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Introduction

UST articulated its commitment to diversity and inclusion, and engaged in a comprehensive assessment of perceptions of the current climate, including quantitative and qualitative perceptions of diversity-related strengths and opportunities at the University. The purpose of this initiative was to better understand the diversity climate at UST from a number of different stakeholder groups. This information will provide an important foundation for the university and help guide future efforts. This document provides a high-level overview of the major findings.

The assessment surfaced favorable perceptions with respect to several key themes important to campus climate. Furthermore, the assessment also suggests room for improvement across a range of strategic theme areas. Successful and sustainable climate change will require bold, consistent, and holistic efforts.

Timeline and Process Overview

- **Phase I: Quantitative Assessment**
  - Research phase was executed during the Spring semester of the 2006/2007 academic year (April 30-May 14, 2007)
  - Findings were shared with the Office of Institutional Diversity in July, 2007
  - Presentation of findings to the President, AAL, and UDAC in October, 2007

- **Phase II: Qualitative Assessment**
  - Research phase was executed during the Fall semester of the 2007/2008 academic year (October-November 2007)
  - Findings were shared with the Office of Institutional Diversity in February, 2008
  - Presentation of findings to the President, AAL, UDAC, and campus community at-large on April 3, 2008

- **Phase III: Strategic Planning and Prioritization of Next Step Actions**
  - UST’s Office of Institutional Diversity is currently leading this effort with support from key stakeholders across the University during April-May, 2008
Methodology and Process

Quantitative Process (Electronic On-Line Survey)

- UST engaged Global Lead Management Consulting (Global Lead) to execute a self-critical analysis focused on surfacing the campus community’s perceptions around the UST climate and perceived diversity-related strengths and opportunities. In addition to identifying perceived diversity-related strengths and opportunities, the assessment was intended to establish a comprehensive measure of the current climate for diversity and inclusion at UST against which future progress can be measured.
- The quantitative component consisted of an on-line survey that was distributed via email to 13,304 UST students, faculty, and staff directly from a third party data tabulation vendor (Modern Survey), and was available for completion from April 30-May 11. The online survey was extended to May 14, 2007.
- An incentive for participating and completing a survey was a chance to enter a raffle with prizes totaling $1,000. The grand prize was a $250 gift certificate from our campus Bookstore. Other prizes included movie tickets, restaurant vouchers and nice gifts.

Qualitative Process (Focus Groups and Interviews)

- UST and Global Lead were able to consider the results from the quantitative phase when determining which populations we should consider for focus groups and interviews during the qualitative phase.
- Based on the quantitative findings and available resources, Global Lead engaged via one-on-one interviews and focus group sessions with members from the university community.\(^1\)
- Focus group and interview moderators were matched to minority UST populations, including African American and Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender (GLBT) staff, students, and faculty. The interviews and focus groups were to:
  - Gain deeper insights into the experiences, perceptions, and realities for various populations in the institution.
  - Identify institutional practices that may have a disparate impact on any population within the University community.
  - Surface strengths as well as areas of opportunity across the institution that need immediate attention to ensure an equitable academic and professional environment.

\(^1\) For information about populations that were part of qualitative phase see page 4
Whom We Heard From: Quantitative Process

- 13,304 members of the UST community had an opportunity to access and respond to the online survey
- 3,623 respondents, 27% response rate
- 95% confidence level (+/- 5%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total number who received access to online survey</th>
<th>Total number completed or partially completed</th>
<th>Percentages of total population who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>10,875</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>13,304</td>
<td>3,623</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whom We Heard From: Qualitative Process

- A total of 8 focus groups and 11 one-on-one interviews were conducted
- Focus group participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>Male, Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Male, Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Male, Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender (GLBT)</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 For additional information on quantitative demographic breakouts please see Appendix A
Overview of Quantitative Findings by Theme: UST Overall

The quantitative data collected was organized according to **seven (7) key theme areas**:

1. Catholicism in Today’s World
2. Communication and Community Engagement
3. Diversity Effectiveness, Commitment, Accountability
4. Diversity Engagement
5. Diversity-related Experiences
6. Equitable Treatment
7. Satisfaction with the University

These seven theme areas were determined after a factor analysis was conducted on the 54 core survey items to identify the natural linkages among survey questions. Core survey items are those questions that were asked to all respondents (students, faculty, and staff). In addition, to the core survey items, a separate set of student-specific questions and faculty/staff-specific questions were included on the assessment.

