



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Assessment • Planning • Interventions

Loyola University New Orleans

Campus Climate
Research Study
Executive Summary

April 2018



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Executive Summary

History of the Project

Loyola University New Orleans (Loyola) affirms its commitment to nurturing the intellectual vitality of the campus community and they engender academic engagement where teaching, working, learning, and living take place in pluralistic communities of mutual respect. Free exchange of different ideas and viewpoints in supportive environments encourages students, faculty, and staff to develop the critical thinking and citizenship skills that will benefit them throughout their lives.

Loyola University New Orleans also is committed to fostering a caring community that provides leadership for constructive participation in a diverse, multicultural world. As noted in Loyola's mission statement, "Loyola University New Orleans...welcomes students of diverse backgrounds and prepares them to lead meaningful lives with and for others; to pursue truth, wisdom, and virtue; and to work for a more just world.¹" To better understand the campus climate, the senior administration at Loyola recognized the need for a comprehensive tool that would provide campus climate metrics for the experiences and perceptions of its students, faculty, and staff. During the fall 2017 semester, Loyola conducted a comprehensive survey of students, faculty, and staff to develop a better understanding of the learning, living, and working environment on campus.

In fall 2016 members of the Loyola community were convened to establish the Campus Climate Assessment Work Group (CCAWG) which was composed of faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Ultimately, Loyola contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to conduct a campus-wide study entitled, "Loyola University: Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working." Data gathered via reviews of relevant Loyola literature, campus focus groups, and a campus-wide survey addressing the experiences and perceptions of various constituent groups will be presented to the Loyola community. The community, upon receiving the report, will then come together to develop and initiate two or three action items by fall 2018.

¹<http://www.loyno.edu/mission-statements/>

Project Design and Campus Involvement

The conceptual model used as the foundation for Loyola's assessment of campus climate was developed by Smith et al. (1997) and modified by Rankin (2003). A power and privilege perspective informs the model, one grounded in critical theory, which establishes that power differentials, both earned and unearned, are central to all human interactions (Brookfield, 2005). Unearned power and privilege are associated with membership in dominant social groups (Johnson, 2005) and influence systems of differentiation that reproduce unequal outcomes. Loyola's assessment was the result of a comprehensive process to identify the strengths and challenges of campus climate, with a specific focus on the distribution of power and privilege among differing social groups. This report provides an overview of the results of the campus-wide survey.

The CCAWG collaborated with R&A to develop the survey instrument. Together, they implemented participatory and community-based processes to review tested survey questions from the R&A question bank and developed a survey instrument for Loyola that would reveal the various dimensions of power and privilege that shape the campus experience. In the first phase, R&A conducted 19 focus groups, which were composed of 106 participants (37 students, 63 faculty and staff, and 6 participants who did not disclose their position status). In the second phase, the CCAWG and R&A used data from the focus groups to co-construct questions for the campus-wide survey. The final Loyola survey queried various campus constituent groups about their experiences and perceptions regarding the academic environment for students, the workplace environment for faculty and staff, employee benefits, unwanted sexual contact or conduct, racial and ethnic identity, gender identity and gender expression, sexual identity, accessibility and disability services, and other topics.

One thousand two hundred thirty-eight (1,238) people completed the survey. In the end, the assessment was the result of a comprehensive process to identify the strengths and challenges of campus climate, with a specific focus on the distribution of power and privilege among differing social groups at Loyola.

