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Introduction

The past 20 years have seen increasing diversification in colleges and universities throughout the country and recent trends toward even more inclusive models of higher education (Banks, 2003). As institutions of higher education have increased efforts to recruit and retain more diverse students, staff, faculty, and administrators, the definition of diversity itself has become more inclusive. Those who have been traditionally understood to be included in diversification policies and programs (e.g., those identified by race, ethnicity, or sex) have been joined by those marginalized by differences in culture or orientation (e.g., Lesbian and Gay people), ability (e.g., people with disabilities), religious affiliation/spiritual beliefs (e.g., non-Christian people2), and economic background (e.g., people from working-class and lower income backgrounds; first generation college students) to diversify the landscape of higher education throughout the United States. As our landscapes changed, campus “climate” emerged as one of the most important factors influencing retention rates, community cohesiveness, and satisfaction with the university experience, especially for diverse individuals thought to be most vulnerable to discrimination from the majority groups.

Many studies now lend support to the idea that it is the climate of a university community that aids in retention (e.g., Hurtado, 1992, 1996; Hurtado, Carter, & Spuler, 1996; Smedley, Myers, & Harrell, 1993). As Alberto Cabrera (2003) noted, “Exposure to a climate of prejudice and discrimination in the classroom and on campus has gained attention as the main factor accounting for differences in withdrawal behavior between minorities and non-minorities.” In the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater’s efforts to improve the retention and success rate for all students and employees, it is important to

2 The designation “non-Christian” is used to identify a minority category, not to imply “Christian” as normative. See the Terms chapter for a discussion of minority and majority.
pay attention to the context in which higher education takes place. This study explored the campus climate specifically for people from minority groups at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater (UWW).

UWW does not track the number of “out” LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer) people or the number of people of various religious/spiritual affiliations. In the past 20 years, however, UWW has seen changes in terms of increased numbers of People of Color, people with disabilities, and women (UWW Institutional Research, 2003). As with other institutions of higher education nationally, UWW needs to focus not only on the number of diverse students and employees recruited, but the number of diverse students and employees retained and the number of diverse students and employees who enjoy full inclusion, equity, safety, and access on campus. Retention and success, rather than recruitment alone, offers the most complete picture of the climate for diversity of a campus.

This study, commissioned by Chancellor Jack Miller, had a two-fold purpose: (a) to investigate the perspectives of UWW students and employees of both minority and majority demographic groups, and (b) to begin the development of a diagnostic tool that could be administered annually. My intention was first to illuminate the overall perceptions of the entire campus community; second, to highlight similarities and differences in perspectives about the current climate of the UWW campus; and third, to develop an ongoing database so that UWW could track change or lack of change to more effectively target interventions and to more precisely set campus priorities for action in terms of diversity.

The primary question addressed in the 2005 Campus Climate Study was: What is the current climate of the UWW campus for students, staff, faculty, and administrators who come from minority backgrounds, perspectives, and experiences? More specifically, we wanted to know whether UWW policies and practices facilitate specific
dimensions of climate—safety; institutional responsiveness; accurate representation and inclusivity of all students, faculty, and staff in university-sponsored events; fairness and equity; a low incidence of discrimination and harassment; and opportunities for advancement—for all students and employees. We had also hoped to highlight policies and practices that should be improved or implemented to augment specific dimensions of our campus climate and to improve retention of a diverse academic community. Being able to target more specific aspects of university climate where community members experience problems and where they do not would give a more comprehensive picture of the different aspects of building a diverse campus community and would allow administrators to more precisely identify “problem areas.” Future studies will investigate these more specific objectives.
Terms

A complete discussion of the use or nature of the terms minority or majority is beyond the scope of this report. However, clarity in both language and intention is critically important to diversity endeavors. Throughout this study, I use the terms minority and majority with a specific intended meaning.

In this study, I use the term minority to refer to anyone whose racial or ethnic background, sex/gender identity, sexual/affectional orientation, economic class, religious affiliation/spiritual beliefs, or ability has historically been ascribed to a subordinate or one-down position, afforded less access to resources or privileges, or someone who has been regarded to be of “minor” standing in a known stratified system (Poorman, 2003). The term minority is not being used to indicate that one group is inferior to another. Minority is not being used to refer only to People of Color as is common in many programs designed to enhance diversity. Minority does not necessarily refer to a group that has fewer members. Some minority groups, like Native Americans, are comprised of a small number of constituents. However, some groups considered minority, like women, actually outnumber men, but have still been historically disadvantaged, considered less than, or subordinated. Minority persons did not earn or deserve the one-down positions. Those with the power and privilege to determine values and norms ascribe positions. Minority, then, is used here to refer to any person or group of people vulnerable to being treated as having less value on the basis of some aspect of their demographic affiliation.

I use the term majority to refer to anyone whose race, ethnicity, sex/gender identity, sexual/affectional orientation, economic class, religious affiliation/spiritual beliefs, or ability has historically been ascribed a dominant position, afforded them
improved access to resources or privileges, or who has been or is regarded as normative or of a “major” standing in a known stratified system (Poorman, 2003). Majority does not refer to being superior and does not always refer to a statistically greater number. It indicates an ascribed status considered to be of major importance in dominating, in accessing resources or privileges, or in determining norms or values.

Throughout this summary, I use the abbreviation LGB/Q to refer to people whose sexual orientation is Lesbian, Gay, or bisexual and those who may be questioning their orientation. While LGB and T are often used together, transgender and intersex are actually variants of sex/gender identity and not variations of sexual orientation. Discrimination against transgendered and intersexed persons is considered a complex variation of sexism and representative of the confusion of orientation and gender identity that results from homophobia.³ For the purposes of this study, LGB/Q persons were categorized together to assess climate based on orientation, and transgender was included as a variant of sex to assess discrimination based on sex/gender identity.

In this summary, I use the terms People of Color, Participants of Color, Students of Color, and Employees of Color to refer collectively to those who identified their racial/ethnic backgrounds as Asian American, African American, Native American/American Indian, or Latino/Chicano/Hispanic. This terminology is not meant to imply that these groups have the same experiences or perceptions. The terms are used to refer to people who face pervasive oppression and discrimination because of race or ethnicity. People of racial/ethnic minority status were categorized together to better assess the UWW campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity.

³ Additional discussion can be found in Jones and Hill (2002) and Lombardi, Wilchins, Priesing, and Malouf (2001).
Method

Multiple campus climate sources and resources informed this study, including reviews of academic literature, national studies, and studies previously conducted at UWW. To ensure constituent input, meetings were held on the UWW campus with minority and majority constituent groups, Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity (AA/EO) committee members, and the UWW Assistant to the Chancellor for AA/EO. In addition, both on- and off-campus researchers provided input.

UWW Population Demographics

Students. In Spring Semester 2005, when this study was conducted, there were 10,215 students enrolled at UWW (UWW Institutional Research, 2005). There were 1,716 Freshmen (17%), 2,096 Sophomores (21%), 2,057 Juniors (20%), 2,671 Seniors (26%), 1,135 graduate students (11%), and 540 other students (5%). More women (53%) than men (47%) were enrolled. UWW did not track the number of transgender students enrolled.

Most of the students enrolled in Spring 2005 identified their race as White Non-Hispanic (89%). Forty-six students identified their race as Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native (.45%), 251 students identified as Latino/Hispanic (2%), 435 students identified as Black/African American (4%), 129 students identified as Asian/Pacific Islander (1%), and 108 students identified as Other (1%). UWW did not track the number of students enrolled who identified as biracial or multiracial.

A number of students enrolled in Spring 2005 identified themselves as having a disability. Students with any type of disability constituted 26% of the students enrolled (Center for Students with Disabilities, 2005). UWW did not track the number of
students with invisible disabilities, visible disabilities, or those with both visible and invisible disabilities. However, of those students with disabilities, most identified an invisible disability (e.g., learning disability; Center for Students with Disabilities, 2005).

UWW did not track the number of students who identified as Lesbian, Gay, or bisexual, nor those who were questioning their orientation. UWW did not track the primary religious/spiritual affiliation of enrolled students.

Employees. UWW employed 1,168 people in Spring 2005. There were 213 academic staff members in non-teaching positions (18%), 221 academic staff members in teaching positions (19%), 414 classified staff members (35%), and 320 faculty members (27%) employed. Employees included 593 female employees (51%) and 575 male employees (49%). UWW did not track the number of employees who identified as transgender.

Most of the employees at UWW identified as White Non-Hispanic (88%). Employees also identified as Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native (.05%), Latino/Hispanic (2%), Black/African American (3%), Asian/Pacific Islander (5%), and Other (1%).

Employees who identified a disability constituted almost 4% of the total number of employees. UWW did not track the number of employees identifying visible, invisible, or both types of disabilities.

UWW did not track the number of employees who identified as Lesbian, Gay, or bisexual, nor those who were questioning their orientation. UWW did not track the primary religious/spiritual affiliations of employees.

Participant Sample Demographics

All students enrolled at UWW who had reached the age of 18 and all employees of UWW constituted the pool of prospective participants. Using a random sampling
program (SPSS Version 12, 2004), half of each group (students and employees) was randomly selected to receive a Letter of Invitation to Participate in the study (see Appendix C). Under my supervision as principal investigator, research assistants trained in research ethics and communication strategies specifically encouraged minority constituencies to participate. This was done to ensure fuller participation, more viable data analysis, and more meaningful results.

*Students.* The study included 790 students from all academic classes at UWW (8% response rate). One hundred-three Freshmen (14%), 146 Sophomores (20%), 168 Juniors (23%), 245 Seniors (33%), 57 graduate students (8%), and 22 students who identified themselves as Other than these academic classifications (3%) participated in the study. Student participants included 501 female students (68%), 238 male students (32%), and 2 students who identified as transgender (0%).

Most of the students who participated identified their race as White Non-Hispanic (91%). Six participants identified their race as Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native (1%), 17 students identified as Latino/Hispanic (2%), 9 students identified as Black/African American (1%), 24 students identified as Asian/Pacific Islander (3%), and 19 students identified as biracial/multiracial (3%).

The majority of students enrolled did not identify a disability (69%). About one-third of the students who participated identified themselves as having a disability (31%). Of the students who reported a disability, 155 reported having an invisible disability (20%). Fifty-one student participants reported having visible disabilities (7%); 41 reported both visible and invisible disabilities (5%).

Most of the students identified themselves as heterosexual (94%). Participants included 5 students who identified as Gay (1%), 9 students who identified as Lesbian (1%), 15 students who identified as bisexual (2%), and 14 students who identified themselves as uncertain about/questioning their sexual orientation (2%).
Most of the students who participated in the study identified their primary religious/spiritual affiliation as Christian, that is, Catholic (30%), Christian (28%), Protestant (9%), or Mormon\(^4\) (0%). One hundred forty-seven students identified no current religious/spiritual affiliation (20%); 64 students identified their religious/spiritual affiliation as Other (9%). The largest group that identified Other wrote in “Lutheran,” which was subsequently recoded as Protestant. A small number of students who identified non-Christian religious/spiritual affiliations participated in the study, specifically, Muslim\(^5\) (1%), Eastern Religions (1%), Unitarian (0%), Jewish\(^6\) (1%), and Nature-oriented spiritual beliefs (1%). No one identified their primary religious/spiritual affiliation as Quaker\(^7\) or Native American spiritual beliefs.\(^8\)

Among students who participated, Seniors, women, and Asian Americans were over-represented in the study sample relative to the UWW student population. Men and African Americans were underrepresented in the study sample relative to the student population at UWW (see Appendix A: Table 1).