- Overall, the UST population identified Diversity Engagement (80% favorable) and Satisfaction with the University (75% favorable) as areas of strength for the institution.
- The greatest number of theme areas (3 out of 7) were neither areas or strength nor opportunity, and fell into the midrange category for the University population overall: Equitable Treatment (64% favorable), Diversity-related Experiences (60% favorable), and Catholicism in Today’s World (52% favorable).
- Additionally, there are two theme areas that the greater UST population perceives to be areas of opportunity for the University: Communication and Community Engagement (51% favorable) and Diversity Effectiveness, Commitment, and Accountability (48% favorable).
- However, there are some demographic populations that have different perceptions than the overall campus population:
  - Males across the institution have more positive perceptions of the University than women and UST overall.
  - The College of Business, School of Engineering, Graduate Programs in Software, IT, & IS, School of Divinity, and “Other” departments and schools shared more favorable perceptions of campus climate than UST overall. In contrast, the College of Arts and Sciences, the Graduate School of Professional Psychology, the School of Education, and the School of Social Work have less favorable perceptions of campus climate than UST overall.
  - University faculty and staff have less favorable perceptions than the student population and UST overall, with faculty having the least favorable perceptions across the theme areas.
  - Members of the campus community who identified as being affiliated with Catholicism, Christianity (Protestant and Orthodox), Islam, or Hinduism have more positive perceptions of the campus climate as compared to individuals who identified with other religions and UST overall. Individuals who are Christian (Other), Jewish, Spiritual (but not affiliated with a religion), Agnostic, Atheist, or “Other” held less favorable perceptions of the campus climate across the theme areas than UST overall.
- African, Caucasian/White, and International students, faculty, and staff have the most positive perceptions of all racial/ethnic groups across the University. Conversely, individuals who identified as Black/African American, Asian American, Native American/Alaska Native/Inuit, Multi-racial/Multi-ethnic, and “Other” have the least favorable perceptions of all racial/ethnic groups across the University, with African Americans having the least favorable perceptions of all racial/ethnic populations.

- Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender students, faculty, and staff, and those that are unsure or currently questioning their sexual orientation, have the least favorable perceptions across all theme areas as compared to any other demographic population at UST.

Overall, respondents’ perceptions regarding the value of engaging in diverse teams and the expectation set by the University that diverse opinions are valued and individuals are to interact positively with those who are different from them are positive and considered an area of strength. Additionally, respondents’ satisfaction with the caliber of education provided by the University is also considered to be an area of strength.
Overview of Quantitative Findings by Demographics

Students

- UST students have the most favorable perceptions of the University and campus climate as compared to the staff and faculty populations. Overall, UST students found Diversity Engagement (82% favorable) and Satisfaction with the University (78% favorable) to be areas of strength with respect to the current campus climate.
- The greatest number of theme areas (5 out of 8) fell into the midrange category for students overall, including: Equitable Treatment (68% favorable), Student-Specific Perceptions (63% favorable), Diversity-related Experiences (61% favorable), Catholicism in Today’s World (54% favorable), and Diversity Effectiveness, Commitment, and Accountability (50%).
- Additionally, students identified one area of opportunity for the University: Communication and Community Engagement (51% favorable).
- However, there are some demographic populations among the UST student body that have different perceptions than the overall student population:
  - Students within the College of Business, School of Engineering, and School of Divinity have more positive perceptions of the University climate overall than those in other schools/colleges, and did not identify any theme area as an area of opportunity for UST.
  - Freshman/first-year students and graduate students have more favorable perceptions of the University than sophomores, juniors, and seniors.
  - Male students had somewhat more positive perceptions of the University than female students, and more favorable perceptions than UST overall.
  - African, Caucasian/White, and International students have the most positive perceptions of all racial/ethnic student populations. However, students who are African American, Asian American, Native American/Alaska Native/Inuit, Multi-racial/Multi-ethnic, or identified as “Other” have the least favorable perceptions of the University’s current climate.
  - Students who are Catholic, Protestant, Christian Orthodox, Muslim, or Hindu have more favorable perceptions of the University. Students who are Buddhist, Spiritual (but unaffiliated with a religion), Agnostic, Atheist, or “Other” have less favorable perceptions of the campus climate as compared to other religious populations and UST overall.
  - Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender students and those that are unsure or currently questioning their sexual orientation have the least favorable perceptions across all theme areas.
- It is also important to note that there were a relatively high percentage of neutral responses to the quantitative survey across several theme areas, including Catholicism in Today’s World, Communication and Community Engagement, Diversity Effectiveness, Commitment, and Accountability, Diversity-related Experiences, and Student-Specific Perceptions (neutral responses ranged from 20 to 28 percent). This relatively high percentage of neutral responses can indicate that, overall, the University student population simply does not know what is happening across the institution relevant to those theme areas (indicating a lack of communication) or that some of the population are not comfortable reporting their candid perceptions.
Overall, the UST faculty population had the least favorable perceptions of campus climate as compared to the other major respondent populations (students and staff).

