



**Spring 2017 Diversity Climate Survey:  
Analysis Report**

**Office of Institutional Research  
November 2017  
OIR 17-18**

# Spring 2017 Diversity Climate Survey Analysis Report

## Introduction

In the spring of 2017, the Office of Compliance and Diversity administered an open-link, online Diversity Climate Survey accessible to both undergraduate and graduate students. The effort was conducted to assess the college's environment with respect to diversity and inclusion issues with the hopes of identifying gaps in services and developing strategic goals and programming for the college. The survey was open from April 19<sup>th</sup> through May 18<sup>th</sup> during which time 2,108 students participated, of which 1599 (76%) completed all questions. The survey was anonymous, although student EMPL ID numbers were requested and stored separately from the survey responses for the sole purpose of entering participants in a prize drawing.

The survey consisted of 33 main questions, nine of which had multiple sub-questions. Twenty of the 33 survey questions focused on gathering respondent perceptions of the college environment; the balance (13 questions) requested personal demographic information. In addition, there were two contingency questions which only appeared to some students; these were open-ended. Seventeen of the total 33 questions allowed for only one response to be selected and 7 questions allowed the respondent to "check all that apply". The nine questions with sub-questions were Likert response scale statements. Respondents were presented with a statement and asked to indicate their degree of agreement using a scale provided. Eight of the nine Likerts were 5-point scales with a "no opinion" response option included, and one was a 4-point scale that did not allow for "no opinion". In total, the complete survey was comprised of 107 data points (excluding the open-ended contingency questions).

## Report Structure

Initially, a general examination of the full survey data was completed, results were presented and discussed with the Office of Compliance and Diversity, and a direction for deeper analysis and focus was then determined and performed; this report represents the results of this collaborative process.

Section I presents the key findings that emerged from an analysis of the focus areas, organized and grouped by major theme. It begins with respondent perceptions of the college environment as a whole, followed by statements targeting specific aspects of climate diversity, and concludes with items relating to classroom dynamics. These findings are presented at the full respondent group level (maximum of 2108 respondents per question), and at the respondent-identified ethnicity group level (Hispanic or Latino/Not Hispanic or Latino,  $n=1599$ ).

Section II provides the full survey response data for every question asked in the survey. Likert scale statement data are presented at the full multi-point scale, and also aggregated to "positive" versus "negative" Likert responses (Table 16). Table 17 provides the complete set of write-in responses (as submitted by respondents; no editing) to "other (please specify)" selections, and to the two, write-in contingency questions. On average, "other" response data did not comprise a significantly large percentage of the total on any given question, nor did respondents that selected "other" necessarily provide details even though prompted to do so; however, where a sizeable list of comments was recorded, they were manually coded and mapped in to larger "themes" for easier analysis. The summary table of themes and associated percentages appears immediately before the detailed respondent comments collected in the full report (Table 17).

Section III contains three appendix tables. Appendix A details the data collected from the respondent demographic questions; Appendix B provides a supplementary analysis of the race/ethnicity demographic data; Appendix C provides a copy of the survey instrument.

# Spring 2017 Diversity Climate Survey Summary Report

## Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Section I: Key Findings</b>	<b>3 - 18</b>
The College Environment	<b>4 - 10</b>
Recruit and Retain Efforts	8 - 10
Diversity Aspects	<b>10 - 15</b>
Aspect 1: Race/Ethnicity	10 - 11
Aspect 2: Sexual Orientation	11 - 12
Aspect 3: Gender Identity	12 - 13
Aspect 4: Religion	13 - 14
Aspect 5: Disability	14 - 15
Classroom Dynamics	<b>15 - 18</b>
<b>Section II: Complete Set of Survey Responses</b>	<b>19 - 69</b>
Table 16. Total Respondent Population Responses	20 - 36
Table 17. Write-in Responses to “Other – please specify”	37 - 69
<b>Section III: Survey Appendix</b>	<b>70 - 89</b>
Table A. Demographics	71 - 73
Table B. Race/Ethnicity Demographic Supplement	74 - 75
Table C. Survey Instrument	76 - 89

## Section I: Key Findings

The survey sought to inform the Office of Compliance and Diversity, Student Affairs and the Diversity and Inclusion Committee about student perceptions of the college’s climate. John Jay College leadership hopes to be able to use the results of this survey to identify gaps in services and develop strategic goals for the institution going forward. Generally speaking, respondents were extremely positive; the vast majority rated all positively-worded Likert scale statements (representing 74% of the total Likert scale statements) as strongly agree/agree, clearly perceiving the community as one of tolerance and acceptance. However, there was a meaningful percentage of respondents that were less satisfied, particularly when asked targeted questions about stakeholder groups or experiences (i.e., classroom dynamics and interactions, one-on-one encounters); these findings form the basis of the key findings in the report analysis.

