

Campus Climate Survey Study Report

Prepared for The University of Vermont Campus Community

By

**Jacqueline S. Weinstock, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Dept. of Integrated Professional Studies
&**

**Mary K. Canales, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Dept. of Nursing and Women's Center**

In Consultation With

**Dorothea Brauer & Alan Howard
Campus Climate Survey Committee Members**

**Based on The Campus Climate Survey Study Designed and
Conducted by Rankin & Associates, Consulting**

And Statistical Analyses Conducted By

**Takamaru Ashikaga, Ph.D.
Professor and Director
Medical Biostatistics
&**

**Pamela Mary Vacek, Ph.D.
Biostatistician and Research Assistant Professor
Medical Biostatistics and Pathology**

AUGUST 24, 2006

Executive Summary and Recommendations

The Context

The extent to which institutions of higher education are able to successfully carry out their mission of producing and disseminating knowledge depends in part on institutional climate. Recognizing the critical role of institutional climate, and committed to insuring that The University of Vermont (UVM) is both welcoming and inclusive of all its members, UVM administrators committed to sponsoring The UVM Assessment of Campus Climate Survey Study [hereafter Campus Climate Survey (CCS)] to assess the climate and utilize the findings to inform its efforts regarding campus climate. Preliminary work on the study began in Fall 2004 with the formation of The Campus Climate Survey Committee (hereafter the Committee). The Offices of the President and Provost charged the Committee with the responsibility of overseeing the construction, administration, and analysis of the survey findings and reporting the results to the University of Vermont community. Rankin & Associates, Consulting, was hired to design and administer the survey, to manage the data, and provide preliminary analyses.

The Study

The survey design was based on previous Rankin & Associates efforts and informed by fact-finding sessions held with UVM constituents in December 2004. Rankin & Associates administered the CCS during the Spring 2005 semester. The survey questions addressed personal campus experiences, perceptions of the campus climate, and perceptions of institutional actions including administrative policies and academic initiatives regarding diversity issues and concerns on campus. Rankin & Associates collected and managed the survey data and prepared the initial data set and a series of analyses for the Committee towards the end of 2005/beginning of 2006. The Committee requested additional statistical analyses, which were conducted by two statistical experts at UVM during Spring 2006.

These statistical analyses yielded five additive scales with reasonable Chronbach's alpha internal consistency; these scales represent five distinct conceptual categories of interest: (1) "Personal Experiences with Bias," (2) "Personal Experiences with Sexual Assault," (3) "Witnessing of Bias," (4) "Personal Comfort," and (5) "Perceptions of Climate."

Five respondent groups were subsequently examined relative to these conceptual categories, based on (1) sexual orientation [Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Questioning (LGBQ) or Heterosexual], (2) Race [Person of Color or White], (3) Gender Identity [Female or Male or Transgender], (4) Disability [None or Physical or Mental or Both], and (5) Religious Affiliation [Christian or Non-Christian or No Affiliation/None].

Additional analyses were conducted that examined a combined majority group¹ representing self-identified Heterosexual, White, Non-Transgender Male and Female (or Non-Transgender Male only) campus community members who reported no Disability versus a combined group of

¹ The Committee opted to conduct analyses based on two different groupings of majority group members versus traditionally marginalized group members with respect to Gender Identity. In one series, Non-Transgender Female respondents were included in the majority group while in another series, these respondents were included in the marginalized group.

self-identified LGBTQ People, People of Color, Transgender People (or Transgender People and Non-Transgender Female), and/or People Reporting a Disability, all of whom have traditionally experienced marginalization in mainstream institutions. A final series of analyses were conducted that examined a combined employee group (staff, faculty, and administrators) versus student group (undergraduate and graduate students).

