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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 group\(^1\) representing self-identified Heterosexual, White, Non-Transgender Male and Female (or Non-Transgender

---

\(^1\) 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.
Male only) campus community members who reported no Disability versus a combined group of self-identified LGBQ 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 following:

- 1,487 undergraduate students, 230 graduate students, 353 faculty, 792 staff, 47 administrators, and 26 “Other” responses;
- 311 People of Color, and 2,569 white;
- 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;
- 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.
1,997 respondents identified as Women, 915 as Men, 22 as Transgender, and 16 identified “Other” responses;

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) Race\(^3\) [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:

- 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%).

- 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.

- Forty-six percent (46%) experienced this conduct while working at a UVM job and twenty-five percent (25%) while in the classroom.

- Forty-five percent (45%) of these respondents identified students, thirty-five percent

---

\(^3\) 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.
(35%) identified faculty, and thirty-five percent (35%) identified staff as a source of the harassment.

- 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.

- 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).
- 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).
- 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.
- 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.
- 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%).
- 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.

- 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.
- 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%).
- 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%).
- 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 LGBQ 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.
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Introduction

Overview of Campus Climate Issues

Increasingly, institutions of higher education in the United States are realizing that their ability to carry out their tripartite mission of teaching, research and service depends in large measure on their ability to create “an environment characterized by equal access for all students, faculty and staff regardless of cultural differences, where individuals are not just tolerated but valued” (Rankin, 2003, p. 3). As Rankin (2003) has articulated, an inclusive and welcoming campus climate may be especially important in today’s increasingly diverse and global world. It is not only students but also staff, faculty and administrators on college campuses that are likely to encounter diverse communities along multiple dimensions including but not limited to Race, Ethnicity, Nationality, Cultural and/or Geographic Heritage, Ability, Religious belief, Socioeconomic status, Sexuality, Sex, and Gender Identity or Expression. Meanwhile, the ability to learn and work at optimal levels is profoundly affected by the extent to which individual community members feel safe, supported, valued and celebrated (see, e.g., Bauer, 1998; Boyer, 1990; Rankin, 1998; Tierney & Dilley, 1996). Perceptions of negative campus climate have been shown to exert direct influence on the psychosocial and learning outcomes of African-American (Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella & Hagedorn, 1999), Latino/Latina (Hurtado, 1994), and Asian American students (Cress & Ikeda, 2003), as well as women (Pascarella et al., 1997; Salter & Persaud, 2003), lesbian, gay, bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) students (Brown, Clarke, Gortmaker & Robinson-Keilig, 2004; Rankin, 2003), and students with disabilities (Junco & Salter, 2004).

It is in recognition of the powerful connection between campus climate and academic excellence that The University of Vermont (UVM) holds that “diversity and academic excellence are inseparable. An excellent university, particularly one that is a public land grant, needs to actively seek to provide access to all students who can excel at the institution, without respect to their heritage and circumstances, including, among other differences, those of race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, cultural and/or geographic heritage, religious belief, age, and disability” (Fogel, 2004).

Furthermore, UVM administrators have articulated their commitment to creating and sustaining a welcoming and inclusive UVM climate that is grounded in respect, nurtured by dialogue and evidenced by a pattern of civil interaction. As President Fogel has articulated in his (2004) statement on “Why Diversity is an Academic and Institutional Strategic Priority,” it is incumbent upon decision-makers and stake-holders within institutions of higher learning to “create campus environments where students can learn and benefit from this increasing diversity.”

The University of Vermont’s sponsorship of the Campus Climate Survey Study (CCS) is evidence of this commitment to creating a positive campus climate for all. The main goal in conducting the CCS was to enable UVM to identify current climate-related challenges and successes that might subsequently inform the development and implementation of initiatives to improve and sustain a positive campus climate. The CCS was a proactive initiative by the President of UVM and the President’s Commission on Diversity and Inclusion.
The University decided in September, 2004 to conduct a Campus Climate Survey Study (CCS) with the goal of assessing the climate and utilizing the findings to help the University plan and work for a welcoming and inclusive campus for all members of the University’s community. The impetus for the CCS emerged from the President’s Commission on Diversity and Inclusion in 2003. At that time, John Gates, then Chief of Staff and member of the President’s Task Force on Racial Diversity, brought together a group of emeritus faculty to consider the feasibility of such a study. While the faculty involved agreed on the importance of such a study, they also determined that an outside consultant should be hired to conduct the study itself. This decision was made in recognition of the tremendous amount of time and effort such a study would involve, while also minimizing internal bias and offering greater confidentiality to participants that often derives from having a non-UVM affiliated research team conduct the data collection and entry processes.

The Campus Climate Survey Committee (hereafter the Committee) was formed as an ad hoc committee of the President’s Commission on Diversity and Inclusion and was charged by the Offices of the President and Provost with the responsibility of overseeing the construction, administration, analysis, and reporting of the findings from the survey to the University of Vermont community. Initial committee members were: Kathryn Friedman, Executive Director of Affirmative Action Equal Opportunity & Diversity & Equity Unit; Dr. Robert Lawson, Professor of Psychology and Chair of the President’s Commission on Racial Diversity; Diane Gaboriault, Senior Assistant, Diversity & Equity Unit; Laura Fishman, Associate Professor of Sociology; Margaret Ottinger, Student Academic Service Manager, ACCESS; Dorothea Brauer, Director, LGBTQA Services; and DaVaughn Bryan, UVM sophomore and SGA Senator.

The Committee researched, interviewed and ultimately hired an outside consultant to design and conduct the survey study. Rankin & Associates, Consulting was the firm selected, and it was Rankin’s conceptual model and survey questions from her earlier work that served as the foundation for the study. Dr. Rankin also employed fact-finding group meetings on campus in December, 2004, that allowed her to meet with members of various under-represented and potentially under-served groups on campus, members of the Administration, and other select groups. Information from these meetings was used to adapt the survey to the UVM context. These fact-finding group meetings also served to foster interest in the survey and to identify staff working with and/or members of under-represented groups who might subsequently serve to promote completion of the survey among members of their constituent and/or identity groups.

In December 2004, two additional faculty members—Dr. Jacqueline Weinstock, Associate Professor, Integrated Professional Studies, and Dr. Mary Canales, Associate Professor of Nursing and Women’s Center staff member—were recruited to serve on the Committee. Dr. Weinstock was asked at that time to prepare the research proposal for the Committee on Research in the Behavioral Sciences (Institutional Review Board) based on Dr. Rankin’s research design, and to officially serve as the Principal Investigator in order to have a UVM faculty member overseeing the ethical conduct of the research. Meanwhile, the study continued to be directed by Dr. Rankin/Rankin & Associates.
The Committee and various other constituent groups on campus worked with Dr. Rankin to adapt the survey to the UVM campus community. The CCS was successfully launched in April 2005 with data collected over a two-plus week period. An initial draft report was presented to the Committee in July, 2005, with additional draft reports presented to and reviewed by the Committee over the next several months. During this time, it became evident that the Committee required additional statistical support. Alan Howard, UVM IT Specialist, was invited to support the Committee in this capacity.

It was ultimately decided by Committee members that additional analyses of the data were warranted that were more sophisticated than the largely descriptive analyses initially conducted by Rankin & Associates. The Committee determined that experts from the UVM Medical Biostatistics Unit were most qualified to perform these additional statistical analyses. In January 2006, Dr. Takamaru Ashikaga, Professor and Director of Medical Biostatistics, and Dr. Pamela Vacek, Biostatistician and Research Assistant Professor, Medical Biostatistics and Pathology, agreed to do this work. Committee members subsequently provided background information, a review of the work to date, and priority areas for further analyses to Drs. Ashikaga and Vacek. During Spring 2006, select additional coding of the original data set occurred to correct or reconcile responses to some of the open-ended categories (e.g., a respondent who marked “Other” for position at UVM but explained that she was both a staff member and a student because she took one course a semester, was recoded as “Staff”). The edited data set was subsequently used as the basis for the analyses conducted by Drs. Ashikaga and Vacek.

Overview of Campus Climate Survey Study

The main aim in carrying out the CCS at The University of Vermont was to provide the University community with institutional information, analysis, and recommendations related to climate. By surveying the entire population of UVM community members, it was intended that the CCS would yield information regarding the current climate as experienced and perceived by its members. This data would provide a valuable base from which to determine priorities for future action. That is, the aim of the CCS was to provide a first level needs assessment regarding UVM’s campus climate.

Although data collection efforts emphasized identifying the experiences and perceptions of members of under-represented and potentially under-served members of the UVM community, attention was also given to majority group members’ experiences and perceptions of the institutional climate.

A total of 2,987 surveys were returned, representing a lower than expected response rate. Although the CCS was designed as a population study, targeting the entire UVM community, data were actually collected from a convenience sample – a small group of self-selected respondents. The results, therefore, cannot be viewed as representative of the entire UVM population. Despite the low response rate, the Committee determined that useful information could be mined from careful consideration of the responses, provided that care was also taken not to generalize the findings beyond the CCS results.

Before turning to the findings from these analyses, a summary of the research methods employed
in the CCS follows.

Method

Overview

The CCS as designed by Rankin & Associates was a population study with the University community as the target group. All students, staff, faculty, and administrators, 18 years of age or older, were invited to participate in the project (See Appendix A: Letter of Invitation to Participate from President Fogel) during a two-week period in April, of the Spring 2005 semester. At that time, 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.

Procedures

Rankin & Associates was hired to design and conduct the CCS. The consulting firm relied upon Rankin’s (2001) “transformational tapestry model of campus culture for maximizing equity on a particular university campus” (Rankin, 2003, p. 53), initially informed by the work of Smith et al. (1997). This model considers “five main aspects of campus culture (access and retention, research and scholarship, inter-group and intra-group relations, curriculum and pedagogy, and university service)” (Rankin, 2003, p. 52). A first step in this model is an internal assessment of campus climate to identify current campus challenges and successes.

Development of the Survey Instrument

The survey relied upon in this study was initially developed by Rankin (2003). The initial survey was revised by Rankin & Associates, Consulting, during Fall 2004 for appropriate delivery at The University of Vermont. Survey development was informed by fact finding meetings proposed by Rankin & Associates and convened in consultation with the CCS Committee. Held over two days, these meetings were approximately one hour in length and were conducted to collect information about positive initiatives and challenges facing the University community in regards to diversity. Participants included the Committee, University Administrators, and members of diverse constituent groups.

In addition to fact-finding meetings, The President, Provost, members of the CCS Committee, and members of various constituent groups reviewed and provided input into several drafts of the survey. The final survey contained 51 multiple-choice questions and additional space for respondents to provide commentary (see Appendix B: The UVM Assessment of Campus Climate Survey). The survey was designed to examine 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. Although the survey was modified into a web-based format, a paper/pencil version with associated scantron forms was also available. It was expected that the survey would take approximately 20 minutes to complete.
Data Collection/Survey Administration

Because of the desire to have as many members of the University community participate in the CCS as possible, surveys were made available via a URL provided by Rankin & Associates Consulting (www.rankin-consulting.com) initially for the two-week period of April 4th (Mon.) through April 15th (Fri.), with an extension through April 20th (Wed.) to increase the number of respondents. Approximately 500 surveys (a small number relative to the UVM population) were also made available in paper and pencil format in select locations for those who either did not have access to a computer or who were uncomfortable completing the survey on-line. Lock boxes were available for participants to place their completed hard-copy surveys. UVM personnel affiliated with the CCS collected completed surveys from lock boxes at the end of each business day during the sampling period. Two additional locked boxes were supervised by two UVM staff volunteers who agreed to act as translators for non-English speaking members of the UVM community (more information below under “Data Collection”). The hard copies and lock boxes were available for the same period as the URL. A total of 91 paper surveys were completed, with the remaining surveys completed on-line.

Recruitment of Participants

All students, staff, faculty, and administrators were invited to participate in the CCS project. An initial e-mail was forwarded to the entire University community from the President (see Letter of Invitation to Participate, Appendix A), using the University Communications System that targets all UVM faculty and staff (uvmfacultystaff@list.uvm.edu) and students (uvmstudents@list.uvm.edu). All UVM affiliates are subscribed to one or the other of these list-servs, where unsubscribing is not an option. One week following the initial Letter of Invitation to Participate, a follow-up e-mail was sent to the target population of UVM community members encouraging participation.

While the aim was to reach the entire UVM community, Rankin & Associates included efforts to over-sample traditionally under-represented populations. Towards this end, following the initial e-mails to the entire campus community, members of the CCS Committee, The President’s Commission on Diversity and Inclusion, and Directors and other key staff members affiliated with various racial, ethnic, sex, sexuality, ability, immigrant, and class-related groups on campus were specifically asked to contact members of under-represented groups on campus requesting that they forward the Letter of Invitation to Participate to their respective constituents. Previous experience suggests that this method increases response rates from underrepresented group members due to the trust potential respondents have from members of their respective groups (Rankin, Personal Communication, January 24, 2005).

Other UVM forums [e.g., The View (http://www.uvm.edu/~uvmpr/thview); and a slide show at the Student Information Center in Waterman that ran for the duration of the survey] were also used to announce the CCS and encourage participation. Fliers, table tents, and bookmarks were also placed in available locations around campus. Though differing in form, they all announced the CCS and requested participation using similar language (see Appendix C for sample announcements).
Ethical Process

Institutional Review Board. Dr. Weinstock completed the research proposal and protocol required by the University’s institutional review board and submitted all paperwork prior to dissemination of the survey campus-wide. The CCS was reviewed and approved by The University of Vermont’s Committee on Human Research in the Behavioral Sciences (CHRBS# 05-109), under the protocol title, “Campus Climate Project.”

Informed consent. No separate signed informed consent forms were used in this study so as to not compromise the identity of the participants. Participants were informed in the “directions” section of the survey that completing and submitting the survey implied their informed consent. Participants were also informed that they could print the first page of the survey and retain it as the consent form for their records (see Appendix B: UVM Assessment of Campus Climate Survey).

Voluntary withdrawal. Those respondents who, during the course of completing the survey, changed their mind and did not wish to continue with the survey, had two options: they could either submit the incomplete survey (through dropping the survey in a lock box if a hard copy version, or through clicking “Submit” if the on-line version) or they could choose not to submit anything (either by ripping up the hard copy survey responses or closing the URL without submitting anything for the on-line version).

