IUP is paying lip service to issues of diversity, equity and inclusion but is taking little visible action.

Beyond students, faculty and others reported feeling confused by the ambiguous and contradictory (compliance vs. advocacy) role of the Office of Social Equity. A number of respondents described having unpleasant, even alienating experiences when they inquired about their rights or sought to obtain information or file a report with the office. Throughout this study, we heard some praise for, but a great deal more confusion and frustration with the Office of Social Equity because the parameters around its role on campus are unclear and leadership is lacking.

### **Punxsutawney Students**

While a number of undergraduate students remarked about their experiences while in Punxsutawney, many faculty respondents of all racial and ethnic backgrounds spoke on behalf of the students who attend their first year at the Punxsutawney campus. Feelings on this topic were notably strong, and one faculty member asserted that sincere conversations about race relations at IUP are impossible until policies surrounding the Punxsutawney campus are addressed. Another faculty member asked, “Why don’t we put the Honor’s College up there?” Words like “horrible idea” and “outrageous” were used to describe the IUP practice of sending the lowest achieving, predominantly minority (African-American and Latino/a) students to spend one year at the geographically, socially, and academically isolated Punxsutawney campus. As one faculty member put it: “Punxsy is an offense to me and it’s painful. ... that so many students from my community end up in that space, which is even more horrific than Indiana, and it’s the first time away from home for many of them ... I don’t know. It’s horrendous.”

This respondent and others describe the location surrounding Punxsutawney campus as “unrelentingly White” with increasing numbers of Confederate flags openly on display and few if any welcoming resources (food, recreation, health care, shopping) for students. Students who had attended Punxsutawney campus reported having pickup trucks drive past them and hearing “White power” or racial epithets shouted from the vehicle. In a manner reminiscent of the experiences of African Americans working in

“sundown towns,” these same students told us that they had been instructed “not to go out at night” while living in Punxsutawney.

Students who spend their first year in college at the Punxsutawney campus are less likely to remain at IUP into the second or third years (see Table 4.7) and graduate in lower rates than their peers starting on main campus. There are several possible explanations for this pattern including the fact that students must adjust- not once but twice- to an entirely new campus environment, which includes making new friends, building new relationships with professors and administrators, and stretching financial aid to pay for courses not offered at the branch campus. Some students who start at Punxsutawney campus adjust to main campus and maintain close friendships with their first year peers. But even those who persist have experiences like the one described by this survey respondent, “I never got along with my roommates. I had many different ones throughout my stay here at IUP. I started at the Punxsy campus so when I got to main campus, it was really hard to make friends. I always seemed to be left out from the roommate outings or ignored in my own house.”

Table 4.7 Student 2nd and 3rd year retention rates by branch campus

	Punxsutawney			Indiana	
	2nd year retention	3rd year retention		2nd year retention	3rd year retention
2013 cohort	67%	57%		75%	67%
2012 cohort	60%	47%		75%	66%
2011 cohort	74%	52%		76%	66%

Data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment

It is not solely the unwelcoming racial climate or the social isolation or the two transitions that disturb many about the campus at Punxsutawney. Except for the Culinary Arts program, the premise of the Punxsutawney campus is seen as fundamentally flawed. While respondents note that the university is giving Punxsutawney “all it can” in terms of resources, and “some things have gotten better than five years ago,” the rationale for assigning students to that campus is problematic. As one faculty member stated,

*... why would you put equal ability (underprepared) students in one place with no achievers there? In other words, there's no higher level students, there's no upper classmen, there's nothing there but the same ability level students. ... That alone to me is a recipe for failure except for extremely resilient kids that ... probably shouldn't have been there anyway.”*

Punxsutawney campus is viewed by some as a “cash cow,” a place to send students who otherwise might not have been admitted to IUP in order to fill “a building full of beds.” As one faculty member noted, when referring to Punxsutawney, “You can't have beds without having heads on them.” The same respondent asserted that the claims of doing these students a service, is disingenuous, when those who

“survive are likely to be the more resilient students anyway.” A survey respondent summarized what many feel about the Punxsutawney campus:

*IUP creates and fosters ableism and racism and sexism and exclusion. Why are international students segregated in some classrooms? Why are there a disproportionate amount of African Americans at the Punxsutawney campus? Why was affirmative action eliminated? Are efforts made to recruit people with impairments? (survey text box)*

Research on campus racial climate policies shows that several campus climate factors are clearly linked to the recruitment and retention of minority students, including size of minority population and access to minority culture, opportunities for school involvement, climate in the dorms, financial aid, and location (Hughes, Anderson, Cannon, Perez & Moore, 1998). For many of these reasons, the campus at Punxsutawney is hugely problematic, and we believe it weighs heavily on the overall campus climate. Minority student and faculty perceptions of the campus climate improve when they see evidence of a clear institutional commitment to racial equity that is demonstrated by actions and policies that move beyond sporadic interventions, workshops or symposiums (Rankin and Reason, 2005).

## **Recommendations to Address Issues related to Student Experiences and Perceptions of Diversity**

### **I. Develop, Implement and Assess Progress Toward an IUP Diversity Action Plan**

B. Encourage professional development opportunities to improve effectiveness of teaching to, working with and serving diverse populations of students.

1. Create diversity focused trainings to engage faculty, staff, administrators in opportunities to reflect on the challenges and value of diversity.

For survey data showing faculty and staff support of this and other recommendations, see Table 3.10 in Appendix B.

2. Institutionalize mechanisms and provide funding for Safe Zone and Diversity training and resources for faculty, staff and administration.

In addition to workshops and reflective practice, certain trainings should be institutionally supported with qualified human capital and other resources, and these trainings should be encouraged and offered at regular intervals. The Safe Zone training developed by faculty and staff at IUP is recognized widely (outside and within IUP) as an excellent model in the area of LGBTQIA support and awareness. Similar programs should be developed around racial/ethnic/religious/disability diversity as a way to increase the competencies of faculty and staff, while also raising the visibility of IUP’s commitment to an inclusive and healthy campus climate.

3. Develop faculty pedagogical competencies in teaching students from diverse backgrounds.



Encourage and support faculty development with trainings and workshops designed to strengthen cultural and pedagogical competencies for working with an increasingly diverse student body.

D. Increase the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty, students, administrators and staff.

Students: There is grave concern on campus about the current recruitment plan, particularly the assignment of non-White and/or underprepared students to the Punxsutawney campus. Our research found that on balance, maintaining satellite campuses, particularly Punxsutawney, has a negative effect on campus climate. Branch campuses are widely understood to serve the primary function of boosting admissions and enrollment numbers (and falsely elevating the SAT/ACT scores for admits) while marginalizing certain students, faculty and staff who, as one respondent put it, are “tethered to these campuses.”

Notwithstanding, there is significant support for increasing the diversity of the student body on Main, as indicated in Appendix B: Table 3.10.

Faculty and Administrative Searches: The data point to a need to review criteria, increase transparency, and improve cultural competency around hiring processes to increase likelihood of diverse applicants in all searches, at all levels. More discussion of this recommendation in section on Workplace Climate)

D. Develop curriculum that supports global engagement and cross cultural competencies.

Students and employees alike felt strongly that diversity education should be a requirement for graduation. Students overwhelmingly called for greater education for themselves and their peers as well. LGBTQ, African-American, international, Latino/a and female students expressed being uncomfortable in classrooms or campus workplaces where they are called upon to educate others, so they seek for a course or set of courses about racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression, that all students would be required to take in order to graduate. As one undergraduate put it, “I think in some way IUP has to incorporate a cultural dialogue into their first year program or whatever. I mean, if it’s required your first year, everyone has that so there’s no excuse you are ignorant to the problem or ignorant to what you are saying because you should have learned it.”

A criticism of the current curriculum arose numerous times: except for some social science courses, liberal studies courses are the only place in the undergraduate curriculum where the contributions of women and underrepresented groups are even supposed to be included. Such a minimal, “add on” approach reflects a lack of university-wide commitment to the mission of preparing students to live and work in a diverse and global future.

There was a clear call among respondents to improve inclusivity and attention to global, international, and national issues throughout the curriculum, campus programming, and in partnership with local community organizations. When asked “How well does the university engage students and the campus with issues that are going on in the world, nationally, internationally or globally?” interview respondents were unanimous in their disappointment. The two main types of responses were either “Not at all” or “only if it’s student led.” Students expressed frustration with the lack of discourse around matters of national and international importance such as immigration, the Syrian refugee crisis, global climate change, Black Lives Matter, and other ongoing issues. One respondent called the campus “apathetic” while others shared their perception that the university caters to the sensibilities of the surrounding, predominantly White community.

F. Establish spaces and structures that expand opportunities for full inclusion (multi-faith prayer space, ADA compliance, culturally appropriate dining options).

## **II. Acknowledge and address discriminatory practices at the Punxsutawney Campus and surrounding community.**

### **III. Create a Multicultural Center administered jointly by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs**

Student and faculty respondents have noted the tremendous amount of new construction at IUP over the past decade- new suites, dining halls, academic buildings, etc. Yet, despite repeated calls for a multicultural center over the years, no such facility or staff support has been planned. Plans to refurbish the bottom floor of Elkin Hall have raised concerns that there an effort afoot to eliminate the African American Cultural Center and reallocate funds and services under the umbrella of a multicultural center. Climate study respondents emphasized that a one-size fits all space that is repurposed and relabeled a “multicultural center” will only further alienate minority populations on this campus.

In order to celebrate diversity, promote engagement, and support collaboration across and within diverse groups of students, a multicultural center requires not only the physical space for African American, Latino, LGBTQIA, Muslim, Asian American, Native American, and various other constituencies to gather, but staff and technological support to facilitate collaboration and advocacy. (see additional recommendations on page 58).

