What works and what can be improved?

Many interviews and focus groups were conducted on campus to discover what works well and what doesn’t work well in terms of equity, inclusion, and diversity. The central themes from these responses were placed in the Climate Study Survey in order to see which themes the overall Auburn community connected with. Respondents were instructed to “select all that apply” from this list. Below are the most frequently selected responses to the two main questions (i.e., what works well and what doesn’t work well).

What works well in terms of equity, inclusion, and diversity (All responses)
- Beauty of the campus (63%)
- Recreation and Wellness Center (58%)
- Providing academic support for students (52%)

What does NOT work well in terms of equity, inclusion, and diversity? (All responses)
- Black/African-American student recruitment and retention (49%)
- Communication about uncomfortable issues (44%)
- Presence of a diverse administration and staff (40%)

What does NOT work well in terms of equity, inclusion, and diversity? (by Affiliation)

Participants were asked at the beginning of the survey to select a primary affiliation. Below is a list of each affiliate groups’ most frequently selected issues that “do not work well”; of note, the top three most frequent responses greater than 40% are reported.

- Undergraduate Students (N=353)
  - (52%) Black/African-American student recruitment and retention
  - (45%) Communication about uncomfortable issues
  - (43%) Diverse high school student recruitment and retention

- Graduate Students (N=106)
  - (53%) Black/African-American student recruitment and retention
  - (47%) Communication about uncomfortable issues
  - (45%) Diverse high school student recruitment and retention

- Faculty Members (N=233)
  - (52%) Black/African-American student recruitment and retention
  - (50%) Presence of a diverse faculty
  - (49%) Recruitment and retention of diverse faculty, staff, and administrators
• **Academic Department Heads and Chairs** *(N=21)*
  o (71%) Spousal-partner hiring practices (trailing spouse-partner)
  o (62%) Presence of a diverse faculty
  o (52%) Presence of a diverse administration and staff

• **Senior Administrators** *(N=18)*
  o (72%) Black/African-American student recruitment and retention
  o (72%) Presence of a diverse faculty
  o (72%) Communication about uncomfortable issues

• **Administrative and Professional Employees** *(N=189)*
  o (58%) Pay equity for the same work
  o (49%) Communication about uncomfortable issues
  o (48%) Presence of a diverse administration and staff

• **Staff Employees** *(N=177)*
  o (57%) Pay equity for the same work
  o (45%) Merit-based compensation
  o (45%) Communication about uncomfortable issues

• **Extension System or Experiment Station Employee** *(N=16)*
  o (50%) Pay equity for the same work

• **Alumni** *(N=119)*
  o (53%) Black/African-American student recruitment and retention
  o (40%) Communication about uncomfortable issues
  o (40%) Attitudes toward equity, inclusion, and diversity

• **Board Members or Trustees** *(N=9)*
  o (56%) Black/African-American student recruitment and retention
  o (56%) Presence of a diverse faculty
  o (44%) Diversity and multicultural programming

• **Advisory Group Members** *(N=2)*
  o (100%) Recruitment and retention of transfer students
  o (100%) Availability of need-based scholarships
  o (100%) Merit-based compensation
Readiness for Change: A Longitudinal View

In 2003, Auburn University administered a Climate Survey to undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, administrative & professional staff, senior administrators, and staff. This survey was administered via pencil and paper. Three of the same questions from this survey were included in the 2016 survey allowing for a longitudinal comparison of Auburn University’s readiness for diversity change. Each item was measured on a 4-point Likert scale where 1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Somewhat Disagree, 3- Somewhat Agree, 4- Strongly Agree. Figure 1 below displays these three questions and aggregate responses from 2003 and 2016. Figures 2-4 display each individual question by primary affiliation.

Figure 1 – Overall Readiness for Change Responses
Figure 2 – Diversity is Good for Auburn University (Longitudinal Comparison)

Diversity is good for Auburn University and should be actively promoted by students, staff, faculty, and administrators.
Figure 3 – Emphasis on Diversity (Longitudinal Comparison)

Auburn University is placing too much emphasis on achieving diversity
Figure 4 – Auburn University Climate (Longitudinal Comparison)

Auburn University has a climate which fosters diversity

Year 2016 Year 2003
Valuing Diversity

The Diversity Steering Committee was interested in directly asking our community about their perception of Auburn’s commitment to diversity. Specifically, respondents were asked to rate their agreement on a five point Likert scale (1- Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4-Agree, 5- Strongly Agree) to the following question: “Auburn University consistently demonstrates the value of equity, inclusion, and diversity.” Figure 5 displays the responses to this question by affiliate group and Figure 6 includes responses by selected identity.

Figure 5 – Commitment to Diversity (by Primary Affiliation)
Auburn University consistently demonstrates the value of equity, inclusion, and diversity.
Sense of Belonging

Sense of Belonging is one dimension of a person’s perceived cohesion to a particular group. Using Bollen & Hoyle’s (1990) three sense of belonging items, we measured participants’ sense of belonging to Auburn University using a 5-point Likert scale where 1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3-Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly Agree. The reliability of the scores in this sample was very high and a total score was created to reflect sense of belonging. Figures 7-9 reflect different groups sense of belonging to Auburn University.

Figure 7 – Sense of Belonging (by Affiliation)

![Bar chart showing sense of belonging to Auburn University by affiliation.](chart.png)
Figure 7 – Sense of Belonging (by Selected Identity)

Sense of Belonging by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8 – Sense of Belonging (by Religious Affiliation)

Sense of Belonging by Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiously Unaffiliated</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>