Before presenting a summary of select results and recommendations from the Committee, it is important to establish an appropriate framework for interpreting these results and recommendations. The fundamental aim of the CCS was to initiate the first step in a systematic endeavor to assess the climate of UVM regarding how diverse UVM community members perceive and experience the campus climate while assuring the anonymity of each respondent. Although the Committee believes this aim has been achieved, there are several limitations of the study that need to be addressed. Specifically, three critical cautions must be kept in mind as readers consider the findings and identify next steps: (1) limited sample size and lack of representativeness of the sample; (2) the large number of comparative analyses conducted on these data; and (3) the great variability of responses both within and across selected identity groups, a variability that is not obvious when analyses and reports focus on identified patterns of responses across groups. With these limitations in mind, it is critically important to avoid the temptation to over-generalize the survey findings and/or rely solely on standard significance levels. Instead, we encourage the campus community to commit to a reasoned, sustained and sensitive examination and discussion of the trends identified on the basis of the available data. These trends, we believe, can and should help us prioritize areas for future action.

Select Findings from the Campus Climate Survey Study (Spring 2005)

Demographics

At the time the CCS was conducted, there were an estimated 14,013 UVM community members, including approximately 2,281 full and part-time staff members, 1,250 full and part-time faculty members (this includes Officers of Extension and Officers of Library), 7,701 undergraduate students, 1,709 graduate students, and 1,072 non-degree students. Of this total, two thousand, nine hundred and eighty-seven surveys (2,987) were returned representing the following²:

- o 1,487 undergraduate students, 230 graduate students, 353 faculty, 792 staff, 47 administrators, and 26 “Other” responses;
- o 311 People of Color, and 2,569 white;
- o 117 people who identified as having a physical disability and 350 as having a cognitive or emotional disability; of these, 30 reported both a physical and a cognitive or emotional disability;
- o 312 people who identified as a sexual minority (lesbian, gay, bisexual, or queer), 2,560 people who identified as Heterosexual and 39 who recorded “Other” responses;

² Numbers may not add up to the total surveys collected due to omitted/missing responses.

- o 1,997 respondents identified as Women, 915 as Men, 22 as Transgender, and 16 identified “Other” responses;
- o 1,262 people identified their religious or spiritual affiliation as Christian, 407 identified their religious or spiritual affiliation as one that was other than Christian affiliation, 1,128 indicated they had spiritual beliefs but were not affiliated with an organized religion, and 42 respondents indicated having no religious or spiritual beliefs.

Considering that the study yielded only a small sample size relative to the whole UVM population, with some groups being greatly under-represented, the following results should be interpreted cautiously.

The results are presented according to five distinct conceptual categories of interest. These conceptual categories are (1) “Personal Experiences with Bias,” (2) “Personal Experiences with Sexual Assault,” (3) “Witnessing of Bias,” (4) “Personal Comfort,” and (5) “Perceptions of Climate.” In addition, five select respondent groups were also identified based upon (1) sexual orientation [LGBQ or Heterosexual], (2) Race³ [Person of Color or White], (3) Gender Identity [Female or Male or Transgender], (4) Disability [None or Physical or Mental or Both], and (5) Religious Affiliation [Christian or Non-Christian or No Affiliation/None]. Using scales to represent the five distinct conceptual categories of interest, the five different respondent groups were examined relative to these conceptual categories. This work yielded a reliable and useful statistical analysis of the UVM CCS data.

Personal Experiences with Bias

When personal experiences with bias were examined, ***nineteen percent of the respondents in the total sample (n=561) reported they had personally experienced offensive, hostile, or intimidating conduct that interfered with their ability to work or learn on campus.***

Of these respondents:

- o The most commonly cited reasons believed to be the basis of this conduct were: respondent’s Gender (43%), UVM status (29%), Age (23%), and/or Race (19%).
- o Forty-three percent (43%) of these respondents felt ignored or excluded, forty-two percent (42%) felt intimidated or bullied, and forty percent (40%) experienced derogatory remarks.
- o Forty-six percent (46%) experienced this conduct while working at a UVM job and twenty-five percent (25%) while in the classroom.
- o Forty-five percent (45%) of these respondents identified students, thirty-five percent (35%) identified faculty, and thirty-five percent (35%) identified staff as a source of the harassment.