### **IV. Create a Women’s Center**

The administration should provide funds and space for a Women’s Center and Director to provide women’s programming, especially in the area of sexual assault and violence. Proper training and compensation to our student sexual assault peer educators needs also to be ensured. The Women’s Center is needed to serve as a centralized hub for women’s programming and initiatives on campus, with resources, and human capital to organize, coordinate, and direct services and programs for all women and families.

**V. Institute an Office of the Ombudsman**

The role of the Office of Social Equity is ambiguous and employees seeking to respond to instances of harassment, intimidation, perpetual conflict and discrimination feel unserved by the Office of Human Resources. An Ombudsman, independent of those offices, could represent complainants' interests and ensure a neutral response.

## 5. Classrooms and Student Faculty Relations

In this section we present students' and faculty views on how they experience IUP classrooms as well as their perception of the relationships between students and faculty. We also asked staff and administrators to provide their perspectives of the IUP classroom and student/faculty relations. We begin by describing the mixed sentiments underrepresented students feel about classroom climates and faculty support. We then turn to faculty by describing their frustration with implementing diversity material in their courses, feelings of discrimination and mistreatment from students by faculty of color and female faculty, and the mentoring and service burdens faculty of color experience.

Tables 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 represent students' sentiments on the classroom climate. Table 5.1 shows that the majority of students (72.4 percent of males and 70.9 percent of females) believe the climate is welcoming for students based on their gender. Table 5.2 suggests something slightly different based on race. While a majority of students believe the classroom climate is welcoming for students based on their race (50 percent non-White and 66.3 percent White), a significant number of non-White students (48.6 percent) are either neutral or Disagree that the climate is welcoming for students based on race. Table 5.3 suggests most students Agree the classroom climate is welcoming for students based on their sexual orientation, 61.2 percent of heterosexual students and 55.9 percent of LGBTQIA students Agree. Yet as with non-White students, a large number of LGBTQIA students are neutral (26.9 percent) or Disagree (12.9 percent) that the climate is welcoming based on sexual orientation. These three tables suggest classroom climates may be less welcoming for racial minority students and LGBTQIA students. The qualitative data certainly confirms that classrooms seem to be most difficult for students of color.

*Table 5.1 The Classroom Climate is Welcoming for Students Based on Their Gender*

Student Responses	Male (n=123)	Female (n=285)
Agree	72.4%	70.9%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	15.4%	20.3%
Disagree	8.9%	.4%
Don't Know	3.3%	2.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

*Table 5.2 The Classroom Climate is Welcoming for Students Based on Their Race*

Student Responses	Non-White (n=74)	White (n=321)
Agree	50.0%	66.3%
Neutral	35.1%	22.1%
Disagree	13.5%	7.8%
Don't Know	1.4%	3.7%

<b>Total</b>	100.0%	100.0%
--------------	--------	--------

*Table 5.3 The Classroom Climate is Welcoming for Students Based on Their Sexual Orientation*

<b>Student Responses</b>	<b>Heterosexual (n=307)</b>	<b>LGBTQIA (n=93)</b>
<b>Agree</b>	61.2%	55.9%
<b>Neutral</b>	22.8%	26.9%
<b>Disagree</b>	10.8%	12.9%
<b>Don't Know</b>	5.2%	4.3%
<b>Total</b>	100.0%	100.0%

In interviews and focus groups we learned many underrepresented student respondents did not initially feel supported by faculty when they came to IUP and, generally, it took them some time to feel connected to faculty, if they did at all. This is especially true for racial/ethnic minority, low-income, and LGBTQIA students. Underrepresented students said they felt supported when faculty reached out to them and when courses they took integrated diversity into the curriculum. However, as discussed more below, faculty who said they incorporate diversity into their curriculum experience backlash from majority students and in some cases, especially if that faculty is a minority, receive negative evaluations. An overwhelmingly common sentiment among all of the participants was that IUP must make more concerted efforts to diversify our faculty so that students can see and connect with individuals in positions of instruction and leadership who share their backgrounds and understand their cultures. At the same time, White faculty need to be encouraged to increase their competencies when it comes to teaching to and about diverse populations and issues.

When underrepresented students arrive on campus, they already feel “different” and in some ways, they also feel intimidated. A number of people described a harmful, paternalistic attitude held by many White faculty and administrators. For example, a female African-American student said, “A lot of it goes back to that belief that these poor kids from Philly can’t do what the rest of these kids can ... They [African American students] need to be challenged and respected for the fact that they’re here, and held to the same high standards. The pity thing is what holds people down.” (female African-American student focus group).

Another female African-American student shared her perspective on student faculty relations, and described the transition from high school to college in the following way, “The first thing you hear [about college] is teachers don’t care. You just got to do your work and if you fail, you fail. Teachers are not going to care. They get paid anyway. So that’s already programmed into our heads.” In the same focus group, another racial minority student elaborated on what it is like to initially interact with IUP professors. The student said, “They also are intimidating when you get there. Because then they’re like, I feel like...judged because you’re different. Like you’re different and you might not think you’re competent enough to go to the faculty and ask them for help. So that’s even an issue there.”

These comments reflect the impact on IUP students of a paternalistic or “deficit model” way of thinking that pervades American culture, including aspects of the education system and IUP. The deficit perspective shapes campus diversity policies (Hoover, 1990), teacher training and subsequently, student-educator relations (Gorski, 2010), and majority-minority interactions more generally (Tochluk, 2010). By placing responsibility for differences in achievement on individual members of minority communities, educators and policymakers expect non-White or low-income students to do all of the assimilating and adjusting (into college classrooms, for example) without requiring non-minority members to change in response to the multicultural experience (Hughes, et.al., 1998). This way of thinking is quite often unconscious, yet it negatively shapes the student-faculty relationships.

Table 5.4 illustrates most students generally feel that faculty are concerned about them. In fact, 70.3 percent of White students and 51.7 percent of non-White students Agree to the statement, “I think faculty are genuinely concerned with my welfare.” Yet, a slightly larger percent of non-White students Disagree with the statement (15.0 percent of non-White versus 13.6 percent of White students). This suggests that faculty/student relationships may be more difficult for non-White students.

*Table 5.4 Student response to, “I Think IUP Faculty Are Genuinely Concerned With My Welfare”*

Student Responses	White (n=273)	Non-White (n=60)
Agree	70.3%	51.7%
Neutral	15.8%	30.0%
Disagree	13.6%	15.0%
Don't Know	0.4%	3.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Several students reported a lack of cultural sensitivity around gender from some professors and discussed unfriendly classroom interactions. For example, one student described a professor as calling female students “girls” and assuming they all use the Pinterest app as if it was “inherent to females.” In the open-ended survey questions a student discussed her discomfort with the lack of faculty cultural sensitivity. The student said, “Faculty need to reflect on their own biases while teaching students. Where is the accountability? I complained once and it was clear the department knew I had. I no longer trust the IUP system. I just want my degree and I am unimpressed by most of the faculty.” A faculty member suggested students felt intimidated when she initially brought up LGBT issues in her classroom because students’ saw a potential insensitivity to her approach. She had to reassure them an open dialogue was encouraged in her classroom. Finally, another faculty member described an unfriendly environment toward international students on campus, suggesting there are no test taking services for ESL students or cultural understanding of how international students may be trained to work and study more collaboratively and collectively than the individualistic approach often taught to American students. Students and faculty felt faculty should also have professional development opportunities and/or mandated diversity training.

Students said they feel most supported by faculty when faculty verbally reach out and provide visual cues, such as Safe Zone signs or photos in their offices, to indicate their allegiance to underrepresented students. A racial minority student explained, “So the teachers will have to make that branch out, you know, and say, hey you can actually come talk to me. Like don’t just say ‘It’s in the syllabus’ or ‘We have office hours’. No, you all can come and talk to me if you all have some issues you need help with.” Once students acclimate, many, but not all, find trusting, even mentoring, relationships with faculty.

The tables below are illustrations of how students’ perceptions differ on how inclusive IUP’s curriculum is based on gender and race. Across the board, non-White and international students alike experience the curriculum as less-inclusive and not reflective of diverse perspectives, while White students are more likely to feel that the curriculum is inclusive. These patterns are consistent with finding from comparable climate studies and research conducted by Hughes, Anderson, Cannon, Perez, and Moore (1998) and confirmed by Watson, et. al. (2002).

Table 5.5 suggests that to a much greater extent than White students, non-White students do not feel their *gender* is represented in course material. Many survey and interview/focus group respondents told us that IUP was both male and White dominated, and one place where non-White students are not seeing men or women of their race represented is in their courses.

*Table 5.5 Student response to, “To What Extent Do You Agree That Your Courses at IUP Include Sufficient Materials, Perspectives and/ or Experiences of People Based on Their Gender.”*

Student Responses	White (n=214)	Non-White (n=48)
Agree	59.4%	37.5%
Neutral	20.6%	27.1%
Disagree	6.5%	20.9%
Don't Know	13.6%	14.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Moreover, Table 5.6 shows a stark difference in how White and non-White students perceive their courses representing people based on their race. A majority of White students (55.9 percent) Agree, whereas a majority of non-White students are either neutral (32.7 percent) or Disagree (22.4 percent) that materials, perspectives, and experiences of people based on race are sufficient. Again, these patterns are consistent with findings from studies conducted by Rankin and Reason (2005) and others (Chang, 2003, Feagin, et.al, 1996).

