



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

Assessment • Planning • Interventions

# University of New Hampshire

## Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working Executive Summary

September 2019



Rankin & Associates, Consulting

## Executive Summary

### History of the Project

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

The University of New Hampshire also is committed to fostering a welcoming community that provides leadership for productive participation in a culturally diverse world. As noted in the University of New Hampshire mission statement, “The University of New Hampshire is the state’s public research university, providing comprehensive, high-quality undergraduate programs and graduate programs of distinction. Its primary purpose is learning: students collaborating with faculty in teaching, research, creative expression and service. UNH has a national and international agenda and holds land-grant, sea-grant and space-grant charters. From its main campus in Durham, its college in Manchester and the UNH School of Law in Concord, the university serves New Hampshire and the region through continuing education, cooperative extension, cultural outreach, economic development activities and applied research.”<sup>1</sup>

Additionally, the University’s vision and values statement calls for developing “A Culture of Inclusion and Diversity.”<sup>2</sup> To better understand the campus climate, the senior administration at the University of New Hampshire recognized the need for a comprehensive tool that would provide campus climate metrics to collect the experiences and perceptions of its students, faculty, and staff. During the spring of 2019, the University of New Hampshire conducted a comprehensive survey of students, faculty, and staff to develop a better understanding of the learning, living, and working environment on campus.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.unh.edu/president/mission-and-strategic-plan>

<sup>2</sup> [https://d7admin.unh.edu/sites/default/files/departments/president/media/strategicplan\\_final\\_update\\_2015\\_june\\_2018.pdf](https://d7admin.unh.edu/sites/default/files/departments/president/media/strategicplan_final_update_2015_june_2018.pdf)

In 2018, the University of New Hampshire contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to conduct a campus-wide study entitled “Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working.” This campus-wide study included UNH at Manchester and the UNH Franklin Pierce School of Law. Members of the UNH community formed the Climate Study Working Group (CSWG), which was composed of faculty, administrators, staff, and students, and the group was tasked with developing a campus-wide survey instrument and promoting the survey’s administration between February 26, 2019 and April 5, 2019. In fall 2019, R&A will present at community forums the information gathered from the campus-wide survey and will encourage the UNH community to develop two to three action items based on these findings.

## **Methodology**

**Survey Instrument.**<sup>3</sup> The Climate Study Working Group (CSWG) reviewed several drafts of the initial survey that R&A proposed and vetted the questions to be contextually appropriate for the University of New Hampshire. The final university-wide survey instrument contained 120 questions, including 91 quantitative questions and 29 open-ended questions for respondents to provide commentary. Respondents also had opportunities to “write-in” responses should the list of available response choices not include the specific response they wished to offer.

**Incentives.** As an incentive for completing the assessment, eligible members of the University of New Hampshire community were offered the opportunity to enter a random drawing to win a \$500 tuition waiver, \$500 worth of meals from UNH Dining, or a \$500 Visa gift card.

**Institutional Review.** The study was vetted through an Institutional Review Board (IRB) process, which is meant to ensure confidentiality and protect the rights and welfare of individuals participating in a research study. The IRB/University Committee on Activities Involving Human Subjects through the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment reviewed the survey and processes and approved the assessment on January 9th, 2019.

---

<sup>3</sup> The full assessment is available in Appendix D in the full report.

**Sample Construction.** All eligible members of the University of New Hampshire community were invited to participate in the assessment.<sup>4</sup> Prospective respondents received an invitation from President James W. Dean Jr. that contained the URL link to the survey instrument. The CSWG worked with the University of New Hampshire's communications team to create inclusive, thoughtful, and tailored messaging for email distribution, social media platforms, and other forms of media. Six thousand five hundred and forty-four (6,544) surveys were returned for a 34% overall response rate. Of respondents, 59% ( $n = 3,831$ ) were Undergraduate Students, 14% ( $n = 899$ ) were Graduate/Law Students, 20% ( $n = 1,285$ ) were Staff respondents, and 8% ( $n = 529$ ) were Faculty. Primary status data for respondents were collapsed into the following categories for analyses: Undergraduate Student respondents, Graduate/Law Student respondents, Faculty respondents, and Staff respondents.<sup>5,6</sup> Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic characteristics of assessment respondents.

