THE MU CAMPUS CLIMATE STUDY FOR UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS

Phase V:

MU Stakeholders

Focus Groups and Interviews

RESEARCH TEAM

Roger L. Worthington   Office of the Deputy Chancellor
Faculty Fellow

Sean Clouse   College of Education
Doctoral Candidate

Katherine Spencer   College of Education
Doctoral Student

Marc Kayson   College of Education
Doctoral Student

Rachel Navarro   College of Education
Doctoral Candidate

Christine L. Civiletto   University Counseling Center
Psychological Resident

Noor Azizan-Gardner   Chancellor's Diversity Initiative
Coordinator

Raeona Nichols   University Counseling Center
Senior Staff Psychologist

Laura Hacquard   University Women's Center
Director

Pablo Mendoza   Office of Multicultural Affairs
Director

Charlotte McCloskey   College of Education
Doctoral Student

THE MU CAMPUS CLIMATE STUDY

Between 2001 and 2005, members of the University of Missouri-Columbia (MU) have participated in the MU Campus Climate Study for Underrepresented Groups conducted by a team of faculty, staff and student researchers from a variety of campus units and representing each of the six targeted underrepresented groups (women, racial-ethnic minority group members, people with disabilities, non-native English speakers, non-Christian religious minorities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender individuals).

The MU Campus Climate Study received public support from Chancellors Richard Wallace and Brady Deaton, as well as financial support from each of the following campus units:

College of Education
Research Council
The Graduate School
MU Alumni Association
MU Bookstore
MU Concert Series
MU Libraries
Student Health Services
School of Nursing
School of Veterinary Sciences
College of Business
Women's Center
LGBT Resource Center
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
Division of Enrollment Management
Office of Multicultural Student Affairs
Department of Educational, School & Counseling Psychology
Center for Multicultural Research, Training and Consultation
Vice Provost's Office of Minority Affairs, International Programs, and Faculty Development

With campus-wide support, the MU Campus Climate Research Team collected 5913 usable surveys for Phases I – IV. Sixty faculty, staff and students participated in focus groups or individual interviews for the fifth and final phase of data collection. The information contained in this document provides the findings for Phase V of the MU Campus Climate Study for Underrepresented Groups. Detailed descriptions of the findings from Phase I were reported in Volume 1 (disseminated in the fall of 2002), and findings from Phases II-IV can be found in Volume 2 (disseminated in the winter of 2004) of the MU Campus Climate Study Report.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger L. Worthington, Ph.D.
Associate Professor/Principal Investigator
MU Campus Climate Research Team
March 3, 2005

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

The MU Campus Climate Study was proposed and developed over the course of two academic years (1999-2001) by a team of MU faculty, staff, and students associated with a variety of campus units. The project was designed to occur within five specific phases of data collection: (1) National Campus Climate Survey, (2) MU Student Services Providers Survey, (3) MU Student Services Consumers Survey, (4) MU Violence and Harassment Survey, and (5) MU Stakeholders Focus Groups and Interviews. The aim was to reveal the perceptions of these campus constituents concerning the climate for diversity with respect to people of color; people with disabilities; lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals; non-Christians; non-native English speakers; and women.

- Phase I (National Campus Climate Survey) data collection began in October, 2001 and was completed by December 31, 2001. Faculty, staff, students and administrators submitted 3324 usable surveys. Findings from Phase I were disseminated in October of 2002 (about the same time data collection for Phases II – IV were being completed). Data were collected using two different surveys, the Rankin Underrepresented Groups (URG) Survey, and the Rankin Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) Individuals Survey. The MU Campus Climate Research Team presented the findings from Phase I to numerous campus administrators and other groups, including but not limited to Chancellor Richard Wallace and the Chancellor's Staff, Provost Brady Deaton and the Provost's Staff, the Council of Deans, Vice Chancellor Cathy Scroggs and the Student Affairs Directors.

  A full report of the findings from Phase I can be found in Volume 1 of the MU Campus Climate Study Report, and a summary report can be found online at http://gradschool.missouri.edu/pff/campus_climate_files/frame.htm.

  A supplemental report was submitted in the Summer of 2004 containing a comparison of the MU institutional findings for Phase I with a draft of the Rankin National Campus Climate Assessment for Underrepresented Groups.

- Phase II of the study targeted professionals who are non-academic student service providers on campus (e.g., Student Health, Counseling Center, Success Center, Student Life, Admissions, Financial Aid, MU Libraries, etc.). The goal was to evaluate the accessibility, suitability, and quality of their services to students from these groups, as well as the knowledge, awareness and competencies of the service providers in each unit.

- Phase III of the study targeted students who use the various non-academic services on campus to assess their perceptions of the accessibility, suitability, and quality of services to members of underrepresented groups. Information obtained from Phases II and III is intended for use by each participating unit in gaining greater understanding of how to serve all students well.

- Phase IV of the study focused on students' experiences of violence and harassment on campus. Data was collected from faculty, students and staff, as in Phase I, in order to assess the prevalence and types of violence and harassment experienced by members of the MU community.

Findings from Phases II-IV can be found in Volume 2 of the MU Campus Climate Study Report. The MU Campus Climate Research Team presented the findings from Phases II-IV to a joint meeting of the Chancellor's and Provost's staffs on March 31, 2004.

An executive summary of the findings for Phases I-IV is provided in Appendix 1 of this report (see page 33).

- Phase V of the study was a qualitative analysis of 13 focus groups and 6 individual interviews that took place during the summer, fall and winter 2004-2005 semesters. The purpose of this phase was to go beyond quantifying the phenomena in question, and aid in the broader interpretation of the findings of the earlier phases.

The findings of the prior four phases of data collection provided the context for Phase V of the MU Campus Climate Study for Underrepresented Groups. Participants were provided with the findings from earlier phases of the study as the stimulus for discussions and recommendations for change.

This remainder of this report provides the findings from Phase V of the MU Campus Climate Study for Underrepresented Groups.

PHASE V: MU STAKEHOLDERS FOCUS GROUPS AND INTERVIEWS

Phase V of the MU Campus Climate Study involved focus groups and interviews held with members of the MU community. The goal was to provide a qualitative analysis of the four earlier phases of data collection and to generate recommendations for specific improvements in the campus climate via changes in the social, cultural, academic and physical environment as well as targeted changes in policies designed to promote diversity.

It should be made clear that Phase V of the MU Campus Climate Study was not designed to objectively evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the campus climate for diversity at MU—that was the purpose of the four earlier phases of data collection (which are summarized in the Appendix for this report). Instead, this phase of data collection was intended to generate specific, concrete recommendations for action strategies designed to improve the climate for diversity at MU. Therefore, it was necessary to emphasize areas of concern that could be the focus of ongoing efforts to promote positive changes. Thus, Volume 3 of the MU Campus Climate Study Report will inevitably have an unbalanced appearance toward problematic issues. Readers are cautioned to avoid thinking about this report as a reflection of the overall quality of the campus climate for diversity at MU, and to instead consider this document as a source of ideas and recommendations designed to address perceived problem areas that are likely to be present on any number of university campuses across the country. As such, the MU Campus Climate Research Team requests that any quote or citation of the findings contained in this report be qualified by these considerations.

Participants

There were a total of 60 participants in Phase V of the MU Campus Climate Study. The sample included 21 students, 23 staff, and 16 faculty, comprised of 20 men, 40 women, and 0 transgender individuals. There were 8 persons of African or African American ancestry, 0 Middle Easterners, 4 Asians or Asian Americans, 3 Native American Indians, 2 Biracial or Multiethnic individuals, 31 White/European Americans, 6 Hispanic/Latino(a)s, and 2 others. Of these, 10 were non-native English speakers. There were a total of 7 participants who indicated they had one or more disabilities, including 0 visual, 0 hearing, 1 learning, 1 mobility, 1 speech, 2 medical, 1 psychological and 1 other. The sample included 5 bisexual persons, 5 gay men, 40 heterosexuals, 5 lesbians, 1 person who was uncertain of her/his sexual orientations and 2 other. In terms of religious orientation, there were 2 agnostics, 4 atheists, 1 Buddhist, 20 Christian/Protestant/Catholic/ Orthodox, 2 Hindu, 2 Jewish, 0 Muslim, and 17 others.

Note: Although recruitment efforts involved purposeful sampling of underrepresented group members, participants in the study also included four individuals who did not belong to any of the targeted underrepresented groups (i.e., they identified as White, Christian, heterosexual, native English-speaking, able-bodied men). Two of these participants specifically requested inclusion in the study in order to express concerns and objections to the purpose and methods of the investigation.

Procedure

Focus group participants were recruited via a purposeful sampling approach designed to identify members of the MU community who could contribute meaningfully to the purpose of the study to generate recommendations for the administration which can be used in the ongoing process of efforts to improve the campus climate for diversity. Campus leaders were contacted by e-mail and asked to nominate potential focus group participants and forward to those nominees a recruitment announcement with information about the study and how to volunteer to participate. When a smaller number of participants than anticipated were recruited by this approach, a mass e-mail was sent by Chancellor Deaton to all students, staff and faculty encouraging people to volunteer for the study if contacted by the research team. A total of 112 participants initially responded to requests for the initial solicitation attempts. Of those, approximately 54% attended a focus group or individual interview.

Focus groups were conducted over a two-hour period of time and ranged from 2 to 10 participants. All focus groups were led or co-led by the principal investigator (R. L. Worthington) and one or two of the other research team members. Six of the focus groups contained participants with common membership in one of the specific target groups of interest (i.e., women; people of color; people with disabilities; lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender individuals; non-native English speakers; and non-Christian religious minorities). The remaining focus groups contained members from any of the six target groups. Individual interviews were conducted with specific participants who were unable to participate in a focus group and/or represented a segment of the MU community that was not already represented in the focus groups. Following the focus groups or interviews, participants (with their permission) were sent follow-up e-mails to inquire about additional reactions or recommendations. Eighteen participants offered additional e-mail comments.

