

Running head: CLIMATE OF INCLUSIVITY AND DIVERSITY

Examining Campus Racial Climate for Faculty and Staff

Sherri Fujita

Spring 2019

University of Washington, Tacoma

A dissertation in practice submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

Supervisory Committee:

Ginger MacDonald, Ph.D., Chair

Lawrence Knopp, Ph.D., Member

Yukari Amos, Ph.D., Member

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to understand how campus racial climate at a historically White public university in the Pacific Northwest of the United States is perceived by faculty and staff. Two theoretical frameworks are used in this study; first, that of critical race theory's notion of interest-convergence and racial capitalism, and second, DiAngelo's (2018) tenet of white fragility. A modified version of Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Alma's (1998) multidimensional framework was used to guide the study to include demographics of the university as well as historical, structural, and psychological descriptions. A mixed method study was conducted using institutional data and a faculty and staff survey on perceived campus climate. The survey results revealed that there are significant differences in the way that campus racial climate is perceived according to race. While faculty and staff of color perceive racism and exclusion, some White faculty and staff perceive the university's commitment to racial diversity with anger and frustration. While there have been advances in the way in which this university's leadership has encouraged an improved racial climate, most, if not all of these advances, can be attributed to interest convergence and racial capitalism. For true sustainable change, the pervasiveness of White fragility and racial innocence among the ranks of the university's White faculty and staff must first be addressed.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Acknowledgements

I would like to pause and take a moment to acknowledge and honor the people who were there for me as I completed this research project. First of all, I would like all of the world to know that Dr. Ginger MacDonald and Dr. Chris Knaus are two life-changing souls who opened the world and pushed me to see beyond the mundane and to comprehend society as complex interconnected systems. I would like to thank all of cohort 2 for their friendship, but particularly my cohort sisters who laughed and loved and supported me unconditionally through the Ed.D. program, Olga Inglebritson, Paulette Lopez, and Chanira Reang Sperry.

This research would not have been possible without the cooperation of faculty and staff at RNU who assisted me with the collection of artifacts and data and gave me their time and support through the data collection phase. Thank you so much. I am indebted.

I would like to appreciate my brother, Dr. Todd Leibert, who patiently offered invaluable guidance and advice on quantitative data analysis. I believe my study is richer and deeper as a result. And finally, this dissertation would not have been completed had I not had the full support of my long suffering family, particularly my husband, Dr. Kagari Fujita, for allowing me to pursue my dream.

“Continued resistance by the powerless eventually triumphs over power, and thus oppression must be resisted, even when opposition seems useless.”

Derrick Bell

Table of Contents

I. Introduction5

II. Statement of Problem and Rationale7

III. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review10

IV. Research Questions20

V. Research Study Design20

VI. Strengths and Limitations of the Design22

VII. Methods24

VIII. Results – Historical, Structural, Organizational.....29

IX. Results - Psychological.....38

X. Discussion56

XI. Recommendations and Implications for RNU.....66

XII. Conclusion - Inclusive Racial Climate Hindered by White Fragility69

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Examining Campus Racial Climate for Faculty and Staff

The purpose of this study is to explore how faculty and staff at a public university in the Pacific Northwest region of the U.S. perceive a campus racial climate. This study is underpinned by key research in this area and is structured using a modified version of Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen's (1998) multidimensional framework and supported by two theoretical frameworks. First, that of critical race theory's notion of interest-convergence and racial capitalism, and second, that of DiAngelo's (2018) White fragility. How these theoretical frameworks relate to the study will be explained in detail along with the review of previous research. This is followed by the research questions, the methods used, data collection process, analysis and results.

Historically, university campuses in the United States, have been dominated not only by White students, but also White faculty and staff, White academic advisors, and White administrative leadership (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). Over the last twenty years, however the number of students of color attending institutions of higher education has been steadily increasing (Poloma, 2014; Rankin & Reason, 2008; Victorino, Nylund-Gibson, & Conley, 2013). According to the Lumina Foundation, between 1996 and 2010, the percentage increase of Hispanic students was 240 percent, and of Black students, 72 percent. In the same time period, the number of White undergraduate students increased by only 11 percent (Lumina Foundation, 2017).

With this increase in racial and ethnic diversity came concerns for the need for an inclusive campus climate. Campus climate is a broad term which can encompass a number of issues such as gender equity, racial equity, and equity for underserved or minoritized populations (Hart & Fellabaum, 2008; Hurtado et al., 1998; Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, &

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Arellano, 2012; Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2006; Rankin & Reason, 2008; Victorino et al., 2013). Peterson and Spencer (1990), in their analysis of academic culture and climate, found that the term culture focuses on dimensions of “deeply embedded patterns of organizational behavior and the shared values, assumptions, beliefs, or ideologies” whereas climate is made up of the organization’s members’ “perceptions of and attitudes” (pp. 7-8) toward those dimensions of organizational life. Similarly, Rankin and Reason (2008) see campus climate as the “attitudes, behaviors, standards, and practices of employees and students of an institution” (p. 264).

Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen (1999) assert that in order to enhance and improve campus climate, climate assessment should be related specifically to racial/ethnic diversity. This assertion was based mainly in demographics. At the time of writing, Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen (1999) projected that 24 percent of students under the age of 17 in 2010 would be students of color. They correctly predicted that the number of students of color attending institutions of higher education would also increase and that there would be a great challenge for these institutions of higher education to address the needs of this changing demographic.

Later, Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, and Arellano (2012) urged campus administrations to look beyond simply increasing the percentage of diverse students and instead “rearticulate the role of institutions in promoting social equity and democratic pluralism” (p.46). Certainly because of the increase of ethnic diversity of students to higher education over the last twenty years, campus racial climate has been a particular focus of institutional researchers (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado et al., 1998; Rankin & Reason, 2008).

This study focuses on the campus racial climate at a public university in the Pacific Northwest. To maintain confidentiality, the campus in question will be called Rural Northwest

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

University (RNU). Specific reports and data sources are intentionally being omitted to retain confidentiality and will be labeled, “according to campus data.” The terms students of color, staff and/or faculty of color are used to refer to African American/Black, Alaskan/Native American, Asian, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Latino/Hispanic, and multiracial individuals.

Furthermore, in this study, the term “campus climate” is used specifically to examine issues related to diversity and inclusion of race and ethnicity. While evaluations of campus climate can and should include other underrepresented groups, such as those of gender, sexuality, age, and disability, it is beyond the scope of this study to provide analysis of data for these other groups.

Statement of Problem and Rationale

While student demographics indicate more diversity on university campuses across the United States, the diversity of faculty has not kept pace (Clayton-Pedersen, Parker, Smith, Moreno, & Teraguchi, 2007; Garcia, 2015; Mayhew et al., 2006). Public four-year (non-research) universities in the United States report an average of 67 percent of White students enrolled (Status and Trends in Education of Racial and Ethnic Minorities, 2010). Faculty diversity, on the other hand, lags behind with 82 percent of fulltime faculty in U.S. colleges and universities reported to be White (NCES, 2017).

RNU is no exception. There are just over 10,000 students, with slightly more women than men. In 2016-2017, RNU reported that 53 percent of undergraduates identified as White, non-Hispanic, 16 percent as Hispanic/Latino, 4 percent as Black or African American, 4 percent as Asian, 7 percent as two or more races, 3 percent are international (non-resident aliens), and the rest (13 percent) are unidentified (according to campus data). This places RNU as slightly

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

above average in terms of student diversity assuming that the 13 percent of unidentified students are not White.

RNU's Equal Opportunity Employment data reveal that only 13 percent of faculty in tenure or tenure track positions are minority faculty, a term which includes faculty who self-disclose as Black, non-Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, or Hispanic. Two percent are classified as "non-resident alien," a dated, xenophobic term which is used in Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data reports. In non-tenure track positions, only seven percent self-disclosed as minority faculty. Minorities in academic support positions known as "exempt" make up 23 percent, and clerical and general office support, only eight percent.

RNU is located in a small town called Springfield (pseudonym) in the Northwest of the United States. In 2015, the population was reported to be just over 19,000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016). According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2016), this categorizes Springfield as an "urban cluster" since there are more than 2,500 people and less than 50,000. The nearest urban area is over 90 miles away. The town of Springfield itself is dominated by RNU, which is listed as the number one employer of the county (Springfield County Chamber of Commerce, 2016). In 2018 according to the Census data, the race and ethnicity of the citizens of Springfield was primarily White at 91.8 percent. Hispanic or Latinos made up 8.9 percent of the population and others such as Asian or those reporting two or more races combined made up the rest. So not only is RNU a primarily White campus, but the town in which it is located is also primarily White.

Bonilla-Silva (2015) refers to universities such as RNU as a historically White colleges and universities or HWCUs. Bonilla-Silva (2015) believes that HWCU is an appropriate term to describe and contextualize most universities and colleges in the United States since they have

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

been historically perpetuating the concept of Whiteness, the notion of a “privileged social identity” (Cabrera, 2012), through their hiring practices, curriculum, and campus culture.

Bonilla-Silva (2015) argues that White people often believe that university campuses are race neutral, something he terms the “White innocence game” in which White people do not recognize their own racial dominance in a given space or context. Despite the fact that the term “predominately White institution” or PWI is more common, I believe that the use of HWCU to describe institutions such as RNU is more precise since it is more descriptive and contextualizes the campus more accurately.

Smith and Wolf-Wendel (2005) identified several key benefits for diversifying faculty and staff. Among them is the idea that students of color are more likely to seek out faculty and staff of color for support and that a diverse faculty means bringing diverse perspectives to the curriculum. Clayton-Petersen et. al (2007) also stressed the importance of the influence that faculty have over numerous facets of the university experience from the curriculum to university governance. Furthermore, faculty play a part in influencing how students understand issues related to race (Hurtado et al., 1999). Poloma (2014) offered a compelling argument for a diverse faculty who provide strong, positive role models for students of color so that they can “see themselves reflected in the professional realm” (p.338). Similarly, the importance of the role of staff cannot be underestimated since they play a key part in creating a positive campus atmosphere (Mayhew et al., 2006). Garcia (2015) noted that student affairs staff, particularly, are tasked with administering campus diversity efforts and therefore, their experience with campus climate has direct relevance.

Despite the value a diverse faculty and staff brings to a university, negative experiences of faculty and staff of color working at predominantly White institutions (PWIs) or HWCUs

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

have been frequently documented (Garvey, 2016; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Poloma, 2014; Victorino et al., 2013). For example, Jayakumar et al. (2009) describe structural barriers related to biased tenure and promotion processes, a lack of mentoring of faculty of color, and the expectation of being available to lead so-called “minority affairs” issues on campus (pp. 541-542). Poloma (2014) documented the stress that can occur with the underrepresentation of faculty of color combined with assumption of colleagues that they don’t have the credentials to compete in higher education.

Because of this, recruiting and retaining faculty and staff of color has become an issue of concern (Clayton-Pedersen et al., 2007; Jayakumar et al., 2009; Moreno, Smith, Clayton-Pedersen, Parker, & Teraguchi, 2006). Assessing the campus racial climate, particularly how it is perceived by faculty and staff of color is thus a vital first step in addressing overall campus goals that relate to diversity and inclusivity.

Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory (CRT) is one of two frameworks used to underpin this study of campus climate at RNU for faculty and staff. Delgado and Stefancic (2012) describe CRT as a lens through which relationships between race and power are studied. Understanding this relationship through CRT helps explain the persistence of racism in the context of higher education (Harper, 2012; Iverson, 2007; Ledesma & Calderón, 2015). Racism in this paper is defined according to Harper (2012) as:

“...individual actions (both intentional and unconscious) that engender marginalization and inflict varying degrees of harm on minoritized persons; structures that determine and

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

cyclically remanufacture racial inequality; and institutional norms that sustain White privilege and permit the ongoing subordination of minoritized persons” (p. 10).

Harper’s definition embodies racism at both the individual and the structural levels. This duality is important in exploring how racism is manifested in higher education. As Harper (2012) explains, racism has historically been viewed as an individual act which is expressed by an overtly racist person such as a White supremacist or a person who uses racial epithets. While this view itself is not incorrect, it also significantly lacks depth and scope. Racism, Harper (2012) maintains, is also manifested in structures and systems, which impact everyday life such as where and how people live, study, and work.

Through the CRT lens, systems such as the policies, practices, and interventions of the university relating to diversity and inclusivity can be examined with the understanding and open acknowledgement that Whiteness is often centered and used as the benchmark to determine success and norms. According to Solórzano and Yosso (2002), CRT in education is a framework designed to deconstruct and disrupt racism and “all forms of subordination” (p. 25) both within and outside of the classroom. Furthermore, Solórzano and Yosso maintain that CRT draws on the legitimate experience of people of Color to understand what it means to be oppressed. They describe the key elements of CRT in education starting with the baseline understanding that racism is a pervasive, ubiquitous presence in all aspects of the system and that the so-called colorblindness or race neutrality that many universities claim to uphold, is in fact, a way of masking the dominance of the privileged group.

DiAngelo (2018) traces the notion of colorblindness to the social reaction to Dr. Martin Luther King’s “I Have a Dream” speech in which he urged people to look beyond skin color to instead the content of character. This, DiAngelo (2018) argues, was boiled down to a simple

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

idea that White people immediately adhered to that it would bring about a “simple and immediate solution to racial tensions” (p. 41). In other words, if we don’t notice skin color, racism will end. This adherence to colorblindness extends to institutions of higher education where systems which superficially appear to be neutral, such as admissions policies or standardized testing practices can be highly discriminatory against underrepresented groups (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012).

Interest convergence – CRT. Interest convergence can be a useful lens for the examination of higher education policies and practices within the CRT framework because it allows for a critical analysis of changes to systems and structures which appear to be for the benefit of people of color. Bell (1980, 2004) identified a practice titled “interest-convergence covenants.” Interest-convergence describes a policy, law or practice which appears to benefit Black people, but on deeper analysis, reveals that the result of such practices, in fact, benefit the majority White population. Bell (2004) describes two parts to the concept of interest convergence. The first is that changes to systems to benefit Blacks will only take place if they also benefit Whites in positions of power. And the second is the momentum for change will cease at the point when it no longer serves to benefit Whites in positions of power.

The *Brown vs. Board of Education* ruling was used by Bell (2004) as a definitive example of interest convergence when U.S. government policy makers needed to demonstrate the appearance of racial justice in a time of the Cold War with the former Soviet Union. In the end, however, while giving the appearance of a positive step forward for race relations, the *Brown* decision did little to further access to education for Black children (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005). After the ruling, Black children still continued to receive an inferior education. Despite the fact that schools had the appearance of being more racially integrated and balanced, the

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Brown ruling did not protect Black children from discrimination based on race. Suspensions and expulsions were much higher for Black children than for White children, and Black children experienced harassment and even physical violence in the post Brown era (Bell, 1980).