Faculty members found Diversity Engagement (78% favorable) to be an area of strength, and identified two theme areas as midrange areas (neither areas of strength nor opportunity), including: Satisfaction with the University (61% favorable) and Diversity-related Experiences (52% favorable).

The greatest number of theme areas (5 of 8) were identified as areas of opportunity for the University by faculty members, including: Equitable Treatment (54% favorable), Faculty-Specific Perceptions (52% favorable), Catholicism in Today's World (45% favorable), Communication and Community Engagement (45% favorable), and Diversity Effectiveness, Commitment, and Accountability (42% favorable).

However, there are some faculty demographic populations that have different perceptions than the overall UST faculty population:

- Faculties within the College of Business and School of Law have more positive perceptions of the campus climate as compared to overall faculty perceptions and UST overall. Conversely, faculty within the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Education have significantly less favorable perceptions as compared to faculty overall and UST overall.
- Generally speaking, faculty members with less than one year of service have the most positive perceptions of the University, while faculty members with six to fifteen years tenure have significantly less favorable perceptions of campus climate.
- Female faculty members have significantly less favorable perceptions than male faculty members and the overall UST population across theme areas.
- Faculty members who are Catholic have significantly more favorable perceptions of the University than other religious populations, the overall faculty population, and overall UST population. However, faculty members who are Agnostic, Atheist, or “Other” shared less favorable perceptions of campus climate.
- Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender faculty members have the least favorable perceptions across all theme areas.

It is important to note that the only racial/ethnic population whose data could be reported on was Caucasian/White faculty members due to insufficient data collected for other racial/ethnic populations. This is an area that should be explored in future qualitative assessments and sensing studies.

It is also important to note that there were a relatively high percentage of neutral responses to the quantitative survey across several theme areas, including Catholicism in Today’s World, Communication and Community Engagement, Diversity Effectiveness, Commitment, and Accountability, and Diversity-related Experiences (neutral responses ranged from 25 to 27 percent). This relatively high percentage of neutral responses can indicate that, overall, the University’s faculty population simply does not know what is happening across the institution relevant to those theme areas (indicating a lack of communication) or that some of the population are not comfortable reporting their candid perceptions.
Overall, UST staff members found Diversity Engagement (78% favorable) and Satisfaction with the University (70% favorable) to be areas of strength for the institution.

While one area fell into the midrange category [Diversity-related Experiences (57% favorable)], the greatest number of theme areas (5 of 8) were identified as areas of opportunity, including: Equitable Treatment (54% favorable), Staff-Specific Perceptions (52% favorable), Catholicism in Today's World (50% favorable), Communication and Community Engagement (49% favorable), and Diversity Effectiveness, Commitment, and Accountability (46% favorable).

However, there are some specific demographic populations that have different perceptions than the overall staff population at UST:
- Staff within the School of Education and "Other" departments have the most positive perceptions of the campus climate at UST.
- Generally speaking, staff with tenures of less than one year or 21 years or more have the most favorable perceptions as compared to staff members with other lengths of service to the University and UST overall.
- Female staff members have somewhat more positive perceptions of the University than male staff members and the overall staff population.
- Staff who are Catholic have significantly more favorable perceptions across all theme areas as compared to other religious populations and the overall staff population.
- Black-African American staff members have significantly less favorable perceptions than Caucasian/White staff with respect to campus climate.
- Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender staff members have the least favorable perceptions across all theme areas.

It is also important to note that there were a relatively high percentage of neutral responses (from the Staff Population) to the quantitative survey across several theme areas, including Catholicism in Today’s World, Communication and Community Engagement, Diversity Effectiveness, Commitment, and Accountability, and Diversity-related Experiences (neutral responses ranged from 25 to 29 percent). This relatively high percentage of neutral responses can indicate that the overall staff population overall simply does not know what is happening across the institution relevant to those theme areas (indicating a lack of communication) or that some members of the population are not comfortable reporting their candid perceptions.
Overview of Qualitative Findings

The qualitative research phase of the climate assessment focused on gaining deeper insights into the experiences, perceptions, and realities for various populations in the institution to complement the quantitative assessment findings. Overall, qualitative perceptions on campus climate are less positive than perceptions surfaced during the quantitative research phase.