Participants were asked to review summary findings of the four earlier phases of data collection and respond to four focus questions. The four focus questions were as follows:

(1) **On the basis of the findings of the MU Campus Climate Study, what are your immediate reactions?**

(2) **How do these findings make you personally feel as a member of the MU community?**

(3) **What environmental changes might be beneficial for MU to address the needs of underrepresented groups?**

(4) **What policy recommendations should we make to the university administration on the basis of these findings?**

Analyses

Ten members of the MU Campus Climate Research Team listened to audio recordings of the focus group meetings and took notes regarding themes of discussion related to the four focus group questions identified above. Two research team members listened to each focus group meeting and submitted their notes to the principal investigator for inclusion in this report. The principal investigator collated the notes of the other research team members to identify overarching themes, issues, and recommendations which had been culled from the focus group audio recordings. Direct quotes of focus group and interview participants are used to highlight the major findings described in the text. Some quotes were modified slightly to preserve confidentiality or conserve space.

Overarching Perspectives Related to Diversity at MU and Specific to the Climate Study Purpose and Methods

A variety of different perspectives and a range of different experiences with respect to diversity were uncovered during focus group meetings and individual interviews. A significant number of participants reported feelings of validation from reading about the climate study, and indicated that they felt the findings from earlier phases of data collection accurately reflected their experiences. Other participants stated that they had expectations that the findings would be more negative, and expressed some surprise that there were not more reports of harassment, hate crimes and hate incidents. A smaller number of target group members reported having expectations that the findings would be more positive—a few reported overwhelmingly positive experiences with the climate at MU.

"I don't think the campus promotes hatred, but I also don't think the campus promotes embracing of diversity."

"It's scary to think that some people believe we spend too much time on diversity at this university."

A subgroup of participants recognized that harassment and discrimination are subtle, hidden, unmeasured aspects of campus climate. These participants expressed concern that there may have been a lack of attention to micro-aggressions in the way that the study was designed to examine overt, blatant forms of harassment and discrimination. Micro-aggressions refer to subtle forms of racism or bias identified by Pierce (1970) as small continuous bombardments of insults, slights or indifferences that are an inherent ingredient of race relations and racial interactions in the U.S.

Some participants expressed a sense of powerlessness or hopelessness about efforts to promote positive changes in the climate for diversity. These participants recognized that the conditions under which the current climate developed were present for many years and that concerted efforts to make improvements have been ongoing over a long period of time. These participants also expressed recognition that efforts to increase representation among members of the various minority groups are exceptionally complex. These participants held the perception that policies are unlikely to change the climate for diversity because the support for specific policies waxes and wanes in the face of persistent barriers to change. Finally, these participants tended to perceive a hierarchical structure of power at the university (and more broadly) that was occupied by individuals who benefited from the status quo and who tend to respond permissively toward others who engage in harassment.

"We can do as much as we can but there will always be outside influences—the reality is that we live in Mid-Missouri."

Similarly, there was a significant amount of discussion in more than one focus group about reconciling the goals of the University with the demographics and politics of the State. On the one hand, a number of participants identified these contextual factors as persistent barriers to improving numerical representations of a variety of different groups, as well as to enacting important policies that were designed to enhance the climate for diversity. On the other hand, state demographics and politics were perceived by some participants as an excuse for lack of diversity at MU. Participants generally agreed that the broader culture and location of the university tended to result in a campus that is tolerant but not necessarily embracing of diversity.

Two non-minority individuals who requested to participate in the study in order to express objections to the purpose and methods of the investigation stated that (a) the data collection contained serious limitations, (b) the study was perceived to be based on a liberal political agenda, (c) "diversity" is defined in a way that did not match their views about the social, cultural and political context of higher education, (d) Whites, males, Christians and heterosexuals are discriminated against by the university, and (e) the findings of the MU Campus Climate Study should not be used to inform policy decisions at the university. These views were not shared by the majority of participants in Phase V of the MU Campus Climate Study, but it is impossible to know the extent to which these views represent other members of the larger campus community.

> **"It may not be our job to make sure that a [student] goes through four years of college without at some point or another being the 'victim' of a joke or stereotype…these things happen on this campus…this is the world."**

Increasing Non-Minority Members' Work to Improve Climate

Many participants commented about perceptions that the bulk of work at the university designed to foster awareness and sensitivity toward diversity was most often initiated and carried-out by faculty, students and staff who belong to underrepresented groups. Among many of the participants, this perception leads to a number of logically consistent conclusions, including (a) although many majority group members express public support for diversity initiatives, the time, energy and sacrifices necessary to take action with respect to diversity issues on campus fall primarily on the shoulders of minority group members; (b) majority group members are less concerned with promoting diversity on campus than minority group members; (c) majority group members are less cognizant of incidents of harassment and oppression (as evidenced by findings from Phase I of the MU Campus Climate Study); and (d) in order for the campus to become truly committed to diversity initiatives, it will be necessary for majority group members to shoulder a significantly greater share of the responsibility.

> **"I'm sick of [other people] not saying, 'That's my job, too.' People should be working much harder at understanding how to be allies. They should feel compelled to understand that. It should be a requirement of their job."**

- Help majority group members become more cognizant of incidents of harassment and oppression.

- Increase the overall dissemination of diversity-related information on campus so that it is no longer the sole responsibility of a small number of active minority group members.

- Identify and fund innovative programs designed to foster awareness of diversity issues (e.g., Theatre of the Oppressed Program, Vagina Monologues).

- Work to eliminate the responsibility that minority students often feel to speak for and educate their peers (and often their instructors) in the classroom about diversity issues relevant to their group.

Perceptions about Mandatory and Voluntary Programs Designed to Foster Awareness and Sensitivity

There were mixed views among focus group participants about the utility of mandatory trainings to promote increased awareness and sensitivity toward diversity at MU. Although there were a substantial number of participants who spoke strongly in favor of mandatory trainings, virtually all of the participants also expressed some recognition of the difficulties inherent in enforcing such a policy and the perceived effectiveness of involuntary participation. Among participants who were the most opposed to mandatory trainings, the single most common explanation of their views was that involuntary participation would effectively eliminate any chance that the trainings would produce desired effects.

"I think people resent mandatory trainings, but we need more awareness of what is here and, if possible, stipends to promote participation."

A number of participants expressed an understanding that mandatory diversity training is more problematic to enforce for faculty than staff and students, suggesting that a mandatory "Valuing Diversity" course could be required of students at MU (akin to CMSU), and that staff in many units already have mandatory diversity training requirements as part of their normal course of in-service training requirements. Some proponents of mandatory diversity trainings believed that it might reduce the variability in current practices with respect to quality and quantity among campus units. In addition, these proponents believed that mandatory diversity training would promote the sense that diversity is highly valued and important to administrators and the larger campus community. Many proponents of mandatory diversity training indicated that it was most important for faculty and staff to receive mandatory training related to increasing sensitivity toward various minority groups, as well as learning how to respond to bigotry in the classroom. One staff member participant suggested that required sensitivity trainings should not be used by HR as a punishment for complaints because it creates a derogatory perception of the process.

"The University spends money on programs that hardly anyone attends or appreciates. I would rather see a rich agenda of professional development designed to better meet the needs of students and faculty…The diversity issue could easily be a part of this."

Overall, there was general support for voluntary campus programs designed to foster diversity awareness, yet these were perceived as important but insufficient to an overall diversity plan. Some participants perceived diversity programs as short-lived and transient attempts to easily foster the perception of valuing diversity without committing substantial resources to make a larger impact on the issues that need to be addressed. Most participants perceived this type of programming as voluntarily attended by only those who already have an interest in and value diversity; often times only target group members show up (e.g., primarily international students show up to International Bazaar). One suggestion was to make diversity programming a normal part

of every form of programming on campus so that it isn't perceived as "diversity programming," but is the diversity component of all programming (especially orientations).

- Provide better advertising for diversity awareness programs and find innovative ways to encourage greater attendance (e.g., many instructors provide extra credit for student participation in research, but the IRB requires alternatives for earning extra credit for those who decide not participate in research, so why not encourage faculty to make attendance at diversity-related events one method of providing extra credit alternatives).

- Institute mandatory on-line diversity training for all employees (akin to IRB training).

- Incorporate a diversity sensitivity training component into virtually all programming at the university at orientations and retreats for faculty and staff.

- Develop a required course for all incoming students on "Valuing Diversity."

- Develop a reward system for faculty to voluntarily attend diversity training (e.g., offer travel money awards, small research expenditure awards, etc.).

- Design diversity programming to increase majority members' exposure to other cultures.

- Increase funding and visibility of the Safe Space training program to reach all campus constituencies (suggested by a number of participants).

Improving the Process of Handling Complaints, Perceptions about Accountability, and Truth in Advertising

There was a substantial amount of concern expressed among participants that many people who had reported harassment and discrimination in earlier phases of the climate study had not made an official report or had rated the quality of the official response to a complaint as below adequate. Some participants speculated that the process of making complaints regarding harassment and discrimination at MU was not clearly and publicly articulated. A number of participants expressed perceptions that complaints are or might be met with inaction, indifference and/or secondary discrimination. In addition, a number of participants held the perception that some people responsible for handling complaints in different campus units might (a) belong to the oppressive group, and/or (b) hold attitudes or beliefs similar to those of the perpetrator.

There were numerous recommendations about holding university personnel accountable for reinforcing cultural sensitivity. A variety of participants felt that it is necessary to increase the accountability on campus for (a) fostering diversity, and (b) engaging in behavior that is oppressive toward members of underrepresented groups. Among these participants, there was a perception that transgressors of harassment and discrimination often go unpunished, which creates a perception that the university is not a safe place for members of underrepresented groups and that there is little concern among administrators for these issues. The primary examples used in describing these types of occurrences were with respect to faculty in a classroom environment.

