Campus Climate Study
AY 2018-2019
AGENDA

1. Context & Methodology
2. Demographics
3. Findings
4. Discussion
CONTEXT & METHODOLOGY
What is Campus Climate?

• The way in which students, faculty, and staff perceive campus, especially as it pertains to diversity.

• Includes perceptions about:
  ▪ Safety
  ▪ Prejudice
  ▪ Equal opportunities
  ▪ University commitment to diversity
  ▪ Discrimination
  ▪ Support
  ▪ Fair & respectful treatment
  ▪ Sense of belonging
Methodology

- IRB approved
- Survey created by campus climate survey committee; Survey took 15-20 minutes to complete; Administered Spring 2019
- Survey measured 4 dimensions of campus climate
  - Commitment to diversity (3 items)
  - Sense of belonging (11 items)
  - Inequitable treatment (12 items)
  - Respectful & Fair treatment (20 items)
- Scores for each of the 4 dimension were calculated by averaging the scores from the applicable survey items
- Scores range from 1 to 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology (Cont’d)

- Purpose of study - to compare differences in perceptions of campus climate by:
  - Ethnicity (White/Non-White)
  - Gender identity (Male/Female)
  - Sexual orientation (Straight/GLBQ)
  - Disability status (No disability/At least 1 disability)
  - Veteran status (Non-Veteran/Veteran)

- Dichotomous variables were created in order to protect the anonymity of the participants and to allow for appropriate statistical analyses
DEMOGRAPHICS
Ethnicity
Gender Identity

Staff
- Male: 0.80%
- Female: 68.20%
- Other: 31%

Faculty
- Male: 1.20%
- Female: 41.70%
- Other: 57%

Students
- Male: 2.8%
- Female: 68.2%
- Other: 29.0%
Sexual Orientation

- **Staff**: 89.20%
  - Heterosexual or straight: 3.50%
  - Lesbian or gay: 0.40%
  - Bisexual: 1.90%
  - Other: 5%

- **Faculty**: 89.10%
  - Heterosexual or straight: 1.70%
  - Lesbian or gay: 0.80%
  - Bisexual: 0.40%
  - Pansexual: 2.50%

- **Students**: 76.6%
  - Heterosexual or straight: 10.2%
  - Lesbian or gay: 4.8%
  - Bisexual: 2.9%
  - Pansexual: 2.3%
  - Asexual: 2.2%
  - Questioning sexual orientation: 2.3%
  - Other: 1.0%
Disability Status

Staff
- No disability: 77.90%
- At least 1 disability: 22.10%

Faculty
- No disability: 78.40%
- At least 1 disability: 21.60%

Students
- No disability: 60.50%
- At least 1 disability: 39.50%

Legend:
- Gray: No disability
- Yellow: At least 1 disability
Veteran Status

Staff
3.10%
96.90%

Faculty
4.50%
95.50%

Students
2%
98%

Veteran  Non-Veteran
QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS: OVERALL CAMPUS CLIMATE
4 Dimensions of Campus Climate

% of Respondents with a Positive Perception

- **Commitment to Diversity (Scored ≥ 3)**: 75% (Staff), 71% (Faculty), 82% (Students)
- **Respectful/Fair Treatment (Scored ≥ 3)**: 75% (Staff), 64% (Faculty), 80% (Students)
- **Lack of Inequitable Treatment (Scored ≤ 2)**: 54% (Staff), 50% (Faculty), 62% (Students)
- **Sense of Belonging (Scored ≥ 3)**: 59% (Staff), 49% (Faculty), 63% (Students)
4 Dimensions of Campus Climate: Demographic Comparisons for Staff

% of Staff with a Positive Perception: Gender & Ethnic Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to diversity</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful/Fair Treatment</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Inequitable Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Dimensions of Campus Climate: Demographic Comparisons for Faculty

% of Faculty with a Positive Perception: Gender & Ethnic Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to diversity</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful/Fair Treatment</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Inequitable Treatment</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender***</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gender: Male, Female
Ethnicity: White, Non-White
### 4 Dimensions of Campus Climate: Demographic Comparisons for Students

#### % of Students with a Positive Perception: Gender & Ethnic Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to diversity</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful/Fair Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Inequitable Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gender*, **Ethnicity**

**Slide 18**
Responses to 2 specific survey items: “Would you recommend NKU” & “I feel I belong at NKU”

- **% Who Would Recommend NKU**
  - Staff: 90%
  - Faculty: 84%
  - Students: 92%