*Table 5.6 Student response to, “To What Extent Do You Agree That Your Courses at IUP Include Sufficient Materials, Perspectives and/ or Experiences of People Based on Their Race?”*

Student Responses	White (n=211)	Non-White (n=49)
Agree	55.9%	30.6%
Neutral	22.3%	32.7%
Disagree	6.7%	22.4%
Don't Know	15.2%	14.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

In interviews and focus groups, non-White and other underrepresented students reported feeling safe and drawn to professors when their courses include curriculum that reflects diverse perspectives. Yet we heard from faculty there is limited opportunity to teach interdisciplinary courses or team-teach in ways that could diversify the curriculum. Moreover, the general liberal studies courses are often taught by adjunct faculty who are either required to follow a standard syllabus, which doesn't allow room to incorporate diversity curriculum, or they eliminate diverse perspectives to ensure positive teaching evaluations for rehire. To remedy the lack of diverse perspectives in the curriculum, numerous students and faculty members suggested there should be a “mandated diversity course” so that students who have not been exposed to diverse people and experiences could be.

Not surprisingly (but unfortunately), quite a few faculty voiced fears about a diversity course or even putting diversity in their regular classes because many majority students make fun of these issues or make harmful comments in the classroom that are hard to diffuse. Tables 5.7, 5.8, and 5.9 confirm the tension felt by faculty in the classroom. For example, Table 5.7 illustrates female faculty are much more likely than male faculty to Agree with the statement, “I perceive tension in classroom discussions with regard to a person's gender,” (29.1 percent compared to 5.6 percent). Likewise, Table 5.8 reveals that non-White faculty are much more likely than White faculty (32.1 percent compared to 20.0 percent) perceive tension in classroom discussion with regard to a person's race. Finally, Table 5.9 shows LGBTQIA faculty are significantly more likely than heterosexual faculty (40.0 percent compared to 17.8 percent) to perceive tension in classroom discussions with regard to a person's sexual orientation. These data suggests that faculty from minority and underrepresented groups are more likely to perceive tension in classroom discussions with regard to minority people than faculty from majority populations. These findings align with research that shows that people with privilege do not readily see or acknowledge how that privilege aligns with their everyday experience, or when injustices occur on the basis of structural or cultural discrimination (Bonilla-Silva, 2010; McIntosh, 1989; Tatum, 2003).

*Table 5.7 Faculty's response to, “I perceive tension in classroom discussions with regard to a person's gender.”*

Faculty Responses	Male (n=72)	Female (n=116)
Agree	5.6%	29.1%
Neutral	22%	31.9%
Disagree	68.0%	40.5%



<b>Don't Know</b>	4.1%	9.5%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%

*Table 5.8 Faculty response to, “I perceive tension in classroom discussions with regard to a person’s race?”*

<b>Faculty Responses</b>	<b>Non-White (n=28)</b>	<b>White (n=155)</b>
<b>Agree</b>	32.1%	20.0%
<b>Neutral</b>	14.2%	21.9%
<b>Disagree</b>	46.4%	49.0%
<b>Don't Know</b>	7.1%	9.0%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%

*Table 5.9 Faculty response to, “I perceived tension in classroom discussions with regard to a person’s sexual orientation?”*

<b>Faculty Responses</b>	<b>Heterosexual (n=163)</b>	<b>LGBTQIA (n=20)</b>
<b>Agree</b>	17.8%	40.0%
<b>Neutral</b>	27.0%	20.0%
<b>Disagree</b>	44.1%	25.0%
<b>Don't Know</b>	11.0%	15%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%

As mentioned previously, faculty who work hard to incorporate diverse perspectives and culturally sensitive and informed content in their courses report feeling resistance, disinterest, and even hostility from some majority students. They describe implementing such content “carefully” and with the understanding they will likely be negatively evaluated by some majority students, which in turn means a negative evaluation by their peers, chair, and dean. This process is frustrating for faculty who feel teaching social justice issues, or “challenging students’ fundamental views” has to be “watered down” to ensure acceptable teaching evaluations. This pattern of majority student resistance to interventions on behalf of diversity is quite common, as the literature suggests (Hughes, et. al., 1998; Rankin and Reason, 2005) and faculty and administrators need to be aware of this when such resistance manifests in negative teaching evaluations.

In similar fashion, underrepresented faculty are frustrated by the lack of acknowledgement of how their own identity impacts how they are perceived and harshly evaluated by students. Female faculty who teach about “social justice issues” reported being perceived as “aggressive,” “biased,” and “angry.” As one female faculty suggested, “As a woman, I feel pressured to constantly demonstrate my expertise and skills. I believe that men have an easier time with student evaluations. Consequently, I am disturbed that student evaluations, proven to be gender and racially biased, hold so much weight in our performance evaluations” (survey text box). Racial minority faculty participants discussed walking into a classroom knowing that “a majority of these students have never been taught by a Black person before” having to take great care to make sure students “feel comfortable.” In an extreme case, an international faculty member recalled receiving a harsh evaluation that said, “F you, F that, F this” referring to the professor’s stance on foreign policy, and ended by asking of the professor, “Why don’t he go back to where he came from?” Interestingly, this particular international faculty member, as well as another female international faculty member, reported taking great measures to learn to accommodate hostile students, by sitting in on colleagues’ courses to learn how to be more “likeable” and by having colleagues sit in on their own courses to critique their approaches. A comment from open-ended survey questions further summarized frustrations of faculty of color and international faculty:

*The Office of Social Equity could do a better job of investigating complaints, and taking complaints seriously. Faculty with minority status report feeling unheard, unsupported and invalidated during the investigation process and are often left confused about their rights and the disposition of their complaints. Confidentiality in this office is also a problem that inhibits others from pursuing complaints. (survey text box)*

At the same time underrepresented faculty experience student bias and discrimination, they are often also overwhelmed by the mentoring expectations underrepresented students (and majority faculty and administration) have of them. One survey respondent summarized,

*As I mentioned before, employing a more diverse faculty and staff, will help with recruitment/retention rates of Minority students. I am the only one in my office who speaks Spanish. Currently no one in the (redacted) office speaks Spanish, so naturally I get all the inquiries and have to spend a lot of time translating. It would help to host programs in Spanish and have a representative who may understand the backgrounds of the minority students.” (survey text box).*

As the next section shows, faculty often feel their service work is devalued, but faculty of color and international faculty feel the tremendous amount of service they do to retain and guide students who share their backgrounds is “invisible” and goes “unnoticed” (survey text box).

## **Recommendations to Address Climate Issues in Classrooms and Student Faculty Relations**

### **I. Develop, Implement and Assess Progress Toward an IUP Diversity Action Plan**

B. Encourage professional development opportunities to improve effectiveness of teaching to, working with, and serving diverse populations of students

1. Create diversity focused trainings to engage faculty, administrators and staff in opportunities to reflect on the challenges and value of diversity.

For survey data showing faculty and staff support of this and other recommendations, see Table 3.10 in Appendix B.

2. Institutionalize mechanisms and provide funding to require Safe Zone and Diversity trainings for faculty, staff and administrators.
3. Develop faculty competencies in teaching students from diverse backgrounds.

C. Provide support (communication and funding) to develop partnerships between student, university and community organizations to foster intercultural experiences and appreciation for diversity.

There were numerous calls to support these partnerships with a simplified communication and space-use apparatus to facilitate coordination, collaboration and programming and incentives for faculty and staff to lead these efforts. Student leaders and faculty who work with student

organizations lamented the difficulty of coordinating, finding space for and publicizing student-led events on campus. Numerous respondents noted that diversity related events, in particular, are not well publicized and are often scheduled at times that compete with other events. Students reported that the procedures for securing permission to have a peaceful rally or march to express their concerns are tightly controlled. One Latino student described his experience shortly after the shooting of Trayvon Martin:

*The police on campus actually told us where we could walk. We couldn't walk the entire campus. We had a specific route and it was on the edge of campus. We came through half of Oak Grove, cut through Wilson and Leonard and walked back over to Pratt Hall which is all the way on the end of campus. We couldn't be in the Oak Grove for too long. So why could Take Back the Night happen and march the entire Oak Grove but because we wanted to march in protest of a student, we had to be all the way at Pratt Hall at the corner of campus? When the president (Obama) was re-elected, we were celebrating in the Oak Grove. They kicked us out. Things like that. (Latino student)*

Some students were told by IUP officials that they require a permit to assemble or demonstrate on campus, despite the fact that outdoor space use policies published on the IUP website contradict this fact. A faculty member who works closely with students of color recalled learning of this permit requirement from an undergraduate.

*Here, when talking to the student and I say you know, what you need to do, is in a peaceful way get your word out publicly. Let other people know that you have a concern you want to demonstrate about. And they say "Well did you know, Dr. (redacted), here at IUP we need permits to do that." A permit?! Since when do you need a permit to demonstrate peacefully? Not a parade, not a large congregation of people, but five or six people holding a poster of someone who was beaten at the border or a poster of a Syrian refugee trying to enter Europe. "Dr. (redacted) said we need permits for that." I mean are we that controlled? Are our students that controlled now that they can't spontaneously in a peaceful way during lunch or whatever and go out and protest peacefully? (faculty member)*

- D. Increase the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty, students, administrators and staff.
- E. Develop curriculum that supports global engagement and cross cultural competencies. As discussed above, numerous respondents to both the survey and the interviews called for integrating a diversity education requirement into the graduation requirements.

