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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During UNK’s recent strategic planning process, the university reaffirmed its commitment to fostering a climate of mutual respect and an inclusive environment that explicitly values the diversity of individuals, cultures, thought, and expression. With financial support from President Bounds, UNK engaged The Kaleidoscope Group to conduct a comprehensive campus review focusing on diversity and inclusion. Findings will guide recommendations to the Chancellor on key diversity and inclusion strengths to leverage, gaps to address, and means of enhancing UNK efforts moving forward.

Assessment Objectives

The primary purpose of the assessment was to understand the progress UNK has made to date, measure where diversity and inclusion currently stands and make recommendations for any areas of improvement. Data from multiple sources were collected and used as the basis of findings and recommendations. These include:

- Administration of the Diversity and Inclusion Climate survey to the entire UNK community, including all students, faculty, staff, and administrators.
- Focus groups with a diverse selection of all university affiliation groups (students, faculty, staff, administrators) and members of the Kearney and Buffalo County communities.
- Interviews with various university leaders, administrators, faculty, and staff to gain an understanding of their perceptions of current diversity and inclusion efforts.
- Assessment of UNK policies, procedures, activities, and previous research results relating to diversity and inclusion.

Main Findings

The overarching finding is that UNK has made significant progress to encourage diversity and inclusion among university stakeholders, including a boost in diverse student and faculty representation, federal compliance with Affirmative Action Plans, and establishing a campus culture where for the most part everyone feels welcome and different perspectives are respected.

That said, the university has not achieved optimal success as some barriers to inclusion persist, which in turn impacts the ability to draw and retain diversity in representation. Progress appears slow in part because diversity and inclusion efforts have occurred in isolation from one another. In effect, UNK has taken proactive and meaningful steps toward a diverse and inclusive campus, but these are for the most part managed in silos which has in turn limited reach and impact.
Diverse Representation

Advancements in representation at UNK have been made over the past decade. However, the overall increase in diverse representation has not been sufficient to bridge the race and ethnicity gap and bring UNK in line with Nebraska or the broader US population. Approximately 17 percent of the Nebraska population is comprised of racial and ethnically diverse people. However, just 12 percent of the total UNK student body is comprised of non-White students.

A significant gap exists among African Americans, who comprise 4.6 percent of Nebraska’s total population and 13 percent of the total US population, but only 2.1 percent of the 2017 UNK enrollment. Hispanics have stronger representation, comprising 9 percent of 2017 UNK enrollment, 10 percent of Nebraska and 17 percent of the US population. However, given the significant increase in the Hispanic population within historically strong counties for UNK recruitment, additional opportunity exists to boost Hispanic enrollment.

The multicultural segment of faculty, staff, and administrators at UNK also demonstrates some significant gaps. According to the 2017 UNK Diversity and Inclusion Climate Survey, just 2.7 percent of faculty, 2.5 percent of staff, and 7.7 percent of administration identified as African American. Hispanic representation was at similar levels: 3.7 percent of faculty, 3.2 percent of staff, and no administrators. Numbers in some race and ethnic categories are so small, a loss or gain of one individual produces wide variations in multi-year comparisons.

Student Experience

Recruitment and Enrollment

The 7.7 percent decrease in enrollment between the Fall of 2012 and 2017 was driven primarily by drops in Male and White students. The university may be able to offset reduced enrollments by increasing active outreach targeting a more diverse group of student prospects. Current strategic enrollment goals do include some directly tied to diversity, but the potential reach of diversity and inclusion on enrollment goes beyond race and ethnicity. If students of different perspectives and backgrounds do not perceive UNK as a respectful and inclusive community other enrollment goals, such as nonresident domestic and top quartile resident student recruitment, may be negatively impacted.

The 2016 UNK strategic plan includes strategies to increase recruitment of a quality, diverse student body through holistic enrollment management. Though UNK has developed a comprehensive enrollment management plan, there does not appear to be an integrated recruitment plan for UNK. Rather, recruitment strategy and initiatives with a diversity focus appear primarily driven by the Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA), with the Office of International Education (OIE) focused on international students, while broader UNK recruitment is managed by the Office of Recruitment and Admissions.

Website and admissions materials rely heavily on Hispanics and international students to demonstrate diverse representation. There are very few African Americans included, and other dimensions, such as disability or non-gender conforming individuals, are completely absent.
Retention
Retention rates at UNK among Caucasian Non-Hispanics, Hispanics, and first-generation students are comparable and relatively strong. However, African American student persistence rates are considerably lower, with just one-third continuing after their second year at UNK (2014-15 STARs).

A variety of student retention efforts exist, although those targeting diverse and/or at risk students appear limited in scope and resources.

Faculty and Staff Perspective

Recruitment and Hiring
UNK has formal recruitment policies and hiring guidelines in place that clearly support equity. However, there are limited strategies and efforts in place to actively improve diversity among faculty and staff.

Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure
The staff performance evaluation includes a “Cultural Diversity and Sensitivity” factor, but how consistently staff or supervisors understand it, and how it is being used in the evaluation, is not clear. Additionally, the university has also adopted a rather robust process for annual review of faculty performance. However, it has not been updated since 2008 and does not contain any statements or measures specific to supporting an inclusive environment of mutual respect in and out of the classroom.

The process for promotion is clearly outlined in the UNK Faculty Handbook in terms of the procedures and timeline for completion of noted and required steps. The criteria are clear, however, there are insufficient measures included to ensure a fully objective and unbiased assessment for tenure and promotion. Teaching is understood to be the most critical factor in a faculty member’s application, but little guidance is given in terms of quantifiable thresholds. Additionally, there are currently no criteria related to supporting diversity and inclusion (e.g. planning course content, facilitating classroom discussion, service supporting diverse populations and perspectives) included in the process for promotion.

Inclusive Environment

Overall Campus Climate
Overall, the University of Nebraska at Kearney is viewed by its community and stakeholders as a comfortable welcoming environment. There are, however, some areas for improvement as some groups are perceived to be treated with more disrespect, specifically: non-native English speakers, people from other nations, members of the LGBTTQQ community, Muslim, Jewish, and other members of racial or ethnic minority groups.
Perceptions of Exclusionary Bias and Discrimination

Relatively low levels of bias and discrimination exist at UNK overall. However, some groups experience these at higher rates than others. This was reported from two different perspectives: the observation of how others are treated and personal experience.

The most common perception of bias across all survey respondents is racism, followed by homophobia. There are differences in bias perceptions based on university affiliation group. Across all categories of bias, faculty reported the highest perceptions of bias, particularly related to sexism and homophobia. Additionally, some diverse groups feel the effects of discrimination more, with women, Hispanics, African Americans, and certain religious affiliations reporting higher incidence.

Students experienced or observed nearly half of all exclusionary conduct incidents reported in the survey. The most common forms of exclusionary behavior included derogatory verbal comments or remarks, someone being deliberately excluded, ignored, or left out, and bullying or harassment. The most frequently reported places for exclusionary conduct are classrooms and campus facilities or events.

Curricular Diversity and Classroom Environment

While most participants agree that overall representation of diverse groups in course materials is adequate, some believe there are gaps in course material representing LGBTQQ perspectives.

For the most part students feel valued for their contributions in classroom discussions. However, tensions related to race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation were consistently reported. Another common perception is that non-native English speakers and international students may experience more exclusionary behavior in the classroom, perpetuated by some faculty members. This does not happen in all classes but was reported with enough frequency (in focus groups, interviews, and the survey) that it merits mention.

Recommendations

The primary recommendations are to integrate diversity and inclusion into institutional planning and engage in elevating the cultural competency of the entire university community. These steps will increase the role diversity and inclusion plays in UNK’s long-term success, by transforming a series of initiatives led by separate teams into the collective realization of UNK vision and strategy. Ultimately, diversity and inclusion can be leveraged as mechanisms to support long-term institutional growth and sustainability.

Detailed recommendations are provided below and include strategies and tactics to guide decisions that enhance UNK’s diversity and inclusion efforts moving forward. These are structured around five core themes:
1. Diversify Students, Faculty, and Staff

UNK has made great strides in diverse representation over the past ten to fifteen years. However, gaps persist and among some populations remain quite broad. Further action is needed to advance diversity – among students, faculty, staff, and administration – to bring representation in line with the broader UNK mission and vision.

Key recommendations include the following:

- Develop an integrated UNK recruitment plan and team to assure consistent outreach and admissions strategies that attract and support a highly diverse group of students.

- Consider the impact diversity and inclusion has on enrollment goals, beyond racial and ethnic representation. Other dimensions (e.g. sexual identity and orientation, religion) can impact the ability to achieve nonresident domestic and top quartile resident enrollment goals, should prospective students believe they would not fit in at UNK or have concerns about being treated with respect.

- Consider bias and cultural competency training specific to recruitment and hiring for members who work with student recruitment and admissions, along with recruitment and hiring managers for faculty and staff.

- Website and marketing materials need to be inclusive of areas beyond Hispanic and international students (e.g. disabilities and non-gender conformity) to acknowledge the depth of diversity dimensions recognized by UNK and deliver a consistent message of mutual respect and inclusion.

- Consider readdressing faculty and staff placement goals and hiring guidelines. Current AAPs includes some placement goals but are limited, and enhancements to the hiring guidelines could boost access and ultimately increase diversity among faculty and staff at a faster pace.

2. Provide Ongoing Support for Diverse Populations

Some diverse groups currently face challenges at UNK, particularly the disrespectful treatment of non-native English speakers, people from other countries, the LGBTQQQ community, and women. Additionally, Hispanics felt unwelcome at UNK at higher rates than other demographic groups, African American student attrition is extremely high. Immediate support is needed for
these groups to protect retention, reinforce UNK’s commitment to equity and diversity, and send a consistent message to the broader UNK community that this type of behavior is unacceptable. Key recommendations include the following:

- Review organizational resourcing pertaining to the recruitment and retention of historically underrepresented groups. For example:
  - Leverage resources to implement strategies in UNK’s Strategic Plan that focus on at risk populations, such as African American students.
  - OMA has yielded positive results but is lacking in staff and funding resources needed to support a broad range of needs across diversity dimensions.
  - Assess Student Support Services to better understand program impact on historically underrepresented student groups, then determine ways to increase reach and success, such as through collaboration with other departments.

- Consider further investigation of low African American student persistence. Elevated perceptions of discrimination and discomfort were expressed in the survey and focus groups. However, low base sizes prohibit the ability to determine key drivers or draw conclusions from this assessment.

- Assess the promotion, application, and selection process of visible and other key programs such as the Chancellor’s Ambassadors, NSE (New Student Enrollment) leaders, and LPAC (Loper Programming and Activities Council), to ensure access and encourage participation from a diverse group of qualified UNK students.

- Encourage collaboration between Women’s, Gender & Ethnic studies and other departments to support adding a required diversity course as part of the general studies requirement.

- Expand support for diverse groups through initiatives that foster understanding and mutual respect, such as cultural immersion experiences, conversations tables, friendship programs, and informal mentoring.

- Improve the current process regarding discrimination and harassment complaints and concerns. Consistent and timely communication about the issue and its resolution are critical to demonstrating commitment and avoiding the potentially lasting effects of communication challenges, as UNK has experienced in the past.

- Create conflict resolution processes for students, faculty, and staff based on principles of restorative justice, which focuses on repairing harm and creating opportunities to return victims and perpetrators of injustices to a place of resolution and equity.

_Elevate and Encourage Efforts in Diversity and Inclusion_

Expand and enhance policies, practices, and procedures to foster diversity and inclusion. Incentivize and reward achievements that further UNK goals to develop a highly diverse and
inclusive learning environment and community. Address diversity and inclusion needs across the broader Kearney community through mutually beneficial collaboration.

Key recommendations include the following:

- Add a measure to course evaluations that addresses respect for inclusion in the classroom experience.

- Incorporate diversity and inclusion into UNK’s standards of professional conduct for faculty. Clarifying obligations to support inclusion (e.g. planning course content, facilitating classroom discussion) will enhance efforts and ensure accountability.

- Revisit staff performance evaluations to ensure the Cultural Diversity and Sensitivity measure is clearly communicated to staff and provide supervisor training to ensure consistent measurement.

- Identify ways to include and measure inclusive behaviors as part of annual faculty performance review.

- Consider revising faculty tenure and promotion criteria to include measures that can positively impact diversity and inclusion. Examples include:
  - Add a measure regarding inclusive classroom experience to student evaluations and include in the tenure guidelines with defined thresholds.
  - Include training and service related to diversity and inclusion as relevant achievements to support Scholarship and Service criteria.

- Incentivize and reward achievements of faculty and staff that align with the goal of a diverse and inclusive learning environment and community.

- Develop an advisory group of UNK and Kearney community members to identify diversity and inclusion needs, growth opportunities, and develop strategies to address these in the broader Kearney community.

**Assure Sustainable Efforts in Diversity and Inclusion**

How diversity and inclusion can support the university’s success has not been clearly articulated to date, and efforts remain disjointed. Developing an integrated institutional approach to diversity and inclusion will ensure long-term, sustainable advancement.

Key recommendations include the following:

- Establish a vision of success for diversity and inclusion. This would send a strong message to the campus and community, and lay the groundwork for sustainable efforts through the following:
Engage senior administrators and key diversity stakeholders in collaboration to better define what diversity and inclusion means for the success of UNK and, importantly, how it supports UNK’s broader strategic plan.

Gain alignment on common definitions of diversity for the NU system identified in the work completed by the DOC.

- Assign accountability measures to diversity and inclusion in the UNK strategic plan. It is commendable that diversity and inclusion is embedded in UNK’s current strategic plan. Assigning accountability is the next step in this process, to assure these elements are more likely to be achieved.

- Create a new position of Diversity Officer for the campus that is separate from compliance monitoring to organize, facilitate, and manage the recommendations of OMA and EAD. The purpose of this new position is to oversee and manage long term diversity and inclusion sustainability for UNK.

- Regular assessment of UNK’s diversity and inclusion climate is crucial to advancing efforts through accountability. Additionally, coordinating timing on climate updates with UNK strategic planning updates, will assure diversity and inclusion is embedded into the institution, as opposed to executed and measured in a vacuum.

**Enhance Campus-wide Cultural Competence**

Strengthen cultural competency skills across the campus population, enabling students, faculty, staff, and administrators alike to be more effective in their interactions, both in and out of the classroom, with perspectives and cultures other than their own.

Key recommendations include the following:

- Develop a series of town hall style meetings that elevate understanding and personalize the value of diversity and inclusion—to move the dialogue beyond viewing it just as an operational matter or as a “directive from Administration.”

- Take university leaders and key administrators through a Diversity and Inclusion Commitment Journey, aligning on the strategic direction of diversity and inclusion at UNK, elevating awareness and providing implementation support for committed behaviors and actions from UNK leadership.

- Create a Diversity and Inclusion Learning Roadmap to identify key developmental objectives for the institution and across specific departments and/or roles. Objectives are broken down into clear steps and, as such, support long-term planning and goal achievement. Examples include:
  - Diversity and Inclusion Awareness and Managing Bias training tailored for student recruitment and admissions and staff/faculty hiring managers.
  - Communication skills building workshops for selected faculty, staff, and student groups (e.g. Leadership UNK).
In Closing

The Kaleidoscope Group recognizes and applauds the meaningful work the University of Nebraska at Kearney has done in recent years to improve diversity and inclusion on campus, as well as strengthening ties with the greater Kearney community. While there are opportunities for change and improvement, UNK has made progress and demonstrated dedication to continuing to reinforce equal access, respect, and inclusion of all people.

We wish UNK great success as the university moves toward establishing new goals and further strengthens its position as an institution of choice for students, faculty, and staff.
INTRODUCTION

The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) is the regional accrediting body for 19 states and includes the University of Nebraska System. Currently, approximately 1,000 institutions are affiliated with the HLC. The HLC has five criteria for maintaining accreditation. Criterion 1 focuses on an institution’s mission and states that “The institution’s mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution’s operations” (Higher Learning Commission, 2013). Within Criterion 1 are several core components including core component 1C, which states:

The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society; The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society; and the institution’s processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves. (Higher Learning Commission, 2013)

To address the strategic diversity goals established by the Higher Learning Commission and University of Nebraska system, the University of Nebraska at Kearney (UNK) has established the Equity, Access and Diversity (EAD) Advisory to assist the Chancellor in further nurturing a diverse institution, together with fostering an atmosphere of inclusion for faculty, staff, students, and visitors. The EAD serves in an advisory capacity to the Chancellor, offering guidance on issues including comprehensive equity, access, diversity, initiatives, policy, and compliance (e.g. AA/EO/ADA, Title IX, and embracing diversity).

Advisory activity includes regular meetings; annual reporting; advancement of campus awareness and engagement; and contributions to strategic planning, initiatives, and assessment. The EAD also fulfills the function of UNK’s Affirmative Action Commission, whose members form a cadre of qualified members who can serve on hearing panels as required.

During UNK’s recent strategic planning process, UNK reaffirmed its commitment to fostering a climate of mutual respect and an inclusive environment that explicitly values diversity of individuals, cultures, thought, and expression. Senior administrators and the EAD felt that the Fall 2017 semester was the right time to take measure of both progress to date and the current campus climate. Results will be used to identify means of enhancing UNK’s efforts moving forward.

With financial support from President Bounds, UNK engaged The Kaleidoscope Group to conduct a comprehensive campus review focusing on diversity and inclusion. The review included a campus-wide electronic survey (UNK Diversity & Inclusion Campus Climate Survey), secondary documents, and a series of focus groups with students, faculty, staff, administrators, and community representatives invited to participate. Detailed information is provided in this report about methods, findings, and recommendations.
PROJECT OVERVIEW

Purpose

The primary purpose of the assessment is to understand the progress UNK has made to date, to assess where diversity and inclusion currently stands at UNK and to make recommendations for any areas of improvement. Research findings will be used to guide recommendations to the chancellor on key diversity & inclusion strengths to leverage, gaps to address, and means of enhancing UNK efforts moving forward.