Loyola Participants

Loyola community members completed one thousand two hundred thirty-eight (1,238) surveys for an overall response rate of 29%. Only surveys that were at least 50% completed were included in the final data set for analyses.² Fifty-nine percent ($n = 724$) of the sample were Undergraduate Students, 9% ($n = 108$) were Graduate/Law Students, 16% ($n = 192$) were Faculty/Administrators with Faculty Rank, and 17% ($n = 214$) were Staff/Administrators without Faculty Rank. Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic characteristics of survey respondents. The percentages offered in Table 1 are based on the numbers of respondents in the sample (n) for each demographic characteristic.³

Table 1. Loyola University Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Subgroup	<i>n</i>	% of Sample
Position status	Undergraduate Student	724	58.5
	Graduate/Law Student	108	8.7
	Faculty/Administrator with Faculty Rank	192	15.5
	Staff/Administrator without Faculty Rank	214	17.3
Gender identity	Woman	843	68.1
	Man	351	28.4
	Transspectrum	35	2.8
	Missing	9	0.7
Racial/ethnic identity	Black/African American	162	13.1
	Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@	102	8.2
	Multiracial	139	11.2
	Other People of Color	49	4.0
	White	746	60.3
	Other/Unknown	40	3.2
Sexual identity	LGBQ	267	21.6
	Heterosexual	916	74.0
	Missing	55	4.4
Citizenship status	U.S. Citizen	1,185	95.7

²17 surveys were removed because the respondents did not complete at least 50% of the survey, and 11 duplicate submissions were removed.

³The total n for each demographic characteristic may differ as a result of missing data.

Table 1. Loyola University Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Subgroup	<i>n</i>	% of Sample
	Non-U.S./Naturalized Citizen	49	4.0
	Missing	< 5	---
Disability status	Single Disability	137	11.1
	No Disability	1,004	81.1
	Multiple Disabilities	88	7.1
	Missing	9	0.7
Religious affiliation	Catholic/Roman Catholic	359	29.0
	Christian	279	22.5
	Additional Religious/Spiritual Affiliation	64	5.2
	No Affiliation	390	31.5
	Multiple Religious/Spiritual Affiliations	121	9.8
	Missing	25	2.0

Key Findings – Areas of Strength

1. High levels of comfort with the climate at Loyola

Climate is defined as the “current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of employees and students concerning the access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and potential.”⁴ The level of comfort experienced by faculty, staff, and students is one indicator of campus climate.

- 72% ($n = 886$) of survey respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate at Loyola.
- 84% ($n = 854$) of Student and Faculty respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their classes.

2. Faculty Respondents – Positive attitudes about faculty work

- 82% ($n = 157$) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by faculty in their department/program.
- 81% ($n = 153$) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by their department/program chair.

3. Staff Respondents –Positive attitudes about staff work

- 76% ($n = 163$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.
- 70% ($n = 148$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance.
- 84% ($n = 178$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their supervisors were supportive of their taking leave (e.g., vacation, parental, personal, short-term disability).
- 85% ($n = 181$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by coworkers in their department.

⁴Rankin & Reason (2008)

4. Student Respondents – Positive attitudes about academic experiences

The way students perceive and experience their campus climate influences their performance and success in college.⁵ Research also supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for improving learning outcomes.⁶ Attitudes toward academic pursuits are one indicator of campus climate.

- 77% ($n = 633$) of Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by Loyola faculty.
- 81% ($n = 661$) of Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by Loyola faculty in the classroom.
- 76% ($n = 618$) of Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they had faculty whom they perceived as role models.

5. Student Respondents *Perceived Academic Success*

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the scale, *Perceived Academic Success*, derived from Question 11 on the survey. Analyses using this scale revealed:

- A significant difference existed in the overall test for means for Student respondents’ *Perceived Academic Success* by only two categories: racial identity and disability status.

Findings

- Black/African American Undergraduate Student respondents have less *Perceived Academic Success* than White Undergraduate Student respondents.
- Undergraduate Student respondents with Multiple Disabilities have less *Perceived Academic Success* than Undergraduate Student respondents with No Disability.

