## Executive Summary

### History of the Project

The University of Nevada, Reno seeks to create an environment characterized by openness, fairness, and equal access for all students, staff, and faculty. Creating and maintaining a welcoming community environment that respects individuals, their needs, abilities, and potential is critically important.

The university undertook the campus climate survey to evaluate the current campus climate as experienced and perceived by all members of the university community. The goals were multifold:

- Identify successful initiatives.
- Uncover any challenges facing members of the University community.
- Develop strategic initiatives to build on successes, address challenges, and create lasting positive change.

To ensure full transparency and to provide a more complete perspective, in 2018, the University of Nevada, Reno contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to help lead this effort. Beginning in June, 2018, an R&A team worked with a Climate Study Work Group (CSWG) of University students, academic faculty, administrative faculty and classified staff to develop an assessment and promote it during the February 2019 – March 2019 survey administration period. Six thousand four hundred fifteen (6,415) members of the University community completed the *University of Nevada, Reno, Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working*, which represented a 27% response rate.

**Methodology**

**Focus Groups.** The first phase of the climate assessment process was to conduct a series of focus groups at the University to gather information from students, academic faculty, administrative faculty, and classified staff about their perceptions of the campus climate. On October 22, 2018, University students, academic faculty, administrative faculty and classified staff (134 in total) participated in 20 focus groups conducted by R&A facilitators. Feedback from these focus groups directly informed item selection and wording, so that the assessment would provide the insight necessary for the University to understand key elements of the learning, living, and working environment.

**Survey Instrument.**[1] The CSWG reviewed several drafts of the initial survey that R&A proposed and vetted the questions to be contextually appropriate for the University. The working group also reviewed the final focus group report and revised/added questions to the survey based on the themes that emerged from the focus groups. The final university-wide survey instrument contained 120 questions, including 97 quantitative questions and 23 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 community were offered the opportunity to enter a random drawing that included prizes such as parking passess, Wolf Shop gifts cards, Performing Arts Series tickets, a six-month membership to the E. L. Wiegand Fitness Center, and sporting event tickets.

**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 through the Office of Research Integrity reviewed the survey and processes and approved the assessment on January 19, 2019.

---

[1] The full assessment is available in Appendix D in the full report.

**Sample Construction.** All eligible members of the University community were invited to participate in the assessment.[2] Prospective respondents received an invitation from President Marc Johnson that contained the URL link to the survey instrument. The assessment working group's marketing subcommittee worked with the University's communications team to create inclusive, thoughtful, and tailored messaging for email distribution and social media platforms. Additional marketing items including posters, postcards, buttons, and digital screens. Six thousand four hundred fifteen (6,415) surveys were included in the analyses for a 27% overall response rate.[3] A summary of the respondents in the sample by position status follows:

- 53% ($n$ = 3,389) of the sample were Undergraduate Students representing 22% of the total undergraduate student population;

- 12% ($n$ = 794) of the sample were Graduate/Professional Students representing 23% of the total graduate/professional student population;

- 12% ($n$ = 738) of the sample were Academic Faculty/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Research Scientist/Librarian members representing 36% of the total academic faculty/post-doctoral scholar/research scientist/librarian members population;

- 12% ($n$ = 781) of the sample were Administrative Faculty/Executive-level Administrative Faculty representing 70% of the total administrative faculty/executive-level administrative faculty population; and

- 11% ($n$ = 713) of the sample were Classified Staff representing 67% of the total classified staff population.

Primary status data for respondents were collapsed into the following categories for analyses: Undergraduate Student respondents,[4] Graduate/Professional Student respondents, Academic Faculty/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Research Scientist/Librarian (Academic Faculty) respondents,[5]

---

[2] A detailed presentation of sample characteristics is offered later in the full report.

[3] Please refer to Table 3 in the full report for more detailed population data.

[4] Non-Degree student respondents were not included in analyses to maintain confidentiality owing to a low response number.

[5] The CSWG, in collaboration with R&A, decided to collapse Post-Doctorial Scholars ($n$ = 30) and Research Scientists and Librarians ($n$ = 6) with Academic Faculty respondents ($n$ = 708), leading to more methodologically sound analyses. Unless noted, the group is referred to as "Academic Faculty" throughout the remainder of the report.

Administrative Faculty/Executive-level Administrative Faculty (Administrative Faculty) respondents, and Classified Staff respondents. Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic characteristics of assessment respondents.