Assessment Objectives

This assessment was guided by a set of objectives to assess:

- How well UNK is promoting diversity and equity;
- Practices and/or attitudes that promote or impede inclusive work and learning environments;
- Areas in need of improvement to support an inclusive work and learning environment;
- Examine whether UNK is currently well-positioned and/or sufficiently organized to take advantage of opportunities of excellence, and;
- Identify strategies that best respond to areas in need of improvement.

Methods

Three research methods were used for this study:

1. a survey distributed to campus community members,
2. focus groups and interviews, and
3. secondary document analysis.

This combination enabled the consulting team to extract data reflecting multiple perspectives and points in time, and to provide directional comparisons over time. All participant responses were kept confidential. Each method is described in detail below.

Survey

The Kaleidoscope Group and the UNK EAD Advisory collaborated closely on The UNK Diversity and Inclusion Campus Climate Survey. On November 6, 2017, 5,686 electronic surveys were delivered to students, faculty, staff, and administrators of the UNK campus. Everyone on
campus received the survey so that all would feel included in the research process. Non-respondents received four reminder e-mails from November 13, 2017 to November 27, 2017 to increase response rates.

Survey data collection closed with a dataset of 907 total useable survey responses. However, not every participant responded to every question block or question, as filters were developed to determine the questions most applicable to each participant. Most questions were analyzed using a dataset of approximately 735 responses. Based on the response received, results can be generalized to the larger UNK population.

The survey was comprised of 44 questions. Certain questions were only visible depending on whether participants were students, faculty, staff, or administrators.

The data collected were largely based on Likert-type responses that used a 5-point scale. For open-ended questions, the data obtained were summarized to preserve the privacy of participants. Likert scale responses included the designations/ranks of Strongly Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Somewhat Agree, and Strongly Disagree. It is important to note that Likert-type data are technically categorical, but because a scaled response is used, those data can be interpreted as interval or ratio-level data. However, this approach has some limitations in that it is not possible to measure the distance or numeric value between the scale values, and as such, they are always an approximation that is subjective to the respondent. For surveys such as this (that is, climate and inclusiveness studies), a 5-point Likert scale is standard in the industry.

Data analysis followed three primary stages. First, all survey data were examined for consistency to remove outliers (if necessary) and to test for normalcy of distribution using mean and standard deviation. Data were not normally distributed, which is expected in a survey of this nature. Then, summary responses (from all respondents) for each question were examined in table form, though not all tables were included in this report. Third, cross-tabulations for each question by specific groups of respondents were developed. These cross-tabulations include role in the institution (that is, students, faculty, staff, or administrators) for each question. Then, cross-tabulations by certain demographics—including race and ethnicity, gender, orientation, political affiliation, religion, military service status, and disability—were conducted for most questions and question blocks, except for questions related to experiences or observances of specific types of exclusionary behavior where summations of data were used. The last cross-tabulation for each question examined demographic groups by role (student, faculty, staff, and administrators) with detailed attention to race/ethnicity, gender, orientation, political affiliation, religion, military status, and disability status. Statistical association for each cross-tabulation was evaluated through the chi-square test of association.
Focus Groups

Eight focus groups were convened on November 8 and 9, 2017. Each focus group was 90 minutes long and consisted of 10-12 participants each. In total, 93 participants comprised the following groups:

- Students (two groups)
- Faculty (two groups)
- Staff (two groups)
- Administrators (one group)
- Community Representatives (one group)

The EAD Advisory recommended that participants participate from each homogenous group. Each focus group was led by a facilitator using the same discussion guide (see Appendix D), which was developed by the Kaleidoscope Group and approved by the EAD Advisory. The facilitator took notes and compiled them for later analysis. Discussions were rich in content, and all responses were kept confidential.

In addition to focus groups, meetings were held with the Chancellor's Cabinet, members of the EAD, and Human Resources representatives. These meetings took place on November 8, 2017. These meetings were designed to get clarification on campus systems, policies, and practices.

Analysis of focus group discussion data began with cleaning up notes and grouping responses for each question based on the homogenous groups. Even though responses were grouped, specific responses for each focus group were preserved to identify nuances. The consultant did an initial identification of common themes, and two raters identified common themes to ensure triangulation. Triangulation improved the trustworthiness of the themes that emerge and reduced researcher bias. Common themes are detailed in the findings section. A second layer of analysis occurred to identify noteworthy comparisons and contrasts between each set of homogenous groups (faculty, staff, students, administrators, and community).

Secondary Documents

The Kaleidoscope Group requested an extensive list of documents to gain deeper understanding of policies, procedures, and activities relating to diversity and inclusion at University of Nebraska at Kearney. Additionally, past research results were provided to provide directional understanding of past work and progress that may have been achieved regarding diversity and inclusion. If used in the construction of this report, secondary data sources are listed in the bibliography.

Document analyses were used as support materials in the presentation of key themes and findings, and in considering public and institutional demographic data. They were also used in
reviewing research regarding best practices, in considering progress made over time, and in generating observations and recommendations.

Included in secondary data received was specific curriculum information for courses related to diversity and inclusion from two undergraduate minors: Women’s and Gender Studies and Ethnic Studies. These two programs offer a multidisciplinary approach to teaching students about diversity and inclusion. The Women’s Gender and Ethnic Studies Major has courses that overlap between the two minors, so looking at the two minors separately captured the major components. Looking at the two minors also allowed for specific nuances of each minor to be addressed. Course descriptions and selected syllabi that address various dimensions of diversity were read to identify gaps based on current trends in diversity and inclusion and consultant higher education expertise. Curriculum recommendations are identified and discussed in the Classroom Environment and Curriculum Section.
CAMPUS CLIMATE AND INCLUSIVENESS IN PERSPECTIVE

In the last few decades, campus climate has become a relevant research topic as colleges and universities have become interested in how the social environment influences students, faculty, and staff. There has been limited consensus on how exactly to define campus climate, but the research, in general, has focused on how diversity and multiculturalism are accepted within campuses (Hart & Fellabaum, 2008). “Campus climate” refers to the ways in which different groups interact on campus and the degree to which members of a university community feel accepted by peers and faculty.

Research regarding campus climate is important, as it reveals several factors related to university education and student life that could be used to help facilitate more open access to education. For example, a recent study examined how non-white students feel at predominantly white universities. The results identified over 70 interpersonal racial micro-aggressions toward non-whites. The students in the study reported racial slurs, especially racialization of space via writing on the walls of residence halls. In addition to these perceptions of segregated residence hall spaces, participants perceived that the residence halls that housed higher numbers of ethnic minorities were inferior in quality of housing. Some raised concerns about security regulations as well. Most importantly, participants reported that their negative feelings of exclusion were further worsened when staff members appeared to minimize the importance of racism. This shows not only that universities need to implement diversity programs to help students develop more inclusive behaviors, but also that administrators and staff also play an important role in reducing instances of exclusionary behavior (Harwood, Huntt, Mendenhall, & Lewis, 2012).

Another example of campus climate study research revealed that issues of sexual orientation and gender raised opportunities for students and faculty to feel excluded. This study, concentrated on two-year community colleges, suggested that there is a strong relationship between campus climate and classroom climate for LGBTQQ students. In other words, inclusion of LGBTQQ students in class—both by encouraging interaction with the faculty and fellow students, and by incorporating topics that are important for the LGBTQQ community into the curriculum—is what enhances these students’ feeling of belonging. The study also revealed that classroom inclusion was limited, partly because of the attitudes of community college faculty members, who work mostly part-time and feel detached from the college itself (Garvey, Taylor, & Rankin, 2015).

Immigration has been a significant topic in recent years, but very few studies have examined how international college students experience campus climate issues. A recent study at the University of California Berkeley was completed to understand the connection between campus climate and a sense of belonging among international students. The results showed that campus climate, which included feeling that the students are respected regardless of their race or ethnicity, political or religious beliefs, or sexual orientation, correlates to a sense of belonging on campus for first- and second-generation international students. Interestingly, faculty and peer
interaction had positive effects on international students overall, but faculty interactions did not have much relation to second-generation international students’ sense of belonging. The results show that a sophisticated approach is needed in order to develop a sense of belonging for international students and that developing a fully integrated campus climate is the most important step (Stebleton, Soria, Huesman, & Torres, 2014).

Not only is a climate of exclusion bad for those affected; studies show that diversity itself has positive effects on education. Gurin and her colleagues argued that racial and ethnic diversity have positive effects on educational outcomes, especially learning outcomes (active thinking, motivation, and intellectual engagement) and democratic outcomes (perspective-taking, citizenship engagement, and racial and cultural understanding) (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado & Gurin, 2002).

Students are not the only population affected by the campus climate. Research has shown that campus climate also affects university employees. A study that examined the position of 208 women in academia shows that those who reported negative experience in the workplace, like gender discrimination, sexism and sexual harassment, had poorer job outcomes. Those who reported a positive climate, in which they did not feel in any way discriminated against, described themselves as more productive (Settles, Cortina, Malley, & Stewart, 2006). A study by Sears (2002) reports similar results for LGBTQQQ faculty members. Respondents could classify their institutions as affirming, tolerant, intolerant, or hostile toward sexual minorities. A more positive institutional climate was correlated with feelings of personal support and value.

In summary, campus climate studies have always identified the pulse of a campus at a moment in time. Colleges and universities use data from campus climate studies to shape university policy and ensure that the entire campus community feels valued and included. Climate studies will continue to be important tools for administrators who seek to understand the perceptions of students, faculty, staff, and community leaders.
PART I: DIVERSE REPRESENTATION

This section provides an overview of the progress made to date, current status, and recommendations for enhancements to the diverse representation of UNK students, faculty, staff, and administration. Key areas covered include:

- A brief overview of diversity in the state of Nebraska, the central region, and the Kearney community is provided as important context for current UNK enrollment trends, as approximately 87 percent of the current student population are Nebraska residents.

- Recruitment, admission, and retention of students is then examined and considered within the context of the current state, along with 2020 UNK enrollment goals.

- A review and assessment of practices and policies related to faculty and staff recruitment, hiring, promotion, and tenure is provided.

Changing Landscape of Nebraska

The demographic landscape of Nebraska continues to change, fueled by multiple factors such as industry, immigration, and social progress. One of those changes in recent years is the migration of rural residents to urban centers. Along with demographic change comes opportunity for changes in diversity throughout the Kearney area and Nebraska at large.

Some dimensions of diversity, such as gender or the LGBTQ community, are shifting more in terms of roles, rights, and perceptions. Recent United States Census data suggests that other dimensions, such as race and ethnicity, are experiencing population shifts in Nebraska, driven strongly by immigration. In 1990, immigrants accounted for only 1.8 percent of the state’s total population. By 2010, that share had climbed to 6 percent, and between 2010 and 2014, Nebraska’s foreign-born population increased by an additional almost 11,000 people, growing by almost 10 percent. Today, Nebraska is home to more than 120,000 foreign-born individuals who make their living as anything from software developers to meatpacking workers.

A large percentage of immigrants are of Hispanic origin, so the size of the Hispanic population in Nebraska has more than doubled since the 2000 Census. This is particularly meaningful for UNK, given current enrollment patterns. Half of UNK’s Fall 2017 Nebraska resident student enrollment came from six counties. These six counties happen to be home to 58 percent of the total Hispanic population in Nebraska, but only 40 percent of the total White, Non-Hispanic population (Source: US Census). Additionally, high school graduate figures presented in the 2013 North Central Association Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Self Study project a 145 percent increase in Hispanic high school graduates in Nebraska by 2018, while the pool of Caucasian Non-Hispanic high school graduates is expected to decline by approximately 15 percent during this same time period.

Due to the size and continued growth of the population in Nebraska, and UNK’s historical enrollment patterns, Hispanics should be a critical component to UNK’s strategic enrollment
goals. This is not to say Hispanics should be the sole focus of diversity recruitment and admissions efforts. There are certain gaps in representation at UNK, given population size to UNK student and faculty ratios, particularly among the African American population. Additionally, there are other affinity groups and diversity dimensions that may be considered well-represented at UNK but require additional support and resources to ensure an inclusive and welcoming environment is cultivated, to drive retention, and achieve the university’s broader vision to ‘preparation of students to lead responsible and productive lives in a democratic, multicultural society.’

The People of UNK

The people of the University of Nebraska at Kearney include representatives of diverse populations in terms of religion, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, political ideology, and veteran status. By and large, everyone lives and learns together in an environment that is substantively free of conflict, cohesive, and productive. While there are exceptions, UNK has been largely successful in recruiting diverse populations to the University. Figures 1 through 8 provide detailed information about the people of UNK in terms of their university affiliation group (that is, students, faculty, staff, and administrators) across multiple dimensions of diversity.

The most common demographic characteristics of survey participants are heterosexual female, non-Hispanic White, Republican, Protestant Christian, does not have a disability, and is not currently enlisted in the military or a veteran. This profile is generally representative of the University and is an indicator that our survey sample, though not entirely random, is sufficiently representative of UNK that we are comfortable presenting conclusions based on the data acquired.
FIGURE 2:
GENDER IDENTITY BY UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION GROUP

FIGURE 3:
SEXUAL ORIENTATION BY UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asexual</th>
<th>Bisexual</th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Heterosexual</th>
<th>Lesbian</th>
<th>Queer</th>
<th>Questioning</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 4: RACE AND ETHNICITY BY UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American/Black</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>White/Middle Eastern</th>
<th>Two or more races</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino/Latina/LatinX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrator</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Student**
- **Faculty**
- **Staff**
- **Administrator**
- **Total**
FIGURE 5: DISABILITY ACROSS ALL UNIVERSITY GROUPS

- No Disability
- ADHD
- Asperger’s
- Emotional/Psychological
- Hearing
- Learning Disability
- Medical/health
- Physical/mobility
- Traumatic Brain Injury
- Visual
- Other (please specify)
- Prefer not to answer

FIGURE 6: POLITICAL AFFILIATION BY UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7: Religious Affiliation (all University Groups)

- Agnostic
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- Christian – Mormon
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- Nothing; non-religious
- Other
- Prefer not to say
One potential area for improvement for UNK in terms of demographic composition involves increasing representation among certain groups. In this respect, the greatest racial/ethnic gap is among African Americans, who comprise 4.6 percent of Nebraska’s total population and 13 percent of the total US population. However, African Americans accounted for just 2.1 percent of the 2017 UNK enrollment and 2.5 percent of survey respondents. While progress has been made related to diverse student representation, the overall increase in diverse student representation over the past 10-15 years has not been sufficient to bridge the race and ethnicity gap and bring UNK in line with Nebraska or the broader US population. Approximately 17 percent of the Nebraska population is comprised of racial and ethnically diverse residents. However, just 12 percent of the total UNK student body is comprised of non-White students (excludes nonresident aliens).

Several other dimensions were also considered when assessing diverse representation at UNK. Unless otherwise noted, the source is the 2017 UNK Diversity and Inclusion Climate Study:

- As of Fall 2017, male students represent 39.3 percent of the total student population, and females represent 60.6 percent.

- Based on results of the 2017 UNK Diversity and Inclusion Survey which served as a primary data source for the assessment, nearly 80 percent (79.6%) of respondents identified as heterosexual. The next largest group identified as asexual (10.7%), and just under 10 percent (9.85%) identified as gay, lesbian, queer, or questioning. The remaining respondents (2.3%) self-identified as “other” in terms of sexual orientation. According to a 2017 Gallup poll, 3.6 percent of the adult population in Nebraska identifies as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transsexual.

- Survey results also indicate that just 1.5 percent identified as transgender, non-binary, or gender nonconforming.
Slightly over 60 percent of students reported ascribing to a Christian religion that includes Catholic, Mormon, and Protestant denominations. This mirrors the larger Kearney community.

The next largest group in terms of religious affiliation identified as Agnostic or Atheist (combined 12.1%), followed by no religion or non-conforming religious affiliation (7.8%).

Very few participants (18 total, or 2.4%) identify themselves as Hindi, Buddhist, Jewish, or Muslim. Under 1 percent of the Kearney population are Jewish, ascribe to an Eastern religion, or are Muslim (2017 UNK Diversity and Inclusion Climate Study).

Diversity Among Students: Enrollment and Retention

Across the nation, enrollment at colleges and universities has decreased. In part, this is a product of an improved economy with low unemployment rates. There also are a greater number of regionally accredited institutions offering degree programs in a variety of ways ranging from the traditional, residential college experience to fully online programs. State funded universities find themselves in the position of competing for students against non-profit, private universities, and proprietary institutions. These factors have, in combination with the changing demographics of key Nebraska counties, contributed to reductions in enrollment at UNK, which appears to be primarily driven by a drop in White and Male students.

However, progress has been made in increasing the size of the diverse student population for over a decade, with a 156 percent increase in non-white/non-Hispanic students (excludes non-resident aliens) between 2005 to 2017. This growth was strongly led by a significant increase in Hispanic student enrollment (191 total students in 2005 to 603 in 2017). Overall, Hispanics are better represented at UNK, at 9.0 percent of Fall 2017 student enrollment.

Hispanics comprise 10 percent of the Nebraska, and 17 percent of the US population, and there is evidence that UNK is moving towards strong Hispanic representation. However, when broader UNK enrollment patterns and regional population growth patterns are taken into consideration, there is still a Hispanic gap at UNK. 50 percent of UNK student enrollment coming from six Nebraska counties; the combined Hispanic population in these counties is considerably higher than the state average.

Asians and African Americans also had significant growth during this time, however as their total size at UNK is so small, strong growth rates have not translated into significant enrollment figures. In 2017 there were only 55 Asian students enrolled at UNK. However, 5.9 percent of students are international, the majority of which are from Asian countries (primarily Korea, Japan, and China). Therefore, perspective on Asian representation at UNK varies, depending on whether US residents only are considered or in tandem with nonresident aliens.

Other groups are underrepresented at UNK, in terms of student enrollment size, according to the 2017 UNK Diversity and Inclusion Climate Study:
• The majority (77.8%) reported having no disability. The remaining 20.3 percent of respondents reporting on this question were diverse in their responses in that every category of disability, including “other” and “prefer not to answer,” was represented. Emotional and psychological disabilities were most prevalent (8.9%).