³ Though survey respondents were categorized based on answers to the question, “What is your race/ethnicity? we refer to this respondent group as “race” rather than “race and ethnicity” to reduce any confusion that might arise when reporting on results based on the treatment of race and ethnicity as separate items.

- o Twenty-five percent (25%) of respondents that experienced harassment reported it to a UVM employee or official.

Furthermore, respondents who identified as members of certain under-represented groups within the UVM community were significantly more likely to report having personally experienced offensive, hostile, or intimidating conduct that interfered with their ability to work or learn on campus, and to report perceiving being treated differently in other ways from respondents who identified as members of corresponding majority groups.

- o A significantly higher percentage of respondents of color (40%) reported personal experiences of offensive, hostile, or intimidating conduct than did white respondents (16%) ($p < 0.01$).
- o Fifty-one percent (51%) of respondents of color who experienced harassment felt they had been deliberately ignored or excluded, compared to forty percent (40%) of the white respondents who experienced harassment ($p = 0.02$).
- o A significantly higher percentage of LGBQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Questioning) respondents (39%) reported these personal experiences than did Heterosexuals (16%) ($p < 0.01$). The LGBQ respondents most often cited Sexual Orientation (54%) and Gender (42%) as the basis for the conduct.
- o Males were least likely to report personal experience with bias with Transgender respondents the most likely. The percentage of Transgender respondents reporting negative experiences (50%) was substantially higher than Female (19%) and Male (17%) experiences.
- o The four Disability groups also reflected great variation in reporting of offensive, hostile or intimidating behaviors. Those respondents with no Disability (17%) reported such behaviors least frequently while those with a physical disability (25%) and those with an emotional disability (30%) were intermediate to those respondents with both physical and emotional disabilities (63%).
- o Non-Christians reported greater personal experiences with bias (23%) compared to those with no (17%) or a Christian (18%) affiliation.

Personal Experience with Sexual Assault

When responses to personal experience with sexual assault were examined, 4% (105) of respondents reported being a victim of sexual assault while at UVM, with 5% reporting experiences of being touched in a sexual manner that created feelings of fear and discomfort “Sometimes” or more frequently. A significantly higher percent of LGBQ respondents reported personal experiences with inappropriate touching (30%) and sexual assault (5%) than Heterosexuals (16% and 3%, respectively). A similar trend was observed between Gender Identity groups: Female and Transgender respondents reported greater experiences with inappropriate touching and sexual assault than Males. Similarly, individuals with emotional

disabilities reported greater levels of personal experiences with inappropriate touching and sexual assault than those with only Physical Disabilities, while individuals with both emotional and Physical Disabilities reported the greatest levels of personal experiences with inappropriate touching and sexual assault compared to those with only Physical Disabilities or no disabilities. Finally, a similar trend was noted among Religious Affiliation, with Non-Christians reporting greater personal experiences with inappropriate touching compared to Christians or those with No Affiliation.

In contrast to the patterns found regarding other climate issues, People of Color and whites reported similar experiences with inappropriate touching and sexual assault.

With respect to being confident that they would be supported by the UVM community and that some action would be taken on their behalf if they were sexually assaulted, only fifty-nine percent (59%) of the respondents reported feeling confident in these regards. A full twenty-nine percent (29%) of respondents were unsure and 11% did not feel confident of any such situational support.

Witnessing of Bias

In addition to personal experiences, respondents were asked about whether they had, within the past year, observed or personally been made aware of conduct on campus that created an offensive, hostile, or intimidating working or learning environment. Thirty-seven percent (37%) of respondents reported having observed or personally been made aware of this negative conduct.