Racial Capitalism – CRT. Taking interest convergence a step further, Leong (2013) identifies a “long-standing, common, and deeply problematic practice” (p. 2152) which she calls racial capitalism. Racial capitalism is a “systemic phenomenon... to describe the way that White people and predominantly White institutions derive value from non-Whiteness” (p. 2154). While Leong (2013) applauds HWCUs for promoting diversity of students, faculty, and staff, and believes that it is a worthy and vital development, she also warns that this drive for diversity needs to be done carefully so that the non-White individuals are not upheld as prizes or tokens on a predominantly White campus. For example, faculty or staff of color may be disproportionately asked to serve on university committees. Their photos might be used on the university’s website or marketing materials to demonstrate the university’s commitment to diversity.

White Fragility

The interest convergence tenet reflects White people’s selfishness and their strong desire to protect and sustain their dominance and status quo over people of color. This type of mentality of White people is well explained by another concept known as white fragility which will be used as the second framework for understanding campus racial climate. White fragility is defined by DiAngelo (2018) as a “powerful means of White racial control and the protection of White advantage” (p. 2). DiAngelo (2018) explains that White people are seldom challenged about their racial dominance and that they are not skillful or knowledgeable about racism or race. In cases when White people perceive that they could have any responsibility for a system of oppression based on race, they tend to become defensive and angry. DiAngelo (2018) considers

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

this a “process” in which White people first resist responsibility and finally recover their sense of security and racial dominance through that resistance. Triggers for White fragility can come from the mere acknowledgement of race to deeper perceptions of superiority and the right to control. The emotional response that White people have when challenged about the existence of racism or White supremacy of anger or denial, serves as a way of shutting down the dialogue and maintaining the status quo.

An underlying factor in white fragility is the all-encompassing, deep sense of belonging that White people have, particularly those who live in the United States or in the “Western context” (DiAngelo 2018, p. 51). Because the world is dominated by White people in daily life, at school, work, on the media, White people seldom, if ever, have to consider their race. Cameron (2004) referred to this sense of belonging or not belonging as racial identity salience. Racial identity salience is a term used to describe the frequency in which a person thinks about their own race. Jayakumar and Adamian (2017) found that white fragility was triggered even for White students attending HBCUs (Historically Black Colleges and Universities) when they were exposed to racial salience issues such as conversations about race or discussions on systemic racism.

Additionally, DiAngelo (2018) highlights what has become the good/bad binary of the concept of being “a racist.” She argues that the term “racist” has been reduced to an overly simplistic binary of the good and the bad and that it is conflated with singular acts (of racism). Instead, DiAngelo (2018) says, racism is systemic in nature and is deeply interwoven with our day to day lives. This belief is “... at the root of virtually all White defensiveness...” (p. 73). For example, if a White person perceives herself as not racist, then there is nothing left for that

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

person to do regarding racism. It is a perception, a “worldview” that prevents White people from seeing a need to take action against racism (p. 73).

These aspects of white fragility, resisting the reality of racism, operating in a world in which they do not have to think about race frequently, and falsely conceptualizing racism as a good/bad binary, ensure that many White people lack the skills and knowledge to participate in conversations about race and to make informed decisions about systems and processes which serve to oppress people of color.

The Dimensions of Campus Climate - Overview

Understanding campus climate is recognized as a vital component to university health and student well-being and retention as well as faculty and staff retention (Bowman & Brandenberger, 2012; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Hurtado, 1992; Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005). Hurtado (1992), in a study which attempted to explain contexts for racial conflict in HWCUs, proposed that racial incidents occur as part of a variety of climate issues which relate to student perceptions of campus climate and the general social context. In this case, Hurtado (1992) reviewed the social context from the time of the civil rights movement and desegregation as a result of the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision to cuts to the federal financial aid packaging under Reagan. This decision placed a larger burden on Black and Hispanic students. It became apparent that racial conflict was part of a larger issue not just on college campuses, but in the whole of society. As far back as the early 1990s when describing the campus climate at the University of California at Berkeley, Duster (1993) posited that the dominant White group on campus was threatened by the recent changes in diversity of the student population. While at the time of writing, half the students at UC Berkeley were students of color and the faculty was still 89 percent White. Duster (1993) described a climate in which

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

the faculty struggled with the loss of the traditional “1950s version of the canon” (p. 252) and the unfamiliar behavior of minority students.

Campus climate: A five dimensional model. In 1998, Hurtado, et al. proposed assessing campus racial climate using a four dimensional approach which would encompass both the policy context and the sociohistorical context of the institution.

- a) The institution’s historical legacy
- b) Structural diversity (numerical representation of ethnic groups)
- c) Psychological climate of perceptions and attitudes between and among groups
- d) Behavioral climate-campus intergroup relations

This model was based on almost 30 years of research on underrepresented populations on university and college campuses to provide a common framework by which institutions of higher education could assess themselves and create policies and practices to improve upon campus racial climate. Until this time, according to Hurtado et al. (1998), defining campus racial climate was considered too complex and “intangible” (p. 2). However, Hurtado et al. (1998) developed this four-dimensional framework to push institutions of higher education to look beyond simple numbers and demographics. A year later, Hurtado et al. (1998) published a report for Association for the Study of Higher Education-ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education (ASHE-ERIC) with the specific purpose of guiding administrators in higher education on a pathway to improve campus racial climate. It includes a detailed description of each dimension, its relevance to improving campus climate, both based on race and gender with implications for both faculty and students.

A fifth dimension was first explored by Milem, Dey, and White (2004) as an organizational/structural aspect in their study on diversity in the healthcare bureaucracy. In this

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

study, Milem et al. (2004) advised that the bureaucracy of an institution has a profound effect on the extent to which an organization can implement diversity initiatives. A year later, Milem, Chang, and Antonio (2005) pulled in this fifth dimension and recommended its inclusion in one of three commissioned papers on diversifying institutions of higher education for the Association of American Colleges and Universities. Milem et al. (2005) believed that this fifth dimension of organizational structure is needed to represent the way in which a university uses structure to benefit certain groups within the organization. This can include the way in which curriculum is decided and structured, budgeting, reward structures, hiring, and admissions policies. Milem et al. (2005) illustrate this point by calling attention to hiring practices for faculty. If the hiring committee is dominated by White faculty, it is likely they will not hire outside their racial group unless “deliberate steps are taken” to change to the process and structure of hiring (p. 18).

Hurtado et al. (2012) describe changes that other campuses have made as a result of reviewing institutional practices to improve campus racial climate, which impacted student access to the institution and success while attending.

Campus climate model in use. Harper and Hurtado (2007) reviewed fifteen years of campus racial climate research and then conducted a series of focus group studies on five HWCUs in three different regions of the U.S. This resulted in the synthesis of a series of themes or trends in university campuses across the U.S. Harper and Hurtado (2007) found consistently that racial/ethnic minorities experience campus climate differently than White students at the same institution. Racial and ethnic minority students reported feeling excluded and tokenized. In some instances, microaggressions on an almost daily basis were reported. Microaggressions can be defined as automatic, unconscious verbal, non-verbal, and visual insults which are aimed at people of color. These insults can range from almost imperceptible to more blatant (Solórzano

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

et al. 2000; Garcia, 2015). On the other hand, White students, who overall expressed satisfaction, tended to overestimate minority student satisfaction.

Harper and Hurtado (2007) also found that there are clear educational benefits to diversifying the campus. All students, both minority and White, reported that they believed that their institution was “negligent” (p. 16) in their role of facilitating racial understanding and recognized that their institution tended to avoid the discussion of the topic of race. Harper and Hurtado (2007) concluded that the minority staff who took part in focus groups were already knowledgeable about the plight of the minority students, but they also felt powerless to make institutional changes, opting instead to help students on an individual level.

Faculty & staff and campus climate research. Hurtado et al.’s (1998) multidimensional framework has been used countless times since its initial development to describe, assess, and analyze campus climate for mainly for students but also for faculty and staff. Mayhew and Grunwald (2006) used a variation of Hurtado’s (1998) framework to study the factors that influence staff perceptions of their campus community in terms of positive climate for diversity in a HWCU in the Midwest. They discovered that staff had different perceptions of their departments compared to the institution as a whole, and that staff of color and women were more likely to criticize the institution’s approach to climate for diversity. Interestingly, staff with higher educational backgrounds were the most critical.

Critical race theory was used in the analysis of data collected by Jayakumar et al. (2009) in their study of racial climate for faculty at over 400 colleges and universities across the U.S. Jayakumar et al. (2009) were interested in not only the racial climate but also issues related to retention and job satisfaction. The results of this study found that, not surprisingly, a negative campus climate results in poor job satisfaction in faculty of color. However, the same negative

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

climate resulted in greater retention for White faculty. At the same time, Jayakumar et al. (2009) also discovered that faculty of color who stayed with the institution developed coping skills for the hostile climate. Jayakumar et al. (2009) could not, however, speak to the experiences of the faculty who had left.

In examining the relationship between faculty satisfaction and campus climate, Victorino, Nylund-Gibson, and Conley (2013) used a variation of Hurtado's (2012) multidimensional framework. Their study using a large, national sample of faculty, revealed that campus climate matters to all faculty. Victorino, et al. (2013) described this finding as encouraging for university administrators to "motivate campus leaders to prioritize the improvement of campus racial climate for all members of the academic community" (p. 795).

Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments. Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, and Arellano (2012) updated the Hurtado et al.'s (1998) framework naming it the Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (DLE model). In addition to adding the organizational/structural dimension as recommended by Milem et al. (2005), the DLE model links the benefits of a diverse learning environment more explicitly with learning outcomes. The DLE model also includes a more robust way to assess the significant role that staff play on improving campus racial climate. The DLE model recognizes the role of CRT in the assessment of campus racial climate, specifically interest convergence. Hurtado et al. (2012) frame this viewpoint by considering the institution's need for student success which includes all students both the underrepresented groups and the dominant, White group. Through the use of DLE assessments of student and faculty equity which include processes and strategies to improve access and academic success, interests are converging "whatever the motivation" (p. 43).

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

The Diverse Learning Environment's five dimensions of historical legacy, structural diversity, psychological climate, and organizational/structural is comprehensive and self-described as "multicontextual" (p. 42). The current study used a modified version of the DLE framework to examine campus racial climate.

Research Questions

Using a modified version of the DLE model, along with racial capitalism, the interest convergence tenet from CRT and DiAngelo's (2018) white fragility, I used the following questions to guide the study on the racial campus climate at RNU for faculty and staff.

1. How do faculty and staff perceive the campus racial climate at RNU?
2. How do RNU employees' perceptions of the campus racial climate differ according to their demographic characteristics (race, gender, and status)?
3. How is commitment to racial diversity by RNU's leadership perceived by faculty and staff?

Research Study Design

This study is a mixed methods design using a variation on a convergent parallel design (Creswell, 2015; See Figure 1). Convergent parallel design is used when both qualitative and quantitative data is collected at the same time and then merged to interpret the data. This method can give a multidimensional view of an issue or research question through the collection of different types of data.

For this study, data has been collected to support analysis of the components of Hurtado's (2012) multidimensional framework. Four of the five dimensions to understand campus racial climate at RNU will be described: the historical legacy, the structural diversity, the organizational/structural, and the psychological climate. The dimension of behavioral climate-

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

campus intergroup relations is beyond the scope of this study since it is based primarily on data derived from students on how students interact with each other. This study is primarily driven by data collected on faculty and staff. Although Hurtado et al. (1998) urges campus administrators to examine all dimensions, this framework provides useful guidance for the purpose and scope of this study.

The Institution's Historical Legacy

To understand what was done in the past regarding campus climate at RNU, historical documents from three points in time were examined. According to Iverson (2007), examining university diversity policies can reveal inherent racism by focusing on the manner in which standards and norms are framed. Martella, Nelson, Morgan, and Marchand-Martella (2013) state that historical research can serve five purposes: establishing facts, determining what worked in the past, understanding present circumstances, identifying trends, and developing further studies. Campus climate reports were done by RNU in the early 1990s, the early 2000s, and finally in 2009. These three reports were reviewed using the framework of CRT and white fragility to understand RNU's context and circumstances leading to the current campus climate.

Structural Diversity (Numerical Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups)

A structurally diverse campus is viewed by Hurtado et al. (1998) as a vital component for providing educational benefits for students of all races (pp. 4-5). Increasing the diversity of the campus is considered an important first step for achieving a positive campus climate for three reasons. The first is that a campus with one dominant race has very limited opportunities for students to interact across racial barriers. Second is that students from underrepresented groups can feel tokenized and stressed from the experience of being a minority. Lastly, having a diverse student body can play a part in demonstrating an institution's commitment to diversity. When an

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

institution is seen to expend resources attracting and maintaining a diverse group of students, the institution communicates to the campus community how this diversity is valued and cultivated.

With this in mind, the structural diversity of RNU is described using RNU's institutional data on number of students, faculty, and staff broken down by race and gender.

Organizational/Structural Dimension

The organizational/structural dimension is described using institutional documents on structural processes of the university. This included the mission and vision statement, and the core value that covers diversity and inclusion. Additional documents reviewed was the campus's faculty collective bargaining agreement which includes tenure and promotion policy, and RNU's policies on recruitment, retention. As with the historical legacy dimension, CRT interest convergence/racial capitalism principles will be used as a framework to identify themes and patterns. The analysis for this section will be primarily qualitative and descriptive.

Psychological Climate of Perceptions and Attitudes Between and Among Groups

The psychological climate for faculty and staff at RNU was assessed using institutional data from a campus racial climate survey on faculty and staff inclusivity which was conducted in 2018. The data collected from this survey is primarily quantitative with a limited number of qualitative items. Both will be analyzed and discussed.

Strengths and Limitations of the Design

Hurtado et al.'s (2012) design calls for a five-dimensional view of a campus racial climate. A mixture of quantitative and qualitative data sources focusing on four of the five dimensions allowed for a thorough examination of the campus and the culture through the unique lens of the faculty and staff at RNU. Quantitative data was used to describe the demographics of the campus and to measure perceptions of campus climate as part of a survey instrument.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Qualitative data was used to describe the historical legacy and organizational structures of the university as they relate to racial climate. Qualitative data was also collected from the survey to gather insights and nuances from respondents that may not be as easily captured through quantitative methods.

There are some limitations, however. A version of the survey was administered in 2009, but no formal validation took place at that time. The analysis and report were thorough, and it appeared that the survey questions allowed the researchers to construct a picture of RNU's climate of inclusivity and diversity at that point in time. The 2018 survey was adapted for use of only faculty and staff, not students. The survey was tested on a limited number of people but there had not been a formal analysis of validity. Therefore, there was initially a concern of survey validity. However, the use of a factor analysis and Cronbach's Alpha for each factor on the 2018 survey ensured reliability with coefficients above .80. Moreover, because data was collected at multiple points using an adapted version of Hurtado et al.'s (2012) framework, validity was further evaluated through the strength of the convergent parallel design.

In terms of positionality, I am a White female who was employed at RNU for a few years. This close connection may create a potential for bias, though every effort was taken to remain objective through solicitation of feedback of the study from neutral observers.

As stated earlier, I acknowledge that evaluations of campus climate can and should include other underrepresented groups, such as those of gender, sexuality, age, and disability. However, the primary variable in this study is race. Gender and employment status are considered in research question 2 in relationship to perceptions of campus racial climate. A limitation of this study is that these variables are not considered in detail as they are beyond the scope of this research.