As indicated in the introduction, the survey data was also examined by respondent-identified ethnicity. Table 1 presents a summary of the responses to the survey question, “Which describes your ethnicity?” Survey participants were forced to select “Hispanic or Latino” (henceforth to be abbreviated as HL) or “Not Hispanic or Latino” (henceforth to be abbreviated as Not-HL) with no option to “choose not to respond” or “other (please specify)” offered. This question was among those appearing in the demographic section at the end of the survey; 1599 respondents submitted an answer out of a possible 2108 (76%). This produced an *n* that was both sufficiently large and representative enough that it could be used to perform statistical tests and analysis across the multi-point Likert scales, and ascertain distinctions between sub-population perspectives based on ethnic identity. As a general statement, an analysis of the data by ethnicity grouping revealed that each were highly satisfied with the diversity climate of the institution, classroom, and toward college stakeholders - a direct reflection of the larger respondent population results. However, percentage levels of satisfaction varied between the two groups with two consistent patterns clearly emerging: 1) throughout the survey, the HL levels of percentage positive agreement by survey question/statement tended to higher than the full respondent population percentages, and 2) the Not-HL group – while highly positive overall – tended to be less positive than the full respondent population and less positive than the HL group; the percentage differential between the two ethnic groupings by question/statemnt ranged from a negligible .1 to a more marked 7.5 percentage points. Where response differentials were statistically significant, they were reported and detailed in the report findings.

**Table 1. Respondent Self-identified Ethnicity**

Student Self-identified Ethnicity	Number of Respondents	Percent to Total	John Jay College Population <sup>1</sup>
Hispanic or Latino (HL)	722	45.2%	41.4%
Not Hispanic or Latino (Not-HL)	877	54.8%	58.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Fall 2016 Fact Book, Tables 7 and 10, fall 2016 student enrollment personal characteristics data, “Imputed Ethnicity”, undergraduate and graduate students combined (reflecting survey data).

## The College Environment

The below tables present survey statements that sought feedback on the institution’s climate in general; in cases where the statement was later replicated by stakeholder group, those findings were also presented to provide a fuller context and allow for meaningful analysis and interpretation. As stated above, total survey respondents (N=2108) were extremely positive about the John Jay College environment, with most statements garnering strongly agree/agree percentages of 90% and above. One-quarter of respondents expressed the feeling that diversity was over-emphasized, although just below one-fifth believed top administration did not appear interested in diversity issues at all. It should be noted that on both of these statements, an equally large percentage of students selected “no opinion” (20% and 22%, respectively).

**Table 2. Total Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements	Strongly agree/Agree
I believe the campus climate at John Jay College is open and accepting of diversity.	95.0
At John Jay College, people are treated fairly regardless of Category	90.3
At John Jay College, people have equal opportunity to excel at John Jay College regardless of Category	90.3
John Jay College provides an environment where people are free to give their ideas, opinions, or beliefs.	89.9
I believe my values and the values of John Jay College are similar.	89.2
The top administration at John Jay College <b>does not</b> appear to be interested in diversity issues.	18.5
John Jay College focuses <b>too much</b> on issues of diversity.	25.1

In a set of questions related to the campus providing a free and open environment, survey participants were asked if each stakeholder group created this environment. Respondents’ positive levels of agreement varied between the three stakeholder groups by 5 percentage points, with fellow students seen as least contributory.

**Table 2a. Total Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statement	Strongly agree/Agree Percentages		
	Faculty	Staff	Students
[ ] create an environment for the free and open expression of ideas, opinions and beliefs.	91.9	88.5	86.5

When the data was analyzed by ethnicity grouping, findings for each statement by ethnicity group were highly positive. In part of a general pattern that emerged throughout the survey findings, the HL group tended to be more positive than the population as a whole on every statement, as well as more positive than the Not-HL group. In five of the seven statements, the difference in agreement levels between the two groups was statistically significant. Further, the two groups differed from one another on the degree to which they viewed specific stakeholder contributions to the institution’s free and open environment, particularly where fellow students were concerned. Statements on perceptions that 1) there was too much of a focus on diversity, and 2) a lack of interest by top administration, were consistent with the opinions of the larger respondent group, and were not statistically significantly different from one another.

