Introduction
In every demographic cohort, certain groups confront barriers that prevent them from fully participating in the classroom, social, political or civic activities, this is also true in education. Often this can be the result of active exclusion (i.e., discrimination); but more often, it is subtle, their needs or differences are ignored. According to Maccoby (2013), social inclusion is the process of improving the terms on which groups take part in society—improving the ability, opportunity, and dignity of those disadvantaged on the basis of their identity. That identity may be based on ethnicity, race, age, gender, sexual orientation, religion, or disability status. Marginalization occurs when a historically oppressed group feels they do not belong or matter, due to an exclusionary environment (Miceli & Pacze, 2005).

In education, particularly college, when students embark on a new, autonomous life stage, often far from home, family, and a cultural in-group, minority students are disproportionately disadvantaged relative to resources and social support (Pyne & Means, 2013, p. 186). In-groups and those who share similar ideals, histories, experiences, and beliefs provide a buffer against depression, anxiety, and isolation (Moran, Chen, & Tryon, 2018). Despite the progressive culture of our campus, and liberal arts colleges, it is not uncommon for educators to wrongly assume all students feel equally supported and included. Minority students are disproportionately excluded from fully participating in autonomous life stage, often far from home, family, and a cultural in environment.

Purpose
There are several resources on campus to offer support to marginalized groups: The Student Multicultural Center, The Center for Gender Equity, Veterans Outreach, Transfer Student Center, and the Peace and Spirituality Center. These too are costly, particularly, specifically: The Student Multicultural Center, The Center for Gender Equity, Veterans Outreach, Transfer Student Center, and the Peace and Spirituality Center. These too are costly, particularly:

Empirical Questions
Phase One, Pilot - Social Inclusion and the Student Multicultural Center. The first part of this study involved the development of a broad measure of student social inclusion based on a similar measure for a smaller demographic focusing on LGBTQ+ students and the Center for Gender Equity (Bird, Williams & Island, 2018). The purpose of the SIBS was to establish three broad domains (IMA): Identification, Mechanism, and Action for the target group, who self-report exclusion.

1. Identification: Who are the excluded groups on campus?
2. Mechanism: Why are the identified groups excluded?
3. Action: What action can be taken to support social inclusion on campus?

Method
Pilot Sample
For the pilot, we convened convenience undergraduate students the Pacific University using email list serves, as well as snowball sampling through word of mouth. The survey was conducted through the Qualtrics online survey platform and yielded 57 responses, 39 females and 18 males (all identified as cisgender) with a mean age of 20.98 years (SD=1.35). See Table 1 for demographic descriptors.

Materials
We developed the Student Inclusion and Belonging Survey (SIBS), a 59-item survey to assess student self-beliefs and attitudes of inclusion within the campus community. We also assessed questions on the role, value, and visibility of the SMC. The SIBS assessed 9 domains of inclusion specifically focusing on the resource of the SMC.
1. Inclusivity within the campus community (12 questions)
2. Visibility of the SMC (6 questions)
3. Value of the SMC (6 questions)
4. Role of the SMC (10 questions)
5. Perceived Discrimination (10 questions)
6. Pacific University Critique (10 questions)
7. Ambassador Fatigue (5 questions)
8. Pacific University Safety and Inclusion (14 questions)

Design and Procedure
This descriptive project is a two-part study with Phase One, the pilot, reported here the SIBS development and Phase Two, the follow-up revision using the pilot data to better evaluate social inclusion across all self-reported, marginalized groups.

Results
The first empirical question addressed the issue of who the excluded groups are on campus (i.e., Identification: Who are the excluded groups on campus?). In order to establish this, we collected demographic responses from all of our participants and grouped participants. It was our intention to look at differences on the SIBS by ethnic identity, sexual expression, campus residence, and age. However, participant solicitation began concurrent with the Oregon Shelter-in-Place order and although the measure was distributed by email, we did not garner a diverse enough participant pool to group by ethnic identity, campus residence, age, or across the breadth of gender categories.

In order to assess the question of Mechanism, Why are the identified groups excluded? We conducted an independent samples t-test for gender, persons of color, and sexual expression between heterosexual and nonheteronormative persons across all domains of the SIBS. There were significant differences for males' (M=29.89; SD=5.92) and females' (M=25.96; SD=6.23) reported significant differences in total score on the domain of Perceived PUO Diversity (i.e., diversity among faculty and staff). (t(70)=2.33, p<.02) However there were significant differences among participants when groups were compared by persons-of-color and white students. Students-of-color reported significantly higher scores on the domain scores of SMC Visibility, (t(70)=2.90, p<.006; SMC Role, (t(70)=2.42, p<.02; and Ambassador Fatigue, t(59)=2.50, p<.02). See Table 1 for descriptive statistics by group.

Additionally for nonheteronormative students (e.g., gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and non-binary), they reported significantly higher scores on the domain of PUO Discrimination (i.e., at one point or another, they felt discriminated by students, faculty, or staff while at Pacific) than heteronormative students (i.e., heterosexual), (t(72)=2.04, p<.04. Interestingly, this was not true for students-of-color.

Discussion
Phase One. For the first phase of this project, we modestly identified who feels excluded at Pacific: Nonheteronormative students and Students-of-Color. Though we did not include several important demographic variables to be truly inclusive of marginalization, these were: Religion, Political Affiliation, Learning Accommodation, Veterans, and Physical Disability status. These were oversights in survey development and will be corrected in the revision. We also established some descriptive, the mechanism, the role of the SMC, and Discrimination of students—especially Faculty and Staff, Ambassador Fatigue, and PUO Discrimination. It was also clear from the results that Persons-of-CO color perceived the role and visibility of the SMC as important, thereby partially answering the third question of what action should be taken to support social inclusion on campus? the answer is to continue to nurture a Student Multicultural Center on campus.

Phase Two. The SIBS will be revised to accommodate the demographic variables we missed in the first iteration, as well as questions pertaining to the other Centers on campus (e.g., OAA, Transfer Student Center, Veterans, etc.).
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