• Slightly more participants identified as Republican (35%) than Democrat (29%). Approximately one quarter (25.8%) identified as Independent. This distribution varies from the Kearney community where nearly 70 percent of registered voters are Republican, slightly over 25 percent are Democrats, and under 3 percent are Independent.

• Only 3.4 percent of survey participants identified as being active duty or veteran military members whereas approximately 7 percent of the Kearney community are military veterans. However, it should be noted that most Kearney veterans are older so the comparison may not directly relate to measuring UNK representation in this case.

The UNK Strategic Enrollment Goals 2020 include a list of 16 specific goals regarding increasing the size and composition of the overall university headcount enrollment. Two of these goals are directly tied to diversity:

• Increase racial and ethnic diversity of the student body to 15 percent (1080 of 7,200).

• Increase the overall head count enrollment of Hispanic students to 13 percent of the student body (936 of 7,200).

Based on Fall 2017 enrollment figures, the 2020 goals represent modest growth for diverse students overall (current diverse student enrollment is at 978 vs. 1,080 goal). However, Hispanics represent approximately two-thirds (67%) of total projected growth in UNK enrollment (2020 student enrollment is projected to include an additional 556 students overall, with Hispanics comprising 370 of this total). It is important to take these figures into account in recruitment strategy development and resource planning.

Currently low African American and Asian American student enrollment should also be considered when establishing growth goals and action plans. Several key variables should be given weight in strategic decisions:

• Low representation of these groups in traditional recruitment areas for UNK will require new strategies and either a shift or increase in resources.

• Relatively low population size in Nebraska overall will require targeted outreach efforts in-state to see best results.

• Non-resident domestic student goals may also support additional recruitment efforts targeting African American and Asian American students.

Finally, diversity can have a strong impact on many of the Strategic Enrollment Goals outside of racial and ethnic representation. Nonresident domestic, overall retention rates, and admissions from top quartile Nebraska students are examples of goals that should take broader diversity dimensions (i.e. sexual identity and orientation, disability, and religion) into consideration during
strategy implementation. Meaning, a broader perspective of diversity should be embedded into enrollment strategy goal development to support goal achievement. Ensuring all students feel welcome and respected at UNK is most critical to achieving broader enrollment goals.

**Diverse Student Recruitment**

The 2016 UNK Strategic Plan lists strategies to increase recruitment of a quality, diverse student body through holistic enrollment management. These include:

- Elevate expectations for every unit/member of the campus community to embrace the critical role each plays in recruiting/retaining students—emphasizing engagement, positive interactions, and mutual respect.
- Evaluate and enhance all aspects of recruitment (e.g., Admissions & Financial Aid strategies, campus tours and academic department visits, marketing/messaging, transfer processes).
- Deploy targeted initiatives to increase enrollments of transfer, minority, and international students and increase presence in specific Nebraska schools with strong academic programs and high number of quality graduates.

The first point regarding everyone’s role in creating an inclusive and welcoming environment is critical to the overall success of diverse student recruitment and retention. This goes well beyond the role of Admissions, the Office of Multicultural Affairs, and Student Affairs - and is covered in more depth in the Inclusive Environment section of this report.

Current diverse outreach is primarily led by the Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA), with the Office of International Education (OIE) focused on international students, and broader recruitment efforts are run through Admissions. A bilingual staff member was hired within Admissions to support inbound communication needs. However, there is no clear approach for handling broader diversity recruitment, beyond Hispanic needs, and, whilst a comprehensive enrollment management plan has been developed, there appears to be no integrated recruitment efforts.

Consider embedding diversity into the broader institutional recruitment efforts. Having an integrated team work together to enhance UNK recruitment can limit redundancies and inefficiencies that occur where two or more groups work in the same area, but function in silos. The result of integrated efforts is an increase in resource efficiency and consistency in delivery and execution. Ultimately, it also supports UNK’s commitment to diversity and inclusion through a message of ‘we,’ as opposed to directing diverse students to programming and support ‘for them.’

**Tactics and Messaging**

Recruitment efforts have expanded considerable in the past few years as documented in the 2016 OMA Self Study report, although close to home, face-to-face recruitment remains the primary focus. Key initiatives include:
• Hosting the Nebraska Cultural Unity Conference
• Hosting the Multicultural Scholars and Leaders Day
• Individual High School Visits
• Organizations/Heritage Months/Upcoming Events
• Merit and Need-Based Financial Aid

The UNK website and admissions materials rely heavily on Hispanics and international students to demonstrate diverse representation. There are very few African Americans and other diversity dimensions that can be visibly identified. For example, visibly apparent disabilities or non-gender conforming individuals are completely absent.

Initiatives and messaging also seemed weighed towards Hispanics and international students. This perception was also identified in focus groups, as some participants feel UNK portrays greater diversity than actually exists in marketing materials. Others pointed toward the emphasis on international students. As one focus group participant put it, “Apply the same resources as recruiting international students for recruiting US minorities based on race, gender, sexual orientation, etcetera.”

Given the breadth and depth of potential diversity dimensions that could be taken into consideration for initiative/event planning and communications, it is important for UNK to first determine a detailed, consistent definition of diversity at UNK and priority areas of focus. Then clearly articulate how diversity can support the overall institutions mission and goals. With this level of clarity, strategy and resource planning can be developed to achieve maximum positive impact.

**Diverse Student Persistence and Retention**

Institutional retention, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, is defined as the percentage of students who complete a program or maintain enrollment at their first institution, while persistence refers to students who complete a program or maintain enrollment at any institution. Reporting, specifically in STARS, is not clear on differences between persistence and retention; these terms are used interchangeably. For purposes of this report, we also use persistence and retention interchangeably, but recognize that there may be advantages to UNK to recognize the differences between the two measures and report outcomes for each group separately for purposes of long-term planning.

Retention rates among Caucasian Non-Hispanics, Hispanics, and First Generation are all comparable and strong (74.2%, 73.4%, and 71.3% after the second year, 2014-15 STARs), and even higher for international students at 90.3 percent. Based on these figures, it would appear the current level support for Hispanic and international students is yielding positive results.

However, African American student persistence rates are considerably lower than all other demographic subgroups, with just one-third continuing after their second year at UNK (2014-15 STARs). African American retention, particularly males, is a challenge on a national level; the
National Student Clearinghouse Research Center estimates a roughly 55 percent completion rate for African American Students. However, the retention of African American students at UNK is extremely low as compared to other groups, implying a greater issue that requires further examination to determine the root cause.

Retention figures for other diverse groups, such as students with disabilities, those who identify as LGBTQQ, gender non-conforming, and other dimensions of diversity outside gender, race, and ethnicity are not available.

Current efforts to support students at UNK are extensive. Some resources are available to all students, while others target first generation, low income and/or diverse students. Current retention efforts include:

- The Office of Student Engagement, along with OMA, provide numerous opportunities to become actively engaged in student organizations, student governance, community service, special events opportunities, and mentoring activities.
- Roughly 200 UNK students (2013 TRiO Self Study Report) are served by Student Support Services, which provides academic tutoring, personal counseling, mentoring, financial guidance, and other support for educational access and retention.
- The UNK Counseling Center provides short-term professional counseling, supporting the growth of UNK students’ academic, emotional, and social wellbeing.
- The Learning Commons targets the needs of students wanting to improve their understanding of course material through the development of stronger learning skills.
- The Disability Services for Students coordinates reasonable accommodations to afford equal opportunity and full participation in UNK programs for undergraduate and graduate students with disabilities, according to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, and the Amendments Act of 2008.
- The Office of Residence Life is dedicated to providing service and support to students’ needs. This office coordinates all aspects of the residence halls and off-campus apartments.

Focus group data indicates that UNK sponsors and hosts many events that promote specific cultures or special interest groups. While participants largely were appreciative of these opportunities to explore other cultures and perspectives, many also commented that the approach is somewhat disjointed and siloed and leaves the impression that these are segregated events for specific groups, and by default, exclude others from participation. Some focus group participants view these efforts as ways to learn about other cultures, but that the presentations and events tend to lack context that would allow participants to understand how the event fits into the broader UNK campus culture.

We also heard concerns from focus group participants that these events are largely focused on Hispanic and international diversity, and as a result may exclude other diverse groups that are part of the UNK community. One cause of this may be that OMA resources are insufficient and
as a result, decisions are made to provide programming that appeal to the largest diverse communities.

Student Codes of Conduct can also serve as another retention support mechanism, as reinforcement of a commitment to providing an inclusive environment. UNK has a Student Code of Conduct in place, but it is less clear whether the Code of Conduct adequately addresses issues related to diversity and inclusion. It is worth noting that no statements or prescribed behaviors are linked to respecting diversity or students’ roles in ensuring an inclusive environment. However, in 2016 a Student Statement of Values was developed and includes direct reference to mutual respect and dignity, being open-minded and valuing the intrinsic worth and ideas of others. Integrating these values into the Student Code of Conduct may give them more weight and provide another opportunity for broad communication about the University’s commitment to diversity and inclusion.

Conclusions on Student Diversity Efforts

- Diverse representation at UNK has grown over the past 12 years, and while all groups have seen an increase, growth is most heavily driven by Hispanics.
- The changing landscape of Nebraska and the region UNK has historically drawn from, have changed considerably during this same timeframe. Hispanics play a strong role in population growth, particularly in counties with strong UNK enrollment.
- African Americans and Asian Americans are underrepresented at UNK.
- The LGBTQQ community is represented at UNK among students, but many diversity dimensions are not easily tracked so it’s not possible to understand where representation stands.
- African Americans have considerably lower retention rates than all other groups at UNK.
- Most diversity recruitment and retention efforts appear specific to Hispanics and international students.
- Recruitment is lacking an integrated team, strategy, and approach, as for the most part, diverse recruitment is still managed by OMA.
- There is a lack of broad diverse representation in the website and admissions materials – diversity is also heavily weighted to Hispanic and international students.

Recommendations for Diverse Student Recruitment, Enrollment, and Retention

- Many factors come into play when considering diverse recruitment beyond US Census figures and historic UNK performance. Broader diversity and inclusion vision for UNK, nonresident domestic student, and other enrollment profile goals must be considered to determine the best strategy and implementation plan for UNK moving forward.
• There are other affinity groups and diversity dimensions that may be considered well-represented at UNK but may require additional support and resources to ensure an inclusive and welcoming environment is provided, to drive retention and achieve the university’s broader vision to ‘preparation of students to lead responsible and productive lives in a democratic, multicultural society.’

• Diversity can have a strong impact on many of the Strategic Enrollment Goals outside of racial and ethnic representation. Nonresident domestic and top quartile Nebraska students are examples of goals that should take broader diversity dimensions into consideration, such as sexual identity and orientation, disability, and religion. Ensuring all students feel welcome and respected at UNK is most critical to achieving broader enrollment goals.

• An integrated, UNK recruitment team can solve for some resources concerns, as it eliminates multiple departments/units working in silos. Additionally, it can increase the quality and impact of efforts, with many perspectives included in internal teams communicating externally, and culturally relevant messages and approaches applied when needed.

• Ensure the right level of resources are in place to support diverse student retention. While UNK has extensive programs in place, many lack sufficient resources and staffing to support the volume of need. Student Support Services specifically mentions wait lists. It’s important to ensure easy access to support, so a detailed evaluation of the right level of resources in line with current levels of diversity, and growth projections, is needed.

• Assess the promotion, application, and selection process of visible and other key programs such as the Chancellor’s Ambassadors, NSE (New Student Enrollment) leaders, and LPAC (Loper Programming and Activities Council), to ensure access and encourage participation from a diverse group of qualified UNK students.

• There is a need for culturally relevant messaging and diversity in images, as it is important for potential students to see themselves at UNK.

• Consider incorporating conduct related to respecting diversity and mutual respect in an inclusive learning environment to the Student Code of Conduct, raise awareness, and make the document more easily available to all.

**Diversity Among Faculty and Staff: Recruitment, Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure**

While female representation is strong among faculty, staff, and administrators, racial and ethnic minorities are underrepresented among all groups. A relatively smaller proportion of faculty and staff self-identify as LGBTQQ as compared to students, with 4.2 percent of faculty, 3.1 percent of staff, and no administrators. Other notable findings related to diversity among faculty and staff include the following elements:
• Affirmative Action Plans for Minorities, Females, Individuals with Disabilities, and Veterans are significant progress towards improving diverse representation among the UNK employee population, but areas of opportunity exist to facilitate the increase of diversity among staff and faculty.

• The University of Nebraska at Kearney has adopted a rather robust process for the annual review of faculty performance; however, it appears to have not been updated since 2008.

• While UNK has established standards of professional conduct for faculty, these do not include any statements on fostering an inclusive learning and/or classroom environment.

• The process for promotion is clearly outlined in the UNK Faculty Handbook in terms of the procedures and timeline for completion of noted and required procedural steps. Criteria for promotion and tenure are set at the departmental level, however, clear and measurable decision criteria is lacking at the institutional level for university-wide expectations across disciplines and programs.

**Diversity of Faculty, Staff and Administrators**
Multicultural representation of faculty, staff, and administrators at UNK is low, compared to Nebraska and national averages. According to the 2017 UNK Diversity and Inclusion Climate Survey, 23 percent of Faculty, and 15.4 percent (2 out of 13) Administrators identify as a race and/or ethnicity other than White. And numbers in specific race and ethnic categories are so small in some cases that a loss or gain of a single individual tends to produce wide variations in multi-year comparisons. Greater progress has been made with female representation within the faculty, albeit not as quickly in senior positions. There is strong female representation among faculty, staff, and administrators.

Most of university employees identified as heterosexual, and the next largest group identified as asexual, albeit at a low proportion (6.4% and less). A smaller proportion self-identify as LGBTQ than students, with 4.2 percent of faculty, 3.1 percent of staff, and no administrators. These figures are in line with state comparisons - according to a 2017 Gallup poll, 3.6 percent of the adult population in Nebraska identifies as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, or Transsexual.

**Recruitment and Hiring**
The University of Nebraska at Kearney, like most other traditional publicly funded institutions, relies on national searches for faculty. The University also has Affirmative Action Plans (AAP) in place for Minorities and Females, Individuals with Disabilities, and Veterans. These include some fundamentals of a strong plan, including structure, policies, processes, and some assessment reports.

The AAPs for Minorities and Females, Individuals with Disabilities and Veterans contain robust reviews of processes and targeted recruitment efforts. These include recruitment strategies such as targeting colleges and universities with a significant number of target groups.
represented, publishing job advertisements in targeted sources, using specialized recruitment companies, and using the Employment Delivery System. Additional steps are mentioned to support internal promotion and advancement, including mentorship programs, job training, and tuition reimbursement to employees. The remaining steps included in the AAPs detail reviews of employment decisions, hires/promotions, termination, and compensation.

A set of Action-Oriented Programs have also been instituted for minorities and females, to ensure no barriers to employment exist. Several of these programs include evaluations and measures to ensure a fair recruitment and hiring process, such as a robust selection process evaluation, training for personnel and management staff on EEO and best practice interview and selection processes.

Additionally, UNK has a formal Recruitment Policy and Hiring Guidelines for faculty and staff. While there are strategies for recruitment of Individuals with Disabilities and Veterans in their respective AAPs, it is worth noting UNK’s current recruitment policy only references strategies and efforts for minorities and women. The Hiring Guidelines include fundamental guidelines and steps to ensure a fair and equitable process.

Internal auditing and reporting systems are in place in all Affirmative Action Plans at UNK. Personnel activities for Individuals with Disabilities and Veterans are reviewed at least annually, so adequate measures should be in place. However, the Minorities and Females AAP states activities are reviewed “as necessary and desirable.”

The Minorities and Females AAP does include both a Placement Goals Report and Goal Attainment Report for the year prior. However, the job groups in each do not align, so it is difficult to draw conclusions, particularly as the Goal Attainment Report does not include any Faculty, which would be a critical component to any Placement Goals, given the low representation of minorities and lower representation of women in certain faculty roles, such as full Professor.

Some enhancements can be considered as UNK actively seeks to enhance diversity among faculty and staff. These do not need to be a part of the AAPs specifically, and it is important to note goals regarding diversity do not need to be limited to placement. Alternatives such as advertising, outreach efforts, amendments to the search committee process, and procedures such as removing names from resumes for initial review can also be considered to demonstrate more active efforts to ensure equity and access in the hiring processes. Additionally, continued development for those involved in the hiring process, albeit search committees or hiring managers, on addressing bias in the search and hiring process is critical.

Finally, analysis conducted by the University of Nebraska at Kearney Education Association conclude that, as of 2012, UNK does not have gender equity issues with respect to salaries for women faculty members (Source: 2013 NCA HLC Self-Study). And the Minorities and Females AAP includes salary as part of the personnel activities reviewed. However, concerns about salary equality and discrimination against women at UNK came up various times over the course of the research, particularly among faculty and staff. Additionally, the Staff Senate survey results include salary structure for staff as an issue staff would like to have addressed.
No data were provided to demonstrate disparity in salary, but given the concerns mentioned, additional transparency and communication about salary structure is suggested.

**Performance Measurement**

Measuring employee performance is an important step in diversity and inclusion, as it serves as a method for equality and a means to identify key issues to address to ensure an inclusive environment. This section focuses on the performance, promotion, and tenure of UNK staff and faculty.

Currently the Board of Regents requires a formal staff performance appraisal be completed on an annual basis. The evaluation form is comprised of measures specific to each individual role, and a standard set of 15 measures. One of these is related to “Cultural Diversity and Sensitivity,” although it is not clear how consistently staff or supervisors interpret the statement, nor how it is being used in the evaluation process.

The University of Nebraska at Kearney has adopted a robust process for the annual review of faculty performance, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook, which is the guiding policy for faculty members. One of the key strengths of the annual review process is its support of UNK as a teaching institution that places an emphasis on the instruction and cultivation of the student experience. A positive element is that the annual performance reviews and tenure processes include the requirement of classroom visitations and peer review of teaching. Furthermore, student evaluations of every course instructed for each professor or lecturer are critical elements, underscoring the value and importance of the student experience.