A number of participants raised concerns about their perceptions that some departments advertise themselves to be more demographically diverse or culturally inclusive than they actually

are in reality. This was viewed as an unfair ploy designed to foster their recruitment of minority group students and faculty. These participants expressed some understanding that these departments were making an effort to improve the climate through recruiting, but felt that the tactics used were inappropriate and misleading, and ultimately served to harm the people they were successful in recruiting.

- Create a central office to report incidents, handle complaints, and achieve resolution.

- Increase the Clarity of Who, When, How, Where and Why complaints can and should be made.

- Provide training and information for all faculty and staff in process of handling complaints.

- Emphasize that even when complaints will result in no action or change, the person making the complaint needs to be treated with respect, compassion and concern.

- Objectively evaluate teaching practices (e.g., classroom audits).

- Reward departments and divisions for diversity work (e.g., "What gets rewarded gets done.") Maybe set aside a small fraction of unit's budget that is designated as a reward for accomplishing specific diversity-related objectives which 25-50% of units are assumed to fall short of meeting. (The remainder goes into a diversity enhancement fund that receives applications for diversity-related projects which even units who originally lost their funding could receive specific allocations to address their shortcomings.)

- Develop a system of checks and balances for departmental recruiting.

- Design web-pages to reflect diversity (as long as they are accurate and not misleading).

Perceptions about Adding "Diversity" as a Fifth Value

"I don't care if it becomes a value if we're not really valuing it—if we're not living it, breathing it, doing it—I could care less if it is on paper or on a stone."

There were mixed views among the focus group and interview participants about the proposal to add "Diversity" as a fifth value for the university. Some participants were strongly in favor of the proposal, while others viewed the idea as premature, unnecessary, or a gimmick. Although the original proposal to add "Diversity" as a fifth value came from a group of students, at least one non-minority group participant viewed the idea as an effort by administrators to appease dissatisfied minority group members. A number of participants suggested that there would need to be action with respect to diversity on campus which demonstrated that the proposal was warranted so the result would not be viewed as superficial and meaningless. A number of participants recommended alternatives to the proposal.

- A proposed alternative to adding "Diversity" as a fifth value was to develop an honor code with one component focusing on diversity, in which hate incidents can be addressed (punished) internally.

- A proposed alternative to adding diversity as a fifth value was to develop a diversity campaign to address "What kind of campus do we want to be?" Develop slogans and competitions that might live beyond the duration of the campaign which will promote experiences of pride in being a campus that values diversity. This must be a campus-wide campaign with buy-in from faculty, staff and student organizations, planned well in advance so faculty can incorporate it into syllabi (films, food, cultural events, speakers, etc.). Schedule a week for each cultural group. Participation from dining commons (food), Bookstore (displays), etc.

Leadership as a Key to Promoting Diversity

There were consistent comments throughout Phase V that the primary responsibility for promoting diversity at MU rests on the shoulders of key individuals in leadership positions of the administration of the university, including the Chancellor, Provost, Deans, Department Chairs, Faculty, Directors and Coordinators. In addition, there was a consistently held perception that upper administrators have been historically unconcerned with diversity, except at the most superficial levels. There were also a substantial number of comments that expressed a belief in a trend toward gradual improvement in the administration's responsiveness and proactive efforts to address diversity issues at MU, with significant acknowledgement of recent efforts in this area.

A number of participants expressed the view that the administration was much more concerned with issues of fiscal policy and image management/public relations, and that one of the central motivators for campus administrators at all levels of campus leadership to become more active in addressing diversity issues would be to help them understand the fiscal impact of a failure to effectively address diversity issues. It was also suggested that lower level administrators could be motivated to respond to diversity initiatives primarily via budgetary control mechanisms that establish a system of evaluation and reward that is directly linked to diversity efforts across the board.

"I think that one way to get them to look at this stuff is to get them to see the money they are losing by not retaining faculty and by having to train new staff and losing alumni dollars. I think that is the only way you're going to have any real change that takes place; it's going to have to be money driven."

Responding to the finding in Phase I that "few respondents felt that the university leadership visibly fostered diversity," a number of Phase V participants expressed the belief that administrators need to communicate with regularity that diversity is valued by the university and that intolerance will be addressed appropriately by high level administrators.

There was a consistent perception among Phase V participants that power positions in the university are held primarily by White males and that women in administrative positions are almost exclusively White. At the same time, a number of participants noted the continued perception of a "good 'ol boys network" in operation in which powerful men socialize and collaborate professionally in a manner that excludes women and diminishes their chances for participating in

processes necessary for advancement. Participants also noted a particular absence of people of color and openly LGBTQ individuals in power positions in the upper administration that are not inherently responsible for diversity initiatives at the university. Participants felt that this was an important component to demonstrating the institutional commitment to diversity broadly, as well as providing role models for students, faculty and staff.

Participants recognized that there is substantial variation in the extent to which different units on campus express a respect for diversity and foster sensitivity toward different groups. Their perception was that some campus units foster greater sensitivity to and respect for diversity because of the perspective and value directly attributed to the unit head (Deans, Chairs, Directors and Coordinators).

Participants identified a variety of possible mechanisms by which the university could respond to the issues identified in the area of leadership.

- Upper administration should identify and promote key minority individuals to positions of power where they can serve as role models, advocates and change agents.

- Administrators need to be visibly present at diversity-related events on campus.

- When administrators respond to student protests of hate incidents on campus, they should keep their promises and follow through (e.g., a town hall meeting was promised by an administrator responding to one protest but it never occurred).

- Administrators should take clearly articulated public stands about legislation that might negatively affect climate at MU (e.g., House Bill 328 in the MO legislature designed to overturn UM policy of including sexual orientation in nondiscrimination policy).

- Upper administration should ask department chairs and supervisors to report what they have done in response to the findings of campus climate study.

- MU needs a system of reward designed to promote efforts to foster diversity on the part of college-level and department-level administrators. The administration should develop a report card system of evaluation that might be tied to monetary rewards or penalties.

Issues Specific to Faculty, Staff, or Students

Faculty Issues

Many respondents expressed the belief that the academic climate at MU was the primary responsibility of professors, instructors and TAs. At the same time, a number of minority faculty felt that their work was much more difficult as a result of resistance from students and a lack of shared responsibility from their non-minority colleagues and administrators.

Sensitivity to diversity in the classroom was of particular concern to participants. For example, a number of student participants indicated that they had experienced conditions that they attributed to deficits in classroom management by their instructors. Examples of these types of

"It is exploitation to recruit minority students to come here so they can serve to educate other people about themselves— it's not their responsibility."

incidents included (but were not limited to) the following: (a) hearing an instructor address issues of diversity in a manner that seemed biased or uninformed (e.g., instructors talking off the top of their heads or using stereotypes during lectures), (b) being asked to speak in class for all members of their minority group with respect to a topic or issue being addressed in the class, (c) being exposed to informal classroom discussions or behavior that was perceived as offensive or bigoted, and (d) witnessing student presentations that directly expressed bigotry without intervention or commentary from the instructor.

Some participants expressed the belief that non-minority faculty may fear initiating dialogue about diversity-related issues out of fear of conflict or lack or preparedness to address issues that will arise. Many non-minority faculty were perceived as indifferent or unconcerned with issues of diversity, or as lacking expertise in diversity issues in their own fields. At times they were perceived as addressing diversity issues on only the most superficial levels or in ways that actually contributed to or overtly expressed stereotypes about minority group members. These problems were perceived by both faculty and student participants as issues of training, recruitment and expanding the scope of responsibility to include non-minority faculty in enhancing the climate for diversity in the classroom.

Some participants highlighted the fact that minority faculty experience added pressures and heavier burdens, which are often not recognized or acknowledged by non-minority faculty or administrators. Minority faculty experience added pressure to contribute extra service out of a sense of obligation and commitment to improving the campus with respect to diversity. For example, minority junior faculty feel a genuine obligation to mentor minority students, but often sense that they are making sacrifices in their own progress toward tenure. In addition, minority faculty are often asked to contribute service to committees to provide the "voice of diversity," increasing their share of the service load without corresponding load reductions. Often the added service requirements are perceived as mandatory. Furthermore, some minority faculty expressed concerns that they have been perceived as "axe-grinding" when they teach about diversity issues, and that students express their biases against them in the end of semester teaching evaluations. In addition, a number of participants told stories about burn-out on the part of minority faculty that they believed to be the result of these added burdens and pressures. The result is often that minority faculty are recruited but are not retained because they burn-out and leave before going up for tenure, or they are unable to produce enough scholarship to qualify for tenure.

"I really do think there should be some formal structure for mentoring faculty from oppressed groups so that they can be successful—so that folks can reach tenure and they are not brought in to promote the idea of diversity on campus and burned-out and sent away. The long-term benefit is that you would have people of diversity sticking around for a while."

In addition, some minority faculty complained that their scholarly contributions were sometimes misunderstood or undervalued by non-minority senior colleagues who have power and authority in the promotion and tenure process. For example, many minority faculty focus their scholarly efforts in nontraditional areas of their fields, and are often forced to publish their work in

newer and less established journals which specifically target diversity issues in their fields. Such journals may be identified as second- or third-tier journals by senior colleagues. As a result, nontraditional scholarship might receive superficial support but also may fail to meet unspoken criteria for importance and impact that influence tenure and promotion decisions. This set of conditions sets the stage for significant struggles on the part of some minority faculty throughout the tenure and promotion process, leads to experiences of feeling undervalued, and in some instances results in burn-out or failure to retain otherwise qualified minority faculty members.

There was a corresponding perception that faculty of color seem to get some attention and protection from the added pressures and obligations, but members of other underrepresented groups seem to receive less. The perception here seems to be that the culture at MU with respect to diversity sometimes overemphasizes racial diversity even though it is generally understood that MU values the contributions of a broad range of diverse groups. As a result, there was some concern that the university afford similar attention and protection to faculty who belong to other underrepresented groups and experience similar pressures (e.g., women, LGBT individuals, people with disabilities, non-native English speakers and non-Christian religious minorities).