**Quantitative Data Analysis.**[6] The data first were analyzed to tabulate responses to each of the questions in the survey.[7] Descriptive statistics were calculated by salient group memberships (e.g., gender identity, racial identity, primary position) to provide additional information regarding participant responses.[8] This report presents data using valid percentages.[9] Actual percentages[10] 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 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.

---

[6] More details on the quantitative and qualitative methods are provided later in the methods section of the full report.

[7] For a complete review of the responses for each question offered in the survey, refer to Appendix B.

[8] 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.

[9] Valid percentages were derived using the total number of respondents to an item (i.e., missing data were excluded).

[10] Actual percentages were derived using the total number of survey respondents.

Factor Analysis[11]

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on one set of questions 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 factor score for *Perceived Academic Success* was created by taking the average of the scores for the six sub-questions in the factor. 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., first-generation status) 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 $\text{Eta}^2$ and any moderate-to-large effects are noted.

**Qualitative Data Analysis.**[12] Several assessment questions provided respondents the opportunity to describe their experiences at the University, 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.

---

[11] A more detailed review of the factor analysis methodology is offered later in the full report.

[12] Qualitative analyses are offered in the full report.

**Limitations.**[13] 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 Nevada, Reno Sample Demographics[14]**

| Characteristic | Subgroup | *n* | % of Sample |
|---|---|---|---|
| Position status[a] | Undergraduate Student | 3,389 | 52.8 |
| | Graduate/Professional Student | 794 | 12.4 |
| | Academic Faculty/Post-Doctoral Scholar/Research Scientist, Librarian | 738 | 11.5 |
| | Administrative Faculty/Executive-level Administrative Faculty | 781 | 12.2 |
| | Classified Staff | 713 | 11.1 |
| Gender identity[b] | Women | 3,848 | 60.0 |
| | Men | 2,405 | 37.5 |
| | Trans-spectrum | 87 | 1.4 |
| | Missing (not answered) | 75 | 1.2 |
| Racial/ethnic identity[c] | Asian/Asian American | 452 | 7.2 |
| | Black/African American | 184 | 2.9 |
| | Latina/x/o/Chicana/x/o | 580 | 9.3 |
| | White/European American | 3,971 | 62.2 |
| | Multiracial | 804 | 12.9 |
| | Missing/Unknown | 208 | 3.3 |

---

[13] A more detailed explanation on limitations is offered in the full report.

[14] For more detailed information on the demographic variables, see pages Sample Characteristics Section in the full report

*Table 1*. **University of Nevada, Reno Sample Demographics[14]**

| Characteristic | Subgroup | *n* | % of Sample |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sexual identity | Queer-spectrum | 509 | 7.9 |
| | Bisexual | 411 | 6.4 |
| | Heterosexual | 5,309 | 82.8 |
| | Missing/Asexual/Not Listed | 186 | 2.9 |
| Citizenship status | U.S. Citizen | 5,574 | 86.9 |
| | U.S. Citizen, Naturalized | 373 | 5.8 |
| | Non-U.S. Citizen | 418 | 6.5 |
| | Missing (not answered) | 50 | 0.8 |
| Disability status | Single Disability | 481 | 7.5 |
| | No Disability | 5,595 | 87.2 |
| | Multiple Disabilities | 285 | 4.4 |
| | Missing (not answered) | 54 | 0.8 |
| Religious affiliation | Christian Religious Affiliation | 2,484 | 38.7 |
| | Other Religious Affiliation | 406 | 6.3 |
| | No Religious Affiliation | 3,030 | 47.2 |
| | Multiple Religious Affiliations | 282 | 4.4 |
| | Missing (not answered) | 213 | 3.3 |

Note: The total *n* for each demographic characteristic may differ as a result of missing data.
[a] $X^2 (4, N = 6{,}415) = 1{,}632.50$, $p < .001$
[b] $X^2 (2, N = 6{,}328) = 479.18$, $p < .001$
[c] $X^2 (2, N = 6{,}199) = 566.60$, $p < .001$

## Key Findings

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.[15] The level of comfort experienced by faculty, staff, and students is one indicator of campus climate.

