

# Please, Not Another Climate Survey: Lessons learned from a diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility focus group study

Authors: Jen-chien Yu, George Gottschalk, Lauren Phegley, JJ Pionke

## Introduction

This paper presents a study that utilized focus groups for climate assessment at the University Library of University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (U. of I.) during spring and summer of 2022. Semi-structured focus groups were conducted either in-person or via Zoom. Participants were put into groups based on their employment categories and were invited to share their lived experiences and perceptions with regards to diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility. Focus group findings were presented in a final report and shared with the library. In the Practical Implications & Value section, the authors reflect the lesson learned from an assessment perspective with the hope that libraries can consider qualitative approaches for climate assessment.

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign is a public land-grant university situated in two adjacent cities, Urbana and Champaign in Illinois. The University Library is a network of more than twenty physical and virtual libraries and services. With more than fifteen million physical and electronic volumes, and millions of users visiting library spaces, and utilizing services and electronic resources, the library is considered to be one of the top academic research libraries in the US. Based on the most recent institutional data published in fall 2024, the library employs approximately three hundred and sixty-five employees. The largest employment category employed by the library is Civil Service/Civil Service professional exempt staff (41 percent)<sup>1</sup>, followed by library faculty (21 percent)<sup>2</sup> and graduate pre-professional assistants (21 percent), and the rest are academic professional staff (16 percent)<sup>3</sup>. The library also employs hundreds of hourly workers (0 percent full time equivalent jobs that are paid on an hourly basis) each year.

## Climate Assessments

Climate assessments in higher education focus on understanding and exploring climate and culture in the workplace and the learning environment. It began in the late 1950s with instruments such as the College Characteristics Index by Pace and Stern (1958)<sup>4</sup>. Early climate assessments in higher education focused on measuring institutional characteristics, and students were the target population.

The term "climate" was introduced in 1990 to characterize institutional environments including human attitudes and behavioral factors. Peterson and Spencer<sup>5</sup> provided a definition of "climate" from an institutional researcher's perspective as "the current common patterns of important dimensions of organizational life or its members' perceptions of and attitudes toward those dimensions." They suggested three broad categories of climate: *objective climate*, which are patterns of behaviors or activities in an institution that can be observed by institutional researchers directly and objectively; *perceived climate*, which are participants' perceptions of how an organization actually functions or should function; and *psychological or felt climate*, which are how participants feel about an organization and their work. Peterson and Spencer also address that both quantitative and qualitative methods can be used to assess organizational climate. However, they believe qualitative methods captures "distinctiveness" and "significant insight on new emergent issues and organizational phenomena" while quantitative methods "provide information that can be statistically compared and contrasted."

Lee et al. (2024)<sup>6</sup> published a systematic review of climate assessments in higher education institutions conducted from 2016 to 2023. The study found that the most frequently included content in the climate assessments was institutional support for and commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, and the sense of belonging. Lee et al. cited the 2016 presidential election and the significantly hostile campus climate afterwards, as well as the impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic as the reason for focusing their research during this eight-year period. They found the administration of climate assessment peaked during 2021.

## Climate Assessments at the University and the University Library

Like many higher education institutions, the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (U. of I.) and the University Library face challenges related to diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA) and have sought climate assessments to collect data for improvement. U. of I. has conducted a Diversity Survey for many years. In 2023, the university administered a new instrument for an all campus climate survey<sup>7</sup>. In addition to university-wide climate surveys, the University Library also conducted locally developed employee surveys as well as ClimateQUAL<sup>®8</sup> in 2013.

During spring to summer of 2020, the COVID-19 Pandemic and movement for justice following the deaths of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor brought systematic issues and the need to act to the forefront. In late fall 2020, the library charged a DEIA Task Force<sup>9</sup>. The two-year task force to address a set of goals for advancing DEIA in the library. The four authors of this paper were on the task force and worked on specific goals with regards to climate assessment. Three of the four authors have since left the university and hold professional positions elsewhere. While this paper presents a study conducted as part of the task force work, the discussions represent the authors' own viewpoints and not of the U. of I. library or current employers.

## Purpose & Goals

The primary emphasis of this paper is on the use of focus groups as a climate assessment strategy for the purpose of gathering data to inform recommended interventions to improve employee experiences of diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA) within a library workplace. The focus groups conducted were part of a climate assessment that aligned with a two-year DEIA Task Force. The year one goal was to "identify a method(s) to measure the impact of the Task Force."<sup>10</sup> The authors of the present paper worked on this goal by developing a climate survey to collect baseline data (the Base Survey). The same survey deployed at the end of the task force was used as a means of comparison.