*Employees.* The study included 221 employees from all positions at UWW (19% response rate). Fifty-eight academic staff members in non-teaching positions (32%), 28 academic staff members in teaching positions (20%), 30 classified staff members (17%), and 66 faculty members (36%) participated in the study. Employee participants included 91 female employees (51%), 87 male employees (49%), and no employees who identified as transgender (0%).

Most of the employees who participated identified as White Non-Hispanic (93%). Employees participated who identified as Native American/American Indian/Alaskan

\(^4\) Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints  
\(^5\) Islam  
\(^6\) Judaism  
\(^7\) Society of Friends  
\(^8\) Percentages were based on number of participants who answered each question.
Native (1%), Latino/Hispanic (2%), Black/African American (2%), Asian/Pacific Islander (2%), and biracial/multiracial (1%).

Most of the employees who participated did not identify a disability (72%). About a quarter of the employees identified themselves as having a disability (28%). Of the employee participants, 39 reported having invisible disabilities (18%), 7 reported having visible disabilities (3%), and 16 reported having both visible and invisible disabilities (7%).

Most of the employees who participated identified themselves as heterosexual (94%). Participants included employees who identified as Gay (2%), Lesbian (3%), bisexual (1%), and uncertain/questioning their sexual orientation (1%).

Most of the employees who participated in the study identified their primary religious/spiritual affiliation as Christian, that is, Catholic (24%), Christian (23%), or Protestant (22%). Thirty-three employees identified as having no current religious/spiritual affiliation (19%); 9 employees identified their religious/spiritual affiliation as Other (4%). A small number of employees who identified non-Christian religious/spiritual affiliations participated in the study, specifically Eastern Religions (1%), Unitarian (3%), Jewish (1%), Native American spiritual beliefs (1%), and Nature-oriented spiritual beliefs (1%). None of the employees who participated identified themselves as Muslim or Mormon.

Among employees who participated, academic staff (non-teaching) and faculty were over-represented in this sample relative to the employee population at UWW, while classified staff were underrepresented. White employees and employees with disabilities were over-represented in the sample relative to the employee population, while Asian American employees were underrepresented.
Survey Instrument

After a great deal of review, study, discussion, and deliberation, an original survey instrument was developed to gather descriptive and inferential data across various minority and majority subgroups within the UWW university community and across several key dimensions of campus climate. While the instrument was designed to assess the current climate of the UWW campus, some items resembling those used in studies of campus climate throughout the country and those previously used at UWW itself in studies conducted 10 to 15 years ago were used as guides and the actual language of previous items was replicated in some cases. Matching the language, emphasis, and structure of the questions in this study with previously conducted surveys was intended to allow for some comparisons within and between institutions, to facilitate our contribution to the growing body of scholarly literature on campus climate, and to facilitate implementing diversity-related programs.

Survey items addressing attitudes and perceptions about diversity and UWW’s climate were then drafted utilizing prior research from peer-reviewed publications, previous studies conducted at UWW, interviews with constituency groups, and previously published survey instruments. The final instrument was designed to offer a rough screening, that is, a glimpse of the UWW climate relative to diversity, focusing on five key dimensions: (a) providing a safe, non-threatening, accessible environment; (b) perceived adequacy of administrative response to incidents of discrimination and harassment; (c) representation of diverse populations on campus in event programming; (d) first-hand knowledge of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of minority demographic membership; (f) perceived opportunities for advancement (leadership opportunities for students; promotion, merit increases, contract renewal, and tenure for employees). Chancellor Miller (2005) ultimately selected the 6 questions used in this survey out of the original 32 questions. His stated
intention was to commission additional surveys to address more specific elements of concern as they were identified from this survey.

The six survey questions measure the targeted dimensions of campus climate for each of the targeted minority populations—Gay, Lesbian, bisexual or transgendered people; People of Color; people with disabilities; people of all religious affiliations; and women. The first three questions (Q1, Q2, and Q3) had four response options—Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. The next two questions (Q4 and Q5) had four different response options—Never, Rarely, Occasionally, and Regularly. The last question (Q6) had four response options that inverted the Q1, Q2, and Q3 response options—Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, and Strongly Agree.

Demographic features of participants were assessed using six questions asking participants to identify their position or academic class, any visible or invisible disabilities, race, sex/gender identity, sexual orientation, and primary religious/spiritual affiliation.

Procedure

Sampling strategy. Half of all the eligible UWW students, staff, and faculty were randomly selected and then contacted by broadcast e-mail or letter. Employees with no access to computers or only computer access that would be inadequate for full or anonymous inclusion in the study were sent hard-copy packets including the Letter of Invitation to Participate and the survey instrument. Research assistants also specifically encouraged participation by those considered most vulnerable to discrimination due to social identity group affiliation based on race/ethnicity, sex/gender identity, disabilities, religious/spiritual affiliation, or sexual orientation.

Consent and safeguards. The broadcast e-mail was linked to a Web site that contained the Letter of Invitation to Participate (see Appendix C). The letter included standard informed consent elements and additional information about safeguards of
anonymity for online surveys and alternative methods for voicing perspectives. The online letter also contained a link to university and area mental health services in the event that survey participants wished to seek professional help to address any discomfort that resulted from participating in the study. The letter ended with a direct link to the survey. The online survey itself contained a brief introduction with reminders to participants of their rights to informed consent. At the completion of the survey, participants were reminded to close all browser windows to eliminate the possibility of unauthorized access to their responses. Completing and submitting the survey was considered each participant's final consent to participate.

Employees who were sent hard-copy packets received a Letter of Invitation to Participate, survey instrument, and return envelope. The letter included contact information. The hard-copy survey was an exact duplicate of the online survey. The return envelope allowed participants to send the survey anonymously via campus mail.

Online survey responses were stored in a response tally file (without names) that identified each participant only by a line item in a table. Hard copy survey responses were kept in a locked office and manually entered into the final employee data set by a supervised assistant. The anonymous data sets allowed for analysis of aggregated data and generation of summary reports.

Data Analysis

Data were retrieved from the online survey program (ASP Version 6, 2005), converted into a comma-delimited file, and then imported into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Version 12, 2004) where they were further sorted, coded, and statistically analyzed. Hard copy survey responses were manually entered into the data set.
Questions were encoded with the numbers that appeared in the survey. Targeted minority groups were encoded with the letters a to e for each content question. Response options for the content questions were encoded 1 to 4. Lower scores on the content questions indicated more positive perceptions of climate; less frequently witnessed/experienced incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access; and fewer perceived limitations in opportunities for advancement, while the letters a to e referred to a specific minority group.

Understanding central tendencies or analyses based on central tendencies such as average response or average number of people responding in a specific direction cannot give a comprehensive picture of campus climate. In fact, measures of central tendency and frequency counts can obscure an understanding of the very within group differences (including those of minority groups) that this study was intended to investigate. In other words, it's simply not enough to know that most students or employees perceive the campus climate relative to diversity in a positive light. It is also important to know what those who bring diverse, minority backgrounds to the campus perceive about that campus climate. The answer to this question was considered by examining the student group alone and the employee group alone, combining student and employee responses, and by a question-by-question examination of significant differences in perceptions. Examining the individual subscales of each scale and the differences within each group yielded additional understanding of differences in perceptions between minority and majority participants.

Analyses in this summary include descriptive and inferential statistics. For example, simple frequency counts indicated the number of people who participated. Ratio calculations indicated the percentage of participants who responded in a particular way to a specific question and the percentage of the participants identified with each of the demographic variables. Average response or mean (M) was calculated
for each question to indicate the average rating all participants gave each dimension and sub-dimension of climate. Participants selected an answer for each of the six questions (scales) and each of the five dimensions (subscales). Question Mean Scores were calculated by totaling participant responses for all subscales of a question and dividing by the number of subscales (5). Grand Mean Scores were calculated by totaling participant responses to all 30 variables and then dividing by the number of total items.

Statistical analyses compared the average response of minority and majority participants to each of the questions. When only two groups were compared, independent samples $t$ tests were used to indicate whether the mean (average) response of minority group participants was significantly different from the average response of majority group participants. When more than two demographic groups responses were being compared, analyses of variance (ANOVA, $F$) indicated the degree to which group averages varied significantly in their distance from the "average" response. Significance values ($p$) indicated the degree of confidence that the results did not occur by chance. Usually, confidence levels are set at .05 to allow the researcher to indicate that there is a 5% chance ($p = .05$), less than 5% chance ($p < .05$), or greater than 5% ($p > .05$) chance that the significant differences reported could have occurred by chance (Cronk, 2004; Salkind, 2004). In this study, actual $p$ values are reported.

For statistical, ethical, and practical reasons, demographic groupings were collapsed conceptually along majority and minority lines for some analyses. Some of the demographic groups are small and specific statistical analyses assume a certain number of responses to provide accurate, reliable answers. In addition, aggregated and collapsed data sets provided additional anonymity to participants. Finally, though it is certainly true that each participant contributed his or her individual perspective to the study and each certainly contributes to the climate itself, it is the overall picture of climate that offers a foundation for using data to shape change.
Independent samples $t$ tests compared average response of the collapsed groups with two categories. For example, race/ethnicity was condensed to White Students/Employees and Students/Employees of Color and this statistical analysis was used to compare the number of participants of each group who responded in a specific way to Q1a through Q6e. Orientation was also condensed to Heterosexual Students/Employees and LGB/Q Students/Employees to compare the number of participants of each group who responded in a specific way to Q1a through Q6e.

Analyses of variance (ANOVA) were used to examine average response between groups with three or more subcategories. For example, Work/Academic Classification was not condensed. Each contained a number of classification categories that were left intact for analyses (e.g., Freshmen, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Graduate, and Other; Academic Staff–Non-Teaching, Academic Staff–Teaching, Classified Staff, Faculty). Sex/Gender Identity was not condensed for the student or combined analyses. While sex is usually conceptualized as a binary variable, the very nature of this study demanded the possibility that transgendered people may prefer to identify as transgender than as male or female (the employee data set did contain transgendered people). Disability Status was condensed into four categories: those who reported having visible disabilities, those who reported having invisible disabilities, those who reported having both visible and invisible disabilities, and those who reported no disabilities. Religious/Spiritual Affiliation was condensed into three categories: Christian-based affiliations (Catholic, Protestant, Mormon, Christian), non-Christian based affiliations (Jewish, Muslim, Eastern Religions, Unitarian, Quaker, Native American spiritual beliefs, and Nature-oriented spiritual beliefs), and None/Other affiliations (those who identified no current religious/spiritual affiliation or who identified a religious/spiritual affiliation other than those listed).
Chi-square tests of independence were also used to test whether the numbers of participants from the various groups who responded in a specific direction were statistically different from each other. For these analyses, responses were collapsed into two categories: Agree and Disagree. Responses of Agree or Strongly Agree were all encoded as Agree and responses of Disagree or Strongly Disagree were all encoded as Disagree. Significant findings indicated differences between the groups in terms of the numbers of participants in each group who endorsed positive and negative views of the campus climate. For example, “Significantly more Students of Color than White students disagreed with the statement . . .”