Annual faculty performance evaluations are conducted for each faculty member at every rank, and for tenure track faculty members, the annual review is a process used to support the tenure and promotion of probationary faculty by providing a written assessment of performance related to teaching, scholarship, and service (prioritized in that order). The annual review is also an opportunity to support faculty who have attained tenure, but not yet full promotion to full professor by providing a formal mechanism for feedback related to teaching, scholarship, and service with the goal of supporting the success of the faculty member in attaining the rank of full professor. However, the tenure and review process appears to have not been updated since 2008, so may not reflect culture shifts or organizational priorities related to teaching, scholarship, and service in a way that more actively promotes diversity and inclusion in the classroom and workplace.

UNK has established standards of professional conduct for faculty, albeit outdated as the last recorded update appears to have been in 2005. These standards include statements on discrimination and sexual harassment. However, diversity and inclusion are not addressed. Specifically, including reinforcement on UNK’s dedication to ensuring an inclusive environment, together with detailed description of faculty obligations to support inclusion (e.g. planning course content, facilitating classroom discussion) can enhance efforts and ensure accountability for individual faculty actions.
**Promotion and Tenure**

The process for promotion is clearly outlined in the UNK Faculty Handbook in terms of the procedures and timeline for completion of noted and required steps. The criteria is clear, however, there are insufficient measures included to ensure a fully objective and unbiased assessment for tenure and promotion. Teaching is understood to be the most critical factor in a faculty member’s application, but little guidance is given in terms of quantifiable thresholds for effectiveness in teaching, creativity, or course management. The same ambiguity exists in the Faculty Handbook related to Scholarship. The section on service is a bit more detailed in that it includes examples of appropriate evidence of service activities that may be considered in the tenure and promotion review process. Finally, there are currently no criteria related to supporting diversity and inclusion (e.g. planning course content, facilitating classroom discussion, service supporting diverse populations and perspectives).

Many within higher education have noted some concerns with the tenure and promotion process across US institutions, from an equity, access, and diversity perspective. One of the most frequently mentioned is a lack of criteria with objective measures. Tenure decisions are most often made by a committee of Associate or Full Professors following a list of criteria without clear measures to guide the decision process. As an example, publication in high impact academic journals, along with an active research agenda with external funding, are typically presumed to carry more weight for decisions around tenure and/or promotion than others such as teaching or service - but to what degree is not clear. Additionally, effectiveness in teaching and/or ensuring an inclusive learning environment are not commonly assessed with quantifiable measures and thresholds. Without clear measures embedded into the criteria, the possibility of bias and exclusion entering the tenure decision process is greater.

**Training and Development**

UNK has multiple practices and initiatives in place to help diverse talent retention through supporting professional growth and development. Some of these include Leadership UNK for staff members, Staff and Faculty Senates, and ad hoc professional development and training. In addition, Leadership UNK provides staff employees with exposure to leadership opportunities on campus and in the Kearney community. This program is an excellent platform to foster diverse staff development, so it is important to ensure the program, the application process, and communications are designed to foster equal access.

The Staff and Faculty Senates address topics affecting members of those communities at a policy level and promotes elements of faculty and staff governance that are essential to community building and meeting regional accreditation standards. Ensuring diverse representation is critical to equitable and consistent practices.

In a recent Staff Senate Professional Development Survey, multiculturalism and diversity garnered relatively low interest among staff for training and development topics. However, topics such as conflict management and improving communication ranked toward the top. These skills are usually at the core of diversity and inclusion training. Staff perceptions of each supports a recurring theme throughout the research: there is a lack of consistent understanding
about issues at the core of diversity and inclusion, and elevated cultural competency will support the continued growth and development of staff and faculty.

**Conclusions**

In many ways, UNK employees are representative of the community in which it is situated and serves. The University, like the community surrounding it, is largely White, Heterosexual, Protestant, Republican, with a relatively small military veteran population. Of the 323 faculty members at UNK, 281 (or 87 percent) are White Non-Hispanic. Only six faculty members are Hispanic, and an additional six are Black. The University’s greatest opportunity for enhancing diversity among the faculty and staff population is to increase resourcing and focus on the recruitment and hiring of more diverse individuals.

Regarding promotion, tenure, and retention, UNK has some institutional policies that are significant and impressive departures from traditional higher education in the United States. These focus on the quality of instruction for faculty members at various positions and ranks, as opposed to the singular focus on grant funded research and research publications that is the dominant culture at research-intensive universities. However, some policies and practices, such as performance measurement and the tenure process, should be reviewed as part of the efforts to advance equity, access, and diversity. And new policies should be considered to enhance consistency in inclusive conduct and provide a platform to hold UNK faculty and staff to consistent standards.

Professional development and training opportunities to support diverse staff and retention appear based at the department level, so are difficult to assess their scope and impact. And finally, lack of knowledge and understanding about key diversity and inclusion topics, and how to interact with individuals from diverse backgrounds appear to be barriers to developing a consistently inclusive campus at UNK. Cultural competency development for faculty and staff is needed to address these concerns and support diverse retention.
Recommendations

In terms of creating opportunities for improving diversity and inclusion among faculty and staff, along with supporting equity for faculty members seeking tenure and promotion, we recommend the following:

- Some enhancements are recommended for the Recruitment Policy and Hiring Guidelines, to reinforce commitment to diversity and inclusion for all UNK community members. For example:
  - Readdressing the diverse groups singled out in the Recruitment Policy for additional support to enhance recruitment and hiring opportunities.
  - Ensure hiring criteria and advertising statements do not include exclusionary comments or demonstrate bias.
  - Consider increasing the minimum requirement of diverse members and expanding the diversity dimensions included in search committee minority member requirements. For example, consider expanding minority requirements to two of the three members, however, dimensions can include sexual orientation, religion, political affiliation. The objective is to build a search committee rich in diverse perspectives and ideas that can enhance the hiring process.
  - Consider blind recruitment tactics, such as removing names and other personally identifiable information from resumes and applications.
  - Continue training for hiring managers and search committees on cultural competency and bias in the hiring process.

- Convene faculty of all ranks to revisit and update the 2008 revision to the Faculty Handbook regarding performance reviews, tenure, and promotion for faculty. Minimally, this process should focus on evaluation of diversity and inclusion in the critical elements of teaching, scholarship, and service. We recommend that each of these elements include specific examples of what inclusion would look like in a way that is respectful to the discipline. Then use faculty governance processes to implement diversity and inclusion as a standard for performance evaluation to help set the culture shift that is needed to embrace an inclusive learning and working environment.

- Ensure that annual performance appraisal processes for faculty and staff include performance measures related to diversity and inclusion, which are clearly understood by contributors and supervisors. Provide supervisor training to ensure diversity and inclusion is addressed appropriately and consistently in the process.

- Evaluate tenure guidelines, measures, and criteria to ensure an equitable process that is respectful of academic disciplines.

- Assure the development of mechanisms that include teaching evaluations as part of the tenure and promotional review process for all academic departments.
• Encourage professional development in diversity and inclusion, and consider these efforts as rated criteria related to service for purposes of tenure and promotion.

• Update the faculty standards for professional conduct to include standards for diversity and inclusion. Specifically, include reinforcement of UNK’s dedication to ensuring an inclusive environment, together with detailed description of faculty obligations to support inclusion (e.g. planning course content, facilitating classroom discussion) that enhance efforts and ensure accountability for individual faculty actions.
PART II: INCLUSIVE ENVIRONMENT

Research findings regarding an inclusive environment at UNK are presented according to the following key focus areas:

- Overall campus climate (comfortable, welcoming, and respectful)
- Perceptions of bias and discrimination
- Experienced or observed exclusionary attitudes and behaviors
- Diversity in curriculum
- Classroom environment
- Perceptions of the Kearney community

Within each focus area, an overview of key findings is provided, followed by the presentation detailed of findings according to demographic groups of respondents, including where possible:

- University group affiliation (student, faculty, staff, or administrator)
- Gender and gender identity
- Sexual orientation
- Race and ethnicity
- Religion
- Political affiliation
- Military status

Conclusions and Recommendations are provided at the end of each focus area section.

Findings from the 2017 Diversity and Inclusion Climate Survey are a primary data source. Focus group results are also included in this section, as applicable, to offer support to key findings and add depth and context to analysis and findings. Where relevant, comparisons to past research and external sources are also made and appropriately noted. Sources include, but are not limited past UNK climate studies, and various self-study documents, including the Self Study for the Higher Learning Commission.
Overall Campus Climate

In total, 744 participants among students, faculty, staff, and administrators responded to Diversity and Inclusion Climate Survey questions related to campus climate and reported their perceptions of the degree of respect with which certain groups of people are perceived and treated. Students, faculty, administrators, and staff generally feel comfortable on campus and that UNK, as a whole, is a welcoming place to live and learn. There were, however, some indications that not all UNK community members feel comfortable or welcome:

- Across all university affiliations and demographic groups, non-native English speakers are perceived to most likely to be treated disrespectfully to some extent (at 36.3%). This group is followed by people from other nations (17.1%), members of the LGBTQQQ community (16.3%), and Muslims or members of racial or ethnic minority groups (both at 16%).

- Additionally, among respondents who self-identified on Race and Ethnicity, nearly 40 percent (39.8%) viewed the climate toward Jewish people to be disrespectful or very disrespectful.

- Among Christian-based religions, including Protestantism, Catholicism, and Mormonism, 6.4 percent of respondents view UNK as unwelcoming to some extent. By contrast, 14.3 percent of those who identify as Agnostic, Atheist, or non-religious reported that UNK is unwelcoming.

- Nearly every race and ethnicity, apart from African American and Middle Eastern, noted some degree of disagreement with the statement that UNK is welcoming (Strongly Disagree and Somewhat Disagree); 18 percent of Hispanics, 17.4 percent self-identify “other” as their race, 14.2 percent self-identified two or more races, and 9.4 percent of Asians.

- Democrats are less likely to feel UNK is a welcoming place, with 13.6 percent noting that they strongly disagree or somewhat disagree, as compared to under 3 percent of Republicans.

- Democrats are more likely to perceive that specific groups of people are treated differently or disrespectfully.

University Affiliation

In terms of university group affiliation (students, faculty, staff, and administrators), the majority of respondents believe UNK to be a comfortable place, with 668 respondents across all university affiliation groups reporting that they strongly agree or somewhat agree with this question (88.9%). Only 46 respondents (or 6.1%) indicated disagreement with this statement, and 37 (4.9%) expressed a neutral perception.

Staff and administrators are slightly more likely to view the overall comfort at UNK as favorable (91.3% and 92.3% respectively), indicating they strongly or somewhat agree that UNK is a
comfortable place as compared to students (87.8%) and faculty (88.7%). The difference across university group affiliations, however, is not statistically significant.

Similar to comfort, respondents were asked if UNK was a welcoming place. As with perceptions of comfort, most participants also feel welcome, but there are some differences. People are slightly less likely to feel welcome than they are to feel comfortable. Figure 9 provides detail on perceptions of feeling welcome at UNK.

Across all university affiliations, it is perceived that the group most likely to be treated with the greatest level of disrespect (expressed through scores of very disrespectful or disrespectful for each category) are non-native English speakers, at 36.3 percent. This group is followed by

![Figure 9: Perceptions of Comfort by University Affiliation Group](image)
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people from other nations (17.1%), members of the LGBTQ community (16.3%), and Muslims or members of racial or ethnic minority groups (both at 16%).

Based on chi-square tests of association, the only statistically significant associations by University Affiliation/Role are among people who are LGBTQ (p < .02), people who are Jewish (p < .03), people who are Muslim (p < .01), racial and ethnic minorities (p < .01), people who are non-native English speakers (p < .01), and people from other countries (p < .04).

Figure 11 presents information about the percentage of students, faculty, staff, and administrators perceive a disrespectful campus climate toward specific groups of people on the UNK campus.

**Gender, Gender Identity, and Sexual Orientation**

Among gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation combined, 89 percent of respondents generally agree that UNK is a comfortable place. Males are slightly more likely than females to report a negative climate (7.6% versus 4.5%).
In the survey population, only two people identified as a transgender woman or transgender man, so to preserve the privacy of those individuals, responses related to people who self-identified as transgender were removed from most data analysis.

Respondents who identified as binary/non-conforming gender identity, queer, or other were the most likely groups to perceive a negative campus climate. Figure 12 provides detailed information about the number of people by birth sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation and their evaluation of the claim, “The University of Nebraska at Kearney is a comfortable place for me”.

**FIGURE 12:**
OVERALL COMFORT AT UNK BY GENDER, GENDER IDENTITY, AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION
"UNK is a comfortable place for me"
In terms of UNK being perceived as a welcoming place, over 80 percent (82.8%) of all respondents who responded to gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation questions agreed or strongly agreed that UNK is welcoming.

When comparing male/masculine perceptions versus female/feminine perceptions, the extent to which UNK is felt to be not welcoming remains very consistent (7.8% and 7.5%).

Among the total population who responded to questions related to gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation the following population groups were identified as those who encounter the greatest climate of disrespect on the UNK campus (as measured by a score of very disrespectful or disrespectful):

- Non-Native English Speakers (19.1%)
- Transgender or Gender Nonconforming (18.8%)
- People from Other Nations (16.8%)
- Members of the LGBTQQ Community (16%)
- People who are Muslim (15.6%)
FIGURE 14
PERCENTAGES OF PEOPLE WHO VIEW A DISRESPECTFUL CAMPUS CLIMATE BY GENDER IDENTITY

- Total (n = 738)
- Non-Binary/Gender Non-Conforming (n = 7)
- Other (n = 11)
- Female (n = 477)
- Male (n = 242)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Non-Binary/Gender Non-Conforming</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People from different socio-economic backgrounds</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from other nations</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native English speakers</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health challenges</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological challenges</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disabled</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender/Gender non-conforming</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lgbtq</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional categories:
- Psychological challenges
- Health challenges
- Learning disabled
- Muslim
- Jewish
- Christian
- Transgender/Gender non-conforming
- Lgbtq
- Male
- Female
In terms of race and ethnicity, most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that UNK is a welcoming place, which is consistent with other demographic groups. Overall, 83.2 percent of participants who identified a race, and 83.5 percent of participants who identified as Hispanic, view UNK as welcoming.

However, nearly every race and ethnicity, apart from African Americans and Middle Eastern, noted some degree of disagreement with the statement that UNK is welcoming (strongly disagree and somewhat disagree), suggesting there is room for improvement of the experiences of minority races and ethnicities at UNK:

- 18 percent of respondents who self-identified as Hispanic, Latino, Latina, or Latinx.
- 17.4 percent of respondents who identified “other” as their race.
- 14.2 percent of respondents who self-identified two or more races.
9.4 percent of Asian.

Figure 16 provides information regarding perceptions of UNK as a welcoming place by race and ethnicity. Figure 17 provides detailed information regarding perceptions of UNK as a comfortable place by race and ethnicity.
Slightly over 700 people who reported a race also responded to questions about whether they view the UNK campus climate as respectful toward specific groups of people. Two groups of participants were removed from this analysis because the combined groups of American Indian/Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders constituted fewer than ten participants.

Overall, in every category, respondents viewed the campus climate as neutral or favorable in terms of the degree of respect for specific groups of individuals. However, when viewing campus climate and respectfulness from the perspective of race, 39.8 percent of respondents viewed the climate toward Jewish people to be disrespectful or very disrespectful.

Non-native English speakers and transgender and gender non-conforming UNK community members are also perceived as being treated disrespectfully or very disrespectfully (18.9% and 18.6% of total).

In terms of statistical significance, based on chi-square tests of association, there are significant associations between race and respectfulness toward women ($p < .01$), men ($p < .01$), people who are Christian ($p < .02$), and people who are Muslim ($p < .03$). There is no statistically significant association between race of respondent and any other category of people in terms of respectful climate.
FIGURE 18:
PERCENTAGE OF PEOPLE WHO VIEW A DISRESPECTFUL CAMPUS CLIMATE FOR SPECIFIC GROUPS BY RACE AND ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>African American/ Black (n = 18)</th>
<th>Asian (n = 31)</th>
<th>White (n = 597)</th>
<th>Middle Eastern (n = 13)</th>
<th>Two or More Races (n = 21)</th>
<th>Other (n = 23)</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Latinx (n = 71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Native English Speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from Other Nations</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| People from Different Socio-Economic Backgrounds | 14.3 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 14.3
**Religious Affiliation**

In terms of overall comfort by religious affiliation, 653 people (88.9%) reported that they agree, to some degree, that UNK is a comfortable place for them. This finding suggests that when overall climate and comfort is viewed through the lens of religious affiliation, there are not substantive differences when religion is viewed in contrast to university affiliation group.

Only 6.1 percent of all respondents across all religious groups reported that they felt, to some extent, that UNK is not a comfortable place to be. The most common religious group to report discomfort is Christians who ascribe to a Protestant denomination (1.7% of respondents), but it is likely that this occurs because of the relatively large Christian population at UNK, as the proportion of respondents are similar across all religious groups.

Figure 19 depicts the number of participants who responded to the question of overall comfort at UNK by religious affiliation.
In terms of religious affiliation, most people at UNK believe it to be a welcoming environment (82.8% of respondents somewhat or strongly agreed).

There are some differences, however, among denominations and religious beliefs. Among Christian-based religions, including the various denominations of Protestantism, Catholicism, and Mormonism, 6.4 percent of respondents view UNK as unwelcoming to some extent. By contrast, 14.3 percent of those who identify as Agnostic, Atheist, or non-religious reported that UNK is unwelcoming. This suggests that for the non-religious, UNK is somewhat less likely to be viewed as a welcoming place.

Approximately 733 participants who identified a religious affiliation answered the series of questions related to the degree to which specific populations of people at UNK are viewed as being treated respectfully. However, groups of respondents that constituted fewer than nine participants could not be logically combined with other groups of religious beliefs and were removed from this analysis. As such, participants who identified as Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, and Muslim were removed from the dataset analyzed here.

