PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY INVENTORY

An Institutional Climate Measure

SAMPLE

Institutional Report of Campus Professional Responses

DATE

PERSONAL AND SOCIAL
RESPONSIBILITY INVENTORY
An Institutional Climate Measure

Introduction

Thank you for participating in the Personal and Social Responsibility Inventory (PSRI). The Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE) at Iowa State University, in partnership with the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U), would like to express our appreciation for your support, interest, and participation in the PSRI.

The PSRI is a climate instrument designed to assess students' and campus professionals' perceptions of institutional support and opportunities for education in personal and social responsibility. Your involvement, along with the involvement of other institutions, allows us to not only provide data for institutional improvement, but also continue exploration into interventions and strategies that will inform a national conversation on ways to strengthen learning for personal and social responsibility. The data in this report allow your campus to make empirically informed decisions and improve your students' learning; the research emerging from this project informs good practice for the development of personal and social responsibility for all students.

Along with this report, your institution receives a dataset that includes faculty, staff, and administrators' responses. These data have been de-identified to protect the anonymity of respondents. This dataset can be used to contribute to understanding how perceptions vary within and across groups, analyzing assets and gaps in curricular and co-curricular offerings, confirming or challenging existing beliefs about the campus climate, making decisions about resources and future areas of work, and enhancing the educational experience of students.

Again, we thank you for your participation in this study, and we encourage your future involvement with the PSRI. If you have any questions, please contact the RISE office at (515) 294-6234 or email: psri@iastate.edu.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Reason
Professor of Education
Iowa State University

Using the Report

The report is organized into multiple sections that array data in meaningful and useful ways. The data include professional respondent demographic and academic characteristics, item responses and factor scores, and a section listing all open-ended responses. For the purposes of this report, all national norms are calculated using data collected from the PSRI in the last four years. The report sections are listed below:

Campus Professional Characteristics: This section includes campus professional responses to demographic and academic characteristics.

Factor Scores: This section presents factor scores for survey respondents. A factor contains individual items that measure a similar concept. A complete explanation of factors, as well as how the PSRI factors were derived, can be found on the PSRI website (www.psri.hs.iastate.edu). Table 1 provides a comparison of campus professional factor scores, which are averages of responses for each set of items, for the institution and the national norms. Table 2 provides the mean and standard deviation of the growth factor that spans the five dimensions of the PSRI. It also includes the means and standard deviations of the component items of the factor.

Dimension-Specific Items and Factor Scores: This section (Tables 3 through 32) provides frequency and descriptive summaries of PSRI items and factors within each of the five dimensions. Each dimension sub-section begins with tables displaying the number and percentage of campus professionals indicating a particular response, the institutional mean and standard deviation, and the national mean and standard deviation. The end of each dimension section provides a summary of the factors associated with each dimension and the component items of that factor. The factor tables include the means and standard deviations of the component items and the factor.

Open-ended Responses: The final section of this report includes all open-ended responses in the PSRI. The final item for each dimension on the survey allowed participants to provide a written response. These responses have not been edited, although PSRI staff members have attempted to identify and remove any names/other identifiable information included in the responses in order to avoid the negative-targeting of a member of the campus community. [Note: Although we took great pains to clean these responses in this manner, we cannot guarantee that we eliminated all personally identifiable information.]

PSRI Dimension Descriptions

The Personal and Social Responsibility Inventory assesses campus climate on five dimensions of personal and social responsibility that describe developmentally appropriate goals for students in college.

Striving for Excellence

- Developing a strong work ethic and consciously doing one's very best in all aspects of college

Cultivating Academic Integrity

- Recognizing and acting on a sense of honor, ranging from honesty, fairness, and respect for others and their work to engaging with a formal academic honors code

Contributing to a Larger Community

- Recognizing and acting on one's responsibility to the educational community and the wider society, locally, nationally, and globally

Taking Seriously the Perspectives of Others

- Recognizing and acting on the obligation to inform one's own judgment; engaging diverse and competing perspectives as a resource for learning, citizenship, and work

Developing Competence in Ethical and Moral Reasoning and Action

- Developing ethical and moral reasoning in ways that incorporate the other four responsibilities; using such reasoning in learning and in life

Table of Contents

Respondent Characteristics

	N	Percent
Gender		
Male	1	12
Female	1	12
Transgender/Gender Nonconforming	2	25
Rather Not Say	4	50
Total	8	
Race		
Nonresident (International)	1	7
Hispanic of any race	1	7
American Indian/Alaska Native	1	7
Asian American/Asian	1	7
African American/Black	1	7
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1	7
White/Caucasian	1	7
Multiracial	8	53
Total	15	

Respondent Characteristics cont.