**Quantitative Data Analysis.**<sup>7</sup> The data first were analyzed to tabulate responses to each of the questions in the survey.<sup>8</sup> Descriptive statistics were calculated by salient group memberships (e.g., gender identity, racial identity, primary position) to provide additional information regarding participant responses.<sup>9</sup> This report presents data using valid percentages.<sup>10</sup> Actual percentages<sup>11</sup> with missing or “no response” information may be found in the frequency analyses tables in Appendix B. The purpose for this difference in reporting was to note the missing or “no response” data in the appendices for institutional information, while removing such data within the report for subsequent cross tabulations and significance testing using the chi-square test for

---

<sup>4</sup> A detailed presentation of sample characteristics is offered later in the full report.

<sup>5</sup> The CSWG, in collaboration with R&A, decided to collapse Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty ( $n = 279$ ) and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty ( $n = 250$ ) into Faculty respondents ( $n = 529$ ), leading to more methodologically sound analyses.

<sup>6</sup> The CSWG, in collaboration with R&A, decided to collapse Senior and Academic Administrator respondents ( $n = 50$ ) under Staff respondents ( $n = 529$ ), leading to more methodologically sound analyses.

<sup>7</sup> More details on the quantitative and qualitative methods are provided later in the methods section of the full report.

<sup>8</sup> For a complete review of the responses for each question offered in the survey, refer to Appendix B.

<sup>9</sup> Analyses were performed to explore how survey responses differed based on selected demographic characteristics. All the findings are presented as percentages of the entire sample or of the subgroups being examined. The percentages in these figures and tables do not always add up to 100% as a result of respondents being able to select more than one answer to a question (“mark all that apply”) or owing to rounding. Where the  $n$ 's were considered small enough to compromise the identity of the respondent,  $n < 5$  is reported.

<sup>10</sup> Valid percentages were derived using the total number of respondents to an item (i.e., missing data were excluded).

<sup>11</sup> Actual percentages were derived using the total number of survey respondents.

independence. Chi-square tests identify that significant differences exist but do not specify if differences exist between specific groups. Therefore, these analyses included post hoc investigations of statistically significant findings by conducting  $z$ -tests between column proportions for each row in the chi-square contingency table, with a Bonferroni adjustment for larger contingency tables. This statistical approach is useful because it compares individual cells to each other to determine if they are statistically different. Thus, the data may be interpreted more precisely by showing the source of the greatest discrepancies. The report offers statistically significant distinctions between groups. For groups with response rates less than 30%, caution is recommended when generalizing to the entire constituent group.

### Factor Analysis<sup>12</sup>

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on one scale embedded in Question 12 of the assessment. The factor score for *Perceived Academic Success* was created by taking the average of the scores for the six sub-questions in the factor. Each respondent who answered all the questions included in the given factor was given a score on a five-point scale. The score was then reverse-coded so higher scores on *Perceived Academic Success* factor suggest a student or constituent group perceives themselves as more academically successful.

### Means Testing

When only two categories existed for the specified demographic variable (e.g., sexual identity) in the factor analysis, a  $t$ -test for difference of means was used. If the difference in means was significant, effect size was calculated using Cohen's  $d$ . Any moderate-to-large effects are noted. When the specific variable of interest had more than two categories (e.g., racial identity), ANOVAs were run to determine whether any differences existed. If the ANOVA was significant, post hoc tests were run to determine which differences between pairs of means were significant. Additionally, if the difference in means was significant, effect size was calculated using  $\eta^2$  and any moderate-to-large effects are noted.

---

<sup>12</sup> A more detailed review of the factor analysis methodology is offered later in the full report.

