The IE Campus Climate Report public presentation took place on June 11, 2013. Please note that minor edits and additional notations have been made to this presentation from the original presentation date.
Overview & Data Presentation

- Survey Goals & Methods
- Who Participated in the Campus Climate Survey?
- Good News
- Not so Good News
- Additional Findings
- Implications & Best Practices
- Questions
The University of Denver Campus Climate Survey took place in February and March of the 2011-2012 academic year.

The survey was created in collaboration with faculty, staff, and graduate students in psychology, education, the Office of Institutional Research, and the Center for Multicultural Excellence. This was a six month process included both instrument and content research and was vetted prior to implementation.
For all survey questions, analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing was completed, exploring difference across social identity groups by participant population (faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students).

A majority of the survey questions utilized a 4-point likert scale with the poles being strongly disagree and strongly agree. In additional, all questions had a “Don’t Know” option. Some of the questions utilized a dichotomous (i.e., yes or no); thus, due to the different scales, in this presentation percentages will be provided of those participants who either agreed or disagreed when no statistically significant differences were found between groups.

Moreover, an outside expert completed a series of more sophisticated statistical testing including Latent Construct Analysis (LCA) and LCA using covariates. These analyses allow us to see how people’s perceptions hang together – are there different groups of individual perceptions?

Upon completion of ANOVA statistical testing, the Center for Multicultural Excellence along with and outside expert completed a qualitative analysis on the survey’s open-ended questions. Qualitative data is not provided here.
Generally, the overall survey sample was representative of the DU demographics in regard to race, gender, and citizenship. Within social science research a 26.2% response rate is considered really good.

All survey demographic questions were open response, meaning participants were not required to answer any question to continue with the survey. Below are definitions and/or information on social identity representation within this participation and representation in the survey.

**Gender:**
On the survey demographic gender options included, “man”, “woman”, “transgender”, and “gender queer”. Those participants who responded as either transgender or gender queer accounted for such a small population (0.6%) that comparative analysis was not possible.

**Race & Ethnicity:**
Race and Ethnicity data were both aggregated and disaggregated for different levels of analysis. When aggregated, the four groups included, “Domestic Racial Minority”, “White”, “International”, and “Other/Did not Respond”.

**LGBQ:**
On the survey demographic options for sexual orientation included, “bisexual/pansexual”, “heterosexual/straight”, “gay”, “lesbian”, “queer”, “asexual”, “questioning”, and “other”. To provide a level of anonymity and to allow for comparative analysis, sexual orientation was aggregated into three categories – heterosexual, LGBQ, and other/did not respond.
Good News

◆ Overall, undergraduate students have a favorable perception of campus climate.

◆ A majority of students agree that,
  ◆ Their departments support their development of competence in the practice of Inclusive Excellence (67.6% of Graduate; 70.0% of Undergraduate).
  ◆ They have taken classes that have prepared them to successfully participate in an increasingly diverse society (74.1% of Graduate; 73.1% of Undergraduate).
  ◆ They have taken classes that have prepared them to successfully participate in an increasingly global society (80.4% of Graduate; 85.1% of Undergraduate).
  ◆ Their departments recognize their contributions/commitments to Inclusive Excellence (60.6% of Graduate; 65.0% of Undergraduate).
Good News

◆ Students, Faculty, and Staff, regardless of social identity, agree that Inclusive Excellence is important to them (83.7% of Undergraduate; 86.1% of Graduate; 91.0% of Faculty; 88.7% of Staff).

◆ A majority of faculty, regardless of social identity, indicated that,
  ◆ Inclusive Excellence is valued in their academic department (71.3%).
  ◆ They are comfortable with implementing classroom behaviors that promote Inclusive Excellence (88.1%).
  ◆ IE is reflected in their teaching practice (96.9%).
  ◆ They are conscious of the cultural references they make in the classroom (99.5%).
  ◆ They intervene when racially charged situations emerge in the classroom (98.2%).
Not so Good News: Racial Minority Groups

- **Faculty** of Color were significantly less likely to be in the favorable campus climate latent category compared to the not favorable category (OR=0.46, 95% CI = 0.24-0.89).

- **Faculty** of Color are less likely to strongly agree that their departments are welcoming to people of color ($F(2, 392) = 4.91, p = .008$).