It is important to remember that the qualitative assessment includes the perspectives from UST populations who faced the greatest challenges as revealed in the quantitative findings. As mentioned above, the purpose was to gain deeper insights into the experiences, perceptions, and realities for these populations\(^3\) in the institution.\(^4\)

The qualitative data collected were analyzed and organized according to six (6) key themes:

- **Theme #1**: There is a fundamental understanding of diversity and its many dimensions; however, there is not a consistent definition or framework for the concept of inclusion.
- **Theme #2**: UST is experiencing challenges with respect to inclusion and needs to strengthen its efforts to create and sustain an inclusive culture that values, appreciates, and engages the diversity of its students, faculty, and staff.
- **Theme #3**: The opportunity for University leaders to embrace and engage in the institution’s diversity and inclusion efforts is a significant one.
- **Theme #4**: UST is making progress in its efforts to recruit a diverse population; however, there is an opportunity to better engage and retain these individuals once they are members of the UST community.
- **Theme #5**: Age, gender, job position/function, race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and other dimensions of diversity are sources of tension and conflict for the University.
- **Theme #6**: The University’s population sees a link between diversity and inclusion and many of the institution’s current challenges.

Within each theme, a series of “headline” findings were reported as well as “composite verbatims”\(^5\) that support each headline finding. Composite verbatims represent aggregate comments and reflect the experiences and perceptions of a group of individuals within a demographic population.

---

3 See page 3 above “Whom We Heard From: Qualitative Phase for specific populations surveyed

4 Additional focus groups were conducted by Spradley & Associates, Inc. (a qualitative research firm affiliated with Global Lead), March 26-28, 2008. The purpose was to expand the insights about the experiences, perceptions and realities of immigrant and international student populations. These focus groups and interviews were funded by the Undergraduate Student Government. A separate report is available on these findings. The findings will be used in conjunction with data presented in this Executive Summary for overall diversity planning moving forward.

5 For this report, composite verbatims were not listed; however, they are reported as aggregate comments in the full Report on Qualitative Findings which can be requested by completing a Research Request Form online at [http://www.stthomas.edu/ira/researchrequest.html](http://www.stthomas.edu/ira/researchrequest.html).
Overview of Qualitative Findings by Themes

Theme #1: Inclusive Definition of Diversity

- **Members of the UST community have an inclusive definition of diversity and its many dimensions**
  - Diversity, as defined by members of the UST community, includes a wide breadth of attributes and dimensions
  - Diversity was defined as “physical differences,” “richness,” “rural/urban,” “Minnesota/not Minnesota,” “strength,” “background,” “sexual orientation,” “different perspectives,” “race,” and “openness”
- **However, there is not institutional alignment around the concept of “inclusion” and its benefits**
  - The majority of University constituents define the word “inclusion” as being action-oriented and focused on embracing and engaging the University’s available diversity
  - Inclusion is defined as “everyone has a voice,” “respect,” “being able to accept every person for their strengths and weaknesses,” “acceptance,” “valuing everyone,” and “takes effort”
  - There are some members of the campus community that do not perceive the term “inclusion” to be positive or action-oriented

Theme #2: Inclusion & Engagement of Diverse Populations

- **The University has leveraged several strategies to engage the diverse populations it serves**
- **There are pockets of the University population that have taken proactive steps to build connections and community across differences**
- **UST’s focus on diversity is an asset, but current efforts to engage the diverse populations is perceived as an area of opportunity**
  - The University is making progress on its diversity journey relative to the recruitment of diverse faculty, staff, and students, but there is a significant opportunity to enhance its effectiveness in including, engaging, and leveraging these diverse populations within the campus community
  - It is perceived that faculty/staff must be Catholic, Caucasian, middle-class, heterosexual, and male to be successful
- **Overall, there is ambiguity and confusion regarding the University’s Catholic identity and its manifestation on campus relative to the diversity and inclusion initiative**
  - UST actively tries to include (and recruit) individuals from diverse religious backgrounds
  - There is a broad range of perspectives regarding what respondents called, “UST’s Catholic identity” that vary from UST being labeled as moderate, to being cited as a highly conservative institution
  - Some perceive that the University hides behind its Catholic identity when addressing certain dimensions of diversity (e.g., sexual orientation) that are in conflict with the Catholic doctrine
It is critical to understand the Minnesota culture and its influence on the University