Participants identified a variety of possible mechanisms by which the university could respond to the issues identified in this area.

- Encourage or require faculty to obtain training in creating a safe environment for multicultural discourse and responding appropriately to hate speech in the classroom (e.g., similar to mandatory IRB training).

- Develop evaluation criteria for faculty regarding sensitivity to diversity—(e.g., course evaluations, merit pay evaluations, promotion and tenure).

- Audit the tenure process with regard to diversity and refusal. Evaluate the extent to which individual tenure applicants have experienced service loads or other burdens that stem from their minority status which may have substantially hindered progress toward tenure.

- Attend to disproportionate service loads by minority faculty. Develop a service load offset program for minority junior faculty funded out of the Minority Affairs or Faculty Development in which faculty can receive either small research grants or teaching load reductions in recognition of service contributions above the standard (e.g., 20%).

- Develop a system for rewarding work which promotes diversity at MU. Set aside a small amount of funding to be targeted toward diversity enhancement through specific demonstration of competencies, scholarship, mentoring, programming, curricular development, and self-improvement. Faculty who demonstrate that they are engaged in activities which promote diversity can be rewarded via a variety of mechanisms (e.g., small grant research support, conference travel funding, teaching load reductions, graduate student support, salary increases, recognition through awards or fellowships).

Staff Issues

Staff often expressed a sense of occupying the lowest rung of the social class structure at the university, in which faculty and students often receive priority in any decisions being made

(especially during and related to fiscal crises). There were also perceptions of a hierarchy of class distinctions among different categories of staff, primarily along the lines of blue-collar staff (buildings, grounds, construction, dining services, etc.), administrative staff (clerical, fiscal, and administrative assistants, etc.), and professional staff (directors, unit coordinators, counselors, specialists, etc.). In addition, all types of staff were perceived to have glaring inequities in the power and hierarchy structure, in which women and people of color occupy the bottom rungs and are perceived as being passed over for promotion, while Whites and males occupy the highest rungs of the ladder.

There were a variety of different impressions about the Phase II data regarding the extent to which staff members receive training on diversity issues as part of their employment at MU. A number of participants pointed out that the data from Phase II did not include the vast majority of staff on campus because the target group was restricted to student services staff—who were perceived as the most likely group of staff to receive training on diversity issues. These participants indicated that they believed other staff also require sensitivity training because students are not the only people who represent diverse groups; and in fact Phase I data showed that "peers" were the most common source of harassment, making staff most likely to experience derogatory comments from other staff. A number of participants expressed concerns that staff can work at MU for many years without ever receiving sensitivity training.

A number of participants indicated that staff members are perceived as dispensable and expressed concern about the costs of locating and retraining new staff because minority staff members leave due to discrimination or lack of support. These participants suggested that minority staff members are the most vulnerable to experiences of harassment and discrimination because (a) the source of harassment and/or discrimination is often a person in a position of power over them or a group of more dominant peers, (b) staff members have few if any realistic means of addressing problems they experience due to harassment and discrimination, (c) the processes and outcomes related to complaints often re-victimize the complainant, (d) experiences of discrimination are perceived to be part of larger systemic structures and procedures at the university which affect classes of people rather than target individual staff members, and (e) staff members do not receive the same protections as faculty or students when they make complaints about harassment or discrimination.

"My second day of work my boss told me she hated all queer people…And then when she found out that I wasn't Christian she told me I was going to hell…So when I took this other job, I said to myself 'I want to be who I am… I don't want to have stomach aches every morning.'"

One participant stated she believed that the implementation of the "exemption policy" by HR was discriminatory against women. She suggested that some men were promoted to staff levels which qualified for exemption, while most women remained in positions which became non-exempt, and that those women's careers were harmed as a result.

A number of staff related experiences in which complaints were inadequately addressed. These participants identified secondary forms of discrimination during the complaint process in which complainants became castigated or marginalized within a workplace after making a complaint about harassment or discrimination. One participant complained that victims of

harassment are sent to receive counseling to cope with their experiences of harassment while perpetrators are left unaddressed.

Participants identified a variety of possible mechanisms by which the university could respond to the issues identified in this area.

- Review staff promotion and hiring procedures to ensure greater attention to diversity, not just at the lower rungs but among the hierarchy as well.

- Require sensitivity training for all staff at orientation and periodically thereafter.

- Provide training and updates for administrators at various levels on legal issues in hiring and promotion practices.

- Review the structure and process for handling complaints about harassment and discrimination by staff members.

Student Issues

There were a variety of issues addressed which would improve the campus climate at MU with respect to students. On the one hand, minority students were interested in seeing the campus climate for diversity improve so that their own experiences as minority students would improve. On the other hand, a number of participants felt there was a need for specific efforts designed to promote a greater awareness and sensitivity to diversity among students at MU.

The focus group and interview participants represented students from all of the different target groups in the MU Campus Climate Study, as well as from each of the four racial-ethnic minority groups. Among minority students, there were two central themes: (a) recognition that on many accounts the climate at MU has improved over the years, and (b) a sense of dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs. For example, African American students recognized the gains that have been made historically at MU with respect to racial issues, but also expressed ongoing concerns about the frequency with which racial incidents occur on campus and concerns that turn-over among African American faculty affected their experiences. Although Latino/a students in the study reported generally positive experiences overall with respect to climate, they identified a lack of sizable Latino/a community and a lack of role models among faculty as significant deficits. A number of participants expressed serious concern about the lack of a visible Native American Indian student population on campus in a state where there was once a very sizable Native population.

"African American students think faculty and administrators don't really care about them. It is very hard for them to find role models…and that makes it difficult to recruit other African American students."

Although it was acknowledged that recruitment of students of color has increased in recent years, there was a perception among some participants that these efforts should be more aggressive. In addition, a number of students of color expressed concern that once they had been recruited, they sometimes felt left without support or tracked into lower academic levels because of stereotypes and discrimination after they arrive. Some graduate students of color indicated that their interests in

pursuing ethnic studies as part of their curriculum was hindered due to a lack of course offerings in their areas of interest.

Participants identified multiple sources of harassment directed toward female students by faculty or peers that seemed to occur without consequence. One participant suggested that instances of sexual harassment are so common for female students on campus that they simply tune it out and forget that what they are experiencing is harassment. Another participant suggested that the inconsequential acceptance of sexual harassment on campus served to diminish the sense of safety experienced by female students, and may contribute to a culture of violence against women. A number of participants expressed concerns that too little is done on campus to combat the prevalence of sexual assault against women.

"I've heard female graduate students who had uncomfortable comments from male faculty, others who were blatantly approached, and others who felt it was important to their career that they either comply or even encourage advances from faculty."

There were also concerns expressed about faculty treatment of students with disabilities, in which faculty were reported to have failed to comply with ADA requirements to provide accommodations for testing situations, or to have expressed hostility in the process of providing accommodations which felt intimidating to students. One student commented about inadvertent lapses in confidentiality with respect to students with disabilities when instructors inform other students about accommodations being made for specific students in the administration of exams or the timing of returning graded work to students. In addition, issues of accessibility to campus buildings and accessible parking spaces, which make it difficult to arrive to classes on time or at all, were a major source of concern regarding students with disabilities.

"I was getting out of my car [which has a gay rights bumper sticker] when this group of guys walks by…and one of them said [loudly, turning in my direction], 'Hey do you remember when we did that gay bashing? Man that was fun!'…I assumed it was just some sick attempt to intimidate me, but who knows? There was nothing I could do."

Members of the LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer) community expressed satisfaction that the UM System nondiscrimination clause now includes sexual orientation, yet they also indicated that there is still work to do in addressing the harassment and discrimination experienced by LGBTQ students on campus. For example, LGBTQ participants indicated that faculty continue to exhibit a lack of knowledge, awareness or inclusiveness about LGBTQ issues, and that many LGBTQ students continue to perceive a lack of safety about coming out to their peers or professors in the classroom, as well as a diminished sense of safety on campus in general. Some students suggested that instructors very rarely address LGBTQ issues in the classroom even when they are relevant to the topic (e.g., "In a course on human sexuality, the professor skimmed over the topic because he said that LGBT issues were 'too controversial.'"). There was also a perception that inclusion of sexual orientation in the nondiscrimination policy may have had a more significant impact on faculty and staff, while students continue to be openly hostile toward LGBT individuals on campus. Finally, a number of participants noted that some LGBTQ students who "come out" to themselves and their

families after arriving at MU suffer financial hardships when their parents cut off financial support, and the institutional bureaucracy necessary to obtain financial under those circumstances is exceedingly prohibitive.

A number of participants noted that international students often feel marginalized in classrooms and among the student population at MU. One of the central forms of marginalization identified by non-native English speakers was the sense that they were often ignored in classrooms and among other students when working together on group projects or during study sessions. In addition, non-native English speakers expressed concern that some faculty fail to recognize that it is substantially more difficult for some students to participate in classroom discussions and then assign lower grades on the basis of classroom participation.

Highlighting the fact that most international students are graduate students, some participants expressed concerns about the system of evaluating international graduate students for English language proficiency by randomly selecting a small group of European American undergraduate students and asking them to provide evaluations, oftentimes without sufficient training to do so. In addition, a number of participants indicated that part of the sense of marginalization on campus for international students results from having the International Center located in the basement of Memorial Union rather than in a more prominent, visible location on campus. There were also perceptions of vulnerability and exploitation of international graduate students by their professors or departments (e.g., taking advantage of cultural norms of international students by requesting them to engage in service or activities that would not be required of U.S. students; purposefully delaying graduation of international students by requiring them to engage in extra research activities).