Data Management

UVM personnel affiliated with the CCS project collected all completed paper survey responses and stored them in a locked file drawer in a locked office until such time as they were federal expressed to Rankin & Associates, Consulting. All hard copy surveys were subsequently scanned by Rankin & Associates and entered into a secure data base (www.rankin-consulting.com); before and following such scanning, completed paper survey responses were kept by the consultant in a locked file cabinet in a locked office for a period of six months, at which time they were destroyed.

All completed on-line surveys were entered into a secure site database (www.rankin-consulting.com). Once the participant submitted the survey, Rankin & Associates, Consulting stripped the IP address from the submission and separated any open-ended comments from the remaining multiple-choice items to assure confidentiality and anonymity.

Data from the on-line surveys and paper surveys were combined and tabulated for appropriate analysis. Following collection and input of the raw data, Rankin & Associates, Consulting examined the quality of the data and addressed any identified irregularities (e.g., replicated surveys). The consulting firm then reviewed and analyzed the data and prepared a preliminary report representing the frequency of responses to individual questions, as well as, select additional analyses. It was determined that if any group’s responses numbered less than 5 for any particular response, those responses would be combined with other groups to eliminate any potential for identifiable demographic information. Furthermore, the consulting firm removed
any other information where identifiability of the respondent was of concern.

Following receipt of the data set, frequencies on all data items were reviewed to verify that all values were within the valid range and to identify any logical inconsistencies. Three items were identified with missing data for more than 90% of respondents: Question 11 (observation of discriminatory practices relating to promotion), Question 24-4 (climate for Asian Americans), and Question 47-14 (climate for people of Islamic faith). Investigation of these anomalies revealed that the latter two items appeared to have been omitted from the on-line version of the survey, so responses were only captured for those who completed the paper version. The reason for the large number of missing responses for Question 11 is unclear. All three items were subsequently excluded from further analyses.

Additional data coding was conducted as follows: items that included a possible response of “not applicable” were recoded as missing for statistical analysis. Question 12 was recoded so that the ordinal scale of 1, 2, and 3 corresponded to “yes,” “unsure,” and “no,” respectively. Finally, “Other” responses to select questions were examined and recoded to a more specific category when it appeared reasonable to do so (e.g., an “Other” response with a follow-up explanation that the respondent is a full-time staff person who also takes courses at UVM, was recoded as a “Staff” person).

Data Analysis

The primary focus of the overall analysis was to compare differing respondent groups relative to information derived from the UVM CCS. However, due to the very large number of individual questionnaire items that were collected, group comparisons on each of these individual items would not be a wise analytic strategy due to the potential for observing spurious differences based upon traditional statistical hypothesis testing p-values. That is, the more statistical hypothesis tests that are performed, the more likely one is to find statistical significance purely by chance. Fortunately, the questionnaire items appeared to be organized into coherent domains, and thus a data dimension reduction approach was deemed conceptually feasible.

With the assistance of the CCS Committee, Drs. Ashikaga and Vacek sorted selected questionnaire items into five distinct conceptual categories of interest. These conceptual categories were (1) “Personal Experiences with Bias,” (2) “Personal Experiences with Sexual Assault,” (3) “Witnessing of Bias,” (4) “Personal Comfort,” and (5) “Perceptions of Climate.” Each of the five categories incorporated both a differing number of items and items that were collected using differing response typologies. Thus, Drs. Ashikaga and Vacek made some further decisions regarding a priori sets of items that would be included as specific domains within each of these five main conceptual categories. These items were then subjected to traditional item analyses and scale construction analyses. It should be noted that some categories only included one (“Personal Experiences with Bias”) or two items (“Personal Experience of Sexual Assault”) and were not amenable to traditional item analyses.

The data dimension reduction procedure used exploratory factor analysis as the traditional scale analysis approach, as implemented in SPSS for UNIX, Release 6.1. The goal in factor analysis is to reduce the number of items that pertain to a conceptual category into a few additive scales or
“factors” (ideally, one or two) which explain a large proportion of the variance contained in the original items. That is, a large number of individual items is reduced to (hopefully) one or two additive scales composed of these items that contain as much of the information as possible in the original items. The individual items that appeared related to each other and that showed a common structure became the basis for the creation of these additive scales. Each additive scale was also characterized by Cronbach’s coefficient alpha to measure internal consistency. This provided some further assurance that the scales have reasonable reliability levels.

Continuing to work in consultation with the CCS Committee, five select respondent groups were also identified based upon (1) sexual orientation [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]. Using the 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. To summarize, Drs. Ashikaga and Vacek were able to construct additive scales with reasonable Chronbach’s alpha internal consistency that 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.”

Statistical analysis approaches. Factor analyses with a varimax rotation were applied to sets of potentially conceptually related items. Scree plots were examined to assist in determining the number of related factors, with eigenvalues above 1.0 of primary interest. Items with rotated factor loading of less than 0.40 were not considered for use in the construction of subsequent additive scales and are reported using the symbols “—” in the factor loading tables. Items with loadings of 0.40 or higher on more that one factor, were included in the additive scale corresponding to the factor for which it had the highest loading. The proportion of variation explained by each factor is also noted. For those item categories that did not yield strong factor loadings, no additive scales were created. For those additive scales that were derived from these factor analyses, Cronbach’s alpha for additive scales were obtained to quantify internal consistency reliability along with scale and item correlations. The additive scales were averaged to retain the original ordinal scoring ranges. Descriptive statistics (25th, 50th, 75th-percentiles) for each additive scale are also presented.

Group comparisons for the additive scales were conducted using a two-sample t-test when only two groups were involved. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted when three or more groups were compared. A significant ANOVA F-test was then followed with a paired comparison of group means using a Student-Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons approach. Group comparisons for those questionnaire items that were dichotomous (yes or no) were made using contingency tables methods. Thus, 2x2 tables were used when comparing two groups while 2x3 or 2x4 tables were used when comparing the percents of yes responses across three or four groups, respectively. Standard significance values are listed. No adjustments for multiple testing were made. It should be emphasized that the standard significance levels

4 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.
achieved (i.e. p-values) will tend to be rather small due to the very large sample sizes that are being used in all of the comparative analyses. **Thus, it would be wise to interpret any significance levels in conjunction with the actual observed mean differences as well as the actual observed percentage differences.**

Select additional groupings. In addition to the five selected respondent groups, the CCS Committee decided to conduct two additional series of analyses to generate descriptive findings for two additional respondent groupings. One series of analyses (referred to in brief as “Marginalized/Majority”) compared respondents who identified as a Person of Color, LGBQ, Transgender, and/or as a Person with a Disability—that is, respondents who identified with one or more marginalized groups related to Race, Sexuality, Gender Identity/Expression, and Disability (four of the five respondent groups originally selected for group comparisons)—with respondents who did not identify with any of these four marginalized groups—that is, respondents who self-identified as White, Non-Transgender Male or Female campus community members who reported No Disability]. An alternative series of analyses was also completed (referred to as “Marginalized/Majority2”) wherein Non-Transgender Females were included as part of the Marginalized group rather than the Majority group.5

A second series of analyses considered and compared students (full-time and part-time undergraduate and graduate students, excluding those part-time students who were also staff) and staff (including faculty, administrators, and all categories of staff).

Results6

Demographics of the Sample

The total number of completed surveys was 2,987, including 1,487 undergraduate students, 230 graduate students, 353 faculty, 792 staff, 47 administrators, and 26 “Other” (with 52 surveys having missing data on this question of position at UVM). This yielded a sample over 50% of which was comprised of undergraduate and graduate students and over 25% staff compared to just under 12% faculty. Administrators comprised 1.6% of the sample. These demographics are summarized in the table on the following page.

---

5 The Committee’s decision to include Non-Transgender Females in the historically majority group in the first series of analyses was largely due to the large percentage of the sample that they comprise. The alternative series of analyses in which Non-Transgender Female respondents were included in the historically marginalized group reflects the recognition of the continued existence of sexism despite the large number of Non-Transgender Females as part of the campus community.

6 Major findings and select additional findings are reported here that emerged from analyses drawing upon the five conceptual categories and five select demographic groups previously identified as our focus. We note that the data may still be mined for additional important information. This is especially true for the open-ended responses provided by respondents that, while not reported upon here, have informed our understanding of the quantitative findings and are important to consider in future endeavors.
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.

With respect to Race, of the total sample, there were 311 respondents who identified themselves as a person of color, and 2,569 respondents who self-identified as white, with 107 surveys missing information on this category.

With respect to physical disability, 117 respondents reported a physical disability while 2,819 respondents reported no physical disability. There were missing data for 51 survey respondents on this question.
With regard to reporting of a cognitive or emotional disability, 350 respondents identified as having this kind of disability, while 2,592 identified as not having this kind of disability. Meanwhile, there were missing data for 45 survey respondents.

### Physical disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,819</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,987</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When responses to both cognitive or emotional disability, and physical disability were examined together, 87 respondents identified as having a physical disability only, 316 identified as having a cognitive or emotional disability, and 30 respondents identified as having both a physical and a cognitive or emotional disability. A total of 59 respondents, however, had missing data for either physical disability, cognitive or emotional disability, or both.

With respect to sexual orientation, 312 people identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or questioning, while 2,560 people identified as Heterosexual. There were missing or incomplete data for an additional 115 respondents. There are no available estimates of the total population of LGBQ UVM community members.
The demographic pattern of responses by self-identified Gender Identity revealed 1,997 Female respondents, 915 Male respondents, and 22 Transgender/Transsexual/Genderqueer respondents; of the latter, 17 identified along the Female to Male spectrum and 5 along the Male to Female spectrum. Sixteen respondents recorded “Other” and 37 respondents had missing data on this item. There are no available estimates of the total population of Transgender UVM community members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender identity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender/transsexual/genderqueer (female to male spectrum)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender/transsexual/genderqueer (male to female spectrum)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2950</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2987</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious or spiritual affiliation was also examined. Of the respondents, 1,262 identified their religious or spiritual affiliation as Christian, 407 identified a religious or spiritual affiliation that was other than Christian, and 1,128 indicated they have religious or spiritual beliefs but were not affiliated with an organized religion. An additional 42 respondents reported no religious or spiritual beliefs, and 62 respondents recorded the response of “Other.” Finally, 86 respondents had missing data on this variable. See summary table on following page.
Religious affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Christian</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have beliefs, but no affiliation</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious beliefs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2901</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2987</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select Descriptive Statistics for the Full Sample

The Committee recognizes that descriptive statistics for the full sample may be both useful and misleading at the same time. Only a few select descriptive statistics for the full sample are presented here, to offer some insight into majority patterns of responses.

Personal Experiences with Bias

Nineteen percent (19%) of all the respondents to this survey reported they had personally experienced offensive, hostile, or intimidating conduct that interfered with their ability to work or learn on campus. 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%). Of those who experienced this conduct, 43% reported feeling ignored or excluded, 42% intimidated or bullied, and 40% reported experiencing derogatory remarks.

Additionally, 46% of these respondents experienced this conduct while working at a UVM job and 25% while in the classroom. With respect to reported source of the harassment, 45% of these respondents identified students, 35% identified faculty, and 35% identified staff. Meanwhile, only twenty-five percent (25%) of respondents that reported personal experiences of bias reported it to a UVM employee or official.

Personal Experiences 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.

With regards to the University’s response to a sexual assault, 59% of respondents felt 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. However, 29% were unsure and 11% did not feel confident of any such situational support. Thus, only 6 out of 10 respondents expressed confidence in this area.
Witnessing of Bias

Thirty-seven percent (37%) of all respondents reported having observed or personally been made aware of conduct on campus that created an offensive, hostile, or intimidating working or learning environment. Sexual Orientation (50%), Race (49%), and Gender (41%) were the most often cited reasons believed to be the basis of the conduct, while the types of conduct these respondents most often personally observed or were made aware of were staring (44%), racial profiling (43%), graffiti (42%), derogatory remarks (40%), and people being deliberately ignored (36%). This conduct was most often cited as having occurred while walking on campus (40%), in University housing (38%), in public space on campus (33%), in University jobs (32%) and in the classroom (31%). The most common sources of this conduct were students (65%), followed by equal percentages of staff and faculty (26%).

Personal Comfort

Eighty-two percent (82%) of respondents indicated that they were comfortable with the overall climate at UVM; similarly, 82% indicated that they were comfortable with the climate in their academic college or administrative unit. While this suggests that UVM’s campus climate is a positive one from the perspectives and experiences of over three-quarters of survey respondents, there remains a substantial portion of the sample that did not report being comfortable with the overall climate or the climate in their academic college or administrative unit.

Perceptions of Climate

In addition to reporting on personal experiences of bias, sexual assault, witnessing of bias, and personal comfort, respondents were asked to share their perceptions of campus climate in a variety of ways. Based on analyses of the questions related to this category, it appears that a lower percentage of respondents indicated a favorable perception of the campus climate than reported being comfortable themselves with the climate. For example, while 82% of the total sample reported being comfortable with the overall campus climate and the climate in their academic college or administrative unit, 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.

Sixty-one percent (61%) of respondents noted they believe UVM values their involvement in diversity initiatives on campus and fifty-two percent (52%) reported that they believe the President’s Office visibly fosters diversity. 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.
Factor Analysis: Conceptual Categories

In the above sections, we have reported descriptive statistics. Next we report on the results of the factor analyses for three of the five conceptual categories. Factor analyses were not conducted for Category 1: Personal Experiences with Bias, or Category 2: Personal Experiences with Sexual Assault, given that only 1 or 2 questions, respectively, were relied upon for these reports. We report the results for these categories here, however, so that all five conceptual categories are represented.

The first series of results are based on the total sample; following these, we report on the results of the analyses by individual groups and selected groupings.

In the following, the basic frequencies for individual items are self-explanatory. However, some material regarding the factor analyses is included to aid in understanding these results. The specific survey question(s) that informed the factor analysis are also provided.

Category 1: Personal Experiences with Bias (no factor analysis)

Only one question, “Have you personally experienced any offensive, hostile, or intimidating conduct that has interfered with your ability to work or learn at UVM?” was relied upon to assess personal experiences with bias; thus no factor analysis was necessary. We note here, however, that nineteen percent (19%) of respondents, or almost one in five respondents reported personally experiencing inappropriate conduct that impacted negatively upon their ability to work or learn at UVM.

Category 2: Personal Experiences with Sexual Assault (no factor analysis)

The following two questions and response options were relied upon for this second category; response percentages are also reported.