For the second year of the task force, one of the task force goals was to "review and recommend practices and processes that help the Library improve DEIA efforts."<sup>11</sup> We opted to use focus groups to gather data for this purpose. The choice of focus groups served the following goals.

## Idea Generation

Because the first and foremost goal of this assessment was to surface ideas from the employee population, focus groups were chosen as they allowed for rich qualitative data within the context of a forum that could prompt idea exchange. Unlike surveys, focus groups allow participants flexibility to surface data and themes beyond the constraints of the question. As well, participants can benefit from hearing others as they seek a means to express an idea that may be emergent in their minds and are able to draw from others' comments to structure their idea into verbal expression.

## Employment Category Inclusion

In addition to “inclusion” being embedded within the name of the task force itself, the Base Survey data surfaced distinctions between employment categories that reflected an area of need to address as part of the task force’s overarching mandates. This was not a surprising finding. This did, however, provide a data-informed impetus to organize the focus groups in a manner that would be participatory and would allow for a sense of safety, well-being and openness. In short, because of the Base Survey data, it was clear that the focus groups would have to be planned to address perceptions of power differentials and related concerns between different employee classifications. For that reason, creating separate focus group options for each employment category became a critical secondary goal of the focus group design, as well as for effective data gathering.

## Level-setting

At the outset, members of the task force acknowledged that each person may have a general sense of their own understanding of DEIA and what those terms mean, both on their own and operating as a collective set of principles. In fact, one of the task force goals within its charge was to operationalize definitions for “diversity,” “equity,” “inclusion,” and “accessibility” for the University Library. While this work is needed at an organizational level to allow for operationalized discussions and actions, we hypothesized that the focus group would allow for a means to achieve a more organic understanding of beliefs about DEIA and what that means to employees’ lived experiences. This goal was to identify convergences and divergences of employee beliefs about what DEIA is and what it means, specifically within the context of the library workplace.

## Action Recommendations

The focus group questions were structured such that initial ideation around level-setting would inform this part of the discussion within any given session. Participants would be encouraged to share their ideas for actionable changes that the library might be able to undertake. This was also a fundamental goal because the charge of the task force was to enact improvement. This was also the goal and question area within which data emerged that could speak to a more concrete identification of what “improvement” meant to the target population (employment categories that the focus group participants represent).

## Prioritization

The final goal of the focus groups was for the participants to share the one change that most mattered to them and to identify what was most important to them. This goal sought to allow for prioritization across emergent themes within the data. It also served as a means to encourage participants to drive the ability to identify and code for themes. While this is not a unique focus group protocol or strategy, it is worth highlighting for the purposes of this paper discussion. The reason this is highlighted is because this goal and technique aligns with the DEIA impetus for the focus groups. It served as a means of participant empowerment to drive thematic coding. We wanted to ensure that the participants had shared ownership of thematic coding of the data and were not just general human subjects being subjected to any researcher’s imposed biases. Qualitative data necessarily impels researchers to be diligent in their ethical self-monitoring. The added consideration in this study is that the focus group facilitators were also part of the population. As such, a means of bias-checking was all the more imperative in this study.

## Design & Methodology

We decided to conduct focus groups to involve the library employees in generating new ideas for improving DEIA and collect ideas for actionable change (see Appendix A: Focus Group Questions). A review of the literature found that often climate assessment in library workplaces takes the form of mixed methods or quantitative surveys. While this methodology is an important tool, we wanted to have employees engage with one another to brainstorm ways that DEIA could be improved.

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the U. of I. approved the focus group research proposal (Exempt ii) in March 2022. The intention behind applying for IRB approval was to ensure the protection of human subjects, especially when discussing a topic that can evoke strong feelings about their workplace, while in their workplace. After the study was completed, the IRB determined it to be non-human subjects research during a review as part of its transition to a new online system. IRB stated that the intention of this project was to improve the working environment of the Library through DEIA initiatives and does not require IRB oversight.

The focus groups were conducted by six facilitators. Four facilitators were the authors of this paper and two were members of the DEIA Task Force. All facilitators completed human subject training. Facilitators obtained oral consent from participants before conducting the focus group. Recruitment was undertaken by putting flyers in the library employee break room and emailing invitations to the library's internal LISTSERVs.