## **II. Create a Multicultural Center that is administered jointly by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.**

The proposed repurposing of Elkin Hall as a possible multicultural center has resulted in both positive and negative responses, all of which revolve around three main issues: 1) There is grave concern that a

Multicultural Center will be an effort to deal with social segregation and structural segmentation on campus by adopting a “one size fits all” space that, in effect, eliminates diversity by turning everyone into “multicultural students” rather than recognizing, supporting, and celebrating cultural differences; 2) There is equal dismay that the decision making processes are moving forward in “typical IUP fashion,” meaning **without** the informed and active involvement of students, faculty advisors, and individuals who work closely with and understand intimately the needs of diverse student populations. The third concern centers on who (which administrative division) would be in charge-- budgetarily and administratively- of a Multicultural Center. Given the findings of this study, and after reviewing numerous climate studies from other institutions, we strongly recommend that, wherever it is located, a new Multicultural Center *not* be administered by a single division within IUP’s organizational structure. Rather, a shared space dedicated to serving the campus’s diverse student body should be administered jointly by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. This will enhance communication and collaboration across divisions and better serve the needs of all students.

**VI. Create venues for regular discussions and dialogues about equity and inclusion- at all levels, town meetings, college chairs, cabinet, senate, union meetings, etc.**

**VII. Recognize and Reward Diversity and Social Justice Work as part of University Service and Scholarship**

## 6. Workplace Climate and Career/Life Balance

In this section we present administrator, faculty, and staff respondents' views on the workplace climate at IUP and career/life balance. Many faculty desired a more diverse faculty makeup and shared their perceptions of the barriers to diversifying. Faculty of color felt they lacked a community of individuals who shared their cultural background and experiences. Just as students expressed, faculty also found pockets of comfort and hostility, depending on the department and college. For example, male and White dominated disciplines seem to be more difficult for faculty women and faculty of color to navigate. Many faculty are frustrated with a heavy workload, lack of compensation for service, and a lack of clarity of promotion and tenure criteria. Female staff especially, but also faculty, expressed a lack of mentoring and training when they enter new positions, and shared that human resource policies and practices are ambiguous and feel discriminatory. Finally, staff and faculty, especially women, often feel overworked, over-serviced, and under/devalued, leaving many of them strained in their work/life balance. A response to an open ended survey question summarizes what is put forth in this section,

*Overall, my sense is that the campus is attempting to improve its climate to be more and more welcoming, but that there are key ways in which there are unconscious biases that remain in play. In particular, positions of power continue to be dominated by people who are largely male, largely White, largely straight, largely privileged--or at least this appears to be the case. In addition, students themselves hold biases that judge non-native English speakers or otherwise marked "outsiders" in lower esteem because the tenure/promotion system relies so absurdly on multiple-choice student evaluations that students themselves don't understand as valuable, these members of the community, as well as women and other minorities, are likely to receive lower-than-deserve evaluation scores, and these are weighted too heavily. In addition, staff positions appear to me to be underpaid; in particular, traditionally feminized positions of secretarial and administrative assistants seem to be far too poorly remunerated. (survey text box)*

We asked faculty respondents if the workplace climate was welcoming for faculty based on their gender, race, sexual orientation and other variables. Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 show that members of minority groups, (women, non-White, and LGBTQIA) were more likely than majority faculty (male, White, heterosexual) to Disagree. Specifically, Table 6.1 shows 29.0 percent of female faculty Disagreed with the statement, "The workplace climate is welcoming for faculty based on their gender," compared to 6.8 percent of males and 10.9 percent of female staff Disagreed with the statement, "The workplace climate is welcoming for staff based on their gender," compared to 6.8 percent of male staff. Similarly, Table 6.2 shows 27.6 percent of non-White faculty Disagreed with the statement, "The workplace climate is welcoming for faculty based on their race," compared to 14.4 percent of White faculty and 33.3 percent of non-White staff Disagreed with the statement, "The workplace climate is welcoming for staff based on their race," compared to 4.8 percent of White staff. Finally, Table 6.3 shows 35.0 percent of LGBTQIA faculty Disagreed with the statement, "The workplace climate is welcoming for faculty based on their sexual orientation," compared to only 11.0 percent of heterosexual participants and 18.8 percent of LGBTQIA staff Disagreed with the statement, "The workplace climate is welcoming for staff based on their sexual orientation," compared to 8.9 percent of heterosexual staff.

Table 6.1 Faculty and staff response to, “The workplace climate is welcoming for faculty/staff based on their gender.”

	Male Faculty (n=74)	Female Faculty (n=119)	Male Staff (n=60)	Female Staff (n=129)
<b>Agree</b>	56.0%	43.7%	60.0%	60.7%
<b>Neutral</b>	21.6%	16.0%	30.0%	27.1%
<b>Disagree</b>	6.8%	29.0%	6.7%	10.9%
<b>Don't Know</b>	2.3%	2.5%	3.3%	2.3%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 6.2 Faculty/staff response to, “The workplace climate is welcoming for faculty/staff based on their race.”

	White Faculty (n=153)	Non-White Faculty (n=29)	White Staff (n=165)	Non-White Staff (n=15)
<b>Agree</b>	49.7%	55.1%	58.8%	26.7%
<b>Neutral</b>	28.8%	13.7%	34.0%	26.7%
<b>Disagree</b>	14.4%	27.6%	4.8%	33.3%
<b>Don't Know</b>	7.2%	3.4%	4.8%	2.3%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 6.3 Faculty/staff response to, “The workplace climate is welcoming for faculty/staff based on their sexual orientation.”

Faculty Responses	Heterosexual Faculty (n=164)	LGBTQIA Faculty (n=20)	Heterosexual Staff (n=168)	LGBTQIA Staff (n=16)
<b>Agree</b>	51.9%	30.0%	66.0%	50.0%
<b>Neutral</b>	28.0%	30.0%	27.4%	31.3%
<b>Disagree</b>	11.0%	35.0%	8.9%	18.8%
<b>Don't Know</b>	11.0%	15%	3.0%	18.8%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%

Almost all of the respondents (except for members of the Council of Trustees who saw a promising increase in diversity) expressed a desire to see a more diverse makeup of faculty, staff and administrators, and argued that “IUP could make a more conscious effort” to recruit and retain employees of color. Some respondents recognized that it is difficult to attract and retain faculty of color (in particular) to a predominantly White and rural institution but a male faculty member of color suggested efforts to recruit are diminished because we presume “no one wants to live in Indiana.” This individual argued that sentiment “feels like a cop out,” citing incentives that could help diversify IUP faculty and staff, including spousal hires and the lure of IUP’s close proximity to larger cities.

Another faculty member of color suggested that IUP may currently be making more concerted efforts to recruit diverse faculty, as indicated in the increase in financial and institutionalized support to diversify faculty over the last few years. However, this person noted that the selection process is often skewed because potential hires from majority backgrounds appear to search committees to be a “better fit” than racial minorities or international faculty. “When you have three candidates and one has been raised in rural Pennsylvania, and the other two have been raised in different places, they are talking about ideas that may not be very familiar.” Thus, the “local candidate” is more likely to be selected. Comments from survey texts boxes reiterate these sentiments and suggest a bias toward hiring “White males.” As one respondent said, “IUP does not like to hire non-Whites from the US b/c then the institutionalized racism that defines IUP is challenged.” Another survey respondent also said,

*Diverse candidates are sometimes excluded during the preliminary phase because faculty do not know how to interpret their material, and do not take the time to do this. When they do get called to interviews candidates that were raised in PA, or neighboring states are chosen because “they are a better fit.” Of course they will be a better fit - they look and sound like the majority. Our students really need to see more diversity not just in terms of ethnicity and race, but in terms of academic background, thinking, linguistic background, and culture. (survey text box)*

Table 6.4 summarizes faculty sentiments about whether they perceive the university as valuing diversity. As the table suggests, while the majority of faculty Agreed to the statement, “I think the university understands the value of a diverse faculty,” female faculty were more likely than male faculty (20.2 percent compared to 11.1 percent) and non-White faculty were more likely than White faculty (27.2 percent and 13.2 percent) to Disagree with the statement. Those from historically disadvantaged groups, women and non-White participants are less likely to feel the university values diversity than those in the majority.

*Table 6.4 Faculty response to, “I think the university understands the value of a diverse faculty.”*

Faculty Responses	Male Faculty (n=81)	Female Faculty (n=129)	White Faculty (n=167)	Non-White Faculty (n=33)
Agree	66.7%	56.6%	62.3%	57.6%
Neutral	19.8%	21.7%	22.8%	12.1%
Disagree	11.1%	20.2%	13.2%	27.2%
Not Applicable	2.4%	1.5%	1.8%	3.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Other respondents expressed frustration in hiring and promotion practices for management and positions in administration. For example, a survey respondent suggested, “I’ve seen several cases in which searches were not conducted for management positions. I am not referring to the recent ones; rather, these occurred 2008-2012, and the result has been the right skills sets are not in the most appropriate assignments and they’ve led to less-than-stellar performance. It reflects poor judgment.” Another survey respondent said, it was unfair to have an “All male hiring committee choosing ten finalists who were all male,” and another said, “Hiring another... middle-aged White guy for the position of (redacted) was an affront to the many fine, RESEARCH ACTIVE faculty members on campus. And undermines the diverse workforce we should seek. The hiring WITHOUT A SEARCH is a violation of IUP policy.”

According to survey respondents, the lack of diversity in management and administration contributes to what one survey respondent described as a “campus climate that’s implicitly more difficult for women.” The respondent added, “The same can most likely be said for other identity categories (ethnicity, sexuality, etc.), though I’m struck especially by the fact that major positions of power--President, Provost, most Deans, most Chairs, Social Equity, etc.--are all male.” Another survey respondent echoed these sentiments,

*One of my faculty colleagues who came from (redacted) was really dismayed after the opening ceremonies in the fall. It was just so clear that there are SO few women in positions of the highest authority on this campus. Most women who do have leadership roles are assistants or associates. There are a few women in high administrative positions, and I feel sorry for them because I think*

*they are dumped on, dismissed, and generally given a harder time than men in the same positions. (survey text box)*

Additionally, survey results suggest that faculty of color feel as if they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition. As Table 6.5 indicates, more than half of non-White faculty respondents, 53.0 percent, Agreed to the statement, “As a faculty member, I have to worker harder than I believe my colleagues do to achieve the same recognition,” compared to only 36.0 percent of White faculty.