Q13. I have been touched in a sexual manner that has made me feel uncomfortable or fearful.
     82% (Never)  13% (Rarely)  4% (Sometimes)  <1% (Often + Very often)

Q15. Have you ever been a victim of sexual assault while at UVM?
     4% (yes)

The two upper categories for Q13 (Often and Very often) were combined here for simplicity since both together represented less than 1% of the responses. The analysis of Q13 also utilized a dichotomization into Never (82%) or a combined (Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Very Often) (18%) due to the low frequency of responses in these higher frequency categories when crossed with the subsequent group comparisons.

Approximately 5% of the respondents reported experiencing being touched in a sexual manner that created feelings of fear and discomfort “Sometimes” or more frequently. This reported percentage of inappropriate touching appears to be similar to the percentage of respondents who indicated that they were a victim of sexual assault while at UVM (4%).
Category 3: Witnessing of Bias

The four questions dealing with witnessing of bias (Q8 to Q11) were obtained on a yes or no basis. Question 11 had almost 93% missing and was thus not included in the factor analysis. The remaining three questions explained 46% of the variation although the factor loadings were not very impressive. The resulting Cronbach alpha value reflected these rather modest factor loadings and a rather mediocre internal consistency reliability value of 0.36 for an additive scale that might be constructed using these two items. An additive scale was therefore not created using these items due to these results. Subsequent group comparisons utilized the yes-no response patterns for each of the items.

Factor 1

Q8. Have you observed or personally been made aware of any conduct directed toward a person or group of people at the University of Vermont that you believe has created an offensive, hostile, or intimidating working or learning environment? 37% (yes)

Q9. I observed discriminatory hiring practices at UVM (e.g. search committee bias, limited recruiting pool, etc.) 13% (yes)

Q10. I observed discriminatory firing at UVM. 5% (yes)

Q11. I observed discriminatory behavior or employment practices related to promotion at UVM. 93% (Missing)

Percent of Variance 46%

Cronbach’s alpha 0.36

Thirty-seven percent (37%) reported having observed or been made aware of inappropriate conduct at UVM that created an offensive, hostile, or intimidating working or learning environment. A smaller percentage (13%) indicated observing discriminatory hiring practices and an even smaller percentage reported observing discriminatory firing practices (5%).

Category 4: Personal Comfort

The following table presents the choices that were available for the next set of questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following definition of climate was provided as part of the survey: “Climate refers to current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of employees and students concerning the access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and potential.”

### Within the last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1-Q4</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Overall, how comfortable are you with the climate at UVM?</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Overall, how comfortable are you with the climate in your academic college (e.g. College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, College of Education &amp; Social Services, etc.) or administrative division (Administration &amp; Finance, Student &amp; Campus Life, Office of the Provost, etc.)</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Overall, how comfortable are you with the climate in your department/work area?</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Overall, how comfortable are you with the relationship you have with your academic advisor/advisee(s) and/or supervisor/supervisee(s)?</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>61%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 25<sup>th</sup> %tile | 1.5 |
| 50<sup>th</sup> %tile | 2.0 |
| 75<sup>th</sup> %tile | 2.2 |

The above four questions deal with the personal comfort individuals feel about various settings and individuals. Q1 to Q4 resulted in a single factor that explained 61% of the variation and reflected higher loadings for academic college or administrative unit, and department or work area. Question 4 showed the lowest loading when dealing with specific individuals such as academic advisor, advisees, supervisors or supervisees. The Cronbach alpha reflected good internal consistency reliability at 0.78.

The distribution of scores for this personal comfort scale indicates that 50% of the respondents feel either “Very comfortable” or “Comfortable” given that the median value was 2.0 which equaled the 2 = “Comfortable” rating, and that over 75% appear to be rating this factor above the 3 = “Unsure” rating.

### To what extent have you had the following experiences in the past year at UVM?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q48-Q49 Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q48. I am comfortable being open on campus about my identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49. I feel that my cultural heritage is valued at UVM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The factor analysis for these two experience items indicated that a single factor explained 71% of the variation. However, the correlation between these two items was not very substantial. As can be seen, the Cronbach alpha value did not reflect very good internal consistency reliability for an additive scale using these two items. Thus, frequencies for Q48 and Q49 are listed below since there was not sufficient justification to create an additive scale using Q48 and Q49.

48. I am comfortable being open on campus about my identity.
   2% (Never) 3% (Rarely) 16% (Sometimes) 29% (Often) 50% (Very often)

49. I feel that my cultural heritage is valued at UVM.
   8% (Never) 16% (Rarely) 32% (Sometimes) 25% (Often) 19% (Very often)

Seventy-nine percent of the respondents indicated that they “Often” or “Very often” feel comfortable in being open about their identity (Q48). In contrast, 24% either “Never” or “Rarely” feel that their cultural heritage is valued in the UVM community (Q49). These two items are positively correlated as noted in the factor analysis. However, it is interesting to see a shift in the percentage of respondents endorsing lower frequency ratings for the valuing of their cultural heritage.

The following table presents the choices that were available for the next set of questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>do not agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q51. As a student, I am comfortable requesting assistance from a:</td>
<td>1 White Professor</td>
<td>2 Male Professor</td>
<td>3 Female Professor</td>
<td>4 Professor of Color</td>
<td>5 “Out” Lesbian, Gay, or Bisexual Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Out” Transgender/Transsexual/Gender-Queer Professor</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Professor with a Disability</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>International Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Variance 72%
Cronbach’s alpha 0.94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; %tile</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; %tile</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; %tile</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor analysis of the eight sources of assistance items of Q51 indicates that a single factor explains 72% of the variation in the comfort scores. The additive scale has an excellent Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient value of 0.94.

There appears to be very strong endorsement by students in their comfort in seeking of assistance from faculty members across a wide-range of identities given that this factor resulted in a median value of 1.1 and a 75<sup>th</sup> %tile value of 2.0.

Category 5: Perceptions of Climate

The following table presents the choices that were available for the next set of questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>do not agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17. The University of Vermont proactively addresses issues related to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q17A Factor 1</th>
<th>Q17B Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnicity</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employee status</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender variance</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international students, faculty, staff</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mental illness</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disability</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical characteristics</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native English speakers</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual orientation</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socioeconomic class</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Variance  48%  12%
The factor analysis of the fourteen Q17 items asking about UVM proactively addressing issues reveals that two factors explained about 60% of the total variation. The first factor Q17A explained the bulk of the variation (48%) and loaded strongly on ethnicity, gender, gender variance, individuals from outside the US, Race, and Sexual Orientation. The second factor Q17B explained 12% of the variation and loaded upon age, employee status, mental illness, disability, physical characteristics, non-native English speakers and socioeconomic class. The additive scales for both had very good Cronbach alpha internal reliability values (0.89 and 0.86).

The distribution of responses for Factor 1 (Q17A) can be characterized by examining the percentile values. Here the 25th %tile score of 2.0 coincides with “Agree” coding exactly, while the median score of 2.3 and the 75th %tile score of 2.9 lie between “Agree” and “Do not agree nor disagree.” Thus, over 50% of the respondents scores were above a neutral rating for this factor relating to UVM addressing issues of ethnicity, gender, gender variance, individuals from outside the U.S., Race, and Sexual Orientation. The distribution of responses for the Factor 2 (Q17B) was not as favorable as Factor 1, with the 25th %tile of 2.4, a median of 2.9 and a 75th %tile of 3.2. Here UVM was not viewed as proactive in addressing issues of age, employee status, mental illness, disability, physical characteristics, non-native English speakers and socioeconomic class given that the 25th %tile falls between the “Agree” and the neutral response, and the 75th %tile was ranging into the neutral to “Disagree” range.

Q18. There is visible leadership to foster diversity at UVM from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q18</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The President’s Office</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dean of Student’s Office</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My academic dean/unit head</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My department head/direct supervisor</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Faculty in my department</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Student government</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student organizations</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Faculty senate</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Diversity &amp; Equity Unit</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Variance 46%
Cronbach’s alpha  0.87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25th %tile</th>
<th>50th %tile</th>
<th>75th %tile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q19. Course content at UVM includes materials, perspectives, and/or experiences of people from historically underrepresented/marginalized groups.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20. I believe that UVM values my involvement in diversity initiatives on campus.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21. I believe the classroom climate is welcoming for students from historically under-represented/marginalized groups.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22. I believe the workplace climate is welcoming for employees from historically underrepresented/marginalized groups.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Variance  57%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25th %tile</th>
<th>50th %tile</th>
<th>75th %tile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q19-Q22 Factor 1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ten items of Q18 asking about the visibility of UVM leadership sources indicates that a single factor explained 46% of the total variation with higher loadings for most all of the sources with the exception the Faculty Senate and the President’s Office. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliability coefficient for the additive scale was very respectable (0.87). Factor analysis of the four question items asking about aspects of inclusiveness (Q19 to Q22) reflected a single factor explaining 57% of the variation. The loadings for this factor however, appear less robust for inclusiveness relative to course content and valuing participation in diversity initiatives compared to having classroom climates and workplace climates that are welcoming to historically underrepresented or marginalized groups.

The distribution of this factor (Q18) indicates that the 25th %tile value of 2.1 sits somewhat below the “Agree” rating and that the median of 2.5 is exactly midway between “Agree” and neutral ratings. The 75th %tile value of 2.9 sits just above the neutral rating. It thus appears that over 75% of the respondents agree that there is visible leadership to foster diversity in multiple domains.

The distribution of the inclusive factor (Q19-Q22) tends to range between an “Agree” rating and neutral rating given the 25th %tile value of 2.0 and 75th %tile value of 3.0. The wider inter-quartile range (75th – 25th%tile) for this inclusiveness factor indicates a wider dispersion of endorsement compared to the leadership factor (Q18).
The following table presents the choices that were available for the next set of questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessible</th>
<th>Accessible</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Somewhat Inaccessible</th>
<th>Very Inaccessible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q23. How would you rate the accessibility of the campus for people with disabilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Billings Student Center</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dean of Student’s Office</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Classroom Buildings</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Specific Classrooms</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Administrative Buildings</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Grounds (snow, construction)</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Athletic Facilities</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Residence Halls</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dining Facilities</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Greek Houses</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>UVM Web Site</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Information in Alternative Formats (Braille, etc)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>41%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seventeen questionnaire items of Q23 dealing with campus access for individuals with disabilities resulted in a single factor that explained 41% of the variation. It should be noted that several items with low loadings (Greek Houses, UVM Web Site, Alternative Information Formats) were not included in the subsequent additive scale. The overall Cronbach alpha for the additive scale was very good at 0.91.

The 25th %tile value of 2.6 sits between a rating of 2 = “Accessible” and a rating of 3 = “Don’t
Know” while the median of 3.0 equals the latter rating. The 75th %tile of 3.3 sits between “Don’t Know” and a value of 4 = “Somewhat Inaccessible.” Thus, the respondents were split between rating the physical campus as being accessible or not.

The following table presents the choices that were available for the next set of questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Respectful</th>
<th>Moderately Respectful</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Respectful</th>
<th>Not at all Respectful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q24. How would you rate the overall campus climate for people who are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q24 Factor</th>
<th>African Americans/Blacks</th>
<th>American Indians/Alaskan Natives</th>
<th>Arabs/Arab Americans</th>
<th>Asian Americans</th>
<th>Caucasians/Whites</th>
<th>Latino(a)s/Chicano(a)s/Hispanics</th>
<th>Middle Eastern persons</th>
<th>Multiracial, multiethnic, or multicultural persons</th>
<th>Pacific Islanders/Hawaiian Natives</th>
<th>Gay, lesbian, bisexual persons</th>
<th>International students, staff, or faculty</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Non-native English speakers</th>
<th>Transgender/transsexual/gender-queer persons</th>
<th>With disabilities</th>
<th>With less socioeconomic privilege</th>
<th>With minority religious affiliations</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Variance  60%  

Cronbach’s alpha  0.96  

25th %tile  2.0  
50th %tile  2.5  
75th %tile  3.0

The eighteen items dealing with respect for others from Q24 revealed one major factor. This factor (Q24) explained 60% of the variation and loaded upon all items with the exception of
being white/non-Hispanic and Male. The Cronbach alpha for the additive scales Q24 is very respectable at 0.91.

The respect for others factor Q24 had a 25th %tile value of 2.0 which corresponded to 2 = “Moderately Respectful,” a median of 2.5, and a 75th %tile value of 3.0 which corresponds to 3 = “Not Sure” on the rating scale. Thus, over 75% of the respondents endorse the campus climate as being respectful of others.

The following table presents the choices that were available for the next set of questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q47. Using a scale of 1-5, please rate the overall campus climate at UVM on the following dimensions:</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 friendly - hostile</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 communicative- reserved</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 concerned - indifferent</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 respectful - disrespectful</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 cooperative - uncooperative</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 improving - regressing</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 accessible to persons- inaccessible to persons with disabilities</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 non-racist - racist</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 non-sexist – sexist</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 non-heterosexist – heterosexist</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 positive for people - not positive for people who identify as LGB who identify as LGB</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 positive for people - not positive for people who are gender-variant who are gender-variant</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 positive for people of Jewish heritage - anti-Semitic (anti-Jewish)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 positive for people of Islamic faith - anti-Islamic</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 positive for people who practice other than the Christian faith - not positive for people who practice other than the Christian faith</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 positive for people who practice the Christian faith - not positive for people who practice the Christian faith</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an example, for the first item, “friendly—hostile,”

1 = very friendly
2 = somewhat friendly
3 = neither friendly nor hostile
4 = somewhat hostile, and
5 = very hostile
The twenty-one items of Q47 that rated two extreme adjectives to describe the overall UVM climate resulted in three factors Q47A, Q47B and Q47C that explained 47%, 9% and 6% of the variation, respectively. The first factor (Q47A) reflects a generalized climate response. The second factor (Q47B) reflects a more specific climate response that loads on Race, Sex, Sexuality and Gender Identity/Expression related items. The third factor (Q47C) loads on faith items and to a lesser degree on being a native English speaker or being from outside of the US. All three additive scales show very good Cronbach alpha values of 0.90, 0.91 and 0.87, respectively.

Examination of the 25th %tile (1.7), median (2.1), and 75th %tile (2.7) values for the first factor Q47A, which reflects a general campus climate, indicates that over 75% of respondents tend to view the UVM climate as being friendly. The %tile values for the next two factors (Q47B, Q47C) that load on more specific climate issues such as Race, Sex, Sexuality, and Gender Identity/Expression related items, and on faith items and other items indicates a lower level of endorsement of the campus climate, with 25th %tile values of 2.0 and 75th %tile values of 3.0 for both factors.