**Qualitative Data Analysis.**<sup>13</sup> Several assessment questions provided respondents the opportunity to describe their experiences at the University of New Hampshire, elaborate upon their assessment responses, and append additional thoughts. Comments were solicited to give voice to the data and to highlight areas of concern that might have been missed in the quantitative items of the survey. Analyses of each question generated common themes, which are provided later in the narrative of the full report directly following the analyses of the quantitative question that primed the qualitative response.

**Limitations.**<sup>14</sup> Two limitations existed in this project that may have influenced the representativeness of the sample. Respondents “self-selected” to participate in the study. This type of bias can occur when an individual’s decision to participate is correlated with experiences and concerns being measured by the study, causing a type of non-representativeness known as selection bias. The second limitation may have occurred where response rates were less than 30% for some groups. **For groups with response rates less than 30%, caution should be used when generalizing the results to the entire constituent group.**

*Table 1. University of New Hampshire Sample Demographics*

Characteristic	Subgroup	Sample	
		<i>n</i>	%
Position status	Undergraduate Student	3,831	58.5
	Graduate/Law Student	899	13.7
	Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty	279	4.3
	Not on the Tenure-Track Faculty	250	3.8
	Staff	1,285	19.6
Gender identity	Women	4,239	64.8
	Men	2,154	32.9
	Trans-spectrum/Not Listed	47	0.7
	Multiple	42	0.6
	Missing/Not Declared	62	0.9
Racial/ethnic identity	Asian/Asian American	270	4.1
	Black/African American	73	1.1

<sup>13</sup> Qualitative analyses are offered in the full report.

<sup>14</sup> A more detailed explanation on limitations is offered in the full report.

**Table 1. University of New Hampshire Sample Demographics**

Characteristic	Subgroup	Sample	
		<i>n</i>	%
	Hispanic/Latinx/Chicanx	104	1.6
	White/European American	5,488	83.9
	Middle Eastern	47	0.7
	American Indian/Alaska Native	8	0.1
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	6	0.1
	South Asian	39	0.6
	Multiracial	304	4.6
	Nonresident Alien	ND*	ND*
	Missing/Not Listed	205	3.1
Sexual identity	Queer-Spectrum	435	6.6
	Heterosexual	5,454	83.3
	Bisexual	390	6.0
	Missing/Not Listed	265	4.0
Citizenship status	U.S. Citizen, Birth	5,824	89.0
	U.S. Citizen, Naturalized	224	3.4
	Non-U.S. Citizen	448	6.8
	Missing	48	0.7
Disability status	Single Disability	520	7.9
	No Disability	5,684	86.9
	Multiple Disabilities	272	4.2
	Missing	68	1.0
Religious affiliation	Catholic Religious Affiliation	1,513	23.1
	Other Christian Religious Affiliation	892	13.6
	Other Religious Affiliation	448	6.8
	No Religious Affiliation	2,584	39.5
	Multiple Religious Affiliations	103	1.6
	Missing/Not Listed	1,004	15.3

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

\*ND: No Data available

<sup>a</sup>X<sup>2</sup> (4, *N* = 6,544) = 5,686.467, *p* < .001

<sup>b</sup>X<sup>2</sup> (1, *N* = 6,393) = 318.914, *p* < .001

<sup>c</sup>X<sup>2</sup> (7, *N* = 6,458) = 504.721, *p* < .001

## Key Findings – Areas of Strength

### 1. High Levels of Comfort With the Climate at The University of New Hampshire

Climate was defined as the current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of faculty, staff, administrators, and students as well as the campus environment and university policies that influence the level of respect for individual needs, abilities, and potential.<sup>15</sup> The level of comfort experienced by faculty, staff, and students is one indicator of campus climate. Data for Faculty and Students is further broken out on page xii of the Executive Summary and page 52 of the narrative.

- 81% ( $n = 5,269$ ) of survey respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate at the University of New Hampshire.
- 74% ( $n = 1,340$ ) of Faculty and Staff respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their departments/program or work units.
- 86% ( $n = 4,497$ ) of Student and Faculty respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the climate in their classes.