Consistent to responses by other demographic groups, participants who identified a religious affiliation reported non-native English speakers, members of the LGBTQQ community, and people who are transgender or gender non-conforming as the top three populations that
respondents, overall, were most likely to recognize as being subjected to disrespectful treatment.

Interestingly, however, a higher level of disrespect was perceived towards Muslims and racial or ethnic minorities (16% each). This is particularly interesting given that people who self-identified as Muslim were not included in this analysis, suggesting that members of the campus community overall, perceive some degree of disrespectful treatment toward Muslims.

It is also an interesting observation that among Agnostics, Atheists, and non-religious people, not one single respondent perceived any disrespect toward Christians. It is also notable that nationwide, the number of college students who ascribe to no religious affiliation has tripled over the last three decades (Downey, 2017), and that trend seems to be evident at UNK. The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) has also reported that the number of students whose religious preference is “none” has changed significantly since 1990 and increases at a rate of approximately 1 percent per year.
Political Affiliation

Among respondents who identified a political affiliation, 88.7 percent agreed that UNK is a comfortable place for them, while 6.2 percent disagreed, and 5.1 percent were neutral, that UNK is comfortable for them.

Among Democrats, 86 percent report UNK as being comfortable, compared to 91 percent of Republicans and 88 percent of Independents and other political affiliations. The difference between these groups is not statistically significant, indicating that among all political affiliations, UNK is largely viewed as a comfortable place to study or work.

Figure 22 presents the number of participants by political affiliation and response to the question, “The University of Nebraska at Kearney is a comfortable place for me.”

Respondents overwhelmingly view the University of Nebraska at Kearney as a welcoming place regardless of political affiliation (82.8% across political affiliations). Fewer than 10 percent (8.4%) disagree to some extent with the statement that UNK is a welcoming place.

Democrats are least likely to view UNK as welcoming, with 13.6 percent noting that they strongly disagree or somewhat disagree. The next largest group to disagree are those respondents who self-identified as “other political affiliation,” with 15 percent disagreeing to some extent that UNK is a welcoming place. Republicans are the least likely to perceive UNK as unwelcoming, with under 3 percent (2.8%) noting disagreement to some extent.

Political affiliation and the perception that UNK is a welcoming place are statistically associated with one another based on a chi-square test of association ($p < .01$). Slightly more than 80 percent of respondents who identified a political affiliation believe that, to some extent, UNK has a respectful climate.
As with the perceptions related to whether UNK is welcoming, the largest variation came from respondents who self-identified as Democrats or other political affiliations. Both groups are more likely to feel that UNK is not respectful (12.7% and 17.8%). Based on a chi-square test of association, political affiliation is statistically associated with feelings of being respected ($p < .01$).

Overall the groups most likely viewed as being treated disrespectfully are the same among political affiliation as other groups of respondents. These include members of the LGBTQ community (16.4%), transgender and gender non-conforming community members (18.9%), and non-native English speakers (18.8%).

Democrats are more likely to perceive that specific groups of people are treated differently or disrespectfully, much like they reported for other components of the survey. Across most measured dimensions of diversity, Democrats perceive levels of disrespect at three to four times that of Republicans. The only exceptions are for Males and Christians, for whom Democrats reported lower levels of disrespectful treatment.

In terms of testing for significance, all associations are statistically significant ($p < .05$) except for the relationship between political affiliation and male gender identity.
Conclusions on Campus Climate

Overall, the University of Nebraska at Kearney is viewed by its community and stakeholders as a welcoming environment to learn, live, and work. As one student noted, "I am a bisexual man who has bipolar disorder and is a practicing Orthodox Christian, so there are a few different fronts on which I could potentially feel discriminated against. I am happy to report, though, that I have always felt accepted on this campus. I think that is a profound statement to be able to make, that this campus makes me feel welcomed in both my LGBT identity (a classically "liberal" trait) and my traditional Christian identity (a classically "conservative" trait). As far as I am concerned, UNK deserves a pat on the back for having arms wide enough to embrace a person like me. I think that is a profound statement to be able to make, that this campus makes me feel welcomed in both my LGBT identity (a classically "liberal" trait) and my traditional Christian identity (a classically "conservative" trait). As far as I am concerned, UNK deserves a pat on the back for having arms wide enough to embrace a person like me. Sure, there are ways it could be better (there always will be), but in my experience UNK does an excellent job of accepting people who are conservative, liberal, religious, irreligious, queer, strait, and everything in between.”

There are, however, some concerns that create opportunities for improving this admirable record of inclusion. UNK is a largely homogenous group, in that it is largely comprised of White, Protestant, Republicans who are heterosexual, and the data suggests that while overall the majority of people who work and learn at UNK feel welcomed, or at least not excluded, for
community members who do not fit into the dominant demographic, there are some gaps in terms of the degree to which people feel welcome or disrespect that is perceived by the broader UNK population.

**Campus Climate Recommendations**

It is not possible to determine the root cause of concerns that emerged in the data, although it is possible the population and social changes taking place in Nebraska, particularly those that the region immediately surrounding UNK may feel more strongly, are impacting how some groups are perceived and their own perceptions of feeling welcome and respected. Change is hard, and Nebraska has experienced considerable change in a relatively short period of time.

The points of concern that emerged in the data regarding the UNK campus climate and levels of disrespect were among a broad set of diversity dimensions, creating an opportunity for UNK leadership to address how its members perceive and interact with people of other cultures, beliefs, and practices. The overarching recommendation to enhance the campus climate at the University of Nebraska at Kearney is to focus on developing cultural competency.

While broad issues around diversity and inclusion should be addressed to achieve broad impact, the data demonstrates that some diverse groups may need immediate support and possibly further investigation to determine the root cause of the negative perceptions and concerns. These include:

- Perceptions of feeling welcome by Hispanics, Asians, and other people of color (two or more races and “other”).
- Perceptions of feeling welcome among Agnostic, Atheist, or other non-religious groups.
- Perceptions of feeling welcome among Democrats.
- Perceptions of disrespect for non-native English speakers, people from other nations, different races and ethnicities, members of the LGBTQQ community, and those who identify as non-binary or non-gender conforming.

**Perceptions of Exclusionary Bias and Discrimination**

Participants in the UNK Campus Climate Survey were asked to report on their beliefs about whether the climate at UNK is exclusionary or biased in specific areas, including race and ethnicity, sexism, homophobia, age, socio-economic status, disability, and non-normative sexual orientation. Approximately 750 people responded to this series of questions. Key findings include:

- Respondents who self-identified as Democrats tended to perceive higher levels of exclusionary bias than the overall average.
- The most common perception of exclusionary bias is based on race and ethnicity, with 26 percent of all respondents reporting they agree to some extent that UNK is biased based on race and/or ethnicity.
• When analyzed according to religious affiliation, the most common forms of bias perceived by respondents are race (17.3%), non-normative sexual identity (14.8%), and homophobia bias (13.9%).

There are differences in perceptions of bias based on university affiliation. Across all seven categories of bias, faculty reported the highest perceptions of bias. Most striking is that faculty and administrators reported bias related to sexism and homophobia at 23.5 percent each. Faculty also perceived higher levels of bias based on race and/or ethnicity than other affiliation groups. Notably, students reported bias related to sex, gender, or orientation at far lower levels.

In all cases, exclusionary bias is statistically associated with university affiliation group ($p < .01$).

FIGURE 25:
PERCENTAGES OF EXCLUSIONARY BIAS BY UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION GROUP (n = 752)

"I believe that the (faculty, staff, students, UNK as a whole) is biased based on...

Given the trend toward moderately high perceptions of bias based on gender, orientation, or gender identity, it is useful to view each group of exclusionary bias according to the respondent’s gender identity. Given the very low, and in some cases non-existent, numbers of people who identified as transgender woman/female/feminine or transgender man/male/masculine, those categories have been removed from this analysis to protect the confidentiality of the respondents. Participants who reported their gender identity as “other” or “non-binary/gender non-conforming” were combined into a single category.

People who self-identified their gender identity as “other,” non-binary, or non-gender conforming tended to report higher instances of exclusionary bias than groups with other gender identities. All groups combined, however, expressed a perception of bias across all categories included in the survey at rates generally slightly higher than 10 percent (with the exception of age bias, which was slightly lower than 10%). Figure 26 details bias perceptions of respondents (who reported that they somewhat or strongly agree with the existence of exclusionary bias based on type) according to self-reported gender identity.
Exclusionary Bias by Race and Ethnicity

The most common perception of exclusionary bias is based on race and ethnicity, with 26 percent of all respondents reporting they agree to some extent that UNK is biased based on race and/or ethnicity. Fully, half of African Americans and American Indians/Alaskan Natives affirmatively believed the same, though it should be noted that the size of each of these groups (18 and 4, respectively) is small in comparison to the overall population of respondents.

The second most common perception of bias is based on non-normative sexual identity (14.8%), followed by homophobic bias (13.5%). It should be noted that perceptions of bias based on sexism follow very closely, with 13.4% of all respondents expressing that they somewhat or strongly agreed that sexist bias exists at UNK.
Exclusionary Bias by Political Affiliation

The most prevalent form of exclusionary bias by political affiliation is race: 17.2 percent of respondents, irrespective of political affiliation, somewhat or strongly agreed that race-based bias exists at UNK. Respondents who self-identified as Democrats tended to perceive higher levels of exclusionary bias than the overall average of across all categories of bias.
Exclusionary Bias by Religious Affiliation

To better understand perceptions of exclusionary bias by religious affiliation, some categories of religions were grouped. Agnostics, atheists, and people who self-identified as non-religious were collapsed into a single group. Furthermore, Christian Protestants and Mormons were combined. And the category of “Other” includes people whose religious affiliation was not included in the survey, people who prefer not to identify a religious affiliation, and people who do not know their religious affiliation. In total, 734 people who identified a religious preference responded to questions related to exclusionary bias.

The most common form of bias, among respondents who answered religious affiliation, is that of race (17.3% of all respondents), followed by non-normative sexual identity (14.8%) and homophobia (13.9%).

Among the categories of religion as described, Agnostic/Atheist/Non-Religious respondents were more likely to agree to some extent that bias exists among all categories.
Exclusionary Bias Related to Disability

Consistently, across all groups, discrimination based on disability status is noted at around 11 percent. An examination of qualitative survey responses and focus group data revealed that most disability concerns are regarding the lack of adequate accommodation. In the discussions and comments from community members with disabilities, it was clear that they generally acknowledge that the University meets the requirements of reasonable accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act, but some needs remain unmet. For example:

- …Our campus and again, specific buildings on campus are NOT easy to access. While they may technically meet the accessibility requirements, for those who are actually trying to use certain buildings it is not access friendly. We must do better! The "ramp" into Warner Hall is extremely steep, slippery, and difficult to navigate. There should be improvements!

- When one is working with the disability office, it can sometimes be hard to completely match the student’s accommodations. I, as a student with disability and an accommodation, feel like my accommodation is often undermined and like I am in hidden words being told [by various UNK staff members] to make compromises that impact my ability to manage my disability.
Experiences and Observations of Exclusionary Conduct

Exclusionary conduct refers to behaviors that are marked by incivility, bullying, discrimination against individuals and groups who are different, and are antithetical to creating a diverse and inclusive environment. In the UNK Campus Climate Survey, all survey participants were given the opportunity to respond to a series of questions regarding any instances in which they may have experienced exclusionary conduct themselves or were witnesses to exclusionary conduct directed at others.

Overall, reported responses about exclusionary conduct are relatively low for each university affiliation group and by category of exclusionary conduct. In total, 572 reports of exclusionary conduct were indicated. Of these, students experienced or observed nearly half of incidents (45.6%). Faculty reported approximately 27 percent, staff reported 23.2 percent, and administrators reported 3 percent of all instances experienced or observed by the target of the exclusionary conduct.

Appendix E includes a series of tables that provide detail on dimensions of exclusionary conduct including whether the conduct was witnessed or experienced firsthand, location, and certain characteristics of the instigator. Key information is summarized here, but we felt additional detail may be needed to fully understand the scope and breadth of behaviors that are perceived by UNK stakeholders as offensive and exclusionary in nature. The tables in Appendix E provide detail on the number and types of exclusionary conduct, and by whom those events were witnessed or experienced.

Source of Exclusionary Conduct

In total, respondents reported 569 instances of exclusionary conduct, but it is not possible to know how many specific incidents occurred or how many respondents may be referencing the same or similar incidents. As with observations of exclusionary conduct, most instances were noted by students who observed or experienced 267 (46.9%) of occurrences where the instigator of the conduct was identified. Faculty reported another 146 (25.7%), staff reported 133 (23.4%), and administrators reported 11 (1.9%).

In terms of the source, or identity, of the instigator of exclusionary behavior, faculty and staff are nearly equal as reported by participants (146 and 133 instances, respectively) for a total of 49.0% of all instances reported. The tables in Appendix E provide detailed information about the source or instigator of exclusionary behavior by University Group Affiliation.

Forms of Exclusionary Behavior

In total, 823 instances of different forms of exclusionary behavior were reported by respondents, but it is also important to bear in mind that this number is not an accurate count of specific incidents. It is not possible to know how many specific incidents occurred based on the data collected. As with observations of exclusionary conduct, the majority of instances were noted by students, who observed or experienced 358 (43.5%) forms of exclusionary behavior. Faculty
reported another 235 (28.5%), staff reported 200 (24.3%), and administrators reported 30 (3.6%).

The most common forms of exclusionary behavior included derogatory verbal comments or remarks (145 occurrences), someone being deliberately excluded, ignored, or left out (129), and bullying or harassment (122). Together, these three forms of exclusionary behavior constitute nearly half (48.1%) of reported instances of exclusionary conduct.

**Location of Exclusionary Behavior**

Slightly under 400 survey participants reported 391 instances of exclusionary conduct where the location was identified. It is important to bear in mind that this number is not an accurate count of specific number of incidents and it is not possible to know how many specific incidents occurred based on this data collection effort. As with other questions related to the nature of exclusionary behavior, students were more likely than other respondents to report on the location where exclusionary behavior occurred.

The most commonly reported places for exclusionary conduct included classrooms and campus facilities or events (54.5% combined). The least likely location for exclusionary behavior was through social media (8.7%).

**Limitations to Observations and Experiences with Exclusionary Conduct**

This study’s key limitation for estimating the pervasiveness of exclusionary conduct at UNK is that it is not possible to determine from this data collection effort how many documented incidents occurred or how many respondents referenced the same incidents. For example, the most commonly reported place for exclusionary conduct are classrooms and campus events, meaning that there are likely multiple potential witnesses to the same event, and it is not possible to know how many individuals who responded to the survey may be referencing the same incident.

**Conclusions on Exclusionary Conduct**

Among campus affiliation groups, students are far more likely to observe exclusionary conduct than any other stakeholder. In most cases, faculty and staff were seen as being the most likely instigators of exclusionary conduct, and verbal comments, deliberately ignoring someone, or bullying and harassment are the most common forms of exclusionary behavior. Exclusionary behaviors tend to occur more in classrooms or at campus events, and less at residence halls or through social media.

**Perceptions of Bias and Discrimination at UNK**

Across all university affiliation groups, generally fewer than 10 percent of survey respondents reported feeling strongly or somewhat strongly that they had been discriminated against. The exception to this trend relates to gender discrimination where slightly higher (13%) of respondents perceive gender-based discrimination. The least likely sources of discrimination were non-normative gender identity, disability, and sexual orientation. Approximately 10 percent
of survey respondents reported perceptions of discrimination based on age. Last, students are slightly more likely than other university affiliation groups to perceive discrimination based on race and/or ethnicity. Approximately 8 percent of students reported that they, personally, felt discriminated against on the basis of race or ethnicity.

**University Policies Regarding Discrimination**
UNK policy statements regarding compliance with federal and state laws are noted on the UNK website, are accessible, and understandable to a wide range of stakeholder groups. Policies specifically pertaining to discrimination and harassment are also available on the website, along with procedures for filing a discrimination complaint and grievance procedures related to discrimination for classes of people protected under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and the Americans With Disabilities Act, particularly Section 504 grievances. The University also has an Affirmative Action Plan which reinforces the core values of the institution related to employee recruitment and on-boarding of new faculty.

What is less obvious, however, is a mechanism for students, faculty, staff, and other university stakeholders to make complaints or share concerns related to exclusionary conduct in a way that is confidential and includes controls that reasonably ensure that issues made in good faith are followed up on by the institution. As noted in earlier parts of this report, there is a clear code of conduct for students, but one for faculty, staff, and administrators is less obvious. Though there are policies and procedures in place to address protected status violations it seems the University relies more on the policies regarding discrimination, harassment, and compliance to address any exclusionary behavior, but those policies do not encompass the full range of exclusionary behaviors that potentially occur on a diverse campus. As one university employee commented, “I know there are resources for students to turn if they feel discriminated against (which is wonderful), but I do not see a lot of info of where staff/faculty can turn to for confidential reporting/talking”.

Focus group participants from several groups noted the lack of follow up by administration regarding reporting of incidents of discrimination on campus. The perception is that once incidents are reported nothing is done. Participants also generally offered a recommendation that to counter the perception that nothing is done on the reports is for administrators to bring closure to the investigation by informing the person or group of the outcome of the investigation and giving specific actions that were taken. There was a concern that a lack of transparency in the reporting process may contribute to false assumptions and a general lack of clarity about whether reports of discrimination are taken seriously and acted upon. Furthermore, in spite of the consistent messaging regarding a university-wide zero-tolerance policy regarding retaliation, a recurring theme from faculty and staff participating in focus groups involved the uneasiness of reporting discrimination incidents due to possible retaliation. This was most concerning for non-tenured faculty who feared retaliation from getting tenure.