---

[15] Rankin & Reason (2008)

1. **The overall campus climate, workplace climate, and classroom climate were described as comfortable by many respondents, however less comfortable by a significant minority of other respondents.**

   - 71% ($n$ = 4,568) of survey respondents were "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the climate at the University (Table 22 in full report).
     - By gender identity, women respondents and trans-spectrum respondents reported being significantly less comfortable than men respondents (Figure 20 in full report).
     - By racial identity, Black/African American respondents reported being significantly less comfortable with the overall climate than White respondents or Other Respondents of Color (Figure 23 in full report).
     - By sexual identity, Queer-spectrum respondents and Bisexual respondents reported being significantly less comfortable than Heterosexual respondents (Figure 25 in full report).
     - By disability status, respondents with Multiple Disabilities reported being significantly less comfortable than respondents with No Disabilities (Figure 27 in full report).
     - By income status, Low-Income Student respondents were significantly less comfortable than Not-Low-Income Students respondents (Figure 29 in full report).
     - By first-generation status, First-Generation Student respondents were significantly less comfortable than Not-First-Generation Student respondents (Figure 31 in full report).
   - 70% ($n$ = 1,549) of Academic Faculty, Administrative Faculty, and Classified Staff respondents were "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the climate in their departments/work units (Figure 18 in full report).
     - By position status, Academic Faculty respondents reported being significantly less comfortable than Administrative Faculty (Figure 18 in full report).

- ○ By gender identity, women respondents reported being significantly less comfortable than men respondents (Figure 21 in full report).
- 79% (*n* = 3,868) of Student and Academic Faculty respondents were "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the climate in their classes.
  - ○ By position status, Undergraduate Student respondents reported being significantly less comfortable than Graduate/Professional Student respondents or Academic Faculty respondents (Figure 19 in full report).
  - ○ By gender identity, Women Academic Faculty and Student respondents reported being significantly less comfortable than Men Academic Faculty and Student respondents (Figure 22 in full report).
  - ○ By racial identity, Black/African American Academic Faculty and Student Respondents reported being significantly less comfortable than Asian/Asian American Academic Faculty and Student respondents (Figure 23 in full report).
  - ○ By sexual identity, Queer-spectrum Academic Faculty and Student respondents and Bisexual Academic Faculty and Student respondents reported being significantly less comfortable than Heterosexual Academic Faculty and Student respondents (Figure 26 in full report).
  - ○ By disability status, Academic Faculty and Student respondents with Multiple Disabilities reported being significantly less comfortable than Academic Faculty and Student respondents with No Disabilities (Figure 28 in full report).
  - ○ By income status, Low-Income Student respondents were significantly less comfortable than Not-Low-Income Students respondents (Figure 30 in full report).

2. **Academic Faculty Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Work**

   *Tenured and Tenure-Track*

   - 83% ($n = 407$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that research was valued by the University (Table 95 in full report).

   *Non-Tenure-Track*

   - 66% ($n = 167$) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that expectations of their responsibilities were clear (Table 98 in full report).

3. **Administrative Faculty Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Work**

   - 68% ($n = 519$) of Administrative Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they had supervisors who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it (Table 66 in full report).

   - 75% ($n = 566$) of Administrative Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it (Table 66 in full report).

   - 76% ($n = 567$) of Administrative Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance (Table 68 in full report).

4. **Classified Staff Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Work**

   - 73% ($n = 519$) of Classified Staff respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it (Table 70 in full report).

   - 77% ($n = 541$) of Classified Staff respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance (Table 72 in full report).

   - 74% ($n = 519$) of Classified Staff respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they were able to complete their assigned duties during scheduled hours (Table 73 in full report).

**5. Student Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Academic Experiences**

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

*Undergraduate Students*

- 68% ($n = 2,269$) of Undergraduate Student respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt valued by the academic faculty in the classroom (Table 126 in full report).
- 65% ($n = 2,195$) of Undergraduate Student respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they had academic faculty whom they perceived as role models (Table 126 in full report).

*Graduate/Professional Students*

- 73% ($n = 579$) of Graduate/Professional Student respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt valued by the academic faculty (Table 129 in full report).
- 76% ($n = 598$) of Graduate/Professional Student respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt valued by other students in the classroom (Table 130 in full report).
- 80% ($n = 631$) of Graduate/Professional Student respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they had academic faculty whom they perceived as role models (Table 132 in full report).