### 2. Faculty Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Faculty Work

#### *Tenured and Tenure-Track*

- 81% ( $n = 226$ ) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that research was valued by UNH.
- 80% ( $n = 222$ ) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that teaching was valued by UNH.

#### *Not on the Tenure-Track*

- 78% ( $n = 175$ ) of Not on the Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that research was valued by UNH.
- 76% ( $n = 170$ ) of Not on the Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that teaching was valued by UNH.

#### *All Faculty*

- 81% ( $n = 422$ ) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by students in the classroom.

---

<sup>15</sup> Rankin & Reason (2008)

- 78% ( $n = 412$ ) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by their department/program chair.
- 79% ( $n = 414$ ) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by faculty in their department/program.

### **3. Staff Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Staff Work**

- 81% ( $n = 1,034$ ) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by their supervisors/managers.
- 86% ( $n = 1,101$ ) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by coworkers in their department.
- 80% ( $n = 1,019$ ) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they were able to complete their assigned duties during scheduled hours.

### **4. Student Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Academic Experiences**

The way students perceive and experience their campus climate influences their performance and success in college.<sup>16</sup> Research also supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for improving learning outcomes.<sup>17</sup> Attitudes toward academic pursuits are one indicator of campus climate.

- 82% ( $n = 3,841$ ) of Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by faculty in the classroom.
- 81% ( $n = 722$ ) of Graduate/Law Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt comfortable sharing their professional goals with their advisors.
- 88% ( $n = 783$ ) of Graduate/Law Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their department staff members (other than their advisor) responded to their emails, calls, or voicemails in a prompt manner.

---

<sup>16</sup> Pascarella & Terenzini (2005)

<sup>17</sup> Hale (2004); Harper & Hurtado (2007); Harper & Quaye (2004)

## Key Findings – Opportunities for Improvement

### 1. Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

Several empirical studies reinforce the importance of the perception of non-discriminatory environments for positive learning and developmental outcomes.<sup>18</sup> Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.<sup>19</sup> The survey requested information on experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

- 16% ( $n = 1,027$ ) of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.<sup>20</sup>
  - 25% ( $n = 259$ ) noted that the conduct was based on their position status, 19% ( $n = 195$ ) on their gender/gender identity, and 14% ( $n = 141$ ) on their age.

#### *Differences Based on Position Status, Gender/Gender Identity, and Age*

- By position status, a higher percentage of Faculty respondents (29%,  $n = 152$ ) and a higher percentage of Staff respondents (20%,  $n = 259$ ) than Undergraduate Student respondents (13%,  $n = 492$ ) and Graduate/Law Student respondents (14%,  $n = 124$ ) indicated that they had experienced this conduct.
  - A significantly higher percentage of Staff respondents (48%,  $n = 124$ ), than Faculty respondents (33%,  $n = 50$ ) and Graduate Student respondents (31%,  $n = 38$ ) believed the conduct was based on their position status.
  - A significantly lower percentage of Undergraduate Student respondents (10%,  $n = 47$ ) thought that the conduct was based on their position status compared to Faculty respondents (33%,  $n = 50$ ), Staff respondents (48%,  $n = 124$ ), and Graduate Student respondents (31%,  $n = 38$ ).

---

<sup>18</sup> Aguirre & Messineo (1997); Flowers & Pascarella (1999); Pascarella & Terenzini (2005); Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora (2011)

<sup>19</sup> Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley (2008); Waldo (1998)

<sup>20</sup> The literature on microaggressions is clear that this type of conduct has a negative influence on people who experience the conduct, even if they feel at the time that it had no impact (Sue, 2010; Yosso et al., 2009).