**General Perceptions of Discrimination**
Generally, most participants who offered information on the survey or participated in focus groups noted that UNK does a fairly good job of addressing discrimination. Equal Opportunity
Affirmations clearly appear in guiding policies related to compliance with federal and state laws governing equal opportunity, discrimination, and harassment, and the university has a process in place for the filing of discrimination complaints and the resolution of discrimination grievances. These policies are clearly available to all campus stakeholders, including students, faculty, staff, vendors, and campus visitors.

In spite of these procedures, both focus group and survey participants identified an awareness of discrimination at UNK. Several participants were aware of perceived discrimination on campus. Minorities and women students, faculty, and staff are more sensitive to instances of perceived discrimination than their majority counterparts. Common perceptions included the following types of comments:

- Many respondents noted a general perception that faculty may have some preferences to working with exclusively White students, to the exclusion of other groups, including Hispanic people. For example, one student noted an experience with a professor who “liked to go off on rants about different minorities.” The same respondent noted that it was his or her perception that some faculty members favor men over women and recalled a situation where s/he recalled that a faculty member made disparaging comments about women; mentally ill people; people who are gay, lesbian, or transgender; overweight people; and the role of religion in gender identity.

- Respondents also noted that they perceive the existence of an “old boys club” and that women struggle to have equal voices on campus.

- Faculty respondents described their experiences working in hostile work environments with regard to gender. Some noted that women are assigned a greater workload but are not fairly compensated for disparate work assignments. In another example, a faculty or staff member openly commented that women attended universities in order to acquire their MRS degree and nothing else.

- A variety of respondents expressed concerns about the exclusion of religious, racial, and ethnic minorities.

- Many respondents across all university groups raised concerns that international students are treated differently than American students. They reported behaviors including name-calling, social exclusion in the classroom, and disparaging comments about accents and speech affect. One respondent commented that “racial diversity should be valued above all else, yet the International Office has staff who exclude or disrespect staff of differing ethnicity.”

Diversity and Inclusion Education for Students, Faculty, and Staff

Participants voiced a general consensus that there is a need for diversity and inclusion education for all on campus; however, faculty training is widely perceived as the most urgent need. Culturally insensitive comments or actions that made students and staff feel devalued stemmed from faculty in the examples mentioned above. While the concept of academic
freedom is a pillar of any university, cultural insensitivity is not. Participants indicated that diversity and inclusion training should be ongoing throughout the year, not just a one-time annual occurrence. Specific examples of comments are below:

- “Need training beyond first day – every year we should have yearly training and do refreshers.”
- “Dining staff and custodial staffs need to be included in training.”
- “Given the current political climate, reaffirm that professors will not face repercussions for supporting Muslims, the LGBTQ community, people with mental disabilities or other distinctions, and that discussions of the problems these groups face should be accepted in the classroom.”
- “We need this to be a campus wide effort. There needs to be more training opportunities available. The training also needs to be hosted in a variety of mediums, in-person training is not always feasible when offices are short staffed, so making them available online would be helpful.”
- “Diversity education about not only race, ethnicity and sexual orientation but also gender and age. Ageism is very prevalent and is not addressed”.
- “Offer educational services to combat these harmful beliefs about minorities. I’m not exactly sure what kinds of educational services work the best...classes? brochures? presentations? But, I feel like these underlying assumptions about minorities are toxic and should be combatted somehow, not just swept under a rug because then they don’t really go away...they just stew and create more toxicity”.

**Perceptions of Discrimination by University Affiliation Group**

Survey participants were asked to rate their personal perceptions of discrimination against them based on age, race and/or ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, socioeconomic status, and disability status. Across all university affiliation groups—that is, students, faculty, staff, and administrators—generally fewer than 10 percent of respondents reported that they felt strongly or somewhat strongly that they have been discriminated against. The exception to this trend is in the case of gender-based discrimination: 13 percent of respondents across all university affiliation groups reported feeling that they had experienced discrimination on the basis of gender to some extent. The next ranking category of discrimination was age, where approximately 10 percent of respondents reported the perception of discrimination, followed by religion (9%). Approximately 7 percent overall reported perceptions of discrimination on the basis of race or ethnicity. Students are slightly more likely to perceive racial or ethnic discrimination, with approximately 8 percent of students reporting that they have been discriminated against based on race or ethnicity. The least prevalent sources of discrimination, overall, were non-normative gender identity (1.6%), disability (2.5%), and sexual orientation (4.1%). Figure 30 provides detail on the number of participants, by university affiliation group,
who report having experienced various types of discrimination. Survey scores of somewhat agree and strongly agree were combined to estimate perceived occurrences of discrimination.

**FIGURE 30: NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO HAVE FELT DISCRIMINATED AGAINST BY TYPE AND UNIVERSITY GROUP**

"I have felt discriminated against at UNK because of my..."

**Discrimination Based on Religious Preferences**

UNK’s community includes a diverse array of major world religions and alternative religious affiliations including agnosticism and atheism. The majority of survey participants reported being of a Christian-based faith, including Catholicism, Protestantism, and Mormonism (63.2%). Nearly 20 percent of the sample population reported being Agnostic, Atheist, or non-religious. Participants were also asked to identify whether they have felt discriminated against at UNK because of religion.

The majority of respondents reported strong or moderate disagreement with the statement, “I have felt discriminated against at UNK because of my religion”. However, on closer examination of those participants who reported feeling discriminated against based on religion, agnostics and atheists, when combined are more likely to perceive discrimination than any other religious group. A total of 90 participants identified as being agnostic or atheist, and 15, or 16.7 percent, reported perceptions of discrimination on the basis of religion. Of the 50 participants who reported that they are non-religious, 5 (10%) also reported a sense of discrimination on the basis of religion, as did those who prefer to not say their religious beliefs, or practice a belief not categorized in the survey (97 people), 11.3 percent noted they felt personally discriminated against on the basis of religion. This may indicate that UNK has done good work in reducing bias or perceptions of discrimination against those who practice Eastern religions, are Muslim, or Jewish as compared to the dominant religious Christian faiths, but there may be opportunities to focus on the inclusion of the non-religious, atheists, or agnostics. The next largest group of people who identified perceptions of discrimination on the basis of religion are Christian-Protestants, with 7 percent of respondents from that group reporting a sense of discrimination directed at them.
Two groups, Buddhists (n = 6) and Muslims (n = 5), did not report a sense of being discriminated against at UNK. In part, this may be a result of the very small number of participants who identified as Buddhist or Muslim, and may not be directly connected to perceptions regarding inclusion or exclusion. Overall, across all religious affiliations and denominations, 91 percent of respondents disagreed to some extent or were neutral about the degree to which they perceive experiencing discrimination on the basis of religion at UNK. At the same time, with the exception of Muslims and Buddhists, participants from every category of religion noted experiences related to perceptions of religious discrimination to some extent. Figure 31 provides detail regarding participants who reported perceptions of religious discrimination by denomination or category (no percentages are noted because of the small n in most cases).

**Perceptions of Discrimination by Political Affiliation**

The relationship between political affiliation and perceptions of discrimination was examined to better understand how the two factors may be related on the UNK campus. Among those who responded to the questions regarding perceptions of discrimination and identified a political affiliation, approximately 34.5 percent identify as Republican, 28.9 percent identify as Democrat, 25.8 percent identify as Independent, and other affiliations represent slightly over 10 percent (10.25%). Data related to political affiliation were then analyzed to understand how each type of discrimination is viewed relative to political affiliation. The majority of respondents did not
perceive that they have been discriminated against in terms of age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, religion, socio-economic status, non-normative gender identity, or disability status. Across all groups, approximately three-quarters disagreed or somewhat disagreed that they perceived a specific type of discrimination; approximately 10 percent were neutral; and generally speaking, 6-13 percent of the sample indicated that they felt they had been the object of discriminatory behavior at UNK, but the origin of that discrimination was not necessarily political affiliation.

Responses were then analyzed to evaluate whether any particular political affiliation was more closely associated with a specific discrimination type. Across all categories, Democrats and Independents were more likely to report they had been discriminated against than Republicans. In every category of discrimination relative to political affiliation, using a chi-square test of association, each was found to be statistically associated (p <.05). In other words, political affiliation is statistically associated with perceptions of discrimination based on age, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, religion, socio-economic status, non-normative gender identity, and disability. The most common source of feelings of discrimination, when viewed within the context of political affiliation, is gender. In the case of perceptions related to gender discrimination, 23.3 percent of Democrats reported that they strongly or somewhat agreed they had been subjected to discriminatory behavior based on gender, as compared to 7.2 percent of Republicans and 9.8 percent of Independents.

**Perceptions of Discrimination by Active Duty Service Members and Veterans**

A very small percentage, 3.4 percent of respondents (25 individuals), indicated that they were either currently active duty military or were veterans. In most cases, one to two noted they perceived that they had been discriminated against according to each category of discrimination. The slight exception is in the case of discrimination based on religion, where five of the 25 responding active or veteran service members reported the perception they had been discriminated against. However, given the very small sample size of service members compared to the overall sample, statistical testing is not appropriate.

**Perceptions of Discrimination by Gender/Birth Sex**

Approximately 33.6 percent of respondents were male, 65.6 percent were female, and less than 1 percent identified as “other.” Data related to gender were then analyzed to understand how each type of discrimination is viewed relative to self-reported birth sex. The majority of respondents did not perceive that they have been discriminated against in terms of age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, religion, socio-economic status, non-normative gender identity, or disability status. Across all groups, on average, slightly over three-quarters (78.45%) disagreed or somewhat disagreed that they perceived a specific type of discrimination, slightly under 15 percent (14.75%) were neutral, and generally speaking, 6 percent of the sample indicated that they felt they had been the object of discriminatory behavior at UNK.

Responses were then analyzed to evaluate whether any gender or birth sex was more closely associated with a specific discrimination type. In five categories (age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, and disability status), males were slightly more likely than
females to report that they had been discriminated against. In the categories of gender, religion, and non-conforming gender identity, women were more likely to report discrimination. In none of the categories, however, was the differences between groups statistically significant except in the case of gender-based discrimination. In the case of perceptions related to gender discrimination, 16.6 percent of females reported that they strongly or somewhat agreed they had been subjected to discriminatory behavior based on gender as compared to 5.2 percent of males. Birth sex is statistically associated with feelings of gender discrimination ($p < .01$), but is not statistically associated with other categories of discrimination.

**FIGURE 32:**
PERCEPTIONS OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION DISCRIMINATION BY GENDER

"I have felt discriminated against at UNK because of my sexual orientation"

**FIGURE 33:**
PERCEPTIONS OF GENDER DISCRIMINATION BY GENDER

"I have felt discriminated against at UNK because of my gender"
Most people who responded to the UNK Campus Climate Survey strongly disagree with the statement that they have been discriminated against based on sexual orientation or gender, which we believe to be largely the result of the university’s assertive position on consistent policy messaging related to discrimination and compliance with equal opportunity laws at the federal and state level. However, there are some opportunities for improving this record, particularly regarding women, where slightly over half strongly disagree that they’ve felt discriminated against on the basis of gender. Nearly 20 percent of women responding to the survey indicated that they have, to some extent, experienced gender based discrimination at UNK. The anonymous nature of the survey may have provided a venue for women to express their frustration regarding gender-based discrimination, and therefore the percentage of women reporting gender discrimination may not be accurate. Even with these limitations regarding data reporting, we believe that some opportunities exist for UNK to close the gender gap related to discrimination on campus. These recommendations are explained in greater detail in the Recommendations section of this report.

*Perceptions of Discrimination by Race*

Among all racial groups, 84.6 percent noted that they strongly or somewhat disagreed with the statement that they feel discriminated against because of race or ethnicity, and another 9.3 percent neither agreed nor disagreed that they felt discriminated against. This percentage, however, is somewhat deceptive as a result of the large population of White survey participants. Within the group of participants who identified a race, there are some populations who have experienced more racial disparity or discrimination than others. Race and ethnicity are both statistically associated with feelings of discrimination ($p < .01$).

- African American respondents reported 33.4 percent who somewhat or strongly agreed that they have felt discriminated against.
- Over 20 percent (21.7%) of Asians reported experiencing discrimination to some degree;
- Fully one-third of Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders report discrimination;
- Over one-quarter (26.1%) of people belonging to “Other” races report feelings of discrimination.
- Among Hispanics, slightly over one-third (36.4%) indicated that they somewhat or strongly agreed that they have felt discriminated against.

There are some data limitations that should be disclosed. The populations of non-white races at UNK is very small, which means that a single person who reports discrimination or feelings of being discriminated against results in tremendous impact in terms of percentage. At the same time, it is notable that even including the population of White people, the overall percentage of people who report feeling at least somewhat discriminated against is 6.1 percent. Figure 34 provides detail on those participants who somewhat agreed or strongly agreed that they had felt discriminated against on the basis of race and ethnicity according to racial/ethnic population group.
Conclusions on Perceptions of Discrimination

We believe that the University has a basic policy structure in place that is consistent and compliant with the requirements of federal and state law. We also acknowledge that the University is consistent with its messaging regarding retaliation and claims of discrimination and that overall, most stakeholders at UNK do not experience discrimination. However, we also acknowledge that there is evidence of discrimination across most groups of participants, though there are “pockets” of certain groups who experience feelings and perceptions of discrimination at a higher level than others. Specifically, women, Hispanic people, African Americans, and certain religious groups experience higher rates of incidence of discrimination. These occurrences create opportunities for liability for the institution that needs to be avoided to maintain financial and organizational sustainability as UNK moves toward its stated goals for 2020.

Survey results, both qualitative and quantitative, suggest that members of the demographic majority (White – not Hispanic, Republican, Protestant Christians) may be sensing a culture shift toward a more inclusive and multicultural environment in a way that hasn’t been experienced by this community in the past. For example, 5.2 percent of male respondents noted that they feel they have been discriminated against because of their gender or birth sex, 3 percent of White respondents feel they’ve been discriminated against because of their race, and nearly 7 percent of those who prescribe to a Christian faith feel they’ve been discriminated against on the basis of religion.
It appears that some people are experiencing a sense of exclusion that is relatively new to them as cultural patterns and needs shift. This dimension of inclusion is more apparent in some comments from the survey and focus group participants:

- “Honestly, if you are white & male you are the new minority - the least respected among all classes”.
- As a faculty member commented, “As a white, male conservative, I and my colleagues feel constantly out of place and attacked for our beliefs. I personally seek an equal and encouraging environment and in a lot of cases I believe that there is discrimination to all parties, however the only relief from this discrimination seems to be going towards minorities and liberals”.
- “The university tries so hard to include all other races and people with gender-dysphoria that I, as a white, straight male, often feel as though the whole world is trying to cover up my existence by putting such a significant highlight on all of the minority groups. Diversity is perfectly okay, but you need to remember the people that have historically been and currently are the majority”.

The University needs to work toward careful and strategic management of the various dimensions of multi-culturalism so that all people at UNK, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, or religion engage in a place that is as free of exclusive behavior as possible.

**Diversity and Inclusion in the Student Experience: Classroom Environment and Curricula**

As part of a holistic assessment of inclusiveness at UNK, we explored certain dimensions of curriculum and the classroom experience. The University has a clear orientation toward teaching and supporting efforts to ensure a positive student experience which is evident through marketing, web presence, policy statements, and as part of multiple self-studies conducted by the university and programs.

**Diversity in Curricula**

UNK has numerous interdisciplinary courses through the Women’s, Gender & Ethnic Studies Major that explore multiple dimensions of diversity, and diversity and inclusion are woven throughout the curriculum from a number of other programs and that generally speaking, the university meets HLC requirements related to diversity and inclusiveness across the curriculum. There are many opportunities for students to learn about elements of diversity, though a consistent theme we identified is that often times, students need to intentionally seek out diversity in terms of selecting courses, and there is some indication that diversity and inclusion is not consistent across all degree programs. This undermines the University’s ability to instill a campus wide culture of inclusiveness.

The UNK General Studies Program is a diverse set of courses that provides the foundational knowledge that society expects an educated citizen to have. The General Studies program provides the skill-set necessary for life-long learning and provides students the opportunity to
explore subjects and/or areas of interest. The General Studies mission is to help students acquire knowledge and abilities to: understand the world, make connections across disciplines, and contribute to the solution of contemporary problems. Some of the most requested knowledge and skills from employers are comfort with diversity and understanding the importance of multicultural inclusion. There is also an opportunity for students to learn about what inclusion means for leaders. Understanding the concept of inclusion will highlight why diversity is important and how fostering inclusive cultures at work will help them after they graduate. Since employers regard inclusive leadership as a valuable skill, this form of career preparation would further advance the mission of General Studies. We also found that outcome measures associated with the General Studies courses may not always include measures associated with diversity and inclusion in a way that supports the mission of General Studies.

We reviewed the major in Women’s, Gender, and Ethnic Studies curriculum as part of this review of campus climate related to diversity and inclusion and noted that the number of specific courses related to diversity is quite high compared to universities of similar size. However, diversity and inclusion may not be as apparent in all program curricula across the university. While it was outside the scope of this study to examine the curricula for all programs, we did notice that some participants noted an absence of cultural diversity. For example, one participant noted that “there is no focus on cultural diversity curriculum, so students can actually spend four to five years studying and never build skills to help them function in a diverse world”.

Diversity in the Classroom Environment: Course Materials

Approximately 540 people who participated in the survey, principally students and faculty, answered the questions about diversity in classroom environments. We looked for information specifically related to whether classroom materials, including texts, handouts, and visual presentations include fair and sufficient perspectives of:

- Women
- People who are LGBTQQ
- People who are transgender and gender nonconforming
- People from various religious views
- People with disabilities, including emotional, psychological, and physical disabilities
- People who are from racial or ethnic minorities
- People from other countries
- People from various socio-economic statuses
- People who are intersex
As with other survey components, responses related to classroom environment were evaluated on a five-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Figure 35 presents the various university affiliation groups (that is faculty, students, and administrators and staff) and their ranked agreement with the statement that classroom materials include fair and sufficient perspectives of women. Generally, all university affiliations view the materials to be sufficiently representative (72.46%), with approximately 20 percent having a neutral perception on the issue. Nearly 8 percent of respondents, however, disagreed to some extent that materials were adequate in terms of perspectives of women. Faculty members are more likely than students to disagree that course room materials presented adequate and fair representations of women. There are statistically significant associations between university role and classroom materials related to various religious views, people with disabilities, people from various socio-economic statuses, and people who are intersex (\( p < .05 \) for each association). The remaining associations between university affiliation and role and classroom materials are not statistically significant.