For non-Christian religious minority students, the major issue that arose in focus group discussions was the perception that many people on campus are unaware of the existence of any other faiths and as a result they fail to respect non-Christians. This was a major source of concern with respect to the scheduling of exams and assignments by instructors. Although some participants were aware that a universal calendar of religious holidays is available to instructors, many expressed a lack of knowledge of it, and most people who addressed this concern felt that there was too little concern about making accommodations for non-Christians to celebrate holidays without suffering consequences in their classes. In addition, a number of participants expressed a perception that most religions go unaddressed in the curriculum. Finally, a number of participants pointed out that although they were required as students to pay fees related to their on-campus meals, dining services rarely offers meals that are in accordance with religious holidays for non-Christians.

"Students sometimes have tests on days that are religious holidays for them. Not all teachers will allow them to miss that day and give them a make-up test…that is wrong."

There were a number of specific themes which dominated the focus of discussions about students who engaged in behaviors that constituted harassment against members of minority groups. The most prominent major theme involved an acknowledgement that students come to MU from

"I think there is a real need for curricular reform in most academic programs to engage students in broader, critical, more inclusive ways of thinking. Many students at MU are rather provincial in experience and thought. Informing and expanding thought would not only privilege majority students, it could benefit underrepresented groups."

many different places, some of which are significantly less diverse than MU itself. It is difficult for many of these students to adjust to their new and more diverse environment, and many have not been taught how to behave in mature, responsible and sensitive ways toward all of the different people they encounter. Another major theme about harassment by students revolved around the notion that students typically do not experience a consistent culture at MU that promotes a respect for diversity. Participants generally agreed that the messages students receive about diversity tend to be inconsistent in their quality, quantity and intensity, and they are interspersed among messages that run contrary to the belief that diversity is valued among members of the MU community. Finally, many participants agreed that formalized, curricular and programmatic efforts are needed to increase awareness and sensitivity to promote a culture of respect toward diversity among students.

Sources of student journalism on campus were identified on a number of occasions as communicating disrespect for diversity (including hate incidents), and there was a perceived lack of effectiveness on the part of campus leaders in responding to major transgressions in the past.

There was a perception among some participants that the structure and culture of the Greek System at MU tended to contribute to a perceived lack of integration among racial groups on campus (particularly African Americans and Whites). Two specific examples which were perceived to be tied to the Greek System were (a) the existence of sorority and fraternity houses whose membership tend to be racially homogenous, and (b) the perception that Homecoming lacked attendance by a diverse group of participants because it has historically been run by the Greek System rather than being a campus-wide event.

Participants identified a variety of possible mechanisms by which the university could respond to the issues identified in this area.

- Continue to target recruitment efforts to increase enrollments among minority students, while at the same time ensuring that minority students who enroll at MU receive the level of material and social support necessary to be successful.

- Take specific steps toward the development of a broader culture that appreciates and supports the diversity of students after they arrive, and the provision of role models who can facilitate the retention and learning goals of minority students.

- Recruit professors who have expertise in areas of diversity which need to be taught in the classroom. Encourage and assist current professors to increase their competencies with respect to diversity issues in their fields of instruction.

- Make the sexual harassment policy more public and promote a sexual harassment free campus.

- Continue to take steps to combat sexual violence at MU by providing financial support for educational and residential programming.

- Streamline the financial aid process for students who suffer financial hardships after being cut off financially by their parents.

- Relocate the International Center to a more visible, prominent place on campus.

- Change the method of selecting raters for testing English Language Proficiency for international student TAs and instructors.

- Provide training for faculty and TAs about the American with Disabilities Act, how Disability Services works and what services students receive there.

- To the degree allowable by law, collect data on students with disabilities so that it is possible to track resources and evaluate changing needs (as well as progress in addressing issues identified as problematic).

- Institute expanded training in world religions.

- Establish a mechanism for non-Christians to help them celebrate their holidays without suffering adverse consequences—this should be formalized in policy established by the Provost or Chancellor.

- Make the religious holiday calendar more public.

- Include a statement in syllabi about respect for religious obligations similar to the one for making accommodations in accordance with the ADA.

- Require Dining Services to respect religious food preparation for non-Christian students.

- Promote a culture of respect for diversity among students through (a) curriculum requirements, (b) orientation, residential and extra-curricular programming, and (c) role modeling by faculty, staff and administrators.

- Develop innovative methods of increasing student participation at diversity-related events that will help them increase awareness and sensitivity toward diversity issues.

- Adopt a Code of Honor for all students at the university in which diversity plays a prominent role. Enforce disciplinary actions against students who violate the code.

- More effectively educate student media about diversity issues before they are allowed to have positions of responsibility about what is published as journalism (e.g., faculty advisors should develop a regular program of encouraging and rewarding responsible coverage of diversity-related events and feature stories).

- Promote Homecoming as a campus-wide event rather than solely sponsored by the Greek System.

Issues Specific to Target Groups

People of Color

A variety of issues relevant to the four primary American racial-ethnic minority groups were raised. A number of participants from a variety of backgrounds expressed the belief that efforts to promote different ethnic studies programs to departmental status were important to the improvement of the campus climate for diversity at MU. A number of participants acknowledged a variety of potential barriers, including (a) the amount of fiscal support necessary to initiate these projects, (b) the number of new faculty who would need to be hired, and (c) the potential negative impact on other departments when faculty currently holding joint appointments move to full-time appointments in Black Studies, Latino/a Studies, Asian Studies, American Indian Studies and/or a broad Ethnic Studies program.

A number of participants from a variety of backgrounds expressed a belief that self-segregation among members of different racial and ethnic groups (including Whites) was a serious problem at MU. Some participants countered these concerns by expressing the understanding that self-segregation among racial-ethnic minority group members is self-protective and adaptive behavior for individuals belonging to oppressed groups because it allows minority group individuals to interact with people who have similar or shared experiences and/or backgrounds and thus receive social support. Nevertheless, the majority of participants who addressed this issue agreed that finding innovative ways to increase social integration among groups would be a positive step toward improving the campus climate for diversity.

"I think it's about getting social support in a place where you don't always feel welcome…It's not about rejecting White people; it's about finding people who you can relate to, who you know experience the same kinds of things you have…."

There were a significant number of participants who perceived the university community as equating "diversity" with Black-White race relations, and expressed concern over the lack of attention to other racial-ethnic minority groups on campus. Participants from a variety of backgrounds indicated that they believed it to be necessary to expand the university's attention to the issues of all of the racial-ethnic minority groups, including Latino/as and Hispanics, Asian Americans, and Native American Indians. Representation of these groups in faculty and student populations was perceived by many participants to be far below acceptable levels. Two students expressed concerns that it was difficult to develop a sense of community among Latino/as or Native American Indians due to small numbers, and that finding mentors was virtually impossible.

There was considerable discussion among participants from a variety of backgrounds about the perceived rift between the MU administration and African American faculty, staff and students. Participants who were commenting from the outside noted that the public controversy had become a source of tension for all members of the MU community. African American participants expressed a range of experiences and emotions, including (a) anger and resentment, (b) mistrust and resignation, (c) feelings of being misunderstood, (d) a desire to heal the rift and move on, and (e) feeling uninformed about the central issues in the controversy. Participants who commented extensively on the issue indicated that they believed there was a history of conflict and betrayal over the course of

many years. None of the participants who commented on this issue was able to offer specific recommendations for resolution.

Participants identified a variety of possible mechanisms by which the university could respond to the issues identified in this area.

- Begin process to develop, expand, or promote to departmental status Black Studies, Latino/a Studies, American Indian Studies, Asian Studies and/or broader Ethnic Studies programs.

- Work to build bridges between the administration and Black faculty, staff, and students.

- Expand recruiting efforts to Latino/a, Asian, and Native American Indian students and faculty on par with recruiting of African Americans.

- Consider innovative ways to decrease self-segregation, while simultaneously reminding majority group members that some self-segregation is adaptive and supportive for many minority group individuals.

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer (LGBTQ) Individuals

LGBTQ individuals were consistently identified in Phase I data as the "least accepted" group on campus, regardless of which subgroup in the population was asked. As such, there was considerable attention to the needs and concerns of LGBTQ individuals during the focus groups and interviews in Phase V. Although a number of these issues have been addressed in other sections of this report, some overarching issues remain. For example, there were persisting perceptions that coming out in classrooms or the workplace is still very risky. In addition, perceptions were that the responsibility is often placed on LGBTQ individuals to keep themselves safe from harassment, discrimination and violence, rather than being protected by the larger institutional structure.

A number of participants believed that some stress has been relieved for LGBTQ people on campus after sexual orientation was included in the nondiscrimination policy. However, many continue to express concern that there is still a substantial amount of work to do to improve the campus climate for LGBTQ individuals. Domestic partner benefits were a major source of concern among LGBTQ individuals and their allies— next to the nondiscrimination policy, domestic partnership benefits were viewed as a central issue of equity for LGBTQ faculty and staff. In addition, equity in partner hiring practices for people in same-sex partnerships was viewed as a major issue for LGBTQ faculty, staff and administrators—whereas it is widely recognized that highly recruited faculty who are legally married will often have offers extended to their spouses, partner hiring is virtually unheard of for same-sex couples. Finally, transgender individuals are still uncertain about whether they are covered by the nondiscrimination policy.

"It's one thing to change the policy, but it is a completely different thing to change the way people act toward [LGBTQ] people on this campus. There are still lots of [harassment and discrimination] going on that didn't just go away all of a sudden. The question now is, 'Will it be enforced?'"

Participants identified a variety of possible mechanisms by which the university could respond to the issues identified in this area.

- Continue efforts to reduce harassment and discrimination against LGBTQ individuals on campus.

- Increase funding to Safe Space program as one way to promote greater understanding of and sensitivity toward LGBTQ people and issues.

- Enforce the nondiscrimination policy when harassment on the basis of sexual orientation is reported.

- Offer domestic partner benefits to employees in same sex relationships.

- Expand partner hiring practices to include recruitment efforts to hire faculty, staff, and administrators.