	N	Percent
Professional Role		
Academic Administrator	1	12
Faculty Member	3	38
Student Affairs Professional	4	50
Total	8	
Primary Academic Appointment Category		
Art and Humanities	0	0
Biological Science	0	0
Business	1	12
Education	2	25
Engineering	1	12
Physical Science	0	0
Professional	3	38
Social Science	0	0
Technical	1	12
Other Field	0	0
Total	8	

Campus Professional Factor Score and Component Items

Table 1: Institutional and National Professional Factor Scores

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Campus Professionals' Perceptions of Students' Growth on the Dimensions	2.95	0.45	4.14	0.64
Striving For Excellence				
Overall Climate for Excellence	3.11	0.60	3.75	0.95
Communicating Expectations about Excellence	2.50	1.04	4.02	0.95
Professional Role in Supporting Excellence	3.31	0.92	4.42	0.72
Cultivating Academic Integrity				
General Climate for Academic Integrity	2.94	0.73	3.92	0.77
Faculty Roles in Academic Integrity	3.18	0.82	4.32	0.72
Contributing to a Larger Community				
General Climate for Contributing to a Larger Community	3.24	0.82	4.27	0.75
Advocating for Contributing to a Larger Community	2.35	0.72	3.84	0.91
Professional Roles in Encouraging Contributing to a Larger Community	3.15	0.78	3.03	1.07
Taking Seriously the Perspectives of Others				
General Climate for Perspective Taking	3.25	0.76	4.00	0.83
Advocating for Perspective Taking	3.01	0.73	3.89	0.80
Refining Ethical and Moral Reasoning and Action				
General Climate for Ethical and Moral Reasoning	3.09	0.95	3.94	0.83
Sources of Support for Ethical and Moral Reasoning	2.83	0.94	3.90	0.90
Professional Roles in Developing Ethical and Moral Reasoning	3.01	0.64	3.95	0.67

Table 2: Campus Professionals' Perceptions of Students' Growth on the Dimensions

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Campus professionals' perceptions of students' growth on the dimensions	**2.95**	**0.45**	**4.14**	**0.64**
Students usually have an increased capacity for ethical and moral reasoning at graduation than they had at the beginning of college	2.50	1.05	3.50	1.50
Students usually have an expanded awareness of the importance of being involved in the community and contributing to the greater good at the end of their time on campus than they had at the beginning of college	2.14	1.35	3.50	1.50
Students here develop an increased ability to gather and thoughtfully use evidence to support their ideas during their studies on campus	3.86	1.68	3.50	1.50
During the time students are here, they develop an increased ability to understand evidence, analysis, and the perspectives of others even when they disagree	3.13	1.64	3.50	1.50
Students usually have an increased capacity to learn from diverse perspectives at graduation than they had at the beginning of college	3.67	1.51	3.50	1.50
Students usually have a better understanding of academic integrity when they graduate than they demonstrated at the beginning of college	2.33	1.51	3.50	1.50
Students have a stronger work ethic at the end of their studies here	3.00	1.29	3.50	1.50

Striving for Excellence

Table 3: Striving for Excellence

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree	No Basis for Judgment	Institutional		National	
								Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Helping students to develop a strong work ethic is a major focus of this campus	7	2 29%	1 14%	0 0%	2 29%	2 29%	1	**3.14**	**1.77**	3.90	1.02
Helping students to develop a strong work ethic should be a major focus of this campus	7	0 0%	2 29%	2 29%	1 14%	2 29%	1	**3.43**	**1.27**	3.50	1.50
The characteristics of a strong work ethic are frequently emphasized and discussed in this campus community	6	2 33%	2 33%	0 0%	1 17%	1 17%	2	**2.50**	**1.64**	3.61	1.14
This campus makes clear connections between having a strong work ethic and success in college	8	0 0%	1 12%	1 12%	4 50%	2 25%	0	**3.88**	**0.99**	3.75	1.11
This campus makes clear connections between having a strong work ethic and success after college	6	0 0%	2 33%	0 0%	3 50%	1 17%	2	**3.50**	**1.22**	3.77	1.09
In my professional role at this institution, I help motivate students to become more self-disciplined, accountable, and responsible in their work	8	0 0%	0 0%	5 62%	2 25%	1 12%	0	**3.50**	**0.76**	4.55	0.72
This campus community has high expectations for students in terms of their personal work ethic in non-academic areas	7	4 57%	0 0%	0 0%	3 43%	0 0%	1	**2.29**	**1.60**	3.74	1.12

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree.