---

[16] Pascarella & Terenzini (2005)

[17] Hale (2004); Harper & Hurtado (2007); Harper & Quaye (2004)

6. **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.[18] Research also underscores the relationship between workplace discrimination and subsequent productivity.[19] The survey requested information on experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

   - 21% ($n = 1,357$) of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.[20]
     - 30% ($n = 405$) noted that the conduct was based on their position status.
     - 21% ($n = 289$) believed it was based on their gender/gender identity.
     - 18% shared it was based on their age ($n = 240$).
     - 18% noted it was based on their ethnicity ($n = 237$).

   *Differences Based on Position Status, Gender Identity, and Racial Identity*

   - By position status, a higher percentage of Classified Staff respondents (31%, $n = 220$) and Academic Faculty respondents (30%, $n = 222$) than Undergraduate Student respondents (16%, $n = 550$) and Graduate/Professional Student respondents (21%, $n = 165$) believed that they had experienced this conduct (Figure 34 in full report).
     - A higher percentage of Classified Staff respondents (50%, $n = 109$) and Administrative Faculty respondents (47%, $n = 94$) than Graduate/Professional Student respondents (33%, $n = 54$) and Undergraduate Student respondents (12%, $n = 68$) thought that the conduct was based on their position status (Figure 34 in full report).

---

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

[19] Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley (2008); Waldo (1998)

[20] 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 (37%, $n = 32$) than Women respondents (23%, $n = 873$), along with a higher percentage of Women respondents than Men respondents (18%, $n = 423$), indicated that they had experienced this conduct (Figure 35 in full report).
  - A higher percentage of Trans-spectrum respondents (66%, $n = 21$) than Women respondents (25%, $n = 214$), along with a higher percentage of Women respondents than Men respondents (11%, $n = 46$), who had experienced this conduct indicated that the conduct was based on their gender identity (Figure 35 in full report).
- By racial identity, a higher percentage of Black/African American respondents (34%, $n = 63$) than White respondents (20%, $n = 800$), Multiracial respondents (22%, $n = 177$), Latina/x/o/Chicana/x/o respondents (21%, $n = 119$), and Asian/Asian American respondents (14%, $n = 64$) indicated that they had experienced this conduct in the past year (Figure 36 in full report).
  - A higher percentage of Other Respondents of Color (38%, $n = 22$), Asian/Asian American respondents (34%, $n = 22$), Black/African American respondents (52%, $n = 33$), Latina/x/o/Chicana/x/o respondents (50%, $n = 60$), and Multiracial respondents (23%, $n = 41$) than White respondents (6%, $n = 46$) who had experienced this conduct indicated that the conduct was based on their racial identity (Figure 36 in full report).

Respondents were offered the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct at the University. Six hundred seventy-one, 11% of all respondents, elaborated on experiences with this conduct. Bullying and hostile conduct were major themes that emerged. Participants described how the conduct came from a variety of sources, including academic faculty, supervisors, and graduate advisors. Participants also described experiencing discrimination often based on race or gender identity.

7. **Academic Faculty, Administrative Faculty, and Classified Staff Respondents –
   Seriously Considered Leaving University of Nevada, Reno**

   - 55% ($n = 403$) of Academic Faculty respondents, 56% ($n = 439$) of
     Administrative Faculty respondents, and 51% ($n = 359$) of Classified Staff
     respondents had seriously considered leaving the University in the past year
     (Figure 54 in full report).
     - 53% ($n = 219$) of those Academic Faculty respondents who seriously
       considered leaving did so because of low salary/pay rate and 35% ($n =
       143$) because of increased workload (Table 109 in full report).
     - 59% ($n = 252$) of those Administrative Faculty respondents who seriously
       considered leaving did so because of low salary/pay rate and 49% ($n =
       212$) because of limited advancement opportunities (Table 107 in full
       report).
     - 55% ($n = 197$) of those Classified Staff respondents who seriously
       considered leaving did so because of a low salary/pay rate and 46% ($n =
       165$) because of limited advancement opportunities (Table 108 in full
       report).

   Eight hundred seven Academic Faculty, Administrative Faculty, and Classified Staff
   respondents, 9% of all Academic Faculty, Administrative Faculty, and Classified Staff
   respondents, elaborated on why they had seriously considered leaving the University.
   One theme emerged from both Administrative Faculty and Classified Staff respondents:
   poor compensation. Two additional themes emerged from Classified Staff respondents:
   supervisor tension and a toxic work environment. Classified Staff respondents explained
   how they were treated poorly by their supervisor and described incidents that created a
   toxic work environment. One theme emerged for Academic Faculty respondents: lack of
   merit pay. Participants described not having a living wage or, with Academic Faculty
   respondents, not having the ability to make merit raises.