Future analyses may use this data differently to answer other questions. For the purpose of this study, collapsing some of the demographic data allowed for greater protection of the anonymity of participants, more viable statistical analyses, and more practical interpretation. Collapsing some of the responses facilitated answering a broad question of whether majority and minority students held more negative or more positive perceptions of the campus climate.
Results Summary

Half of all students and employees who constitute the UWW campus community were invited to participate in the 2005 Campus Climate Survey. Approximately 7% of the UWW students and 19% of the employees responded to the invitation and took part in the study. Careful randomization of the student and employee populations in the 2005 UWW Campus Climate survey sample provided reasonable certainty that perceptions contained in the survey results are a generally valid representation of the perceptions of the UWW campus community as a whole. This outline summarizes the full report of significant findings found in Results:

- Overall, most participants perceived the campus climate for diversity at UWW as favorable.

- Overall, most participants reported never or rarely experiencing/witnessing harassment, discrimination, or denied access.

- Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across participant demographic groups.
  - A number of participants perceived the campus climate for diversity at UWW as unfavorable.
  - A number of participants reported occasionally or regularly experiencing or witnessing harassment, discrimination, or denied access.

- Statistically significant differences were found between majority and minority participant perceptions of the UWW campus climate for diversity.

- Statistically significant differences were found between majority and minority participants in reported frequency of experienced and witnessed incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access.
• Statistically significant differences between participants were found in the average strength of agreement with each of the following dimensions of the campus climate:
  ▶ Safety, threat, and accessibility
  ▶ Adequacy of response by administrators to incidents of harassment and discrimination
  ▶ Provision of inclusive events, speakers, art, and music featuring the diversity of the campus population
  ▶ Opportunities for advancement (e.g., leadership opportunities for students; promotion, contract renewal, merit increases, tenure for employees)

• Statistically significant differences between participants were found in the reported frequency of:
  ▶ Experienced incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access
  ▶ Witnessed incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access

• Where there were statistically significant differences, majority students and employees were significantly stronger in their agreement than minority students and employees that UWW generally has a favorable climate for diversity.

• Where there were statistically significant differences, more minority students and employees than majority students and employees disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW has a generally favorable climate for diversity.

• Where there were statistically significant differences, majority students and employees reported experiencing and witnessing less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, and denied access than minority students and employees.
• Where there were statistically significant differences, more minority students and employees than majority students and employees reported experiencing and witnessing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, and denied access.

• Students and employees differed significantly in their perceptions and experiences of the campus climate:
  ▶ In general, where there were statistically significant differences between students and employees, employees perceived the climate for diversity more negatively and more employees perceived the campus climate for diversity negatively.
  ▶ Where there were statistically significant differences between students and employees, employees reported experiencing and witnessing more frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, and denied access than students, and more employees than students reported occasionally or regularly experiencing and witnessing harassment, discrimination, or denied access.
  ▶ Students of Color differed significantly from White students on more dimensions of racism on campus than Employees of Color differed from White employees.
  ▶ Students with identified disabilities differed significantly from students without identified disabilities on more dimensions of ableism on campus than employees with and without identified disabilities.
  ▶ Female employees differed significantly from male employees on more dimensions of sexism on campus than female students and male students.

• Some minority groups were significantly farther apart from the majority group perceptions than other minority groups:
  ▶ LGB/Q employees differed significantly from heterosexual employees on six of six dimensions assessing heterosexism/homophobia on campus. LGB/Q students
also differed significantly from heterosexual students on six out of six dimensions assessing heterosexism/homophobia on campus.

- Employees of Color differed significantly from White employees on one dimension of racism on campus. Students of Color differed significantly from White students on six out of six dimensions assessing racism on campus.
- Employees with disabilities differed from employees without identified disabilities on one dimension assessing ableism on campus. Students with disabilities differed from students without identified disabilities on five out of six dimensions assessing ableism on campus.
- Non-Christian employees differed significantly from Christian employees on four of six dimensions assessing religious oppression on campus. Employees who identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations differed from Christian employees on one of the six dimensions assessing religious oppression on campus. Non-Christian students differed significantly from Christian students on two of the six dimensions assessing religious oppression on campus. Students who identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations differed significantly from Christian students on three of the six dimensions measuring religious oppression on campus.
- Female employees differed significantly from male employees on five out of six dimensions assessing sexism on campus. Female students differed significantly from male students on two out of six dimensions assessing sexism on campus. Transgendered students differed significantly from both female and male students on three out of six dimensions assessing sexism on campus. No employees identified themselves as transgendered.

- Where there were statistically significant differences between students based on academic class, Seniors perceived the campus climate for diversity significantly more negatively than Freshmen or Juniors.
Additional or more complex analyses beyond the initial scope of this study may reveal other campus climate concerns. For example, analyses yielded positive correlations between academic class, reported frequency of experienced/witnessed incidents for students, and perceived adequacy of administrative response to harassment and discrimination. This appears to indicate that the longer minority students had been on campus, the greater their reported frequency of experienced/witnessed incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access, and the more negatively they perceived administrative responses to harassment and discrimination.
Results

Results of the combined student–employee responses analyses are presented first, detailing results of data analyses for each question separately. Student response results are presented second and results of data analyses are detailed for each question separately. Finally, employee response results are presented. In each section, results of additional data analyses to determine statistically significant group differences based on participant demographics are presented for each question and subscale.

COMBINED STUDENT–EMPLOYEE RESULTS

Overall Climate for Diversity at UWW

Grand Mean

Parallel scales and subscales making up the 2005 Campus Climate Survey were summed and averaged across participants to arrive at grand mean scores. The average participant response was 1.64 $\sigma = 35$. On average then, participants agreed that UWW does a good job of providing a safe, non-threatening, and accessible environment; that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; and that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature diverse populations. This further indicates that, on average, participants reported never or rarely experiencing incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access and, on average, participants never or rarely witnessed others experiencing harassment, discrimination, or denied access.

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales or demographic features of participants. Many participants disagreed or strongly disagreed with positive statements about UWW; agreed with negative statements about
UWW climate; and experienced and witnessed more frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access.

Statistically Significant Differences in Combined Participant Responses to Grand Mean

There were no statistically significant differences between participants of different disability status or sex/gender identity in their grand mean scores. There were statistically significant differences between participants of different racial/ethnic backgrounds \( t(754) = -3.87, p = .00 \); orientations \( t(757) = 5.13, p = .00 \); and religious/spiritual affiliations \( F(2, 749) = 6.67, p = .00 \).

White participants agreed significantly more strongly than Participants of Color that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; and provides events that feature diverse populations. White participants experienced and witnessed significantly less frequent incidents of harassment and discrimination, and denied access than Participants of Color \( M = 1.63, SD = .33; M = 1.79, SD = .43 \).

Heterosexual participants agreed significantly more strongly than LGB/Q participants that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; and provides events that feature diverse populations. Heterosexual participants experienced and witnessed significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, and denied access than LGB/Q participants \( M = 1.63, SD = .34; M = 1.89, SD = .36 \).

Christian participants agreed significantly more strongly than non-Christian participants or participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; and provides events that feature diverse populations. Christian participants experienced and witnessed significantly less frequent incidents of harassment and discrimination, and
denied access than non-Christian participants and participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.61, SD = .33; M = 1.78, SD = .44; M = 1.69, SD = .38$.

Summary interpretation of grand mean. In general, participants agreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; and provides events that feature diverse populations, but this was less true for People of Color, LGB/Q people, and people who do not identify as Christian. In addition, People of Color, LGB/Q people, and people who do not identify as Christian experienced and witnessed more harassment, discrimination, and denied access.
Safe, Non-Threatening, and Accessible Atmosphere (Q1)

When student and employee responses were combined, results indicated that most participants agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 88.4%; n = 942, M = 1.95, SD = .59; (b) People of Color 93.2%; n = 944, M = 1.75, SD = .59; (c) people with disabilities 96.7%; n = 945, M = 1.47, SD = .58; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 88.3%; n = 947, M = 1.84, SD = .68; and (e) women 95.6%; n = 951, M = 1.65, SD = .59.”

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. Many participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW was providing a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for (a) Gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 11.5%; (b) People of Color 6.7%; (c) people with disabilities 3.3%; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 11.7%; and (e) women 4.4%.

Q1 Mean Score

Q1 subscales were summed and averaged across participants to arrive at Q1 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring whether UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for students and employees was 1.73 SD = .46.

Statistically Significant Differences in Combined Participant Q1 Mean Scores

There were statistically significant differences between groups on Q1 mean scores based on whether the participant was a student or employee \( t(927) = 3.90, p = .00 \) and based on participant race/ethnicity \( t(884) = -2.81, p = .01 \); orientation \( t(885) = 3.44, p = .00 \); and religious/spiritual affiliation \( F(2, 877) = 4.43, p = .01 \). Students agreed significantly more strongly \( M = 1.70, SD = .45 \) than employees \( M = 1.85, SD = .49 \) that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for people from diverse backgrounds. White participants agreed significantly more strongly \( M = 1.72, SD = .46 \) than Participants of Color.
heterosexual participants agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.72$, $SD = .46$ than LGB/Q participants $M = 1.94$, $SD = .50$; and Christian participants agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.70$, $SD = .44$ than non-Christian participants $M = 1.89$, $SD = .57$ that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for people from diverse backgrounds.

Statistically Significant Differences in Combined Participant Responses to Q1 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on participant demographic differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q1 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of participants on campus.

Student-employee differences on Q1 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between student and employee participants in their average response to Q1b $t(942) = 4.95$, $p = .00$; Q1d $t(945) = 3.95$, $p = .00$; and Q1e $t(949) = 3.74$, $p = .00$. Students agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.94$, $SD = .63$ than employees $M = 1.70$, $SD = .57$ that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for People of Color; for people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.80$, $SD = .67$; $M = 2.02$, $SD = .69$; and for women $M = 1.61$, $SD = .56$; $M = 1.79$, $SD = .69$.

The number of students and employees who agreed with the statements measured by Q1 also differed significantly on three of the five dimensions. Significantly more employees than students disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for People of Color $F(1, 942) = 24.49$, $p = .00$; people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $F(1, 945) = 15.64$, $p = .00$; and women $F(1, 945) = 13.95$, $p = .00$.

Orientation differences on Q1 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between participants of different orientations in their average response to Q1a $t(894) = 3.28$, $p = .00$; Q1b $t(896) = 3.05$, $p = .00$; Q1c $t(898) = 2.43$, $p = .02$; and Q1e $t(904) = 3.03$, $p = .00$. 
Heterosexual participants agreed significantly more strongly than LGB/Q participants that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $M = 1.93, SD = .56; M = 2.19, SD = .77$; People of Color $M = 1.73, SD = .59; M = 1.98, SD = .67$; people with disabilities $M = 1.46, SD = .58; M = 1.65, SD = .61$; and women $M = 1.63, SD = .58; M = 1.88, SD = .71$.

Additional analyses also revealed that significantly more LGB/Q participants than heterosexual participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $\chi^2(1, 896) = 11.76, p = .00$ and for People of Color $\chi^2(1, 898) = 8.20, p = .00$.

**Racial/ethnic differences on Q1 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between White participants and Participants of Color in their average response to Q1b $t(895) = -3.82, p = .00$ and Q1d $t(899) = -3.14, p = .00$.