Research Institute for Studies in Education | Iowa State University

Table 4: Striving for Excellence cont.

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree	No Basis for Judgment	Institutional		National	
								Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Students here typically have developed a strong work ethic prior to coming to college	6	1 17%	1 17%	1 17%	0 0%	3 50%	2	3.50	1.76	3.50	1.50
Students have a stronger work ethic at the end of their studies here	7	1 14%	1 14%	3 43%	1 14%	1 14%	1	3.00	1.29	3.50	1.50
My professional role at this institution helps students to further develop their work ethic	7	1 14%	1 14%	2 29%	2 29%	1 14%	1	3.14	1.35	4.29	0.87
Students feel it is important to develop a strong work ethic in their academic activities	7	1 14%	0 0%	2 29%	2 29%	2 29%	1	3.57	1.40	3.50	1.50
Students feel it is important to develop a strong work ethic in their non-academic involvements	6	0 0%	3 50%	2 33%	1 17%	0 0%	2	2.67	0.82	3.50	1.50

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree.

Table 5: Striving for Excellence cont.

How often do the following groups communicate high expectations for students in terms of their academic work?

	N	Almost Never	Not Very Often	Occasionally	Often	Almost Always	No Basis for Judgment	**Institutional**		National	
								Mean	**SD**	Mean	SD
Faculty members	8	3 38%	2 25%	1 12%	1 12%	1 12%	0	**2.38**	**1.51**	4.38	0.79
Senior administrators	6	1 17%	2 33%	0 0%	2 33%	1 17%	2	**3.00**	**1.55**	3.77	1.36
Student affairs professionals	8	4 50%	1 12%	0 0%	2 25%	1 12%	0	**2.38**	**1.69**	3.91	1.52
Students	4	1 25%	2 50%	1 25%	0 0%	0 0%	4	**2.00**	**0.82**	3.50	1.50

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Almost Never to (5) Almost Always.

Table 6: Overall Climate for Excellence

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Overall climate for excellence	**3.11**	**0.60**	**3.75**	**0.95**
Helping students develop a strong work ethic **is** a major focus of this campus	3.14	1.77	3.90	1.02
The characteristics of a strong work ethic are frequently emphasized and discussed in this campus community	2.50	1.64	3.61	1.14
This campus makes clear connections between having a strong work ethic and success in college	3.88	0.99	3.75	1.11
This campus makes clear connections between having a strong work ethic and success after college	3.50	1.22	3.77	1.09
This campus community has high expectations for students in terms of their personal work ethic in non-academic areas	2.29	1.60	3.74	1.12

Table 7: Communicating Expectations about Excellence

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Communicating expectations about excellence	**2.50**	**1.04**	**4.02**	**0.95**
How often to **senior administrators** communicate high expectations for students in terms of their academic work?	3.00	1.55	3.77	1.36
How often do **faculty members** communicate high expectations for students in terms of their academic work?	2.38	1.51	4.38	0.79
How often do **student affairs professionals** communicate high expectations for students in terms of their academic work?	2.38	1.69	3.91	1.52

Table 8: Professional Role in Supporting Excellence

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Professional role in supporting excellence	**3.31**	**0.92**	**4.42**	**0.72**
In my professional role at this institution, I help motivate students to become more self-disciplined, accountable, and responsible in their work	3.50	0.76	4.55	0.72
My professional role at this institution helps students to further develop their work ethic	3.14	1.35	4.29	0.87