- o Of the respondents who reported having observed or personally been made aware of this conduct, Sexual Orientation (50%), Race (49%), and Gender (41%) were most often cited as the basis for the conduct.
- o Respondents most often observed or were made aware of this conduct in the forms of staring (44%), racial profiling (43%), graffiti (42%), derogatory remarks (40%), and people being deliberately ignored (36%).
- o This conduct was most often cited as having occurred while walking on campus (40%), in University housing (38%), in public spaces on campus (33%), in University jobs (32%) and in the classroom (31%).
- o The most common sources of this conduct were students (65%), followed by staff (26%) and faculty (26%).

Personal Comfort

When comfort with overall climate was examined, eighty-two percent (82%) of the respondents in the total sample indicated that within the past year, they were comfortable with the overall

climate at UVM, and eighty-two percent (82%) indicated that they were comfortable with the climate in their academic college or administrative unit. In addition, sixty-one percent (61%) of respondents believed that UVM values their involvement in diversity initiatives on campus while over half of all respondents (52%) believed that the President's Office visibly fosters diversity.

Personal comfort in relation to identity was also positive. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents indicated that they "Often" or "Very often" feel comfortable in being open about their identity. In contrast, 24% either "Never" or "Rarely" feel that their cultural heritage is valued in the UVM community. This distinction between personal comfort with one's identity compared to the valuing of one's cultural heritage is of concern.

Perceptions of Climate

Respondents were asked to rate the overall campus climate for 18 different groups of people. Results from the factor analysis revealed one major factor that explained 60% of the variance and indicated that over 75% of respondents endorsed the campus climate as being respectful of different groups. Yet only 52% of faculty and 61% of student respondents felt that the classroom climate was welcoming for students from historically under-represented and marginalized groups. Meanwhile, 49% of faculty and 56% of staff and administrator respondents thought the workplace climate was welcoming for employees from historically under-represented and marginalized groups.

When responses to perceptions of climate were compared by respondent group, respondents from typically under-represented or historically oppressed groups reported greater knowledge of hostile and inappropriate behaviors and/or greater observation of discriminatory hiring and/or firing than their respective counterparts. For example, witnessing or being made aware of behavior that created a negative working or learning environment was significantly higher for LGBTQ respondents (64%), People of Color respondents (50%), Transgender respondents (77%), persons with disabilities (53% for persons with physical and emotional disabilities), and Non-Christians (43%) compared to their majority counterparts (Heterosexual respondents 33%; white respondents 35%; men 33%; those without any Disability 35%; and Christians 32%, respectively). Similar trends were noted in the observation of discriminatory hiring and/or firing practices although differences were less pronounced.

Results of the factor analysis on the fourteen items that respondents rated in terms of the extent to which they agreed that there is visible leadership to foster diversity at UVM revealed that over 75% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that there is visible leadership to foster diversity in multiple domains. Also of note is that fifty-two percent (52%) of respondents reported that they believe the President's Office visibly fosters diversity. Furthermore, sixty-one percent (61%) of respondents noted they believe UVM values their involvement in diversity initiatives on campus.

In terms of institutional recommendations, 66% of respondents felt that requiring all University students, staff, and faculty to take at least one class that focuses on issues, research, and perspectives about various groups would improve the campus climate for these groups. Forty-five percent (45%) of respondents thought that including diversity-related activities as a criterion for hiring and/or performance evaluations would improve the climate of the University.

Conclusion

The fundamental aim of the CCS has successfully been achieved. This fundamental aim was to initiate the first step in a systematic endeavor to assess the climate of UVM regarding how diverse UVM community members perceive and experience the campus climate while assuring the anonymity of each respondent. Yet critical cautions must be kept in mind as we consider the findings and identify next steps. The following three limitations need to be considered when interpreting CCS results and planning future investigations.