Methods

Quantitative Data Method

Psychological Climate of Perceptions and Attitudes Between and Among Groups.

The psychological climate was assessed using institutional data from a campus climate survey for faculty and staff which focused on faculty and staff perceptions on issues such as sense of belonging, the role of diversity at RNU, communication, and satisfaction of the workplace. This survey was adapted from a study conducted at RNU in 2009 with some updates and modifications. The major modification is that the 2018 survey did not include students, therefore some of the questions were altered or deleted to be relevant to faculty and staff. Additionally, the five-point scale used in 2009 was amended to a four-point scale to discourage the over-selection of neutral responses. The survey was anonymous and was administered by the university administration in May 2018.

The survey had 109 questions broken up into 21 blocks of question sets (See Table 1). Of these questions, 83 used a 4-point Likert scale of strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The 12 items were open response and the remaining 14 were demographic questions or questions requiring a yes or no response. The questions using the 4-point Likert scale were first sorted using a factor analysis with the exception of two blocks of Likert scale questions, block 10 and block 11. Because not all respondents answered these questions based on their status, these questions were eliminated from the factor analysis. In total 79 items were analyzed.

Due to the large number of questions, a factor analysis was run to reduce the variables to a smaller set of dimensions and create factors representing a larger concepts or themes. Once the factors were identified a Cronbach's coefficient alpha was run to test for reliability and internal consistency. Finally a 3-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if the means of the

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

dependent variable (each factor) was the same across the means of the independent variables of gender, race, and employment status.

Survey participants. Since the focus of this research was to determine attitudes of campus racial climate, respondents who did not disclose their race were not included in the analysis. There was an insufficient number of respondents of color to break down the number by ethnicity or race, so instead the respondents who identified as other, Native American, multi-racial, Middle Eastern, Hispanic, Black, or Asian were categorized as “people of color.” People who selected “other” were categorized according to the open response entry. For example, if a respondent selected “other” and then added a text response of “Irish,” this respondent was categorized as White. If the respondent wrote in, for example, “Taiwanese,” the respondent would be categorized as “people of color.” The respondents who did not add a qualifying response or wrote in a response such as “human” were not included in the analysis. Table 2 shows the demographics of survey participants by gender, employment status, and race/ethnicity.

Factor analysis. A factor analysis was used to determine which questions and question sets measure the various attitudes and perceptions and at the same time, reduces the volume of data. Two stages were used in this process; factor extraction and factor rotation. First factor extraction was conducted to determine the number of factors which could be pulled from the data. The dimensionality of 79 items from the survey was analyzed using maximum likelihood factor analysis. Three criteria were used to determine the number of factors to rotate: the priori hypothesis that the measure was unidimensional, the scree plot, and the interpretability of the factor solution. Initially, eigenvalues greater than 1 were used to determine how many factors should be used in the analysis. Next, a scree plot was used to cross-check and determine the point at which the eigenvalues level off. Then factor rotation was used to help make a final

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

decision on the number of factors and the items, which could be associated with each factor. The scree plot indicated that the initial hypothesis of unidimensionality was incorrect. Based on the plot, four factors were rotated using a Varimax rotation procedure. The rotated solution, as shown in Table 3 yielded four interpretable factors.

Using a minimum of .30 or -.30 on the rotated factor matrix, survey items were identified to be associated with each of the four factors. The survey items were then grouped according to factor and named to describe the theme of the items as shown in Table 3. The four factors were named, “workplace communication,” “sense of belonging,” “relationship with diversity,” and “perception of fairness.” A Cronbach’s Alpha test was run on each factor to determine reliability. A high level of reliability was determined for each factor. Table 4 shows each factor with the number of items in the factor and the Cronbach’s Alpha result.

The item responses for each factor were averaged for each survey respondent, creating variables for three-way ANOVA tests. Respondents with fewer than 95 percent response rate to the factored items were removed. Mean replacement was used for missing data from items of 5 percent or less. Table 5 shows the demographics of the respondents for the 3-way ANOVA test.

Qualitative Data Method

Psychological Climate of Perceptions and Attitudes Between and Among Groups.

The data collected from the 2018 survey was primarily quantitative with a limited number of items allowing an open-ended response or other response types, such as yes or no. Items from the question block entitled “Employment at RNU” was selected for analysis because of their content and theme connected directly to the research questions and gives insight into the perceptions of RNU faculty and staff.

Q12.3 – Have you ever seriously considered leaving RNU? (Yes/No)

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Respondents who selected “yes” for Q12.3 were invited to provide a reason for considering a departure (Q12.4) and to provide a reason for staying at RNU (Q12.5). These items were open response.

Q12.4 - Why did you consider leaving [RNU]?

Q12.5 - Why did you decide to stay [RNU]?

At the end of the survey, respondents were invited to “clarify any of your answers or add further comment.”

Q21.1 - Use this space if you would like to clarify any of your answers or add further comment.

The resulting data was analyzed line by line and coded according to theme. Structural coding practices was used to label the data. According to Saldaña (2013), structural coding is considered particularly appropriate for qualitative studies with multiple participants. Coding was done by labelling responses into categories or themes so that the responses could be segmented by similar or differing viewpoints, or by relationships. Once responses were coded in this way, a more detailed analysis was done clarifying the themes that emerged.

Coding was done using NVivo software. Because the focus of this research was to look at differences in responses according to race, those respondents who did not disclose their race were excluded. In total, 589 respondents were analyzed. The survey allowed respondents to select from a number of races and ethnicities (See Table 2). Of this total, 466 respondents identified as White. One hundred and two identified as Native American, multi-racial, Middle Eastern, Hispanic, Black, or Asian. Although the U.S. Census defines people from the Middle East as “White” (Census.gov, 2018), for the purpose of this study, Middle East was classified “of color.” This decision was made to align with the recommendation in a 2015 Census report and

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

the Arab American Institute to include MENA (Middle Eastern or North African) as a separate category (Arab American Institute, 2018; Mathews, et al., 2017). As with the quantitative data analysis, because there was an insufficient number of people in any given category, this data was aggregated to protect identity and labeled “people of color.”

Twenty-one respondents identified as “other.” All respondents were given the choice to enter their own ethnicity or clarify their entry. In the case of those respondents who selected “other,” these entries were used to classify these respondents to either White (Irish, European, etc.) or people of color (Taiwanese, Chinese, etc.). It was not possible to reclassify all because the responses were not descriptive of the race or ethnicity. These remained labeled as other.

First, the respondents who selected yes to the question, “Have you ever seriously considered leaving RNU” were counted and their open text responses for Q12.4 and Q12.5 were extracted for coding. According to Table 15, 66 percent of the respondents considered leaving RNU at some time. White respondents reported seriously considering leaving at 64 percent while people of color reported at a slightly higher rate of 67 percent. Those who selected “other” had the highest rate of 90 percent, but the sample size was considerably less. See Table 16 for the response type by race/ethnicity.

For Q12.4 - Why did you consider leaving [RNU], the responses were coded by theme. To do this, the responses were read one by one. Six themes emerged. Because all of the respondents answered the same question, these themes were clear and well-defined. Some responses contained multiple themes, but the NVivo software allowed for coding at the word and phrase level. The themes are described in Table 17 and Table 18 for response coverage.

Once these six themes emerged, the responses were separated by race/ethnicity to determine if there were differences in the response types. For this analysis, those respondents

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

who selected “other” were labeled, but analyzed with the White respondents. The rationale for this decision was based partly on the types of responses in which the respondent inferred being White; and partly on the fact that RNU is a historically White campus. After analyzing these responses (White and people of color), the respondents who selected “other” were isolated and analyzed.

NVivo provides a percentage of coverage for each theme, which is the percentage of the source that the reference coding represents. While not particularly useful in the context and meaning of the comment, it still provides some direction and insight into what was meaningful to the respondents. The percentage of coverage for each theme gives an overall view of the density of comments for a particular theme. For each theme in the Results section, there is a table showing the percent of coverage for the theme.

Results – Historical Legacy, Structural Diversity, Organizational Structure

The Institution’s Historical Legacy

1996 report. In 1996 the administration at RNU established a committee to review the campus climate of the institution (Rural Northwest University, 1996). For historical context, the so-called Rodney King or Los Angeles uprising took place in April 1992 as a result of four police officers (three were White) being acquitted after severely beating an African-American man (Sastry & Bates, 2017). This event inspired a national conversation about race, inequities, and criminal justice. The uprisings in Los Angeles were not named in the committee report, but it was certainly in the national consciousness (Los Angeles Times Staff, 2017). This committee was established in order to assess the campus climate regarding issues related to gender, diversity, and safety, to compare RNU’s climate with similar universities across the country and finally to make suggestions on how to improve. A charge was sent out by the president of RNU

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

together with the administrative leadership team. Committee members were made up of administrators, faculty of different ranks, staff, and students from various departments. Men and women of color and of different sexual orientations. At that time, according to the report, less than 10 percent of the faculty and staff and less than 10 percent of students were considered minorities. The committee spent over two years meeting and researching the topic before producing a report with a set of recommendations (Rural Northwest University, 1996). The review of practices was wide-ranging and included issues related to not just to gender, diversity, and safety, but also to rewards and recognition of faculty and staff and the improvement of leadership and management practices.

Issues that arose from the report related to racial climate included reporting on verbal abuse and a perception of a lack of respect.

“Minority students feel faculty don’t try to connect with them.”

“Minority students and faculty feel they are being stereotyped.”

“Perception that there is too much of an emphasis by RNU to hire minorities and not necessarily the best qualified candidates.”

Although RNU had attracted underrepresented groups to the campus, the White administrators lacked the forethought to consider the difficulties that students and faculty of color might face due to RNU being an HWCU. This lack of forethought and ignorance demonstrates the principles of Bonilla-Silva’s (2015) “White innocence game” where university administrators failed to understand that their predominately White campus was not race neutral. “Minority” students and faculty were instead tokenized either through stereotyping or by neglecting to connect with them the same way that faculty presumably connected with White students.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

As a result of these comments, an extensive set of action items were developed. Those included recommendations to hire “minorities” for executive positions, implement mandatory diversity training for faculty and staff, and training for faculty in alternate teaching methods for “a diverse classroom.” The committee noted, however, that their work was regarded with “skepticism and some anger” (Rural Northwest University, 1996, p. 4) by those who participated. The committee documented this attitude and clarified that these emotions were expressed largely because people did not expect change and that over time, the committee would disband, and attention from these issues would also fade away (Rural Northwest University, 1996). The belief that any systemic change through committee recommendations would fail has grounding in the tenets of racial capitalism and tokenism. As long as the primary interest of the university is met, that of the presence of token minorities on campus, there is no reason for deep systemic changes to take place such as altering teaching methodology or increasing the number of administrators from underrepresented groups.

2000 report. In the early 2000s, RNU was being run by a new administration, and had a new president. The new president requested an update on diversity initiatives. A committee was established to review the campus climate of inclusion and to make recommendations. In the annual report (Rural Northwest University, 2003), this committee acknowledged the work of the previous committee six years prior, and despite their work to make improvements. The committee recognized that their goal of a “truly diverse, inclusive, and non-threatening community” was far from being realized and that a number of the findings from the earlier report remained problematic. The annual report made recommendations for systemic institutional change which included the hiring of an outside consultant and the establishment of an advisory

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

committee on diversity reporting to the president. The committee further urged administrators to return to the original report to address the recommendations.

Unlike the first report in which committee members carried out interviews to collect data, this committee appeared to have spent time reviewing the findings of the original committee and reviewing current best practices and integrating those practices with those findings. However, embedded in the report are comments that imply that some data was being collected even if informally. For example, in the section regarding the tenure and promotion process, there is a statement on the lack of credibility that faculty have when serving as an advisor to “ethnic clubs and associations” compared to advising an honor society club. It was also mentioned that faculty service on the White dominated academic senate is given more weight than service on the diversity committee which tended to be made up of faculty of color. These attitudes demonstrate the importance of viewing racism as not just an individual act as described by DiAngelo’s (2018) good/bad binary or Harper’s (2012) individual actions. These attitudes demonstrate that white advantage is manifested in systems and structures which as Harper (2012) argued are designed to maintain White dominance in his description of systems which maintain racial inequality.

The report was followed up with the president and the administrative team at the university and a series of recommendations were made as a result. This included distributing the original climate report to key people across the campus leadership and tapping various administrators to pick up on other recommendations such as exploring recruiting, promoting, and hiring a diverse workforce, and including the topic of diversity in their general education requirements. There was some consideration given to having a “cultural audit” undertaken which would include exit interviews to learn why faculty and staff might leave the university.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

2010 report. Almost 10 years later, a committee was formed to survey faculty, staff, and students at RNU as part of an inclusiveness initiative and compile a report (RNU Inclusiveness Initiative, 2010). The survey included over 60 percent of exempt employees, 32 percent of faculty, and 38 percent of classified staff. Sixteen percent of students both undergraduate and graduate filled out the survey. Recommendations included a discussion on how to support students of color who had reported being singled out in class because of their racial identity. A specific recommendation was given to provide training to faculty on how to manage “difficult and sensitive” classroom topics, and to educate them on issues of inclusivity in the classroom (RNU Inclusiveness Initiative, 2010, p. 4).

This survey also received similar comments as previous initiatives with a number of respondents expressing despair that “nothing will change.” Nevertheless, among the summary comments for the survey were statements that there was strong consensus that most people (80 percent) feel welcome at RNU and most people (90 percent) believe that interacting with diverse individuals is a “good thing.” However, it was pointed out that one third of classified staff agreed with the statement, “I think there is too much emphasis on diversity at RNU.” (RNU Inclusiveness Initiative, 2010, p. 2)

It is not surprising that a majority of survey respondents were satisfied with their experience at RNU. Most of the survey respondents were White and employed at a HWCU. Race is invisible to them. It is also not surprising that a majority believe that interacting with diverse individuals is a good thing. Most of these respondents were White and this way of thinking falls in line with DiAngelo’s (2018) good/bad binary description of how racism falls in line with Bonilla-Silva’s white racial innocence. These White people do not believe that they benefit from the system because their focus is at the individual level as they are proud that they

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

interact with diverse individuals. However, with regard to classified staff, it is interesting that such a large number admitted to believing that there is too much emphasis on diversity. There is nuance to this item. In the case of interacting with “diverse individuals,” it is about one on one relationships. However, in the case of the concept of diversity having too much emphasis, this encompasses processes and the structure of the organization. In this case, diversity may be viewed as a threat to those processes and structures which are seen as beneficial to maintaining Whiteness for classified staff.

Structural Diversity (Numerical Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups)

RNU’s institutional data reveal there are just over 1,300 employees with 30 percent classified in IPEDS as instructional. In terms of gender, just over 40 percent of faculty at RNU are female. Only 13 percent of faculty in tenure or tenure track positions are “minority faculty,” a term which includes faculty who self-disclose as Black, non-Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, or Hispanic. Two percent are classified as “non-resident alien.” In non-tenure track positions, only seven percent self-disclosed as minority faculty. Minorities in academic support positions known as “exempt” make up 23 percent and clerical and general office support, only eight percent. Just over 58 percent of non-instructional staff are female.