Cultivating Academic Integrity

Table 9: Cultivating Academic Integrity

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree	No Basis for Judgment	Institutional		National	
								Mean	**SD**	Mean	SD
Helping students develop a strong sense of academic integrity is a major focus of this institution	6	2 33%	1 17%	1 17%	1 17%	1 17%	2	**2.67**	**1.63**	4.23	0.96
Helping students develop a strong sense of academic integrity should be a major focus of this campus	7	2 29%	1 14%	0 0%	3 43%	1 14%	1	**3.00**	**1.63**	3.50	1.50
Students at this institution are academically honest	8	1 12%	1 12%	2 25%	1 12%	3 38%	0	**3.50**	**1.51**	3.78	0.96
Students at this institution conduct themselves with respect for others	6	1 17%	1 17%	1 17%	2 33%	1 17%	2	**3.17**	**1.47**	4.00	0.88
Faculty at this institution understand the campus academic honesty policies	8	1 12%	1 12%	4 50%	1 12%	1 12%	0	**3.00**	**1.20**	4.32	0.98
Faculty at this institution support the campus academic honesty policies	7	2 29%	0 0%	1 14%	2 29%	2 29%	1	**3.29**	**1.70**	4.42	0.89
The campus academic honesty policies help stop cheating	5	2 40%	1 20%	1 20%	1 20%	0 0%	3	**2.20**	**1.30**	3.69	1.18
Students on this campus typically come to college with a well-developed understanding of academic integrity	8	0 0%	0 0%	3 38%	1 12%	4 50%	0	**4.13**	**0.99**	3.50	1.50
Students usually have a better understanding of academic integrity when they graduate than they demonstrated at the beginning of college	6	3 50%	0 0%	1 17%	2 33%	0 0%	2	**2.33**	**1.51**	3.50	1.50

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree.

Table 10: Cultivating Academic Integrity cont.

How often do the following occur at this campus?

	N	Almost Never	Not Very Often	Occasionally	Often	Almost Always	No Basis for Judgment	Institutional		National	
								Mean	**SD**	Mean	SD
Faculty reinforce the campus academic honest policies	7	0 0%	2 29%	0 0%	3 43%	2 29%	1	**3.71**	**1.25**	4.07	1.12
Formal course syllabi define academic dishonesty (plagiarism, improper citation of Internet sources, buying papers from others, cheating on assignments or tests, etc.)	7	1 14%	2 29%	3 43%	1 14%	0 0%	1	**2.57**	**0.98**	4.48	1.03
I have had meaningful discussions about academic integrity with students	7	2 29%	1 14%	1 14%	0 0%	3 43%	1	**3.14**	**1.86**	3.50	1.50

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Almost Never to (5) Almost Always.

Table 11: General Climate for Academic Integrity

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General climate for academic integrity	**2.94**	**0.73**	**3.92**	**0.77**
Students at this institution are academically honest	3.50	1.51	3.78	0.96
Students at this institution conduct themselves with respect for others	3.17	1.47	4.00	0.88
The campus academic honesty policies help stop cheating	2.20	1.30	3.69	1.18
Helping students develop a strong sense of academic integrity is a major focus of this institution	2.67	1.63	4.23	0.96

Table 12: Faculty Roles in Academic Integrity

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Faculty roles in academic integrity	**3.18**	**0.82**	**4.32**	**0.72**
Faculty at this institution understand the campus academic honesty policies	3.00	1.20	4.32	0.98
Faculty at this institution support the campus academic honesty policies	3.29	1.70	4.42	0.89
Faculty reinforce the campus academic honesty policies	3.71	1.25	4.07	1.12
Formal course syllabi define academic dishonesty (plagiarism, improper citation of Internet sources, buying papers from others, cheating on assignments or tests, etc.)	2.57	0.98	4.48	1.03

Contributing to a Larger Community

Table 13: Contributing to a Larger Community

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree	No Basis for Judgment	Institutional Mean	SD	National Mean	SD
The importance of contributing to a larger community and the greater good is a major focus of this institution	5	2 40%	0 0%	1 20%	0 0%	2 40%	3	**3.00**	**2.00**	4.28	1.07
The importance of contributing to a larger community and the greater good **should be** a major focus of this institution	7	1 14%	0 0%	1 14%	4 57%	1 14%	1	**3.57**	**1.27**	4.72	0.64
Contributing to a larger community and the greater good is a responsibility that this campus values and promotes	6	2 33%	2 33%	0 0%	0 0%	2 33%	2	**2.67**	**1.86**	4.36	1.00
This campus actively promotes awareness of U.S. social, political, and economic issues	6	0 0%	2 33%	1 17%	3 50%	0 0%	2	**3.17**	**0.98**	3.50	1.50
This campus actively promotes awareness of global social, political, and economic issues	4	0 0%	1 25%	0 0%	2 50%	1 25%	4	**3.75**	**1.26**	3.50	1.50

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree.

Table 14: Contributing to a Larger Community cont.