- (1) **Sample Size/Representativeness of the Sample:** Despite efforts to encourage completion of the survey by all UVM community members, the study yielded only a small sample size relative to the whole UVM population, with some groups being greatly under-represented. Furthermore, total population estimates for some groups were and remain unavailable. Accordingly, the total number of completed surveys and those completed for select groups, do not necessarily reflect their respective populations. Consequently, the results of the CCS offer us a series of observable trends based upon data analyses using the available sample, which may or may not be representative of the total population.
- (2) **Significance of the Data:** A large number of comparative analyses have been conducted on these data to date with additional analyses planned. Given the relatively large sample size, statistical significance levels are likely to be small. Furthermore, no adjustments for multiple testing were made. Thus, it is recommended that great attention be paid to actual observed mean and percentage differences when interpreting any significance levels.
- (3) **Variability Within Groups:** There was great variability of responses both within and across identified sub-groups. This variability is not obvious, however, when analyses and reports focus on identified patterns of responses across groups.

Reflections on Overall Climate Results and Respondent Group Patterns

While the climate at UVM is perceived to be positive by a majority of the UVM community, it is also evident that there are distinct differences in perceptions, particularly among some members from under-represented groups. While we cannot determine from this particular study, the extent to which these findings are representative of the total population of People of Color, LGBQ people, people with disabilities, people with diverse religious beliefs, and people with marginalized gender identities, we can conclude that the climate at UVM is a hostile one for some community members and especially for some minority group members of the University community. Meanwhile, White majority members of our campus community report a more positive experience of climate, probably due in large part to few feeling/being personally targeted with negative or offensive behavior on the basis of their White identity. Given the greater proportion of White majority respondents to this survey, overall findings tend to mask many important issues concerning campus climate.

Personal Experiences with Bias

Almost one in five respondents (19% of the total sample) reported personally experiencing inappropriate conduct that impacted negatively upon their ability to work or learn at UVM. Yet the group comparisons conducted indicates that under-represented groups on campus experienced this conduct disproportionately. For some members of these groups, their ability to work and learn at UVM has been severely compromised. This is clearly, then, an issue of great concern that warrants concerted attention.

Personal Experience with Sexual Assault

Group comparisons with respect to inappropriate sexual touching and sexual assault revealed significant differences among respondents for sexual orientation, Gender Identity, and Disability. Although these differences were not as stark as some others, they are of great concern, require further investigation and clearly need to be addressed.

Witnessing of Bias

Thirty-seven percent (37%) of all the respondents in this study reported having observed or been made aware of inappropriate conduct at UVM that created an offensive, hostile, or intimidating working or learning environment, while thirteen percent (13%) indicated observing discriminatory hiring practices and five percent (5%) indicated observing discriminatory firing practices. It appears from these results that behaviors that create a negative climate are rather common and that discrimination in hiring and firing may represent an important area warranting further attention.

At the same time, there were clear patterns of differences by group. For example, a full 64% of LGBQ respondents compared to 33% of Heterosexual respondents, reported witnessing or being made aware of behavior that created a negative working or learning environment (Q8), a difference that was statistically significant and that appears to be meaningful as well. Similarly, 50% of Respondents of Color compared to 35% of White respondents reported such witnessing, again a difference that was statistically significant and that appears to be meaningful as well.

Overall, the percentage of respondents reporting witnessing or being made aware of this behavior was much greater than the percentage reporting directly observing discriminatory hiring or firing. The substantial absolute difference might be a result of communication rates among various social networks. Yet what is important to recognize is that simply being made aware of bias may itself negatively impact these individuals and group members. That is, bias does not have to be observed directly for it to become known and felt and, when directed at a group to which one belongs that also has a history of marginalization and discrimination, bias that one is made aware of all too often, in this indirect way, becomes part of one's personal experience. It is in this way, that bias incidents operate as messages to all members of the group that has been targeted.