- **% Who Feel They Belong at NKU**
  - Staff: 85%
  - Faculty: 82%
  - Students: 88%
“Would you recommend NKU”: Ethnic & Gender Comparisons

% Who Would Recommend NKU: Gender & Ethnic Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Gender*</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel I belong at NKU”: Ethnic & Gender Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 85% of the respondents feel they belong at NKU, with slight variations by gender and ethnicity.
Additional Factors
Job Satisfaction, Morale, & Direction of NKU

Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Morale</th>
<th>Direction in Which NKU is Moving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Morale</th>
<th>Direction in Which NKU is Moving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job Satisfaction, Morale, & Direction of NKU: Ethnic & Gender Comparison for Faculty

Faculty Job Satisfaction: Gender & Ethnic Comparison

- Overall: 63% (Low), 59% (Medium), 63% (High)
- Male: 17% (Low), 20% (Medium), 19% (High)
- Female: 18% (Low), 23% (Medium), 19% (High)
- White: 20% (Low), 20% (Medium), 41% (High)
- Non-White: 19% (Low), 17% (Medium), 9% (High)

Faculty Morale: Gender & Ethnic Comparison

- Overall: 50% (Low), 52% (Medium), 49% (High)
- Male: 28% (Low), 22% (Medium), 25% (High)
- Female: 31% (Low), 17% (Medium), 26% (High)
- White: 20% (Low), 29% (Medium), 34% (High)
- Non-White: 19% (Low), 27% (Medium), 34% (High)

Faculty Satisfaction with the Direction in which NKU is Moving: Gender & Ethnic Comparison

- Overall: 34% (Low), 38% (Medium), 38% (High)
- Male: 28% (Low), 34% (Medium), 30% (High)
- Female: 38% (Low), 38% (Medium), 18% (High)
- White: 42% (Low), 37% (Medium), 36% (High)
- Non-White: 21% (Low), 34% (Medium), 32% (High)
Job Satisfaction, Morale, & Direction of NKU: Ethnic & Gender Comparison for Staff

Staff Job Satisfaction: Gender & Ethnic Comparison

- Overall: 63%
- Male: 70%
- Female: 60%
- White: 63%
- Non-White: 59%

Staff Morale: Gender & Ethnic Comparison

- Overall: 46%
- Male: 29%
- Female: 25%
- White: 29%
- Non-White: 25%

Staff Satisfaction with the Direction in which NKU is Moving: Gender & Ethnic Comparison

- Overall: 50%
- Male: 35%
- Female: 36%
- White: 45%
- Non-White: 45%

Overall:
- Low: 13%
- Medium: 24%
- High: 63%

Gender:
- Male: 16%
- Female: 14%

Ethnicity:
- White: 12%
- Non-White: 28%

Overall:
- Low: 24%
- Medium: 25%
- High: 59%

Gender:
- Male: 24%
- Female: 24%

Ethnicity:
- White: 28%
- Non-White: 24%

Overall:
- Low: 15%
- Medium: 19%
- High: 14%

Gender:
- Male: 14%
- Female: 19%

Ethnicity:
- White: 15%
- Non-White: 15%

Overall:
- Low: 35%
- Medium: 36%
- High: 45%

Gender:
- Male: 14%
- Female: 19%

Ethnicity:
- White: 15%
- Non-White: 21%

Overall:
- Low: 15%
- Medium: 34%
- High: 38%

Gender:
- Male: 14%
- Female: 19%

Ethnicity:
- White: 15%
- Non-White: 21%
### Power-Based Personal Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyberbullying</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Sexual Assault</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incapacitated Sexual Assault</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating Violence</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Stalking, bullying, and sexual harassment questions inquired about incidents that occurred on campus within the past 5 years.
- Sexual assault and dating violence questions inquired about incidents that occurred since coming to NKU.
# Power-Based Personal Violence: Gender Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bullying</strong></td>
<td>n (M/F/U)¹</td>
<td>% (M/F/U)²</td>
<td>n (M/F/U)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 (13/30/0)</td>
<td>16.4% (30%/70%/0%)</td>
<td>80 (22/57/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cyberbullying</strong></td>
<td>5 (2/3/0)</td>
<td>2.2% (40%/60%/0%)</td>
<td>23 (7/16/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Harassment</strong></td>
<td>12 (0/12/0)</td>
<td>5.4% (0%/100%/0%)</td>
<td>17 (2/15/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stalking</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forcible Sexual Assault</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incapacitated Sexual Assault</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dating Violence</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(M/F/U)¹ - Number of male, female, and unknown gender participants who reported experiencing each type of power based personal violence.