Statistical Analyses: Group Comparisons

Groups Used for Comparisons

The specific groups used in the comparative analyses that follow were: (1) Sexual Orientation [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]. These five groups and their frequencies are listed in the table on the following page. We recognize that this list is incomplete; however, this list represents the most common categories of historically under-represented/marginalized groups on campus.
The frequencies in the above table represent the frequencies of the various categorizations within each group including the frequency of missing items. It should be noted that subsequent group comparisons may not necessarily reflect the simple marginal totals since group comparisons require complete data on the scales or items being compared across the groups.

**Category 1: Personal Experiences with Bias**

Item Q7 asked about personal experiences of offensive, hostile or intimidating conduct that interfered with respondents’ ability to work or learn at UVM. This one item comprised “Personal Experience with Bias.” The percentage of respondents reporting personal experience with bias is reported in the table below, along with the standard deviation and the total number of

---

7 LGBQ stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, or questioning in this study.
sub-group respondents for which data was available.

### Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>StdDev</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBQ</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>StdDev</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>StdDev</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>StdDev</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As already reported, 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 presented here indicate that under-represented groups on campus experienced this conduct disproportionately.

**Sexual orientation.** LGBQ respondents were 2.5 times more likely to report such experiences than their Heterosexual counterparts (40% vs. 16%), a difference that is statistically significant and that appears to reflect a meaningful difference as well.

**Race.** People of Color were also 2.5 times more likely as white respondents to report having such experiences (40% vs. 16%). Again, this difference was statistically significant and appears to reflect a meaningful difference as well.

**Gender Identity.** The percentage of Transgender respondents reporting negative experiences (50%) was substantially higher than Female (19%) and Male (17%) experiences. These results are statistically significant; while the responses of Non-Transgender Female and Male respondents do not appear to reflect a meaningful difference, their difference from that of Transgender respondents does appear to reflect a meaningful difference.

**Disability.** 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%). These findings are statistically significant and, again, appear to
reflect a meaningful difference.

Religious affiliation. Non-Christian respondents reported the highest level of experiencing negative behaviors (23%) compared to those with no (17%) or a Christian (18%) affiliation. These findings are statistically significant although whether they reflect a meaningful difference is less clear.

Category 2: Personal Experience of Sexual Assault

Category 2 included two items wherein respondents were asked to report on whether and to what extent they had “been touched in a sexual manner that has made me feel uncomfortable or fearful” (Q13) and whether they “have ever been a victim of sexual assault while at UVM (Q15). Response options for Q13 ranged from “Never” to “Very Often,” this ordinal scale was subsequently dichotomized to 0 = (never) and 1 = (rarely to very often) to allow for sufficient numbers of responses for the desired comparisons. The item asking about being a victim of sexual assault while at UVM (Q15) was solicited using a yes-no response format. Thus, all of the results in this section deal with percentages being compared across groups and, as before, percentages of “yes” responses indicating touching in a sexual manner and sexual assault victimization are reported, along with the standard deviation and the total number of sub-group respondents for which data was available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Q13 (yes)</th>
<th>Q15 (yes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBQ</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Q13 (yes)</th>
<th>Q15 (yes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Q13 (yes)</th>
<th>Q15 (yes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>StdDev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of the above analyses indicates that experiences with sexual assault were less consistent than the previously analyzed category. Yet significant differences in reporting of both inappropriate touching and sexual assault were identified for sexual orientation, gender identity, and disability.

**Sexual orientation.** Reporting of inappropriate touching (Q13) and sexual assault (Q15)
depended upon respondent sexual orientation. A significantly higher percent of LGBQ respondents (30%) reported being touched in a sexual manner compared to Heterosexual respondents (16%). A similar directional difference was observed for reporting of being a sexual assault victim while at UVM (5% vs. 3%).

**Race.** Neither questionnaire item appeared to differ significantly between People of Color and Whites. Both People of Color and Whites reported similar rates of being touched in a sexual manner. People of Color (5%) compared to Whites (3%) reported a higher frequency of sexual assault while at UVM although this did not reach a 5% significance level.

**Gender Identity.** Both items showed significant variation between the three Gender Identity groups. A rather strong difference in reported rates of being touched was observed starting from Male (9%), female (21%) and Transgender (50%) respondents. A similar pattern of Gender Identity differences was seen for sexual assault, although the absolute group differences were smaller in magnitude. Here the group specific reports were observed to be Male (2%), Female (4%) and Transgender (5%).

**Disability.** Both items differed significantly between groups. Differences in reported rates of being touched in a sexual manner were observed, with those with Physical Disabilities reporting the lowest rate (9%), followed by respondents reporting no disabilities (16%), emotional disabilities (30%), and both emotional and Physical Disabilities (47%). These pronounced differences raise questions about any potential temporal or cause and effect issues. A less pronounced set of differences was observed for sexual assault, with those with emotional (9%) and those with both physical and emotional disabilities (7%) being higher compared to those with none (3%) or only a physical disability (1%).

**Religious affiliation.** Only reports of touching in a sexual manner that made respondents feel uncomfortable differed significantly between non-Christian (23%) and those with no affiliation (18%) or a Christian (16%) affiliation. These differences in the percentages may be a reflection of associated cultural standards regarding physical contact. No differences in reported sexual assault rates while at UVM were observed between these three groups.

**Category 3: Witnessing of Bias**

Originally, four yes-no response pattern items (Q8, Q9, Q10, Q11) were identified as dealing with the hearing about or witnessing of bias while at UVM. Item Q11 that dealt with observing discriminatory behavior or employment practices related to promotion was deleted due to the large number of missing responses (93%). The remaining items did not form a viable additive scale. Thus, the following deal with the percentage of individuals being compared across the various groups on each of three questions that asked respondents about whether they have **observed or personally been made aware of any** conduct directed toward a person or group of people at the University of Vermont that you believe has created an offensive, hostile, or intimidating working or learning environment (Q8), whether they “observed discriminatory hiring practices at UVM” (Q9) and whether they “observed discriminatory firing at UVM” (Q10). The percentages of “Yes” responses are reported, along with the standard deviations and number of respondents in each analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q8 (yes)</th>
<th>Q9 (yes)</th>
<th>Q10 (yes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBQ</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>2536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2558</td>
<td>2540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2481</td>
<td>2465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, while less pronounced, the same pattern persisted with this category as with Personal Experiences with Bias. That is, there were still distinctions in witnessing biases between majority and minority respondents across all under-represented groups.

**Sexual orientation.** All three items differed between respondents with a LGBQ sexual orientation and a Heterosexual orientation. Witnessing or being made aware of behavior that created a negative working or learning environment (Q8) was significantly higher for LGBQ respondents (64%) than Heterosexual respondents (33%). A similar pattern of differences relative to witnessing of discriminatory hiring practices (Q9) (19% vs 12%) and witnessing discriminatory firing practices (Q10) (8% vs 4%) was also observed although the absolute percentages declined. It could be argued that these declines would be expected since these latter two items asked about actual observation of practices while item Q8 related to being made aware of such situations or conditions.

**Race.** As was the case for sexual orientation, all three items had higher rates of reports among People of Color compared to white respondents. Hearing about or being made aware of behaviors that created a negative working or learning environment (Q8) was significantly higher for People of Color (50%) than white respondents (35%). Differences in the witnessing of discriminatory hiring (Q9) (17% vs 12%) and firing (Q10) (11% vs 4%) practices were less pronounced although consistent. The absolute response rates for Q8 are not as pronounced as was the case for sexual orientation.
Gender Identity. Item Q8 differed among Male (33%), Female (37%) and Transgender (77%) respondents. This substantial difference however should be viewed with some caution given the small number of Transgender individuals (n=22). The actual statistical significance may be due to the difference between Males and Females. No differences relative to witnessing discriminatory hiring or firing practices were observed although it might be argued that participation of Transgender individuals in specific hiring and firing roles may be limited.

Disability. All three items reflect significant differences among Disability groupings (none, physical, emotional, both). Hearing about or being made aware of behaviors that created a negative working or learning environment (Q8) reflected an interesting trend among these four groupings with response percentages of 35%, 39%, 45%, and 53%, respectively. However, the witnessing of hiring discrimination (Q9) (28%) and the witnessing of discrimination in firing (Q10) (24%) appeared to be highest among those with both disabilities compared to the three other groups.

Religious affiliation. Non-Christian respondents tended to report higher percentages for all three items compared to Christian or No Affiliation respondents. Hearing about or being made aware of behaviors that created a negative working or learning environment (Q8) by Non-Christians (43%) was followed by those with no religious affiliation (38%) and a Christian (32%) affiliation. Witnessing discriminatory firing practices (Q10) was higher among Non-Christians (8%) than either of the other two groups (4% and 4%), and witnessing discriminatory hiring practices (Q9) had a similar pattern (16%, 12%, 12%) although not reaching statistical significance.

Category 4: Personal Comfort

The category of Personal Comfort was examined with several items, including a combination of Questions 1-4, Q14, Q48, Q49 and Q51.

In Q1-4, respondents were asked to rate their overall comfort with the climate at UVM, in their academic college, in their department/work area, and with their relationship with their academic advisor/advisee(s) and/or supervisor/supervisee(s), based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next three questions relied upon the following scale and asked respondents to report the extent to which there are times when within the campus community that they fear being sexually assaulted (Q14), the extent to which they are “comfortable being open on campus about my identity,” (Q48) the extent to which they “feel that my cultural heritage is valued at UVM” (Q49).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, Q51 offered a scale ranging from [1] Strongly Agree to [5] Strongly Disagree, with [6] as Not Applicable, to assess students’ comfort requesting assistance from diverse faculty; responses to the diverse faculty options were combined for these analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1 - Q4</th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Q48</th>
<th>Q49</th>
<th>Q51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBQ</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2556</td>
<td>2544</td>
<td>2103</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p-value</strong></td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2564</td>
<td>2554</td>
<td>2124</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p-value</strong></td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>1444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p-value</strong></td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As is observable in the above table, personal comfort with UVM differed between members of under-represented groups and their majority counterparts in some areas. The pattern was less evident, however, compared to the other categories analyzed. Yet 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.

**Sexual orientation.** Four of the five personal comfort scales or items differed significantly between LGBQ and Heterosexual respondents. LGBQ respondents expressed less comfort with respect to UVM organizational settings and individuals (Q1-Q4) as well as having fearful feelings of being sexually assaulted (Q14) compared to Heterosexual respondents. LGBQ individuals were also less comfortable about being open about their identity (Q48) and their heritage (Q49). No differences were seen for the scale dealing with students seeking assistance from various sources (Q51).

**Race.** All five scales and items reflected differences between People of Color and
Whites. People of Color expressed less comfort with respect to UVM organizational settings and individuals (Q1-Q4), as well as having greater levels of fear of being sexually assaulted (Q14) compared to whites. This pattern was also seen when requesting assistance (Q51) where students of color were less comfortable seeking assistance compared to white students. Individuals of color were also less comfortable about being open about their identity (Q48) and feeling that their heritage was valued (Q49) compared to white respondents.

**Gender Identity.** Three of the five scales indicated Gender Identity group differences. A Student-Newman-Keuls (SNK) multiple comparison indicated that Transgender respondents were less comfortable with UVM organizational settings and individuals (Q1-Q4) compared to either Male or Female respondents. A similar SNK comparison indicated that all three Gender-Identity groups differed substantially from each other with Transgender individuals being the most fearful of being sexually assaulted within the campus community (Q14) followed by Female and then Male respondents. Females felt that their cultural heritage was less valued at UVM (Q49) compared to Male respondents. Statistical differences were not seen for comfort with being open about their identity (Q48) and students seeking assistance from various sources (Q51).

**Disability.** All five scales showed significant differences by Disability groupings although the patterns were somewhat complex to the four Disability groupings. A Student-Newman-Keuls (SNK) multiple comparison indicated that respondents with both physical and emotional disabilities were less comfortable with UVM organizational settings and individuals (Q1-Q4) compared to all other respondent groups, and those with an emotional disability were less comfortable relative to those without any disabilities. Fear of sexual assault (Q14) by those with both disabilities was higher than those with only a physical or no disabilities. Fear of sexual assault (Q14) was also higher among those with an emotional disability compared to those respondents with only a physical or no disabilities. Respondents with both physical and emotional disabilities were least comfortable with being open regarding their identity (Q48) compared to each of the other groups. Respondents with both disabilities did not feel that their cultural heritage was as valued (Q49) compared to those with no disabilities, while respondents with only an emotional disability were also less likely to feel valued compared to respondents without any disabilities. Comfort levels in seeking assistance (Q51) was lower among those with both disabilities compared to those without any disabilities, and was also lower compared to those with only an emotional disability.

**Religious affiliation.** Only two of the five scales or items differed among religious affiliation groupings. A Student-Newman-Keuls (SNK) multiple comparison indicated that Non-Christians were less comfortable than Christians with UVM organizational settings and individuals (Q1-Q4). Non-Christians were also less comfortable about identity expression (Q48) than either Christian or no affiliation respondents. Religious affiliation did not appear to influence fear of sexual assault (Q14), having one’s cultural heritage valued (Q49), or comfort in seeking assistance (Q51).

**Category 5: Perceptions of Climate**

Ten items were included as part of “Perceptions of Climate,” including Q12, Q17-A, Q17-B,
Q18, Q19-Q22 (these four questions were combined into one item for these analyses), Q23, Q24, Q47-A, Q47-B, and Q47-C. See Appendix B for the wording and response categories for these questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q17-A</th>
<th>Q17-B</th>
<th>Q18</th>
<th>Q19-Q22</th>
<th>Q23</th>
<th>Q24</th>
<th>Q47-A</th>
<th>Q47-B</th>
<th>Q47-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBQ</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2534</td>
<td>2493</td>
<td>2488</td>
<td>2446</td>
<td>2448</td>
<td>2432</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>2487</td>
<td>2465</td>
<td>2438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2546</td>
<td>2504</td>
<td>2501</td>
<td>2450</td>
<td>2456</td>
<td>2444</td>
<td>2441</td>
<td>2507</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>2452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2471</td>
<td>2427</td>
<td>2423</td>
<td>2379</td>
<td>2391</td>
<td>2369</td>
<td>2377</td>
<td>2430</td>
<td>2408</td>
<td>2380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

**Sexual orientation.** All ten comparisons in this domain were statistically significant \((p < 0.01)\) with the same directional pattern being observed for all of the scales and items. LGBQ respondents were less confident that the UVM community would be supportive compared to Heterosexual respondents if sexually assaulted (Q12). LGBQ respondents were also less confident that the University proactively addresses issues (Q17A and Q17B) related to a variety of climate issues, that there is visible leadership to foster diversity at UVM from a variety of sources (Q18), and that UVM values and is welcoming of diversity in a diversity of contexts (Q19-Q22). Furthermore, these respondents recorded lower levels of ratings for accessibility for those with disabilities (Q23), for overall climate for a variety of under-represented/marginalized groups (Q24), and were generally less positive about overall campus climate along a variety of dimensions (Q47A, Q47B, Q47C). However, it should be noted that the absolute differences are less than two adjacent response categories.