- By gender identity, a higher percentage of Trans-spectrum respondents (25%,  $n = 22$ ) and Women respondents (17%,  $n = 731$ ) than Men respondents (12%,  $n = 257$ ) indicated that they had experienced this conduct.
  - All groups significantly differed from one another with 5% of Men respondents ( $n = 14$ ), 23% of Women respondents ( $n = 169$ ), and 50% of Trans-spectrum respondents ( $n = 11$ ) indicating they had experienced this conduct based on their gender identity.
- By age, a higher percentage of respondents aged 45-54 (26%,  $n = 117$ ) than respondents aged 19 and younger (12%,  $n = 182$ ) indicated that they had exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct within the past year.
  - A higher percentage of respondents aged 25-34 (22%,  $n = 30$ ) and respondents aged 35-44 (23%,  $n = 22$ ) than respondents aged 20-21 (7%,  $n = 16$ ) who had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct indicated that the conduct was based on their age.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct at the University of New Hampshire. Three hundred ninety-six (396) respondents elaborated on experiences with this conduct. Two themes emerged from the responses across all respondent types: reporting process, and race-based incidents. In addition, there were two themes specific to Faculty and Staff respondents: negative workplace environment, and lack of respect. There was one theme specific to Student (Undergraduate and Graduate) respondents: student misconduct.

## **2. Less Comfort With Campus, Workplace, and Classroom Climates**

Prior research on campus climate has focused on the experiences of faculty, staff, and students associated with historically underserved social/community/affinity groups (e.g., women, People of Color, people with disabilities, first-generation students, and veterans).<sup>21</sup> Several groups at the University of New Hampshire indicated that they were

---

<sup>21</sup> Harper & Hurtado (2007); Hart & Fellabaum (2008); Rankin (2003); Rankin & Reason (2005); Worthington, et al. (2008)

less comfortable than their majority counterparts with the climates of the campus, workplace, and classroom.

***Examples of Findings for Overall Climate at the University of New Hampshire***

- 35% ( $n = 756$ ) of Men respondents, 25% ( $n = 1,043$ ) of Women respondents, and 14% ( $n = 12$ ) of Trans-spectrum/Multiple/Other respondents felt “very comfortable” with the overall climate at the University of New Hampshire.
- 20% ( $n = 109$ ) of Respondents of Color, 23% ( $n = 69$ ) of Multiracial respondents, and 29% ( $n = 1,602$ ) of White respondents were “very comfortable” with the overall climate at UNH.
- 19% ( $n = 73$ ) of Bisexual respondents, 21% ( $n = 91$ ) of Queer-spectrum respondents, and 30% ( $n = 1,613$ ) of Heterosexual respondents felt “very comfortable” with the overall climate at UNH.
- 23% ( $n = 118$ ) of Respondents With a Single Disability, 17% ( $n = 47$ ) of Respondents With Multiple Disabilities, and 29% ( $n = 1,650$ ) of Heterosexual respondents felt “very comfortable” with the overall climate at UNH.

***Examples of Findings for Department/Program and Work Unit Climate***

- 32% ( $n = 357$ ) of Women Faculty and Staff respondents and 46% ( $n = 293$ ) of Men Faculty and Staff respondents felt “very comfortable” with the climate in their department/program or work unit.
- 39% ( $n = 599$ ) of White Faculty and Staff respondents compared with 20% ( $n = 9$ ) Multiracial Faculty and Staff respondents felt “very comfortable” with the climate in their department/program or work unit.
- 19% ( $n = 10$ ) of Bisexual Faculty and Staff respondents and 39% ( $n = 589$ ) of Heterosexual Faculty and Staff respondents felt “very comfortable” with the climate in their department/program or work unit.

***Examples of Findings for Classroom Climate***

- 31% ( $n = 1,202$ ) of Undergraduate Student respondents and 38% ( $n = 191$ ) of Faculty respondents felt “very comfortable” with the climate in their classroom.

- 21% ( $n = 16$ ) of Trans-spectrum Faculty and Student respondents, 30% ( $n = 1,009$ ) of Women Faculty and Student respondents, and 39% ( $n = 676$ ) of Men Faculty and Student respondents felt “very comfortable” with the climate in their classroom.
- 25% ( $n = 125$ ) of Faculty and Student Respondents of Color and 34% ( $n = 1,456$ ) of White Faculty and Student respondents felt “very comfortable” with the climate in their classroom.