In terms of faculty and staff demographics, RNU’s employees do not reflect the relative diversity of the student body. Hurtado et al. (2012) considered the numerical representation of underrepresented groups an “initial step in the creation of a diverse learning environment” and that tracking these numbers is an important part of understanding the dynamics of campus racial climate. However, Hurtado et al. (2012) also advise that just demonstrating diversity through numerical representation is not adequate in terms of achieving equity on campus.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Organizational/Structural Dimension

The organizational/structural dimension of the university is important because it sets the tone for not only the university's public approach to diversity and inclusion but also the internal framework in which employees must operate. Typically, documentation which is used to describe this dimension includes the mission and vision statement and strategic planning information such as benchmarks related to diversity and inclusion. The tenure and promotion policy, policies on recruitment, retention, and hiring are also relevant towards establishing the culture in which the faculty and staff must adhere to. In order to maintain confidentiality of RNU, specific identifying information from these documents will not be disclosed including direct quotes and use of unique terminology. However, the intent and scope can be explored.

RNU's mission and vision statements do not have specific language related to inclusion, diversity, or equity. The strategic plan, however, does have a benchmark theme of equity and inclusion, which establishes an institutional commitment to fostering diversity. A further commitment is given to ensuring that all faculty, staff, and students feel secure enough through inclusion and equity initiatives on campus so that they can fully engage in the university community. Like many universities, there is a shared governance system described in the strategic plan, which establishes the university's intent towards transparency of information sharing and decision making.

The equity and inclusivity themed benchmark in RNU's strategic plan provides the rationale that diversity is valued primarily because of the likelihood that RNU graduates will be working and living in a diverse world (RNU institutional data, 2019). RNU promises to ensure that the people working and studying on their campuses will be exposed to a diverse and inclusive environment. Diversity, according to RNU, is wide-ranging and includes sexual

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

orientation, gender, ability, political views, as well as race. Measurable benchmarks for this theme include the use of surveys, the use of recruitment and retention tools to attract and keep faculty, staff, and students from traditionally underrepresented groups. On an academic level, there are two benchmarks to measure commitment to social justice. One is to measure how many courses include outcomes relate to social justice issues, and the other is on how many co-curricular activities are offered (Strategic Planning, 2019).

RNU's Human Resources office has explicit policies which affirm the university's commitment to equal opportunity and non-discrimination. This includes the hiring and promotion process as well as all personnel actions. There are also a variety of policies to protect against sexual harassment, violence, and intimidation. There is a standing committee which reports to the vice president overseeing Human Resources. The committee investigates and reviews policies and actions, which may impact human resources issues such as unfair practices in the tenure and promotion process or affirmative action (Equal Opportunity, 2019).

Faculty and staff search committees are given instruction to be mindful of the university's commitment to a diverse workforce and are actively encouraged to recruit with this goal in mind. Search committees are given a selection of questions to choose from to prepare for their interviews. The direction is to have at least one question which addresses the applicant's opinion on diversity, either to define it or to describe a situation in which a diversity issue was centered. Search committees are also required to be diverse both in terms of gender and ethnicity. Because RNU has so few faculty and staff of color, Human Resources provides a list of faculty and staff of color who are willing to serve on committees regardless of their department (Human Resources - RNU, 2019)

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Evaluation of faculty for consideration of tenure and promotion consists of three main areas - classroom teaching, scholarship, and service (RNU, 2014). The notions of equity, inclusion, and diversity are not explicitly named in the guidance documentation (RNU, 2014). Classroom teaching is listed first in importance and is evaluated through observations of peers, student evaluations, syllabi, and self-reflective statements. The evaluation of scholarship is listed next. This evaluation system includes publication in peer reviewed journals, presentations at conferences, juried exhibitions, textbook authorship, and grant funding. This section is well-developed and fully detailed in the types of acceptable publications, presentations, and other professional accomplishments. The types of scholarship are divided into tiers of importance. For example, the first tier includes publication in a peer reviewed journal or a large external grant from a major funding agency such as the NSF (National Science Foundation). Second tier scholarship would include a presentation at a regional conference or a published book review. There is a great deal of detail into how many scholarship activities are required and from which categories for all phases from tenure to promotion and for post-tenure review. Out of the three areas of evaluation, the area of scholarship is the most robust in terms of definitions and expectations.

Finally, service to the community or to the university is required. This service should be aligned directly with the faculty member's teaching assignment and the needs of the department. Examples of service activities consist mainly department level or university level committee work. Guidance on service is the shortest and least detailed of the tenure and promotion evaluation descriptions (RNU, 2014).

RNU's approach process and structure is in line with Milem et al. (2005) belief that structures, policies, and procedures are used to maintain the interests of the majority race. For

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

example, hiring processes tend reproduce Whiteness because that is the way the process is designed and controlled. Despite the fact that minority faculty and staff are encouraged to be included in the committee make up, it is not required. Other more systemic changes to the hiring process such as the way in which the job description is written or the structure of the interview process itself is unchanged. The tenure and promotion criteria used by RNU appears to devalue committee and service to community. These are both areas in which faculty of color are expected to take part in, a further example of Leong's (2013) racial capitalism. Faculty and staff of color are expected to participate, but their participation is not valued or rewarded in the tenure and promotion process.

Results – Psychological Climate

Quantitative Results

Results for factor 1 - workplace communication. Factor 1 consists of 25 items from the survey. The title, “workplace communication” was given because the items on the rotated factor matrix reflect various aspects of communication at RNU between the administration of the university and the faculty and staff. See Table 6 for example of items which demonstrate this theme.

As with all items in the factor rotation, respondents rated each item on a four-point Likert scale with 4 = strongly agree. A three-way ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of workplace communication on gender, status, and race. The means and standard deviations of the Likert scale responses are presented in Table 7. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between race, gender, status, $F(4, 490) = 1.40, p = .23$. There was no significant interaction between race and gender, $F(1, 490) = .03, p = .87$. There was no significant interaction between race and status, $F(5, 490) = .34, p = .89$ or between gender and status, $F(5,$

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

490) = .79, $p = .56$. There was, however, a statistically significant simple main effect for status, $F(5, 490) = 5.38, p = .00$ but not for race $F(1, 490) = .14, p = .70$ or for gender, $F(1, 490) = 1.37, p = .24$. The status main effect indicates that employment status influences perceptions regarding workplace communication. This will be examined in the discussion section.

Results for factor 2 - sense of belonging. Factor 2 consists of 22 items from the survey. The title, “Sense of Belonging” was given because the items on the rotated factor matrix reflect various aspects of how faculty and staff feel connected with RNU. See Table 8 for examples of items which demonstrate this theme.

A three-way ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of sense of belonging on race, gender, status. The means and standard deviations of the Likert scale responses are presented in Table 9. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between race, gender, status, $F(4, 490) = 1.97, p = .10$. There was no significant interaction between race and gender, $F(1, 490) = 2.12, p = .15$. There was no significant interaction between race and status, $F(5, 490) = .33, p = .89$ or between gender and status, $F(5, 490) = 1.39, p = .23$. There was a statistically significant simple main effect for status, $F(5, 490) = 7.46, p = .00$ but not for race $F(1, 490) = .01, p = .91$ or for gender, $F(1, 490) = 3.43, p = .07$. The status main effect indicates that employment status influences perceptions regarding sense of belonging. This will be examined in the discussion section.

Results for factor 3 – relationship with diversity. Factor 3 consists of 11 items from the survey. The title, “Relationship with Diversity” was given because the items on the rotated factor matrix reflect various aspects of individual’s relationships with issues related to diversity. Items with a negative rotated factor were reverse scored. See table 10 and 11 for examples of items which demonstrate this theme.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

A three-way ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of relationship with diversity on race, gender, status. The means and standard deviations of the Likert scale responses are presented in Table 11. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between race, gender, status, $F(4, 490) = 1.31, p = .27$. There was no significant interaction between gender and status, $F(5, 490) = .22, p = .95$. There was no significant interaction between race and gender, $F(1, 490) = 1.16, p = .28$. There was a statistically significant interaction between race and status, $F(5, 490) = 2.32, p = .04$. There was a statistically significant simple main effect for race, $F(1, 490) = 19.16, p = .00$ and for gender $F(1, 490) = 5.82, p = .02$ and for status, $F(5, 490) = 3.47, p = .00$. The interaction between race and status indicates that race and employment status influences perceptions regarding relationship with diversity. In addition, the race, gender, and status main effects indicates that these variables influence perceptions regarding relationship with diversity. These interactions and main effects will be examined in the discussion section. The average mean in relationship with diversity was significantly lower in White males ($M = 2.6, SD = .58$) than males of Color ($M = 2.91, SD = .47$), and in White females ($M = 2.76, SD = .51$) than females of Color ($M = 3.03, SD = .47$).

Results for factor 4 – perception of fairness. Factor 4 consists of 6 items from the survey. The title, “Perception of Fairness” was given because the items on the rotated factor matrix reflect various aspects of how survey respondents perceived fairness at the university. All items in this factor return a negative rotation factor. See Table 13 for examples of items which demonstrate this theme.

A three-way ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of perception of fairness on race, gender, status. The means and standard deviations of the Likert scale responses are presented in Table 14. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between race, gender,

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

status, $F(4, 490) = .76, p = .56$. There was no significant interaction between race and gender, $F(1, 490) = .36, p = .55$. There was no significant interaction between race and status, $F(5, 490) = .41, p = .84$ or between gender and status, $F(5, 490) = .78, p = .56$. There was a statistically significant simple main effect for status, $F(5, 490) = 2.80, p = .02$ but not for race $F(1, 490) = .74, p = .39$ or for gender, $F(1, 490) = .18, p = .67$. The status main effect indicates that employment status influences perceptions regarding perception of fairness, this will be examined in the discussion section.

Qualitative Results

This section describes the qualitative results from the 2018 survey. Each theme is presented, described, followed by a brief analysis of the theme. The responses were separated by race/ethnicity to determine if there were differences in the response type. After coding, the responses were examined for themes that related to the research questions.

1. How do faculty and staff perceive the campus racial climate at RNU?
2. How do RNU employees' perceptions of the campus racial climate differ according to their demographic characteristics (race, gender, status)?
3. How is commitment to racial diversity by RNU's leadership perceived by faculty and staff?

Why did you consider leaving RNU? The respondents who answered yes to Q12.3, "have you ever seriously considered leaving RNU?" (see Table 15) were then asked to give reasons why (see Table 17 for Themes). Of note is the difference in the coverage of comments coded to "Climate" according to race. Comments from White respondents had 4.17 percent coverage while comments from respondents of color had 11.69 percent coverage. Most White respondents on climate tended to comment on the work environment or the culture.

"Tired of office politics with no positive resolution in sight." (Female, Classified)

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

“work environment was toxic” (Female, Classified)

“The climate within my program has become divisive and toxic and has limited my ability to work effectively” (Female Faculty-Tenure Track)

“RNU is chaotic with high turnover.”(Female, Exempt)

Comments such as these demonstrate the privilege that White respondents have with regard to thinking about their race in relation to climate. The campus is a place in which White respondents not only seldom need to think about their race, but they also tend to regard their perception of climate on an individual level rather than a systemic level.

A few White respondents commented on being uncomfortable because of their religion or conservative viewpoints.

“Discrimination: I have been harassed because of my religion, with faculty members explicitly questioning my ability to research or reason because of my religion...” (Male, Tenured Faculty)

“My ideas are not the “main stream” ideas of the university and so I keep quiet.” (Male, Classified)

“Hostility towards me personally. I am more conservative than most faculty.” (Male, Tenured Faculty)

Like the comments made by White respondents regarding their work environment, the comments made by these respondents demonstrate their privilege by attempting to shift the topic from race to religion or conservative viewpoints.

Respondents of color tended to comment on race and racial climate clearly demonstrating the notion of racial salience, the frequency in which a person thinks about their own race (Cameron, 2014). In the responses from faculty and staff of color, race and racial identity was

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

mentioned frequently. In contrast, the White respondents did not mention their race in response to this item.

“With distressing regularity have had [student evaluations] containing racist comments that reflect nothing of my teaching nor do they offer anything in the way of ways I should improve other than the idea people of my ethnic background should die/not teach/etc. etc.” (Female of color, Senior Lecturer)

“I am tired of being the only lonely. I feel tokenized. It is painful for me as faculty to experience so much racism AND my students should not be subjected to this racism coupled with the POWER that faculty/staff have over them.” (Female of color, Tenure Track Faculty)

“As a single, Asian ethnic origin, I feel I am invisible and not trusted when I attempt to defend myself.” (Female of color, Tenured Faculty)

“Racial climate” (Female of color, Exempt)

“I am the only person of my race in my department. no matter how much I complain about my needs they have not been met” (Female of color, Tenured Faculty)

These comments on the theme of campus climate not only demonstrate clearly that faculty and staff of color at RNU must think about their race frequently but that their race also is regarded negatively by the White people around them. At the extreme end, one female faculty of color was told to “die” because of her race. Others describe the loneliness of exclusion and the belief that colleagues, and administrators do not listen or care. On the other hand, these issues were not salient for White respondents.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Why did you decide to stay? Following the question on why respondents wanted to leave RNU, respondents were then asked, “Why did you decide to stay?” Again, the responses were coded by theme. Seven themes emerged and are described in Table 19.

As with the previous item, the responses were separated by race/ethnicity to determine if there were differences in the response types. The percentage of coverage for each theme was examined to determine trends which is shown in Table 20.

For themes on family, good job, pay, and benefits there were little differences in the response types between respondents of color and White respondents. The response coverage for “good colleagues” and “unresolved/other” was slightly higher for respondents of color, but again, the response type was very similar. The response coverage for “placebound” was higher for White respondents compared to respondents of color, but the response type was again very similar with respondents commenting on staying in Springfield because they did not want to remove their children from school, or a spouse had a job in the area. Table 21 displays response coverage. However, it could be inferred that since Springfield is historically a White majority town, it is less likely that faculty and staff of color are tied to the area in the same way that some White people are.

Both White and respondents of color mentioned students as a reason to stay at RNU with the respondents of color having a slightly higher response coverage. Both groups commented on their love of teaching and interacting with the students as can be seen in the comments below.

White respondents gave comments on how much they enjoyed working with the students.

I enjoy teaching and the students. (Female, Senior Lecturer)

Because I enjoy the students so much. (Male, Senior Lecturer)

...for the students (Male, Senior Lecturer)

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Love working with the students (Female, Exempt)

The respondents of color tended to comment not only on their enjoyment working with the students but also on their role in relation to the students.

My students who tell me that if it weren't for that talk or the follow up, or the box of Kleenex on my desk, or the kind words-that they would have left RNU. (Female, Tenure Track Faculty)

Loyalty to students I recruit, and passion to improve department and university... (Male, Non-Tenure Track Faculty)

Love working with and being a mentor to our students. (Male, Exempt)

...feel rewarding to be the outlier, students value my presence as a minority and my engaging pedagogy... (Male, Tenure Track Faculty)

This connection with students is interesting because it demonstrates the importance of having faculty and staff of color to be mentors and advisors to students of color on the campus (Clayton-Peterson et al. 2007, Poloma, 2014, Mayhew et al. 2006). White faculty and White students have the privilege of being the dominant racial group, so this relationship was not named as important for the White respondents. On the other hand, faculty and staff of color expressed experiencing a relationship with students of a fiercer intensity. It appeared that faculty of color felt a connection to minority students who "...value my presence as a minority..." or "loyalty" to minority students. This connection was so intense that these faculty and staff of color decided to stay at RNU even though they had expressed a desire to leave.