**Race.** Nine of the ten comparisons in this domain were statistically significant \((p<0.01)\) with the same directional pattern being observed for all scales and items. The only exception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>2.7</th>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>2.8</th>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>2.6</th>
<th>2.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StdDev</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Religious Affiliation**

| Christian         | Mean  | 1.4 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 2.3 |
|                   | StdDev| 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
|                   | N     | 1249| 1229| 1228| 1212| 1203| 1202| 1197| 1229| 1220| 1207|
| Non-Christian     | Mean  | 1.6 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.5 |
|                   | StdDev| 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
|                   | N     | 401 | 393 | 391 | 387 | 393 | 383 | 385 | 390 | 383 | 380 |
| No Affiliation/None| Mean  | 1.6 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3   | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 2.4 |
|                   | StdDev| 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
|                   | N     | 1163| 1144| 1141| 1121| 1123| 1117| 1117| 1146| 1137| 1125|
|                   | p-value | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 |

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.
was accessibility for those with disabilities (Q23) where persons of color and whites were similar in their assessments. Persons of color compared to white respondents were less confident that the UVM community would be supportive if they were sexually assaulted (Q12), saw less institutional pro-activity addressing issues (Q17A and Q17B), less visible leadership (Q18), less inclusiveness (Q19-Q22), less respect (Q24), and saw UVM generally in a less positive light (Q47A, Q47B, Q47C). As was the case previously, it should be noted that the absolute differences are less than two adjacent response categories.

**Gender Identity.** Six of the ten comparisons were statistically significant at the $p<0.01$ level and one at the $p<0.05$ level. No differences were observed on the level of confidence that the UVM community would be supportive if sexually assaulted (Q12). Student-Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons of the three Gender Identity groups indicated that none of the groups differed on the first proactive scale (Q17A) while Females were in less agreement than Males on the second proactive scale (Q17B). All respondent groups differed in their views of inclusiveness (Q19-Q22) with Males being in most agreement followed by Females and Transgender respondents. Males also tended to see campus accessibility for those with disabilities (Q23) as being better compared to either Female or Transgender respondents. As was the pattern with inclusiveness (Q19-Q22), all groups differed in their views of respect afforded to others (Q24), and on climate issues relating to Race, Gender and faith issues (Q47B, Q47C).

**Disability.** All ten of the climate scales differed between respondents who described themselves as either having none, a physical, an emotional, both physical and emotional disabilities, respectively. Those with either emotional or emotional and Physical Disabilities reported lower levels of confidence that the UVM community would be supportive if sexually assaulted (Q12) compared to those with no or only a physical disability. Those with both types of disabilities were in less agreement on the first proactive scale (Q17A) compared to each of the other three groups who responded similarly. The second proactive scale (Q17B) which included high loadings on mental illness, disability and physical characteristics showed that those with Physical Disabilities were in greater agreement compared to respondents with emotional or both conditions. Those who reported no disabilities rated the second proactive scale (Q17B) more favorably than those with emotional or both conditions. A similar pattern emerged for leadership (Q18) with the added observation that those who suffer from both conditions differed from all other groups. This same pattern was seen for inclusiveness (Q19-Q22), accessibility (Q23), respect afforded to others (Q24), and adjectives describing the overall UVM campus climate (Q47A, Q47B, Q47C) where those reporting both conditions reported less favorable responses compared to each of the other three groups.

**Religious affiliation.** All ten scales differed between the three religious affiliation groups (Christian, Non-Christian, No Affiliation/None). Non-Christians and those with no religious affiliation were less confident that the UVM community would be supportive compared to Christians if sexually assaulted (Q12). This same general pattern was observed with other scales where respondents identified as Christians rated the proactive scales (Q17A, Q17B), leadership (Q18), inclusiveness (Q19-Q22), respect for others (Q24), and the general climate scales (Q47A, Q47B, Q47C) more favorably than Non-Christians or those with no affiliation. However, both Christians and Non-Christians held similar perceptions on accessibility (Q23), which were more
favorable than those without any affiliation.

**Select Descriptive Statistics: Additional Groupings**

The following cross-tabulations were conducted to allow for select comparisons among the two additional groupings described earlier: “Marginalized/Majority” and “Employee/Student.” The cross-tabulations for “Marginalized/Majority” are presented first. Each table presents the actual count and the corresponding percentage of the sample that responded.

**Cross-tabulations by “Marginalized/Majority” Groupings**

The first of the two tables presented in each case below represents the “Marginalized/Majority” grouping with Non-Transgender Female respondents included as part of the majority group; the second table, referred to as “Marginalized/Majority2,” is based on the inclusion of Non-Transgender Female respondents in the marginalized group.

**Personal experiences with bias.** The following cross-tabulations allow for comparisons between “Marginalized” and “Majority” group member respondents regarding personal experiences with bias.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you personally experienced any offensive, hostile, or intimidating conduct that has interfered with your ability to work or learn at UVM?</th>
<th>Marginalized/Majority</th>
<th>Marginalized/Majority2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not surprisingly, a greater percentage of “Marginalized” group respondents reported personal experience with negative conduct. Indeed, as the first table reveals, where Non-Transgender Females were included as part of the “Majority” group, one-third (33.6%) of respondents in the “Marginalized” group reported such conduct compared to twelve percent (12.2%) of “Majority” group members who participated in the survey. A similar but less striking pattern is evident in the second table.

**Personal experiences with sexual assault.** The following cross-tabulations were conducted to compare experiences of inappropriate touching among target groups. Each table presents the actual count and the corresponding percentage of the sample that responded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marginalized/Majority</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalized group</td>
<td>Majority group</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the first table above, where Non-Transgender Females are included as part of the
“Majority” group, almost one-quarter of marginalized group member respondents (specifically 24.5%) reported some experience (i.e., those who reported from “rarely” to “very often”) of touching in a sexual manner that made them uncomfortable or fearful. Meanwhile, over fifteen percent (15.2%) of majority group members reported some experience of this kind of touching. This percentage decreases when Non-Transgender Females are removed from the Majority group and included instead in the Marginalized group; in this case, 21.1% of marginalized group respondents reported some experience with this kind of touching compared to 6.9% of majority group members.

Cross-tabulations examining responses to the more specific question about sexual assault victimization while at UVM are presented next; as usual, the first table presents the results when Non-Transgender Females are included with the Majority group, while the second table presents the results with these Females in the Marginalized group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever been a victim of sexual assault while at UVM?</th>
<th>Marginalized/Majority</th>
<th>Marginalized/Majority2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Majority group</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2752</td>
<td>2752</td>
<td>2752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While over 96.5% of all respondents reported never having been a victim of sexual assault while at UVM, 5.6% of respondents in the Marginalized group that excluded Non-Transgender Females reported “yes” to this question, compared to 2.5% of respondents in the Majority group (without Non-Transgender Females). When Non-Transgender Females were included as part of the Marginalized group, a similar pattern was found, with 4% of those in the Marginalized group reporting this experience compared to 1.3% of those in the Majority group.
**Personal comfort.** The following cross-tabulations examined overall comfort with the climate at UVM for respondents who identified as part of one or more marginalized groups compared to respondents who did not identify as part of any of these groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, how comfortable are you with the climate at UVM?</th>
<th>Marginalized/Majority</th>
<th>Majority group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Comfortable</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comfortable</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsure</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncomfortable</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Uncomfortable</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the first table, where Non-Transgender Females are represented within the “Majority” group, 86.4% of majority group members reported being comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at UVM compared to 72.1% of marginalized group members. Conversely, almost fifteen percent (14.6%) of those in the marginalized group reported being uncomfortable or very uncomfortable with the climate, compared to five percent (5%) of those in the majority group.

When Non-Transgender Females are included as part of the “Marginalized” group, a similar but less striking pattern is evident.

**Perceptions of climate.** The following cross-tabulations were conducted to compare perceptions of support in the event of a sexual assault among target groups. Each table presents the actual count and the corresponding percentage of the sample that responded.
With Non-Transgender Females included as part of the “Majority” group, 63.3% of these respondents report confidence in the University community if sexually assaulted while at UVM compared to 8.7% who do not report being confident. In striking contrast, only 50.4% of “Marginalized” group respondents report being confident in the University community in this situation, and 17.3% do not report being confident. When Non-Transgender Females are included in the “Marginalized” group, the differences between groups are largely erased.

The following cross-tabulations compare respondents’ reports of fear of being sexually assaulted within the campus community. What is most striking here is that when Non-Transgender Females are included as part of the “Marginalized” group, only a little more than half the respondents in this group report never fearing being sexually assaulted within the campus community compared to over 95% of the majority member respondents.
There are times when I am within the campus community that I fear being sexually assaulted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Marginalized group</th>
<th>Majority group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>2843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next cross-tabulations were conducted to compare beliefs about there being visible leadership to foster diversity at UVM from the President’s Office among target groups. Each
The table presents the actual count and the corresponding percentage of the sample that responded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Marginalized group</th>
<th>Majority group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Marginalized group</th>
<th>Majority group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>Marginalized/Majority2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>Marginalized/Majority2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>Marginalized/Majority2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>Marginalized/Majority2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2194</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Marginalized/Majority2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As both tables indicate, members of the marginalized group were less likely to endorse the belief that there is visible leadership in this regard from the President’s Office. In the first comparison, 41.9% of those in the Marginalized group compared to 56.6% of those in the Majority group.
reported either agreeing or strongly agreeing that there is such visible leadership. In the second comparison, there was a smaller difference, with 50.2% of those in the Marginalized group compared to 58.7% of those in the Majority group agreeing or strongly agreeing.

The next two tables present the cross-tabulations conducted to compare perceptions of visible leadership from faculty in respondents’ departments among target groups. There was very little difference found among target groups, with 51-55% of all respondent groups reporting agreeing/strongly agreeing that there is visible leadership from faculty in respondents’ own departments.
Next, cross-tabulations were conducted to compare perceptions of the inclusiveness of course content and workplace environment at UVM among target groups. Only slight differences were revealed in the percentage of those who agreed/strongly agreed that course content is inclusive, representing a range from 60% to 67% agreement. Meanwhile, lower overall percentages and larger differences were revealed in the percentage of those who agreed/strongly agreed that the workplace is welcoming for people from historically under-represented groups. Specifically,
when Non-Transgender Females were included with the Majority group, only 45.2% of respondents in the Marginalized group agreed or strongly agreed with this view of the workplace compared to 59.9% of those in the Majority group. In the second analysis with Non-Transgender Females included in the Marginalized group, 52.9% of Marginalized compared to 64% of Majority respondents reported such agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marginalized/Majority</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalized</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not agree nor disagree</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marginalized/Majority2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalized</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course content at UVM</strong></td>
<td><strong>Marginalized</strong></td>
<td>299</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Majority</strong></td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority2</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority2</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not agree nor disagree</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority2</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the workplace climate is welcoming for employees from historically underrepresented/marginalized groups.</td>
<td>Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>Marginalized group</td>
<td>Majority group</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>2617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Marginalized/Majority</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, cross-tabulations were conducted to compare the extent of agreement that UVM values one’s involvement in diversity initiatives on campus by target groups. The Marginalized and Majority groups reported quite similar rates of agreement/strong agreement, although when Non-Transgender Females were included with the Majority group, only about 55% of both Marginalized and Majority respondents reported such agreement compared to 60-63% of respondents in both groups when Non-Transgender Females were included with the Marginalized group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I believe that UVM values my involvement in diversity initiatives on campus.</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Marginalized group</th>
<th>Majority group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree nor disagree</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I believe that UVM values my involvement in diversity initiatives on campus.</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Marginalized group</th>
<th>Majority group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree nor disagree</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross-Tabulations by Employee/Student Grouping

**Personal experiences with bias.** The following cross-tabulation was conducted to compare experiences of bias as reported by employee versus student respondents. There was almost a six percent (6%) difference between employees and students who reported personally experiencing negative conduct, with over twenty-two percent (22%) of employees reporting experiencing such conduct compared to almost seventeen (17%) of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you personally experienced any offensive, hostile, or intimidating conduct that has interfered with your ability to work or learn at UVM?</th>
<th>Student or employee</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>2370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>2926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal experiences with sexual assault.** The following cross-tabulation was conducted to compare experiences of inappropriate touching among students versus employees of the University. Almost ninety percent of all employees report never having been touched in a sexual manner that has made them uncomfortable or fearful while only 77% of all students report this. Meanwhile, an examination of responses to the more specific question, “Have you ever been a victim of sexual assault while at UVM”? indicated that of the survey respondents, 1.3% of employees and 5.1% of students reported “yes” to this question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have been touched in a sexual manner that has made me feel uncomfortable or fearful.</th>
<th>Student or employee</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever been a victim of sexual assault while at UVM?</th>
<th>Student or employee</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Personal comfort.* The following cross-tabulation compares employees and students with respect to overall comfort with the climate at UVM. While over three-quarters of respondents in each group report being comfortable or very comfortable with the climate, almost twelve percent (11.9%) of employees compared to 5.8% of students report being uncomfortable or very uncomfortable.
### Perceptions of climate

The following cross-tabulations were conducted to compare perceptions of support in the event of a sexual assault among students and employees. Each table presents the actual count and the corresponding percentage of the sample that responded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If I was sexually assaulted while at UVM, I am confident the University community would support me and take action on my behalf.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Student or employee</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>2906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While most respondents in both groups report confidence that the University community would provide support and take action if they were sexually assaulted, a strikingly large percentage of respondents—over one-quarter—in both groups report being unsure about this. Meanwhile, as indicated in the cross-tabulation presented below, a greater percentage of employees than students report never fearing being sexually assaulted while within the campus community (72.3% versus 53.2%).
There are times when I am within the campus community that I fear being sexually assaulted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Student or employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>53.2% 871 72.3% 1781 61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>28.4% 246 20.4% 733 25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>15.3% 78  6.5% 340 11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.1%  5   .4%  41  1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.0%  4   .3%  21  .7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other indicators of perceptions of climate were also considered for students and employees. For example, as is indicated within the table below, 41.6% of students compared to 65.3% of employees in the sample agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “there is visible leadership to foster diversity at UVM from the President’s Office.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Student or employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is visible leadership to foster diversity at UVM from the President's Office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>10.5% 269 22.7% 443 15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>31.1% 504 42.6% 1022 35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree nor disagree</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>39.9% 260 22.0% 924 32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>13.0% 103  8.7%  320 11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.5%  47   4.0%  138  4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meanwhile, rates of at least agreement with the statement, “There is visible leadership to foster diversity at UVM from faculty in my department” were more similar (53.8% of student responses compared to 51.5% of employee respondents reported agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement), as indicated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is visible leadership to foster diversity at UVM from faculty in my department.</th>
<th>Student or employee</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>2732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Student or employee</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of student and employee respondents’ views of the inclusiveness of course content, as reflected in the next table, indicates that at least in the current sample, students are much more likely than employees to at least agree that course content is inclusive (71.2% versus 54.7% respectively).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course content at UVM includes materials, perspectives, and/or experiences of people from historically underrepresented/marginalized groups.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Student or employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree nor disagree</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanwhile, students and employees are fairly similar in this sample in the percentage at least agreeing that UVM values their involvement in diversity initiatives on campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I believe that UVM values my involvement in diversity initiatives on campus.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Student or employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree nor disagree</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Limitations/Cautions

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.