(M/F/U)² - Proportion of victims who were male, female, and unknown gender.
QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS: COMPARISON OF MINORITIZED GROUPS
## Differences in campus climate factors by minority groups and populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Commitment to Diversity</th>
<th>Respectful/Fair Treatment</th>
<th>Inequitable Treatment</th>
<th>Sense of Belonging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (White/not)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (male/female)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation (straight/LGBQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (none/1 or more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran (Veteran/not)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No asterisk = no significant difference in perception of factor between populations
- One or more asterisks = dominant group had a significantly more positive perception than minoritized group (* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001)
- Green fill = improvement since 2015 data
- Red fill = setback since 2015 data
In general, minoritized groups continue to have less favorable perceptions of campus climate.

- **Ethnicity**: This is especially true for ethnic minority *students and staff* (no differences emerged for faculty). While there were 2 areas of improvement since AY14-15, there were 5 areas of *decline* for ethnic minority staff and students.

- **Gender**: Female *students and faculty* continue to report less favorable perceptions of campus climate. *Setbacks* were noted in this area from AY14-15 until now.

- **LGBQ**: While LGBQ *students* still report less favorable perceptions of CC in some areas, *great strides* were made since AY14-15. Furthermore, perceptions of campus climate are comparable for LGBTQ & Straight *faculty and staff*. This is, again, an improvement from AY14-15.

- **Disabilities**: Great strides were made for *students* with disabilities. Students with disabilities reported *comparable* perceptions of campus climate as compared to students without disabilities. This is a great step *forward* from AY14-15. Contrarily, perceptions of campus climate declined for faculty and to some extent staff with disabilities.

- **Veterans**: As was true in the prior campus climate study, perceptions of campus climate are comparable for veterans and non-veterans.
Conclusion: Areas of greatest concern:

1. Students & staff of color
2. Female students and faculty
3. Faculty and staff with disabilities
Comparison of AY14-15 & AY18-19 Campus Climate Data
Comparing AY14-15 data with AY18-19 data for students, staff, and faculty

Overall findings:

- **Student** perceptions became less favorable
- **Faculty** perceptions remained relatively unchanged
- **Staff** perceptions became more favorable
Students
(*p<.05, **p<.01; ***p<.001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Diversity</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful/Fair Treatment</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequitable Treatment</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty
(*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Diversity</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful/Fair Treatment</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequitable Treatment</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff
(*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Diversity</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful/Fair Treatment</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequitable Treatment</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student perceptions of campus climate became **less** favorable in 2 areas.

Faculty perceptions remained relatively **unchanged**.

Staff perceptions of campus climate **improved** in 1 area.
Comparing AY14-15 data with AY18-19 data for different minority groups

Overall findings:

• *Ethnic minority and Women’s* perceptions became *less* favorable
• *Individuals with disabilities’* perceptions remained relatively *unchanged*
• *LGBQ & Veteran* perceptions became *more* favorable
Comparison of Campus Climate Perceptions Within Minority Groups: Setbacks (Denoted in red)

**Ethnic Minorities**  
(*p<.05; **p<.01)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commitment to Diversity</th>
<th>Respectful/Fair Treatment</th>
<th>Inequitable Treatment**</th>
<th>Sense of Belonging*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015 (2.94)</td>
<td>3.18 (3.16)</td>
<td>2.05 (2.2)</td>
<td>2.98 (2.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 (2.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Women**  
(*p<.05; **p<.01)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commitment to Diversity</th>
<th>Respectful/Fair Treatment</th>
<th>Inequitable Treatment**</th>
<th>Sense of Belonging*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015 (3.14)</td>
<td>3.15 (3.27)</td>
<td>1.94 (2.01)</td>
<td>3.09 (3.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 (3.27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Campus Climate Perceptions Within Minority Groups: Status Quo