- **Faculty** of Color are more likely than their peers to indicate that they often feel they are the only members of their social identified group ($F(2,62.19) = 26.67, p < .001$).

- **Staff** Members of Color are less likely to agree than their White counterparts that their departments support the professional advancement of staff, faculty, and students from historically underrepresented populations ($F(2, 602)= 4.38, p=.013$).

- Those **Staff** members who identified as of Hispanic ethnicity, compared with other historically marginalized racial categories, associated with a lower likelihood of being in the mostly favorable latent class vs. the not favorable latent class (OR=0.33, CI=0.13-0.84).
Not so Good News: *Racial Minority Groups*

- African American **Graduate Students** were significantly less likely than their White counterparts to be classified in the favorable perceptions latent class vs. the not favorable perceptions latent class ($OR=0.18$, CI=0.06-0.56).

- **Graduate Students** of Color are less likely to agree that they feel welcome in their departments ($F(2,1198)=3.10$, $p=.04$).

- **Graduate Students** of Color are statistically more likely than their peers to indicate they have experienced ($F(2,129.73)=4.039$, $p=.02$) and witnessed ($F(2,132.75)=4.60$, $p=.01$) an act of discrimination.

- Those **Undergraduate Students** who identified as of Hispanic ethnicity ($OR=1.6$, CI=1.03-2.51) and those classified as other ($OR=3.38$, CI=1.25-9.10) were significantly more likely to be classified in the somewhat favorable perceptions latent class vs. mostly favorable perceptions latent class.

- **Undergraduate Students** of Color are less likely to agree that they feel welcome in their departments ($F(2,1005)=8.60$, $p<.01$).

- **Undergraduate Students** of Color are statistically more likely than their peers to indicate they have experienced ($F(2,94.17)=19.737$, $p<.01$) and witnessed ($F(2,88.78)=11.95$, $p<.01$) an act of discrimination.

Note: Participants were not provided with a definition of “harassment” or “discrimination” within the survey nor were they prompted to respond in regard to a particular social identity. For example, a women of color who identifies as heterosexual may have witnessed an anti-LGBQ incident.
Not so Good News: Women

- Women Faculty members were significantly less likely than men to be in the favorable latent category compared to the not favorable latent category (OR = 0.45, 95% CI = 0.23-0.87).
- Women Faculty are more likely to agree that they have experienced an act of discrimination ($F(2,10.865)= 7.42, p=.01$) and are more likely to agree that they have witnessed an act of discrimination in their department in comparison to men ($F(2, 13.46)= 15.28, p<.01$).
- Women Staff members were significantly less likely to be classified as having favorable perceptions than men (OR=0.42, CI=0.25-0.73).
- Women Graduate Students were significantly less likely to be classified in the mostly favorable latent category compared to men (OR=0.42, CI=0.23-0.77).

Note: Participants were not provided with a definition of “harassment” or “discrimination” within the survey nor were they prompted to respond in regard to a particular social identity. For example, a women of color who identifies as heterosexual may have witnessed an anti-LGBQ incident.
Not so Good News: *The LGBQ Community*

- **Staff** members who identify as LGBQ are three times less likely of being classified as having favorable perceptions compared to those who identify as heterosexual (OR=3.37, CI=1.5-7.5).

- **Staff** members who identify as LGBQ are more likely to agree that they have witnessed an act of discrimination in their department in comparison to staff members who identify as heterosexual ($F(1,71.34)= 10.52, p<.01$).

- **Graduate Students** who identify as LGBQ are less likely to agree that they feel welcome in their departments ($F(1,123.92)= 6.98, p<.01$)

- **Graduate Students** who identify as LGBQ are statistically more likely than their peers to indicate they have experienced ($F(1,121)= 5.68, p=.02$) and witnessed ($F(1,128.43)= 30.40, p<.01$) an act of discrimination.

- **Undergraduate Students** who identify as LGBQ indicate that they are less likely to feel welcome in their departments ($F(1,900)= 10.465, p<.01$).

- **Undergraduate Students** who identify as LGBQ are statistically more likely than their peers to indicate they have experienced ($F(1,107.77)=19.07, p<.01$) and witnessed ($F(1,110.97)= 14.05, p<.01$) an act of discrimination.