**Table 2b. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value <sup>2</sup>
I believe the campus climate at John Jay College is open and accepting of diversity.	96.4	93.6	**
At John Jay College, people are treated fairly regardless of Category.	91.6	88.1	*
At John Jay College, people have equal opportunity to excel at John Jay College regardless of Category.	92.9	87.6	**
John Jay College provides an environment where people are free to give their ideas, opinions, or beliefs.	91.7	88.4	*
I believe my values and the values of John Jay College are similar.	91.6	87.5	**

**Table 2c. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

[ ] create an environment for the free and open expression of ideas, opinions and beliefs.	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
Faculty	93.5	90.9	**
Staff	90.9	86.9	**
Students	90.7	83.5	**

Survey participants were also asked about generally witnessing or experiencing discriminatory behavior and/or harassment. While the vast majority of total respondents were confident that they had *not* (83% and higher), 9% - 17% of respondents reported that they either had, or were not sure if they had; definitions of discrimination and harassment were provided with the survey questions.

**Table 3. Total Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements	Yes/Not Sure
Have you witnessed discriminatory behavior?	16.7
Have you witnessed harassment?	11.6
Have you experienced harassment? <sup>3</sup>	8.5

When the ethnicity populations were compared to one another on these questions, we see a statistically significant difference between the percentages of respondents that report definitely or possibly witnessing and/or experiencing *harassment* behavior; this was not the case for the question on witnessing *discrimination*.

**Table 3a. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements	HL Yes/Not Sure	Not-HL Yes/Not Sure	p-value
Have you witnessed harassment?	8.9	13.6	*
Have you experienced harassment?	6.2	10.3	*

<sup>2</sup> \* represents a p-value of <= .05; \*\* represents a p-value of <= .01

<sup>3</sup> The survey only asked the respondent if they had *experienced harassment*; a separate question was *not* included to inquire if they had experienced discrimination.

There were two related questions directed toward evaluating the faculty stakeholder group on responsiveness to reports of discrimination and harassment. For both statements, a substantial 39% of total respondents had “no opinion”; these high percentages may be a function of the confidential nature of reporting and responding to such incidences. In light of the high percentage of “no opinion” selections, the positive levels of agreement were much lower, yet still majority positive. Fifty-six percent of total respondents strongly agreed/agreed that faculty were responsive to reports of discrimination and 57% to reports of harassment. The HL/Not-HL comparative analysis revealed similar percentages of “no opinion” responses relative to the total response population, however a statistically significant difference in respondent perceptions was found for faculty responsiveness to harassment (none for discrimination).

**Table 3b. Total Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements	Strongly agree/Agree
Faculty are responsive to reports of discrimination.	56.3
Faculty are responsive to reports of harassment.	57.1

**Table 3c. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statement	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
Faculty are responsive to reports of harassment.	60.2	53.5	*

In addition, 13% of total respondents reported that they had, or might have been, *singled out* on campus or in class because of their identity within the last 12 months. The top five reasons cited by respondents who stated that they definitely had been singled out were race (57%), ethnicity (33%), gender (30%), culture (28%) and socio-economic status (24%); respondents could select more than one reason or write in their own. Additionally, almost half (48%) of all respondents claimed that it was another student who was the “actor”, while 29% stated it was a faculty member (see the full results, Table 16, Question 7A and 7B). While the data does not give us reasons for respondent perspectives, this latter finding may be somewhat a function of respondent frequency and nature of interactions with different stakeholder groups.

**Table 3d. Total Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statement	Yes/Not Sure
Have you been singled out on campus or in class because of your identity within the last 12 months?	13.4

The HL and Not-HL respondents statistically significantly differed in their response to this question as well, with a higher percentage of Not-HL respondents reporting being singled out. Those that answered affirmatively reflected the larger population in their selection of reasons and relative importance with the exception of socio-economic status. For the Not-HL respondents, religion and socio-economic status were equally cited as fifth in importance, but for the HL group, religion was cited as fifth with socio-economic status next at almost 4 percentage points lower. Not-HL respondents cited faculty as the main “actors” (30% vs. HL of 27%), whereas HL respondents cited students as the main “actors” (54% vs. Not-HL 45%); however, an additional 5% of Not-HL students reported that faculty, staff and students were all actors (HL = 0%).

**Table 3e. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements	HL Yes/ Not Sure	Not-HL Yes/Not Sure	p-value
Have you been singled out on campus or in class because of your identity within the last 12 months?	10.8	15.2	*

In an analysis of identically-worded Likert scale statements on general climate issues, where only the stakeholder group in the statement changed, perceptual differences were identified<sup>4</sup>. By grouping them together, it allows for comparative analysis of respondent satisfaction levels across stakeholder groups on the same climate aspect. *It is important to note that these comparative stakeholder statement findings should be interpreted with caution, as respondent perceptions are likely influenced by the frequency and nature of interactions with different stakeholder groups.*

On the whole, respondents were overwhelmingly positive in their perceptions of faculty, staff and students, however, statements on stereotyping and inappropriate jokes or comments resonated with respondents at percentages ranging from 22% to 34% depending upon stakeholder group, with students being perceived as the primary “actors” followed by faculty.