*Table 6.5 Faculty response to, “As a faculty member, I have to work harder than I believe my colleagues do to achieve the same recognition.*

<b>Faculty Responses</b>	<b>White (n=164)</b>	<b>Non-White (n=20)</b>
<b>Agree</b>	36.0%	53.0%
<b>Neutral</b>	12.8%	20.0%
<b>Disagree</b>	50%	35.3%
<b>Not Applicable</b>	1.8%	0%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%

Several faculty of color who have worked at IUP for a number of years suggested institutionalized efforts to help facilitate a supportive community have diminished over time. This shift has contributed to their sense of isolation and may be the reason why IUP “has difficulty retaining faculty of color.” They reminisced when they first came to IUP being “taken under the wings” of another faculty member of color. There was a time, in the not too distant past, when monthly social events were hosted by the Academic division for faculty of color and these events were attended by the Provost. These were reserved and regular meeting times where faculty of color could dialogue about the issues they faced and the Provost would simply listen. As one respondent described it: “It was very helpful when we knew the Provost had our back.” Another respondent suggested faculty of color currently working at IUP often flounder because “we don’t have those informal communities and networks as we once did. So it’s just a whole lot harder how to figure out how to get things done.” One African-American faculty member emphasized that a sense of community and social networks contribute to one’s ability to work effectively, whereas many currently experience the campus as “hostile” or run into “brick walls,” making IUP a difficult “place to navigate” or feel welcome. A survey respondent explained how some faculty of color experience IUP:

*I moved to Indiana from a very diverse environment. Living here I have encountered many things related to race and ethnicity including, being followed by University Police, being spoken down to because of my age (I look young and constantly confused for student). The people in my office constantly have lunch together, never an invite for the minorities in the office. I was told I talk too loud. I get asked questions differently from the way a White person would be asked the same questions, for example ‘You need to submit your time’ as opposed to ‘can you please make sure to submit your time’. (survey text box)*

Factors that contribute to faculty and staff satisfaction, growth, and success include a clear description of their job expectations, transparent practices that impact their job duties, and clear promotion policies. Yet many faculty and staff experienced ambiguity and perceived discrimination in the implementation of



these policies and practices. These experiences differed for faculty and staff; the former (faculty) felt the assignment of classes and departmental service duties were arbitrary and often, unfair while the latter (staff) desired more training when they entered new positions and were discouraged by the classification system for promotion. Moreover, a common theme expressed by both faculty and staff was that they learned to navigate and advance within the institution on their own through a “sink or swim” approach and felt like “I fought for myself” with little mentoring or support for their advancement. One survey respondent summarized,

*Most of the men in my department are on the graduate faculty and afforded prime teaching schedules, fewer contact hours, and summer teaching opportunities as a result. Most of the people who are not graduate faculty are women. There's a clear glass ceiling here, and no one cares (or likes it being pointed out). The majority of administrators (from managers to chairs) here are men, and I repeatedly see women filling "service" roles and not roles of important decision-making in the university, even when well-qualified women are all over this campus. I feel, with a few significant exceptions, that my career progresses \*in spite of\* IUP and not because of it. (survey text box)*

All interview and focus group participants were asked, “Are there university policies, practices, or events that pose challenges or offer support to your group?” Several women and faculty of color expressed frustration with the assignment of classes within their departments suggesting “seniority” is often a cover for giving minority faculty less attractive and more difficult classes to teach. They also suggested women and faculty of color are often assigned “diversity courses” even if they do not have the expertise to teach them. These same faculty were disheartened that “Title IX training is not taken seriously,” “gender identity” is not included in IUP’s non-discrimination statement, and IUP has no institutionalized “hate speech” policy.

Several women faculty and staff shared stories of experiencing ambiguous and seemingly illegal human resource practices when it came to family leave policies. Staff and faculty “without the protection of tenure” felt especially vulnerable when it came to utilizing family leave benefits. One staff member said her supervisor repeatedly described her job as better suited for “someone without children,” and another staff member asked of the compensation and time restrictions of IUP’s family leave policies, “It is six weeks! Ha! Who can afford to go unpaid for six weeks?” While the experiences of women utilizing FMLA to care for a newborn or sick family member differed, a common theme was that the law was implemented differently depending on their supervisors. In sum, participants believed IUP’s family leave practices were “old school” and inconsistently implemented.

Faculty were also asked about tenure and promotion processes directly on the survey and inadvertently during the interviews. While most faculty thought the tenure process was clear, a large number of faculty thought the promotion process was much more difficult to navigate. As one faculty summarized, “I believe the guidelines for tenure are clear. The guidelines and expectations for promotion are not as clear. You do not know what the standard is for promotion. It depends on who is going up with you or the university committee that reviews your box.” Survey data also indicates most faculty believe the promotion process is not clear. Table 6.6 shows faculty responses to the question, “I believe the

promotion process is clear” and suggests that a majority of all faculty, male and female faculty, White and non-White alike disagree that the promotion process is clear. Across faculty background, more than 40 percent disagree that the promotion process is clear.

Table 6.6 Faculty response to, “As a faculty member I believe the promotion process is clear.”

Faculty Responses	Male Faculty (n=82)	Female Faculty (n=130)	White Faculty (n=167)	Non-White Faculty (n=34)
Agree	36.6%	32.3%	34.7%	35.3%
Neutral	20.0%	13.8%	27.4%	31.3%
Disagree	40.2%	47.0%	42.5%	44.1%
Not Applicable	4.9%	6.9%	6.0%	29.4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

These data are supported by interview and survey text box data as well where we frequently heard promotion explained as “a mystery.” Here is what some survey respondents said,

1. *The promotion process remains a Black box with arbitrary and indefensible outcomes ... how in one year a given faculty member cannot be recommended at the UWPC level despite high ratings by the DPC/Chair/Dean, but then submit essentially the exact same package in the following year and be highly rated by the UWPC. It's disconcerting, disheartening, and creates long term resentment of the process and institution. (survey text box)*
2. *At IUP, there is an impression that tenure is a slam dunk but promotion is not. Thus promotion committee are more subjective and unfair. First of all, the S3P is not followed and then only a narrow # (take this instructor again and rating of instruction) of criteria are picked and everyone is judged based on those regardless of the rigor of course, the expected grades, Sciences versus liberal arts, etc. And then to judge the "promotion" of an individual based on those 2 criteria and negate everything else for teaching, service or scholarship is unfair. Not many in my department want to do "real" service as it takes time and at the end it is not appreciated. So it is important to be selfish-focus on research, get awarded AWEs for research because that is what is important-get money! Academia is becoming more like business ... (survey text box)*
3. *I believe the tenure and promotion processes are clear. However, what is not clear is the criteria used to evaluate what I submit. For example, what I might consider one of my "top five" in scholarship the committee evaluating my materials might not consider it as highly as I do. IUP prides itself on assessment, using rubrics, etc. Why can't the assessment criteria for assessing those of us applying for tenure and promotion be provided up front? (survey text box)*

4. *Promotion is a mystery -- and I say this after serving on the committee. A look around the university also strongly suggests that more men are promoted than women. I feel that tenure is automatic at IUP. I do not think this is a good policy. I also feel that scholarship is undervalued and should be required for both tenure and promotion, but especially promotion to 'full'. (survey text box)*
5. *Again I see colleagues who do NO SERVICE and constantly complained about by students, yet they are shining examples as opposed to someone with good teaching evaluations, excellent service and limited research. Had I wanted a research environment I would have chosen a research school. I do research and got regular paper publications but now have quit attending conferences and only focus on journal articles because despite what the CBA says that is apparently all that counts in my college. While I prefer a conference and a chance to interact with my peers, I have given that up to focus exclusively on journal articles. When I told someone I was going to a conference this fall to present, his comment was "Why are you wasting your time?" (survey text box)*

Another major theme that emerged among faculty and staff was concern over the transparency and use of survey and other data gathered to assess policies and practices at the university, i.e., Middle States, Campus Climate survey data, LGBT Climate Study data, etc. Many respondents commented that they had never seen “honest” reports of data, that publicized Middle States data has been “watered down,” and those seeking to use data to build arguments for funding, programming, or other diversity initiatives have been denied access or had their request for data diverted.

The sentiment was that as a university we should be honestly and transparently reporting assessment data and thoughtfully using it to guide change and decision making. As one female faculty member suggested, “People are frustrated that when they do the work to gather data to improve university policies and programs, nothing is done with it. Part of feeling valued is feeling like people are listening.” For example, in 2007 a sub-committee of the LGBT Commission conducted a study of the IUP community as a whole (not just LGBTQIA), students and faculty, to assess the climate around LGBT issues, compare the findings to a previous study conducted in 1992, and understand the importance of campus and community resources addressing LGBT concerns. The results were reported, but virtually no actions on the recommendations were taken at an institutional level, though some students and faculty made follow up efforts of their own initiative. In 2008 a team of faculty and students conducted interviews with students at both Punxsutawney and Main campus to draw attention to overt and subtle forms of racism on both campuses. The results and their presentation of that study drew attention to overt and subtle forms of racism on both campuses. The results of that study were shared widely with upper level administration but none of the recommendations were followed. In 2012, the Provost appointed a group of faculty and administrators to be part of the PASSHE-wide effort to work with the Center for Urban Education to address issues of access, retention, and excellence for racial and ethnic minority students. The Equity and Excellence Team (EET) worked for more than a year to make evidence-based recommendations for improving access to IUP, and began discussions on improving minority student retention and graduation rates. However, the team was disbanded in its second year when members learned that their efforts not only were being duplicated by another administrative office, but its recommendations were being disregarded.