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree	No Basis for Judgment	Institutional		National	
								Mean	**SD**	Mean	SD
Students on this campus are aware of the importance of being involved in the community and contributing to the greater good prior to coming to college	8	1 12%	2 25%	1 12%	2 25%	2 25%	0	**3.25**	**1.49**	3.73	1.08
Students usually have an expanded awareness of the importance of being involved in the community and contributing to the greater good at the end of their time on campus than they had at the beginning of college	7	3 43%	2 29%	0 0%	2 29%	0 0%	1	**2.14**	**1.35**	3.50	1.50
Students usually have learned the skills necessary to effectively change society for the butter by the end of their time on campus compared to the beginning of college	6	2 33%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	4 67%	2	**3.67**	**2.07**	3.50	1.50
Students usually have deepened their commitment to contribute to the greater good by the end of their time on campus compared to the beginning of college	6	2 33%	1 17%	0 0%	2 33%	1 17%	2	**2.83**	**1.72**	3.50	1.50

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree.

Table 15: Contributing to a Larger Community cont.

How often do the following groups publicly advocate the need for students to become active and involved citizens?

	N	Almost Never	Not Very Often	Occasionally	Often	Almost Always	Institutional		National	
							Mean	**SD**	Mean	SD
Faculty members	6	2 33%	0 0%	1 17%	1 17%	2 33%	**3.17**	**1.83**	3.95	1.09
Senior administrators	8	2 25%	4 50%	0 0%	2 25%	0 0%	**2.25**	**1.16**	3.67	1.45
Student affairs professionals	6	3 50%	1 17%	1 17%	1 17%	0 0%	**2.00**	**1.26**	4.02	1.23
Students	8	3 38%	2 25%	2 25%	1 12%	0 0%	**2.13**	**1.13**	3.72	0.97

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Almost Never to (5) Almost Always.

Table 16: Contributing to a Larger Community cont.

Within the past three years, how often have you done the following?

	N	Never	Not Very Often	Occasionally	Often	Almost Always	Institutional		National	
							Mean	**SD**	Mean	SD
Overseen community-based projects that were officially connected to my courses or programs	8	2 25%	1 12%	3 38%	1 12%	1 12%	**2.75**	**1.39**	2.42	1.72
Included materials on global, political, and economic issues in my courses or programs	8	1 12%	2 25%	1 12%	1 12%	3 38%	**3.38**	**1.60**	3.22	1.47
Had meaningful discussions with students about the need to contribute to the greater good	8	0 0%	3 38%	2 25%	1 12%	2 25%	**3.25**	**1.28**	3.35	1.21
Encouraged students to participate in community-based projects that were not connected to courses or programming	8	1 12%	0 0%	3 38%	2 25%	2 25%	**3.50**	**1.31**	3.11	1.24
Participated in community-based projects that were not connected to my courses or programming	8	2 25%	1 12%	3 38%	0 0%	2 25%	**2.88**	**1.55**	3.03	1.42

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Never to (5) Almost Always.

Table 17: General Climate for Contributing to a Larger Community

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General climate for contributing to a larger community	**3.24**	**0.82**	**4.27**	**0.75**
The importance of contributing to a larger community and the greater good is a major focus of this institution	3.00	2.00	4.28	1.07
The importance of contributing to a larger community and the greater good **should be** a major focus of this institution	3.57	1.27	4.72	0.64
Contributing to a larger community and the greater good is a responsibility that this campus values and promotes	2.67	1.86	4.36	1.00
Students on this campus are aware of the importance of being involved in the community and contributing to the greater good prior to coming to college	3.25	1.49	3.73	1.08

Table 18: Advocating for Contributing to a Larger Community

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Advocating for contributing to a larger community	**2.35**	**0.72**	**3.84**	**0.91**
How often do **senior administrators** publicly advocate the need for students to become active and involved citizens?	2.25	1.16	3.67	1.45
How often to **faculty members** publicly advocate the need for students to become active and involved citizens?	3.17	1.83	3.95	1.09
How often do **student affairs professionals** publicly advocate the need for students to become active and involved citizens?	2.00	1.26	4.02	1.23
How often do **students** publicly advocate the need for students to become active and involved citizens?	2.13	1.13	3.72	0.97

Table 19: Professional Roles in Encouraging Contributing to a Larger Community

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Professional roles in encouraging contributing to a larger community	**3.15**	**0.78**	**3.03**	**1.07**
Within the past three years, how often have you overseen community-based projects that **were** officially connected to my courses or programs?	2.75	1.39	2.42	1.72
Within the past three years, how often have you included materials on global, political, and economic issues in my courses or programs?	3.38	1.60	3.22	1.47
Within the past three years, how often have you participated in community-based projects that **were not** connected to my courses or programming?	2.88	1.55	3.03	1.42
Within the past three years, how often have you had meaningful discussions with students about the need to contribute to the greater good?	3.25	1.28	3.35	1.21
Within the past three years, how often have you encouraged students to participate in community-based projects that were not connected to courses or programming?	3.50	1.31	3.11	1.24