(4) Sample Size/Representativeness of the Sample: The Campus Climate Survey was widely available via electronic and hard-copy formats to faculty, staff, students, and administrators affiliated with the University of Vermont in the Spring, 2005 semester. In order to provide the entire UVM community the opportunity to participate in the CCS process, a randomized sampling approach was not undertaken. Despite many 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, what must be emphasized is that the total number of completed surveys, as a whole, and for some select groups, do not reflect the total campus membership nor the total membership of diverse sub-groups. Additionally, there are no available estimates of the portion of the population of certain groups that did complete the survey. 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.

(5) 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.

(6) Variability Within Groups: There was great variability of responses both within and across identified sub-groups. Although this variability is not obvious when analyses and reports focus on identified patterns of responses across groups, it needs to be acknowledged when interpreting

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.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

Higher education aims to provide opportunities for all its participants to learn and develop. Yet it is unlikely that those who are fearful for their physical safety, social acceptance, and psychological inclusion, are able to learn and develop to their fullest extent. Similarly, it is unlikely that employees are able to work as productively as possible if they experience these kinds of fears. 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 here suggest that the climate is less than positive for some members of our UVM community, and especially for those who are also members of one or more historically marginalized identity groups. These trends should help us prioritize areas for future action. At the same time, we strongly believe that the campus community must now commit to a reasoned, sustained, and sensitive examination and discussion of the trends suggested by the available data from the CCS. With this in mind, along with the limitations/cautions noted above, we draw upon
the results of the CCS and other relevant information to recommend a series of next steps aimed at improving the climate at UVM for all its members.

First, the Committee would like to acknowledge that we have not exhausted the CCS data set nor the recommendations that may be most appropriate at this point in time. We are only a small group of UVM community members who volunteered our time and effort on this project. We have sought to provide a useful document to which can serve as a starting point for further reflection. We encourage members from various University constituent groups to study this report and other available data so as to develop additional recommendations for the University community.

Second, we realize that many of the trends suggested in this report will not be seen as new or unexpected by some UVM affiliates. However, we hope that the effort to compile this information at this particular time in our institution’s history can serve as a reminder and confirmation of what we need to work on together as an institutional community. Our wish is that we can seize this opportunity to move forward towards a more inclusive and healthy climate for all UVM community members.

**Recommendation 1**

Successful completion of the CCS reflects an important first step as we move forward with efforts to improve the overall campus climate. The data suggest that there are select populations within the University community that appear, on average, to perceive and experience the UVM climate in less positive ways than the majority population. At the same time, the data suggest that those who have personally experienced and those who have witnessed bias in our community have done so throughout campus. Reports of bias incidents were not limited to residence halls but also were identified in classrooms, the workplace, and in a variety of public spaces on campus. Similarly, reports of bias incidents and observations of bias were not limited to students; faculty and staff also reported directly experiencing and witnessing bias incidents.

Given these findings, it is important that the next steps consider and address the entire University campus. Thus, our first recommendation is that all parts of the institution be involved in the change process. One immediate means to begin to involve the whole University is to post the Executive Summary of this report on UVM’s web-page, and to include elements of the Executive Summary in new faculty, staff, and student orientations.

Another step towards this recommendation comes from CCS respondents themselves. Specifically, 66% of CCS respondents felt that requiring all University students, staff, and faculty to take at least one class that focuses on issues, research, and/or perspectives about various groups would improve the campus climate for these groups. Similarly, 45% of respondents in the sample supported requiring diversity-related learning opportunities for university employees and including such activities as a criterion for hiring and/or performance evaluations. The Committee concurs with the survey respondents and supports these recommendations as one way to offer critical educational opportunities to all UVM community members and to foster the involvement of the whole University campus community in the change process.
It is worth noting that since the survey was conducted, a six-credit diversity requirement has been instituted for UVM undergraduate students. Additional effort needs to be paid to instituting similar learning opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators, and to formally connecting diversity-related activities to hiring and evaluation. These efforts have the potential to improve the climate of the University and, at the same time, create similar requirements and climate expectations for students and employees. To improve the university climate overall, diversity requirements for students need to be balanced with similar requirements for university employees.

Recommendation 2

While in subsequent recommendations the Committee emphasizes the need for the campus community to commit to a reasoned, sustained, and sensitive examination and discussion of the trends suggested by the available data from the CCS and from other sources, we draw upon current findings in strongly arguing for concerted and immediate intervention efforts in response to the 561 survey respondents who reported personal experience of offensive, hostile or intimidating conduct that interfered with their ability to work or learn at UVM. While the Committee recognizes that the survey sample is not likely representative of the UVM community as a whole, we believe this number of reports from among those who participated in the current study is meaningful and that it very well could indicate a high rate of personal experience of such negative conduct. Furthermore, the high rates of such reports by those survey respondents who are members of historically under-represented/marginalized groups on the basis of Race, Ability, Sexual Orientation, and Gender Identify, lead us to recommend that immediate actions be focused especially on addressing the climate on campus for these particular groups. Finally, immediate attention is warranted in response to the low percentage of respondents in the current study who reported 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.

Recommendation 3

The Committee acknowledges that while the current report has considered carefully a large portion of the CCS survey results, continued study of these results is warranted. In particular, 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. The focus in this report has been on climate issues for five select groups. Yet it is critical that work continue that enables us to broaden our attention to and deepen our understanding of other critical issues affecting climate, including but not limited to socioeconomic class, immigration status, employee status, English as a second language, and Age. Meanwhile, the open-ended comments tend to reflect impassioned personal testimony about experiences of bias on campus, critiques of current and past administrative efforts, and proposals and suggestions for change. Some comments also reflect the concerns of some community members that the emphasis on climate change is itself potentially dangerous. All these comments should be more fully considered in and of themselves and in relation to the quantitative findings.
Recommendation 4

While the CCS results provide us with valuable information that we believe may be used now to help guide future next steps, especially in terms of identifying priority areas for intervention, the sample size and its likely non-representativeness of the total UVM population require caution against reliance on these results beyond the parameters we identify in this report.

The CCS committee therefore recommends that while moving forward with the priority areas noted in Recommendation 2, we also engage in 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 that has been done thus far to assess our campus climate and to use this knowledge to allow us to move forward with greater success.

With this in mind, we recommend that the Diversity and Equity Unit, under the leadership of Kathryn Friedman, convene a working group to review the various studies and recommendations that have been promulgated over the past 5 years, including but not limited to, the CCS, Status of Women Reports, Campus Gender Violence Project reports and recommendations, the CIRP survey data on incoming students (administered annually by UVM’s Office of Orientation and Parent Relations), the American College Health Survey data collected annually by UVM’s Wellness Promotion office, various reports from the Presidential Commissions, and Institutional Studies. These reports can be collated and recommendations from each prioritized into a plan to guide the university’s future campus climate initiatives.

Recommendation 5

In addition to reviewing available data bases and information regarding campus climate issues, the Committee recommends a careful review of all existing efforts on campus to improve campus climate, and any existing evaluations of such efforts, 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.

A partial listing of existing efforts on campus follows.

A. Currently addressing expression of bias and harassment:
   1. Bias Incident Protocol (revised version to be instituted this fall by the Office of the President)
   2. AA/EO Office and grievance procedure
   3. Center for Student Ethics and Standards
   4. LGBTQA Services Outreach and Training program including Education/Outreach Coordinator (new position) and Ally Training Series
   5. AA/EO online Sexual Harassment training
   6. Gender Identity & Expression Training Team (developed and administered by AA/EO and LGBTQA Services)
B. Currently addressing sexual assault:
1. Campus Gender Violence Project including the Advocacy and Violence Prevention Coordinator and the Education/Outreach Coordinator (housed at the Women’s Center)
2. Campus Advocacy Program including the Gender Violence Response Team and the Paradigm Project (housed at the Women’s Center)
3. SANE training for nurses at Women’s Health Clinic (part of Student Health Services, Center for Health & Wellbeing)
4. UVM Police Services
5. Center for Student Ethics and Standards

C. Currently addressing inclusion of marginalized populations:
1. Diversity & Equity Unit
2. ALANA Student Center
3. Women’s Center
4. LGBTQA Services
5. ACCESS office
6. Project Stay

D. Currently addressing broader aspects of climate and inclusion:
1. UVM’s mission, vision, and strategic planning documents
2. Admissions programs that target recruitment of underrepresented student populations
3. Vice Provost of Multicultural Affairs office
4. Faculty recruitment efforts
5. Orientation programs that address tolerance, safety, respect, and sexual assault
6. The new university-wide 6-credit diversity requirement
7. First Year Diversity Series
8. ALANA US Ethnic Studies program
9. Women’s and Gender Studies program
10. Sexuality and Gender Identity Studies minor
11. Center for Cultural Pluralism
12. New staff and faculty orientation programs
13. Student and Campus Life professional development program on diversity
14. STAR (Students at Risk) Committee (Dean of Students Office)
15. Men’s Initiative (including Men’s Outreach Coordinator housed at the Counseling Center)
16. Residential Life training of RA’s
17. Next Step Social Justice Retreat
18. Student Athlete’s Life Skills Program
19. Alumni Relations new initiative to build connections between alumni of color and between LGBTQ alumni
20. Funds set aside by individual departments for educational programming that deepens awareness of culturally diverse perspectives and experiences
21. UVM’s Police Services’ diversity training for officers

Among the numerous individuals and institutional entities able to provide critical information
and advice about initiatives and programs that are currently in place and intended to address the trends that are suggested by the CCS are:

- Office of the President
- President’s Commissions: LGBT Equity, PCSW, PCRD, Diversity & Inclusion
- Vice Presidents
- Deans
- Department Chairs
- Faculty Senate
- Faculty Caucuses
- Student Government
- Staff Council
- Diversity & Equity Unit
- STAR (Students At Risk) Committee
- Gender Violence Response Team
- ALCO
- Faculty Women’s Caucus
- Faculty of Color Caucus
- Office of Student and Campus Life
- Human Resources

**Recommendation 6**

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. Questions to consider include:

- Are existing initiatives receiving the needed resources to succeed in their missions?
- Can related projects, programs or initiatives become more effective by working together in new ways?
- What resources are needed to ensure that all UVM affiliates know how to and feel comfortable using existing campus resources if they experience or witness bias, harassment, or sexual assault?
- How can we best use the resources that exist at UVM and access the additional resources that will help us continue to build a climate that is welcoming and inclusive for all of our students, staff and faculty members?

**Recommendation 7**

This next recommendation is one that the Committee anticipates will remain necessary despite gleaning additional information from other available sources and from the CCS itself. Specifically, the Committee recommends that focus groups be conducted by trained professionals with the five select populations identified in this report and with additional populations (e.g., those that emerge from analyses conducted as part of Recommendation 3) as a mechanism to further examine the patterns and trends identified in this CCS report.
We envision the focus groups as an opportunity to understand more fully how diverse groups experience the climate and cultures of the university and to gather information that will help guide the construction of appropriate 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. The focus groups will also provide the opportunity to listen to and learn from members of the campus community who have insider information regarding climate-related problems and thus important perspectives regarding initiatives that may be more likely to succeed.

Focus groups should also be conducted with historically over-represented/majority groups so as to more adequately establish a clear baseline of experiences and perceptions of those from these groups.

Recommendation 8

Following review and consideration of available information as noted above, the Committee recommends the development of a priority list of action steps to guide diversity initiatives for the next five years. This priority list should take into consideration existing efforts to date as well as additional venues through which climate improvement could take place. The latter includes but is not limited to:

- Campus media including The View, Vermont Quarterly, The Cynic, Admissions publications, Cat’s Paw student handbook, the UVM web page, Campus Cable Channel 12, WRUV, topics focused on for press releases by UVM Communications, etc.
- Future planning regarding UVM’s physical structures and environment (as detailed in a joint proposal submitted by President’s Commissions), including consideration of universal design standards, planting patterns that address safety issues, cultural representations in architectural style choices, etc.
- Cultural resources and programs readily available to students via Student Life’s Programming Board, Inter Residency Council’s programming funds, department sponsored programs and lecture series, etc.
- Curriculum development support available to faculty through the Center for Teaching & Learning, individual college level initiatives, etc.

Along with the priority list, 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. The overall plan should be multi-faceted as well as multi-year; clear goals, objectives and action steps should be identified according to a yearly timeline with responsibility for completion assigned to various units and groups on campus.

Recommendation 9

We reiterate here the finding from the CCS that over half of CCS respondents (52%) agreed that the President’s Office visibly fosters diversity. Therefore 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. That is, we strongly recommend that a high level administrator in the President’s Office 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

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 re-emphasize the importance of considering this report in light of the methodological limitations of the study upon which it is based, and in light of the need for continued study of and reflection upon the findings and recommendations by others in the UVM community. We also wish to note that we realize that many of the trends suggested in this report will not be seen as new or unexpected by some UVM affiliates. However, we hope that the effort to compile these trends at this particular time in UVM’s history can serve as a reminder and confirmation of what we need to work on together as an institutional community. Finally, we wish 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 here 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.
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Appendix A: Letter of Invitation

I am writing to ask faculty, staff, and students across the campus to take some time—we estimate fifteen to twenty minutes—to respond to a campus climate survey that will be available for twelve days in April as an anonymous, web-based instrument at a site linked below. We are seeking to have a high, statistically significant rate of return, especially since we intend to use the survey to establish a baseline for gauging the efficacy of current and future campus policies, programs, and initiatives designed to improve The University of Vermont as a learning environment that supports the work and development of all members of the campus community.