Key Findings – Opportunities for Improvement

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

Several empirical studies reinforce the importance of the perception of non-discriminatory environments for positive learning and developmental outcomes.⁷

⁵Pascarella & Terenzini (2005)

⁶Hale (2004); Harper & Hurtado (2007); Harper & Quaye (2004)

⁷Aguirre & Messineo (1997); Flowers & Pascarella (1999); Pascarella & Terenzini (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005); Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora (2011)

Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.⁸ The survey requested information on experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

- 23% ($n = 280$) of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.⁹
 - 24% ($n = 68$) noted that the conduct was based on their gender/gender identity, 18% ($n = 49$) on their ethnicity, and 16% each on their political views ($n = 46$), position status ($n = 46$), and age ($n = 45$).

Differences based on Gender Identity, Racial/Ethnic Identity, and Position Status

- By gender identity, a higher percentage of Transspectrum respondents (40%, $n = 14$) than Men respondents (19%, $n = 68$) indicated that they had experienced this conduct.
 - A higher percentage of Transspectrum respondents (43%, $n = 6$) than Men respondents (15%, $n = 10$) who had experienced this conduct indicated that the conduct was based on their gender identity.
- By racial identity, 26% ($n = 80$) of People of Color respondents, 22% ($n = 161$) of White respondents, and 19% ($n = 26$) of Multiracial respondents indicated that they had experienced this conduct.
 - A higher percentage of People of Color respondents (41%, $n = 33$) and Multiracial respondents (27%, $n = 7$) than White respondents (4%, $n = 7$) who experienced this conduct indicated that the conduct was based on their ethnic identity.
- By position status, 16% ($n = 17$) of Graduate/Law Student respondents, 22% ($n = 162$) of Undergraduate Student respondents, 24% ($n = 46$) of Faculty respondents, and 26% ($n = 55$) of Staff respondents had experienced this conduct.

⁸Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley (2008); Waldo (1998)

⁹The literature on microaggressions is clear that this type of conduct has a negative influence on people who experience the conduct, even if they feel at the time that it had no impact (Sue, 2010; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009).

- A higher percentage of Staff respondents (38%, $n = 21$) than Undergraduate Student respondents (9%, $n = 15$) thought that the conduct was based on their position status.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct at Loyola. One hundred twelve respondents elaborated on experiences with this conduct. Four themes emerged from all responses: hostile conduct by students, hostile conduct within the workplace, dissatisfaction with reporting process, and hostile conduct related to political views or ideology.

2. Several constituent groups indicated that they were less comfortable with the overall campus climate, workplace climate, and classroom climate.

Prior research on campus climate has focused on the experiences of faculty, staff, and students associated with historically underserved social/community/affinity groups (e.g., women, people of color, people with disabilities, first-generation students, and veterans).¹⁰ Several groups at Loyola indicated that they were less comfortable than their majority counterparts with the climates of the campus, workplace, and classroom.

Examples of Findings for Overall Climate at Loyola

- 12% ($n = 26$) of Staff respondents and 20% ($n = 38$) of Faculty respondents compared with 36% ($n = 39$) Graduate/Law Student respondents felt “very comfortable” with the overall climate at Loyola.
- 18% ($n = 40$) of At Least One Disability respondents compared with 26% ($n = 262$) of No Disability respondents were “very comfortable” with the overall climate at Loyola.

Examples of Findings for Department/Program and Work Unit Climate

- 29% ($n = 61$) of Staff respondents and 34% ($n = 65$) of Faculty respondents were “very uncomfortable” with the climate in their department/program or work unit at Loyola.

¹⁰Harper & Hurtado (Harper & Hurtado, 2007); Hart & Fellabaum (2008); Rankin (Rankin, 2003); Rankin & Reason (2005); Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart (2008)

Examples of Findings for Classroom Climate

- 29% ($n = 211$) of Undergraduate Student respondents compared with 44% ($n = 82$) of Faculty respondents were “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes at Loyola
- 28% ($n = 110$) of People of Color Faculty and Student respondents compared with 36% ($n = 214$) of White Faculty and Student respondents were “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes.