- The current culture is perceived as being very polite, careful, cautious, and conflict avoidant
- Faculty and staff are not candid, challenging, or confrontational as there is a desire to uphold the “Minnesota nice” culture as the norm
- The majority of faculty and staff don’t want to be seen as “making waves” because they perceive it will have a negative impact on their ability to advance within the University system

The University has an overarching opportunity to build a sense of community across the institution

- Students, faculty, and staff need to feel that they are connected to and a part of a community that is working with a common vision to achieve a collective goal

Theme #3: Leadership Commitment & Involvement

- Students have more favorable perceptions of senior leaders’ commitment to diversity and inclusion than staff and faculty
- Leadership’s commitment to diversity and inclusion must move beyond a focus on “the numbers” and “lip service,” to a focus on strategic and institutional culture change
  - There is an opportunity for leaders across UST to increase their engagement in the University’s diversity efforts to ensure that 1) leaders are visible and active, and 2) there is distributed ownership and accountability
  - UST students are looking for the University’s leaders to become more engaged and active in the institution’s diversity initiative
- Several leaders are seen as committed to diversity/inclusion and driving the University's efforts, however staff and faculty perceive that the majority of University leaders do not “walk the talk”
  - The diversity and inclusion efforts are seen as being led primarily by the Office of Institutional Diversity and a few select members of the UST Administration
  - Faculty and staff believe that the majority of the University’s leaders have the self-perception that they are committed to diversity, but are not driving culture change at an institutional level
  - University leaders are seen as wanting a diverse and inclusive campus, but they are not willing to “roll up their sleeves” and work to transform the culture
  - Specific dimensions of diversity and the presence of external stakeholders (e.g., the Board and alumni) are seen as variables that impact leadership’s commitment to diversity and inclusion
- An opportunity exists to strengthen the communication channels between the student body and University leadership. Students have a strong desire to be informed in real-time and to be a part of the decision-making process
Theme #4: Recruitment & Retention of Diverse Populations

- The general consensus among staff and faculty is that the University is making progress in its efforts to recruit a more diverse faculty population, although there is additional work that needs to be done
  - The number of racially diverse faculty members, particularly the number of African American faculty, has increased
  - The University needs to provide sufficient funding and resources to ensure that diverse populations can be effectively recruited
  - The community in which UST is located, and the communities from which it recruits students, are becoming more diverse and it is important for UST to reflect that diversity
- The University should consider broadening its recruitment efforts to include dimensions of diversity in addition to race/ethnicity
  - The University's current recruitment efforts are focused on attracting racially/ethnically diverse talent
  - Faculty, staff, and students expressed that the University needs to expand its efforts to reflect a wider breadth of diversity dimensions, including but not limited to gender, physical ability, religion, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, and thought/intellect
- A significant opportunity exists to increase the retention and engagement of diverse students on campus
  - The University does provide some funding and resources for student affinity groups and programs, which was identified as a positive behavior
  - The perception exists that limited efforts are being made to support the inclusion, engagement, and retention of diverse students
- Advancement and growth opportunities for diverse faculty and staff are seen as fairly limited
  - Faculty and staff shared the perspective that it can be difficult to get ahead in the University system if you don’t “fit the UST profile”
  - The perception exists that certain diverse populations of faculty/staff are not included and engaged to the same extent as other populations
  - Faculty/staff cited a variety of “unwritten rules for success” that, if one is not privy to, could negatively impact an individual’s advancement opportunities

Theme #5: Diversity-Related Tension & Conflict

- The perception exists across the University that people are treated differently than others based upon dimensions of diversity including: gender, job position/tenure, physical ability, race/ethnicity, religious affiliation, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status

Socio-economic Status

- There are mixed feelings about the University’s outreach efforts to individuals of lower socio-economic status
- However, there is a general consensus that the UST experience can vary significantly according to socio-economic status and the judgments that individuals attach to socio-economic status
Race/Ethnicity
- Members of the UST community from racially/ethnically diverse backgrounds are perceived as being treated differently.
- Specific mention of a recent, racially-motivated hate crime against African American female students was cited repeatedly in an effort to describe the disparate treatment experienced by racial/ethnic minorities.

Gender
- The University has made some progress with the recruitment of women for faculty and staff positions. However, the advancement opportunities for these women have been perceived as limited.