**Table 4. Total Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements	Strongly agree/Agree Percentages		
	Faculty	Staff	Students
[ ] respond to me based upon stereotypes they have about my group(s).	23.1	22.1	28.6
I have had [ ] who made inappropriate jokes or comments about people who are different.	27.0	22.4	33.7
I feel that [ ] at John Jay College accept me for who I am.	94.4	n/a	93.4
[ ] respect me as a person.	92.7	90.0	87.8

When statistical analysis was then performed at the level of ethnicity group, the only statistically significant difference in responses to questions of stereotyping and inappropriate jokes and comments, across stakeholder groups, was with respect to perceptions of staff on the issue of stereotyping. Here, almost one-in-four Not-HL respondents strongly agreed/agreed that staff stereotyped them versus one-in-five HL respondents. Further, statistical differences were identified in HL/Not-HL responses to being respected as a person by faculty and by students.

**Table 4a. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

[ ] respond to me based upon stereotypes they have about my group(s).	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
Staff	19.8	23.6	**

[ ] respect me as a person.	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
Faculty	94.2	92.2	*
Students	90.2	86.0	**

<sup>4</sup> Please note that these statements did not appear successively in the survey.

## **Recruit and Retain Efforts**

The survey further sought to ascertain students' perceptions of the institution's efforts to recruit and retain faculty and students on an array of diversity aspects. For each question, 11 category prompts were given for students to select from, including "none of the above" and "other"; if they selected the latter, they were asked to clarify their response (not all respondents did). Respondents were asked to "check all that apply", so percentages do not total 100%. Almost half (49%) of population respondents selected HL recruitment/retention of faculty as most important followed by LGBTQ (47%); HL was fourth most important in student efforts behind foreign nationals<sup>5</sup> at 46%, LGBTQ and African American (Non-Hispanic), both at 43%. Excluding "none of the above" and "other", respondents were least concerned with efforts targeting men or White/Caucasians. However, it is notable that "none of the above" garnered 18% and 23%, and "other" 8% and 7% (faculty and students, respectively).

**Table 5. Total Respondent Population**

<b>Survey Question Options</b>	<b>Recruit/Retain Faculty (N=1648)</b>	<b>Recruit/Retain Students (N=1648)</b>
Hispanic/Latino/(a)	<b>48.8</b>	42.3
African American (Non-Hispanic)	47.7	43.0
LGBTQ	46.6	43.1
Women	46.5	41.3
Asian/Pacific islander	40.0	42.5
Foreign nationals	39.3	<b>45.7</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native	37.3	40.7
Men	23.7	30.5
White/Caucasian	22.0	29.4
None of the above	18.1	22.9
Other (please specify)	7.6	7.0

In performing this same analysis by ethnic group, the HL respondents expressed their desire for more HL faculty and students to be recruited and retained (69% and 54% agreement levels, respectively), followed by LGBTQ (53% and 49%, respectively) and women (52% and 46% respectively); other race/ethnicity groups were of less importance overall, the highest being African American (Non-Hispanic) at 48% for faculty and 46% for students.

In contrast, Not-HL respondents supported recruiting and retaining all of the Not-HL race/ethnicity groups with higher percentages than HL (with the exception of White/Caucasian). African American (Non-Hispanic) was reported as the most important group for faculty efforts garnering 48% of respondent agreement, followed by Asian/Pacific islander at 43%. For students, the Not-HL group supported greater efforts with respect to foreign nationals (45%) followed by Asian/Pacific islander (43%); HL faculty and student recruitment and retention were seen as least important, only appearing above men and White/Caucasian groups.

As in the total respondent population, both HL and Not-HL groups viewed recruitment and retention of males and White/Caucasian faculty and students as least important overall.

<sup>5</sup> Foreign nationals was not a defined term in the survey.

**Table 5a. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

Survey Question Options	Hispanic or Latino (N=722)		Not Hispanic or Latino (N=877)	
	Retain/Recruit Faculty	Retain/Recruit Students	Retain/Recruit Faculty	Retain/Recruit Students
Hispanic/Latino/(a)	68.6	54.2	33.3	32.6
LGBTQ	52.8	49.2	42.0	38.7
Women	51.8	46.0	42.6	38.0
African American (Non-Hispanic)	47.9	45.8	48.0	40.9
Foreign nationals	38.9	47.9	40.0	44.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	38.5	44.2	37.2	38.7
Asian/Pacific islander	37.0	42.5	43.4	43.3
Men	24.7	33.8	23.0	27.8
White/Caucasian	22.0	29.5	22.3	29.5
None of the above	16.1	20.4	19.5	24.9
Other (please specify)	6.4	5.7	8.8	8.2

Within the “other” write-in responses, the majority of total survey respondents felt that faculty should primarily be recruited and retained based upon their qualifications, and for students that was the second most common comment. “Everyone” was also popular. The top five appear (aggregated by theme) in the table below (the full list is available in Table 17).