### **3. Faculty and Staff Respondents – Seriously Considered Leaving the University of New Hampshire**

- 57% ( $n = 301$ ) of Faculty respondents and 56% ( $n = 712$ ) of Staff respondents had seriously considered leaving the University of New Hampshire in the past year.
  - 29% ( $n = 66$ ) of those Faculty respondents who seriously considered leaving did so for low salary/pay rate and 27% did so because of limited opportunities for advancement ( $n = 62$ ).
  - 27% ( $n = 427$ ) of Staff respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of a low salary/pay rate and 25% because of limited opportunities for advancement ( $n = 403$ ).

Six hundred fifty (650) Faculty and Staff respondents elaborated on why they had seriously considered leaving the University of New Hampshire. Five themes emerged across Employee respondents: low salary, lack of advancement opportunities, concerns about leadership, overwhelming workload, and feeling undervalued. Additionally, Not on the Tenure-Track Faculty respondents shared that they lacked job security.

### **4. Staff Respondents – Challenges With Work-Life Issues**

- 32% ( $n = 399$ ) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that staff opinions were valued by UNH senior administration.
- 32% ( $n = 403$ ) of Staff respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that UNH policies (e.g., FMLA) were fairly applied across UNH.

Staff respondents elaborated on their perceptions of the workplace climate at the University of New Hampshire. Staff respondents shared their challenges with an

overwhelming workload, and the poor interactions they have with people due to their workload. They also shared their concerns and frustrations regarding the performance evaluation process.

## 5. Faculty Respondents – Challenges With Faculty Work

- 54% ( $n = 146$ ) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their service contributions were valued by UNH.
- 38% ( $n = 194$ ) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that salaries for tenure-track faculty positions were competitive.
- 41% ( $n = 90$ ) of Not on the Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the criteria used for contract renewal were clear.

Faculty respondents elaborated on their perceptions of the workplace climate at the University of New Hampshire. Faculty respondents shared their thoughts on benefits, professional development resources, salaries, job security, and the feeling that differential voices were not being heard. Additionally, Faculty respondents emphasized the need to increase the focus on diversity and offer better child care.

## 6. Student Respondents *Perceived Academic Success*

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the *Perceived Academic Success* scale derived from Question 12 on the survey. Using this scale, analyses revealed:

- A significant difference existed in the overall test for means for Student respondents by gender identity, racial identity, disability status, sexual identity, and first-generation/income status on *Perceived Academic Success*.

### *Examples of Findings*

- Trans-spectrum Undergraduate Student respondents had less *Perceived Academic Success* than Women Undergraduate Student respondents.
- People of Color and Multiracial People Undergraduate Student respondents had less *Perceived Academic Success* than White/European American Undergraduate Student respondents.
- Undergraduate Student respondents with a Disability had less *Perceived Academic Success* than Undergraduate Student respondents with No Disability.

- Bisexual Undergraduate Student respondents had less *Perceived Academic Success* than Queer-Spectrum Undergraduate Student respondents.
- Not-First-Generation/Low-Income Graduate/Law Student respondents had greater *Perceived Academic Success* than First-Generation/Low-Income Graduate/Law Student respondents.

## **7. Meaningful Percentage of Respondents Experienced Unwanted Sexual Conduct**

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

- 11% ( $n = 689$ ) of respondents indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact/conduct while at the University of New Hampshire.
  - 1% ( $n = 91$ ) experienced relationship abuse (e.g., ridiculed, controlling, hitting).
  - 2% ( $n = 113$ ) experienced stalking (e.g., following me, on social media, texting, phone calls).
  - 7% ( $n = 476$ ) experienced sexual interaction (e.g., catcalling, repeated sexual advances, sexual harassment).
  - 3% ( $n = 211$ ) experienced unwanted sexual contact (e.g., fondling, rape, sexual assault, penetration without consent).
- Respondents identified University of New Hampshire students, current or former dating/intimate partners, acquaintances/friends, and strangers as sources of unwanted sexual contact/conduct.
- Most respondents did not report the unwanted sexual contact/conduct.