- Include gender identity and expression as part of the nondiscrimination policy.

People with Disabilities

Major themes in focus group discussions regarding people with disabilities included (a) ongoing problems on campus in some buildings related to accessibility, (b) problems with accessible parking (c) perceptions of lengthy delays in responding to complaints about accessibility issues on campus, (c) perceptions that many people on campus think of disabilities only in terms of physical disabilities, and (d) harassment and discrimination against people with disabilities most often occurs in more subtle and hidden ways than when other underrepresented groups are targeted.

Overall, participants agreed that the campus was mostly in compliance with federal regulations regarding accessibility for people with disabilities. Nevertheless, focus group participants with and without disabilities expressed concerns about accessibility for a number of different buildings on campus (e.g., Virginia Avenue Residence Halls). A number of participants pointed out that accessibility is a continuous issue of maintenance and repair, not simply an issue of building or remodeling structures to make them accessible. Elevators, walkways, entry ways and corridors all require periodic maintenance and repair in order to sustain their functional accessibility for people with disabilities. One participant also pointed out that, on occasion, certain campus renovations and repairs result in contractors inadvertently blocking accessible pathways, and that snow and ice removal often either fails to clear accessible pathways or actually blocks those pathways. One student with a disability stated that it took over six months for action to be taken on a specific complaint she had about accessibility to one of her classrooms, and by the time the repair had been made it was too late for her needs to be accommodated by it.

"People don't realize that when a certain sidewalk is blocked for whatever reason, a person in a wheelchair might have to go around the block essentially to get where they need to go."

One participant pointed out that there is a perception on campus that "disabilities" are equated with physical disabilities (e.g., mobility, vision, hearing), when in fact the majority of people with disabilities on campus have learning or other types of disabilities. Accommodations for people with these other forms of disabilities are quite different and are not limited to accessibility. Participants noted that on a university campus, there can still be quite a bit of stigma associated with different types of disabilities that affect learning or performance on specific academic tasks, which is often not understood or acknowledged by faculty or work supervisors. One student highlighted the need for greater awareness among faculty due to inadvertent lapses in confidentiality with respect to students with disabilities when instructors inform other students about accommodations being made for specific students in the administration of exams or the timing of returning graded work to students.

Participants identified a variety of possible mechanisms by which the university could respond to the issues identified in this area.

- Require building coordinators to conduct periodic assessments for accessibility—provide specific training about accessibility requirements under the law to facilitate assessment, maintenance and repairs.

- Require contractors engaged in renovation and repairs to assess the impact for people with disabilities, and to take steps to minimize the extent to which accessibility is blocked or reduced by their activities.

- Address accessibility issues with workers responsible for snow and ice removal.

- Provide periodic training for faculty and TAs regarding ADA requirements for making accommodations and how to maintain confidentiality when doing so.

Non-Native English Speakers

Participation among non-native English speakers in Phase V of the MU Campus Climate Study revealed new issues that had not emerged during earlier phases of data collection. Although non-native English speakers were among those identified as the least accepted groups on campus in Phases I-IV, responses from non-native English speakers during the first four phases of data collection tended to be substantially more positive than negative. However, a more negative set of perceptions about the campus climate emerged from Phase V non-native English speaking participants. Overarching themes related to the campus climate for this group included (a) experiences of marginalization and rejection from the larger MU community, (b) perceptions that the MU community as a whole tended to be uninformed and unconcerned with a global perspective in education or in life more broadly, and (c) the perception that International graduate students were vulnerable to potential forms of exploitation from faculty.

International participants in Phase V reported a mixture of experiences with respect to acceptance and marginalization at MU, with a few reporting overwhelmingly positive experiences while the majority tended to report experiences of marginalization and rejection from students, faculty and staff colleagues. Research team members noticed that racial and linguistic differences might explain some of the differences in perceptions because participants who reported overwhelmingly positive experiences tended to be almost exclusively White and/or spoke with less

noticeable accents, while those who reported more negative experiences tended to be Asian or Latin American and/or spoke with more noticeable accents.

"I was told by my co-workers that I was here taking the place of an American worker."

"Students must know how to interact with people with different communication styles if they are to succeed in the corporate world. You must teach with a global perspective…"

Students, faculty and staff in this group all shared specific examples of experiences which had felt rejecting of them on the basis of their International or non-native English speaking status. Interestingly, although staff reported these experiences primarily from other staff, faculty and TAs reported the experiences primarily from majority group students, and students reported negative experiences primarily from majority group faculty and TAs.

Participants from a variety of backgrounds expressed concern that educational experiences at MU with respect to international issues and perspectives were far below what one might expect from a major university. Many participants attributed this problem to a lack of interest in global perspectives on the part of students and Missourians in general, while others were more likely to attribute the problem to a broader lack of concern for diversity at the university.

Participants identified a variety of possible mechanisms by which the university could respond to the issues identified in this area.

- Increase education abroad programs on campus to promote greater interest in global perspectives and increase sensitivity to international students, faculty and staff on campus.

- Promote greater attendance at international programs.

- Move International Center out of Memorial Union basement to a more visible, central location on campus.

- Encourage faculty to integrate more international perspectives into coursework and research.

Non-Christian Religious Minorities

A number of themes emerged from the focus group discussions about the climate for non-Christian religious minorities. Overall the perception was that Christianity is "an unseen, invisible, ever-present force on campus" that results in the marginalization of members of other groups. Many participants expressed a perception that the presumption among many members of the campus community is that everyone is (or should be) Christian. Non-Christian participants related numerous experiences in which people from the campus community, as well as people from off campus, engage in bigotry on a regular basis without consequence. Many of the activities of Christian groups from off campus in Speakers' Circle were viewed as harassment of non-Christians, in which anti-Semitic and other forms of bigotry occurred regularly.

"American students are exposed very little to other religions …Someone asked, 'Don't you want to be saved?' I said, 'Saved from what?' She said, 'From your sin.' I said, 'What sin?' She said, 'We were all born out of sin.' I said, 'No. In my religion we are all born out of love.' That is the difference."

A number of participants complained that many campus holidays fall on Christian religious holidays and that consideration is rarely given to non-Christians who would like to observe their own religious holidays. Although the primary example was with respect to students being required to take exams or complete assignments during non-Christian religious holidays, staff and faculty also related similar experiences with respect to mandatory meetings and events, as well as the necessity to use vacation time to observe non-Christian holidays. A related source of concern for participants was the perception that the campus actively participates in Christian religious traditions (e.g., the lighting of a Christmas tree on campus and the use of Christmas decorations out doors and in offices), which were perceived as inappropriate for a secular, public institution. These participants believed that such activities communicate a preference for Christianity and disregard toward other religions.

Although we were unable to secure participation from people of the Islamic faiths in Phase V (despite a number of efforts), data from other phases of data collection indicated that people of Middle Eastern descent were the targets of a disproportionate amount of harassment on campus. Many participants from a variety of different backgrounds expressed deep concern about these findings.

Several participants felt that increasing the degree to which other religious world views were covered in the curriculum and campus-wide diversity programming would promote greater understanding about non-Christian religions. Some participants compared the lack of attention to other world views to how world religions are taught in other countries or at other public universities in the U.S. and suggested that MU model itself after these other institutions.

"In India we had to read the Bible, Koran, and Hindu religion. That made us have a much better understanding."

Participants identified a variety of possible mechanisms by which the university could respond to the issues identified in this area.

- Make the Interfaith Calendar more public and encourage faculty and staff administrators to consider non-Christian religious holidays when scheduling mandatory meetings and events.

- Expand the offerings related to non-Christian faiths in the curriculum and campus-wide programming.

- Expand holiday celebrations and décor to explicitly include non-Christian traditions (e.g., Star of David, Menorah, Kwanzaa, etc.).

- Provide an all-faith place of worship on campus if there is to be one at all (e.g., AP Green Chapel).

Women

A number of major themes emerged from discussions about the campus climate for women at MU, including (a) the campus climate survey was not effective in assessing the extent to which women and other underrepresented groups experience stereotyping, which often leads to other forms of bias and discrimination, (b) an acknowledgment that many women at MU also belong to other underrepresented groups (e.g., women of color; lesbian, bisexual, queer and transgender persons; women with disabilities; persons with disabilities; non-Christians) and experience multiple forms of oppression, (c) concerns about a variety of forms of exploitation of women on campus, (d) the continued existence of a "good 'ol boys network" at MU, and (e) inequities in hiring, promotion and pay across all levels of employment at MU.

A number of women in the sample felt that the earlier findings of the MU Campus Climate Study did not effectively assess or represent the problems experienced by women on campus, which tend to be hidden under micro-aggressions, subtle forms of degradation, and a broader sense of indifference and lack of awareness. There was some acknowledgement among participants that within group differences and a broader cultural shift away from feminist perspectives may have contributed to Phase I findings that women were perceived to be among the most accepted groups on campus. Most women who participated in Phase V were also members of other underrepresented groups, and some shared their perspectives about how multiple forms of oppression tended to increase their awareness of biases, stereotypes and discrimination that affect all women—even when many other women might be less likely to perceive these events in their own lives.

A number of women in the sample described experiences of latent hostility from male faculty, staff and students, which they often perceived to be very difficult to address. A number of

"I constantly experience a hostile environment, and that is what my students are bringing to me too, especially women students. The classroom is the most hostile place on campus for women."

women faculty and staff reported that they had been targets of hostility and harassment by students as well as by their peers, which they believed to result from a culture of permissiveness about sexual harassment. A number of female faculty and graduate students expressed the experience of being the target of sexist attitudes on teaching evaluations. There were a number of accounts of males on campus publicly using misogynist slurs (roughly the equivalent of unacceptable racial slurs) without consequence. Members of the Greek System, athletics and student journalism were identified on a number of occasions as common perpetrators of hostility and harassment.