**Table 6. Total Respondent Population**

“Other” Write-in Responses (aggregated by theme)	Recruit/Retain Faculty (N=100)	Recruit/Retain Students (N=92)
Qualifications	28.0	22.8
Everyone	21.0	26.1
Race/Ethnicity ( <i>ones not listed specifically as a selection</i> )	20.0	17.4
Religion	7.0	5.4
People with Disabilities	6.0	7.6

The picture that emerged was once again different when performing a comparison of HL and Not-HL group responses. As in the total respondent population, qualifications were viewed as important, particularly for faculty. However, Not-HL respondents used the “other” write-in opportunity to underscore a desire for greater race/ethnic diversity beyond the categories specifically provided for selection in the survey instrument.

**Table 6a. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

“Other “ Write-in Responses (aggregated by theme)	Hispanic or Latino (N=32/46) (N=32/41)		Not Hispanic or Latino (N=65/77) (N=58/72)	
	Recruit/Retain Faculty	Recruit/Retain Students	Recruit/Retain Faculty	Recruit/Retain Students
Qualifications	37.5	28.1	24.6	20.7
Everyone	31.3	40.6	16.9	19.0
Race/Ethnicity ( <i>ones not listed specifically as a selection</i> )	9.4	6.3	24.6	22.4
Low SES	6.3	0.0	1.5	1.7
Religion	6.3	0.0	6.2	6.9
People with Disabilities	3.1	6.3	7.7	8.6
Gender	3.1	0.0	6.2	5.2

## Diversity Aspects

In general, respondents appear to strongly agree/agree that the institution is most supportive of race/ethnic diversity, followed by sexual orientation, gender identity, religion and then disability (listed in this order based upon a comparison of strongly agree/agree percentages across these diversity aspects). It should be noted, that the range of positive percentages for the institution were higher than for stakeholder groups where the statements were identical. Again comparison between stakeholder groups should be made with caution as the frequency and nature of student interactions across these groups would likely vary and possibly influence the findings. Where there were statistically significant differences found contrasting the responses of the HL and Not-HL groups, staff was the most frequent stakeholder of differing perceptions, and the Not-HL group was consistently lower in its satisfaction levels (on average, by 3 – 5 percentage points) than the HL group.

### Aspect 1: Race/Ethnicity

With respect to race/ethnicity, over 90% of all respondents strongly agreed/agreed that the institution is fair and provides equal opportunity to students regardless of race/ethnicity; stakeholder groups were perceived as being fairly comparable in their levels of support (89% - 91%). Despite this, approximately one-in-five respondents asserted their belief that there is racial tension on campus, and a higher percentage (24% - 27%) report stakeholder resentment of other race/ethnicities.

An analysis of HL and Not-HL responses did reveal a difference in their perceptions of how people of different race/ethnicities are treated and on how well the institution addresses issues that arise. Further, while they agreed in their perception of fellow student support, they differed on their views of how supportive faculty and staff were. Finally, while Not-HL respondents were slightly more likely to report campus racial tension and resentment by stakeholder groups, the difference from the HL group was not statistically significant.

**Table 7. Total Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements: Race/Ethnicity	Strongly agree/Agree
At John Jay College, people have equal opportunity to excel at John Jay College regardless of Race/ethnicity.	94.4
At John Jay College, people are treated fairly regardless of Race/ethnicity.	93.6
I believe there is racial tension on the campus.	19.8
John Jay College does a good job of addressing race issues.	75.9

Likert Scale Statements: Race/Ethnicity	Faculty	Staff	Students
[ ] are supportive of people with different racial and ethnic backgrounds.	91.3	89.4	89.1
[ ] are <i>resentful</i> of others whose race/ethnicity is different from their own.	24.4 <sup>6</sup>		27.5

**Table 7a. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements: Race/Ethnicity	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
At John Jay College, people are treated fairly regardless of Race/ethnicity.	96.0	91.6	**
John Jay College does a good job of addressing race issues.	78.5	73.4	**

[ ] are supportive of people with different racial and ethnic backgrounds.	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
Faculty	93.6	90.6	**
Staff	92.0	87.7	**

**Aspect 2: Sexual Orientation**

When asked to evaluate the climate on issues of sexual orientation, respondents were highly positive overall but about one-in-five expressed some dissatisfaction with the institution’s efforts to provide programming and activities, and with visible signs of support for safe space. Fellow students were perceived as being more supportive than both faculty and staff by 3 to 5 percentage points.