Individuals with Disabilities
(*p<.05; **p<.01)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to Diversity</th>
<th>Respectful/Fair Treatment</th>
<th>Inequitable Treatment</th>
<th>Sense of Belonging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Campus Climate Perceptions Within Minority Groups: Improvements (denoted in green)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LGBQ</th>
<th>Veterans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Diversity*</td>
<td>2.99 3.11</td>
<td>3.15 3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful/Fair Treatment**</td>
<td>3.11 3.24</td>
<td>3.31 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequitable Treatment</td>
<td>2.09 2.06</td>
<td>1.92 1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging</td>
<td>2.95 2.99</td>
<td>3.32 3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*p<.05; **p<.01)
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QUALITATIVE FINDINGS: NKU’S STRENGTHS & CHALLENGES
Methods

We adopted an intersectional approach to the qualitative analysis of the Campus Climate Survey data in order to provide an analysis of the lived university experiences of the various social categories on campus (staff, faculty and students). One of the fundamental values and benefits of an intersectional analysis is the ability to identify even the most subtle forms of experiences that participants perceive to occur across multiple identities. This is particularly useful in the university context, considering that certain experiences with campus climate combine both aspects of the participants’ identities (race, gender, sexuality) and social position (student, staff & faculty).

Analysis

Specifically, we examined the raw qualitative data of the 2018-19 NKU Campus Climate study. We used the variables identified in the quantitative section of the analysis (e.g. race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, belonging, etc.) as a priori codes related to campus climate to complete a first level analysis of the data. Through a second-level intersectional analysis, we were able to established new themes, which were both similar to and distinct from the three (3) target groups of participants (students, staff, and faculty). We also conducted a Qualitative Secondary Analysis (QSA) to explore the raw qualitative data of the previous NKU Campus Climate. This QSA allowed the researchers to ask new questions of previous data, while extrapolating any similarities across the data from both studies. The resulting themes are outlined generally in the Qualitative Findings section of the PowerPoint presentation, and more specifically in the accompanying Summary documents.
## Similarities from Previous Climate Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Safety</td>
<td>• Staff vs. Faculty attitude</td>
<td>• Significant concerns related to gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prejudice</td>
<td>• Historical issues with administration/upper management</td>
<td>• Unclear policies &amp; procedures and unsuccessful reporting mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equal opportunities</td>
<td>• Gender Equity</td>
<td>• Quality matters: Academic standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University commitment to diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>• General perception of multi-leveled disconnections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fair &amp; respectful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Distinctions from Previous Climate Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Post and non-traditional student population concerns</td>
<td>• Heavy bias based on appearance</td>
<td>• Race/Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to university support</td>
<td>• Conservative fear of backlash due to “very liberal learning environment”</td>
<td>• With the exception of int’l faculty; very limited qualitative data on race, ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student anxiety</td>
<td>• Ageism</td>
<td>• Employment status inequities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commuter culture</td>
<td>• Religion</td>
<td>• Significant concerns regarding AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inappropriate student dynamics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shared Themes

• Themes that emerged among Students, Faculty, & Staff
  1. Gender equity
  2. Fair & respectful treatment
  3. Inclusion doesn’t extend to conservatives and Christians

• Themes that emerged only among Students
  4. Safety
  5. Equal Opportunity for Campus life participation
  6. Commuter culture concerns
  7. Anxiety
Shared Themes (cont.)

- Themes that emerged only among Faculty & Staff
  - Unclear and unsuccessful reporting mechanisms
  - Hyper masculine culture
  - Historical issues with administration/upper management
  - Ageism
  - Fear of religious backlash

- Themes that emerged only among Student & Staff
  - Heavy bias based on appearance
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Students

Finding: Safety

- Not enough presence of campus police
- A desire for more cameras on campus, particularly for evening classes
- Feelings of unsafety for members of the LGBTQI+ community, particularly around bathrooms
- Concerns with very late, evening courses and inclement weather

Data:

- **NKU needs to be more open with students about the events happening on campus that affect the safety of students. NKU does really well of hiding incidents and not letting students that there is a racist student on campus or that this specific student has raped someone and is still on campus.**
- **I fear walking to my car at night. I think there should be more emergency call boxes that are more accessible during an emergency.**
- **I am Person! Going to school in negative degree weather at 10pm at night is outrageous [sic]! There is no need for it.**
- **I am gender fluid, and I have never once felt safe in public or on NKU’s campus for that reason. People get followed into the bathroom**
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Students