White participants agreed significantly more strongly than Participants of Color that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for People of Color $M = 1.72, SD = .59; M = 1.98, SD = .63$ and for people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.82, SD = .66; M = 2.06, SD = .77$. In addition, a significantly greater number of Participants of Color than White participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $\chi^2(1, 901) = 4.29, p = .04$.

**Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q1 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between participants of different religious/spiritual affiliations in their average response to Q1a $F(2, 886) = 9.36, p = .00$; Q1b $F(2, 888) = 4.19, p = .02$; and Q1d $F(2, 892) = 12.79, p = .00$. Christian participants agreed significantly more strongly than participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or
transgendered people $M = 1.89, SD = .54; M = 2.07, SD = .61$; for People of Color $M = 1.71, SD = .56; M = 2.35, SD = .95$; and for people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.79, SD = .63; M = 1.87, SD = .69$.

In addition, significantly more non-Christian participants $\chi^2(2, 889) = 29.07, p = .00$ disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people. Finally, significantly more non-Christian participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $\chi^2(2, 895) = 8.49, p = .00$.

**Sex/gender identity differences on Q1 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between participants of different sex/gender identities in their average response to Q1c $t(899) = 2.57, p = .01$ and Q1e $t(904) = 2.62, p = .01$. Male participants agreed significantly more strongly than female participants that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for people with disabilities $M = 1.40, SD = .55; M = 1.51, SD = .60$ and women $M = 1.58, SD = .57; M = 1.69, SD = .60$. 
Adequate Administrative Response to Harassment and Discrimination (Q2)

When student and employee responses were combined, results indicated that most participants agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 89.3%; n = 880, M = 1.94, SD = .55; (b) People of Color 92%; n = 886, M = 1.85, SD = .57; (c) people with disabilities 94.8%; n = 884, M = 1.79, SD = .56; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 89.7%; n = 887, M = 1.92, SD = .57; and (e) women 91.4%; n = 891, M = 1.85, SD = .59."

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. Many participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 10.7%; (b) People of Color 8%; (c) people with disabilities 5.2%; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 10.2%; and (e) women 8.6%.

Q2 Mean Score

Q2 subscales were summed and averaged across participants to arrive at Q2 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring whether UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination was 1.86 SD = .48.

Statistically Significant Differences in Combined Participant Q2 Mean Scores

There were statistically significant differences between groups on Q2 mean scores based on orientation t(825) = 2.53, p = .01 and race/ethnicity t(823) = −1.95, p = .05 of the participants. Heterosexual participants agreed significantly more strongly M = 1.85, SD = .47 than LGB/Q participants M = 2.03, SD = .52 and White participants agreed significantly more strongly M = 1.85, SD = .48 than Participants of Color M = 1.96, SD = .49 that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination.
Statistically Significant Differences in Combined Participant Responses to Q2 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on participant differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q2 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of participants on campus.

**Student–employee differences on Q2 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between the student and employee participants in their average response to Q2e $t(889) = 2.26, p = .02$. Students agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.83, SD = .59$ than employees $M = 1.95, SD = .63$ that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against women.

The number of students and employees who agreed with the statements measured by Q2 also differed significantly on one of the five dimensions. A significantly larger number of employees than students disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against women $F(1, 890) = 5.09, p = .02$.

**Orientation differences on Q2 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between the LGB/Q and heterosexual participants in their average response to Q2a $t(839) = 3.47, p = .00$; Q2b $t(844) = 1.99, p = .05$; and Q2d $t(846) = 2.56, p = .01$. Heterosexual participants agreed significantly more strongly than LGB/Q participants that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $M = 1.92, SD = .54; M = 2.19, SD = .65$; People of Color $M = 1.84, SD = .55; M = 2.00, SD = .76$; and people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.91, SD = .56; M = 2.11, SD = .64$. In addition, significantly more LGB/Q participants than heterosexual participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against Gay,
Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $\chi^2(1, 841) = 10.11, p = .00$; and people with disabilities $\chi^2(1, 845) = 5.26, p = .02$.

**Racial/ethnic differences on Q2 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between White participants and Participants of Color in their average response to Q2a $t(837) = -2.63, p = .01$; Q2b $t(842) = -4.51, p = .00$; and Q2d $t(844) = -2.54, p = .01$. White participants agreed significantly more strongly than Participants of Color that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $M = 1.92, SD = .54; M = 2.09, SD = .60$; People of Color $M = 1.82, SD = .55; M = 2.11, SD = .68$; and people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.91, SD = .56; M = 2.07, SD = .64$. In addition, significantly more Participants of Color than White participants disagreed or strongly disagreed with Q2a, Q2b, and Q2d that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $\chi^2(1, 839) = 8.49, p = .00$; People of Color $\chi^2(1, 844) = 33.09, p = .00$; and people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $\chi^2(1, 846) = 9.07, p = .01$.

**Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q2 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between participants of different religious/spiritual affiliations in their average response to Q2a $F(2, 832) = 3.93, p = .02$ and Q2b $F(2, 837) = 2.99, p = .05$. Christian participants agreed significantly more strongly than participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $M = 1.90, SD = .53; M = 2.01, SD = .57$ and People of Color $M = 1.82, SD = .56; M = 1.92, SD = .58$. In addition, a significantly greater number of non-Christian participants and participants who identified no current/other religious/spiritual affiliation than Christian participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against Gay, Lesbian, bisexual,
and transgendered people \( \chi^2(2, 835) = 13.68, p = .00 \) and people of all religious/spiritual affiliations \( \chi^2(2, 842) = 8.70, p = .01 \).

**Sex/gender identity differences on Q2 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between male and female participants in their average response to Q2e \( \chi^2(849) = 3.00, p = .00 \). Male participants agreed significantly more strongly \( M = 1.78, SD = .58 \) than female participants \( M = 1.90, SD = .60 \) that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against women.

In addition, significantly more female participants than male participants \( \chi^2(849) = 8.22, p = .02 \) disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against people of all religious/spiritual affiliations.
Providing Events That Feature Diverse Populations (Q3)

When student and employee responses were combined, results indicated that most participants agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "UWW does a good job of providing events, such as speakers, art, and music, that feature (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 74.8%; n = 888, M = 2.11, SD = .73; (b) People of Color 91.6%; n = 926, M = 1.71, SD = .65; (c) people with disabilities 72.2%; n = 924, M = 2.12, SD = .73; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 75.1%; n = 921, M = 2.09, SD = .76; and (e) women 91.1%; n = 923, M = 1.76, SD = .53."

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. Many participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 25.2%; (b) People of Color 8.4%; (c) people with disabilities 27.8%; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 24.9%; and (e) women 8.9%.

Q3 Mean Score

Q3 subscales were summed and averaged across participants to arrive at Q3 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring whether UWW does a good job of providing events that feature diverse populations was 1.95 SD = .54.

Statistically Significant Differences in Combined Participant Q3 Mean Scores

There were statistically significant differences between groups on Q3 mean scores based on participant orientation $t(830) = 4.20, p = .00$; race/ethnicity $t(828) = -2.14, p = .03$; and religious/spiritual affiliation $F(2, 823) = 8.67, p = .00$. Heterosexual participants agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.94, SD = .53$ than LGB/Q participants $M = 2.25, SD = .50$; White participants agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.94, SD = .53$ than Participants of Color $M = 2.07, SD = .58$; and Christian participants agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.92, SD = .52$ than non-Christian participants $M = 2.27, SD = .59$ or participants identified with no
current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 2.02$, $SD = .55$ that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature diverse populations.

Statistically Significant Differences in Combined Participant Responses to Q3 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on participant differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q3 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of participants on campus.

Student–employee differences on Q3 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between the student and employee participants in their average response to Q3b $t(924) = 2.22, p = .03$; Q3d $t(919) = 2.46, p = .01$; and Q3e $t(921) = 2.71, p = .01$. Students agreed significantly more strongly than employees that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature People of Color $M = 1.68$, $SD = .64$; $M = 1.80$, $SD = .70$; people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 2.06$, $SD = .76$; $M = 2.21$, $SD = .76$; and women $M = 1.73$, $SD = .62$; $M = 1.88$, $SD = .68$. In addition, significantly more employees than students disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature People of Color $F(1, 944) = 4.91, p = .03$; people from all religious/spiritual affiliations $F(1, 919) = 6.03, p = .01$; and women $F(1, 921) = 7.34, p = .02$.

Orientation differences on Q3 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between heterosexual and LGB/Q participants in their average response to Q3a $t(847) = 5.87, p = .00$; Q3c $t(881) = 2.72, p = .01$; and Q3e $t(880) = 5.09, p = .00$. Heterosexual participants agreed significantly more strongly than LGB/Q participants that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $M = 2.08$, $SD = .71$; $M = 2.68$, $SD = .87$; people with disabilities $M = 2.12$, $SD = .73$; $M = 2.39$, $SD = .82$; and women $M = 1.74$, $SD = .61$; $M = 12.18$, $SD = .77$. 
In addition, significantly more LGB/Q participants than heterosexual participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $\chi^2(1, 849) = 29.09, p = .00$ and women $\chi^2(2, 882) = 25.29, p = .00$.

**Racial/ethnic differences on Q3 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between White participants and Participants of Color in their average response to Q3b $t(882) = -3.64, p = .00$ and Q3e $t(879) = -2.73, p = .00$. White participants agreed significantly more strongly than Participants of Color $M = 1.68$, $SD = .63$; $M = 1.94$, $SD = .77$ that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature People of Color and women $M = 1.75$, $SD = .62$; $M = 1.94$, $SD = .71$. In addition, significantly more Participants of Color than White participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $\chi^2(1, 847) = 6.23, p = .01$; People of Color $\chi^2(1, 884) = 17.20, p = .00$; and women $\chi^2(1, 881) = 4.63, p = .03$.

**Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q3 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between participants of different religious/spiritual affiliations in their average response to Q3a $F(2, 840) = 10.88, p = .00$; Q3c $F(2, 875) = 4.23, p = .02$; Q3d $F(2, 871) = 5.81, p = .00$; and Q3e $F(2, 873) = 11.90, p = .00$. Christian participants agreed significantly more strongly $M = 2.04$, $SD = .68$ than non-Christian participants $M = 2.39$, $SD = .92$ and significantly more strongly than participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 2.28$, $SD = .79$ that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people. Christian participants agreed significantly more strongly $M = 2.10$, $SD = .72$ than non-Christian participants $M = 2.39$, $SD = .87$ that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature people with disabilities. Christian participants agreed significantly more strongly $M = 2.05$, $SD = .74$ than non-Christian participants $M = 2.46$, $SD = .95$ that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature people of all religious/spiritual affiliations. Christian participants agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.73$, $SD = .58$ than
non-Christian participants $M = 2.25, SD = .87$ and participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.78, SD = .69$ than non-Christian participants $M = 2.25, SD = .87$ that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature women.

In addition, significantly more non-Christian participants than Christian participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature people with disabilities $\chi^2(2, 878) = 7.26, p = .03$; People of Color $\chi^2(2, 879) = 9.60, p = .01$; and people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $\chi^2(2, 843) = 30.49, p = .00$.