Like faculty, clerical staff (and other respondents commenting on staff experiences) were troubled by a lack of opportunities for training, advancement, and ambiguous processes affecting their salary. Several described moving into positions but, because “someone has to be completely vacated from a position before you can hire someone else,” training was not provided, ultimately hindering their ability to do their job. Others suggested feeling “stuck in the position” or intimidated by and apathetic about the reclassification process. One female administrator summarized the staff frustrations over reclassification and promotion processes:

*I think the institution needs to take a really close look at the structure that is in place that enables females in non-faculty positions to grow professionally. And that doesn't just mean administrators. It is also the staff members who are working in department offices. How do we support that? How do we encourage it? What means do we provide institutionally to enable them to take advantage of that? I think it's something that's definitely lacking.*

We certainly heard from numerous staff members that the re-classification system is “unfair” and “frustrating” and ambiguous enough to have female staff person feel the outcome is based on having “the Gods in your favor.” Numerous female staff reported working “out of their classification,” supervising others, doing work that was not in their job description, and “getting paid less for doing more work” than people classified above them and their male counterparts. One female staff suggested the Office of Human Resources was deliberately impeding reclassification to “save money” while another said, “I don't think there is anything evil or despicable going on, I just think people are not paying attention.” One survey respondent said,

*I find it very hard to "climb the ladder" at IUP. When jobs open there is always someone they have in mind already so you interview for nothing. Also, many of the people in the same job such as say a department secretary can be at different levels which is not fair. One department sec. can be a clerk 2 while another is a clerk 3 and they do the same things. (survey text box)*

Some female staff members also wanted their work to be equally compensated with that of male staff (custodial and facilities workers) who they perceived as working less than women but receiving higher pay. As Table 6.7 indicates, female staff were significantly more likely than male staff to believe salary determinations were unfair. When asked, “As a staff member, I believe salary determinations are fair,” 33.0 percent of male staff Agreed compared to only 19.6 percent of women. Conversely, only 35 percent of male staff Disagreed with the statement whereas 56.0 percent of women faculty Disagreed that salary determinations are fair.

*Table 6.7 Staff response to, “As a staff member, I believe salary determinations are fair.”*

Staff Responses	Male Staff (n=38)	Female Staff (n=138)
Agree	33.0%	19.6%
Neutral	32.0%	22.4%
Disagree	35.0%	56.0%

<b>Not Applicable</b>	0%	2.2%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%

Female staff not only felt unfairly compensated for the work they do, they also reported feeling devalued and overworked. They described their feelings of devaluation not coming from explicit acts of hostility but rather subtle nuances like being interrupted and “talked down to,” having their e-mails and participation in meetings ignored, and feeling unworthy on the basis of their position, i.e., “I’m just a secretary.” A few reported having to take work home or to work longer hours to complete tasks and projects. Several desired (but were not offered) flexible work schedules that allowed them to arrive and leave work earlier, especially in less busy times like the summer.

As Table 6.8 shows, both female and male staff thought a more flexible work arrangement would be helpful in their employment at IUP. When staff were asked, “I feel that a more flexible work arrangement, as a staff member, would be helpful in my employment here at IUP,” more than 45 percent of men and 59 percent of women Agreed whereas only 16.4 percent of men and 8.8 percent of women disagreed. As discussed below, much of this desire for flexibility was fueled by familial obligations, especially for women.

*Table 6.8 Staff responses to, “I feel that a more flexible work arrangement would be helpful in my employment here at IUP.”*

<b>Staff Responses</b>	<b>Male Staff (n=67)</b>	<b>Female Staff (n=136)</b>
<b>Agree</b>	45.0%	59.0%
<b>Neutral</b>	34.3%	30.1%
<b>Disagree</b>	16.4%	8.8%
<b>Not applicable</b>	4.5%	2.2%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%

Female faculty also felt overworked and undervalued in two ways: 1) they were not listened to or not included in decision-making processes; and 2) the excessive service work they do goes unacknowledged or is completely invisible. Many female faculty had difficulty managing a “heavy teaching load” with large class sizes and scholarship and service expectations. They advocated for release time, especially for newer, untenured faculty, and described the workload as a “pressure cooker that turns us into anti-social freaks.” Other women faculty and administrators shared feelings that they were not “invited to the table” for important decision-making and there may be preference given to “male opinion and male presence.”

Many faculty, especially women and faculty of color who do social justice work on campus, felt “over-serviced” and a lack of recognition of the “invisible work” they do. As Katie Hogan (2010) explains, university teaching and research accomplishments are easier to measure than service work. Service work

at universities, predominantly done by women and faculty of color, is often “relegated to a gendered form of institutional caregiving” that goes unnoticed, undervalued, and is often invisible. At IUP, female faculty and female professional staff are largely responsible for the social justice programming, student organization advising, and institutional diversity work. Although some of this work is formalized and can be tabulated, much of the academic advising, life and retention counseling, and emotional labor that takes up a tremendous amount of faculty time is not counted. Summarizing this, a female faculty member of color asked, “I mean, how do you document something like that for promotion? How do you document the added value that you bring to the academy? It’s not considered in this whole evaluation process.” These same women report hearing discouraging sentiments about their service work from senior, and often male, colleagues who say advising student organizations and carrying out diversity awareness programming, “will not help [them] get promoted.” As Table 6.9 indicates, male and female feel burdened by service.

*Table 6.9 Faculty response to, “As a faculty member, I feel that I am burdened by service responsibilities (committees, advising, student groups, etc.) beyond those of my colleagues.”*

Faculty Responses	Male Faculty (n=81)	Female Faculty (n=125)
Agree	50.7%	44.8%
Neutral	23.5%	28.0%
Disagree	25.9%	27.2%
Total	100%	100%

For female staff and faculty, feelings of strain were exacerbated by attempts to balance work and home life. Female staff and faculty reported being disappointed in policies and practices that support working women with families. While more women than men participated in interviews where these concerns were discussed, the survey data suggests that men (male faculty and staff) may also be struggling with family leave and work-life balance issues.

Larger PASSHE system-wide and institutional family leave policies were often brought up, including that women (and some men) have to use sick leave for parental leave. IUP-specific barriers were also mentioned including leave time and circumstances being determined on a “case-by-case” basis both within individual departments *and* the Human Resources office, ambiguity in pay calculation, and even threats that one would not be able to return to her position after taking leave. One female staff person who felt extremely vulnerable to job loss for taking leave explained, “That should have been a time where I could have, you know, if you are going to force me not to work, I would have rather used that time for not worrying [about job security] and focusing on the baby.” Instead she was fearful of losing her position entirely.

Table 6.10 illustrates how faculty and staff feel about balancing childcare with their work responsibilities. Female faculty appear to have the most difficulty balancing childcare and work responsibilities with 48.5

percent Agreeing to the statement, “As a faculty/staff member, I find it difficult to balance childcare with my responsibilities,” compared to only 23.7 percent of male faculty Agreeing to the statement and only 17.0 percent of male staff and 22.0 percent of female staff Agreeing.

*Table 6.10 Faculty and staff response to, “As a faculty/staff member, I find it difficult to balance childcare with my responsibilities.”*

Faculty Responses	Male Faculty (n=59)	Female Faculty (n=68)	Male Staff (n=41)	Female Staff (n=75)
Agree	23.7%	48.5%	17.0%	20.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	23.7%	23.5%	36.6%	36.0%
Disagree	42.5%	28.0%	46.3%	44.0%
Total	100%	100.0%	100%	100%

Many female faculty may be of childbearing age at the same time they are working toward tenure and promotion. Yet pressure for tenure and promotion exacerbate the anxiety female faculty feel between balancing work and family commitments. Many female faculty reported disappointment in the lack of campus support services for working mothers such as a proper day care system, emergency day care, family housing, limited lactation spaces, and a Women’s Center. The common sentiment among female faculty and staff regarding work/family balance was that although IUP operates in the confines of a collective bargaining agreement and PASSHE system-wide policies, IUP can make better efforts to be a more family friendly workplace and give people the “flexibility to meet my family’s needs as well as my professional needs.” Survey respondents provided additional insight to the ways faculty and staff struggle to find a work/family balance:

1. *I prefer to teach at certain times due to my children's school schedule. However, I have been given schedules that conflict with theirs. I have communicated that to my Chair, but because I do not have tenure and I don't have enough seniority, I am given what the department ‘needs’ and not what will be best for me to balance work and family life.*
2. *I am single and when I think about the possibility of having a family I have doubts that I could do so and continue on a strong path toward tenure and promotion.*
3. *It would be great if there were some flexible work schedule options out there. I have two small children, and no additional help at home. If they miss school or need or have delays, I have to stay home with them. I would like to be able to move my schedule around, so I don't have to use as much leave.*
4. *Lack of affordable and flexible childcare services on campus for staff/faculty creates additional stress, cost, and burden to arrange adequate care off campus.*
5. *Managing a family of young children is difficult while trying to achieve success in the tenure/promotion process.*

6. *The fact that PASSHE/IUP has no true maternity leave policy, no provisions for child adoption, and no paternity leave provisions beyond the basic FMLA are fairly absurd in today's world.*
7. *In my department, faculty seem to hate those with children. I have experienced a great deal of hostility from coworkers because I have responsibilities for taking care of my children.*
8. *Faculty want to hire candidates who are "collegial," and the definition of "collegial" is who can go to happy hour with them on Friday. Faculty with kids/spouse like myself are considered "non-collegial."*

## **Recommendations to Address Workplace Climate and Career Life Balance**

### **I. Develop, Implement and Assess Progress Toward an IUP Diversity Action Plan**

A. Increase the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty, students, administrators and staff.

Searches: Review criteria, increase transparency and improve cultural competency around hiring processes to increase likelihood of diverse applicants in all searches, at all levels. Respondents from across the university felt strongly that IUP would benefit from hiring more diverse personnel, including administrators, staff, and faculty. When asked about the barriers to accomplishing this objective, study participants recognized that budgetary and collective bargaining limitations exist, but several additional impediments must be addressed, including bias (conscious and unconscious) in the search processes and or circumventing the hiring/promotion process entirely. There is a noticeable status quo bias in the way qualified candidates are screened and their materials interpreted. Status quo bias is pervasive, is not reserved solely for faculty searches, and inhibits even well-intentioned efforts to diversify.