Taking Seriously the Perspectives of Others

Table 20: Taking Seriously the Perspectives of Others

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree	No Basis for Judgment	**Institutional**		National	
								Mean	**SD**	Mean	SD
Helping students recognize the importance of taking seriously the perspectives of others is a major focus of this campus	6	0 0%	0 0%	1 17%	1 17%	4 0%	2	**4.50**	**0.84**	4.12	1.07
Helping students recognize the importance of taking seriously the perspectives of others should be a major focus of this campus	8	2 25%	0 0%	3 38%	2 25%	1 12%	0	**3.00**	**1.41**	3.50	1.50
This campus helps students understand the connection between appreciating various opinions and perspectives and being a well-informed citizen	7	3 43%	0 0%	1 14%	1 14%	2 29%	1	**2.86**	**1.86**	4.06	0.98
It is safe to hold unpopular positions on this campus	7	2 29%	0 0%	2 29%	2 29%	1 14%	1	**3.00**	**1.53**	3.39	1.37
Faculty at this institution teach about the importance of considering diverse intellectual viewpoints	7	0 0%	1 14%	3 43%	2 29%	1 14%	1	**3.43**	**0.98**	4.17	0.98
Faculty at this institution help students think through new and challenging ideas or perspectives	8	1 12%	1 12%	4 50%	2 25%	0 0%	0	**2.88**	**0.99**	4.32	1.17

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree.

Table 21: Taking Seriously the Perspectives of Others cont.

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree	No Basis for Judgment	Institutional		National	
								Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Students at this institution are respectful of one another when discussing controversial issues or perspectives	7	0 0%	1 14%	1 14%	2 29%	3 43%	1	**4.00**	**1.15**	3.89	0.97
This campus has high expectations for students in terms of their ability to take seriously the perspectives of others, especially those with whom they disagree	8	1 12%	2 25%	3 38%	2 25%	0 0%	0	**2.75**	**1.04**	4.04	1.20
Students here are respectful of diverse perspectives when they first come to college	6	1 17%	0 0%	1 17%	3 50%	1 17%	2	**3.50**	**1.38**	3.50	1.50
Students usually have an increased capacity to learn from diverse perspectives at graduation than they had at the beginning of college	6	1 17%	0 0%	1 17%	2 33%	2 33%	2	**3.67**	**1.51**	3.50	1.50
Students here develop an increased ability to gather and thoughtfully use evidence to support their ideas during their studies on campus	7	1 14%	1 14%	0 0%	1 14%	4 57%	1	**3.86**	**1.68**	3.50	1.50
During the time the students are here, they develop an increased ability to understand evidence, analysis, and the perspectives of others even when they disagree	8	2 25%	1 12%	1 12%	2 25%	2 25%	0	**3.13**	**1.64**	3.50	1.50

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree.

Table 22: Taking Seriously the Perspectives of Others cont.

	N	Almost Never	Not Very Often	Occasionally	Often	Almost Always	No Basis for Judgment	Institutional		National	
								Mean	**SD**	Mean	SD
Classes help students explore diverse perspectives, cultures, and world views	7	2 29%	3 43%	0 0%	0 0%	2 29%	1	**2.57**	**1.72**	3.50	1.50
Out-of-class activities help students explore diverse perspectives, cultures, and world views	7	2 29%	2 29%	1 14%	1 14%	1 14%	1	**2.57**	**1.51**	3.93	0.96
Classes encourage students to research ideas and explore controversial issues with various perspectives using evidence-based claims	8	1 12%	2 25%	0 0%	2 25%	3 38%	0	**3.50**	**1.60**	3.89	0.93

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Almost Never to (5) Almost Always.

Table 23: Taking Seriously the Perspectives of Others cont.
How often do the following groups publicly advocate the need for students to respect perspectives different from their own?