**Administrative Faculty – Challenges With Work-Life Issues**

- 32% ($n$ = 241) of Administrative Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the performance evaluation process was productive (Table 67 in full report).

- 31% ($n$ = 234) of Administrative Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the University provided adequate support to help them to manage work-life balance (Table 68 in full report).

- 37% ($n$ = 280) of Administrative Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they performed more work than colleagues with similar performance expectations (Table 68 in full report).

**Classified Staff – Challenges With Work-Life Issues**

- 24% ($n$ = 170) of Classified Staff respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they were burdened by work responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations (Table 72 in full report).

- 48% ($n$ = 335) of Classified Staff respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that their workload increased without additional compensation as a result of other staff departures (Table 73 in full report).

- 60% ($n$ = 422) of Classified Staff respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that a hierarchy existed within classified staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than others (Table 73 in full report).

Administrative Faculty and Classified Staff respondents elaborated on their perceptions of the workplace climate at the University. Several themes emerged from the responses, including arbitrary evaluation process, increased workload, and supportive supervisor. Specifically, Administrative Faculty respondents described feeling that the performance evaluation process was arbitrary and unproductive. All respondents felt that they were overworked and took on additional duties without compensation. Finally, Classified Staff respondents described having a supportive supervisor.

**Academic Faculty Respondents – Challenges With Work**

- 41% ($n$ = 203) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that tenure standards/promotion standards were applied equally to faculty in their schools/division (Table 94 in full report).

- 36% ($n$ = 176) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the Academic Faculty who qualify for delaying their tenure-clock felt empowered to do so (Table 94 in full report).

- 43% ($n$ = 210) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they performed more work to help students (e.g., formal and informal advising, thesis advising, helping with student groups and activities) than did their colleagues (Table 96 in full report).

- 31% ($n$ = 80) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they had job security (Table 98 in full report).

8.  **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, sexual identity, disability status, and first-generation status on *Perceived Academic Success*.

    *Examples of Findings*

    - Men Undergraduate Student respondents had less *Perceived Academic Success* than Women Undergraduate Student respondents (Table 111 in full report).

    - Multiracial Undergraduate Student respondents had less *Perceived Academic Success* than White Undergraduate Student respondents (Table 114 in full report).

    - Graduate/Professional Student Respondents with a Single Disability had less *Perceived Academic Success* than Graduate/Professional Student Respondents with No Disability (Table 122 in full report).

9. **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 survey requested information regarding sexual assault.

- 12% ($n = 771$) of respondents indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact/conduct while at the University (Table 45 in full report).
  - 2% ($n = 115$) experienced relationship violence (e.g., ridiculed, controlling, hitting) (Table 45 in full report).
  - 3% ($n = 186$) experienced stalking (e.g., following me, on social media, texting, phone calls) (Table 45 in full report).
  - 8% ($n = 491$) experienced sexual interaction (e.g., catcalling, repeated sexual advances, sexual harassment) (Table 45 in full report).
  - 4% ($n = 270$) experienced unwanted sexual contact (e.g., fondling, rape, sexual assault, penetration without consent) (Table 45 in full report).
- Respondents identified University students, current or former dating/intimate partners, acquaintances/friends, and strangers as sources of unwanted sexual contact/conduct (Near Table 63 in full report).
- Most respondents did not report the unwanted sexual contact/conduct (Table 63 in full report).

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 included respondents feeling self-blame and fear of retribution.

**Summary.**

The University of Nevada, Reno climate findings[21] were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country, based on the work of R&A Consulting.[22] For example, 70% to 80% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be "very comfortable" or "comfortable." A similar percentage (71%) of the University respondents indicated that they were "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the climate at the University. 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 Nevada, Reno, a similar percentage of respondents (21%) 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.[23]

The University's climate assessment report provides baseline data on diversity and inclusion, and addresses the University's mission and goals. While the findings may guide decision-making regarding policies and practices at the University, 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 community with an opportunity to build upon its strengths and to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. The University, with support from senior administrators and collaborative leadership, is in a prime position to actualize its commitment to promote an inclusive campus and to institute organizational structures that respond to the needs of its dynamic campus community.

---

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

[22] Rankin & Associates Consulting (2016)

[23] 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 (*n*RC-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.