So far we have focused on the negative implications of these results. Yet it may also be that individuals who witness but do not directly experience bias are motivated by this witnessing to work to improve the campus climate and to support efforts on campus in this regard. These

individuals may also serve as important informants when the individuals with direct experiences of negative conduct are uncomfortable or unable to come forward.

Personal Comfort

Assessment of personal comfort with UVM indicated select differences between members of under-represented groups and their majority counterparts. All five scales and items reflected significant differences by Race and by Disability, while four of the five scales or items reflected significant differences by Sexual Orientation and three of the five scales reflected Gender Identity group differences. While the pattern was less evident compared to some of the other categories analyzed, additional attention to personal comfort issues is warranted. It is clearly a complex phenomenon that we believe is only partially captured through the questions in the current survey study.

Perceptions of Climate

Perceptions of the campus climate among members of under-represented groups on campus were consistently less positive than their majority counterparts. Of significance is that this unfavorable pattern existed among all of the underrepresented groups surveyed. Although the absolute differences were often small, the consistency across the scales among the diverse groups is noteworthy and indicates an important area for further study and concerted attention.

Committee Recommendations

When people are fearful for their physical safety, social acceptance, and psychological inclusion, it is unlikely they will be able to work, learn and develop to their fullest potential. While it is critically important to avoid the temptation to over-generalize the survey findings and to rely solely on standard significance levels, we do believe that the trends identified in the report suggest that the climate is less than positive for some members of the UVM community, and especially for those in the UVM community who are members of one or more historically marginalized identity groups. With these trends in mind, the Committee offers 10 specific recommendations and related prioritized actions for improving the climate at UVM for all its members. A brief description of each recommendation follows; further details for each recommendation are provided in the full report, which we encourage every member of the UVM community to read, reflect upon, and build upon in order to continue this important work.

Recommendation 1: Involve All Parts Of The Institution In The Change Process

Findings from the CCS suggest that those who have personally experienced and/or witnessed bias in our community have done so throughout campus, and they include staff and faculty as well as students. Thus, our first recommendation is that all parts of the institution be considered and included in the next steps and throughout the entire climate change process.

Some ways to move forward on this recommendation include posting the Executive Summary of this report on UVM's web page, including elements of this Executive Summary in new faculty, staff, and student orientations, and requiring that all University students, staff, and faculty take a class that focuses on issues, research, and/or perspectives about various historically marginalized

groups. Indeed, two-thirds of the CCS respondents themselves endorsed this idea.

Recommendation 2: Immediate Intervention to Address Personal Experiences of Negative Conduct

While subsequent recommendations emphasize the need for further consideration of the CCS report, the CCS data, and other available data regarding climate issues, the Committee strongly recommends that immediate and concerted action be taken in response to the significant number of people on campus reporting personal experience of offensive, hostile or intimidating conduct (n = 561) and the **potentially** high rates of personal experience of this negative conduct experienced by those in the UVM community who are part of one or more historically under-represented/marginalized groups (including those based on Race, Sexual Orientation, Ability, and Gender Identity). Similarly, immediate action is strongly recommended to address the lack of confidence many members of the UVM community have in the University's likelihood of responding supportively to sexual assault events.

Recommendation 3: Examine Open-Ended Responses from the CCS and Conduct Additional Analyses

The Committee recommends careful examination of the open-ended responses gathered as part of the CCS **and** additional analyses addressing the experiences of other marginalized groups on campus. To date, the focus has been on five select groups yet other critical issues affecting climate must be carefully examined, including but not limited to socioeconomic class, immigration status, employee status, English as a second language, and Age. Meanwhile, the open-ended comments have not yet been carefully considered in and of themselves and in relation to quantitative findings.

Recommendation 4: Review And Consider Other Available Data

The Committee recommends a careful review and consideration of other available data bases and information that consider climate issues. The intention with this recommendation is to appropriately mine all the available data assessing our campus climate and to use this knowledge to allow us to move forward with greater success. We recommend that the Diversity and Equity Unit, under the leadership of Kathryn Friedman, convene a working group to conduct this review with a focus on the past 5 years.