3. Faculty and Staff Respondents – Seriously Considered Leaving Loyola

- 64% ($n = 123$) of Faculty respondents and 65% ($n = 140$) of Staff respondents had seriously considered leaving Loyola in the past year.
 - 69% ($n = 85$) of those Faculty respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of institutional instability and 64% ($n = 79$) because of low salary/pay rate.
 - 73% ($n = 102$) of those Staff respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of low salary/pay rate and 72% ($n = 101$) because of institutional instability.

One hundred seventy-four Faculty and Staff respondents elaborated on why they had seriously considered leaving Loyola. Four themes emerged from the responses: low salary, overwhelming workload, lack of support from the administration, and what many respondents called the “sinking ship” nature of Loyola due to institutional instability.

4. Staff Respondents – Challenges with work-life issues

- 39% ($n = 83$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the performance evaluation process was productive.
- 31% ($n = 66$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they were burdened by work responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations.
- 40% ($n = 86$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they performed more work than colleagues with similar performance expectations.

- 70% ($n = 149$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their workload increased without additional compensation as a result of other staff departures.
- 18% ($n = 37$) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that staff were compensated for work outside normally scheduled work hours.

Staff respondents elaborated on their perceptions of the workplace climate at Loyola. Several themes emerged from the responses including: overwhelming workloads, inadequate/useless performance evaluation processes, and lack of job security.

5. Faculty Respondents – Challenges with faculty work

- 46% ($n = 47$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they were burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations.
- 34% ($n = 35$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that faculty opinions were taken seriously by senior administrators.
- 40% ($n = 29$) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt pressured to do extra work that was uncompensated.
- 18% ($n = 33$) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that Loyola provided adequate resources to help them manage work-life balance.
- 41% ($n = 78$) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they had job security.

Faculty respondents elaborated on statements regarding their perceptions of work-life balance at Loyola. Various themes emerged including: exceptionally low salaries compared with peers, uncompetitive benefits, lack of financial institutional support to complete work functions, and concerns about the future of Loyola.

6. A meaningful percentage of respondents experienced unwanted sexual contact/conduct.

In 2014, Not Alone: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault indicated that sexual assault is a substantial issue for colleges and universities nationwide, affecting the physical health, mental health, and academic success of students. The report highlights that one in five women is sexually assaulted

while in college. One section of the Loyola survey requested information regarding sexual assault.

- 16% ($n = 201$) of respondents indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact/conduct while at Loyola.
 - 2% ($n = 22$) experienced relationship violence (e.g., ridiculed, controlling, hitting).
 - 4% ($n = 49$) experienced stalking (e.g., following me, on social media, texting, phone call).
 - 12% ($n = 143$) experienced unwanted sexual interaction (e.g., cat-calling, repeated sexual advances, sexual harassment).
 - 6% ($n = 70$) experienced unwanted sexual contact (e.g. fondling, rape, sexual assault, penetration without consent).
- Respondents identified Loyola students, current or former dating/intimate partners, acquaintances/friends, and strangers as sources of the unwanted sexual contact/conduct.
- The majority of respondents did not report the unwanted sexual contact/conduct.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on why they did not report unwanted sexual contact/conduct. The primary rationale cited for not reporting these incidents was that respondents expected a poor response from Loyola. Other rationales included blaming themselves, the notion that it happens all the time, it was perceived as not being serious enough to report, respondents felt embarrassed, and respondents were afraid of the consequences for themselves.

Conclusion

Loyola's climate findings¹¹ were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.¹² For example, 70% to 80% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be "very comfortable" or "comfortable." At Loyola 72% of respondents indicated that they were "very comfortable" or

¹¹Additional findings disaggregated by position status and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.