<sup>6</sup> This statement read “faculty and staff are resentful of others whose race/ethnicity is different from their own”, therefore the percentage represents both faculty and staff.

**Table 8. Total Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements: Sexual Orientation	Strongly agree/Agree
At John Jay College, people have equal opportunity to excel at John Jay College regardless of Sexual orientation (i.e., lesbian, gay, bisexual, asexual, or straight)	94.9
At John Jay College, people are treated fairly regardless of sexual orientation (i.e., lesbian, gay, bisexual, asexual, or straight).	92.6
John Jay College does a good job of providing programs and activities that promote acceptance of all sexual orientations.	79.9
There are visible signs of support for safe space on campus for LGBTQ members.	80.8

Likert Scale Statements: Sexual Orientation	Faculty	Staff	Students
[ ] are supportive of a person's sexual orientation (i.e., lesbian, gay, bisexual, asexual, or straight).	85.4	84.0	88.0

At the HL/Not-HL comparative level, there was once again a significant difference in agreement levels with respect to opportunity and fair treatment regardless of sexual orientation, even though both groups demonstrated high levels of positivity. In terms of support by stakeholder groups, perceptual differences were statistically significant when evaluating staff and fellow students, but not faculty.

**Table 8a. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements: Sexual Orientation	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
At John Jay College, people have equal opportunity to excel at John Jay College regardless of Sexual orientation (i.e., lesbian, gay, bisexual, asexual, or straight)	96.7	93.5	*
At John Jay College, people are treated fairly regardless of sexual orientation (i.e., lesbian, gay, bisexual, asexual, or straight).	95.7	89.9	**

[ ] are supportive of a person's sexual orientation (i.e., lesbian, gay, bisexual, asexual, or straight).	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
Staff	88.0	81.3	**
Students	90.9	86.1	**

**Aspect 3: Gender Identity**

Total respondent population perceptions regarding gender identity attitudes received one to two percentage point lower ratings than sexual orientation on statements referencing the college climate as a whole; faculty and staff were viewed as comparatively supportive at levels similarly expressed for the sexual orientation statement (84%-85%). There was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions of support for gender identity reported by HL and Not-HL groups, continuing a pattern across the diversity aspects where the latter strongly agreed/agreed at levels of 3 - 5 percentage points lower than the HL group.

**Table 9. Total Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements: Gender identity	Strongly agree/Agree
At John Jay College, people have equal opportunity to excel at John Jay College regardless of Gender identity/expression (i.e., female, male, transgender, or gender non-conforming)	93.7
At John Jay College, people are treated fairly regardless of Gender identity/expression (i.e., female, male, transgender, or gender non-conforming)	91.3

Likert Scale Statements: Gender identity	Faculty	Staff	Students
[ ] are supportive of a person's gender identity/expression (i.e., female, male, transgender, or gender non-conforming, etc.) <sup>7</sup>	85.0	84.0	n/a

**Table 9a. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements: Gender Identity	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
At John Jay College, people have equal opportunity to excel at John Jay College regardless of Gender identity/expression (i.e., female, male, transgender, or gender non-conforming)	95.7	92.1	*
At John Jay College, people are treated fairly regardless of Gender identity/expression (i.e., female, male, transgender, or gender non-conforming)	93.6	88.6	**

[ ] are supportive of a person's gender identity/expression (i.e., female, male, transgender, or gender non-conforming, etc.)	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
Faculty	88.9	83.4	**
Staff	88.1	81.3	**

**Aspect 4: Religion**

Percentage agreement on statements about religious diversity attitudes and support were similar to that of the aforementioned categories. Similar to race/ethnicity, just below 20% of total respondents reported religious tension on campus, and there was a strong belief in fair treatment and equal opportunity regardless of religious identification. Faculty and staff were perceived as more supportive on issues of religious diversity than on sexual orientation and gender identity. Once again, when analyzing the data by ethnicity identification there were statistically significant differences in perspectives, with the Not-HL group feeling less positive. On the question of religious tension, there was no statistically significant difference between the ethnicity group responses.

<sup>7</sup> Due to a typo, this statement was not evaluated for students as a stakeholder group.