*Sex/gender identity differences on Q3 subscales.* There were statistically significant differences between male and female participants in their average response to Q3b $t(883) = -1.97, p = .05$. Male participants agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.77, SD = .72$ than female participants $M = 1.67, SD = .61$ that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature People of Color. In addition, significantly more female participants than male participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature People of Color $\chi^2(2, 887) = 8.55, p = .01$ and women $\chi^2(2, 884) = 21.00, p = .00$. 
Frequency of Experienced Harassment, Discrimination, or Denied Access (Q4)

When combined, student and employee responses about the frequency of harassment, discrimination, or denied access indicated that most UWW participants reported they had Never or Rarely been harassed, discriminated against, or denied access because of their (a) perceived or actual sexual orientation 97%; n = 904, M = 1.14, SD = .46; (b) race/ethnicity 94.2%; n = 911, M = 1.22, SD = .57; (c) disability 97.8%; n = 911, M = 1.08, SD = .37; (d) religious/spiritual affiliation 93.4%; n = 920, M = 1.24, SD = .61; or (e) sex/gender identity 91.4%; n = 923, M = 1.34, SD = .68.

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. A number of participants reported they had been Occasionally or Regularly harassed, discriminated against, or denied access because of their (a) perceived or actual sexual orientation 3%; (b) race/ethnicity 5.8%; (c) disability 2.2%; (d) religious/spiritual affiliation 6.6%; or (e) sex/gender identity 8.5%.

Q4 Mean Score

Q4 subscales were summed and averaged across participants to arrive at Q4 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring the frequency of experienced harassment, discrimination, or denied access was 1.20 SD = .34.

Statistically Significant Differences in Combined Participant Q4 Mean Scores

There were statistically significant differences between groups on Q4 mean scores based on participant orientation t(852) = 6.95, p = .00; racial/ethnic background t(852) = −6.87, p = .00; and religious/spiritual affiliation F(2, 846) = 5.05, p = .01. Heterosexual participants experienced significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access M = 1.18, SD = .31 than LGB/Q participants M = 1.51, SD = .59. White participants experienced significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access M = 1.37, SD = .31 than Participants of Color M = 1.44, SD = .50. Christian participants experienced significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or
denied access $M = 1.18$, $SD = .31$ than either non-Christian participants $M = 1.31$, $SD = .35$ or participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.24$, $SD = .39$.

Statistically Significant Differences in Combined Participant Responses to Q4 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on participant differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q4 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of participants on campus.

Student-employee differences on Q4 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between students and employees in their average response to Q4a $t(903) = 2.34, p = .02$ and Q4e $t(921) = 3.26, p = .00$. Students reported experiencing significantly less frequent harassment, discrimination, or denied access than employees based on their perceived or actual sexual orientation $M = 1.13$, $SD = .44$; $M = 1.22$, $SD = .52$ and their sex/gender identity $M = 1.30$, $SD = .62$; $M = 1.48$, $SD = .86$. In addition, significantly greater numbers of employees than students reported occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on their perceived or actual sexual orientation $F(1, 903) = 5.48, p = .02$ and their sex/gender identity $F(1, 921) = 10.65, p = .00$.

Orientation differences on Q4 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between heterosexual participants and LGB/Q participants in their average response to Q4a $t(879) = 10.98, p = .00$; Q4b $t(884) = 3.52, p = .00$; and Q4e $t(894) = 5.37, p = .00$. Heterosexual participants reported experiencing significantly less frequent harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on perceived or actual sexual orientation $M = 1.10$, $SD = .38$; $M = 1.76$, $SD = .91$; race/ethnicity $M = 1.20$, $SD = .55$; $M = 1.48$, $SD = .84$; or sex/gender identity $M = 1.30$, $SD = .63$; $M = 1.80$, $SD = 1.03$. In addition, significantly more LGB/Q participants than heterosexual participants reported experiencing occasional or regular harassment or
discrimination based on their perceived or actual sexual orientation $\chi^2(1, 881) = 96.02, p = .00$

and their sex/gender identity $\chi^2(1, 896) = 19.40, p = .00$.

**Racial/ethnic differences on Q4 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between White participants and Participants of Color in their average response to Q4b $t(884) = -14.15, p = .00$; Q4c $t(883) = -2.29, p = .02$; Q4d $t(891) = -2.84, p = .01$; and Q4e $t(894) = -1.98, p = .05$. White participants experienced significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on their race/ethnicity $M = 1.14, SD = .48; M = 1.96, SD = .92$; their disability status $M = 1.07, SD = .34; M = 1.16, SD = .51$; their religious/spiritual affiliation $M = 1.22, SD = .58; M = 1.41, SD = .81$; and their sex/gender identity $M = 1.32, SD = .66; M = 1.47, SD = .79$. In addition, significantly greater numbers of Participants of Color reported experiencing occasional or regular harassment or discrimination than White participants based on their race/ethnicity $\chi^2(1, 886) = 10.99, p = .00$.

**Disability status differences on Q4 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between participants of different disability status in their average response to Q4e $F(3, 919) = 3.20, p = .02$. Participants with invisible disabilities experienced significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on sex/gender identity than participants with both visible and invisible disabilities $M = 1.28, SD = .57; M = 1.56, SD = .93$. In addition, significantly greater numbers of participants with disabilities reported experiencing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on their sex/gender identity $F(3, 922) = 3.20, p = .02$.

**Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q4 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between participants of different religious/spiritual affiliations in their average response to Q4a $F(2, 874) = 5.05, p = .01$ and Q4d $F(2, 884) = 9.54, p = .00$. Christian participants experienced significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on their perceived or actual sexual orientation than participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.11, SD$
Christian participants experienced significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on their religious/spiritual affiliation $M = 1.21, SD = .55$ than non-Christian participants $M = 1.66, SD = .97$, who in turn experienced significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on their religious affiliation than participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.24, SD = .63$.

In addition, significantly greater numbers of participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations than Christians reported occasional or regular harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on their perceived or actual sexual orientation $F(2, 875) = 5.49, p = .00$. Significantly greater numbers of non-Christian participants than Christians reported experiencing occasional or regular harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on their religious/spiritual affiliation $F(2, 886) = 8.69, p = .00$. Significantly greater numbers of non-Christian participants reported experiencing occasional or regular harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on their religious/spiritual affiliations than participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $F(2, 886) = 8.69, p = .00$.

**Sex/gender identity differences on Q4 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between male and female participants in their average response to Q4e $t(895) = 4.10, p = .00$. Male participants experienced significantly fewer incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on sex/gender identity than female participants $M = 1.21, SD = .56; M = 1.40, SD = .72$. In addition, significantly greater numbers of female participants than male participants reported experiencing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on their perceived or actual sexual orientation $\chi^2(2, 884) = 15.57, p = .00$.

Significantly greater numbers of transgendered participants than female or male participants reported occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or
denied access based on their perceived or actual sexual orientation, $F(2,883) = 7.90, p = .00$. Significantly greater numbers of transgendered participants than female participants or male participants reported occasional or regular harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on their race/ethnicity $F(2, 888) = 3.74, p = .02$. Finally, significantly greater numbers of transgendered participants than female participants or male participants reported occasional or regular incidents of harassment or discrimination based on their religious/spiritual affiliation $F(2, 898) = 6.54, p = .00$. 
Frequency of Witnessed Harassment, Discrimination, or Denied Access (Q5)

When student and employee responses were combined, most participants said they had Never or Rarely "witnessed other students, staff, or faculty being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on their (a) perceived or actual orientation 84.7%; n = 927, M = 1.54, SD = .81; (b) race/ethnicity 85.4%; n = 924, M = 1.56, SD = .79; (c) disability 88.9%; n = 918, M = 1.46, SD = .71; (d) religious/spiritual affiliation 88.8%; n = 918, M = 1.44, SD = .74; or (e) sex/gender identity 85.9%; n = 922, M = 1.53, SD = .78."

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. Many participants reported having Occasionally or Regularly witnessed other students, staff, or faculty being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on (a) perceived or actual sexual orientation 15.3%; (b) race/ethnicity 14.6%; (c) disability 11.1%; (d) religious/spiritual affiliation 11.3%; or (e) sex/gender identity 14.2%.

Q5 Mean Score

Q5 subscales were summed and averaged across participants to arrive at Q5 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring the frequency of witnessed harassment, discrimination, or denied access was 1.50 SD = .62.

Statistically Significant Differences in Combined Participant Q5 Mean Scores

There were statistically significant differences between groups on Q5 mean scores based on participant orientation F(882) = 3.96, p = .00; race/ethnicity F(882) = -3.02, p = .00; or religious/spiritual affiliation F(2, 875) = 3.79, p = .02. White participants reported witnessing others facing incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on race/ethnicity M = 1.48, SD = .60 significantly less frequently than Participants of Color reported witnessing such incidents M = 1.69, SD = .75. Heterosexual participants reported witnessing others facing incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access M = 1.48, SD = .61 significantly less frequently than LGB/Q participants reported witnessing such
Christian participants reported witnessing others facing incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access \( M = 1.46, SD = .88 \) significantly less frequently than participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations reported witnessing such incidents \( M = 1.59, SD = .70 \).

**Statistically Significant Differences in Combined Participant Responses to Q5 Subscales**

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on participant differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q5 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of participants on campus.

*Student–employee differences on Q5 subscales.* There were statistically significant differences between students and employees in their average response to Q5e \( t(920) = 3.24, p = .00 \). Students reported witnessing incidents of others facing harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on sex/gender identity significantly less frequently than employees reported witnessing such incidents \( M = 1.50, SD = .74; M = 1.70, SD = .88 \). In addition, significantly greater numbers of employees than students reported witnessing others facing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on sex/gender identity \( F(1, 921) = 10.52, p = .00 \).

*Orientation differences on Q5 subscales.* There were statistically significant differences between participants of different orientations in their average response to Q5a \( t(899) = 5.65, p = .00 \); Q5b \( t(897) = 2.09, p = .04 \); Q5d \( t(892) = 2.39, p = .02 \); and Q5e \( t(896) = 3.98, p = .00 \). Heterosexual participants reported witnessing incidents of others facing harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on perceived or actual sexual orientation \( M = 1.50, SD = .78; M = 2.13, SD = 1.00 \); race/ethnicity \( M = 1.55, SD = .78; M = 1.78, SD = .90 \); religious/spiritual affiliation \( M = 1.43, SD = .74; M = 1.67, SD = .94 \); and sex/gender identity \( M = 1.50, SD = .75; M = 1.93, SD = .96 \) significantly less frequently than LGB/Q participants reported witnessing such incidents. In addition,
significantly greater numbers of LGB/Q participants reported witnessing others occasionally or regularly being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on perceived or actual sexual orientation $\chi^2(1, 901) = 35.57, p = .00$ and sex/gender identity $\chi^2(1, 898) = 7.79, p = .01$.

**Racial/ethnic differences on Q5 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between White participants and Participants of Color in their average response to Q5b $t(897) = -6.37, p = .00$ and Q5e $t(896) = -2.59, p = .01$. White participants reported witnessing incidents of others facing harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on race/ethnicity $M = 1.51, SD = .75$ significantly less frequently than Participants of Color reported witnessing such incidents $M = 2.07, SD = .97$. White participants also reported witnessing incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on sex/gender identity significantly less frequently than Participants of Color reported witnessing such incidents $M = 1.51, SD = .76; M = 1.74, SD = .87$. In addition, significantly greater numbers of Participants of Color than White participants reported witnessing occasional or regular incidents of others being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on race/ethnicity $\chi^2(1, 899) = 34.32, p = .00$ and sex/gender identity $\chi^2(1, 898) = 6.21, p = .01$.

**Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q5 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between participants of different religious/spiritual affiliations in their average response to Q5a $F(2, 892) = 5.86, p = .00$ and Q5d $F(2, 885) = 5.98, p = .00$. Christian participants reported witnessing incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on perceived or actual sexual orientation $M = 1.48, SD = .75$ significantly less frequently than participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations reported witnessing such incidents $M = 1.69, SD = .91$. Christian participants also reported witnessing incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on religious/spiritual affiliation $M = 1.38, SD = .67$ significantly less frequently than non-Christian
participants $M=1.72$, $SD=.94$ or participants identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations reported witnessing such incidents $M=1.52$, $SD=.84$.

Sex/gender identity differences on Q5 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between male and female participants in their average response to Q5c ($t(893)=2.21, p=.03$. Male participants reported witnessing incidents of others facing harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on disability status $M=1.38$, $SD=.64$ significantly less frequently than female participants reported witnessing such incidents $M=1.49$, $SD=.72$. 


STUDENT RESULTS

Student Climate for Diversity at UWW

Grand Mean

Parallel scales and subscales making up the 2005 Campus Climate Survey were summed and averaged across student participants to arrive at grand mean scores. The average student response was 1.64 SD = .35. On average then, students agreed that UWW does a good job of providing a safe, non-threatening, and accessible environment; that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature diverse populations; and that leadership opportunities are available to all students. This core further indicates that most students reported Never or Rarely experiencing incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access and most Never or Rarely witnessed others experiencing harassment, discrimination, or denied access.

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales or demographic features of students. Many students disagreed or strongly disagreed with positive statements about UWW; agreed with negative statements about UWW climate; and experienced and witnessed more frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access.

Statistically Significant Differences in Student Responses to Grand Mean

There were no statistically significant differences between students of different disability status or sex/gender identity in their grand mean scores. There were statistically significant differences between students of different academic classes $F(5, 635) = 3.19, p = .01$; racial/ethnic backgrounds $t(633) = -4.51, p = .00$; and orientations $t(634) = 4.13, p = .00$; and religious/spiritual affiliations $F(2, 628) = 5.13, p = .01$.

Freshmen agreed significantly more strongly than Seniors that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; adequately responds to incidents of
harassment and discrimination; and provides events that feature diverse populations. $M = 1.55, SD = .35; M = 1.70, SD = .34$. Freshmen experienced and witnessed significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, and denied access than Seniors.

White students agreed significantly more strongly than Students of Color that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; and provides events that feature diverse populations. White students experienced and witnessed significantly less frequent incidents of harassment and discrimination, and denied access than Students of Color $M = 1.63, SD = .33; M = 1.81, SD = .44$.

Heterosexual students agreed significantly more strongly that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; and provides events that feature diverse populations than LGB/Q students. Heterosexual students experienced and witnessed significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, and denied access than LGB/Q students $M = 1.87, SD = .36; M = 1.62, SD = .34$.

Christian students agreed significantly more strongly than students identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; and provides events that feature diverse populations. Christian students experienced and witnessed significantly less frequent incidents of harassment and discrimination, and denied access than students identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.62, SD = .32; M = 1.70, SD = .39$.

**Summary interpretation of grand mean.** In general, students agreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; provides events that feature diverse populations; and that equal opportunities for leadership positions are available to all students, but this was less true for Freshmen than Seniors, Students of Color than White
students, LGB/Q students than heterosexual students, and students who are identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations than Christian students. In addition, Seniors, Students of Color, LGB/Q students, and students who identify as no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations experienced and witnessed more frequent harassment, discrimination, and denied access.
Safe, Non-Threatening, and Accessible Atmosphere (Q1)

Most students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for: (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 90%; \( n = 686, M = 1.93, SD = .57 \); (b) People of Color 95%; \( n = 726, M = 1.70, SD = .57 \); (c) people with disabilities 97%; \( n = 736, M = 1.46, SD = .59 \); (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 90%; \( n = 691, M = 1.80, SD = .57 \); and (d) women 97%; \( n = 745, M = 1.61, SD = .56 \)."

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. Many students disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW was providing a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for: (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 10%; (b) People of Color 5%; (c) people with disabilities 4%; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 10%; and (e) women 2%.

Q1 Mean Score

Q1 subscales were summed and averaged across students to arrive at Q1 mean scores. The average response to the five subscales measuring whether UWW was providing a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for minority students was 1.70 \( SD = .45 \).

Statistically Significant Differences in Student Q1 Mean Scores

There were statistically significant differences between groups on Q1 mean scores based on the participant’s orientation \( t(1, 720) = 2.15, p = .03 \); race/ethnicity \( t(1, 719) = 3.71, p = .00 \); and academic class \( F(5, 706) = 2.42, p = .03 \). Heterosexual students agreed significantly more strongly than LGB/Q students \( M = 1.69, SD = .44; M = 1.85, SD = .45 \); White students agreed significantly more strongly than Students of Color \( M = 1.68, SD = .44; M = 1.89, SD = .50 \); Freshmen agreed significantly more strongly than Seniors \( M = 1.84, SD = .54; M = 1.96, SD = .57 \); and Juniors agreed significantly more strongly than Seniors \( M = 1.84, SD = .54; M = 1.87, SD = .51 \) that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for all people.
Statistically Significant Differences in Student Responses to Q1 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on student differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q1 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of students on campus.

Academic class differences on Q1 subscales. There were significant differences in the average response by students from different academic classes to Q1 $F(5, 701) = 2.42, p = .03$. Freshmen agreed more strongly with the statement $M = 1.60, SD = .44$ than Seniors $M = 1.76, SD = .44$. There were also statistically significant differences between students of different academic classes on Q1b $F(5, 710) = 2.87, p = .014$; Q1c $F(5, 710) = 2.20, p = .05$; and Q1d $F(5, 712) = 2.50, p = .03$. Juniors $M = 1.59, SD = .59$ agreed more strongly than Seniors $M = 1.78, SD = .59$ that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for People of Color. Freshmen $M = 1.33, SD = .47$ agreed more strongly than Seniors $M = 1.55, SD = .65$ that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for people with disabilities. Freshmen $M = 1.62, SD = .58$ also agreed more strongly than Seniors $M = 1.87, SD = .70$ that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for people of all religions.

Orientation differences on Q1 subscales. There were significant differences between LGB/Q students and heterosexual students in their average response to Q1e $t(728) = 1.96, p = .05$. Heterosexual students agreed significantly more strongly than LGB/Q students $M = 1.56, SD = .54; M = 1.64, SD = .06$ that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible environment for women. In addition, significantly greater numbers of LGB/Q students than heterosexual students disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, accessible atmosphere for LGB/Q people $\chi^2(1, 730) = 4.10, p = .04$.

Racial/ethnic differences on Q1 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between Students of Color and White students in their average response to
Q1b $t(790) = 37$, $p = .00$. Students of Color disagreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.89$, $SD = .50$ than White students $M = 1.68$, $SD = .44$ that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, accessible atmosphere for People of Color.

There were significant differences between White students and Students of Color in their average response to Q1b $t(729) = -4.76$, $p = .00$; Q1c $t(730) = -2.25$, $p = .03$; Q1d $t(731) = -3.52$, $p = .00$; and Q1e $t(732) = -2.38$, $p = .02$. Further, average response on Q1a showed nearly significant differences between White students and Students of Color $t(728) = -1.81$, $p = .07$. In each subscale, the average response of Students of Color was significantly more negative than that of White students.

In addition, significantly more Students of Color than White students disagreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for: LGB/Q people $\chi^2(1, 730) = 5.77$, $p = .02$; People of Color $\chi^2(1, 731) = 26.19$, $p = .00$; and people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $\chi^2(1, 733) = 6.11$, $p = .01$.

Disability status differences on Q1 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between students with different disability status in their average response to Q1c $\chi^2(3, 762) = 9.00$, $p = .03$ and Q1d $\chi^2(3, 765) = 10.81$, $p = .01$. Significantly more students with invisible disabilities than students without disabilities or students with visible disabilities disagreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for people with disabilities and people of all religious/spiritual affiliations.

Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q1 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between students of different religious/spiritual affiliations in their average response to Q1a $F(2, 720) = 5.69$, $p = .00$ and Q1d $F(2, 723) = 3.30$, $p = .04$. Christian students $M = 1.89$, $SD = .53$ more strongly agreed than students who identified no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 2.03$, $SD = .58$ that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible environment for Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people. Christians agreed more $M = 1.77$, $SD = .64$ than non-Christians $M = 2.12$, $SD$
that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for people of all religions.
Adequate Administrative Response to Harassment and Discrimination (Q2)

Most students agreed with the statement, “UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 88%; n = 650, M = 1.93, SD = .55; (b) People of Color 91%; n = 675, M = 1.84, SD = .56; (c) people with disabilities 95%; n = 694, M = 1.78, SD = .56; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 90%; n = 661, M = 1.90, SD = .57; and (e) women 93%; n = 677, M = 1.83, SD = .59.”

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. Many students disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 11%; (b) People of Color 8%; (c) people with disabilities 5%; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 9%; and (e) women 8%.

Q2 Mean Score

Q2 subscales were summed and averaged across students to arrive at Q2 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring whether the university administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against minority students was 1.86 SD = .48.

Statistically Significant Differences in Student Q2 Mean Scores

There were statistically significant differences between groups on Q2 mean scores based on the student's academic class $F(5, 677) = 2.84, p = .02$; orientation $t(687) = -2.80, p = .05$; religious/spiritual affiliation $F(3, 689) = 2.76, p = .06$; and sex/gender identity $F(2, 704) = 4.67, p = .01$. Juniors agreed more $M = 1.78, SD = .48$ than Seniors $M = 1.94, SD = .46$; heterosexual students agreed more than LGB/Q students $M = 2.00, SD = .50; M = 1.85, SD = .48$; Christian students agreed more $M = 1.90, SD = .54$ than students who identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliation $M = 2.01, SD = .55$; and men agreed more $M = 1.76, SD = .61$ than women $M = 1.87, SD = .57$ that
the university administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against minority groups.

Statistically Significant Differences in Student Responses to Q2 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on student differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q2 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of students on campus.

Academic class differences on Q2 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between Juniors and Seniors in their average response to Q2a \( F(5,686) = 2.27, p = .05 \); Q2c \( F(5, 690) = 2.77, p = .02 \); and Q2d \( F(5, 691) = 2.68, p = .02 \). Juniors agreed more strongly than Seniors that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people \( M = 1.86, SD = .53; M = 1.02, SD = .55 \); people with disabilities \( M = 1.87, SD = .57; M = 1.71, SD = .54 \); and people of all religious/spiritual affiliations \( M = 2.00, SD = .66; M = 1.83, SD = .51 \). In addition, differences between Seniors \( M = 1.92, SD = .58 \) and Juniors \( M = 1.75, SD = .53 \) about whether UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against People of Color approached statistical significance \( F(5, 689) = 2.23, p = .06 \) again indicating less agreement by Seniors.