The climate on a university campus affects the creation of knowledge and has a significant impact on members of the academic community who, in turn, contribute to the creation of the campus environment. Creating and preserving a climate that offers equal learning opportunities for all students, academic freedom for all faculty, and a positive working environment for all employees is one of the primary responsibilities of educational institutions.

From April 4th through April 15th, you will have the opportunity to participate in a campus-wide climate assessment survey. The information developed through the survey will be used in conjunction with other data to provide the University with an inclusive view of the climate at The University of Vermont. The purpose of the survey is to lay the groundwork for action to improve the climate on campus for all.

The survey is your opportunity to shape and inform the picture we are trying to bring into focus of the academic, professional, and psychosocial environment at UVM. All of your answers will remain anonymous and all of the results will be reported in group form only. You will not be identifiable as an individual. Your participation in this project is voluntary, and you do not have to answer questions that you feel uncomfortable answering.

Please help the University in this important undertaking by investing the 15-20 minutes needed to respond to the survey, which will be available from April 4th through 15th at

http://www.uvm.edu/~aaeo/campusclimatesurvey/

Thank you in advance for your contribution to this important project that will help ensure a campus community that values respect, integrity, innovation, openness, justice, and responsibility. We are grateful to colleagues on four presidential commissions who worked on the creation of the survey instrument (the President’s Commissions on the Status of Women; on Racial Diversity; on Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity; and on Diversity and Inclusion). Dr. Susan Rankin, Senior Diversity Planning Analyst at Pennsylvania State University, designed the final version of the survey, and will be providing the University of Vermont with analysis of the responses. Dr. Rankin has administered and analyzed similar surveys at more than fifty institutions of higher education.

Sincerely,
Daniel Fogel
President
Appendix B: The Campus Climate Survey (for UVM)
The University of Vermont
Assessment of Campus Climate

Rationale

You are invited to participate in a survey of students, faculty, and staff regarding the climate at the University of Vermont (UVM). The results of the survey will provide important information about our climate and will enable us to improve the environment for working and learning on campus. The survey is being conducted for UVM by Rankin & Associates, an outside consulting firm.

Participation in this research is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you will not be asked to provide any identifying information and information you provide on the survey will remain confidential. You may skip any questions on the survey that you do not wish to answer. You may also stop the survey at any time and you do not need to submit your completed responses if you decline to participate.

By completing and submitting the survey, your informed consent is implied. The survey will take about 20 minutes to complete. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate. You may print a copy of this consent form for your records.

Confidentiality

If you are concerned that your confidentiality will be compromised by some (or all) of the questions, please keep in mind that individuals will not be identified and only group data will be reported. In addition, the external consultant (Rankin & Associates) will not report any group data for groups that may be small enough to compromise identity. Instead, Rankin & Associates will combine the groups to eliminate any potential for identifiable demographic information. Please also remember that you do not have to answer any question or questions about which you are uncomfortable.

To further assure anonymity and confidentiality, online survey responses will be submitted directly to Rankin & Associates’ server at which time IP addresses will be stripped from the submissions and short answer responses will be separated from multiple choice responses.

Directions

URL only: Please read and answer each question carefully. For each answer, click on/fill in the appropriate oval. If you want to change an answer, click on/fill in the oval of your new answer and your previous response will be erased. You may decline to answer specific questions.

Paper/Pencil only: Please read and answer each question carefully. For each answer, darken the appropriate oval completely. If you want to change an answer, erase your first answer completely and darken the oval of your new answer. You may decline to answer specific questions. Your answers will be scored by machine, so please use a NUMBER 2 PENCIL.
Survey Terms and Definitions

**Climate:** Current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of employees and students concerning the access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and potential.

**Disability:** A physical or mental condition that substantially limits one or more major life activities. Some examples include, but are not limited to, blindness, diabetes, learning disabilities, deafness, etc.

**Ethnic Identity:** A unique social and cultural heritage shared by a group of people.

**Gender Identity:** The inner sense of being a man, a woman, and/or transgender/transsexual/gender-queer. It also includes the gender that one presents to the world.

**Gender Variance:** Term that refers to the blurring or transgressing of traditional gender categories.

**Non-Native English Speakers:** People for whom English is not their first language.

**Physical Characteristics:** Term that refers to one’s appearance.

**Racial Identity:** A socially constructed category about a group of people based on generalized physical features such as skin color, hair type, shape of eyes, physique, etc.

**Sexual Orientation:** Term that refers to the sex of the people one tends to be emotionally, physically, and sexually attracted to; this is inclusive of, but not limited to, lesbians, gay men, bisexual people, heterosexual people, and those who identify as queer.

**Socio-economic class:** The status one holds in society based on one’s level of income, wealth, educational and familial background.

Thank you for your participation in this project.
Questions concerning this project should be directed to:

Susan R. Rankin, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
Rankin and Associates, Consulting
PO Box 576
Howard, PA 16841
sue@rankin-consulting.com
814-625-2780

Questions may also be directed to:

Jacqueline S. Weinstock, Ph.D.
University of Vermont
C-150 Living & Learning Center
Burlington, VT 05405
802-656-2058

Kathryn Friedman
Executive Director, Diversity & Equity Unit
University of Vermont
428 Waterman
Burlington, VT 05405
802-656-3368

Questions concerning the rights of research participants should be directed to:

University of Vermont
Nancy Stalnaker
Committees on Human Research/IRB
Institutional Review Board (IRB)
Nancy.stalnaker@uvm.edu
802-656-5040

Please do not complete this survey more than once.
Part 1. Campus Experiences

Within the past year,

1. Overall, how comfortable are you with the climate at UVM?  
   (Note: Climate refers to current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of employees and students 
   concerning the access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and 
   potential.)

   Very comfortable  Comfortable  Unsure  Uncomfortable  Very uncomfortable
   1                  2                       3                          4                               5

2. Overall, how comfortable are you with the climate in your academic college (e.g. College of Agriculture 
   and Life Sciences, College of Education & Social Services, etc.) or administrative division (Administration 
   & Finance, Student & Campus Life, Office of the Provost, etc.)

   Very comfortable  Comfortable  Unsure  Uncomfortable  Very uncomfortable
   1                  2                       3                          4                              5

3. Overall, how comfortable are you with the climate in your department/work area?

   Very comfortable  Comfortable  Unsure  Uncomfortable  Very uncomfortable
   1                  2                       3                          4                              5

4. Overall, how comfortable are you with the relationship you have with your academic advisor/advisee(s) 
   and/or supervisor/supervisee(s)?

   Very comfortable  Comfortable  Unsure  Uncomfortable  Very uncomfortable
   1                  2                       3                          4                              5

5. I have attended the following diversity programs at UVM: (Mark all that apply.)
   O  residence hall diversity program
   O  UVM sponsored multicultural program
   O  College and/or Departmental sponsored diversity event
   O  Other (please specify) ________________

6. How familiar are you with the following at UVM?  
   very familiar  somewhat familiar  not familiar at all

   ALANA  1  2  3
   ACCESS  1  2  3
   Bias Protocols  1  2  3
   Common Ground Statement  1  2  3
   Diversity & Equity Unit  1  2  3
   LGBTQA Services  1  2  3
   Non-discrimination policy  1  2  3
   Sexuality & Gender Identity Studies  1  2  3
   Women’s Center  1  2  3
   Women’s and Gender Studies  1  2  3
   U.S. Ethnic Studies  1  2  3
7. Have you personally experienced any offensive, hostile, or intimidating conduct that has interfered with your ability to work or learn at UVM?
(Note: If you would like to elaborate on your experiences, you may make any additional comments in Part 6 of the survey.)

O yes  O no (If no, please skip to question 8)

7-1. What do you believe this conduct was based upon? (Mark all that apply.)

O my age
O my disability
O my country of origin
O my race
O my ethnicity
O my religion
O my gender
O my sexual orientation
O my gender variance
O my mental illness
O my socioeconomic class
O my physical characteristics
O my educational level
O my UVM status (e.g. part-time instructor, faculty, classified staff, student etc.)
O my English language proficiency/accent
O other (please specify)________________

7-2. How did you experience this conduct? (Mark all that apply.)

O I was the target of racial/ethnic profiling
O I was the target of graffiti (e.g. event advertisements removed or defaced)
O I received written comments
O I received through phone calls
O I received threats of physical violence
O I received through e-mails
O I was the target of physical violence
O I observed others staring at me
O I felt I was deliberately ignored or excluded
O I was the target of derogatory remarks
O I felt intimidated/bullied
O I have feared for my physical safety
O Someone assumed I was admitted or hired because of my identity
O I was the victim of a crime
O I feared getting a poor grade because of a hostile classroom environment
O I was singled out as the “resident authority” regarding identities
O I felt isolated or left out when work was required in groups
O I felt isolated or left out at UVM because of my socioeconomic class status
O other (please specify)________________
7-3. Where did this conduct occur? (Mark all that apply.)

- in a class
- while working at a UVM job
- while walking on campus
- in University housing
- in University dining facility
- in a campus office
- at a campus event
- in a faculty office
- in a public space on campus (e.g., Billings Student Center, Gutterson Field House, Bailey/Howe Library, etc.)
- in a meeting with one other person
- in a meeting with a group of people
- in off-campus housing
- in the Greek community
- in the athletic community
- other (specify)_________________

7-4. Who was the source of this conduct? (Mark all that apply.)

- student
- staff member
- faculty member
- UVM Police Personnel
- graduate assistant
- student group
- University housing
- dining services staff
- Dean/administrator
- academic advisor
- teaching assistant
- student organization advisor
- supervisor/manager
- person that I supervise
- member of my peer group
- organization on campus (e.g., ROTC, Red Cross)
- athletic coach
- athletic trainer
- University media and events reporter
- other (please specify)______________
- don’t know classification of source person
7-5. Please describe your reactions to experiencing this conduct. (Mark all that apply)

- I felt embarrassed
- I told a friend
- I avoided the person who harassed me
- I ignored it
- I left the situation immediately
- I confronted the harasser at the time
- I didn’t know who to go to
- I confronted the harasser later
- I made a complaint to a UVM employee/official
- I felt somehow responsible
- I didn’t report it for fear of retaliation
- It didn’t affect me at the time
- I sought support from counseling/advocacy services
- other (please specify) ______________________

8. Have you observed or personally been made aware of any conduct directed toward a person or group of people at the University of Vermont that you believe has created an offensive, hostile, or intimidating working or learning environment?

(Note: If you would like to elaborate on these experiences, please go to Section 6 where space is provided for open-ended comments.)

- yes
- no (if no, please skip to question 9)

8-1. What do you believe were the bases for this conduct? (Mark all that apply.)

- age
- disability
- country of origin
- race
- ethnicity
- religion
- gender
- sexual orientation
- gender variance
- mental illness
- socioeconomic class
- physical characteristics
- educational level
- UVM status (e.g. part-time instructor, faculty, classified staff, student etc.)
- English language proficiency/accent
- other (please specify) ______________________
8-2. What forms of conduct have you observed or personally been made aware of? (Mark all that apply.)

- O Someone being racially/ethnically profiled
- O Graffiti (e.g. event advertisements removed or defaced)
- O Someone receiving derogatory written comments because of their identity
- O Someone receiving derogatory phone calls because of their identity
- O Someone receiving threats of physical violence
- O Someone receiving derogatory/unsolicited e-mails because of their identity
- O Someone being the victim of physical violence because of their identity
- O Someone being stared at because of their identity
- O Someone being deliberately ignored or excluded because of their identity
- O Someone receiving derogatory remarks because of their identity
- O Someone being intimidated/bullied because of their identity
- O Someone fearing for their physical safety because of their identity
- O The assumption that someone was admitted or hired because of their identity
- O Someone being the victim of a crime because of their identity
- O Someone receiving a poor grade because of a hostile classroom environment
- O Someone singled out as the “resident authority” due to their identity
- O Someone isolated or left out when work was required in groups because of their identity
- O Someone isolated or left out at UVM because of their identity
- O other (please specify) ___________________

8-3. Where did this conduct occur? (Mark all that apply.)

- O in a class
- O while working at a UVM job
- O while walking on campus
- O in University housing
- O in University dining facility
- O in a campus office
- O at a campus event
- O in a faculty office
- O in a public space on campus (e.g., Billings Student Center, Gutterson Field House, Bailey/Howe Library, etc.)
- O in a meeting with one other person
- O in a meeting with a group of people
- O in off-campus housing
- O in the Greek community
- O in the athletic community
- O other (specify) ___________________
8-4. Who was the source of this conduct? (Mark all that apply.)

- student
- staff member
- faculty member
- UVM Police Personnel
- graduate assistant
- student group
- University housing
- dining services staff
- Dean/administrator
- academic advisor
- teaching assistant
- student organization advisor
- supervisor/manager
- person that I supervise
- member of my peer group
- organization on campus (e.g., ROTC, Red Cross)
- athletic coach
- athletic trainer
- University media and events reporters
- other (please specify) __________________________
- don’t know classification of source person

8-5. Please describe your reactions to observing this conduct. (Mark all that apply.)

- I felt embarrassed
- I told a friend
- I avoided the person who harassed me
- I ignored it
- I left the situation immediately
- I confronted the harasser at the time
- I didn’t know who to go to
- I confronted the harasser later
- I made a complaint to a UVM employee/official
- I felt somehow responsible
- I didn’t report it for fear of retaliation
- It didn’t affect me at the time
- I sought support from counseling/advocacy services
- other (please specify) __________________________
9. I observed discriminatory hiring practices at UVM (e.g. search committee bias, limited recruiting pool, etc.)

O yes          O no (if no, please skip to question 10)

9-1. I believe that the discrimination was based upon (Mark all that apply.)

O age
O physical characteristics
O country of origin
O ethnicity
O race
O employment category (faculty, staff)
O religion
O gender
O sexual orientation
O gender variance
O mental illness
O English language proficiency/accent
O disability
O UVM status (e.g. part-time instructor, faculty, staff, student etc.)
O socioeconomic status
O other (please specify)_________________

10. I observed discriminatory firing at UVM.

O yes          O no (if no, please skip to question 11)

10-1. I believe that the discrimination was based upon (Mark all that apply.)