	N	Almost Never	Not Very Often	Occasionally	Often	Almost Always	No Basis for Judgment	Institutional Mean	SD	National Mean	SD
Faculty members	7	2 29%	1 14%	2 29%	1 14%	1 14%	1	**2.71**	**1.50**	4.08	1.02
Senior administrators	5	0 0%	1 60%	3 60%	0 0%	1 20%	3	**3.20**	**1.10**	3.71	1.28
Student affairs professionals	6	2 33%	0 0%	0 0%	2 33%	2 33%	2	**3.33**	**1.86**	4.07	1.13
Students	6	2 33%	1 17%	2 33%	0 0%	1 17%	2	**2.50**	**1.52**	3.69	1.18

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Almost Never to (5) Almost Always.

Table 24: General Climate for Perspective Taking

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General climate for perspective taking	**3.25**	**0.76**	**4.00**	**0.83**
Helping students recognize the importance of taking seriously the perspectives of others **is** a major focus of this campus	4.50	0.84	4.12	1.07
This campus helps students understand the connection between appreciating various opinions and perspectives and being a well-informed citizen	2.86	1.86	4.06	0.98
It is safe to hold unpopular positions on this campus	3.00	1.53	3.39	1.37
Faculty at this institution teach about the importance of considering diverse intellectual viewpoints	3.43	0.98	4.17	0.98
Faculty at this institution help students think through new and challenging ideas or perspectives	2.88	0.99	4.32	1.17
Students at this institution are respectful of one another when discussing controversial issues or perspectives	4.00	1.15	3.89	0.97
This campus has high expectations for students in terms of their ability to take seriously the perspectives of others, especially those with whom they disagree	2.75	1.04	4.04	1.20

Table 25: Advocating for Perspective Taking

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Advocating for perspective taking	**3.01**	**0.73**	**3.89**	**0.80**
Out-of-class activities help students explore diverse perspectives, cultures, and world views	2.57	1.51	3.93	0.96
How often do **senior administrators** publicly advocate the need for students to respect perspectives different from their own?	3.20	1.10	3.71	1.28
How often do **faculty members** publicly advocate the need for students to respect perspectives different from their own?	2.71	1.50	4.08	1.02
How often do **student affairs professionals** publicly advocate the need for students to respect perspectives different from their own?	3.33	1.86	4.07	1.13
How often do **students** publicly advocate the need for students to respect perspectives different from their own?	2.50	1.52	3.69	1.18
Classes encourage students to research ideas and explore controversial issues with various perspectives using evidence-based claims	3.50	1.60	3.89	0.93

Refining Ethical and Moral Reasoning and Action

Table 26: Refining Ethical and Moral Reasoning and Action

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree	No Basis for Judgment	Institutional		National	
								Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Helping students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning is a major focus of this campus	7	1 14%	0 0%	2 29%	2 29%	2 29%	1	**3.57**	**1.40**	3.89	1.03
Helping students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning **should be** a major focus of this campus	7	2 29%	1 14%	2 29%	1 14%	1 14%	1	**2.71**	**1.50**	4.63	0.69
This campus helps students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning, including the ability to express and act upon personal values responsibly	6	3 50%	1 17%	1 17%	0 0%	1 17%	2	**2.17**	**1.60**	3.94	0.93
The importance of developing a personal sense of ethical and moral reasoning is frequently communicated to students	8	3 38%	2 25%	0 0%	2 25%	1 12%	0	**2.50**	**1.60**	3.79	1.07

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree.

Table 27: Refining Ethical and Moral Reasoning and Action cont.

Students feel they can go to the following groups to discuss questions or concerns they have about their own ethical and moral thinking and the challenges they face.

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree	No Basis for Judgment	Institutional		National	
								Mean	**SD**	Mean	SD
Faculty members	8	2 25%	1 12%	4 50%	0 0%	1 12%	0	**2.63**	**1.30**	4.12	1.04
Senior administrators	6	1 17%	1 17%	1 17%	0 0%	3 50%	2	**3.50**	**1.76**	3.24	1.70
Student affairs professionals	8	2 25%	1 12%	1 12%	2 25%	2 25%	0	**3.13**	**1.64**	4.13	1.11
Students	6	3 50%	0 0%	2 33%	0 0%	1 17%	2	**2.33**	**1.63**	4.11	1.53

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree.

Table 28: Refining Ethical and Moral Reasoning and Action cont.