Recommendation 5: Review and Consider All Existing Campus Efforts to Improve Climate

Careful review of all existing efforts to improve campus climate at UVM, and any evaluations of such efforts, is also recommended, so as to understand what we are already doing successfully, what appears to need improvement, and what additional efforts are necessary. As existing efforts are examined and reflected upon, we recommend that the reviewers keep in mind one particular finding from the CCS—that out of the 2854 people who participated in it, 561 of them reported having personally experienced offensive, hostile, or intimidating conduct that interfered with their ability to work or learn on campus.

Recommendation 6: Determine Necessary and Available Resources and Provide Them

Following the review of available data and existing efforts to improve campus climate, the Committee recommends a careful analysis of available and necessary resources for supporting the successful initiatives and additional identified initiatives, and the subsequent assignment of necessary resources for success.

Recommendation 7: Conduct Focus Groups with Select Populations

The Committee anticipates that, despite gleaning additional information from other available sources and from the CCS itself, it will remain necessary for the University to support the conduct of focus groups by trained professionals with select populations as a mechanism to further examine the patterns and trends identified in the CCS report and from additional mining of the data from the CCS study and other available sources.

We envision the focus groups as an opportunity to understand more fully how diverse groups (including both historically under-represented/marginalized and historically over-represented/majority groups) experience the climate and cultures of the University and to gather information that will help guide the construction and implementation of effective climate improvement efforts. We want to emphasize that prior to the implementation of any systematic interventions to improve the climate, it will be necessary to establish a clear baseline of experiences and perceptions of specific groups within the University community against which outcomes of any such efforts can be evaluated.

Recommendation 8: Develop a Priority List of Action Steps

A priority list of action steps should be developed to guide diversity initiatives for the next five years. Designated persons should be identified and held responsible for the implementation of prioritized action items, and clearly defined action items should be specified within each year of the five year plan.

Recommendation 9: Have the President's Office Play an Active Role in University Communication and Climate Improvement Efforts and Assign a High Level Administrator in the President's Office to Oversee This Work

Given that over half of CCS respondents (52%) agreed that the President's Office visibly fosters diversity, the Committee recommends that the Executive Summary of this report be linked directly to the President's Home Page and that the President's Office maintain an active role in updating the UVM community regarding climate issues, efforts to improve climate, and evaluation of these efforts. Indeed, we strongly recommend that the President's Office be responsible for the implementation process and for overseeing responsibility for completion of action steps developed by the working group described in prior recommendations. Specifically, a high level administrator in the President's Office should be assigned to follow up on the CCS and more generally concentrate on improving the climate of the University for all community members. This assignment must come with the time and necessary resources to successfully engage in this work. If it is simply an add-on to an already over-loaded plate, little progress is likely.

Recommendation 10: Community-Wide Review of Current Report and Development of Additional Recommendations

It is important to remember that the authors of this report and the Committee as a whole represent but a few individuals within a large institution. The recommendations offered here are not intended to be all inclusive, and many have been considered by others in the past. Once others have had the opportunity to consider and reflect upon the findings of the CCS, and are able to consider additional information that becomes available through further analyses of the CCS results and additional data, more recommendations can be promulgated.

In conclusion, the Committee wishes to emphasize that changing an organizational climate and an organizational and community culture are long-term, multi-faceted, and challenging endeavors. Thus, the Committee reiterates our strong belief that the whole University community will be best served by involving all parts of the institution in the change process (this is in fact our first recommendation). The ultimate goal is to create a campus environment that is safe, welcoming, and above all, fosters healthy development and constructive engagement among all its members. Completion of the CCS is only the first step towards achieving this goal for the University of Vermont. Climate concerns exist in an institutional and community context. The most effective way to make lasting change in institutional and community climate and culture is by involving all parts of the institution in the change process.