O age
O physical characteristics
O country of origin
O ethnicity
O race
O employment category (faculty, staff)
O religion
O gender
O sexual orientation
O gender variance
O mental illness
O English language proficiency/accent
O disability
O UVM status (e.g. part-time instructor, faculty, staff, student etc.)
O socioeconomic status
O other (please specify)_________________
11. I observed discriminatory behavior or employment practices related to promotion at UVM.

O yes  O no (if no, please skip to question 12)

11-1. I believe that the discrimination was based upon (Mark all that apply.)

O age  
O physical characteristics  
O country of origin  
O ethnicity  
O race  
O employment category (faculty, staff)  
O religion  
O gender  
O sexual orientation  
O gender variance  
O mental illness  
O disability  
O English language proficiency/accent  
O UVM status (e.g. part-time instructor, faculty, staff, student, etc.)  
O socioeconomic status  
O other (please specify)_________________

Questions 12 – 16 refer to Sexual Misconduct

12. If I was sexually assaulted while at UVM, I am confident the University community would support me and take action on my behalf.

O yes  O no  O unsure

13. I have been touched in a sexual manner that has made me feel uncomfortable or fearful.

O Never  O Rarely  O Sometimes  O Often  O Very often

14. There are times when I am within the campus community that I fear being sexually assaulted.

O Never  O Rarely  O Sometimes  O Often  O Very often

15. Have you ever been a victim of sexual assault while at UVM?

O yes  O no (if no, please skip to question 16)

15-1. Who was the offender? (Mark all that apply)

O acquaintance  
O co-worker  
O roommate  
O relative  
O staff member  
O classmate  
O current partner  
O ex-partner  
O stranger  
O professor  
O friend  
O other (please specify)_________________
15-2. Where did this incident occur?
O on-campus
O off-campus
O specific location (please specify)_____________________

15-3 Please describe your response to experiencing this incident. (Mark all that apply.)
O I sought support from off-campus hot-line/advocacy services
O I sought support from on-campus advocacy services
O I told a friend
O I told a family member
O I told my RA
O I sought support from the UVM Counseling Center
O I sought medical services
O I contacted the police
O I sought support from a UVM staff person
O I sought support from a UVM faculty member
O I sought information on-line
O I did nothing
O other (please specify) ____________________________

16. Question for students only: Would you be more likely to report a sexual assault if you were guaranteed that you would not be charged with an alcohol or substance abuse violation?
O yes O no

Part 2. UVM Actions Relative to Climate Issues

17. The University of Vermont proactively addresses issues related to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree nor disagree</th>
<th>disagree disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employee status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender variance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty, staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mental illness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical characteristics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native English speakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socioeconomic class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. There is visible leadership to foster diversity at UVM from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The President’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My academic dean/unit head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department head/director supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in my department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty senate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity &amp; Equity Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Course content at UVM includes materials, perspectives, and/or experiences of people from historically underrepresented/marginalized groups.

(Note: Underrepresented/marginalized groups can be based on age, gender, gender variance, racial or ethnic identity, disability, national origin, religious creed, sexual orientation, or socioeconomic status.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>do not agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. I believe that UVM values my involvement in diversity initiatives on campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>do not agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. I believe the classroom climate is welcoming for students from historically underrepresented/marginalized groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>do not agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. I believe the workplace climate is welcoming for employees from historically underrepresented/marginalized groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>do not agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. How would you rate the accessibility of the campus for people with disabilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Very Accessible</th>
<th>Accessible</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Somewhat Inaccessible</th>
<th>Very Inaccessible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billings Student Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Classrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds (snow, construction)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Halls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Houses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVM Web Site</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information in Alternative Formats (Braille, etc)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. How would you rate the overall campus climate for people who are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Respectful</th>
<th>Moderately Respectful</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Respectful</th>
<th>Not at all Respectful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Americans/Blacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indians/Alaskan Natives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs/Arab Americans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasians/Whites (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino(a)s/Chicano(a)s/Hispanics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial, multiethnic, or multicultural persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islanders/Hawaiian Natives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay, lesbian, bisexual persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students, staff, or faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native English speakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender/transsexual/gender-queer persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disabilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With less socioeconomic privilege</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With minority religious affiliations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3. Demographic Information

25. What is your gender identity?
   - O Female
   - O Male
   - O Transgender/transsexual/genderqueer (female to male spectrum)
   - O Transgender/transsexual/genderqueer (male to female spectrum)
   - O Other (please specify) ________________

26. Which term best describes your sexual orientation?
   - O bisexual
   - O gay
   - O lesbian
   - O heterosexual
   - O questioning
   - O other (please specify) ________________

27. What is your age?
   - O 18-19
   - O 20-21
   - O 22-32
   - O 33-42
   - O 43-51
   - O 52-60
   - O 61-69
   - O 70 and over

28. What is your current relationship situation? (Mark all that apply.)
   - O single, not dating
   - O single, dating
   - O partnered
   - O partnered in civil union
   - O married
   - O separated
   - O divorced
   - O remarried
   - O partner/spouse deceased

29. What is your current parental status? (Mark all that apply.)
   - O no children
   - O single parent
   - O co-parent with a partner
   - O my/our children were adopted
30. What is the highest level of education achieved by your parents/legal guardians?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Legal Guardian 1:</th>
<th>Parent/Legal Guardian 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O no high school</td>
<td>O no high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O high school</td>
<td>O high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O some college</td>
<td>O some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Associates degree</td>
<td>O Associates degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Bachelors degree</td>
<td>O Bachelors degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Masters</td>
<td>O Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Doctorate</td>
<td>O Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Other professional degree</td>
<td>O Other professional degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Unknown</td>
<td>O Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Not applicable</td>
<td>O Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Prior to age 21, in what size community did you spend the majority of your time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural community</th>
<th>small city (less than 25,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very small town</td>
<td>medium city (25,000 to 60,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(less than 1000)</td>
<td>small town (1000 to 5000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>large urban city (60,000 +)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. What is your primary status at UVM? (Please mark only one)

- O Undergraduate student
- O Master Degree candidate
- O Doctoral Degree candidate
- O Professional Degree candidate
- O Lecturer/Adjunct
- O Assistant Professor
- O Associate Professor
- O Professor
- O Research Faculty
- O Clinical Faculty
- O Visiting Faculty
- O C Family - Administrative Support - all non-exempt
- O P Family - Professional - all exempt
- O T Family - Technical - both non-exempt & exempt
- O K Family - Skilled Craft
- O S Family - Service Maintenance (union & non-union)
- O E Family - Classified Staff Personnel (i.e. Directors)
- O Non Classified (Associate VP, VP, Executive Director)
- O Other (please specify) ___________________________
33. What academic college or administrative work unit are you primarily affiliated with at this time? (Please mark only one.)

- College of Agriculture & Life Sciences
- College of Arts & Sciences
- College of Education & Social Services
- College of Engineering & Mathematics
- College of Medicine
- College of Nursing & Health Sciences
- Conferences and Events
- Continuing Education
- The Rubenstein School of Environmental & Natural Resources
- Development & Alumni Relations
- Administration & Finance
- Student & Campus Life
  - Research & Graduate College
  - Office of the Provost
  - Office of the President
  - Diversity & Equity Office/Unit
  - State and Federal Relations
  - Undergraduate Education
  - Library & Information Technology
  - Intercollegiate Athletics
  - Other (please specify) _____________________

34. Are you full-time (+.75) or part-time in that primary position?

- full-time
- part-time

35. Do you have a physical condition that substantially affects a major life activity (such as seeing, hearing, walking)?

- Yes
- No

36. Do you have a cognitive or emotional condition (e.g., learning disability, depression, etc.) that substantially affects a major life activity?

- Yes
- No

37. What is your race/ethnicity? (If you are of a multi-racial/multi-ethnic/multi-cultural identity, mark all that apply.)

- African/African American/Black (not Hispanic)
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Asian/Asian American
- Latino(a)/Hispanic/Chicano(a)
- Middle Eastern
- Pacific Islander/Hawaiian Native
- White/Caucasian (not Hispanic)
- Other (please specify) _____________________
38. What is your citizenship status?
   - U.S. citizen - born in the United States
   - U.S. citizen – naturalized
   - permanent resident (immigrant)
   - permanent resident (refugee)
   - international (F-1, J-1, H1-B, or other visa)

39. What is your religious or spiritual affiliation?
   - Baptist
   - Baha’i
   - Buddhist
   - Eastern Orthodox
   - Episcopal
   - Hindu
   - Islamic
   - Jewish
   - LDS (Mormon)
   - Lutheran
   - Methodist
   - Muslim
   - Presbyterian
   - Quaker
   - Roman Catholic
   - Seventh Day Adventist
   - Unitarian/Universalist
   - Wiccan
   - No affiliation
   - Other (please specify) ___________

40. How long have you been at UVM?
   - 1 year or less
   - 2-4 years
   - 5-10 years
   - 11-19 years
   - 20-29 years
   - 30+ years
41. What is your yearly income (if single or an independent student) or your best estimate of your family’s yearly income (if partnered, married, or a dependent student)?

- below $9,999
- $10,000 - $19,999
- $20,000 - $29,999
- $30,000 - $39,999
- $40,000 - $49,999
- $50,000 - $59,999
- $60,000 - $69,999
- $70,000 - $79,999
- $80,000 - $89,999
- $90,000 - $99,999
- $100,000 - $149,999
- $150,000 - $199,999
- $200,000 - $249,999
- $250,000 and above

42. If you are a student, where and with whom do you live? (Mark all that apply.)

- single room in residence hall
- double room in residence hall
- suite in residence hall
- on-campus apartment
- off-campus apartment
- off-campus house
- fraternity/sorority housing
- with partner or spouse
- with parent(s)/family/relative(s)
- Other (please specify) _____________________

43. If you are a student, are you involved in any of the following types of organizations? (Mark all that apply.)

- Performing & Visual Arts
- Communications/radio/newspaper/TV
- Political and Social
- Honororary Societies
- Recreation/Intramural Sports
- Intercollegiate Athletics
- Greek Life
- Student Government Association
- Religious and Spiritual
- Multicultural/Diversity
- Other (please specify) _____________________
Part 4. How to Improve the Campus Climate

In your judgment, how would each of the following affect the climate at UVM?
(Note: Climate refers to current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of employees and students concerning the access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and potential.)

44. Providing more social justice workshops/programs to raise campus awareness of the issues and concerns facing people based upon their:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>do not agree nor disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country of origin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disability status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender variance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical characteristics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socioeconomic class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. Requiring all UVM students, staff, and faculty to take at least one social justice class that focuses on issues, research, and perspectives regarding…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>do not agree nor disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country of origin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disability status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender variance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical characteristics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socioeconomic class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
46. Include social justice related activities as one of the criteria for hiring and/or evaluations of non-student staff, faculty, and administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>do not agree nor disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. Using a scale of 1-5, please rate the overall campus climate at UVM on the following dimensions:

(Note: As an example, for the first item, “friendly—hostile,” 1=very friendly, 2=somewhat friendly, 3=neither friendly nor hostile, 4=somewhat hostile, and 5=very hostile)

- **friendly**
- **communicative**
- **concerned**
- **respectful**
- **cooperative**
- **improving**
- **accessible to persons with disabilities**
- **non-racist**
- **non-sexist**
- **non-heterosexist**
- **positive for people who identify as LGB**
- **positive for people who are gender-variant**
- **positive for people of Jewish heritage**
- **positive for people of Islamic faith**
- **positive for people who practice other than the Christian faith**
- **positive for people who practice the Christian faith**
- **positive for non-native English speakers**
- **positive for people from non-U.S. countries**
- **welcoming**
- **competitive**
- **positive for people who are raising children**

- **hostile**
- **reserved**
- **indifferent**
- **disrespectful**
- **uncooperative**
- **regressing**
- **inaccessible to persons with disabilities**
- **racist**
- **sexist**
- **heterosexist**
- **not positive for people who identify as LGB**
- **not positive for people who are gender-variant**
- **anti-Semitic (anti-Jewish)**
- **anti-Islamic**
- **not positive for people who practice other than the Christian faith**
- **not positive for people who practice the Christian faith**
- **not positive for non-native English speakers**
- **not positive for people from non-U.S. countries**
- **non-welcoming**
- **non-competitive**
- **not positive for people who are raising children**
Part 5. Experiences As Member of the UVM Community

To what extent have you had the following experiences in the past year at UVM?

48. I am comfortable being open on campus about my identity.
   never          rarely               sometimes               often       very often       not applicable
   1    2       3  4       5           6

49. I feel that my cultural heritage is valued at UVM.
   never          rarely               sometimes               often       very often
   1    2       3  4       5

50. As a student, I have had classes with the following: (Mark all that apply.)
   O White Professor
   O Male Professor
   O Female Professor
   O Professor of Color
   O “Out” Lesbian, Gay, or Bisexual Professor
   O “Out” Transgender/Transsexual/Gender-Queer Professor
   O Professor with a Disability
   O International Professor

51. As a student, I am comfortable requesting assistance from a:
   strongly       agree       do not agree       disagree       strongly       not
   nor disagree                        disagree       applicable
   O White Professor 1    2  3  4       5           6
   O Male Professor 1    2  3  4       5           6
   O Female Professor 1    2  3  4       5           6
   O Professor of Color 1    2  3  4       5           6
   O “Out” Lesbian, Gay, or Bisexual Professor 1    2  3  4       5           6
   O “Out” Transgender/Transsexual/Gender-Queer Professor 1    2  3  4       5           6
   O Professor with a Disability 1    2  3  4       5           6
   O International Professor 1    2  3  4       5           6

Part 6. Your Additional Comments

This survey has asked you to reflect upon a large number of issues related to campus climate and your experiences of campus climate, using a multiple-choice format. If you would like to elaborate upon any of your survey responses, further describe your experiences of campus climate, or offer additional thoughts about campus climate issues and ways UVM might improve campus climate, we encourage you to do so in the space provided below. Thank you.
Appendix C: Sample Advertisements
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Campus Climate Survey 2005 – April 4th through April 15th

Do you care about the Campus Climate at UVM?

Now is your chance to have your voice heard! Help lay the groundwork for improving the climate on campus for all.

Please see the back of this bookmark for locations of hard copy surveys. They will be available Monday through Friday from 8:00am to 4:30pm for the 2 week period of the survey.

www.uvm.edu/~aaeo/campusclimatesurvey/
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Hard copy locations:
1 L/L, ACCESS
2 ALANA Student Center
3 SGA, Billings
4 Student Information Center, Waterman Building

If you have any questions, please contact the AA/EO office at 656-3368.

Your opinions are important to improving our community!

Don’t miss this opportunity!