Sexual Orientation
- It is perceived that the University does not recognize sexual orientation as a legitimate dimension of diversity.
- Generally speaking, the University has a “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy regarding the sexual orientation of faculty and staff.
- Members of the campus community shared the perception that GLBT students (especially male students) are the recipients of the most negative and disparate treatment.

Job Position
- The University has a significant opportunity to build an inclusive community and culture that values and appreciates the contributions of both faculty and staff members.

Physical Ability
- There were pockets of discussion among members of the University community that physical ability is a dimension of diversity that is becoming an emerging issue for UST.
- The University is going to have to take proactive steps to include individuals with disabilities and ensure access to services across campus.

Theme #6: Linkage Between Diversity & Current UST Challenges
- Recent incidents on campus, which have impacted the University’s reputation, are closely linked with diversity and inclusion.
- Two key events were highlighted consistently by faculty, staff, and students that are closely linked to the University’s success relative to diversity and inclusion:
  - Targeted hate crimes and a series of bias-motivated messages.
  - Decisions made by the University’s Administration surrounding Archbishop Desmond Tutu’s invitation to speak on UST’s campus.
- The University needs to clearly articulate the critical link between its Strategic Direction and its diversity and inclusion efforts:
  - It is not clearly understood by University constituents how diversity and inclusion will be integrated into this framework.
  - The UST population needs to better understand the connection of diversity and inclusion to the UST mission.
Conclusion

What constitutes a diversity climate? Mayhew et al., (2005)\(^6\) summarized Hurtado et al.’s (1998)\(^7\) description of an institution’s climate for diversity using four dimensions of campus life that have a substantial impact on issues related to diversity. These include:

1. a campus’ historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion of various racial or ethnic groups,
2. its structural diversity (i.e., the numerical and proportional representation of diverse groups on campus),
3. its psychological climate (i.e., perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs about diversity), and
4. its behavioral climate (i.e., how different racial and ethnic groups interact on campus).

The extent to which these four dimensions cause “minority” students and employees to feel comfortable and welcomed and to have a sense of belonging as members of the campus community is directly related to the degree to which a campus has achieved a positive climate for diversity (Hurtado and Carter, 1997\(^8\); Loo and Rolison, 1986\(^9\); Mackay and Kuh, 1994\(^10\); McClelland and Auster, 1990\(^11\); Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, and Terenzini, 1996\(^12\)). As Green (1989)\(^13\) notes,

> Campus climate embraces the culture, habits, decision, practices and policies that make up campus life. It is the sum total of the daily environment, and central to the ‘comfort factor’ that minority students, faculty, and staff, and administrators feel on campus. Students and other members of the campus community who feel unwelcome or alienated from the mainstream of campus life are unlikely to remain. If they do remain, they are unlikely to be successful (p. 113).

Global Lead has indicated that leaders are the key determinant to successful outcomes in diversity and inclusion; they are critical to an institution’s diversity and inclusion success because they model the behaviors for others. Individuals will listed to what you say about diversity and inclusion, but they will do what you do. Strategic actions to consider fall into three critical areas for St. Thomas, which can and must be addressed concurrently according to Global Lead’s *Recommended Roadmap for Change*.

---


The three critical areas are:

1. Leadership Commitment and Involvement
2. Engagement and Retention
3. Education and Training

Global Lead's full recommendations report is published on the Office of Institutional Diversity’s website at [www.stthomas.edu/diversity](http://www.stthomas.edu/diversity).
### Quantitative Survey Demographic Breakouts

#### Demographic Breakout: UST Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2573</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Demographic Breakout: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not To Answer</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Respond to Question</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Demographic Breakout: Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black – African American</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black – Caribbean/West Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black – African</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>2813</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaska Native/Inuit</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish/Hispanic/Latino(a)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial/Multi-ethnic</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (Non-US citizen)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not To Answer</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Respond to Question</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Quantitative Survey Demographic Breakouts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Breakout: College/Department</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Professional Psychology</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Programs in Software, IT &amp; IS</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Divinity</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Social Work</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Department</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not To Answer</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Respond to Question</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Breakout: Religion</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christianity – Catholic</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity – Protestant</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity – Orthodox</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity – Other Christian</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Traditional Religion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primal-indigenous</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual, but not affiliated with an organized religion</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Respond to Question</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Quantitative Survey Demographic Breakouts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Breakout: Sexual Orientation</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>3145</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure or Questioning</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not To Answer</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Respond to Question</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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