A frequently raised concern among participants from a variety of backgrounds in Phase V was related to perceptions that the findings from Phase IV severely underreported the incidence of sexual harassment on campus. A number of participants suggested that respondents may have been reporting only the most extreme cases of harassment and that sexual harassment is so pervasive in the lives of women on most college campuses that many women begin to ignore it and fail to recognize it as offensive or oppressive. In addition, however, a number of participants expressed concern that the process of making complaints about sexual harassment at MU needed to be significantly improved to eliminate disparities in recognition, enforcement and punishment of sexual harassment. Similarly, a number participants expressed concern that issues related to sexual assault and violence against women were not more apparent in the findings from earlier phases of

the climate study, and that there was a need for greater attention on this issue by the university. At least on participant suggested that the Cleary Reports were completely inaccurate assessments of sexual violence on campus, due to a variety of reasons, but that perceived efforts to preserve the public image of the institution was among them.

Among faculty and staff, perceived inequities related to hiring, promotion and pay were frequently cited sources of concern. Some staff members reported that they had been passed over for promotions while less qualified men were promoted. Other participants noted that despite apparent advances in the promotion or hiring of women for administrative posts, the vast majority of positions with real power over budgets and policy decisions were occupied by men (including department chairs, deans, and upper level administrators). A number of participants expressed the belief that these conditions were perpetuated by the ongoing existence of a "good 'ol boys network" in which powerful men socialize and collaborate professionally in a manner that excludes women and diminishes their chances for participating in processes necessary for advancement.

Participants identified a variety of possible mechanisms by which the university could respond to the issues identified in this area.

- Focus diversity trainings and programs on increasing awareness about women's issues and reducing misogynist acts.

- Work with the Greek System to promote greater awareness and understanding of women's issues and sexual violence.

- Implement gender sensitivity training for athletes.

- Work with sources of student journalism to encourage responsible efforts to reduce material printed in newspapers or produced in other forums that produce a hostile environment for women.

- Increase the number of women in power-based leadership positions on campus (e.g., department chairs, academic deans, administrators).

- Require TA and faculty training regarding how to create safe classrooms where diversity issues can be discussed.

- Conduct studies of differences in hiring, salaries, rate of tenure and promotion, and evaluations to examine differential treatment of women and other underrepresented groups.

- Have top administrators (e.g., Chancellor) lead the "Take Back the Night Rally and March," particularly through Greek Town in order to visibly demonstrate their commitment to ending violence toward women.

- Have top administrators (e.g., Chancellor) attend speakers for Women's History Month.

- Institute a clear protocol/policy for addressing incidents of sexual harassment on campus between faculty, staff and students that include both formal and informal procedures.

- Ask the campus-level Committee on the Status of Women to respond and address how they will attend to the results of the campus climate study.

- Provide increased funding to the Women's Center and Women's and Gender Studies Program.

- Promote the Women's and Gender Studies Program to departmental status.

Tensions about Respecting All Forms of Diversity

Participants from a variety of backgrounds commented about difficulties they perceived respecting all forms of diversity. On the one hand, the vast majority of participants expressed a desire to be respectful toward human differences. On the other hand, many also recognized tensions that exist between groups on campus and in the broader society, which arise from differences in experiences and perspectives. The focus of these discussions was not divisive, but an attempt to more deeply understand how various groups can coexist despite deeply held and sometimes conflicting convictions. For some participants, their lived experiences as individuals with multiple identities (e.g., a woman of color or gay man who is also Christian) served as examples of the complexities inherent to the goals of a fully pluralistic community. Focal topics of discussion in this area included, (a) How do we respect the religious freedoms of individuals who object to same-sex relationships on religious grounds, while at the same time promote a campus environment that is safe and respectful to the rights and dignity of LGBTQ individuals?; (b) How do we broaden our concerns about diversity beyond race without disrespecting or minimizing the important issues faced by racial-ethnic groups on campus?; (c) How do we broaden our work toward enhancing the racial-ethnic diversity on campus to include Latino/as, Asians, and Native American Indians without producing a situation in which African Americans perceive that resources are being shifted away from them?; and (d) How can African Americans press the administration to keep promises made about increasing representation of their own group without appearing to diminish the needs of other groups?

"The experiences I have had are mostly with people not knowing or not being exposed, but I'm more than happy to tell them what I believe."

These issues were perceived as complex and difficult to resolve by the majority of participants who were involved in the discussions about them. In fact, *resolution* per se was not a central point of these discussions. Instead, participants seemed to assume that one advantage of improving the campus climate might be the opportunity to engage in rich, meaningful discussions about this and similar topics without the tension of needing to *resolve* differences as much as to discuss, understand and respect them in ways that epitomize the mission of the university.

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of Phase V of the MU Campus Climate Study was to generate specific, concrete recommendations for action strategies designed to improve the climate for diversity at MU. A total of 60 participants devoted from one to three hours of their time to review the findings of earlier phases of data collection, participate in focus groups or individual interviews, and respond to follow-up e-mail correspondence. Nearly 100 recommendations resulted from the 13 focus groups and 6 individual interviews that occurred during the summer and fall of 2004 and winter of 2005. The recommendations provided in this report reflect a variety of concrete, specific proposals and a number of broad, overarching ideas about strategies to improve the climate for diversity at the University of Missouri-Columbia. In realistic terms, the responses to these recommendations can be swift for some and gradual for others. Indeed, throughout the four years of data collection for all phases of the MU Campus Climate Study, a number of issues have been addressed proactively and specific recommendations arising from the study have been implemented. Many participants in Phase V were aware of the efforts being made by administrators and other campus leaders to take action.

"Benign neglect can, in its way, be as damaging as overt recalcitrance. This is, I believe, the big issue."

"The more public you are about these things, the more awareness you create, and the more action you see."

It requires openness and courage for an institution to deeply and honestly examine itself at the level required to develop a full and comprehensive understanding of the campus climate for underrepresented groups. Over the course of the past 5 years, the University of Missouri-Columbia has been involved in a deep and meaningful self-examination of campus climate. Many of the participants in Phase V commented about the important message being sent by the university's willingness to support this study on an ongoing basis. At the same time, all but a few participants expressed a belief that the steps that occur after the completion of the study were equally or more important than the study itself. Some participants expressed concern that once it was completed, the study would "sit on a shelf" and little or nothing would result from it in terms of actual climate change. One participant recommended that the administration should commit to making "at least one big policy change per year to demonstrate care and commitment to issues of diversity." With little exception, participants in Phase V viewed *action* as the critical determinant of change.

University support for the objectives of the MU Campus Climate Study was recognized as a step in the desired direction by a majority of the participants, and Chancellor Deaton's mass e-mail encouraging participation in the climate study was mentioned several times in focus group meetings as a source of hope and encouragement about the university's commitment to promoting diversity. Participants also expressed awareness that the study itself had generated a significant amount of dialogue and efforts that had already influenced positive change.

There are many opportunities ahead of us to change the campus climate for all members of the MU community. As a result, we have the potential to create a dynamic, trend-setting educational and work environment. Although some readers may be troubled by the unbalanced perspective of this report with its emphasis on problems as opposed to strengths, it is critical to remember that this

phase of data collection was not intended to produce an objective, balanced evaluation of the campus climate for diversity, but instead to generate recommendations about how to address focal areas of concern. With that objective in mind, this study can be used as a baseline measure for strategic planning for all levels of MU administration. The recommendations contained in this report are starting points for policies and action ideas. The findings of the MU Campus Climate Study can be a catalyst for everyone, majority and underrepresented faculty, staff and students alike, to work toward making this the community that they want to live in. Let us all work together towards this end. Let us put aside blame and finger pointing and join hands in this important endeavor. After all this is our community, our home. Let the work begin.

"The University mission requires that we subject competing points of view to open discussion and exploration, to examine their underlying values and beliefs and the life experiences that shape those views, as well as examining their consequences for others. [We] should strengthen our commitment to pursue a peaceful global society based on reason, tolerance, and understanding of the differences among individuals, groups, and nations. I ask for your renewed support for those ideals of free inquiry, mutual respect, and open discussions of controversial ideas and opinions that are inherent in the concept of a University."

Brady J. Deaton
On the 1st Anniversary of 9/11

"Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in the inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly."

Martin Luther King, Jr.
"Letter from Birmingham Jail"

Appendix 1

Executive Summary for Phases I-IV of the MU Campus Climate Study for Underrepresented Groups

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
PHASES I-IV
MU CAMPUS CLIMATE STUDY

➢ 19.2% of the entire sample of URG participants reported being the victim of harassment on campus;

➢ 30.7% of African Americans, 32.4% of Hispanics/Latino/as, 23.6% of Asian/Asian Americans, 38.9% of Middle Easterners, 33.3% of Native American Indians, 22.5% of women, 37.5% of LGB individuals, 25% of transgender, and 44.0% of people with disabilities in the sample reported experiences of harassment on campus;

➢ 36.3% of the entire sample of URG participants reported having witnessed harassment of other individuals on campus;

➢ 54% of African Americans, 40.0% of Hispanics/Latino/as, 46.0% of Asian/Asian Americans, 62.5% of Middle Easterners, 46.4% of Native American Indians, 39.4% of women, 60.3% of LGB individuals, 14% of transgender, and 49.3% of people with disabilities in the sample reported observing harassment on campus;

➢ There were significant differences between majority and minority group members regarding perceptions of campus climate for minority group members, in which minority group members perceived the environment to be less positive than majority group members in all cases;

➢ There was extensive agreement among participants from different groups that visible racial-ethnic groups, non-native English speakers, and LGBT individuals were the least accepted groups on campus;

➢ Individuals who reported being the victim of, or having witnessed, harassment on campus tended to report lower levels of psychological well-being (e.g., greater degree of depressive symptoms and greater fears for personal safety);

➢ 21% of the LGBT survey participants indicated that they had been harassed due to their sexual orientation/gender identity;

➢ Derogatory remarks were the most common forms of LGBT harassment (85%), but other types of harassment included verbal threats (40%), graffiti (38%), and pressure to conceal one's sexual orientation/gender identity (36%), and

➢ Participants who reported being victims of LGBT harassment had significantly higher fears for physical safety, expectations that LGBT individuals would be harassed on campus, needs to conceal one's sexual orientation/gender identity, and negative perceptions of campus responsiveness to harassment and discrimination.