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on why they did not report unwanted sexual contact/conduct. The primary rationale cited for not reporting these incidents was that the incidents did not feel serious enough to report. Other rationales for

not reporting included respondents expecting negative responses from others, fearing consequences, wanting to forget it happened, and wanting to avoid the reporting process.

## **Conclusion**

The University of New Hampshire's climate findings<sup>22</sup> were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.<sup>23</sup> For example, 70% to 80% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be "very comfortable" or "comfortable." A slightly higher percentage (81%) of University of New Hampshire respondents indicated that they were "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the climate at the University of New Hampshire. Twenty percent to 25% of respondents in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At the University of New Hampshire, a slightly lower percentage of respondents (16%) indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. The results also paralleled the findings of other climate studies of specific constituent groups offered in the literature.<sup>24</sup>

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

---

<sup>22</sup> Additional findings disaggregated by position status and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.

<sup>23</sup> Rankin & Associates Consulting (2016)

<sup>24</sup> Guiffrida, Gouveia, Wall, & Seward (2002); Harper & Hurtado (2007); Harper & Quaye (2004); Hurtado & Ponjuan (2005); Rankin & Reason (2005); Sears (2002); Settles, Cortina, Malley, & Stewart (2006); Silverschanz et al. (2008); Yosso et al. (2009)

## References

- Aguirre, A., & Messineo, M. (1997). Racially motivated incidents in higher education: What do they say about the campus climate for minority students? *Equity & Excellence in Education, 30*(2), 26–30.
- Flowers, L., & Pascarella, E. (1999). Cognitive effects of college racial composition on African American students after 3 years of college. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 669–677.
- Guiffrida, D., Gouveia, A., Wall, A., & Seward, D. (2008). Development and validation of the Need for Relatedness at College Questionnaire (nRC-Q). *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(4), 251–261. doi: 10.1037/a0014051
- Hale, F. W. (2004). What makes racial diversity work in higher education: Academic leaders present successful policies and strategies: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Harper, S., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services, 2007*(120), 7–24.
- Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (2004). Taking seriously the evidence regarding the effects of diversity on student learning in the college classroom: A call for faculty accountability. *UrbanEd, 2*(2), 43–47.
- Hart, J., & Fellabaum, J. (2008). Analyzing campus climate studies: Seeking to define and understand. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(4), 222–234.
- Hurtado, S., & Ponjuan, L. (2005). Latino educational outcomes and the campus climate. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 4*(3), 235–251. doi: 10.1177/1538192705276548
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Diego: Jossey-Bass.

- Rankin, S. (2003). *Campus climate for LGBT people: A national perspective*. New York: NGLTF Policy Institute.
- Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of Student College Development*, 46(1), 43–61.
- Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2008). Transformational tapestry model: A comprehensive approach to transforming campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 262–274. doi: 10.1037/a0014018
- Sears, J. T. (2002). The institutional climate for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual education faculty. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43(1), 11–37. doi: 10.1300/J082v43n01\_02
- Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Malley, J., & Stewart, A. J. (2006). The climate for women in academic science: The good, the bad, and the changeable. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30(1), 47–58. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00261.x
- Silverschanz, P., Cortina, L., Konik, J., & Magley, V. (2008). Slurs, snubs, and queer jokes: Incidence and impact of heterosexist harassment in academia. *Sex Roles*, 58(3–4), 179–191. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9329-7
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Waldo, C. (1999). Out on campus: Sexual orientation and academic climate in a university context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 26, 745–774. doi: 10.1023/A:1022110031745
- Whitt, E. J., Edison, M. I., Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Nora, A. (2001). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the second and third years of college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 172–204.

- Worthington, R. L., Navarro, R. L., Loewy, M., & Hart, J. L. (2008). Color-blind racial attitudes, social dominance orientation, racial-ethnic group membership and college students' perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 1(1), 8–19.
- Yosso, T. J., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. G. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(4), 659–690, 781, 785–786.