Clarify any of your answers or add further comment. The final question on the survey was "use this space if you would like to clarify any of your answers or add further comment." This item allowed respondents to express their feelings or opinions after having

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

taken the survey. One hundred and forty-six or 25 percent of respondents chose to write in a comment. This item was coded first into four broad categories of Climate, Discrimination, University Administration, and Meta Comments. These broader categories were then refined into sub-categories. The themes are described in Table 20. The final category of “meta comments” were comments giving feedback on the survey itself, for example, respondents did not agree with the choice to have a 4-point Likert scale which had no neutral response choice. There were a couple of comments containing personal and sensitive information which is not relevant to this research and was not included in the discussion but was passed on to university administrators.

As with the previous items, the responses were separated by race/ethnicity to determine if there were differences in the response type. After coding, the responses were examined for themes that related to the research questions. Not all responses contained information that related. The responses that addressed the research questions were extracted and analyzed. This analysis included the responses under the theme, “climate” and the response theme “hiring” under the “University Administration” theme (see Table 22).

White respondents did not comment specifically about the climate of the Springfield area in this section. However, faculty and staff of color did. There were three comments, all with a different point of view. One comment was positive. “RNU has the unique opportunity to further integrate a diverse group of students, beliefs, and ideas with the rural heritage of [the local population]” (Male, Classified). The following comment made by a classified, female staff member disagreed: “People of color are brought to campus, but then dropped into a city that is pretty racist (White people say it isn’t, but they don’t have to experience the racism and homophobia that is rampant in Springfield.)” And finally, one female, senior faculty member

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

noted that it was difficult for "...women of non-Christian backgrounds to feel comfortable here."

While the intersections of sexuality and religion are not explored in this study, their salience, along with that of race has still emerged as catalysts for perceptions of oppression.

Both White and respondents of color had comments to make about the general climate of RNU. Of note is the number of White respondents who commented on the efforts of RNU to diversify the campus. These respondents were highly critical of RNU.

Do not say that you care about being a diverse campus and then not be willing to support students with the development of a multi-cultural center. (Male, Exempt)

Some, well known offenders among staff members and faculty are openly racist, xenophobic, and sexist, and nothing is being done with that. (Male, Tenured Faculty)

It has been my experience both as a student and later as an employee that RNU takes credit for the strides their students make in diversity advocacy and education without actually doing any of the hard work themselves. (Female, Classified)

Comments such as these demonstrate that there are White people on the RNU campus who support diversity efforts. Their pointed comments show their interest in supporting students of color through recognizing the work they do, and by calling out racism of faculty and staff.

RNU has held an annual Multicultural Celebration for the past five years in which awards are given to faculty, staff, students, and community members for efforts to promote diversity and inclusion. Last year, almost all of the recipients for the awards were White. Two of the respondents of color noted as such in their comments on the climate of RNU.

Even at the [Multicultural Celebration], those given recognition are White. (Female, Classified)

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Also, please do something about your [multicultural] awards being awarded to mostly White students, faculty or staff. (Female, Classified)

Racial capitalism is apparent in the way in which these awards were made. It was in the interest of the university to appear to honor those who promote diversity in a public ceremony. An interest which presumably is shared by the faculty, staff, and students of color on the campus. However, in the actual granting of the awards, White people were the primary recipients, with one or two people of color receiving recognition. The important thing for the university was to hold the award ceremony and to preserve the feelings of White people by recognizing their work rather than for the faculty and staff of color whose work, for the most part, remained invisible and unremarked.

One female, classified respondent of color commented that the survey would have “severely skewed results” because the “White population is not going to have many adverse interactions within the university or in Springfield.” There is truth to this comment. Bonilla-Silva (2015, 2018) named this the Whiteness of higher education and how Whiteness is perpetuated through dominance of systems to benefit White people. This survey would be presumed to be no different.

There were a number of comments by respondents of color which supported the point of view that RNU (and the town of Springfield) is not welcoming to people of color.

RNU wants to be inclusive, but only in so that cisgendered White people hold power over conversations and change. (Female, Classified)

...I serve as an informal advisor to numerous minority students and counsel them about how to work through the invisibility, condescension, racial isolation, and hurtful racial

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

slights ...which by and large, come not from their professors, but from their White peers.

(Male, Tenure Track Faculty)

I would simply like to mention that as a minority serving at my first [Predominantly White Institution], the racism, prejudice, and discrimination I contend with does not emanate by and large from my peers, but from the predominately White student population I serve. (Male, Tenure Track Faculty)

There is a lot of work to be done. Our students of color are made to feel unwelcome.

(Female, Tenure Track Faculty)

The pervasiveness of Whiteness on the RNU campus is apparent, which particularly seems to negatively impact the climate for students of color from both the general climate of RNU but most notable here, negativity from White students. Despite the fact that faculty and students of color felt marginalized RNU continued to focus on increasing the number of minorities on campus instead of easing that marginalization. The university sought to increase the racial diversity of the student body, capitalizing on the value that the image of being a diverse institution would bring (Leong 2013).

A theme was created to capture the comments that were classified as “White fragility” as defined by DiAngelo (2018). These comments were made by White respondents. White fragility was displayed in a number of comments from White respondents. Their comments revealed extreme discomfort and the anger and denial that DiAngelo (2018) described when White people are faced with the topic of diversity and race.

Diversity to me is about being able to have conversations without people feeling like a person is racist. (Female, Tenure Track Faculty)

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

RNU has gone too far with diversity... We spend a lot of money and effort on diversity and inclusiveness, sometimes to the detriment of students who are not minorities.

Let us expand the definitions of “diversity” to honor the heritage and experience of everyone. (Female, Exempt)

I'm tired of so much discussion on diversity. It's silly... Why do we have a separate black student union, Hispanic associations etc.? There should be only one for all. (Male, Exempt)

The only ethnic/gender group where I have witnessed discriminatory behavior is with White males. It seems that the term “diversity” has come to be a euphemism for anti-White males. (Male, Tenure Track Faculty)

Comments here display typical reactions to common triggers for White fragility. The fear of being labeled a “racist” is a reaction to the good/bad binary described by DiAngelo (2018). These points of view reveal anger and confusion over an initiative (diversity) in which White people, and specifically White males, are not centered. These comments highlight White faculty and staff members’ lament for the possible loss of status they thought they considered permanent, which further indicates that their needs have been centered in the university’s structure.

There were also comments which reflected attitudes of colorblindness and meritocracy.

“Treat others of (sic) you want to be treated.”

“I have never experienced diversity making a more proficient employee or professor.

Work ethic, skills, and abilities of the applicant should be the concern of placement.”

These respondents reveal a defensive posture over being made to consider the notion of diversity.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

“I feel that the focus on diversity training has somewhat backfired in that it has left a certain group of people feeling a little defensive and resentful...The sense was that diverse student/staff feelings are far more important than others’ who don't identify this way.”

“We spend a lot of money and effort on diversity and inclusiveness, sometimes to the detriment of students who are not minorities.”

Some statements revealed a fundamental lack of understanding that racism is a system of oppression versus individual bias or discrimination.

“Inclusiveness should mean everyone, and when you are shown videos entitled “Why you can not be racist toward White people”, you aren't being inclusive toward White people. Teaching things like “White privilege” creates problems in that, because someone is White, it automatically means they have faced less injustice in this world than a non-White person. If “suffered injustice” somehow makes one race more superior than the next in terms of what can and can't be said about it, to the point that it is worth calling out in a compulsory training, is this not inherently racist itself?”

“We have progressed past skin color, we had a President that was black, he is an AMERICAN not an African American! We need to stop dividing by color and start uniting by love of this country of freedom!!”

The differences in perception of campus racial climate at RNU by race is most evident in areas in which issues of race and diversity is explicitly named. In these cases, faculty and staff of color have a more negative view of the campus climate and perceive “racial tension” at a higher rate than their White peers. At the same time, White faculty and staff displayed a

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

different type of perspective. Their perspective was rooted in a lack of understanding of racism, racial salience, and perceived innocence in their role is promoting and perpetuating racism and oppression. For example, in the comment about the fact that we have "...progressed past skin color..." demonstrates a profound lack of awareness of systemic racism. This posturing results in shutting down open conversations about racism. As DiAngelo (2018) maintains, "...unequal power relations cannot be challenged if they are not acknowledged" (p. 86).

Another manifestation of White fragility was the way in which respondents chose to answer the race question on the survey. Most people answered the question using the given selection. Some elected to qualify their response by giving additional information such as "Taiwanese Chinese" to further describe "Asian." Some people elected not to provide a response at all. But there was a subset of people for whom this item elicited flippant, sometimes angry responses in the text option. These people, all males, selected "other" and wrote in responses such as this:

"I am Italian and Irish, I don't feel like I should be seen as non-diverse because my skin color is White. Everyone is diverse because no one is the same as another skin color should not matter..."

"Human"

"US citizen protected by US law"

These responses, like those above, are examples of how White people are triggered by topics that relate to race and racism. The first respondent struggles with not being centered in the discussion about diversity, while the other respondents push away the salience of race. Instead they make an attempt to steer the conversation away from race and instead make the case for race neutrality. The fact that they can do this also signals their status at the university as the

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

dominant group. For these respondents, openly discussing race is extremely uncomfortable, and their racial ignorance means that they lack the vocabulary to express their opinions in a nuanced way.

There were three comments that related to religious discrimination, specifically aimed at Christians. Even though these comments do not address race, there is an element of exclusion and a lack of comfort with the climate, which is of interest of this study. One comment came from a male exempt employee of color.

“In the workplace there is a strong unwritten pressure to never express conservative viewpoints and, in the classroom, there is open hostility and aggression by faculty against traditional Christian ideology.”

This non-instructional employee mentioned specifically that the hostility he encountered regarding his beliefs came from faculty. The other comments came from White, male faculty. Their comments speak to a feeling persecution and being misunderstood.

“...RNU has become increasingly intolerant of beliefs described as conservative or Christian. It has become acceptable to, miss represent (sic) those beliefs, belittle those beliefs, exclude them from conversation, and mandate training that says those beliefs are wrong and unacceptable.”

“If there is one aspect where I have at times felt (indirect) hostility at RNU, it is from being a person of faith. I hope that students of faith at RNU don't experience derision, scorn, or prejudice from faculty or other students on account of their beliefs.”

Discrimination comments that related to gender were made only by White faculty and staff. There were nine comments in all, with one from a male exempt employee. The rest are from a mixture of female faculty, exempt and classified staff.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

“As a woman, I have noticed that some men on campus speak to me with a lack of respect. They are quick to dismiss ideas and suggestions coming from myself or other women in the group. I have seen men do this to several women in the same meeting.”

(White female, classified)

This comment demonstrates dissatisfaction that White female employees perceive from the treatment they received by their male peers. This perception contributes to a negative climate for female faculty and staff.

The final area of interest in the comments section comes under the hiring theme (see Table 24). Comments in this theme covered topics that related to the hiring process of RNU. Faculty and staff of color noted the university’s tendency to hire unfairly. There were only three comments on this topic from faculty and staff of color.

“This university would rather hire international folks than LatinX and blacks from the USA and say it is diverse.” (Female, tenured faculty)

“This university seems to only like to hire White males and females in positions of power.” (Classified female)

The first comment describes a perception by this faculty member of color that the university prefers to hire faculty (or staff) from abroad instead of diversifying by hiring people in country. This perception is known as racial triangulation theory. According to this theory, first proposed by Kim (1999), describes how the division of people in underrepresented groups exist to benefit Whites (Xu & Lee, 2013). RNU, by hiring more foreign minorities such as Asians from Asia, structurally diversifies the faculty demographics. However, doing so still benefits Whites structurally because foreign minority and domestic minority have different concerns, therefore, they are unlikely to collaborate and be a threat to the university structure.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

White respondents tended to comment on their discomfort with the “push” for diversity in hiring. All but one of the comments in this section covered this sentiment in one form or another.

“I believe that we should select the most qualified faculty/staff/students and not focus on being diverse over qualifications.” (Classified, White, male)

“Potential staff members are over-looked if they are White males. Someone with less/no experience but of different gender or ethnicity is encouraged to be hired over the other candidates. It is the side effect of feeling so strongly about diversity, that certain qualified applicants are passed over due to so much pressure to be diverse”.(Tenured, White male)

The respondents strongly believe that the university’s initiative to diversify its faculty and staff has a negative effect. White males are described in the comments as being “overlooked” or “passed over” even though they are qualified. It is unclear from the comments if there is any basis in fact that their assertions are true. It is more apparent that the respondents, in this case, both White males were asserting their dominance and status within RNU.

One staff member commented that hiring faculty and staff of color threatens the harmony and well-being of the local community and posits that this practice may create divisions.

“...the hiring practices at RNU are unbalanced and unrepresentative of the community due to the diversity push. It gives a fake and forced feeling to the diversity on campus and may cause division.” (Exempt, White male)

It is interesting to note that this respondent chose to focus on the inaccurate representation of the community when people of color are brought into the workplace. His logic is not based on the fact because the diversity of students at RNU exceeds that of faculty and

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

staff. His comment indicates fear that he may have to work in a space in which White people are not over-represented.

These comments in this section demonstrate that while RNU has a campus community committed to promoting the ideals of diversity and inclusion, there is a cadre of faculty and staff who are uncomfortable with the changes. RNU is able to derive value from racial diversity of students, faculty, and staff. This value is used to measure success in terms of numbers. The backlash of White fragility which includes defensive, angry posturing which is designed to shut down open conversations about race and racism.

Discussion

In this section, I discuss the results presented in Sections VIII and IX in light of my three research questions guided by Hurtado et al.'s (2012) DLE framework. This discussion includes overall faculty and staff perceptions of campus racial climate including how these perceptions may have differed by race, gender, and employment status. Next, I look at how RNU's employees perceive commitment to racial diversity by RNU's leadership. These discussions will be framed by the CRT's interest convergence and racial capitalism theories. After reviewing and discussing the findings for each of these questions, I set out some conclusions and topics for future research for RNU and potentially for other HWCUs across the United States.

Research Questions 1 and 2

How do faculty and staff perceive the campus racial climate at RNU and how do RNU employees' perceptions of the campus racial climate differ according to their demographic characteristics (race, gender, status)?