The focus groups were designed to be 60-90 minutes in length and could include up to 8 library employees of the same employment categories. Each focus group was conducted by two facilitators, and at least one of the facilitators was from the same employment category as the focus group participants. The employment categories that were part of the focus group were: library faculty, Civil Service/Civil Service professional exempt staff, academic professional staff, and graduate student workers. "Graduate student workers" included pre-professional graduate assistants who held 25 percent to 50 percent time jobs and hourly graduate student workers with 0 percent time jobs that paid on an hourly basis. We considered including undergraduate student workers but did not pursue this direction because the focus group study took place during spring and summer of 2022, and very few undergraduate students work at the library during summer.

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 Pandemic, the focus groups were held either in person in a large conference room or via Zoom. This depended on the desires of the participants, as it would be the antithesis of our efforts to improve inclusion if it were limited to in-person attendees only. Virtual focus groups were recorded through Zoom, but only the audio recordings were kept and used for the study. The in-person focus groups only had audio recorded. All recordings were securely transferred to a transcription service that provided us with cleaned transcripts of the focus groups. The transcripts were accessible only to the authors through the institution's cloud storage software (U. of I. Box). Only de-identified materials were used for data analysis, and only the anonymized aggregated data was used to report findings.

The collected data was analyzed using deep reading and open coding. Two authors began by coding two of the focus group transcripts in order to normalize the coding structure. The coding process involved blind coding of different transcripts and then having multiple conversations that focused on what the major themes were that emerged from our individual examinations of the data. The normalized coding was then applied to all focus group transcripts.

## Findings

The study planned to enroll fifty participants in order to reach saturation. A balanced representation from the four employment categories (library faculty, Civil Service & Civil Service professional exempt employees, academic professional, and graduate student employees) was a factor in why we planned for fifty participants, which was on the high end of what qualitative research typically studies. In the end, a total of five focus group sessions (one in-person and four virtual over U. of I. Zoom) were conducted despite our recruitment efforts. A total of eighteen employees participated. Civil Service/Civil Service professional exempt staff and graduate student employees participated the most, with six and five participants respectively.

Table 1: Employment Categories of Participants

<b>Employment Category</b>	<b>Sessions</b>	<b>Participants</b>
Academic Professional	1 (Zoom)	3
Civil Service & Civil Service Professional Exempt Staff	2 (Zoom and in-person)	6
Library Faculty	1 (Zoom)	4
Graduate Student Employees	1 (Zoom)	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>18</b>

## DEIA as a Priority

When asked about personal experiences and efforts of diversity in the library, many focus group participants felt that DEIA was not a priority. Participants shared experiences of neglect or inactions when they discussed accessibility or retention at the library or university. One participant said:

“Now my main crew has been really incredibly accommodating about [my disabilities], but when I see messages... about we’re having an in person only thing and we won’t consider an online option, [that’s not ok].” - Academic Professional employee

## Visibility of DEIA

While several DEIA efforts were taking shape during the time of the focus group study, including the hiring of a DEIA Director and the creation of the two-year DEIA Task Force, DEIA was still invisible to many. When we asked the participants “When you think about diversity efforts in the Library, what comes to mind?” Several participants could only name one library faculty member who was a subject librarian for disability and accessibility, and has since left the library.

## Performative DEIA

Some participants pointed out that certain DEIA initiatives felt performative and had no real impact. One participant said:

“[W]e have a really like narrow view of what diversity means sometimes within the library system and we try to like check boxes for certain groups...” – Graduate Student Employee

## Retention

The retention issue emerged across all focus groups. A participant described it as:

"I wouldn't say that tenure is at the heart of it [barriers in the Library]. For me it's the people who are in leadership positions over units and supervisory positions and positions of influence. And I've seen it happen in the library where there was a toxic person running a major unit, and then they left and they were replaced by somebody who's awesome, and that person has to kind of rebuild the culture and bring some real change there" - Library Faculty

Another participant described how the retention affects everyone:

"...barriers between job classes and the restrictions on who can and can't do what, depending on what the title is, I think is honestly soul crushing to a lot of people, especially the divide between faculty and non-faculty. Over the years I have watched several brilliant people leave the unit that I work with the most frequently because they were not allowed to do the type of work that they wanted to do because they were [in] the wrong job category for it." - Academic Professional Employee

The study concluded with recommendations for each of the categories (diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility) that came from the focus group participants. It is worth noting that while this study focused on library employees, we found that the participants wanted to see changes that are not only for their own health and workplace safety, but also for the health and safety for their colleagues and library patrons.