Finding: Prejudice based on appearance

- A new theme emerged around prejudice due to ‘appearance’
  - This was captured around gender identity appearance (for females, and gender fluid), appearance related class and affording ‘trendy attire’ and appearance related to professional performativity, etc.
- Data:
  - Both professors and students will treat you differently if you dress differently.
  - I am made very uncomfortable by men on campus fairly often and generally choose to wear clothing that doesn't show any skin to avoid this attention.
  - I believe the law school still has a masculine environment that requires I dress more famine and behave that way as well.
  - I feel as a lesbian I need to dress similar to other females in order to be seen as a legitimate student who has significant abilities that make me as qualified as the other students.
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Students

Finding: Equal Opportunities

• Students presented a number of challenges related to Student Organizations regarding equal opportunities for participation
  • Students reflected that many of the NKU student organizations had an exclusive culture when considering factors of diversity.
  • Students reflected that the fraternities and sororities were perceived to be racist and not inclusive of non-hetero normative identities.
  • There was also a sentiment of classism and not “fitting in” based on appearance and clothing.
  • Students also mentioned “prevalent homo/transphobia” in student government.

• Data:
  • Fraternities are racist. Only made up on one sibgle [sic] ethnicity for majority.
  • Getting involved in other black organizations is difficult because I don’t receive emails or they don’t post on social media. I’d like to be involved and reached out to the correct department; however, I have not received any response from ANY of the organizations. It’s a shame.
  • I never felt a connection to a group or organization.
  • Welcome White Week during my freshman year made my welcome uninviting. My orientation had no one in my group that looked like me. I feel like I am just the token black person in some of my organizations which is why I really only like my black organizations that make me feel important and wanted.
  • I believe fraternities on campus should go through sexual violence training and be monitored somehow when hosting parties. I have had many friends have unwanted advances by many members of various fraternities.
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Students

Finding: Negative responses to university commitment to diversity; political/religious concerns

• While a previously expressed theme was present from under-represented student populations, a new theme emerged from white, male populations around ethnicity, religion and political views around lack of belonging due to
  • “A very liberal campus climate”
  • “Extreme” institutional “push towards diversity”
  • Campus culture of “anti-Christianity”
• Data:
  • As a Christian, I feel that my values are not respected on campus and are in fact actively advocated against. For this reason I’m not as open about my faith as I would be otherwise.
  • My peers have made fun of me for a variety of reasons including the way I choose to dress as a Christian and the way I sometimes act as both a religious person
  • Certain teachers and a growing student population at this campus are hostile toward Bible believing Christians and straight white males. More conservative leaning students (males and females) are afraid to speak their opinion due to fear of being attacked by teachers and students.
  • The LGBT way of life is so obnoxiously glorified at NKU to the point that anyone who doesn't agree with that lifestyle is demonized.
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Students

**Finding: Support**

- While students had an overall positive experience with support programs on campus, there seems to be a significant concern with accessing (i.e., emails unreturned, excessive wait times, etc.) and awareness (no marketing, no access to email listservs, etc.) around the services and support that NKU provides.
- A new finding emerged regarding the perceived support of NKU for **students with personal barriers**. A sentiment is expressed that the university doesn’t do its best to support students with extreme need such as family issues, financial issues, personal trauma, etc.
- Similar themes from past survey regarding staff, administrative and faculty impact on support emerged:
  - Lack of availability
  - Non-responsiveness
  - Limited accommodations for disability
  - Data:
    - *I tried going to the writing center for help and maybe it was a busy time but I waited for 2 hours with no help or indication of when I might receive help.*
    - *DPS needs to work on giving weight to disabilities that aren’t just physical. For instance, working on how to provide captioning for people with Auditory Processing problems, not just Deaf people.*
    - *They talk and talk about how you should get engaged as a student but I find it very difficult to try and join anything. The information isn’t easy to find*
    - *minimal communication/responses in online course*
    - *Professors are often hostile about accommodations. They allow student athletes to do as they please but when it comes to the disabled we must fight for equal treatment.*
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Students

Finding: Belonging

• Hyper-masculine culture
  • Impacts the experience of women on campus, which was a recurrent theme in previous studies.
  • However, new findings show that this culture also impacts the experiences of gender-fluid students as well as male non-conforming students and their experiences of belonging.

• Student Anxiety
  • A large sub-sample of students suffered from issues related to anxiety and depression which impacts their sense of belonging.

