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Assessing Campus Climate

What is it?
- Campus Climate is a construct

Definition?
- Current attitudes, behaviors, and standards and practices of employees and students of an institution

How is it measured?
- Personal Experiences
- Perceptions
- Institutional Efforts

Rankin & Reason, 2008
How students experience their campus environment influences both learning and developmental outcomes.¹

Discriminatory environments have a negative effect on student learning.²

Research supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty on enhancing learning outcomes.³

² Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Hagedron, 1999; Feagin, Vera & Imani, 1996; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005
The personal and professional development of employees including faculty members, administrators, and staff members are impacted by campus climate.¹ Faculty members who judge their campus climate more positively are more likely to feel personally supported and perceive their work unit as more supportive.² Research underscores the relationships between (1) workplace discrimination and negative job/career attitudes and (2) workplace encounters with prejudice and lower health/well-being.³

¹Settles, Cortina, Malley, and Stewart, 2006; Gardner, S. 2013; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, J. 2009
²Costello, 2012; Sears, 2002; Kaminski, & Geisler, 2012; Griffin, Pérez, Holmes, & Mayo 2010
³Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2007; Waldo, 1999
Climate Matters

Student Activism in 2016
Climate Matters

Student Activism in 2016
While the demands vary by institutional context, a qualitative analysis reveals similar themes across the 76 institutions and organizations (representing 73 U.S. colleges and universities, three Canadian universities, one coalition of universities and one consortium of Atlanta HBCUs.)

Chessman & Wayt explore these overarching themes in an effort to provide collective insight into what is important to today’s students in the heated context of racial or other bias-related incidents on college and university campuses.

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016; http://www.thedemands.org/
Seven Major Themes

- Policy (91%)
- Leadership (89%)
- Resources (88%)
- Increased Diversity (86%)
- Training (71%)
- Curriculum (68%)
- Support (61%)

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016; http://www.thedemands.org/
Responses to Unwelcoming Campus Climates

What are students’ behavioral responses?
30% of respondents have seriously considered leaving their institution due to the challenging climate.

What do students offer as the main reason for their departure?

Source: R&A, 2015; Rankin, et al., 2010; Strayhorn, 2012
Suicidal Ideation/Self-Harm

- Experienced Victimization
- Lack of Social Support
- Feelings of hopelessness
- Suicidal Ideation or Self-Harm

Source: Liu & Mustanski 2012
Projected Outcomes

UM System Offices will add to their knowledge base with regard to how constituent groups currently feel about their particular campus climate and how the community responds to them (e.g., work-life issues, curricular integration, inter-group/intra-group relations, respect issues).

UM System Offices will use the results of the assessment to inform current/on-going work.
Setting the Context for Beginning the Work

Examine the Research
• Review work already completed

Preparation
• Readiness of each campus

Assessment
• Examine the climate

Follow-up
• Building on the successes and addressing the challenges
Project Overview

Phase I

• Review of Institutional Data
• Assessment Tool Development and Implementation

Phase II

• Data Analysis

Phase III

• Final Report and Presentation
In collaboration with R&A, the Systemwide Climate Study Team (SCST; composed of faculty, staff, and administrators across the UM System) was created.

In meetings, the SCST developed the survey instrument; reviewed multiple drafts; and approved the final survey instrument.
The final survey was distributed to the entire UM System Offices community via an invitation from Interim President Michael A. Middleton.

The survey was available from November 15th to December 16th.
Instrument/Sample

Final instrument

• 120 questions including space for respondents to provide commentary
• On-line or paper & pencil options

Sample = Population

• All community members were invited to take the survey
• The survey was available from November 15th to December 16th, 2016
Survey Limitations

- Self-selection bias
- Response rates
- Social desirability
- Caution in generalizing results for constituent groups with low response rates
Phase II
Spring 2017

Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted
Method Limitation

Data were not reported for groups of fewer than 5 individuals where identity could be compromised.

Instead, small groups were combined to eliminate possibility of identifying individuals.
Phase III
Summer/Fall 2017

Report draft reviewed by the Local Campus Study Team (LCST) at UM System Offices

Final report submitted to UM System Offices

Presentation to UM System Offices campus community
Results: Response Rates
Who are the respondents?