Orientation differences on Q2 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between LGB/Q students and heterosexual students in their average response to Q2a \( F(696) = 2.88, p = .00 \) and Q2b \( F(700) = 1.89, p = .55 \). Heterosexual students agreed significantly more strongly than LGB/Q students that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment or discrimination against Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people \( M = 2.17, SD = .58; M = 1.92, SD = .55 \) and People of Color \( M = 2.00, SD = .73; M = 1.83, SD = .55 \). In addition, significantly more LGB/Q students disagreed or strongly disagreed
that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment or discrimination against Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $\chi^2(1, 698) = 5.74, p = .02$; People of Color $\chi^2(1, 702) = 12.33, p = .00$; people with disabilities $\chi^2(1, 703) = 8.18, p = .00$; or people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $\chi^2(1, 703) = 4.69, p = .03$.

*Racial/ethnic differences on Q2 subscales.* There were significant differences between Students of Color and White students in their average response to Q2a $t(696) = -2.52, p = .01$; Q2b $t(700) = -4.76, p = .00$; and Q2d $t(701) = -2.76, p = .01$. White students agreed significantly more strongly than Students of Color that the UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment or discrimination against Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $M = 1.91, SD = .54; M = 2.09, SD = .61$; People of Color $M = 1.80, SD = .53; M = 2.12, SD = .69$; and people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.89, SD = .55; M = 2.08, SD = .67$.

Further, significantly more Students of Color than White students disagreed that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment or discrimination against Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $\chi^2(1, 698) = 7.89, p = .01$; People of Color $\chi^2(1, 702) = 35.55, p = .00$; and people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $\chi^2(1, 703) = 11.44, p = .00$.

*Disability status differences on Q2 subscales.* There were statistically significant differences between students with disabilities and those without disabilities in the frequency of generally positive and negative responses to Q2c $F(3, 729) = 3.87, p = .01$ and Q2d $F(3, 729) = 3.96, p = .01$. Significantly more students with both visible and invisible disabilities than students without disabilities disagreed that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against people with disabilities. Further, significantly more students with both visible and invisible disabilities than students with visible disabilities disagreed that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against people with disabilities. Significantly more students with invisible disabilities than students without disabilities disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW administration adequately responds to
incidents of harassment and discrimination against people of all religious/spiritual affiliations.

Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q2 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between students based on their religious/spiritual affiliations in the frequency of negative responses to Q2d $\chi^2(1, 703) = 11.44, p = .00$. More students who identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations than Christian students responded negatively to the statement that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against people of all religious/spiritual affiliations.

Sex/gender identity differences on Q2 subscales. There were statistically significant differences in the number of students responding negatively to Q2d $F(2, 703) = 3.53, p = .03$. Significantly more women than men disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of discrimination and harassment against people of all religious/spiritual affiliations.
Providing Events That Feature Diverse Populations (Q3)

Most students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "UWW does a good job of providing events, such as speakers, art, and music that feature (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 74%; n = 550, M = 2.11, SD = .74; (b) People of Color 94%; n = 702, M = 1.68, SD = .64; (c) people with disabilities 72%; n = 528, M = 2.13, SD = .74; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 77%; n = 570, M = 2.06, SD = .76; and (e) women 93%; n = 697, M = 1.73, SD = .62."

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. Many students disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 26%; (b) People of Color 6%; (c) people with disabilities 28%; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 23%; and (e) women 7%.

Q3 Mean Score

Q3 subscales were summed and averaged across students to arrive at Q3 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring whether UWW provides events that feature diverse populations was 1.94 SD = .54.

Statistically Significant Differences in Student Q3 Mean Scores

There were significant differences between groups on Q3 mean scores based on the student's academic class \( t(5, 677) = 2.84, p = .02 \); orientation \( t(690) = -3.23, p = .00 \); and race/ethnicity \( t(690) = -2.30, p = .02 \). Juniors agreed significantly more strongly \( M = 1.78, SD = .48 \) than Seniors \( M = 1.94, SD = .46 \); heterosexual students agreed significantly more strongly than \( M = 1.93, SD = .54 \) LGB/Q students \( M = 2.20, SD = .45 \); and White students \( M = 1.93, SD = .53 \) agreed significantly more strongly than Students of Color \( M = 2.08, SD = .60 \) that UWW provides events that feature diverse populations.
Statistically Significant Differences in Student Responses to Q3 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on student differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q3 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of students on campus.

Academic class differences on Q3 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between students of different academic classes in their average response to Q3a $F(5, 686) = 2.27, p = .05$; Q3b $F(5, 689) = 2.23, p = .05$; Q3c $F(5, 690) = 2.77, p = .02$; and Q3d $F(5, 691) = 2.68, p = .02$. In each case, Juniors agreed significantly more strongly than Seniors ($M = 1.86, SD = .53; M = 2.02, SD = .55$); ($M = 1.75, SD = .53; M = 1.92, SD = .59$); ($M = 1.71, SD = .54; M = 1.87, SD = .57$); ($M = 1.83, SD = .51; M = 2.00, SD = .60$) respectively that UWW does a good job of providing events, such as speakers, art, and music, that feature diverse populations.

There were also statistically significant differences in the frequency of positive and negative student responses to Q3d based on academic class $F(5, 709) = 2.83, p = .02$. Significantly more Seniors than Sophomores disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature people of all religious/spiritual affiliations.

Orientation differences on Q3 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between LGB/Q students and heterosexual students in their average response to Q3a $t(702) = -4.81, p = .00$; Q3c $t(714) = -2.35, p = .02$; and Q3e $t(716) = -4.16, p = .00$. Heterosexual students agreed significantly more strongly than LGB/Q students that UWW does a good job of providing events featuring people who are Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered $M = 2.08, SD = .72; M = 2.64, SD = .85$; people with disabilities $M = 2.12, SD = .73, M = 2.40, SD = .80$; and women $M = 1.70, SD = .60, M = 2.12, SD = .76$. In addition, significantly more LGB/Q students disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that
feature people who are Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendersed $\chi^2(1, 704) = 19.21, p = .00$ or women $\chi^2(1, 718) = 19.48, p = .00$.

Racial/ethnic differences on Q3 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between Students of Color and White students in their average response to Q3b $t(718) = -4.00, p = .00$ and Q3e $t(716) = -3.09, p = .00$. White students agreed more than Students of Color that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature People of Color $M = 1.65$, $SD = .61; M = 1.96$, $SD = .80$ and women $M = 1.71$, $SD = .60; M = 1.95$, $SD = .72$. There were also statistically significant differences in the frequency of negative responses for Students of Color and White students. More Students of Color disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $\chi^2(1, 704) = 7.79, p = .01$; People of Color $\chi^2(1, 720) = 26.49, p = .00$; or women $\chi^2(1, 718) = 5.73, p = .02$.

Disability status differences on Q3 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between students of different disability status in the frequency of negative student responses to Q3a $F(3, 730) = 3.67, p = .01$; Q3c $F(3, 741) = 8.60, p = .00$; Q3d $F(3, 742) = .59, p = .00$; and Q3e $F(3, 744) = 3.78, p = .01$. Significantly more students with invisible disabilities than students without disabilities disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people or people with disabilities. Significantly more students with both invisible and visible disabilities than students without disabilities disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events for people with disabilities, people of all religious/spiritual affiliations, or women. Finally, significantly more students with invisible disabilities and students with visible disabilities than students with both types of disabilities disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events for those of all religious/spiritual affiliations.
Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q3 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between students of different religious/spiritual affiliations in the frequency of negative responses to Q3a $F(2, 697) = 10.25, p = .00$; Q3b $F(2, 713) = 6.25, p = .00$; and Q3e $F(2, 711) = 12.84, p = .00$. Significantly more students with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations than Christian students disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events for Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people. Significantly more non-Christian students and students with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations than Christian students disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature People of Color and women.

Sex/gender identity differences on Q3 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between men and women in their average response to Q3e $F(2, 704) = 4.67, p = .01$. Men agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.76, SD = .61$ than women $M = 1.87, SD = .57$ that UWW provides events that feature women. There were also statistically significant differences based on sex/gender identity in the frequency of negative student responses to Q3. Significantly more women than men disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature People of Color $F(2, 720) = 4.05, p = .02$. Significantly more transgendered students than female students or male students disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature women $F(2, 718) = 12.12, p = .00$. 
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Frequency of Experienced Harassment, Discrimination, or Denied Access (Q4)

Most students reported they had Never or Rarely "been harassed, discriminated against, or denied access because of their (a) perceived or actual sexual orientation 85%; n = 729, M = 1.13, SD = .44; (b) race/ethnicity 86%; n = 707, M = 1.23, SD = .57; (c) disability 89%; n = 727, M = 1.08, SD = .35; (d) religious/spiritual affiliation 88%; n = 696, M = 1.25, SD = .63; (e) sex/gender identity 88%; n = 692, M = 1.30, SD = .62."

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. Many students reported having been Occasionally or Regularly harassed, discriminated against, or denied access because of their (a) perceived or actual sexual orientation 14%; (b) race/ethnicity 14%; (c) disability 12%; (d) religious/spiritual affiliation 12%; or (e) sex/gender identity 12%.

Q4 Mean Score

Q4 subscales were summed and averaged across students to arrive at Q4 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring the frequency of experienced harassment, discrimination, or denied access was 1.20 SD = .34.

Statistically Significant Differences in Student Q4 Mean Scores

There were statistically significant differences between groups on Q4 mean scores based on the reported frequency of experienced incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on academic class F(5, 691) = 2.37, p = .04; race/ethnicity t(698) = -7.28, p = .00; orientation t(698) = -5.46, p = .00; religious/spiritual affiliation F(2, 691) = 5.72, p = .00; and sex/gender identity F(2, 698) = 11.00, p = .00. Freshmen reported experiencing significantly less frequent incidents M = 1.11, SD = .22 of harassment, discrimination, or denied access than Seniors M = 1.23, SD = .37. White students reported experiencing significantly less frequent incidents than Students of Color M = 1.17, SD = .30; M = 1.46, SD = .53; heterosexual students reported experiencing significantly less frequent incidents than LGB/Q students M = 1.18, SD = .31; M = 1.47, SD = .60; Christian students reported experiencing significantly less frequent
incidents than those students who identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.17$, $SD = .31$; $M = 1.25$, $SD = .40$; and men and women both reported experiencing significantly less frequent incidents than transgendered students $M = 1.19$, $SD = .32$; $M = 1.21$, $SD = .36$; $M = 2.30$, $SD = 1.56$.

Statistically Significant Differences in Student Responses to Q4 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on student differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q4 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of students on campus.

Academic class differences on Q4 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between students from different academic classes in their average response to Q4b $F(5,707) = 2.44$, $p = .03$ and differences approaching statistical significance on Q4d $F(5,709) = 2.13$, $p = .06$. Freshmen reported experiencing significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their race/ethnicity and religious/spiritual affiliation $M = 1.22$, $SD = .49$; $M = 1.33$, $SD = .74$ than Seniors $M = 1.14$, $SD = .40$; $M = 1.30$, $SD = .64$.

Orientation differences on Q4 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between LGB/Q students and heterosexual students in their average response to Q4a $t(715) = -9.42$, $p = .00$; Q4b $t(719) = -2.65$, $p = .01$; and Q4c $t(724) = -3.93$, $p = .00$. Heterosexual students reported experiencing significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation $M = 1.09$, $SD = .36$; $M = 1.71$, $SD = .94$; race/ethnicity $M = 1.21$, $SD = .55$; $M = 1.45$, $SD = .80$; and sex/gender identity $M = 1.28$, $SD = .59$; $M = 1.67$, $SD = .90$ than LGB/Q students reported experiencing. There were also statistically significant differences in the number of LGB/Q students and heterosexual students reporting experiences of harassment, discrimination, or denied
access. Significantly greater numbers of LGB/Q students than heterosexual students reported experiencing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation $\chi^2(1, 717) = 72.70, p = .00$ and because of their sex/gender identity $\chi^2(1, 726) = 9.87, p = .00$.