Note: Participants were not provided with a definition of “harassment” or “discrimination” within the survey nor were they prompted to respond in regard to a particular social identity. For example, a women of color who identifies as heterosexual may have witnessed an anti-LGBQ incident.
Additional Findings

- Approximately half of Undergraduate and Graduate Students indicate that they are not aware of the University procedures to report discrimination and harassment at DU (45.0% of Undergraduate Students; 49.5% of Graduate Students).

- **Climate for International Students**: A majority of Undergraduate and Graduate students disagree that international students are underrepresented (74.6% of Undergraduate; 55.2% of Graduate). Additionally, qualitative data illustrated a distinct angst regarding international students.

- **Socio-Economic Status (SES)**: Undergraduate and Graduate students indicated that the high cost of tuition has an impact on campus climate, in particular for those students who come from lower socio-economic backgrounds. This survey did not collect quantitative information regarding SES, thus more research should be done to consider the experiences of these students.
The factors found using LCA explained at least 50% of the variance among each group (faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students).
Implications: *Creating an Inclusive Campus Climate*

- Need to increase our campus wide efforts to **promote** and provide **education** on Inclusive Excellence – paying particular attention to how we socialize and orient new members to the DU community.

- Need to look at how can we continue to use institutional data to **drive improvement** efforts and **address unhealthy** climate factors. (Status of Women Working Group, other affinity based focus groups)

- Need to consider how can we enhance existing programs and/or create new programs to **encourage** positive group interactions. We need to do a better job of highlighting best practices that exist throughout the University.
Implications: *Creating an Inclusive Campus Climate*

- Need to explore how can we increase opportunities for the DU community to **develop the** cross-cultural **competencies** needed to successfully navigate an increasingly diverse campus and society. How can we **leverage** our existing curriculum and programs?
- Need to provide centralized **resources** (funding & support) to drive IE initiatives - Campus Climate Council Fund.
- Need to identify both unit level and university wide **accountability mechanisms** – IE Strategic Plan. Who is responsible for climate related matters in your unit/division? CME is part of the solution but can't be the only part.
Now What? *New Initiatives & Engaged Work*

- **IRISE**: The Interdisciplinary Research Incubator for the Study of (In)Equality will be a 2013-2016 initiative funded by the Renew DU Committee.

- **BIRT**: The Bias Incident Reporting/Response Protocol builds on existing frameworks in collaboration with campus partners for the implementation of a reporting and response system.

- **All DU IE Website**: Project with University Marketing & Communications to create an all campus IE resource website.

- **IE First Year Seminar Project**: In collaboration, the FSEM program the CME will be conducting an IE integration study.
Now What? *New Initiatives & Engaged Work*

- **Campus Climate Fund:** Exploring a collaborative fund for addressing campus climate issues.

- **IE Strategic Plan:** Report progress and update the strategic plan.

- **CME move to Driscoll:** Plans in development for CME’s move to Driscoll North as part of its coming renovation.
Frequently Asked Questions:

1. Is the raw data available for others to view?
   - No. In agreement with the DU Internal Review Board (IRB) and to respect the information shared by the participants, the raw data is not available for analysis.

2. I have an analysis I would like to suggest, what can I do?
   - If there are additional analyses you would like to have information on, please email cmeinfo@du.edu with your question. There is no guarantee that we will be able to run suggested analyses; however, you may submit a request.

3. Is this the entirety of the data?
   - No. We are still completing additional analyses and will provide follow information as they are completed.

4. What about other social identity groups? Do you have data speaking to their experience on campus?
   - Yes. We did collect information regarding disability/ability and religion/spirituality; however, we have not yet completed those analyses.

5. Can I get a copy of the survey instrument?
   - No. We plan to use the instrument again and like all psychometric measures we are working to refine it.

6. When will you be conducting the next campus climate survey?
   - We plan to conduct campus climate assessments every 3-5 years.
Current Demographics: Communities of Color

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Faculty of Color</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Staff &amp; Administrators of Color</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Graduate Students of Color</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Undergraduate Students of Color</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All current demographic data provided by IR
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Current Demographics: *Gender*

Gender Demographics, Fall 2012

*All current demographic data provided by IR*