**Table 10. Total Respondent Population**

<b>Likert Scale Statements: Religion</b>	<b>Strongly agree/Agree</b>
At John Jay College, people have equal opportunity to excel at John Jay College regardless of religion.	93.4
At John Jay College, people are treated fairly regardless of religion	90.8
I believe there is religious tension on the campus.	19.2

<b>Likert Scale Statements: Religion</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Students</b>
[ ] are supportive of people with different religious backgrounds.	89.5	87.3	87.6

**Table 10a. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

<b>Likert Scale Statements: Religion</b>	<b>HL Strongly agree/agree</b>	<b>Not-HL Strongly agree/agree</b>	<b>p-value</b>
At John Jay College, people have equal opportunity to excel at John Jay College regardless of religion.	95.7	91.2	**
At John Jay College, people are treated fairly regardless of religion	93.1	88.7	*

<b>[ ] are supportive of people with different religious backgrounds.</b>	<b>HL Strongly agree/agree</b>	<b>Not-HL Strongly agree/agree</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Staff	90.0	85.5	*
Students	90.0	86.1	*

**Aspect 5: Disability**

Of the five aspects studied, the lowest percentages of strongly agree/agree were attained on the supportive statements about disability, although still overwhelmingly positive at 90% or more. Seven percent of students expressed that they had been singled out in class due to a disability, but it is not clear how students defined the term “disability” (i.e., what they included/excluded). Percentages of agreement that faculty and staff were accommodating to students were achieved at about the same levels as on sexual orientation and gender identity. Not-HL respondents reported lower levels of satisfaction than the HL group to a statistically significant degree, and perceived staff as significantly less accommodating; the groups did not differ in their response to being singled out in class for a disability.

**Table 11. Total Respondent Population**

<b>Likert Scale Statements: Disability</b>	<b>Strongly agree/ Agree</b>
At John Jay College, people have equal opportunity to excel at John Jay College regardless of Disability	90.7
At John Jay College, people are treated fairly regardless of Disability.	90.2
I am singled out <i>in class</i> because of a disability.	7.1

Likert Scale Statements: Disability	Faculty	Staff
[ ] are accommodating to students with disabilities. <sup>8</sup>	85.1	85.0

**Table 11a. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements: Disability	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
At John Jay College, people have equal opportunity to excel at John Jay College regardless of Disability	93.2	88.3	**
At John Jay College, people are treated fairly regardless of Disability.	92.7	88.1	**

[ ] are accommodating to students with disabilities.	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
Staff	87.4	83.2	**

## Classroom Dynamics

Ninety percent of respondents stated that they strongly agree/agree that the atmosphere in their classes does **not** make them feel like they belong, and 45% expressed high agreement with the statement that they felt expected to represent their race or ethnic group in discussions in the classroom. There was no statistically significant difference in how HL and Not-HL groups responded to these statements. In an effort to understand these expressions of high dissatisfaction better, and possibly identify areas for future discussion and investigation, statements about classroom dynamics were grouped together to promote easier analysis (Tables 12 and 13).

**Table 12. Total Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements <sup>9</sup>	Strongly agree/Agree
Faculty create an environment for the free and open expression of ideas, opinions, and beliefs.	91.9
Students create an environment for free and open expression of ideas, opinions, and beliefs.	86.5
Faculty successfully facilitate discussions about difficult topics.	89.5
Students encourage free and open discussion about difficult topics.	85.3

<sup>8</sup>This statement was not evaluated for students as a stakeholder group.

<sup>9</sup>The first two statements were also discussed under “The College Environment” section as it would seem these statements would be applicable to both classroom and institution-wide environments.

**Table 12a. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

[ ] create an environment for the free and open expression of ideas, opinions and beliefs.	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
Faculty	93.5	90.9	**
Students	90.7	83.5	**

  

Faculty successfully facilitate discussions about difficult topics.	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
Faculty	92.5	87.8	**

  

Students encourage free and open discussion about difficult topics.	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
Students	89.3	82.4	**

Over one-third (38%) of students claimed that they had been exposed to racism in the classroom; 37% reported they had experienced being ignored in class when trying to participate; approximately one-quarter (26%) stated that they had experienced an instructor disrespecting an opinion they made in class, and over one in five respondents stated they had been singled out for having an opinion that was not shared by their instructor. An examination of these same statements, contrasting HL and Not-HL respondent groups, revealed only a statistically significant difference in responses submitted for the statement referring to feeling singled out in class due to a difference in opinion with their instructor, with a seven percentage point difference in level of agreement.

**Table 13. Total Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements	Percentage “Affirmative” Response <sup>10</sup>
How often do you believe you have been exposed to a racist atmosphere in the classroom.	38.3
I am ignored in class, even when I attempt to participate. <sup>11</sup>	36.8
When I make a comment in the classroom, my opinion is <i>not</i> respected by the instructor <sup>12</sup> .	25.5
I am singled out in class because of differences in opinion with the instructor.	22.0
I am singled out in class because of a disability.	7.1

**Table 13a. Self-identified Ethnicity Respondent Population**

Likert Scale Statements	HL Strongly agree/agree	Not-HL Strongly agree/agree	p-value
I am singled out in class because of differences in opinion with the instructor.	17.7	25.0	**

<sup>10</sup> An “affirmative” response is defined as any of the following Likert scale options: rarely, occasionally, often and always.