Trust and transparency around hiring decisions are equally significant for ameliorating the campus climate. Respondents noted that previous IUP administrations left a legacy of distrust between administration and faculty. One particular recent hiring decision appears to have not only reignited that distrust but also raised questions about gender bias in the hiring for top positions. The following are some of the survey comments about that recent hiring decision.

1. *When Dr. Driscoll came to lead the university I saw much improvement in the transparency in decision making, and that has positively affected the climate. Prior to that the lack of transparency engendered a huge amount of distrust. The recent method of replacing the Dean of the Graduate School has made me uncomfortable and worried about my university. Again it is a lack of transparency that leads to my suspicious thinking. If I knew how that decision was made, I think I would feel more comfortable. (survey text box)*



2. *I have grave concerns that there is a gender bias in Sutton. The appointment of a White, male Dean to the graduate school who has no particular experience or expertise in graduate education without a search, when there are a number of others, in particular, women, who were not even given the opportunity to apply, is troubling. (survey text box)*

#### **IV. Create a Women's Center**

Provide funds and space for a Women's Center and Director to provide women's programming around salary and workload negotiations, resume building and career development, work-life balance issues and equal rights protections. Programming should also include reviews of family leave policies and advocacy on behalf of faculty and staff with young families or elder care responsibilities. This space will serve as a centralized hub, with resources and human capital to organize, coordinate, and direct services and programs for all women on campus.

#### **V. Institute an Office of the Ombudsman**

The role of the Office of Social Equity is ambiguous and employees seeking to respond to instances of harassment, intimidation, perpetual conflict and discrimination feel unserved by the Office of Human Resources. An Ombudsman, independent of those offices, could represent complainants' interests and ensure a neutral response.

#### **VI Create venues for regular discussions and dialogues about equity and inclusion at all levels, town meetings, college chairs, cabinet, senate, union meetings, etc.**

#### **VII. Recognize and Reward Diversity and Social Justice Work as part of University Service and Scholarship**

#### **VIII. Assess work-life balance issues for staff and faculty, including leave policies, flex-time options, and inconsistencies across divisions and departments.**

Some suggestions that emerged from the data included developing consistency and/or clarity around how leave requests are determined/denied, how individuals are compensated when on leave, and the barriers preventing individuals from utilizing leave. Conducting exit interviews with faculty and staff will help IUP to understand patterns of termination and why people chose to leave IUP so that retention efforts can be improved. Determine how IUP can innovate leave policies while working within the confines of larger contractual agreements.

#### **IX. Create shared principles and equitable expectations for faculty work and establish appropriate consistency for how work will be evaluated.**

Among faculty and staff, there was a strong call for greater transparency in promotion processes that are experienced as inconsistent and intimidating. Recommendations included providing greater guidance to

candidates for effectively documenting and communicating their efforts, and providing guidance to department faculty development committee chairpersons and/or managers in mentoring faculty/staff toward promotion. Additional, for faculty one of the major concerns was increasing clarity around how to measure service and respect service an equal part of the promotion process.

## 7. Conclusion and Reflections

Interview and focus group respondents were asked two questions: What would an ideal environment for diversity look like? And what are some of the barriers to achieving that ideal environment? These questions elicited a range of responses, from specific ideas and recommendations for changes to be made at IUP, to reflections on the permanence of racism, sexism, and social inequality in the United States. We compared the interview data to responses gleaned from the survey and found consistent patterns. There is widespread recognition that higher education is **the best place** to hold open discussions about and lead social change around such issues, and there was consensus that IUP, as an institution, can and should be doing more to improve the campus climate for all. Students, faculty and staff alike felt strongly that diversity trainings, mentorship, a clear and fair process to resolve conflicts will positively impact IUP's climate. Likewise, creating frequent and consistent opportunities for intercultural dialogue and increasing the diversity of faculty, staff and administrators were seen as essential tools for reshaping the culture of IUP for the better. There are numerous structural changes that were also recommended, including a re-evaluation of norms and procedures around hiring, curriculum changes, more accessible and coordinated scheduling and communications apparatus for student organizations

### Moving Forward

It would seem that the problems IUP faces around issues of diversity are closely intertwined with the structure and practices of our institution that lead to poor communication, alienation, stress, burnout, and isolation in the rest of our daily lives. As with all complex social systems, IUP's ability to meet the challenges outlined in this report requires acknowledgement that the status quo is unacceptable, and while we are doing some things well, cultural and structural changes are both needed and possible.

This report suggests that there is momentum building for positive change at IUP, but a real transformation of the campus climate for diversity and inclusion will require moving beyond the first-order changes such as programs or positions to address diversity. Many respondents are clear in their hope that IUP will adopt what Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller (2014) refer to as "second-order changes," or the infusion of multicultural values, structures, and practices at all levels and in all corners of the institution. By significantly improving IUP's communication apparatus and redesigning shared physical spaces (e.g., Oak Grove, cafeterias, classrooms, and ceremonies), students and their families may begin to experience IUP as welcoming, accessible and representative of their diversity. For all members of the IUP community to thrive, not just survive, multicultural values and inclusive, equitable, practices must be goals that are infused throughout the institution such that each division, college, department, or program is held accountable for supporting women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in meaningful and measurable ways.

### Reflections on the study

As indicated, we strongly encourage long-term institutional commitment to assessing our campus climate. With that said, we would like to reflect on ways that the processes and instruments could be improved. The Phase 1 quantitative portion of the study used a survey instrument that was well-respected and widely

used, but was costly to license and difficult to administer on our own. Our initial Phase 1 team was not strongly committed to the project, and two survey team members left before the results were analyzed. This placed the burden of analysis on others. The research team lacked strong leadership and coordination. As a result, survey results were not shared with the qualitative team in a way that allowed us to fully inform the qualitative process. To increase response rates, we recommend renaming the survey something other than Campus Climate, a phrase that is unfamiliar to many and confusing to others. We also learned that administering the survey via e-mail, particularly to students and some staff, might need to be reconsidered. Providing incentives, such as prizes or gift cards, might also encourage greater participation. The survey questions themselves were poorly worded and confusing and potentially identifying, and many respondents complained that it was way too long, taking more than an hour to complete. The quantitative data should be analyzed and disseminated quickly so that people who participated can feel that their time was not wasted and their voices were heard. Additionally, timely analysis of the survey will better enable the qualitative team to structure its questions and approaches around the findings. The survey team should be responsible for writing a report of the findings and widely disseminating those results to the campus community.

The qualitative portion of the IUP Campus Climate study, Phase 2, can be improved by ensuring the inclusion of harder-to-reach employee populations and small and vulnerable/targeted groups that may be reluctant to participate. Additionally, people were reluctant to participate because of fear of repercussions, and others were simply disinterested. Incentives, more direct outreach, more time and human capital for the research team to do more direct recruitment could increase the number and diversity of participants. Also greater backing and encouragement from all levels of administration would show a serious institutional commitment to the results and increase participation.

Qualitative researchers who implement future climate studies should be open to diversifying methods of data collection that ensure confidentiality and anonymity and encourage comfort for participants who are sharing very personal and private experiences. Analyzing and disseminating qualitative data is an extremely rigorous and time-consuming process; we felt rushed even though we worked on the qualitative portion for 16 months. For these reasons, we recommend this portion be implemented less frequently than the quantitative portion.

More broadly, we recommend the quantitative study be repeated every two years and the qualitative portion every five. Such an extensive study requires a project manager that oversees and coordinates the work of the quantitative and qualitative teams and who has a social science background and is not affiliated with administration. Time and financial resources should be provided to all team members and should realistically reflect the amount of time and level of skill and expertise such extensive research projects entail.