Historical legacy - racial capitalism. The perception of faculty and staff on campus racial climate at RNU was first evaluated through the lens of a historical perspective through a

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

series of three internal reports. Since RNU is predominantly White, these perceptions were driven mainly by the White faculty and staff and a White administration. The 1996 report (Rural Northwest University, 1996) documented claims of racial bias, discrimination, and harassment described by the minority faculty, staff, and students who made up less than 10 percent of the campus population. More than ten years later, in the 2010 survey report, the overall campus climate at RNU had been characterized as welcoming and enjoyable by the majority of the respondents, while at the same time, acknowledging that a significant number of students of color had reported feeling singled out because of their identity (RNU Inclusiveness Initiative, 2010). However, because the notion of diversity is considered valuable to the institution as virtually an item for sale "...to be pursued, captured, possessed and used" (Leong, 2013, p. 2155), maintaining and increasing the number of faculty, staff, and students at RNU was highly desired even if there was little being done explicitly at that time to make the campus more welcoming.

It was in the interest of this historically White institution to examine campus climate periodically. First of all, it was important to show the minority faculty, staff, and students that RNU was willing to take time and resources to demonstrate concern. Secondly, this same concern needed to be demonstrated to White faculty and staff, and that of the wider community of Springfield county in response to events at the time. The Rodney King uprising in Los Angeles may have been a catalyst for the first report, and the inauguration of the first African-American president took place in 2009, which coincides with the timing of the final report. These reports mark a time when the White administration felt a need to examine campus climate. However, once the reports were written, there was minimal momentum to follow up on recommendations to improve racial climate. All three reports contained recommendations which

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

could still be true today. The 1996 report, for example recommended an initiative to hire more racially diverse faculty and administrators and professional development for White faculty to teach more effectively to a diverse group of students. The 2000 and the 2010 reports included the same recommendations.

Organizational structure - Interest convergence and racial capitalism. The initiative to diversify the student body at RNU, as articulated in RNU's strategic plan, arguably, was driven by the belief that students of all races and ethnicities would be enhanced by studying on a diverse campus. The benchmark narrative specifically asserts that students required a diverse campus experience to be prepared to live and work successfully in a diverse environment. What is unnamed in this narrative is that the students being referred to are most likely White students. White students are the majority students at RNU, and they are students who are most likely to have grown up in the racially segregated area of Springfield county or its surroundings. Census data shows that in general, White people tend to live in highly segregated, White majority communities (Frey, 2018). The town of Springfield and Springfield county is 91 percent White. The four counties immediately surrounding Springfield are also populated primarily by White people ranging between 70 to 93 percent (U.S. Census Quick Facts, 2018).

In terms of interest convergence, this a compelling example of how the furtherance of equity for people of color, in this case, admission to an institution of higher education, coincidentally meshes with that of the dominant group. In addition, the leveraging of diversity as a commodity, that is, the participation of people of color either as students or as faculty or staff is a form of racial capitalism from which the university was able to benefit. RNU is able to use racial demographics of the university to demonstrate their commitment to diversity which is driven by their strategic plan's benchmarks on equity and inclusion. At this same time, White

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

students may derive benefit from living and studying with a diverse group of students. This exposure, which for many White students may be the first time, is considered valuable by the institution. It could be argued that the inclusion of people of color on the campus is at least in part for the benefit of White students to gain this exposure. This finding is also supported in campus climate research (Dixson, Anderson, Rousseau, and Donner (2017); Hurtado et al. 2012; Leong, 2013).

The way in which tenured and tenure-track faculty members are evaluated is of particular interest. To gain tenure or promotion, faculty must not only teach well, but they must be professionally active by publishing, presenting, or engaged in grant writing. This was made explicit in the care and detail, which was used to describe expectations. The type or amount of committee work or community service was not detailed. These expectations are not unusual in higher education; however, they are important in the context of the work of faculty of color. For example, because of the small number of faculty and staff of color, the human resources department keeps a list of faculty and staff of color who are willing to serve on screening committees to diversify what would surely otherwise be an all-White committee. This places a greater demand on time and energy for these people. Faculty and staff of color are more likely to be sought after as an advisor or counselor to the students of color or they may be asked to serve on committees with a diversity theme (Fries-Britt, Rowan-Kenyon, Perna, Milem, and Howard, 2011, Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). However, the expertise needed to fulfill these needs, what Padilla (1994) refers to as “cultural taxation,” requires considerable familiarity with diversity issues and deep knowledge of community and culture. This knowledge and expertise is not weighted in the same way that contributions to the other two categories in the evaluation of faculty, which could seriously disadvantage faculty of color in the quest to become tenured or to

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

gain promotion (Fries-Britt, Rowan-Kenyon, Perna, Milem, & Howard, 2011, Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017; Stanley, 2006; Turner, González, & Wood, 2008; Umbach, 2006).

RNU benefits from the unique expertise that faculty and staff of color contribute both to the function of the university on committees and to direct services to students of color. These benefits are realized for example, when RNU produces accreditation reports which address the meeting of benchmarks or when promoting the experience at RNU to increase student enrollment. Yet, having obtained these benefits, according to the tenets of interest convergence and racial capitalism, RNU lacks the motivation to institute systemic changes to reward systems like tenure or promotion.

Psychological climate – quantitative - interest convergence and racial capitalism.

The factor analysis conducted using the quantitative data from the RNU 2019 survey resulted in the extraction of four factors: Factor 1 - Workplace Communication; Factor 2 - Sense of Belonging; Factor 3 – Relationship with Diversity; Factor 4 - Perception of Fairness. The ANOVA results of factors 1, 2, and 4 did not reveal any significant effects with regard to race. However, all three revealed significance with regard to employment status, particularly with that of tenured faculty. However this effect and its significance was not the focus of this research project since it was unconnected to race. It would, however, be an interesting and worthwhile project for the administration of RNU to pursue. The fact that there was no significant effect for these factors was surprising. I expected to find differences in the way that faculty and staff of color experienced workplace communication, belonging, and perceptions of fairness compared to their White colleagues and that expectation was that perceived satisfaction would be higher for White faculty and staff than for those of color. But this turned out not to be

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

the case. The question blocks in the survey that covered these items were neutrally framed, which may be a possible reason for this lack of difference.

The ANOVA results for factor 3 (relationship with diversity), however, uncovered significance of interaction for race, for gender, and between status and race. The mean for faculty and staff of color in factor 3 was higher than for White respondents (Table 10). For example, for item “Q3.4 I discuss diversity-related issues for people I know,” faculty and staff of color were more likely to have selected “strongly agree” or “agree” compared to White respondents. Three of the items in this factor were reverse scored for comparison. For example, item “Q4.4 RNU is supportive of people with ethnic backgrounds” had a negative rotated factor. Faculty and staff of color were more likely to have disagreed or strongly disagreed with this item than some White respondents. This response type indicates that faculty and staff of color do, in fact, experience a hostile climate and perceive a lack of support by the administration.

White fragility was also evident in the results of the analysis of Factor 3 in which White males, followed by White females, had the lowest mean score for items such as “I believe being able to interact with individuals of diverse backgrounds is beneficial.” This explicit naming of diversity may have acted as a trigger for negative reactions from White respondents. This negativity is a behavior pattern for fragile White people when asked to consider a racialized world. A racialized world is in conflict with their view that race does not matter and the good/bad binary.

The items in Factors 1, 2, and 4 were neutral in terms of their content. These items were purely about communication, belonging, or fairness. The concepts of race, ethnicity, and diversity were not mentioned. However, the items in Factor 3 were explicitly about these concepts. It is possible that the items which specifically named race and diversity were more

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

effective at revealing perceptions of racial climate. It is also possible that the use of such vocabulary triggered a stronger negative response from the White respondents or a stronger positive response from the respondents of color. What is apparent through the results of Factor 3 is that campus racial climate is perceived differently by race. For example, faculty and staff of color are more likely to perceive that there is “racial tension on campus” and they are more likely to perceive that that RNU is not “supportive of people of ethnic backgrounds.” This perception is well documented by other campus climate literature (Bowman & Brandenberger, 2012; Clayton-Pedersen et al., 2007; Fries-Britt et al., 2011; Gause et al., 2010; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado et al., 2012; Jayakumar et al., 2009).

These differences are also significant by status and by gender with White male faculty especially having a negative view of diversity-related issues. White male faculty may have such a negative response because they may also feel the most threatened. Other studies have shown similar results from White males when they feel as if their worldview of colorblindness is challenged (Cabrera, Franklin, & Watson, 2017).

The results of the quantitative data show us that faculty and staff perceive campus racial climate differently. The qualitative analysis of responses provides more context to the “how” part of the research question: “how do faculty and staff perceive campus racial climate?” A lack of satisfaction in the workplace can be inferred by the fact that 67 percent of faculty and staff of color and 64 percent of White respondents revealed that they had seriously considered leaving RNU. Respondents of all races expressed dissatisfaction with the administration or with the pay and conditions of employment. There were comments from all races about “climate.” However, the White respondents did not refer to their own race or racism in relation to this theme. Respondents of color did. The issue of racial salience was evident in this response type as

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

respondents of color referred to their own race, racism from RNU students and feelings of isolation and loneliness. In the general comments section at the end of the survey, faculty and staff of color called out the racist attitudes of the White students attending RNU towards themselves and towards students of color. This racism was also apparent in student evaluations done for classes taught by faculty of color. This was a topic not mentioned by White faculty. Racial salience has been found to be relevant in other studies (Cameron, 2004; Heckert, Steck, & Heckert, 2003; Hurtado, Alvarado, & Guillermo-Wann, 2015; Jayakumar & Adamian, 2017).

When respondents were asked why they decided to stay, response types were fairly similar for many of the themes. One exception was the theme of “placebound.” White respondents were more likely to name being placebound as a reason to stay. Because Springfield has been a predominantly White county for at least one hundred and fifty years, it makes sense that mostly White respondents chose placebound as a reason to stay (History, 2019). Another exception in response type was that of “students.” Faculty and staff of all races mentioned their enjoyment and love of teaching and interacting with students. However, faculty and staff of color were more likely to name their role in connection with the students they were serving, mentioning feelings of “loyalty” or enjoying the role of being “a mentor,” a role model or someone who is there to listen. This characterization of relationship between student and faculty/staff is indicative of the importance of having faculty and staff of color on campus to support students of color and is in line with Harper and Hurtado’s (2007) finding that faculty and staff of color feel powerless to change systems but will instead focus on helping individual students.

Certainly the biggest difference in the way that campus racial climate is perceived by faculty and staff at RNU is evident in the response types coded as “White Fragility.” White

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

fragility was demonstrated in a number of ways. The fact that RNU is a HWCU located in a county which is predominately White means that faculty and staff seldom have to think about their race. Their comments displayed a lack of knowledge of race and it appeared that they are seldom confronted with the need to discuss matters related to race. When they do, as in the survey, they become defensive and angry in an attempt to shut down the conversation. There was a tendency demonstrated by White respondents to deflect from naming race, to instead focus on race neutrality or positioning themselves as good in the good/bad binary view of racism.

Research Question 3

How is commitment to racial diversity by RNU's leadership perceived by faculty and staff?

Three dimensions: Historical, structural, and organizational – Perceptions of administrative commitment to racial diversity. Over the last 25 years, RNU's leadership has demonstrated interest in addressing racial diversity by setting up relevant committees, task forces, and reports. There was certainly a push at the leadership level to increase the numerical diversity of students and of faculty and staff. The 1996 report included the information that only 10 percent of students, faculty and staff were "minorities." The percent of students of color attending RNU has increased to more than 40 percent and staff to just over 20 percent. However, the percent of faculty who are of color remained relatively stagnant at 13 percent (RNU institutional data).

In terms of organizational structure, RNU's administration ensured that diversity "issues" would be addressed by including it in the strategic plan, which means that the benchmarks set will be assessed and reported, including presumably, the regional accrediting body. Human resources practice has included diversity in its hiring protocol with strong attention to the inclusion of diversity-related questions and ensuring the hiring committee itself is diverse.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

A certain amount of commitment to racial diversity by the administration at RNU was demonstrated through administrative structures and practices. The results from both qualitative and quantitative data sources indicated that this commitment fell short of expectations. The ANOVA results for Factor 3, Relationship with Diversity, suggest that faculty and staff of color do not believe that RNU is supportive of “people of ethnic backgrounds.” This is coupled with the belief by the same group that there is “racial tension on campus.” In the general comments section at the end of the survey, there were a number of White respondents who criticized how the administration of RNU handled diversity issues naming the lack of support for a multicultural center and that little had been done to hold certain faculty and staff accountable for racist behaviors. The Multicultural Celebration was criticized by faculty and staff of color for honoring primarily White people. While a superficial effort was made to address racial diversity issues, overall, in terms of whiteness and White privilege, RNU maintains White dominance through preservation of its core structures and systems.

At the same time, White faculty and staff expressed clear dissatisfaction with the attention that RNU’s administration was giving to diversity-related issues focused on race. The comments coded to “White Fragility” unmistakably demonstrate this unhappiness, anger, and discomfort. This discomfort was voiced to address a number of contexts such as the increase in the number of students of color on campus, or anger over having to attend a diversity training. Each of these contexts is troubling for the improvement of RNU’s racial climate. However, one particularly problematic push back for the RNU administration relates to the serious misperception that White faculty and staff have in the deliberate attempt to change the hiring process to include others outside their race. This misperception, which was revealed in the survey results, seems rooted in the erroneous belief that when people of color are hired instead of

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

White people, it is solely because of the ethnicity of the person rather than their qualifications (Berry & Bonilla-Silva, 2008; Hurtado et al. 2014). This misperception and push back also demonstrates a backlash to strengthen and reaffirm structures which maintain the dominance of White faculty and staff.

Recommendations and Implications for RNU

It is hoped that the results of this study, the analysis, and conclusions can be used to develop interventions and strategies to further the goal of an inclusive and diverse campus racial climate for RNU. Hurtado, Arellano, Griffin, and Cuellar (2008) reviewed over 90 campus climate instruments to make recommendations on the factors that make up a successful climate assessment. They found that almost all of the surveys focused on students. Only “a handful” of the surveys included university or college staff members and of those most were single institutions (Hurtado et al., 2006). As a result, Hurtado et al. (2006) called for more assessments of both faculty and staff and to have more multi-campus surveys to address this short coming. Faculty and staff are relatively permanent. Identifying their perception of climate is vital towards understanding how the campus environment is experienced by all stakeholders.

It was established earlier in this paper that the role of both faculty and staff is crucial towards achieving an inclusive and racially diverse campus climate (Gause, Dennison, & Perrin, 2010; Hurtado & Guillermo-Wann, 2013; Iverson, 2007; Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2006). The qualitative data from the survey indicates that the most significant issue regarding achieving an inclusive campus climate at RNU is that of White fragility. This is not to say that all White faculty and staff are fragile or that all White faculty and staff are uninformed about systemic racism, racism in education, or racial innocence. This assessment is supported by comments in the survey which came from White faculty and staff who called out racist behaviors and

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

practices. However, there is a vocal contingent of White faculty and staff who not only lack knowledge and understanding of their role in perpetuating the structures and systems that primarily advantage them at the expense of faculty/staff of color. Initiating a change in workplace culture will require a significant amount of work and commitment by the leadership of the university. When I refer to RNU leadership, I am including not just the executive administration but also the dean and director level, as well as participants in shared governance structures such as the academic senate and staff associations to ensure that all aspects of campus culture is included from administration, instruction, and student services.