## Action & Impact

Because the primary purpose of the focus groups was to generate recommendations for the DEIA Task Force to share at the conclusion of the task force, via a final report, the broadest action taken by the authors of the present paper was to generate data-informed recommendations. The most immediate impact was that these recommendations were shared with the broader library employee base at a granular level in a focus group report, as well as to inform a more condensed set of recommendations included in the broader task force final report.

The intended audience for the recommendations generated by the focus group data was the library employee population. For that reason, we chose to group the recommendations within the broad categories of "diversity," "equity," "inclusion," and "accessibility" as lists of action items. This choice of presentation was a topic of some discussion among the authors as it meant organizing the surfacing of themes into sometimes awkward lists. One example of this is under "accessibility" where we included thematic data results around facilities. Both restrooms and elevators were mentioned in more than one focus group session. The lack of all-gender restrooms was part of those data. While some might consider the lack of all-gender restrooms should be categorized as an "equity" or "inclusion" issue, in order to group the facilities related findings into one of the broader categories, we chose "accessibility" as the majority of comments centered around concerns with accessibility. We did not want to lose the thematic finding of facilities concerns. However, parsing these kinds of actionable themes into the DEIA categories meant that we had to make choices that can shift the exact configuration of the takeaways in order to impose the view through the kaleidoscope that best fit the reporting mechanism.

This also serves to highlight that there are several recommendations generated by the data that could inform action. However, those actions may take considerable time to enact and to produce observable impacts. For those reasons, the discussion below states the highlight of the findings that generated the recommendations in the focus group report. Not all actions have been taken as of fall 2024, or may not manifest in a way that is reportable as an "action" or "impact" until a longer arc of time has passed.

Without restating every recommendation, we present some of the thematic action items (or desired action items) that may better highlight the functional issues that focus group participants wished to address. Any action or impact that was a direct or tangential result of this focus group study is described as well.

## Facilities

Facilities considerations and accessibility interventions already mentioned emerged as a theme.

"... inside the stacks we do have the very small, definitely not accessible bathrooms, and we do have the more accessible ones, but I did notice they don't have...they're gender neutral, but they don't have trash cans inside the bathroom just for menstrual products, that sort of thing, and I think that would be a good option to have." - Civil Service Employee

## Training

Mandated training emerged as a theme. This included training around specific matters, such as accessibility, broader training around DEIA awareness and revisions to components of existing training. For the broader DEIA awareness, the task force had been charged with identifying a consultant to develop training. That process was completed and a five-part "DEIA Educational Workshop Series" was created. This training has not been mandated for all employees. The training sessions have been repeated, however, to create a broad reach for employees. To date, more than 100 employees have attended the workshops, though the degree to which these counts measure true impact is unclear. Efforts to assess the value of the training have not yet been conducted to determine if attendees report a change in behavior or attitude.

An additional action that was taken was to change the work orientation training for new graduate student workers. Focus group participants stated discomfort with the existing training for de-escalation and the appropriate use of 911 or request for police presence. Prior training encouraged employees to contact police for instances where any doubt or concern existed when working with individuals manifesting potentially aberrant behavior. Focus group participants expressed a desire for more nuanced training that took a more deliberate approach to contacting police before additional de-escalation steps had been attempted.

"I think that was my main complaint about even the training [de-escalation], because it was really emphasized throughout the entire time, it's like any sort of discomfort, call the cops. You know, like I'm sorry, that's the opposite of de-escalation...in one of my units we've had a lot of discussion about this, about alternatives and what does safety mean. So I'm over at [LIBRARY A]. I'm also in the [LIBRARY B]. So this is at [LIBRARY A]. But we've been talking about that a lot." - Graduate Student Employee

The orientation was revised to provide such nuance and to provide better means of assessing what constitutes behavior of concern. As well, an additional training specific to de-escalation and active shooter scenarios was removed as its own distinct session in 2022.

## Communications

Communications was another recurring theme. Some of the suggestions were specific, such as creating an inventory of DEIA-related events that occur within the library so employees could adjust work schedules to attend. It is probably resonant with anyone who has performed assessment that measuring improvement and/or impact of communications is challenging. As such, we cannot draw any conclusions about impact of the focus group assessments on communication practices within the library, whether DEIA-specific or otherwise.