<sup>11</sup> All students that answered with an affirmative response (as previously defined), were presented with a separate question asking them to express why they felt they had been ignored.

<sup>12</sup> All students that answered with an affirmative response (as previously defined), were presented with a separate question asking them to express why they felt their opinion had been disrespected.

When the respondents that felt they had been ignored (37%) were asked to elaborate, of those that did, 43% cited classroom management issues (e.g. a large class with competition to contribute, time constraints, interruption by peers) as the main problem, followed by 17% that cited faculty (e.g., diversity aspect bias, personality or non-verbal reaction). In focusing on HL and Not-HL respondents, classroom management issues remained the most cited reason for both groups, but the Not-HL group felt more strongly (as a percent to total) about faculty issues and possessing a different opinion/perspective as reasons for being ignored.

**Table 14. Write-in Responses, Aggregated by Theme**

Why do you think your participation attempts were ignored in class? <sup>13</sup>	Total Respondents	HL	Not-HL
Classroom Management	43.2	44.7	41.6
Faculty Bias/Personality/Non-verbal Reaction	16.9	14.6	19.7
Unsure	12.7	15.0	9.9
Different Opinion/Perspective	10.7	8.7	12.9
Student Felt Blamed/Blame Self/Others	10.2	10.2	10.3

Below are a representation of respondent perspectives in their own words; the full set of responses are listed in the complete analysis report, Table 17.

*“Professor wanted to give other students a chance to answer.”*

*“Because my accent.”*

*“I’m quiet and introverted. There are a lot of loud students who shout out answers instead of raising their hands so I don’t get the chance to speak. Or by the time the professor notices my hand, a couple people have already shouted the answer.”*

*“Primarily because of my race and gender. Specially, the fact that I am a Black woman my opinions is often ignored or minimized.”*

*“I am a conservative/republican and almost all the staff and students in the college are liberal/democrat and have no respect for my view point on social and political issues.”*

*“I think because of how i dress they assume that my responses may not be up to the standard of someone who is educated.”*

*“Same People always get picked to participate.”*

*“Only a few male professors may have been uncomfortable because I am gay.”*

Of the 26% who felt they had been disrespected at some point in time, 43% cited possessing an opposing position or perspective from the instructor, 30% cited faculty bias, personality or reaction to them, and another 9% reversed their prior response of having felt disrespected.

<sup>13</sup> Only the top five categories are shown; the complete summary table with detailed student write-in responses can be found in Table 17.

**Table 15. Write-in Responses, Aggregated by Theme**

Why do you think your opinion was not respected by the instructor? <sup>14</sup>	Total Respondents	HL	Not-HL
Different Opinion/Perspective	42.8	39.0	47.3
Faculty Bias/Personality/Non-verbal Reaction	29.8	31.7	29.0
Contradictory Response (to Q10.2)	9.4	13.0	5.9
Unsure	7.7	5.7	7.7
Student Felt Blamed/Blame Self/Others	7.7	6.5	8.3

Below are a select representation of respondent perspectives on why they felt their opinion(s) was/were not respected; the full set of responses are listed in the complete analysis report, Table 17.

- “She laughed at my answer to a question and disregarded my statement.”*
- “He believes his view is correct or he doesn’t listen. He answers before we even finish giving our own opinion.”*
- “I think she just thought I was dumb. I think differently and see things from different perspectives, but I’m not dumb.”*
- “I went on the wrong direction and I don’t want admit my mistakes. It was my faults.”*
- “We were talking about Donald trump in class, I defended a particular issue and she immediately stopped me and told me I was wrong. She refused to let me continue and called on other students and continued to speak herself.”*
- “John jay is a very liberal college, so, even though I do not agree with conservative ideals, I have seen a fair amount of people with that opinion treated like oddities in class.”*
- “Faces made or an attitude given.”*
- “My opinion does not correspond with the stereotype of my race, ethnicity, and gender.”*
- “because my opinion was different than their own. I had a different opinion on a multitude of topics including law enforcement and politics and when I tried to voice my opinion I was verbally attacked by the professor and students.”*
- “Because they were arragont.”*
- “Instructor disagreed with my views and made a gesture of disregard.”*

<sup>14</sup> Only the top five categories are shown; the complete summary table with detailed student write-in responses can be found in Table 17.