RNU's leadership needs to raise awareness of White faculty and staff of how their actions can cause harm and marginalization on their colleagues of color, which needs to be done through engagement and an open conversations about race. This kind of work cannot be done in a single training session or by watching a series of videos online. Instead this type of deep engagement requires a multi-pronged approach. Talking about race, racism, and how racism impacts everyone of all races takes time and effort. Bringing people into these conversations is not easy when some of these people resist the principles and goals. Moving people away from what DiAngelo (2018) called the "good/bad binary" (p. 71) of what it means to be a racist is a vital first step. In his book, *Tears We Cannot Stop: A Sermon to White America*, Dyson (2017) implores White Americans to become racially literate and to educate themselves by reading books about the struggles of people of Color and to take on the obligation of educating not only themselves but others too in their midst.

Through building cohorts of people who are allies in this change movement, White leaders at RNU need to take the initiative and encourage discussions of racism and White fragility openly. The leadership at RNU has already made the commitment to consider diversity

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

and equity a benchmark in the strategic plan. For this commitment to have meaning, the leadership should insist that people who wish to work at RNU also subscribe to this common goal and hold them accountable through tenure and promotion processes or staff performance reviews.

The leadership at RNU needs to examine which structures and institutional norms within the institution perpetuate racial inequality and White privilege. Tenets of interest convergence and racial capitalism served to preserve the structures and policies which protect Whiteness at RNU. For example, the results from this study indicate that the hiring process needs to be dramatically overhauled so that a more diverse workforce can be recruited. This type of overhaul has been discussed since the first climate report in the early 90s, but there has been very little change in the number of faculty and staff of Color at RNU. The survey results also indicate that White fragility is quite possibly a major factor inhibiting the success of a more innovative process of dismantling structures which preserve Whiteness. Such an overhaul would benefit in two main ways. First the workforce would be diversified, and second, the racially literate White people hired under the new system would be allies in RNU's quest towards institutional change at the structural level.

Another example of a structure and institutional norm which perpetuates racial inequality at RNU is the tenure and promotion process. This process should be reviewed and reconfigured to ensure that the unique skills and knowledge base of faculty of color is valued and rewarded appropriately (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). Faculty of all ethnicities should be encouraged to create and deliver curriculum rich in perspectives beyond the Eurocentric. This skill set should be highly prized and rewarded. White faculty as well as faculty of color should be encouraged to teach classes which address racism and white supremacy. According to (Smith, Kashubeck-

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

West, Payton, & Adams, 2017) White professors teaching about racism as a system of oppression rather than individual bias or discrimination can have a meaningful impact on White students which can begin a “cognitive shift” in how they view whiteness and antiracism (p. 662). Dyson (2017) encourages White people to not only learn more about “black life” but to also teach others what they have learned. He advises, “They may not be as defensive with you, so you must be an ambassador of truth to your own tribes...” (p. 203). The knowledge of community and cultural competence possessed by faculty and staff of color, particularly in their work with students is another skill set which can be invaluable to the success of students but is rarely included in faculty evaluation, particularly in their teaching and service to the university.

Conclusion - Inclusive Racial Climate Hindered by White Fragility

The modified version of Hurtado’s (1998) framework was a useful tool for describing the various dimensions of the racial climate at RNU, both the positive and the negative. Critical Race Theory, likewise, provided guidance on how to interpret these descriptions and assisted in providing context and motivation. The fears expressed in RNU’s racial climate reports (1996, 2000, 2010) that nothing would change bears out. When change did occur, such as the increase in student diversity or the development of administrative structures to encourage and support diversity, these changes could largely be attributed to interest convergence and tenets of racial capitalism. Larger and more intractable structural issues such as the need to hire and retain more faculty and staff of color or the successful creation of a welcoming and inclusive campus climate continue to be elusive. Both of these issues exist as manifestations of a significant and insidious problem for HWCUs, that of White fragility and the preservation of Whiteness. RNU must recognize and address the pervasiveness of White fragility and White racial ignorance before any significant, lasting change in campus racial climate can be expected.

References

- Arab American Institute. (2018, April 26). *2020 Census: Reaching an Accurate Count*. Retrieved from Arab American Institute: <https://www.aaiusa.org/2020census>
- Bell, D. (1980). Brown vs. Board of education and the interest convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518–534.
- Bell, D. (2004). The interest-convergence covenants. In *Silent covenants: Brown v. Board of education and the unfulfilled hopes of racial reform* (pp. 79–92). Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>
- Berry, B., & Bonilla-Silva, E. (2008). 'They should hire the one with the best score': White sensitivity to qualification differences in affirmative action hiring decisions. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31(2), 215-242.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2015, November 12). *The white racial innocence game*. Retrieved from Racism Review: <http://www.racismreview.com/blog/2015/11/12/white-racial-innocence-game/>
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2018). *Racism without racists : Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America* (Fifth ed.). Janham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bowman, N., & Brandenberger, J. W. (2012). Experiencing the unexpected: Toward a model of college diversity experiences and attitude change. *The Review of Higher Education*, 35(2), 179–205. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2012.0016>
- Cabrera, N. (Spring 2012). Working Through Whiteness: Male College Students Challenging Racism. *The Review of Higher Education*, 35(3), 375-401.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

- Cabrera, N. L., Franklin, J. D., & Watson, J. S. (2017, January 3). Special Issue: Whiteness in Higher Education: The Invisible Missing Link in Diversity and Racial Analyses. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 42(6), 7-125.
- Cameron, J. E. (2004). A three-factor model of social identity. *Self and Identity*, 3(3), 239–262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13576500444000047>
- Clayton-Pedersen, A., Parker, S., Smith, D. G., Moreno, J. F., & Teraguchi, D. H. (2007). *Making a real difference with diversity*. Washington D.C.
- Creswell, J. W. (2015). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical Race Theory*. New York: New York University Press.
- DiAngelo, R. (2018). *White fragility: why it's so hard for white people to talk about racism*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Dixson, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (2005). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 7–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000340971>
- Dixson, A., Anderson, Celia Rousseau, & Donner, Jamel K. (2017). *Critical race theory in education : All god's children got a song* (Second ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Duster, T. (1993). The diversity of California at Berkeley: An emerging reformulation of “competence” in an increasingly multicultural world. In B. Thompson & S. Tyagi (Eds.) *Beyond a dream deferred: multicultural education and the politics of excellence* (pp. 231–255). University of Minnesota Press.
- Dyson, M. E. (2017). *Tears we cannot stop: A sermon to white America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

- Equal Opportunity*. (2019). Retrieved from RNU: <http://www.xxx.edu/hr/equal-opportunity-committee>
- Frey, W. H. (2018, December 17). *Black-white segregation edges downward since 2000, census shows*. Retrieved from Brookings Institute: <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2018/12/17/black-white-segregation-edges-downward-since-2000-census-shows/>
- Fries-Britt, Sharon & Rowan-Kenyon, Heather & Perna, Laura & Milem, Jeffrey & S. Gerald, Danette. (2011). Underrepresentation in the academy and the institutional climate for faculty diversity. *Journal of the Professoriate*. 5. 1-34.
- Garcia, G. A. (2015). Exploring student affairs professionals' experiences with the campus racial climate at a hispanic serving institution (HSI). *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 9(1), 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039199>
- Garvey, J. (2016). The influence of campus climate and urbanization on queer-spectrum and trans-spectrum faculty intent to leave. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000027>
- Gause, C. P., Dennison, S., & Perrin, D. H. (2010). Equity, inclusiveness, and diversifying the faculty: Transforming the university in the 21st century. *Quest*, 62(1), 61–75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2010.10483632>
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330–366. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.0.0172>
- Harper, S. R. (2012). Race without racism: how higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms. *The Review of Higher Education*, 36(1S), 9–29. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2012.0047>

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Harper, S. R., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 120, 7–24.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ss>

Hart, J., & Fellabaum, J. (2008). Analyzing campus climate studies: seeking to define and understand. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 222–234.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013627>

Heckert, L. W., Steck, L. W., & Heckert, D. A. (2003). The salience of racial identity among African American and White students. *Race and Society*, 6, 57–73.

History. (2019). Retrieved from City of Springfield: <https://www.ci.xxx.xx.us/104/History>

Human Resources - RNU. (2019). Retrieved from Search Committee:

<http://www.xxx.edu/hr/search-committee>

Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate : Contexts of conflict. *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 63, No. 5, Racial Harassment on Campus (Sep. - Published by : Ohio State University Press) Stable URL : <http://www.jstor.org>, 63(5), 539–569.

Hurtado, S., Griffin, K. A., Arellano, L., & Cuellar, M. (2008). Assessing the value of climate assessments: Progress and future directions. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 204–221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014009>

Hurtado S., Alvarez C.L., Guillermo-Wann C., Cuellar M., Arellano L. (2012) A Model for Diverse Learning Environments. In: Smart J., Paulsen M. (eds.) *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, vol. 27. Springer, Dordrecht

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

- Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(3), 279–302.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 26(8), 1–133.
- Iverson, S. V. D. (2007). Camouflaging power and privilege: A critical race analysis of university diversity policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(5), 586–611.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X07307794>
- Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., & Han, J. C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: an exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(5), 538–563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2009.11779031>
- Jayakumar, U. M., & Adamian, A. S. (2017). The Fifth Frame of Colorblind Ideology: Maintaining the Comforts of Colorblind (Jayakumar & Adamian, 2017)ness in the Context of White Fragility. *Sociological Perspectives*, 60(5), 912–936.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121417721910>
- Kim, Claire Jean. 1999. “The racial triangulation of Asian Americans.” *Politics & Society* 27: 105-38.
- Ledesma, M. C., & Calderón, D. (2015). Critical race theory in education: a review of past literature and a look to the future. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 21(3), 206–222.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414557825>
- Leong, N. (2013). Racial capitalism. *Harvard Law Review*, 126(8), 2151–2226.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Los Angeles Times Staff. (2017, April 26). *The L.A. riots: 25 years later*. Retrieved from Los Angeles Times: <http://timelines.latimes.com/los-angeles-riots/>

Lumina Foundation. (2017, 02 15). *Lumina Foundation FAQ*. Retrieved from Lumina Foundation: <https://www.luminafoundation.org/lumina-foundation-faq>

Martella, R. C., & Nelson, J. R. (2013). *Understanding and interpreting educational research*. New York: Guilford Press.

Mathews, K., Phelan, J., Jone, N., Konya, S., Marks, R., Pratt, B., Bentley, M. (2017). *2015 National Content Test Race and Ethnicity Analysis Report: A New Design for the 21st Century*. United States Census Bureau. U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mayhew, M. J., Grunwald, H. E., & Dey, E. L. (2006). Breaking the silence: Achieving a positive campus climate for diversity from the staff perspective. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(1), 63–88.

Milem, J. F., Chang, M. J., & Antonio, A. L. (2005). *Making Diversity Work on Campus : A Research-Based Perspective*. Association of American Colleges and Universities. Washington D.C. Retrieved from

<http://www.wesleyan.edu/partnerships/mei/files/makingdiversityworkoncampus.pdf>

Milem, J. F., Dey, E. L., & White, C. B. (2004). In the nation's compelling interest: Ensuring diversity in the health care workforce. In B. D. Smedley, A. S. Butler, & L. R. Bristow (Eds.), *Diversity of the U.S. Health Care Workforce Board on Health Sciences Policy Brian D. Smedley* (pp. 345–389). Washington D.C.: The National Academies Press. Retrieved from <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10885.html>

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Moreno, J. F., Smith, D. G., Clayton-Pedersen, A., Parker, S., & Teraguchi, D. H. (2006). *The revolving door for underrepresented minority faculty in higher education*. Los Angeles:

The James Irvine Foundation.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017, March 14). *National Center for Education Statistics*. Retrieved from Percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds enrolled in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by level of institution and sex and race/ethnicity of student: 1970 through 2015: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_302.60.asp

Padilla, A. M. (1994). Ethnic minority scholars, research, and mentoring: Current and future issues. *Educational Researcher*, 23(4) 24-27.

Peterson, M. W., & Spencer, M. G. (1990). Understanding academic culture and climate. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 1990(68), 3–18.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.37019906803>

Poloma, A. W. (2014). Why teaching faculty diversity (still) matters. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 89(3), 336–346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2014.913447>

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.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014018>

Rural Northwest University. (1996). *Campus Climate Task Force Report*. Springfield.

Rural Northwest University. (2003). *The President's Diversity Council 2002-2003 Annual Report*. Springfield.

Rural Northwest University. (2014). *Professional record guidelines and faculty performance standards for reappointment, tenure, promotion, post tenure review*.

RNU Inclusiveness Initiative. (2010). *Discussion and recommendations*. Springfield.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

- Sastry, A., & Bates, K. G. (2017, April 26). *When LA erupted in anger: A look back at the Rodney King riots*. Retrieved from National Public Radio:
<https://www.npr.org/2017/04/26/524744989/when-la-erupted-in-anger-a-look-back-at-the-rodney-king-riots>
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd Edition). Los Angeles: Sage Press.
- Sensory, O., & DiAngelo, R. D. (2017). “We are all for diversity, but...”: How faculty hiring committees reproduce whiteness and practical suggestions for how they can change. *Harvard Educational Review*, 87(4), 557–581.
- Smith, Daryl G., Ed., & Wolf-Wendel, Lisa E., Ed. (2005). *The Challenge of Diversity: Involvement or Alienation in the Academy?* ASHE Higher Education Report, Volume 31, Number 1. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 31(1), 1-100.
- Smith, L., Kashubeck-West, S., Payton, G., & Adams, E. (2017). White professors teaching about racism: Challenges and rewards. *Counseling Psychologist*, 45(5), 651–668.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000017717705>
- Springfield County Chamber of Commerce. (2016, July 30). *Springfield County Chamber of Commerce Employment Resources*. Retrieved 2016, from Springfield County Chamber of Commerce: <http://www.xxxcountychamber.com/pages/EmploymentResources>
- Solórzano, D. G., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education*, 69, 60–73.
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for educational research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 23–44.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

- Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly White colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(4), 701–736.
- Status and Trends in Education of Racial and Ethnic Minorities*. (2010, July). Retrieved from IES: National Center for Educational Statistics: https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2010/2010015/tables/table_24_3.asp
- Strategic Planning*. (2019). Retrieved from RNU: <https://www.xxx.edu/mission/strategic-planning/values>
- Turner, C., González, J., & Wood, J. (2008). Faculty of color in academe. What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139–168.
- Victorino, C. A., Nylund-Gibson, K., & Conley, S. (2013). Campus racial climate: A litmus test for faculty satisfaction at four-year colleges and universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 84(6), 769–805. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2013.11777310>
- Umbach, P. (2006). The contribution of faculty of color to undergraduate education. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(3), 317- 345.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2016, July 30). *U.S. Census Bureau*. Retrieved July 30, 2016, from U.S. Census Bureau: <http://www.census.gov/>
- Washington Student Achievement Council. (2013). *Educational attainment for all: diversity and equity in Washington state higher education* (May 2013). Retrieved from https://www.wsac.wa.gov/sites/default/files/Diversity_Report-2013.pdf
- Xu, Jun & C. Lee, Jennifer. (2013). The Marginalized "Model" Minority: An Empirical Examination of the Racial Triangulation of Asian Americans. *Social Forces*. 91. 1363-1397. 10.1093/sf/sot049.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Table 1