## References

- Babbie, Earl. (2004). *The Practice of Social Research*. 10th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Berg, Bruce. (2001). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*, 4th ed. .Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Blee, Kathleen. (2002). *Inside Organized Racism: Women in the Hate Movement*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Bloomsburg University Diversity and Inclusion Survey Leadership Team. (2013). *The Campus Climate at Bloomsburg University: A Snapshot from 2012, Summary Report*. Bloomsburg, PA.
- Boeiji, H. (2002). A Purposeful Approach to the Constant Comparative Method in the Analysis of Qualitative Interviews. *Quality and Quantity*, 36: 391-409.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010) *Racism without Racists, 3rd edition*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Chang, M.J. (2003) Racial differences in viewpoints about contemporary issues among entering college students: Fact or Fiction? *NASPA Journal* 40:5, 55-71.
- Charmaz, Kathy. (2007). "Grounded Theory Methodologies for Social Justice Projects." Presented at the annual meeting of the International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry, May 15, Champagne, IL.
- Clarion University of PA (2013). Strategic Equity Diversity Plan. Clarion, PA. accessed <http://www.clarion.edu/about-clarion/offices-and-administration/university-support-and-business/office-of-social-equity/SE-Strategic-Goals-FINAL.pdf>
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. eds. (2003). *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Feagin, J.R., Vera, H., Imani, N. (1996) *The Agony of Education: Black Students at White Colleges and Universities*. New York: Routledge.
- Gorski, P. (2008). "The myth of the 'culture of poverty'." *Educational Leadership*, 65(7), 32-37.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E., Hurtado, S., and Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72, 330-366.
- Hamilton, J. (2015). *Kutztown University Institutional Climate Committee Report*. Kutztown, PA.
- Hogan, K. (2010). *Over Ten Million Served. Gendered Service in Language and Literature Workplaces*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Hoover, MR. (1990). A Vindicationist Perspective on the Role of Ebonics (Black Language) and other Aspects of Ethnic Studies in the University. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 34, 251-262.

- Hughes, M., Anderson, R., Cannon, J.H., Perez, E., and Moore, H. (1998) Campus Racial Climate Policies: The View from the Bottom Up. *Race, Gender & Class*, 5.2, 139-147.
- Hurtado, S., Griffin, L., Arellano, K., and Cuellar, M. (2008). Assessing the Value of Climate Assessments: Progress and Future Directions. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. 2:4, 204-221.
- Ivankova, N., Creswell, J., and Stick, S. (2006). Using Mixed-Methods Sequential Explanatory Design: From Theory to Practice. *Field Methods*, 18, 1, 3-20.
- King, P.M., and Shuford, B.C. (1996). A multicultural view is a more cognitively complex view: Cognitive development and multicultural education. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40, 153-165.
- McIntosh, P. (1989) "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack." *Peace and Freedom*. Philadelphia, PA: Women's international League for Peace and Freedom.
- Madriz, E. (2003). "Focus Groups in Feminist Research." Chapter 10 in Denzin and Lincoln (eds.), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Material* (pp. 363-388). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Millersville University Climate Assessment Project. (2009) Executive Summary. Millersville, PA.
- Patton, M (2015). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice*. 4th Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pope, R., Reynolds, A. & Mueller, J. (2014). *Creating Multicultural Change on Campus*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.
- Rankin, S. and Reason, R. (2005). Differing Perceptions: How Students of Color and White students Perceive Campus Climate for Underrepresented Groups. *Journal of College Student Development*.46:1, 43-61.
- Rankin, S. and Reason, R. (2008). Transformational Tapestry Model: A comprehensive approach to transforming campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1, 262-274.
- Patton, M (2015). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice*. 4th Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tatum. B.D. (2003). *Why are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria? And other conversations about Race*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tochluk, S. (2010). *Witnessing Whiteness: The Need to Talk about Race and How to Do It*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Watson, L., Terrell, M.C., Wright, D.J., & Associates. (2002) *How minority students experience college: Implications for planning and policy*. Sterling, VA
- Williams, D. A. (2013). *Strategic Diversity Leadership: Activating change and transformation in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

## Appendix A: Interview Guide

1. In our description of this study, we are using words like multicultural climate, diversity, and inclusion on campus, what do these words mean to you? What groups of people would you refer to when hearing these terms?
2. You are here representing \_\_\_\_\_(homogenous group), how do you and people like you experience IUP? In the classroom, on campus, during events, overall university?
3. Are there university policies, practices, or events that pose challenges or offer support to your group?
4. In what ways do the \_\_\_\_\_ work to exhibit a positive, welcoming atmosphere to diversity or inclusion for your affinity group? In what ways do each of these exhibit a negative atmosphere?
  - a) The university
  - b) The faculty
  - c) Students
5. If you were giving IUP a grade for its multicultural climate (or climate for women/LGBTQ/people with disabilities, etc.), what would it be and why? Do you feel the climate might be different for other groups on campus? In what ways?
6. Is it important that IUP response and engagement with global and national issues like refugee crisis in Syria, church shootings, sexual assault on campuses, environmental and natural disasters. How would you describe IUPs engagement? What would you like to see?
7. What would an ideal campus climate for diversity and inclusion look like?
8. What do you think is the biggest barrier or gap to having a truly diverse/respectfully inclusive campus? How can we overcome this gap or barrier?

## Appendix B- Additional Tables

*Table 3.4 Students- Rate the overall campus climate as Friendly/Hostile*

Student Responses	Total (n=419)		Male (n=129)	Female (n=290)		White (n=367)	Non-White (n=81)
Friendly	67.5%		72.1%	65.6%		68.6%	63.1%
Neutral	26.5%		19.4%	29.7%		25.7%	32.9%
Hostile	6.0%		8.5%	4.8%		6.7%	3.9%
<b>Total</b>	100.0%		100.0%	100.1%		100.0%	99.9%

*Table 3.5 Faculty-Rate the overall campus climate as Friendly/Hostile*

Faculty Responses	Total (n=204)		Male (n=76)	Female (n=126)		White (n=160)	Non-White (n=32)
Very Friendly	69.1%		82.8%	61.9%		73.1%	62.6%
Neither Friendly or Hostile	22.5%		9.2%	30.2%		20.6%	25.0%
Somewhat Hostile	8.4%		7.9%	8.0%		6.2%	12.5%
<b>Total</b>	100.0%		99.9%	100.1%		99.9%	100.1%

*Table 3.6 Staff - Rate the overall climate as Friendly/Hostile*

Staff Responses	Total (n=202)		Male (n=65)	Female (n=137)		White (n=177)	Non-White (n=17)
Very Friendly	79.2%		81.5%	78.1%		81.9%	58.8%
Neither Friendly or Hostile	17.8%		16.9%	18.2%		14.7%	41.2%
Somewhat Hostile	3.0%		1.5%	3.7%		3.4%	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	100.0%		99.9%	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%



*Table 3.7 Students- Rate the overall campus climate on encounters with racism*

Student Responses	Total (n=414)	Male (n=127)	Female (n=287)	White (n=327)	Non-White (n=75)
Free of Racism (mostly)	47.6%	53.5%	44.9%	48.9%	40.0%
Occasionally Encounter Racism	31.4%	23.6%	34.8%	30.6%	38.7%
Regularly Encounter Racism	20.0%	22.8%	20.2%	20.5%	21.3%
<b>Total</b>	100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%

*Table 3.8 Faculty- Rate the overall campus climate on encounters with racism*

Faculty Responses	Total (n=202)	Male (n=76)	Female (n=125)	White (n=161)	Non-White (n=30)
Free of Racism (mostly)	43.6%	60.5%	33.6%	44.7%	50.0%
Occasionally Encounter Racism	30.7%	26.3%	32.8%	31.1%	13.3%
Regularly Encounter Racism	25.8%	13.2%	33.6%	24.2%	36.6%
<b>Total</b>	100.1%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%

*Table 3.9 Staff-Rate the overall campus climate on encounters with racism*

Staff Responses	Total (n=200)	Male (n=66)	Female (n=134)	White (n=174)	Non-White (n=17)
Completely Free of Racism	53.0%	59.1%	50.0%	54.0%	23.6%
Occasionally Encounter Racism	33.0%	25.8%	36.6%	33.9%	41.2%
Regularly Encounter Racism	14.0%	15.1%	13.4%	12.1%	35.3%
<b>Total</b>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%

Table 3.9 Students Experiences of harassment or exclusionary conduct by citizenship status

Within the Past Year Have You Personally EXPERIENCED any Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct That Has Interfered With Your Ability To Learn?		
Student Responses	Citizen (n=382)	NRA (n=31)
No	72.8%	73.5%
Yes	27.2%	26.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Table 3.10 Faculty and staff: How would each of the following affect the climate for diversity at IUP?

Faculty Response <i>(Staff/Admin Response)</i>	Providing clear and fair process to resolve conflicts	Providing or improving access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment	Increase diversity - Staff and Faculty	Increase diversity - administration	Increase diversity -student body	Provide Mentorship for new faculty (staff)	Provide Diversity training for staff (including admin)	Provide diversity training for faculty
Not currently available	18 (18)	11 (10)	8 (7)	8 (11)	8 (7)	18 (34)	9 (23)	15 (17)
Positively influence campus climate	125 (112)	120 (116)	128 (101)	120 (96)	124 (106)	132 (101)	106 (105)	103 (73)
Has no influence	8 (14)	15 (15)	18 (34)	24 (34)	22 (31)	11 (17)	27 (28)	31 (22)
Negatively influence campus climate	2 (2)	2 (2)	3 (2)	2 (3)	2 (2)	N/A (1)	1 (2)	3 (3)
Don't know	22 (34)	25 (37)	16 (37)	20 (36)	18 (28)	13 (21)	30 (22)	23 (62)

## Appendix C

### Examples of Diversity plans and Climate Study reports from other PASSHE schools:

1. Clarion University

<http://www.clarion.edu/about-clarion/offices-and-administration/university-support-and-business/office-of-social-equity/SE-Strategic-Goals-FINAL.pdf>

2. Bloomsburg University

Diversity and Inclusion Survey Leadership Team. (2013). *The Campus Climate at Bloomsburg University: A Snapshot from 2012, Summary Report*. Bloomsburg, PA.

#### **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<sup>5</sup> 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.

---

<sup>5</sup> 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 and Comp Science; 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, LGBTA 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.

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, LGBTQIA 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, LGBTQA 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 Universitywide 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.**