## Outreach and engagement

Outreach and engagement with the larger community was also a theme within the findings. Programs of outreach and engagement existed prior to the DEIA Task Force and the focus group assessments, and those have continued. Because there were no substantial number of specific recommendations, there is not a meaningful way to distinguish between actions previously taken and those that were consequent to the focus group findings. As with many library outreach and engagement efforts, some individual programs have an assessment and others do not. However, it remains true that speaking to the actions and impacts that derived from the focus groups is nearly impossible to state with any real meaning.

## Mentoring

Mentoring was another key finding and recommendation. Much like outreach and engagement, discussions were well under way on this front before either the task force or the focus groups. The focus groups did underscore the desire by employees to see more robust mentoring options across all employment categories. Those same mentoring discussions are ongoing. Like outreach and engagement, it is not feasible for the authors to articulate the specific direct impacts the focus group findings have had on these discussions.

## HR Improvements

Working more effectively with library and university human resources was a significant finding of the data. Focus group participants identified both recruitment and annual evaluations as opportunities for intervention. Recruitment of diverse individuals continues to be a difficult area for meaningful assessment. Best practices continue to evolve, and the library and university have adapted and changed many times to incorporate best practices. One example of such practices is writing position descriptions to have fewer "required skills" and inviting candidates to speak to how they can perform in the position within the "desired skills." These kinds of adaptations to evolving practices underscore the subjectivity of recruitment practices. Even longitudinal examinations of job descriptions become thorny due to the lack of consistency in job postings. As such, as with many areas, the authors cannot meaningfully substantiate actions nor impacts taken in this area.

Another finding was a request for an ombudsperson role. While that recommendation went forward, no further action has been taken. Thus, as with many of the findings, we conveyed the findings and recommendations.

Regarding employee evaluations, a new campus system for evaluations overshadows any input the focus group findings might have. The request for more equitable evaluations has been shared with the broader library. A library-wide Performance Management Working Group consists of library HR and representatives from full-time staff (excluding library faculty) is set to work on a new performance evaluation form to use for the 2025-2026 evaluation period that will start June 2025.

Beyond these, the authors had limited organizational knowledge to develop a number of findings into actionable outcomes. Such findings are complex and involve stakeholders that are internal and external to the library. For example, focus group participants encouraged the library to make DEIA a priority by allowing more work time to do so. This would mean negotiating with collective bargaining units. The focus group participants encouraged the library to determine why minorities are uncomfortable discussing their minority identities. Focus group participants called for greater consistency across library units to address toxicity. These would require further work and consultation with other university offices. For all such findings, we were hard-pressed to identify an action. Perhaps taken holistically, the broader culture assessments every few years do have value in that sense.

### Practical Implications & Value

The authors of the present paper learned valuable lessons from the process and findings from an assessment perspective. First, we obtained human subject research approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to ensure the protection of participants' confidentiality and privacy. For past climate assessment projects conducted without an IRB approval at the library or the university, the issue of who can access the data collected could be a contentious issue. Thus, for the focus groups, the authors identified IRB review and the concomitant required training as a means to allow those interested an opportunity to participate in data-gathering with a fuller, university-authorized training in how to work with qualitative data and to protect participant confidentiality. This was a means to invite other task force members into the process while ensuring integrity of the data and protection of confidentiality. Because the focus groups sought to address DEIA, a challenging and emotionally-charged topic, emphasizing the protection of human subjects was of paramount importance.

Second, the focus groups were conducted in 2022 while indoor masking and social distancing protocols were still in place in Illinois. We learned how to construct a "COVID-19 Human Subjects Research Safety Plan" as part of the study. While such safety plans might no longer be required, it was helpful to learn about ways to reduce the risk of contagion in a physical research setting. As well, social science and qualitative research methodologies are, by inherent definition, shaped by sociocultural forces. The authors were reminded of this in high relief during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Rooted within DEIA and subject to lived experiences, potential focus group participants viewed social interaction through considerably different lenses of concern. Some may have been motivated by personal preferences and/or by potentially hidden considerations, such as individuals who were immuno-compromised and, by necessity, more diligent about self-protection against COVID-19 and other infections.

As a practical implication for all who do qualitative research, it was a key takeaway that research methodologies and agreed-upon best practices can change in rapid response to global events. Understanding this and adapting to evolving norms for IRB compliance at a minimum, and broader safety considerations as an ideal value, is a valuable experience that is sure to inform practice for the authors in future assessments and inquiries. This experience also underscored for the authors, that even as we were working through and adapting to changing expectations from the IRB office, the goal remained to

present to potential participants a comprehensible and straightforward experience that the authors' hope reflected an emphasis on safety and respect for participants.