RNU Faculty and Staff Inclusivity Survey Question Blocks

Block	Title
1	Status & Campus
2	Sense of Belonging
3	Role of Diversity-1
4	Role of Diversity-2
5	Work Satisfaction – Supervisor’s Role
6	Work Satisfaction – Environment-My Perspective
7	Work Satisfaction – Environment-How I View Others
8	Communication
9	Departmental Relationships-Faculty & Staff
10	Faculty Only
11	Staff Only
12	Employment at RNU
13	Discrimination-Occurrence
14	Witness Discrimination
15	Experience Discrimination
16	Discrimination-Specifics – How
17	Diversity – University Response
18	Diversity – Personal Development
19	Diversity – Personal Response
20	Diversity – Identity
21	Open Response

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Table 2

Demographics of Survey Participants (N = 755)

Gender	N	%	Status	N	%	Race/Ethnicity	N	%
Men	261	35%	Tenured	119	16%	Not disclosed	162	21%
Women	390	52%	Tenure Track	54	7%	Native American/American Indian	6	1%
Other	5	1%	NTT	62	8%	Asian/Pacific Islander	14	2%
Undisclosed	99	13%	Exempt	242	32%	Black/African-American	10	1%
			Classified	232	31%	Hispanic, Latina/o, Chicana/o	26	3%
			Senior Lecturer	30	4%	Multiracial	40	5%
			Undisclosed	16	2%	White	464	61%
						Other	30	4%
						Middle Eastern	3	0%

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Table 3

Items by Factor

Item No.	Rotated Factor	Item
Factor 1 - Workplace Communication		
Q2.6	0.375	I generally know what's happening at RNU.
Q5.1	0.47	Employee suggestions and recommendations are welcomed by my supervisor.
Q5.2	0.466	My supervisor manages conflict constructively.
Q5.4	0.501	I am able to express my opinions freely.
Q6.4	0.38	I know what is expected of me at work.
Q6.8	0.533	RNU encourages free and open discussions about difficult topics.
Q7.4	0.407	There is a sustained level of interest and focus on the well-being of the students.
Q7.5	0.62	There is a sustained level of interest and focus on the well-being of the faculty and staff.
Q8.1	0.674	There are enough formal and informal methods in place to communicate effectively.
Q8.2	0.742	Information is passed along as quickly as possible.
Q8.3	0.612	Effort is made on the Springfield campus to open the lines of communication among all RNU campuses.
Q8.4	0.653	Effort is made to open the lines of interdepartmental communication.
Q8.5	0.482	There are established grievance procedures in place.
Q8.6	0.65	I do not have to rely on the grapevine to keep informed.
Q8.7	0.596	I feel encouraged to express myself openly and honestly.
Q8.8	0.752	Changes are communicated in a clear and timely way.
Q8.9	0.617	Policies and procedures are clearly communicated and readily available.
Q8.10	0.526	Meetings are scheduled at appropriate times.
Q8.11	0.592	Meetings are productive and participative.
Q8.12	0.676	Suggestions are encouraged and followed up.
Q9.10	0.398	I believe salary determinations are fair.
Q9.11	0.421	I believe salary determinations are clear.
Q9.12	0.424	I think the university administration adequately values the diversity of the faculty and staff.
Q13.2	0.433	RNU is responsive to reports of discrimination.
Q13.1	0.534	I feel I am treated fairly as a member of this campus community.
Factor 2 - Sense of Belonging		
Q2.1	0.689	I feel a sense of belonging here.
Q2.2	0.713	I feel a sense of pride about my campus.
Q2.3	0.698	I enjoy being at RNU.
Q2.4	0.669	I feel welcome on my campus.
Q2.5	0.419	I believe my campus is diverse.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Q4.1	0.367	RNU is supportive of people with disabilities.
Q4.2	0.331	RNU is supportive of veterans.
Q4.5	0.491	RNU is supportive of international, students, faculty, and staff.
Q5.3	0.568	RNU has a reputation as a good place to work.
Q5.5	0.395	In the past month, I have received recognition for doing good work.
Q6.1	0.496	My values and beliefs are accepted in my workplace.
Q6.2	0.45	I work in a safe environment.
Q6.3	0.589	I look forward to coming to work each day.
Q6.6	0.604	I am generally satisfied with my work environment.
Q6.7	0.747	I am proud to be a faculty/staff member of this campus.
Q7.1	0.594	A real spirit of community and cooperation exists on this campus.
Q7.2	0.368	Faculty/staff members understand the mission, vision, and values of RNU. The faculty/staff members of RNU are committed to producing quality work.
Q7.3	0.382	
Q9.2	0.325	My colleagues solicit my opinions about their work.
Q13.1	0.541	I feel I am treated fairly as a member of this campus community.
Q17.4	0.659	I would describe this university as welcoming.
Q17.5	0.622	I would describe this university as respectful.
Factor 3 - Relationship with Diversity		
Q3.3	0.463	I take advantage of the opportunities provided by RNU to learn about diversity-related issues.
Q3.4	0.479	I discuss diversity-related issues with people I know.
Q3.5	0.423	I believe that being able to interact with individuals of diverse backgrounds is beneficial.
Q3.6	0.361	I have become more open-minded about diversity-related issues since my association with RNU.
Q3.7	-0.807	I think there is too much emphasis on diversity at RNU.
Q3.8	0.735	I think there is not enough emphasis on diversity at RNU.
Q4.3	-0.415	RNU is supportive of people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer.
Q4.4	-0.493	RNU is supportive of people of ethnic backgrounds.
Q17.1	0.755	This university should make a greater effort to recruit and retain faculty members from diverse backgrounds.
Q17.2	0.774	This university should make a greater effort to recruit and retain staff members from diverse backgrounds.
Q17.6	0.417	There is racial/ethnic tension on campus.
Factor 4 - Perception of fairness		
Q9.4	-0.534	I constantly feel under scrutiny by my colleagues.
Q9.5	-0.5	I am reluctant to take family leave that I am entitled to for fear that it may affect my career.
Q9.6	-0.866	I have to work harder than I believe my colleagues do in order to be perceived as legitimate.
Q9.7	-0.831	I have to work harder than I believe my colleagues do in order to achieve the same recognition/rewards.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Q9.8	-0.57	There are many unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with colleagues in my work unit.
Q9.9	-0.556	My colleagues have higher expectations of me than other faculty/staff.

Table 4

Factor Labels with Cronbach's Alpha Value

Factor	Label	N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
1	Workplace Communication	25	0.946
2	Sense of Belonging	22	0.942
3	Relationship with Diversity	11	0.833
4	Perception of Fairness	6	0.865

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Table 5

3-Way ANOVA Demographics (N = 513)

Gender	N	Status	N	Race/Ethnicity	N
Male	207	Tenured	84	Of Color	91
Female	306	Tenure Track	41	White	422
		NTT	45		
		Exempt	162		
		Classified	158		
		Senior Lecturer	23		

Table 6

Item Sample of Workplace Communication

Item No.	RF	Item Text
Q8.1	0.674	There are enough formal and informal methods in place to communicate effectively.
Q8.2	0.742	Information is passed along as quickly as possible.
Q8.8	0.752	Changes are communicated in a clear and timely way.
Q8.9	0.617	Policies and procedures are clearly communicated and readily available.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations of Factor 1 by Gender and Status

Gender	Status	Mean	SD
Female	Senior Lecturer	2.83	0.56
	Classified	2.79	0.59
	Exempt	2.86	0.55
	NTT	2.74	0.53
	Tenure Track	2.76	0.60
	Tenured	2.31	0.54
Male	Senior Lecturer	3.06	0.44
	Classified	2.80	0.56
	Exempt	2.95	0.53
	NTT	2.76	0.51
	Tenure Track	2.87	0.65
	Tenured	2.53	0.61

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Table 8

Item Sample of "Sense of Belonging"

Item No.	RF	Item Text
Q2.1	0.689	I feel a sense of belonging here.
Q2.2	0.713	I feel a sense of pride about my campus.
Q6.7	0.747	I am proud to be a faculty/staff member of this campus.
Q17.4	0.659	I would describe this university as welcoming.

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations of Factor 2 by Gender and Status

	Status	Mean	SD
Female	Senior Lecturer	3.05	0.46
	Classified	3.17	0.52
	Exempt	3.24	0.46
	NTT	3.15	0.50
	Tenure Track	3.08	0.54
	Tenured	2.74	0.57
Male	Senior Lecturer	3.36	0.29
	Classified	3.13	0.50
	Exempt	3.34	0.40
	NTT	3.06	0.46

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Tenure Track	3.26	0.61
Tenured	2.87	0.62

Table 10

Item Samples of “Relationship with Diversity”

Item No.	RF	Item Text
Q3.4	0.479	I discuss diversity-related issues with people I know.
Q3.5	0.423	I believe that being able to interact with individuals of diverse backgrounds is beneficial.
Q.17.6	0.417	There is racial/ethnic tension on campus.

Table 11

Reverse Scored Item Samples of “Relationship with Diversity”

Item No.	RF	Item Text
Q3.8	-0.807	I think there is not enough emphasis on diversity at RNU.
Q4.3	-0.415	RNU is supportive of people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer.
Q4.4	-0.493	RNU is supportive of people of ethnic backgrounds.

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations of Factor 3 by Race, Gender and Status

Race	Gender	Status	Mean	SD
Of Color	Female	Senior Lecturer	3.21	0.30
		Classified	2.96	0.27
		Exempt	3.23	0.26
		NTT	3.09	0.27
		Tenure Track	3.18	0.24
		Tenured	2.92	0.26
Of Color	Male	Classified	2.95	0.39
		Exempt	3.16	0.27
		NTT	3.09	0.27
		Tenure Track	3.26	0.15
		Tenured	2.90	0.36
White	Female	Senior Lecturer	2.96	0.28
		Classified	2.89	0.34
		Exempt	3.03	0.28
		NTT	2.99	0.27
		Tenure Track	3.02	0.20
		Tenured	3.01	0.26
	Male	Senior Lecturer	2.79	0.26
		Classified	2.88	0.27
		Exempt	2.98	0.26
		NTT	2.75	0.38
		Tenured	2.91	0.34

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Table 13

Item Samples of "Perception of Fairness"

Item No.	RF	Item Text
Q9.6	-0.866	I have to work harder than I believe my colleagues do in order to be perceived as legitimate.
Q9.7	-0.831	I have to work harder than I believe my colleagues do in order to achieve the same recognition/rewards.
Q9.4	-0.534	I constantly feel under scrutiny by my colleagues.

Table 14

Means and Standard Deviations of Factor 4 by Gender and Status

Gender	Status	Mean	SD
Female	Senior Lecturer	2.84	0.48
	Classified	2.61	0.55
	Exempt	2.87	0.47
	NTT	2.86	0.44
	Tenure Track	3.05	0.35
	Tenured	2.96	0.42
Male	Senior Lecturer	2.55	0.38
	Classified	2.48	0.41
	Exempt	2.71	0.46
	NTT	2.58	0.54
	Tenure Track	2.84	0.55

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Table 15

Q12.3 Have you ever seriously considered leaving RNU? (N=589)

Response	Number	Percent of Total
Yes	386	66%
No	203	34%

Table 16

By Race Q12.3 Have you ever seriously considered leaving RNU? (N=589)

Race/Ethnicity	Yes	No	Total	Percent
White	299	167	466	64%
Of Color	68	34	102	67%
Other	19	2	21	90%

Table 17

Themes Q12.4 - Why did you consider leaving [RNU]?

Theme	Description
Administration Climate	Leadership, administration, administrative policy, supervision, management Work environment, perception of belonging, community, departmental or office culture
Hard Work	Stress, burn out, perception of overwork, heavy teaching load, lack of support
Job Status	Unhappiness with position, lack of tenure, lack of respect, no room for advancement or promotion, being passed over for promotion
Other	Job offer, family, retirement
Pay	Low salary, stagnant, unfair, unequal, pay

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Table 18

Response Coverage for Q12.4 – Why did you consider leaving [RNU]? (N = 386)

Theme	White	Of Color
Administration	18.65%	12.08%
Climate	4.17%	11.69%
Hard Work	3.39%	0.00%
Job Status	5.92%	11.26%
Other	5.13%	2.47%
Pay	8.99%	8.67%

Table 19

Themes Q12.5 - Why did you decide to stay?

Theme	Description
Family	Family responsibilities, children in school, spouse
Good Colleagues	Loyalty to coworkers, great colleagues, positive connection with colleagues
Good Job	Enjoy the job, perception of being needed, pride in the job, love of teaching
Pay Benefits	Paycheck, benefits, healthcare, pension
Placebound	Ties to area, desire to stay in the area, lack of other opportunities in the area
Students	Love of students, passion for working with students, loyalty to students
Unresolved/Other	Waiting for job offer, retiring, didn't get the job

Table 20

Response Coverage for Q12.5 – Why did you decide to stay? (N = 386)

Theme	White	Of Color
Family	4.84%	5.63%
Good Colleagues	2.83%	4.25%
Good Job	12.95%	10.56%
Pay /Benefits	5.91%	5.00%
Placebound	8.20%	1.76%
Students	3.36%	7.63%
Unresolved/Other	6.03%	9.05%

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Table 21

Themes Q21.1 - Use this space if you would like to clarify any of your answers

Theme	Description
Climate	
Local Area	Springfield and surrounding region
RNU Climate	Welcoming nature of RNU, both positive and negative, feelings about diversity
White Fragility	Racially triggered, hostile or defensive attitude regarding explicit naming of race or diversity initiatives
Safety	Perception of safety
Discrimination	
Ageism	Hostility or negative bias based on age
Christian Values	Hostility or negative bias based on Christian beliefs
Disability	Relating to disability
Gender	Hostility or negative bias based on gender
University Administration	
Department-Positive	Specific reference to the department
Department-Negative	Specific reference to the department
Hiring	Policies, practices in the hiring process
HR Role	Role of human resources
Retention	Issues related to the retention of faculty and staff
Union	Issues related to the faculty or classified staff union
Leadership - Negative	Specific reference to the leadership
Leadership - Positive	Specific reference to the leadership
Meta Comments	
Survey	Comments on the survey itself, length, Likert scale
Unrelated	Confidential or unrelated to survey

Table 22

Response Coverage for Climate Theme (N = 146)

Climate Theme	White	Of Color
Local Area	0.00%	8.95%
RNU Climate	14.03%	14.15%
White Fragility	22.91%	0.00%
Safety	4.06%	6.12%

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Table 23

Response Coverage for Discrimination (N = 146)

University Discrimination Theme	White	Of Color
Ageism	1.87%	0.00%
Christian Values	1.05%	4.00%
Disability	5.06%	0.00%
Gender	5.66%	0.00%

Table 24

Response Coverage for University Administration-HR Theme (N = 146)

University Administration-HR Theme	White	Of Color
Hiring	5.50%	12.00%
Retention	1.67%	0.44%
Union	2.50%	0.00%

CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Figure 1 – Mixed Methods Convergent Parallel Design