In terms of fair and sufficient perspectives of people who are LGBTQQ, not quite half of participants across all groups perceived course materials as sufficient. Nearly 15 percent of all groups were neutral on the matter, but approximately 20 percent of all user groups believed that course room materials insufficiently represented the perspectives of people who are LBBTQQ. At not quite 20 percent each, students and faculty were roughly equally likely to believe that representation of LGBTQQ perspectives is inadequate in course materials.
Comparing faculty and student perspectives, faculty are slightly more likely to perceive that classroom materials include fair and sufficient representation of perspectives of people who are transgender or gender non-conforming. Faculty strongly or somewhat disagreed with the statement (23.1% of those who responded), compared to students who disagreed to some extent (approximately 20% of those surveyed). The difference is not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

FIGURE 36:
PERCEPTIONS THAT COURSE MATERIALS RELATED TO LGBTQQ ARE FAIR AND SUFFICIENT BY UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION GROUP (BY PERCENT)

FIGURE 37:
PERCEPTIONS THAT COURSE MATERIALS RELATED TO TRANSGENDER AND NON-GENDER CONFORMING ARE FAIR AND SUFFICIENT BY UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION GROUP (BY PERCENT)
Slightly over 15 percent (16.12%) of all groups perceive that classroom materials are not representative of various religious views. Over 10 percent of students, over 20 percent of faculty, and nearly 30 percent of administrators and staff held this perception. Overall, however, over half (56.3%) of respondents perceive that diverse religious views are to some extent adequately presented in classroom materials.

In terms of fair and adequate representation of people with various emotional, psychological, and physical disabilities, slightly over 85 percent of all participants across groups believe that classroom materials adequately represent people with disabilities, are neutral, or have no opinion. However, close to 15 percent of respondents across all groups disagreed that sufficient and fair representation of people with disabilities occurs. The greatest difference is between students (12.13%) and administrators and staff (20.59%).

FIGURE 38:
PERCEPTIONS THAT COURSE MATERIALS RELATED TO VARIOUS RELIGIOUS VIEWS ARE FAIR AND SUFFICIENT BY UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION GROUP (BY PERCENT)
Among the various demographic and diverse populations included in this section of the survey, the respondents across all university affiliation groups reported more favorably on inclusive course materials related to racial and ethnic minorities. Slightly over 10 percent (11.28%) of all affiliation groups reported that fair and sufficient perspectives of racial and ethnic minorities were not adequately represented in course materials. Slightly over 65 percent of respondents perceive that classroom materials incorporate the perspectives of racial and ethnic minorities.
As with representation of racial and/or ethnic minorities, survey participants generally agreed that classroom materials are fair and include sufficient perspectives of people from other nations. Slightly over 60 percent of participants (62.2%) indicated agreement that classroom materials are fair and adequately inclusive to some extent. Slightly over 13 percent perceived course materials as lacking in terms of inclusiveness. Faculty tend to be slightly more critical of course materials than are students.

FIGURE 41:

PERCEPTIONS THAT COURSE MATERIALS RELATED TO PEOPLE FROM OTHER NATIONS IS FAIR AND SUFFICIENT BY UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION GROUP (BY PERCENT)

In terms of people from various socio-economic groups, under 10 percent of all university affiliation groups believed that the perspectives of various socio-economic groups are underrepresented.
The term “intersex” is a general term to describe a variety of genetic and anatomical conditions where a person is born with a reproductive or sexual anatomy that does not fully fit the typical definition of female or male (Intersex Society of North America, 2017). Among all university affiliation groups, nearly 20 percent of respondents agreed that the perspectives of intersex people are not adequately represented in classroom material, and well under half of participants agreed that adequate representation is present in learning materials and presentations.
Respondents were asked to evaluate how much they agreed with a series of questions about the content and tone of classroom discussions. Only those survey participants who described themselves as familiar with the classroom environment responded to these questions (n = 535). All groups generally responded that they feel valued in classroom discussions, but students are more likely than faculty or staff and administrators to feel valued. At the same time, however, respondents consistently noted they have sensed, perceived, or experienced tensions related to race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation during classroom discussions.

Staff and administrators were combined into a single group for ease of analysis and in order to organize university employees who are least likely to engage in classroom activities on a regular basis into a single category. Interestingly, survey responses indicate that members of this combined group perceive tension in classroom discussions at higher rates than students or faculty. Using the chi-square test of association to test for statistical significance between university group affiliation and classroom discussions, there are statistically significant results related to feeling valued in classroom discussions, tension related to sexual orientation or identity, and free and open exploration of topics ($p < .05$ in each case). All other associations are not statistically significant.

Further, students are more likely to view discussions as being free and open than faculty or staff/administrator groups. However, even in the case of students, a relatively low 27.4 percent noted that they strongly or somewhat agreed that discussions are free and open. In terms of the student experience, students are likely to feel valued for their contributions but somewhat inhibited in terms of free and open discussion. Approximately 20 percent (19.2%) of students noted that they perceive tensions related to diverse populations in classroom discussions.

**FIGURE 44:**

PERCENTAGES OF PEOPLE WHO AGREE REGARDING CERTAIN ELEMENTS OF CLASSROOM DISCUSSION

![Graph showing percentages of people who agree regarding certain elements of classroom discussion.](image-url)
Diversity in the Classroom Environment: Perceptions of Welcome and Comfort

The last set of questions in the section on classroom climate focused attention on how welcome people feel interacting in the classroom in general, with regard to specific diverse populations, and their comfort level in engaging in discourse and interaction in the classroom. Data for this set of questions was collected on the same five-point Likert-type scale as with other questions, though the chart below depicts only the percentage of participants who disagreed somewhat or strongly with the guiding statements noted in the left-hand column. The two items that contained the highest concentration of negative responses were: “the classroom environment is welcoming to people regardless of country of origin” (22.9% of overall participants disagreed with that statement) and “I feel free to share perceptions, beliefs, and views” (this statement elicited nearly 20% disagreement among all groups, as well as the greatest degree of disagreement for each individual group across all questions related to diverse populations). All other responses generally hovered at or below a 10 percent disagreement rate across the total sample of participants, including all university group affiliations. Generally, faculty, staff, and administrator groups tend to perceive a more negative classroom environment than do students across all categories. In terms of statistical significance, there are statistically significant associations based on chi-square testing for university affiliation/role and all categories of classroom environment (p < .05).
Comments from participants who completed the survey or participated in a focus group support these findings and offer greater context about the classroom experience. Students reported incidents of faculty who use culturally insensitive language in some classes and discount experience of minority students of all backgrounds.

Comments from people who have experienced the classroom environment include meaningful context about perceptions of gender, race, and ethnicity that cannot be discounted.

- From a Student: I don’t take kindly to a [faculty member] telling a group of women (even in jest) that they were only in school for their MRS degrees.
• From a Student: One time a teacher said that most of the Latinos get most the scholarships because they qualify since they’re poor, taking away the opportunity for other kids to apply or receive one.

• From a Student: An LGBT student was asked to share their experiences in a classroom discussion about the LGBT community. When they spoke up, they were spoken over and ignored by the instructor.

• From a Student: A new professor who continually said cruel words to a student and reported that the student was a b**** and was very rude towards all students in her class. The professor would laugh at us if the students answered not in the way she wanted. Very disrespectful to graduate students

• From a Student: Several times my experience with harassment made me consider transferring schools or dropping out altogether.

• From a Faculty Member: I was contacted by a Jewish faculty member who was told that they were not allowed to take off for Yom Kippur because that individual chose to work on Christmas. Two Jewish students were told that they had to attend a Student Leadership Event on Yom Kippur and they fasted and both got sick; one of the same Jewish students was told that they had to sing Christmas carols in an event and that it was a required activity; when someone overheard that local Jews were coming together for socialization and that they felt some isolation, that individual said, "Well, if they don't like it here, they should go back to where they came from."

Another recurring theme involves the treatment and experiences of international students:

• From a Student: I reported the instructor to the department chair and said that this instructor had no place at UNK. The instructor treated international students differently from "American" students. She also made comments to the international students that were demeaning.

• From a Faculty Member: I can't count how many times I have seen and heard anecdotal stories of UNK faculty that have an international student in their classroom and cannot pronounce their name. Instead of learning that name, they arbitrarily assign a "nickname" like Susie that they can pronounce. Likewise, if a student has limited language capabilities, they just skip over them or ignore them. This happens every single day at UNK, and it is truly a shame for an institution that likes to think of itself as inclusive.

• From a Student: The views people have in general in Kearney are more open than other cities toward international students. However, there are some staff and faculty members that do not respect international students as much as domestic students. There have been cases in general education courses and major courses from what I have observed.
• From a Student: Students and some professors hate/dislike listening to presentations by international students because they are hard to hear or understand.

Conclusions on Classroom Environment and Curricula
Based on our review of materials, focus group participation, and survey responses some broad conclusions can be drawn. While the majority of participants in this climate study agreed that fair representation of diverse groups in course materials is adequate, there were enough survey respondents who noted that there are some areas where inclusiveness could be improved, particularly around the areas of representation of the perspectives of people who are LGBTQQ. Approximately 20 percent of the UNK community who participated in the survey believe that course material insufficiently represents the perspectives of people who are LGBTQQ.

Approximately 16 percent of all participants believe that classroom materials fail to fairly and sufficiently represent the perspectives of people from various religious views. Similar cultural insensitivity to religious views, particularly when religion and ethnicity intersect, was voiced by focus group participants and survey respondents who provided additional contextual detail in open ended questions. Furthermore, a significant proportion of participants noted a belief that there are tensions in the classroom related to race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation or identity.

Perceptions of the Kearney Community
The University of Nebraska at Kearney is the single largest employer in the city, followed by Good Samaritan Hospital. Over 10 percent of the population of Kearney (including those under 18 years of age) are employed by one of these places. Beyond this, Kearney is characterized by a tourism industry. Given the size and impact the University has on the area, it is important to sustain the relationship the University has with the community in which it is situated and serves.

Data included in this section of the report related to the perceptions of the Kearney community based on focus group results. It is worth noting that focus group recruitment was designed to represent the UNK and Kearney communities; participants were predominantly White, non-Hispanic, and several, native Nebraskans.

UNK’s Relationship with the Community
Perceptions of the Kearney community were generally positive. Most focus group participants see Kearney as a great place to raise a family, a classic closely-knit mid-western community, and a place that they would recommend to others. Participants generally were not aware of how UNK engages with the community regarding diversity and inclusion outside of hosting cultural and food-focused events.

There were some contrasting views of Kearney depending on participant viewpoints. For example, some individuals who grew up in Kearney or the surrounding communities found it challenging to make connections and break through established groups. Minority students reported that they had experienced racial profiling incidents in the Kearney community. Minority faculty, staff, and students all find it difficult to find cultural resources like ethnic foods, ethnic
hair salons, ethnic barber shops, and diverse religious options. Contrasting perspectives are reflected in the sample comments below.

- “Kearney is a great place to live.”
- “Very welcoming community”
- “Have to drive six hours, round trip, to Omaha to get cultural food and hair care products.”
- “Public transportation for international students is lacking.”
- “Housing is really expensive for everyone not just diverse communities.”
- “When students and faculty choose UNK, they look at the community.”
- “Diversity in community would help diversity on campus.”

**Kearney Community Recommendations**

- Establish a university-community advisory council that consists of university representatives including students, faculty, administrators, staff in addition to community leaders. The purpose of the advisory committee would be to identify strategies to work together to increase diversity and inclusion programs, events, and opportunities in the community for all Kearney residents.

- UNK should work with community representatives to address student concerns about incidents of exclusionary behavior while off campus. Several minority students indicated that they have experienced racial profiling and uncomfortable situations while off campus that led them to believe that their race played a factor in the incidents occurring.

- Develop a transitional program for new faculty to help with housing. New faculty face unique challenges with housing due to Kearney’s limited real estate options and competitive housing market. Housing causes a great deal of stress for new faculty and this stress could be minimized through a university sponsored temporary housing arrangement with local realtors where faculty could use university housing on campus or off campus apartments on a short-term basis until permanent housing is identified.

- Public transportation is limited in Kearney which creates a unique challenge for international students. Since UNK has a large population of international students, public transportation would help with their adjustment to the community and campus. A possible solution would be for UNK to offer a shuttle service that could take anyone on campus, not just international students, to locations in the community on a regular basis.
PART III: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The University of Nebraska at Kearney has established its commitment to diversity and inclusion through various activities, events, and policies. However, opportunities exist to enhance progress, to ensure the UNK community thrives in the new landscape of Nebraska and beyond. Above all, the need to elevate cultural competency has been identified as an institutional opportunity to support the continued development of inclusion at UNK, both inside and outside of the classroom. Ultimately, diversity and inclusion are mechanisms for long-term growth and sustainability.

Recommendations

The primary recommendations are to integrate diversity and inclusion into institutional planning and engage in elevating the cultural competency of the entire university community. These steps will increase the role diversity and inclusion plays in UNK’s long-term success, by transforming a series of initiatives led by separate teams into the collective realization of UNK vision and strategy. Ultimately, diversity and inclusion can be leveraged as mechanisms to support long-term institutional growth and sustainability.

Detailed recommendations are provided below and include strategies and tactics to guide decisions that enhance UNK’s diversity and inclusion efforts moving forward. These are structured around five core themes:

1. Diversify Students, Faculty, and Staff
2. Provide Ongoing Support for Diverse Populations
3. Elevate and Encourage Efforts in Diversity and Inclusion
4. Assure Sustainable Efforts in Diversity and Inclusion
5. Enhance Campus-Wide Cultural Competence

Diversify Students, Faculty, and Staff

UNK has made great strides in diverse representation over the past ten to fifteen years. However, gaps persist and among some populations remain quite broad. Further action is needed to advance diversity – among students, faculty, staff, and administration – to bring representation in line with the broader UNK mission and vision.

Key recommendations include the following:

- Develop an integrated UNK recruitment plan and team to assure consistent outreach and admissions strategies that attract and support a highly diverse group of students.
- Consider the impact diversity and inclusion has on enrollment goals, beyond racial and ethnic representation. Other dimensions (e.g. sexual identity and orientation, religion)
can impact the ability to achieve nonresident domestic and top quartile resident enrollment goals, should prospective students believe they would not fit in at UNK or have concerns about being treated with respect.

- Consider bias and cultural competency training specific to recruitment and hiring for members who work with student recruitment and admissions, along with recruitment and hiring managers for faculty and staff.
- Website and marketing materials need to be inclusive of areas beyond Hispanic and international students (e.g. disabilities and non-gender conformity) to acknowledge the depth of diversity dimensions recognized by UNK and deliver a consistent message of mutual respect and inclusion.
- Consider readdressing faculty and staff placement goals and hiring guidelines. Current AAPs includes some placement goals but are limited, and enhancements to the hiring guidelines could boost access and ultimately increase diversity among faculty and staff at a faster pace.

**Provide Ongoing Support for Diverse Populations**

Some diverse groups currently face challenges at UNK, particularly the disrespectful treatment of non-native English speakers, people from other countries, the LGBTQQ community, and women. Additionally, Hispanics felt unwelcome at UNK at higher rates than other demographic groups, African American student attrition is extremely high. Immediate support is needed for these groups to protect retention, reinforce UNK’s commitment to equity and diversity, and send a consistent message to the broader UNK community that this type of behavior is unacceptable.

Key recommendations include the following:

- Review organizational resourcing pertaining to the recruitment and retention of historically underrepresented groups. For example:
  - Leverage resources to implement strategies in UNK’s Strategic Plan that focus on at risk populations, such as African American students.
  - OMA has yielded positive results but is lacking in staff and funding resources needed to support a broad range of needs across diversity dimensions.
  - Assess Student Support Services to better understand program impact on historically underrepresented student groups, then determine ways to increase reach and success, such as through collaboration with other departments.

- Consider further investigation of low African American student persistence. Elevated perceptions of discrimination and discomfort were expressed in the survey and focus groups. However, low base sizes prohibit the ability to determine key drivers or draw conclusions from this assessment.

- Assess the promotion, application, and selection process of visible and other key programs such as the Chancellor’s Ambassadors, NSE (New Student Enrollment)
leaders, and LPAC (Loper Programming and Activities Council), to ensure access and encourage participation from a diverse group of qualified UNK students.

- Encourage collaboration between Women’s, Gender & Ethnic studies and other departments to support adding a required diversity course as part of the general studies requirement.

- Expand support for diverse groups through initiatives that foster understanding and mutual respect, such as cultural immersion experiences, conversations tables, friendship programs, and informal mentoring.

- Improve the current process regarding discrimination and harassment complaints and concerns. Consistent and timely communication about the issue and its resolution are critical to demonstrating commitment and avoiding the potentially lasting effects of communication challenges, as UNK has experienced in the past.

- Create conflict resolution processes for students, faculty, and staff based on principles of restorative justice, which focuses on repairing harm and creating opportunities to return victims and perpetrators of injustices to a place of resolution and equity.

**Elevate and Encourage Efforts in Diversity and Inclusion**

Expand and enhance policies, practices, and procedures to foster diversity and inclusion. Incentivize and reward achievements that further UNK goals to develop a highly diverse and inclusive learning environment and community. Address diversity and inclusion needs across the broader Kearney community through mutually beneficial collaboration.

Key recommendations include the following:

- Add a measure to course evaluations that addresses respect for inclusion in the classroom experience.

- Incorporate diversity and inclusion into UNK’s standards of professional conduct for faculty. Clarifying obligations to support inclusion (e.g. planning course content, facilitating classroom discussion) will enhance efforts and ensure accountability.