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree	No Basis for Judgment	Institutional		National	
								Mean	**SD**	Mean	SD
Students have a well-developed capacity for moral and ethical reasoning when they first come to college	7	1 14%	1 14%	3 43%	2 29%	0 0%	1	**2.86**	**1.07**	3.50	1.50
Students usually have an increased capacity for ethical and moral reasoning at graduation than they had at the beginning of college	6	1 17%	2 33%	2 33%	1 17%	0 0%	2	**2.50**	**1.05**	3.50	1.50
This campus provides opportunities for students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning in their academic work	6	0 0%	1 17%	0 0%	1 17%	4 67%	2	**4.33**	**1.21**	4.10	0.89
This campus provides opportunities for students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning in their personal life	6	0 0%	3 50%	0 0%	2 33%	1 17%	2	**3.17**	**1.33**	3.97	0.97

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree.

Table 29: Refining Ethical and Moral Reasoning and Action cont.

How often do the following occur at this campus?

	N	Almost Never	Not Very Often	Occasionally	Often	Almost Always	No Basis for Judgment	Institutional		National	
								Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Class activities, and the curriculum in general, provide opportunity for students to further develop their ethical and moral reasoning	7	1 14%	2 29%	2 29%	0 0%	2 29%	1	**3.00**	**1.53**	3.66	1.01
There are opportunities outside the classroom for students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning	8	3 38%	1 12%	2 25%	2 25%	0 0%	0	**2.38**	**1.30**	3.75	0.95
In my professional role, I encourage students to discuss the ethical aspects of the subject matter they are studying	7	0 0%	0 0%	2 29%	2 29%	3 43%	1	**4.14**	**0.90**	3.76	1.37

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.
Scale: (1) Almost Never to (5) Almost Always.

Table 30: General Climate for Ethical and Moral Reasoning

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
General climate for ethical and moral reasoning	**3.09**	**0.95**	**3.94**	**0.83**
Helping students develop their ethical and moral reasoning **is** a major focus of this campus	3.57	1.40	3.89	1.03
This campus helps students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning, including the ability to express and act upon personal values responsibly	2.17	1.60	3.94	0.93
The importance of developing a personal sense of ethical and moral reasoning is frequently communicated to students	2.50	1.60	3.79	1.07
This campus provides opportunities for students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning in their **personal life**	3.17	1.33	3.97	0.97
This campus provides opportunities for students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning in their **academic work**	4.33	1.21	4.10	0.89

Table 31: Sources of Support for Ethical and Moral Reasoning

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Sources of support for ethical and moral reasoning	**2.83**	**0.94**	**3.90**	**0.90**
Students feel they can go to **senior administrators** to discuss questions or concerns they have about their own ethical and moral thinking and the challenges they face	3.50	1.76	3.24	1.70
Students feel they can go to **faculty members** to discuss questions or concerns they have about their own ethical and moral thinking and the challenges they face	2.63	1.30	4.12	1.04
Students feel they can go to **student affairs professionals** to discuss questions or concerns they have about their own ethical and moral thinking and the challenges they face	3.13	1.64	4.13	1.11
Students feel they can go to **students** to discuss questions or concerns they have about their own ethical and moral thinking and the challenges they face	2.33	1.63	4.11	1.53

Table 32: Professional Roles in Developing Ethical and Moral Reasoning

	Institutional		National	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Professional roles in developing ethical and moral reasoning	**3.01**	**0.64**	**3.95**	**0.67**
Helping students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning **should be** a major focus of this campus	2.71	1.50	4.63	0.69
Class activities, and the curriculum in general, provide opportunity for students to further develop their ethical and moral reasoning	3.00	1.53	3.66	1.01
There are opportunities outside the classroom for students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning	2.38	1.30	3.75	0.95
In my professional role, I encourage students to discuss the ethical aspects of the subject matter they are studying	4.14	0.90	3.76	1.37

Open-Ended Responses

About the PSRI and AAC&U

The Personal and Social Responsibility Inventory (PSRI): An Institutional Climate Measure is a campus climate survey developed originally as part of an initiative called Core Commitments: Educating Students for Personal and Social Responsibility. Sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities and directed by Caryn McTighe Musil, Core Commitments was supported by a grant from the John Templeton Foundation. The initial inventory was developed in 2006 by L. Lee Knefelkamp, Teachers Colleges, Columbia University, who consulted with Richard Hersh, Council for Aid to Education, and drew on the research assistance of Lauren Ruff. The initiation inventory was then refined in cooperation with Eric L. Dey and associates at the University of Michigan's Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education and refined after Dey's death by Robert D. Reason, at Iowa State University.

AAC&U is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal education. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises 1,250 member institutions -- including accredited public and private colleges and universities of every type and size.