¹²Rankin & Associates Consulting (2016)

“comfortable” with the overall climate. Twenty to 25% of respondents in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At Loyola, 23% of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. The results also paralleled the findings of other climate studies of specific constituent groups offered in the literature.¹³

Loyola’s climate assessment report provides baseline data on diversity and inclusion, and addresses Loyola’s mission and goals. While the findings may guide decision-making in regard to policies and practices at Loyola, it is important to note that the cultural fabric of any institution and unique aspects of each campus’s environment must be taken into consideration when deliberating additional action items based on these findings. The climate assessment findings provide the Loyola community with an opportunity to build upon its strengths and to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. Loyola, with support from senior administrators and collaborative leadership, is in a prime position to actualize its commitment to promote an inclusive campus and to institute organizational structures that respond to the needs of its dynamic campus community.

¹³Guiffreda, Gouveia, Wall, & Seward (2002); Harper & Hurtado (Harper & Hurtado, 2007); Harper & Quaye (Harper & Quaye, 2004); Hurtado & Ponjuan (2005); Rankin & Reason (Rankin & Reason, 2005); Sears (2002); Settles, Cortina, Malley, & Stewart (2006); Silverschanz et al. (Silverschanz et al., 2008); Yosso et al. (Yosso et al., 2009)

References

- Aguirre, A., & Messineo, M. (1997). Racially motivated incidents in higher education: What do they say about the campus climate for minority students? *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 30(2), 26–30.
- Brookfield, S. D. (2005). *The power of critical theory: Liberating adult learning and teaching*. San Diego, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Flowers, L., & Pascarella, E. T. (1999). Cognitive effects of college racial composition on african american student after 3 years of college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40, 669–677.
- Guiffrida, D., Gouveia, A., Wall, A., & Seward, D. (2002). Development and validation of the Need for Relatedness at College Questionnaire (nRC-Q). *Harvard Educational Review*, 1(2), 330–365.
- Hale, F. W. (2004). *What makes racial diversity work in higher education: Academic leaders present successful policies and strategies*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Harper, S. R., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2007(120), 7–24.
- Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (2004). Taking seriously the evidence regarding the effects of diversity on student learning in the college classroom: A call for faculty accountability. *UrbanEd*, 2(2), 43–47.
- Hart, J. L., & Fellabaum, J. (2008). Analyzing campus climate studies: Seeking to define and understand. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 222–234.
- Hurtado, S., & Ponjuan, L. (2005). Latino educational outcomes and the campus climate. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 4(3), 235–251.
- Johnson, A. (2005). *Privilege, power, and difference* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of*

research (Vol. 2). San Diego, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rankin, S. (2003). *Campus Climate for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgendered People: A National Perspective*. New York, NY: National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute.

Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of Student College Development, 46*(1), 43–61.

Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2008). Transformational tapestry model: A comprehensive approach to transforming campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(4), 262–274.

Rankin & Associates Consulting. (2016). Recent Clients.

Sears, J. T. (2002). The institutional climate for lesbian, gay and bisexual education faculty. *Journal of Homosexuality, 43*(1), 11–37.

Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Malley, J., & Stewart, A. J. (2006). The Climate for Women in Academic Science: The Good, the Bad, and the Changeable. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*(1), 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00261.x>

Silverschanz, P., Cortina, L. M., Konik, J., & Magley, V. (2008). Slurs, snubs, and queer jokes: Incidence and impact of heterosexist harassment in academia. *Sex Roles, 58*(3–4), 179–191.

Smith, D. G., Gerbick, G. L., Figueroa, M. A., Watkins, G. H., Levitan, T., Moore, L. C., & Figueroa, B. (1997). *Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Sue, D. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Waldo, C. R. (1998). Out on Campus: Sexual Orientation and Academic Climate in a University Context. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 26*(5), 745–774.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022110031745>

- Whitt, E. J., Edison, M. I., Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2011). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the second and third years of college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 172–204.
- Worthington, R. L., Navarro, R. L., Loewy, M., & Hart, J. L. (2008). Color-blind racial attitudes, social dominance orientation, racial-ethnic group membership and college students' perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(1), 8–19.
- Yosso, T. J., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. G. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(4), 659–690, 781, 785–786.