142 surveys were returned for a 27% overall response rate
Response Rates by Employee Position

- **25%**
  - Staff – Salary ($n = 94$)

- **24%**
  - Staff – Hourly ($n = 37$)

- N/A
  - Administrator without Faculty Rank ($n = 9$)

- N/A
  - Administrator with Faculty Rank ($n < 5$)
Response Rates by Gender Identity

- **27%**
  - Woman ($n = 80$)

- **24%**
  - Man ($n = 57$)

- **N/A**
  - Transspectrum ($n = 0$)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- **100%**
  - Multiracial ($n = 5$)

- **25%**
  - White/European American ($n = 116$)

- **23%**
  - Black/African American ($n = 6$)

- N/A
  - Asian/Asian American ($n < 5$)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@ ($n < 5$)
- American Indian/Alaska Native ($n < 5$)
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander ($n = 0$)
- Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian ($n = 0$)
Response Rates by Citizenship Status

46% • Non-U.S. Citizen ($n = 6$)

26% • U.S. Citizen ($n = 133$)
Additional Demographic Characteristics

Thank you for your support of Catalyst Corporate Development Council
Respondents by Position (%)

- 72% Hourly Staff
- 28% Salary Staff
99% ($n = 140$) were full-time in their primary positions

99% ($n = 141$) were benefits eligible
## Primary UM System Offices Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodrail Center</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Hall</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Alumni Building</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemone Building</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locust St. Building</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom Building</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (%)
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%) (Duplicated Total)

- White/European American: 85%
- American Indian/Native: 4%
- African/Black/African American: 4%
- Racial identity not listed
- Native Hawaiian
- Alaska Native
- Pacific Islander
- Middle Eastern/Southwest Asian
- Hispanic/Latin@/Chican@
- Asian/Asian American
Respondents by Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Unduplicated Total)

- White: 87%
- Multiracial: 4%
- People of Color: 9%
12% \((n = 17)\) of Respondents Had a Condition/Disability that Influenced Their Learning, Working, or Living Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Diagnosis or Medical Condition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health/Psychological Condition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental/Learning difference/Disability</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Mobility condition that affects walking</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vision or blind</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of hearing or deaf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Mobility condition that does not affect walking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired/Neurological/Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/communication condition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A disability/condition not listed here</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Religious/Spiritual Identity (%)

- **Christian Identity**: 70%
- **No Identity**: 25%
- **Other Religious/Spiritual Identity**: 5%
Respondents with a Disability - Accommodations

77% (n = 13) of respondents indicated that they were not receiving accommodations
Citizenship/Immigration Status

U.S. Citizen
(94%, n = 133)
# Military Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never served in the military</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On active duty in the past, but not now</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now on active duty (including Reserves or National Guard)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Age ($n$)
Respondents by Caregiving Responsibilities (%)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
# Years Employed at UM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years employed</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35% \((n = 50)\) of Respondents Reported Experiencing Financial Hardship…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial hardship</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affording housing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording health care</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording food</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording professional development</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording childcare</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording travel to and from UM System Office/MU</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording benefits</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affording other campus fees (e.g., parking)</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A financial hardship not listed here</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes respondents who reported having experienced financial hardship \((n = 50)\) only.
Findings
Comfort Levels

Overall Campus Climate (63%)

Work Areas (80%)
Challenges and Opportunities
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

- 27 respondents indicated that they had personally experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct at UM System Offices within the past year.
Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 27). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
# Top Forms of Experienced Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was ignored or excluded</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was isolated or left out</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was the target of workplace incivility</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced a hostile work environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was the target of derogatory verbal remarks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received a low or unfair performance evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n = 27$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Position Status (%)

- Hourly Staff: 22% (n = 8)
- Salary Staff: 17% (n = 16)
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Gender Identity (%)
# Location of Experienced Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a staff office</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While working at a UM System Office/MU job</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a(n) UM System Office/MU administrative office</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct \(n = 27\). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Position (%)

- Coworkers/colleagues
- Supervisor/manager

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 27).
Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?

Emotional Responses

- Felt angry (67%)
- Felt embarrassed (44%)
- Was afraid (22%)
- Ignored it (22%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 27). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?

Actions

- Told a family member (33%)
- Didn’t do anything (30%)
- Told a friend (26%)
- Avoided the person/venue (22%)
- Confronted the person(s) later (22%)
- Contacted a UM System Office/MU resource (19%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 27). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Themes

Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Lack of support

Harassment based on age, sexuality, or nationality
Intent to Persist
50% \((n = 71)\) of Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving UM System Offices
Top Reasons Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving UM System Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low salary/pay rate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position at another institution</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of professional development opportunities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those respondents who indicated that they considered leaving (n = 71).
Qualitative Themes for Respondents

Why Considered leaving...