➢ There was a total of 15,356 participants in the national study (20% of whom came from MU alone). The distributions of students, staff/administrators, and faculty were virtually identical for the national and MU samples. The gender distribution of the two samples was virtually identical. The racial/ethnic background of the participants in the two samples was also very

similar, with the MU sample comprising slightly larger percentages of African American/Black and white participants and slightly smaller percentages of Asian/Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and Chicano/Latino/Hispanic participants. A comparison of the sexual orientation identities of the participants in the two samples reveals that the MU sample had a slightly larger percentage of heterosexuals and fewer lesbian, gay, bisexual and uncertain participants than the national sample. Overall, the two samples are quite comparable.

➢ One-quarter of the survey respondents in the national sample, versus 19.2 percent of the MU sample, reported experiences of harassment, which was defined as conduct that unreasonably interfered with their ability to work or learn on campus. Approximately 30 percent of people of color versus 22 percent of whites reported harassment in the national sample, whereas 29.3 percent of people of color and 16.9 percent of whites in the MU sample reported harassment. Thus, the lower overall percentage of participants reporting harassment in the MU sample versus national sample can be partially explained by a substantially lower percentage of whites in the MU sample reporting harassment, whereas people of color in the MU sample reported harassment at approximately the same rate as people of color in the national sample.

➢ A higher percentage of people of color in the MU sample (59%) reported experiences of harassment based on race or ethnicity than people of color in the national sample (31%).

➢ A higher percentage of women in the MU sample (72%) reported gender-based harassment than women in the national sample (60%), whereas relatively equivalent percentages of transgender individuals in both samples (50% and 56%, respectively) reported gender-based harassment.

➢ Similar percentages of LGB/uncertain participants reported harassment based on sexual orientation in the MU (60%) and national (55%) samples.

➢ In both the national and MU samples, students were the main source of harassment for all groups (students, faculty, staff/administrators), but when the source of harassment is examined by position, the greatest percentage of harassment comes from within groups. For example, staff members report that they most often experience harassment from other staff. The result is similar for faculty, students and administrators.

➢ Forty-two percent of respondents in the national sample reported having observed harassment on their campuses, only slightly higher than the 37 percent of participants in the MU sample who reported observing harassment.

➢ Although roughly the same percentage of people of color and whites in the national sample reported observing harassment on their campuses (43% and 41%, respectively), there was a higher percentage of people of color than whites in the MU sample who reported observing harassment (49% versus 35%, respectively).

➢ Similar percentages of women and men reported observing harassment on campus in both the national (44% and 38%) and MU samples (39% and 34%).

➢ Substantially higher percentages of LGB/uncertain versus heterosexual participants reported observing harassment on campus in both the national (61% versus 42%, respectively) and MU samples (57% versus 37%, respectively).

➢ A cross-tabulation of race/ethnicity (whites versus people of color) with perceptions of the campus climate as racist (non-racist, neutral, racist) revealed similar patterns in both the national sample and MU sample, in that the percentage of people of color who believed that campus to be racist was virtually twice the percentage of whites with the same perceptions, yet people of color were evenly split between perceptions of the campus as non-racist, neutral, and racist and the largest percentage of whites believing the campus to be non-racist.

➢ A cross-tabulation of gender (men versus women) with perceptions of the campus climate as sexist (non-sexist, neutral, sexist) revealed similar patterns in both the national and MU samples, in that slight higher percentages of women than men perceived the campus as sexist, but the largest percentages of both men and women perceived the campus to be non-sexist.

➢ A cross-tabulation of sexual identity (LGB/uncertain versus heterosexual) with perceptions of the campus climate as homophobic (non-homophobic, neutral, homophobic) revealed similar patterns in both the national sample and MU sample, in that heterosexuals were relatively evenly split among the three climate perception categories but LGB/uncertain individuals were 2 to 4 times more likely to perceive the climate as homophobic versus neutral or non-homophobic.

➢ Similar percentages of respondents in both samples (national and MU) believed that the college/university thoroughly addresses racism, sexism, homophobia, ageism, and religious harassment. However, there was a substantial difference in the percentages of participants in the MU sample versus the national sample who believed that the college/university thoroughly addresses issues related to disabilities, in which the MU sample agreed by a margin of 2 to 1 versus a much smaller margin of agreement in the national sample. Note that supplemental analyses conducted by the MU Campus Climate Research Team also indicated that people with disabilities viewed the campus acceptance of people with disabilities as considerably less than people without disabilities viewed campus acceptance of people with disabilities, which suggests that the discrepancy in the data noted above is likely to have been influenced primarily by the overwhelmingly greater numbers of people without disabilities in the MU sample.

➢ A cross-tabulation of race/ethnicity (people of color versus whites) with perceptions of whether the college/university thoroughly addresses racism resulted in similar patterns of results for both the national and MU samples, in which the largest percentages of both groups agreed or strongly agreed that the university thoroughly addressed racism, but with substantially larger percentages of people of color than whites who disagreed or strongly disagreed.

➢ A cross-tabulation of sexual identity (LGB/uncertain versus heterosexual) with perceptions of whether the college/university thoroughly addresses heterosexism/homophobia revealed a substantial discrepancy between the MU sample and the national sample. A substantially higher percentage of LGB/uncertain participants in the MU sample than the national sample

disagreed or strongly disagreed that the college/university thoroughly addresses heterosexism/homophobia. This finding may be the result of the lack of inclusion of sexual orientation in the nondiscrimination policy in the University of Missouri System at the time of the survey, which was a hotly contested issue for many years until the policy was changed in 2003.

➢ A cross-tabulation of gender (women versus men) with perceptions of whether the college/university thoroughly addresses sexism resulted in similar patterns of results for both the national and MU samples, in which the largest percentages of both groups agreed or strongly agreed that the university thoroughly addressed sexism, but with substantially larger percentages of women than men who disagreed or strongly disagreed.

➢ Phase II data indicate that respondents overall tended to rate the quality of the services provided by their units on average as above "adequate" and below "extremely well" with respect to the issues addressed in the survey questionnaire. Among Phase II participants, average ratings for the "*effectiveness of diversity trainings*," "*staff knowledge*," and "*availability of appropriate resources*" tended to be lower than ratings on other items.

➢ Phase II respondents rated the quality of services rendered by their units lower on average for non-native English speakers, non-Christian individuals, persons with disabilities, and LGB students.

➢ Many Phase II participants reported that they had received no training at MU to address the needs of underrepresented groups, and many others reported training that appears to have taken place outside the context of their current employment at MU.

➢ The vast majority of student service units evaluated in Phase III received average ratings from all six underrepresented group participants that were above a rating of "adequate" and below a rating of "extremely well," with only a few exceptions.

➢ Average ratings that were below "adequate" were obtained for a small number of student service units in Phase III with respect to LGBT and/or non-Christian religious minorities.

➢ There were 224 Phase IV participants (16.5%) who reported being victimized by sexual harassment by a person affiliated with MU, which was primarily reported by women (n = 194) of European American descent (n = 199) and heterosexual orientation (n = 199).

➢ The primary forms of sexual harassment reported in Phase IV were "unwanted contacts" (n = 97) and "uncomfortable sexual speech/jokes" (n = 134), and were committed most often by work supervisors (n = 41), faculty/TAs (n = 60), peers (n = 80), and coworkers (n = 63).

➢ Participants in Phase IV reported that they most often discussed the harassment with nobody (n = 54), family (n = 59), friends (n = 124), and significant others (71).

➢ The majority of Phase IV respondents who provided a rating of the effectiveness of the responses received from university officials regarding sexual harassment did not perceive them to be effective.

➤ Experiences of sexual harassment were associated with higher rates of depressive symptoms and fears for personal safety.

➤ There were 33 Phase IV participants (2.4%) who reported being victims of hate crimes on campus at MU, which were primarily based on the victim's gender (n = 8), race/ethnicity (n = 9), sexual orientation (n = 5), religion (n = 5) and other (n = 5).

➤ The types of hate crimes reported by Phase IV participants included threats of violence (n = 7), threatening or harassing phone calls (n = 5), vandalism (n = 5), and other (n = 15).

➤ Participants in Phase IV indicated that they primarily discussed the hate crimes with nobody (n = 6), family (n = 9), friends (n = 16), and significant others (n = 10).

➤ The majority of Phase IV respondents who provided a rating of the effectiveness of the responses received from university officials regarding hate crime victimization did not perceive them to be effective.

➤ Experiences of hate crime victimization were associated with higher rates of fears for personal safety.

➤ There were 142 Phase IV participants (10.5%) who reported being victims of hate incidents on campus at MU, which were primarily based on the victim's gender (n = 42), race/ethnicity (n = 57), sexual orientation (n = 37), religion (n = 52) and other (n = 10).

➤ The types of hate incidents reported by Phase IV participants included offensive jokes or remarks (n = 122), offensive editorials, cartoons or news stories (n = 120), and public displays of objects, signs or symbols (n = 51).

➤ Participants in Phase IV indicated that they primarily discussed the hate incidents with nobody (n = 26), faculty/TA (n = 21), family (n = 63), friends (n = 97), and significant others (n = 55).

➤ The majority of Phase IV respondents who provided a rating of the effectiveness of the responses received from university officials regarding hate incident victimization did not perceive them to be effective.

➤ Experiences of hate incident victimization were associated with higher levels of depressive symptoms.

➤ There were 95 Phase IV participants (7.0%) who reported witnessing hate crimes and 340 Phase IV participants (25.1%) who reported witnessing hate incidents on campus at MU.