• Commuter Culture
  • Some students felt that their sense of belonging was impacted by the commuter culture at NKU.
    • A recurring theme of a cost-analysis of attending NKU as an out-of-state institution and whether the cost met the value due to the lack of “integrated campus life” vs. “commuter environment”

• Data:
  • Not everyone is as accepting of LGBTQ+ as I am so I try to avoid people knowing I am LGBTQ+ sometimes.
  • Disability services did not take my anxiety seriously
  • As an Ohio resident, I feel like I don't belong here and like my tuition is more and that I don't have as much opportunity for scholarships because Kentucky residents not only pay cheaper tuition but get exclusive scholarships for attending KY high schools and so many grants just for living in NKY. It's like Ohio residents aren't very welcome.
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Staff

Finding: Concern of Expressing Political Viewpoints

• Political Viewpoints
  • Conservative fear of backlash due to “very liberal learning environment”
  • Data:
    – cannot be conservative [sic] this place is much too liberal. feels like the institution makes a value judgement on any conservative [sic] thought.
    – If you are not a progressive liberal you are not toeing the campus party line as far as the faculty and administration are concerned. If you have strongly held religious [sic] or political views that don't fit the liberal point of view you have to keep your opinions to yourself.
    – I feel like I have to reserve my conservative opinion here.
    – I love NKU despite feeling more and more excluded as a conservative.
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Staff

Finding: Heavy bias based on Appearance

- Intense emphasis ‘on attire’ and professionalism
- “No dress code for faculty”: Continued reference to the double standard of dress codes for staff vs. faculty
- Data:
  - The different dress standards applied to staff as opposed to faculty need to be removed
  - I'm a staff member and am expected to maintain a "professional level" of dress while faculty are allowed to walk around in jeans, t-shirts, shorts...
  - People place stereotypes on perception based on the way people dress, so I choose to dress professionally at all times
  - I don't want to be pre-judged for having a more eccentric style of dress, thus I keep a more "professional" attire.
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Staff

Finding: Hyper masculine culture

- Pay inequities based on gender
- Inappropriate comments and behavior by senior male staff
- Intense focus on and dress requirements regarding the appearance of women under the guise of “professional appearance”
- Data:
  - *men seem to be treated with more respect and pay than women*
  - *I feel that women (and myself as a woman) are not reviewed as positively and financially rewarded as well as men during annual reviews.*
  - *I responded that there were areas related to my gender where I don't feel supported. The lack of a comprehensive paid parental leave program impacts not just me and my identity, but all parents and potential parents on campus. It also tends to dis-proportionally impact women who are often considered the primary caregivers.*
  - *I feel that women (and myself as a woman) are not reviewed as positively and financially rewarded as well as men during annual reviews.*
  - *Leadership tell lude sexual jokes*
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Staff

Finding: Staff vs. Faculty perception

- Opportunity for development given only to faculty not staff
- A sense that “Faculty run the show and do whatever they want”
- Continued reference to “No dress code for faculty”
- “Academic snobbery” disposition of some faculty members towards staff members
- Data:
  - The combination of being female in a staff role without a Ph.D. weighs heavily on how I am treated.
  - Not unlike our students, I have felt my contributions to a discussion are dismissed because I do not know the "language" of a specific discipline, even though I may actually understand the concepts of the discussion. There are real issues with classism and what I would term, academic snobbery.
  - Opportunities for professional development for some. (Others aren't allowed to leave their desks, unfortunately.)
  - I feel opportunities [sic] for development or advancement are offered to faculty and not staff
  - The opinion of faculty seem to have more weight than that of staff
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Staff

Finding: Historical issues with administration/upper management

• Mistrust of HR/perception of lack of support
• Data:
  • No one is listening
  • Human Resources is absolutely no help and administrators always protect their own
  • When seeking help from other departments, like HR or procurement it is very hard to get a hold of them or get answers from them. It feels like we are not a team and that they do not care about people who also work here
• Cliques
  • Perceived preferential treatment in the old guard vs. new guard in senior staff
  • Idea of cliques being tied to promotion and opportunity
• Data:
  • There are clicks on this campus and if you do not fit in, you are an outcast.
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Staff

Finding: How ‘difference’ is recognized and treated on campus

• LGBTQ
  • Limited availability of similar and equal resources offered to all marginalized groups on campus
  • Not feeling safe to be authentic and open on campus
    • Data:
      – Since I was discriminated against in the past based on my sexual orientation, I am more reserved than my colleagues about my personal life.
      – I do not feel comfortable letting my coworkers know my sexual orientation or my lack of religious beliefs.
      – In the past, I felt I was discriminated against by my former manager on the basis of my gender and sexual orientation.