Low and/or static salary

Lack of quality leadership
Perceptions
Respondents who observed conduct or communications directed towards a person/group of people that created an exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile working or learning environment…

24% \( (n = 34) \)
Top Forms of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory verbal remarks</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person ignored or excluded</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person isolated or left out</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person experienced a hostile work environment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was the target of workplace incivility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct \((n = 34)\). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct Based on…(%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Gender Identity (n=10)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political views (n=7)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identity (n=7)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity (n=6)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct (n = 34). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

- Supervisor or manager (35%)
- Coworker/colleague (21%)
- Faculty member/other instructional staff (18%)
- Staff member (18%)
- Student (15%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct (n = 34). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Target of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

- Coworker/colleague (44%)
- Staff member (29%)
- Student (27%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct ($n=34$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
**Location of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a staff office</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other public spaces at UM System Office/MU</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct ($n = 34$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Actions in Response to Observed Conduct

- Told a family member: 18%
- Confronted the person(s) at the time: 15%

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed exclusionary conduct (n = 34). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Themes
Observed Conduct

Excluding or attacking the perspectives of individuals in the majority
Perceptions of Climate
Perceptions of Unjust Hiring Practices

19% \((n = 7)\) of Hourly Staff respondents

17% \((n = 16)\) of Salary Staff respondents
Perceptions of Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

(n < 5) of Hourly Staff respondents

5% (n = 5) of Salary Staff respondents
Perceptions of Unjust Practices Related to Promotion

22% (n = 8) of Hourly Staff respondents

24% (n = 22) of Salary Staff respondents
Most Common Bases for Discriminatory Employment Practices

- Age
  - Nepotism/cronyism
  - Racial identity
    - Gender identity
    - Ethnicity
Work-Life Issues
SUCCESSES & CHALLENGES

The majority of Staff respondents expressed positive views of campus climate.
Staff Respondents
Examples of Successes

94% indicated that their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance.

89% had adequate resources to perform their job duties.

 Majority had supervisors (81%) or colleagues/coworkers (79%) who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.
Staff Respondents
Examples of Successes

83% believed that they were given a reasonable time frame to complete assigned responsibilities

76% believed that their supervisors were supportive of flexible work schedules

86% believed that their supervisors were supportive of their taking leave
A majority felt valued by coworkers in their department (83%) and outside their department (79%), and by supervisors/managers (82%).

A majority felt that their skills (76%) and work (79%) were valued.
### Staff Respondents
**Examples of Challenges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>A hierarchy existed within staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>People who have children or elder care were burdened with balancing work and family responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Performed more work than colleagues with similar performance expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 23% • Child care benefits were competitive
- 25% • Clear procedures existed on how they could advance at UM System Office
- 25% • Staff opinions were valued by University of Missouri faculty
Staff Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 24% Felt valued by University of Missouri students
- 30% Felt valued by University of Missouri faculty
- 39% Felt valued by University of Missouri senior administrators
Qualitative Themes
Staff Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Short-comings of staff evaluations

Workload/salary imbalances
Qualitative Themes
Staff Respondents
Professional Development, Leave, Flexible Work Schedule, Salary, Benefits

Lack of job security
Institutional Actions
Top Five Available Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate for Staff Respondents

- Career development opportunities for staff
- Supervisory training for supervisors/managers
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
Top Five Unavailable Campus Initiatives that *Would* Positively Influence Climate for Staff Respondents

- Affordable child care
- Mentorship for new staff
- Career development opportunities for staff
- A location for staff for informal networking (e.g., University Club)
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
Qualitative Themes
Campus Initiatives – Staff Respondents

Administrative support for diversity programs and initiatives
Summary

Strengths and Successes

Opportunities for Improvement
Although colleges and universities attempt to foster welcoming and inclusive environments, they are not immune to negative societal attitudes and discriminatory behaviors.

As a microcosm of the larger social environment, college and university campuses reflect the pervasive prejudices of society.

Classism, Racism, Sexism, Genderism, Heterosexism, etc.

Overall Strengths and Successes

- **80%** of respondents were comfortable with the climate in their primary work area.
- **83%** felt valued by coworkers and **82%** felt valued by supervisors/managers.
- **81%** believed that they had supervisors who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.
- **76%** believed that their supervisors were supportive of flexible work schedules.
Overall Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement

- **24%** observed exclusionary conduct within the last year at UM System Offices
- **63%** were comfortable with the overall climate - less than the national average
- **19%** personally experienced exclusionary conduct within the last year at UM System Offices
- **50%** of Staff respondents seriously considered leaving UM System Offices
Sharing the Report with the Community

Executive Summary, Full Report, and Power Point will be available at https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/dei/campus-climate-survey
Questions and Discussion