- Revisit staff performance evaluations to ensure the Cultural Diversity and Sensitivity measure is clearly communicated to staff and provide supervisor training to ensure consistent measurement.

- Identify ways to include and measure inclusive behaviors as part of annual faculty performance review.

- Consider revising faculty tenure and promotion criteria to include measures that can positively impact diversity and inclusion. Examples include:
  - Add a measure regarding inclusive classroom experience to student evaluations and include in the tenure guidelines with defined thresholds.
Include training and service related to diversity and inclusion as relevant achievements to support Scholarship and Service criteria.

- Incentivize and reward achievements of faculty and staff that align with the goal of a diverse and inclusive learning environment and community.
- Develop an advisory group of UNK and Kearney community members to identify diversity and inclusion needs, growth opportunities, and develop strategies to address these in the broader Kearney community.

**Assure Sustainable Efforts in Diversity and Inclusion**

How diversity and inclusion can support the university’s success has not been clearly articulated to date, and efforts remain disjointed. Developing an integrated institutional approach to diversity and inclusion will ensure long-term, sustainable advancement.

Key recommendations include the following:

- Establish a vision of success for diversity and inclusion. This would send a strong message to the campus and community, and lay the groundwork for sustainable efforts through the following:
  - Engage senior administrators and key diversity stakeholders in collaboration to better define what diversity and inclusion means for the success of UNK and, importantly, how it supports UNK’s broader strategic plan.
  - Gain alignment on common definitions of diversity for the NU system identified in the work completed by the DOC.

- Assign accountability measures to diversity and inclusion in the UNK strategic plan. It is commendable that diversity and inclusion is embedded in UNK’s current strategic plan. Assigning accountability is the next step in this process, to assure these elements are more likely to be achieved.

- Create a new position of Diversity Officer for the campus that is separate from compliance monitoring to organize, facilitate, and manage the recommendations of OMA and EAD. The purpose of this new position is to oversee and manage long term diversity and inclusion sustainability for UNK.

- Regular assessment of UNK’s diversity and inclusion climate is crucial to advancing efforts through accountability. Additionally, coordinating timing on climate updates with UNK strategic planning updates, will assure diversity and inclusion is embedded into the institution, as opposed to executed and measured in a vacuum.
**Enhance Campus-wide Cultural Competence**

Strengthen cultural competency skills across the campus population, enabling students, faculty, staff, and administrators alike to be more effective in their interactions, both in and out of the classroom, with perspectives and cultures other than their own.

Key recommendations include the following:

- Develop a series of town hall style meetings that elevate understanding and personalize the value of diversity and inclusion—to move the dialogue beyond viewing it just as an operational matter or as a “directive from Administration.”

- Take university leaders and key administrators through a Diversity and Inclusion Commitment Journey, aligning on the strategic direction of diversity and inclusion at UNK, elevating awareness and providing implementation support for committed behaviors and actions from UNK leadership.

- Create a Diversity and Inclusion Learning Roadmap to identify key developmental objectives for the institution and across specific departments and/or roles. Objectives are broken down into clear steps and, as such, support long-term planning and goal achievement. Examples include:
  - Diversity and Inclusion Awareness and Managing Bias training tailored for student recruitment and admissions and staff/faculty hiring managers.
  - Communication skills building workshops for selected faculty, staff, and student groups (e.g. Leadership UNK).

**In Closing**

The Kaleidoscope Group recognizes and applauds the meaningful work the University of Nebraska at Kearney has done in recent years to improve diversity and inclusion on campus, as well as strengthening ties with the greater Kearney community. While there are opportunities for change and improvement, UNK has made progress and demonstrated dedication to continuing to reinforce equal access, respect, and inclusion of all people.

We wish UNK great success as the university moves toward establishing new goals and further strengthens its position as an institution of choice for students, faculty, and staff.
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Appendix A: Chancellor Communication of Diversity and Inclusion Review

From: employees-bounces@list.unk.edu [mailto:employees-bounces@list.unk.edu] On Behalf Of Douglas A. Kristensen
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2017 10:10 AM
To: employees@list.unk.edu
Subject: [Employees] Campus Review: Diversity and Inclusion

Students, Faculty and Staff—
During our recent strategic planning process, UNK reaffirmed its commitment to fostering a climate of mutual respect and an inclusive environment that explicitly values diversity of individuals, cultures, thought and expression. Now is the right time to take quantitative and qualitative measure of both our progress to date and our current campus climate, and to identify means of enhancing our efforts moving forward.

To this end, and with financial support from President Bounds, UNK has engaged The Kaleidoscope Group to conduct a comprehensive campus review focusing on diversity and inclusion. Led by consultant Cassandra Caldwell, Ph.D., the review will include:

1. a campus-wide climate survey. I encourage all members of our campus community to participate. Every voice needs to be heard. You will receive a “UNK Diversity Survey” via email next week. (Please watch for it in case it routes to your spam folder.) All responses will be confidential and it will not take long to complete.
2. a series of focus groups with students, faculty, staff, administrators and community representatives invited to participate. Many of you have already been invited to take part, and I greatly appreciate your engagement.

A report of results will be presented to senior administration and the campus community early next spring.

I extend appreciation to the dedicated members of the Equity, Access and Diversity advisory group for continuing to steward this opportunity, and many others, for our campus. If you have questions relative to this review, please feel free to contact Gilbert Hinga at hingaq2@unk.edu or Mary Petroski at petroskimj@unk.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this important review.

Sincerely,
Doug

Douglas A. Kristensen, J.D.
Chancellor
University of Nebraska at Kearney
1000 Warner Hall
2504 Ninth Ave.
Kearney NE 68849
308-865-8208
kristesend@unk.edu
Appendix B: UNK Diversity & Inclusion Campus Climate Study Survey Invitation

Dear Participant:

During the recent campus strategic planning process, UNK reaffirmed its commitment to fostering a climate of mutual respect and an inclusive environment that explicitly values diversity of individuals, cultures, thought and expression. In light of this, now is a good time to take quantitative and qualitative measures of UNK’s current campus climate and progress regarding diversity and inclusion so that UNK can identify ways to enhance these efforts. One of the areas that is anticipated to be impacted is recruitment and retention.

This diversity & inclusion survey is part of that review. The Kaleidoscope Group (KG) is helping UNK to conduct this survey.

Your participation is voluntary, but very important. We need your voice to be heard. All responses from the survey will be confidential. The survey takes about 20 minutes to complete. You do not have to take it in one sitting; if necessary, you can save your responses and come back to them later to complete. To take the survey, please click the link below. Follow this Link to the Survey:

$(l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey)

After the survey, KG will analyze the responses from the survey, and other data that we are gathering (e.g. information from focus groups, previous data, etc.) and we will provide results to UNK early this coming spring. If you have questions about this survey, please feel free me at cassandra.caldwell@kgdiversity.com.

Thank you for completing the survey.

Kind regards,
Cassandra D. Caldwell, Ph.D.
Consultant
The Kaleidoscope Group

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
$(l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe)
Appendix C: UNK Diversity & Inclusion Campus Climate Survey

Part I: Campus Climate: Perceptions of Inclusion

Using the following scale, please respond to each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska, Kearney is a comfortable place for me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have felt discriminated against at UNK because of my age.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have felt discriminated against at UNK because of my race/ethnicity.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have felt discriminated against at UNK because of my sexual orientation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have felt discriminated against at UNK because of my gender.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have felt discriminated against at UNK because of my religion.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the following scale, please respond to each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I have felt discriminated against at UNK because of my socio-economic status.</strong></td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I feel comfortable with the climate related to diversity and inclusion in my department/unit.</strong></td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The University of Nebraska Kearney is a welcoming place to be.</strong></td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I feel respected at the University of Nebraska Kearney.</strong></td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I have felt discriminated against because of my disability.</strong></td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I have felt discriminated against at UNK because of my non-normative gender identity.</strong></td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I believe that the (faculty; staff; students; UNK as a whole) at the University of Nebraska Kearney is biased based on race/ethnicity.</strong></td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I believe that the (faculty; staff; students; UNK as a whole) at the University of Nebraska Kearney is sexist.</strong></td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the (faculty; staff; students; UNK as a whole) at the University of Nebraska Kearney is homophobic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the (faculty; staff; students; UNK as a whole) at the University of Nebraska Kearney is age biased.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the (faculty; staff; students; UNK as a whole) at the University of Nebraska Kearney is biased based on socioeconomic status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the (faculty; staff; students; UNK as a whole) at the University of Nebraska Kearney is biased based on disability, including physical, learning, or emotional/psychological disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the (faculty; staff; students; UNK as a whole) at the University of Nebraska Kearney is biased against non-normative gender identities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on your experiences, how do you rate the climate on campus for people who are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Very Disrespectful</th>
<th>Disrespectful</th>
<th>Neither Respectful or Disrespectful</th>
<th>Somewhat Respectful</th>
<th>Very Respectful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Disrespectful</td>
<td>Disrespectful</td>
<td>Neither Respectful or Disrespectful</td>
<td>Somewhat Respectful</td>
<td>Very Respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender and gender nonconforming</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disabled</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience psychological health issues</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience physical health issues</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial or ethnic minorities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native English speakers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From other countries</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From various socio-economic statuses</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you familiar with classroom environments on campus?

Yes
No

Classroom materials, including texts, handouts, and visual presentations include fair and sufficient perspectives of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are LGBTQ</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are transgender and gender nonconforming</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualities Survey Software

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People from various religious views</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities, including emotional, psychological, and physical disabilities</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are from racial or ethnic minorities</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from other countries</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from various socio-economic statuses</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are intersex</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please evaluate the following statements about classroom discussions at the University of Nebraska Kearney.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel valued in the classroom during discussions.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel there are racial tensions in classroom discussions.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel there are ethnic tensions in classroom discussions.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel there are gender tensions in classroom discussions.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel there are sexual orientation or identity tensions in classroom discussions.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please evaluate the following statements about the classroom environment at the University of Nebraska, Kearney.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think the classroom discussions encourage free and open exploration of difficult topics related to inclusion and diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classroom environment is welcoming to people regardless of age.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classroom environment is welcoming to people regardless of country of origin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classroom environment is welcoming to people regardless of ethnicity/race.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classroom environment is welcoming to people regardless of sex (male, female, intersexed).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classroom environment is welcoming to people regardless of gender identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classroom environment is welcoming to people regardless of physical disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part II: Observations of Exclusionary Conduct

During your time at the University of Nebraska at Kearney, have you experienced or observed any conduct directed toward a person or group of people from UNK that you believe has created an exclusionary working or learning environment (feeling shunned or ignored)?

**Yes**

**No**

Who was the target (in other words, victim) of the exclusionary behavior? Please select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Experienced</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student/Graduate Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Visitor/Guest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who or what was the source of this behavior, that is, who instigated, the exclusionary behavior? Please select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experienced</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student/Graduate Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Visitor/Guest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group or Category of People (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Law Enforcement or Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual media (e.g., poster, brochure, website)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer not to answer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What form(s) of exclusionary behavior did you observe? Please select all that apply.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experienced</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An admission, hiring, or promotion decision based on identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying or harassment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone was deliberately ignored, excluded, or left out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory verbal comments or remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory email, text messages, social network posts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other derogatory written comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory phone calls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone who was fearful of their personal/physical safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial profiling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of a crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic profiling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homophobic behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to not answer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where did this behavior take place? Please select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experienced</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a campus facility or event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In campus housing/residence hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through social media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is there anything else about this experience you would like to share?

During your time at the University of Nebraska at Kearney, have you experienced or observed any conduct directed toward a person or group of people from UNK that you believe has created an intimidating, offensive, or hostile working or learning environment?

Yes
No

Who was the target (in other words, victim) of this intimidating, offensive, or hostile working or learning environment? Please select all that apply.

Student
Faculty
Staff
Graduate Student/Graduate Assistant
Administrator
Friend
Campus Visitor/Guest
Group or Category of People (please specify)
Campus Law Enforcement or Public Safety
Other (please specify)
I prefer not to answer.
Who or what was the source of this behavior, that is, who instigated, the intimidating, offensive, or hostile working or learning environment? Please select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Experienced</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student/Graduate Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Visitor/Guest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group or Category of People (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Law Enforcement or Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual media (e.g., poster, brochure, website)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer not to answer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What form(s) of intimidating, offensive, or hostile working or learning environment did you experience or observe? Please select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Experienced</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumption that someone was admitted/hired/promoted based on identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption that someone was not admitted/hired/promoted based on identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying or harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Quartics Survey Software**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experienced</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Someone was deliberately ignored, excluded, or left out</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory verbal comments or remarks</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory email, text messages, social network posts</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other derogatory written comments</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory phone calls</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone who was fearful of their personal/physical safety</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial profiling</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of a crime</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic profiling</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homophobic behavior</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to not answer.</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where did this intimidating, offensive, or hostile working or learning environment take place? Please select all that apply.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experienced</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a classroom</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a campus facility or event</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In campus housing/residence hall</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through social media</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify.)</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to not answer.</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is there anything else about these observations or experiences you would like to share?

Part III: Conclusion

What do you think the University of Nebraska Kearney could do to enhance diversity and inclusion within the university community?

To enhance diversity and inclusion within the university community, Is there anything you think the University of Nebraska Kearney should stop doing?

Is there anything else about your experience with campus diversity and inclusion you would like us to know about?

Part IV: Demographics

What is your birth sex?

Male
Female
Intersex
Other

What is your gender identity?

Male
Female
Transgender Woman/Female/Feminine
Transgender Man/Male/Masculine
Non-Binary/Gender Non-Conforming
______________________________________Other

What term best describes your sexual orientation? (mark all that apply)
Asexual
Bisexual
Gay
Heterosexual
Lesbian
Queer
Questioning
______________________________________Other (please specify)

What is your race?
African American/Black
American Indian or Alaska Native
Asian
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
White
White/Middle Eastern
Two or more races
______________________________________Other (please specify)

Ethnicity: I am Hispanic, Latino, Latina, or Latinx
Yes
No
Do you have a disability that substantially limits one or more major life activities? (select all that apply)

No Disability
ADHD
Asperger's
Emotional/Psychological
Hearing
Learning Disability
Medical/health
Physical/mobility
Traumatic Brain Injury
Visual

[ ] Other (please specify)

Prefer not to answer

What is your religious affiliation?

Agnostic
Atheist
Buddhist
Christian - Catholic
Christian - Protestant
Hindu
Jewish
Mormon
Muslim
Nothing; non-religious

[ ] Other (please specify)

Prefer not to say
Don’t know

What is your political affiliation?

Republican
Democrat
Independent

Other

Are you a military veteran or active duty military?
Yes
No

Please indicate your primary university group affiliation.
Student
Faculty
Staff
Administrator

Are you a student athlete?
Yes
No

What is your class?
Freshman
Sophomore
Junior
Senior
Graduate Student

Where do you live?
On campus
Off campus
What is your major?

What is your national origin?
Domestic
International
Prefer not to say

How long have you been employed at the university?
Less than 1 year
1-5 years
6-10 years
11-15 years
16-20 years
More than 21 years

What is your employment status?
Full time
Part time

What is your staff designation?
Academic Unit
Non-Academic Unit

How long have you been employed at the university as an administrator?
Less than 1 year
1-5 years
6-10 years
11-15 years
16-20 years
More than 21 years

Which primary administration title do you hold?

Senior Administrator
Vice-President/Chancellor
Dean
Department Chair
Director
Other (please specify)

How long have you been employed at the university as faculty member?

Less than 1 year
1-5 years
6-10 years
11-15 years
16-20 years
More than 21 years

What is your faculty designation?

Tenured
Tenure-track
Adjunct
Post Doc
Other Academic Appointment
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Appendix D: Focus Group Discussion Guide

1. How would you describe diversity and inclusion initiatives at University of Nebraska at Kearney?

2. What does the university do to make all faculty, staff, administrators, and students feel welcome?

3. Share some of the policies that you are aware of that promote diversity and inclusion?

4. Are you aware of any discrimination occurring on campus?

5. Share some of the policies that you are aware of that may hinder diversity and inclusion.

6. Would you recommend the university to diverse faculty, staff, students, and administrators?

7. How is the climate in the community outside of the university as it relates to diversity and inclusion?

8. How is the university working with the Kearney community to promote diversity and inclusion?

9. What suggestions do you have for the university as it relates to diversity and inclusion initiatives?

10. What are other issues related to the climate of diversity and inclusion at University of Nebraska at Kearney that you would like to discuss?
Appendix E: Detailed Tables on Observations of Exclusionary Conduct

Table A: Target of Exclusionary Conduct by University Group Affiliation (Select percentages noted in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target of Exclusionary Conduct</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friend</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Visitor/Guest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group or Category of People (unspecified)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Law Enforcement/Public Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prefer to Not Answer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Assistant/Student Assistant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SUM**                       | **572**| **261** | **158** | **133**| **17**       |** (3.0%)**
Table B: Source/Instigator of Exclusionary Behavior Witnessed or Experienced by University Group Affiliation (Select percentages noted in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instigator or Source of Exclusionary Behavior</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friend</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Visitor/Guest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group or Category of People (unspecified)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Law Enforcement/Public Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Media (e.g., Poster)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prefer to Not Answer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prefer to Not Answer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C: Forms of Exclusionary Behavior by University Affiliation Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Exclusionary Behavior</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An admission, hiring, or promotion decision based on identity</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying or harassment</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone who was deliberately ignored, excluded, or left out</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory verbal comments or remarks</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory email, text messages, social network posts</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other derogatory written comments</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory phone calls</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone who was fearful of their personal/physical safety</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial profiling</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D: Location of Exclusionary Conduct by University Group Affiliation (Select percentages noted in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In a classroom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus facility or event</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In campus housing/residence hall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Through social media</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>SUM</strong>              | 823    | 358 (43.5%) | 235 (28.5%) | 200 (24.3%) | 30 (3.6%)     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefer to Not Answer</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SUM                      | 391      | 196 (50.1%) | 88 (22.5%) | 92 (23.5%) | 15 (3.8%) |