• General
  • Staff can’t be authentic on campus, due to NKU’s “identity crisis”
  • Common sentiment of staff feeling like they are in a corner
  • How to support Christian, white, republican conservatives who are expressing a sense of being marginalized and non-belonging
  • Data:
    • There is no political openness [sic]. People are most on one side and don’t [sic] like the other side. So opinions are kept to self
    • we are trying to help everyone and not doing it well. So it ends up being damaging to most
    • I ama [sic] Christian and I feel like we are discriminated against on campus.
    • cannot express Christian values and conservative [sic] political thoughts.
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Staff

Finding: Ageism

- Fear of being pushed out; favoritism of younger employees
- Data:
  - Recently, favoritism has become fairly apparent, especially among the younger females in my office.
  - Made to feel guilty and at fault for world's problems as an old white male.
  - I also feel that those of us who are older or who have disabilities must mitigate these as much as possible to be considered worth keeping at NKU. Supervisors do not like dealing with employees who may have health or disability issues.
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Staff

Finding: Religion

- Discomfort with praying during meetings. But, unwilling to speak up due to perceived repercussions
- Religious fear:
  - fear of being non-Christian in departments/programs that induce religion into the culture
  - fear of being Christian in a pro-LGBQTI+ climate
- Data:
  - *This campus seems to have a negative view on certain religious affiliations. I am not comfortable at all revealing my religious denomination for fear of negative treatment*
  - *I ama [sic] Christian and I feel like we are discriminated against on campus. If I don't follow the culture of the "in crowd", then I don't fit in. Sad but true!*
  - *people on campus feel they have to hide their political point of view if they are Republican or Christian, but nothing ever changes so why keep asking about it*
  - *Not everyone agrees with one being an open Christian....*
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Faculty

Finding: Ageism

• Significant concerns address in the data regarding Age
  • Feelings of being pushed out
  • Ageism - Feelings of discrimination of hiring “older” faculty; preference towards “younger” hires

• Data:
  • I feel discriminated against in my dept [sic] because my field and interests are different from most of the other faculty. When I apply for promotion, they cite requirements that do not exist and are also ageist.
  • As a senior faculty member my contributions are not as valued as rose of newer faculty. Age discrimination is real on campus.
  • As a woman and "of a certain age," I feel I need to dress more carefully--nothing too short, too tight, or too revealing. I also feel like I need to dress less casually than my male colleagues to be taken seriously by students. (*related to question of impact of identity on Annual Performance Review)
  • I feel I have to dress very conservatively to be accepted. Big prints, bright colors/patterns are frowned upon on women over a certain size or age. (*related to question of impact of identity on Annual Performance Review)
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Faculty

Finding: Experience of international faculty

- In contrast to previous year’s study, very limited qualitative data was included around the identity of race, ethnicity
  - With the exception of international faculty data
  - Data:
    - *I am an international faculty member and I believe that especially my students [sic] teaching evaluations would be affected if I am different than the "norm" faculty member (e.g. white American).*
    - *As a muslim [sic] faculty member, I don’t [sic] feel comfortable to disclose to others, especially to students in class. Many of them are not used to international faculty members or Msulim [sic] faculty members.*
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Faculty

Finding: Gender

- Recurrent theme from previous years’ study
- Recurrent theme from the student and staff data from current year’s study
- Hyper-masculine culture
  - Impacts Advancement and promotion
  - Sexual harassment
  - Toxic environment
  - Program/department culture
- Data:
  - the experience of women on campus
  - As a woman, I have often received smaller raises than male colleagues for no apparent reason.
  - There are gender differentials in RPT
  - It is important to fit into a "man's" world in order to be accepted or have an opinion heard/considered.
  - If you are not a man, you are not treated equally or respectfully. Northern has a glass ceiling for women and it has been evident the entire time I have been here, even as a student.
  - I have experienced numerous incidents of retaliation and discrimination. to name a few of the experiences I have had: sexual harassment, unwarranted conditions for reappointment, denial of tenure, collusion between program coordinator and department chair to deny professional development opportunities, gender discrimination, institutional discrimination, lack of collegiality, potential Title IX violations by department chair, collusion amongst administration to ignore certain claims, etc.
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Faculty