Thirdly, the authors developed a qualitative research training module for research team members who were not familiar with the focus group research method. The entire research team then went through the training together before conducting the focus groups. The process not only familiarized the research team on the research protocol approved by the IRB, but also the foundational values of a quality approach to climate assessment. As stated above, the training also emphasized the role of facilitators in a focus group. The two primary aims were to highlight participants having a strong perception of safety and respect, and to understand the value of the focus groups for generating a comprehensive data set. For those new to focus groups, the distinction between an open discussion and a data-gathering focus group was a critical point of comprehension. Principles that may seem intuitive or fundamental to experienced focus group facilitators needed stronger emphasis for new facilitators. Examples of these fundamental principles included an understanding that a focus group facilitator may become excited about a topic, but that role does not mean becoming an active participant in the discussion where personal opinions are offered to the participants. Another example of such a principle was ensuring facilitators understand that their role was to invite participants in, but that did not extend to pointed questioning or extensive scrutiny of an individual who may still elect to remain quiet. It is worth highlighting that this was of particular emphasis, as all of the focus group facilitators were also employees and may have had direct working relationships with some of the focus group participants. While facilitators were matched to minimize this possibility, it was critical for the authors to ensure that no facilitator was tempted to overstep their role and start to function as a participant or, worse, to become dominant in the focus group sharing. The qualitative research training module has since been used for other library projects as well.

## Conclusion

Climate assessments in higher education institutions can be seen as ineffective. It is because making structural, organizational or systematic changes takes time, resources, and commitment. However, conducting thoughtful and listening focused climate assessment in the workplace has value beyond its findings. It can help libraries and individuals to learn how to build trust and be DEIA allies. Assessment projects can be designed to enhance safety, psychological safety, and well-being for participants engaged in challenging issues. This study has underscored that assessment has to be a crucial part of the process of change, not only as a means for measuring outcomes and impact.

## Notes

1. Civil service employees are staff members whose positions are subject to the Illinois State Universities Civil Service System classification plan. A number of civil service classifications are covered by a collective bargaining agreement.
2. Tenure-system or specialized faculty who hold appointments in the University Library.
3. Academic professionals are staff members whose positions have been exempted from the Illinois State University Civil Service System.
4. Pace, C. Robert, and George G. Stern. "An Approach to the Measurement of Psychological Characteristics of College Environments." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 49, no. 5 (1958): 269–77. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047828>.

5. Peterson, Marvin W., and Melinda G. Spencer. "Understanding Academic Culture and Climate." *New Directions for Institutional Research* 1990, no. 68 (1990): 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.37019906803>.
6. Lee, HyeSun, Martina Ortouste, Anabiah Syed, and Kaylena Mann. "A Systematic Review of Campus Climate Assessments at Institutions of Higher Education." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, July 18, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000594>.
7. "All Campus Climate Assessment Initiative – Office of the Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity & Inclusion." Accessed January 10, 2025. <https://diversity.illinois.edu/committees/all-campus-climate-assessment/>.
8. ClimateQUAL®: Organizational Climate and Diversity Assessment is an online survey for assessing organizational climate in a library setting. <https://www.climatequal.org/home>.
9. "Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Task Force – Employees Site – Committees & Divisions – U of I Library." Accessed January 25, 2025. <https://www.library.illinois.edu/committees/committees/diversity-equity-inclusion-and-accessibility-deia-task-force/>.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.

# Appendix A: Focus Group Questions

## Focus Group Questions

### Opening Question

Please tell us your name and in a sentence what diversity means to you.

>> Facilitators can provide an example such as “I will start. My name is Jen and diversity means a happy place to work.

### Introduction

Think about your experience of diversity in the Library. What aspects of diversity are the most important to you?

>> Examples: Age, ability/disability, employment categories, race, sexual orientation, etc..  
>> Participants should be free to express experience inside/outside of the Library

### Transition Question

When you think about diversity efforts in the Library, what comes to mind?

>> Examples: The representation (or the lack of) of library staff, perceptions of all gender bathrooms

### Key Questions

Tell us a bit about what practical diversity efforts or changes you would like to see occur in the library.

If money, time, and other resources were unlimited, what changes would you like to see in the library in regards to diversity?

### Ending Question

If there was one thing in the Library, in regards to diversity, that you could change, what would it be?

Of all the things that we talked about today, what is the most important to you?