Finding: Unclear Policies and Procedures and unsuccessful reporting mechanisms

- Perception “nowhere to turn to”
  - Multiple answers of: “No one” under the question: If you do not feel safe going to your supervisor, where do you go?
  - Concerns with transparency and lack of action on behalf of HR
- Data:
  - When there is an issue with an administrator based on gender or gender identity there is no process for resolution. Human Resources is absolutely no help and administrators always protect their own.
  - In the past, I have experienced severe bullying from certain faculty and high level administrative members. I followed the policy at the time to file a complaint with HR. It was never dealt with and the perpetrators continue to be part of the visible NKU community. It was so disheartening and to this day I believe that NKU continues to protect the perpetrators. I do not feel safe in their presence and try to avoid any contact at all with them. Any emails and announcements from them are triggers for me.
  - There is NOWHERE to go for faculty UNLESS the issue is related to pay/salary or standard HR issues such as sexual harassment [sic] - you cannot even file a grievance if, for example, the administration has violated explicit policies from any number of sources. The corrupt administration will simply bury you.
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Faculty

Finding: Differential treatment based on employment status

- Employment Status
  - Tenure vs. non-tenure; part-time, adjunct, NTTT and NTTR
    - Clear perceptions of bias against non-tenured faculty
      - Feelings of being disposable
      - Disrespected
    - Limited opportunities
      - For advancement – feelings of intentional dismissal simply due to current employment status
      - Limited access to professional development – resources only available to tenure-track faculty
      - No APRs, so no opportunity for feedback and improvement
  - Data:
    - Race, gender, ethnicity, etc. aren’t nearly as big a factor as part-time vs. full-time employment status. Not a day goes by where an email that says something to the effect of “eligible full time faculty” or mentions some benefit that doesn’t apply to part-time faculty, even though many work as many teaching hours as full time faculty with no paid sabbaticals, or research time.
    - As adjunct faculty, I do not feel part of the community of NKU. We are certainly not treated as well as FT faculty. We are kind of the "hired help".
    - Adjuncts cannot ad advance. If a full time position opens outside candidates are more attractive because adjuncts can be kept in permanent limbo.
    - it affects in that I do not receive an annual review because of my "part-time" status; I have worked here for 4 years and have never had any feedback given to me from my superiors
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Faculty

Finding: General perception of multi-leveled disconnections

- Administrators are disconnected from faculty
  - Particularly related to create budgets seen to be mismatched with classroom and student needs
- University leaders are disconnected from Pres. Vaidya
  - Inconsistency of the actions of leaders from the message and vision of Pres. Vaidya which causes problems with implementation and assessment at the faculty level
- Faculty are disconnected from students
  - Financial constraints placed on students due to
    - Pricey textbooks
    - Secondary educational support requirements (i.e., test preps)
  - Assumption that students aren’t capable
- Data:
  - *Stop being administrative heavy; think about students more; this is a student centered university - or it used to be. We are to be serving students*
  - *The administration is completely disconnected from the faculty. It's like we're at two different institutions. Do they understand what we deal with in terms of student problems*
  - *President Vaidya is a leader to follow (as mentioned above); however, several people who report directly to him do not mimic his leadership style. This creates a sort-of cognitive dissonance with NKU employees who follow and buy-into the President's words and actions - but then their own direct leaders say and do things that are contradictory to the President's vision.*
  - *Many of my colleagues do not really understand the struggles that many of our students have.*
Qualitative Data supporting our Findings – Faculty

Finding: Inappropriate student dynamics

- No appropriate process for responding to hostile students
- Growing presence of disrespect by students in classrooms
- Data:
  - Administration does not support ethical classroom behavior among students, and faculty are forced to teach hostile students
  - The university often does nothing about and sometimes supports students who are abusive to professors.
  - Students sometimes do not respect female professors or provide fair comments to female professors on course evaluations. Their comments are often gendered.
Strengths

- Affordability of education
- General sense of support for vision of President Vaidya
- New and remodeled facilities
- Caring faculty and staff
- Commitment to innovation
- Engagement
  - Community - local and campus-wide
  - Increased civic engagement programming and opportunities
- Family-friendly environment
- Classroom size
  - Faculty : Student ratio
MOVING FORWARD: RECOMMENDATIONS
We are all tied together in a single garment of destiny... an inescapable network of mutuality.... I can never be what I ought to be until you are allowed to be what you ought to be.

Dr. Martin Luther King, 1963