**Racial/ethnic differences on Q4 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between Students of Color and White students in their average response to Q4b $t(719) = -13.27, p = .00$; Q4d $t(728) = -3.15, p = .00$; and Q4e $t(724) = -3.50, p = .00$. White students reported experiencing significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access than Students of Color because of their race/ethnicity $M = 1.14, SD = .44; M = 1.97, SD = .90$; religious/spiritual affiliation $M = 1.22, SD = .59; M = 1.47, SD = .85$; and sex/gender identity $M = 1.28, SD = .59; M = 1.54, SD = .83$. In addition, significantly more Students of Color reported experiencing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their race/ethnicity $\chi^2(1, 721) = 8.51, p = .00$; religious/spiritual affiliation $\chi^2(1, 739) = 4.09, p = .04$; and sex/gender identity $\chi^2(1, 726) = 9.87, p = .00$.

**Disability status differences on Q4 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between students of different disability status in their average response to Q4c $F(3, 732) = 11.43, p = .00$ and Q4d $F(3, 743) = 3.19, p = .02$ in terms of the numbers of students reporting occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access. Significantly greater numbers of students with invisible disabilities and students with both invisible and visible disabilities reported experiencing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their disability than students without disabilities reported. Significantly greater numbers of students with invisible disabilities and students with visible disabilities reported occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their religious/spiritual affiliation than students with both visible and invisible disabilities. Significantly more students with both visible and invisible disabilities reported
occasional or regular harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their religious/spiritual affiliation than students without disabilities reported experiencing.

Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q4 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between students of different religious/spiritual affiliations in their average response to Q4a $F(2, 708) = 5.14, p = .01$; Q4d $F(2, 720) = 9.42, p = .00$; and Q4e $F(2, 716) = 5.14, p = .01$. Christian students experienced significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access $M = 1.10, SD = .37$ than students with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.22, SD = .59$ because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation. Christian students and students identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations experienced significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their religious/spiritual affiliation $M = 1.21, SD = .56; M = 1.75, SD = .94$ than non-Christians $M = 1.27, SD = .66; M = 1.75, SD = .94$. Finally, Christian students experienced significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access than those students identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations because of their sex/gender identity $M = 1.25, SD = .55; M = 1.42, SD = .76$.

There were also statistically significant differences in the number of students from different religious/spiritual affiliations who reported occasional and regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation $F(2, 710) = 4.11, p = .02$; religious/spiritual affiliation $F(2, 722) = 7.40, p = .00$; and sex/gender identity $F(2, 718) = 4.74, p = .01$. Significantly more students who identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations reported experiencing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access than Christian students because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation. Significantly more non-Christian students reported experiencing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their religious/spiritual affiliation than
Christian students reported experiencing. Significantly more non-Christian students reported experiencing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their religious/spiritual affiliation than students who identified as no current/other religious/spiritual affiliation reported experiencing. Finally, significantly more students who identified no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations reported experiencing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on their sex/gender identity than Christian students reported experiencing.

**Sex/gender identity differences on Q4 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between male students, female students, and transgendered students in their average response to Q4a $F(2, 713) = 13.30, p = .00; Q4b F(2, 719) = 10.48, p = .00; Q4d F(2, 728) = 4.57, p = .01$ and Q4e $F(2, 724) = 12.81, p = .00$. Female students reported significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access than male students because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation $M = 1.09, SD = .38; M = 1.19, SD = .51$ and both male and female students reported significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access than transgendered students because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation $M = 1.09, SD = .38; M = 1.19, SD = .51; M = 2.50, SD = 2.12$. Female and male students reported significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their race/ethnicity than transgendered students $M = 1.21, SD = .54; M = 1.25, SD = .60; M = 3.00, SD = 1.41$ respectively. Female and male students reported significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their religious/spiritual affiliation than transgendered students $M = 1.23, SD = .58; M = 1.29, SD = .70; M = 2.50, SD = 2.12$ respectively. Male students reported experiencing significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their sex/gender identity than either female students or transgendered students $M = 1.16, SD = .45; M = 1.37, SD = .67; M = 2.50, SD = 2.12$ respectively.
There were also statistically significant differences in the numbers of female, male, and transgender students reporting occasional and regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation $F(2, 717) = 8.91, p = .00$; race/ethnicity $F(2, 721) = 3.50, p = .03$; religious/spiritual affiliation $F(2, 730) = 3.83, p = .02$; and sex/gender identity $F(2, 726) = 7.78, p = .00$. Significantly more transgendered students than male or female students reported occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation; race/ethnicity; and religious/spiritual affiliation. Significantly more female students and transgendered students than male students reported occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their sex/gender identity.
Frequency of Witnessed Harassment, Discrimination, or Denied Access (Q5)

Most students said they had Never or Rarely "witnessed other students, staff, or faculty being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on their perceived or actual sexual orientation 83%; n = 630, M = 1.55, SD = .82; race/ethnicity 86%; n = 644, M = 1.57, SD = .80; disability 89%; n = 660, M = 1.46, SD = .71; religious/spiritual affiliation 88%; n = 655, M = 1.44, SD = .75; sex/gender identity 88%; n = 658, M = 1.49, SD = .74.

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. Many students reported having Occasionally or Regularly witnessed other students, staff, or faculty being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on perceived or actual sexual orientation 14%; race/ethnicity 14%; disability 12%; religious/spiritual affiliation 12%; or sex/gender identity 12%.

Q5 Mean Score

Q5 subscales were summed and averaged across students to arrive at Q5 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring frequency of witnessing others being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access was 1.50 SD = .62.

Statistically Significant Differences in Student Q5 Mean Scores

There were statistically significant differences between groups on Q5 mean scores based on the reported frequency of witnessed incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access between LGB/Q students and heterosexual students \( t(718) = -3.90, p = .00 \); Students of Color and White students \( t(729) = -6.16, p = .00 \); students of different religious/spiritual affiliations \( F(2, 710) = 3.12, p = .05 \); and between male, female, and transgender students. Heterosexual students reported witnessing significantly less frequent incidents \( M = 1.48, SD = .60 \) than LGB/Q students \( M = 1.86, SD = .81 \); White students reported witnessing significantly less frequent incidents than Students of Color \( M = 1.47, SD = .81 \).
Christian students reported witnessing significantly less frequent incidents than students with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.46, SD = .57$; $M = 1.59, SD = .71$; and male students reported witnessing significantly less frequent incidents than female students or transgender students $M = 1.47, SD = .75$; $M = 1.51, SD = .63$; $M = 2.80, SD = 1.70$ respectively.

Statistically Significant Differences in Student Responses to Q5 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on student differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q5 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of students on campus.

Orientation differences on Q5 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between LGB/Q students and heterosexual students in the average frequency of witnessed incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on Q5a $t(728) = -4.90, p = .00$; Q5b $t(729) = -2.22, p = .03$; Q5c $t(724) = -2.26, p = .02$; Q5d $t(725) = -2.83, p = .01$; and Q5e $t(729) = -3.52, p = .00$. Heterosexual students reported witnessing significantly less frequent incidents of others being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on perceived or actual sexual orientation $M = 1.52, SD = .79$; $M = 2.14, SD = 1.03$; race/ethnicity $M = 1.55, SD = .78$; $M = 1.83, SD = .96$; disability $M = 1.45, SD = .70$; $M = 1.71, SD = .90$; religious/spiritual affiliation $M = 1.42, SD = .74$; $M = 1.76, SD = .90$; and sex/gender identity $M = 1.47, SD = .73$; $M = 1.88, SD = .89$ than LGB/Q students reported witnessing.

There were also statistically significant differences in the numbers of LGB/Q students and heterosexual students who reported witnessing incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on perceived or actual sexual orientation and sex/gender identity. Significantly more LGB/Q students reported witnessing others facing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access
based on perceived or actual sexual orientation $\chi^2(1, 730) = 21.28, p = .00$ and sex/gender identity $\chi^2(1, 731) = 5.28, p = .02$.

Racial/ethnic differences on Q5 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between Students of Color and White students in their average response to Q5b $t(718) = -3.23, p = .00$ and Q5e $t(729) = -5.23, p = .00$. White students reported witnessing significantly less frequently than Students of Color incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on race/ethnicity $M = 1.91, SD = .74; M = 2.09, SD = 1.01$ and sex/gender identity $M = 1.46, SD = .73; M = 1.76, SD = .87$.

There were also significant differences in the number of Students of Color and White students who reported Occasionally or Regularly witnessing incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on race/ethnicity $\chi^2(1, 731) = 32.76, p = .00$ and sex/gender identity $\chi^2(1, 731) = 8.08, p = .00$. Significantly more Students of Color than White students reported witnessing others facing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, and denied access based on race/ethnicity and sex/gender identity.

Disability status differences on Q5 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between the number of students of different disability status who reported Occasionally or Regularly witnessing incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on Q5a $F(3, 473) = 4.05, p = .01$; Q5c $F(3, 738) = 4.78, p = .00$; and Q5e $F(3, 743) = 4.53, p = .00$. Significantly more students with both visible and invisible disabilities than students without disabilities reported witnessing others facing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on perceived or actual sexual orientation, disability, and sex/gender identity.

Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q5 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between students of different religious/spiritual affiliations in the average frequency of witnessed harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on
Q5a $F(2, 720) = 5.50, p = .00$; Q5d $F(2, 717) = 3.65, p = .01$; and Q5e $F(2, 721) = 3.10, p = .05$. Christian students reported witnessing significantly less frequent incidents of others being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on perceived or actual sexual orientation $M = 1.48, SD = .76; M = 1.71, SD = .93$; religious/spiritual affiliation $M = 1.39, SD = .69; M = 1.53, SD = .86$; and sex/gender identity $M = 1.45, SD = .70; M = 1.60, SD = .84$ than students with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations reported witnessing.

There were also statistically significant differences in the number of students with different religious/spiritual affiliations who reported Occasionally or Regularly witnessing incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on religious/spiritual affiliation $F(2, 719) = 4.33, p = .01$ and sex/gender identity $F(2, 723) = 3.40, p = .03$. Significantly more students who identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliation than Christian students reported Occasionally or Regularly witnessing incidents of harassment, discrimination, and denied access based on religious/spiritual affiliation and sex/gender identity.

Sex/gender identity differences on Q5 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between male, female, and transgender students in the reported frequency of witnessed incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on perceived or actual sexual orientation $F(2, 728) = 3.19, p = .04$; disability status $F(2, 724) = 6.35, p = .00$; and sex/gender identity $F(2, 729) = 5.41, p = .01$. Male students and female students reported witnessing significantly less frequent incidents than transgendered students reported witnessing based on perceived or actual sexual orientation $M = 1.55, SD = .81; M = 1.54, SD = .81; M = 3.00, SD = .141$; disability $M = 1.39, SD = .66; M = 1.49, SD = .72; M = 3.00, SD = 1.41$; and sex/gender identity $M = 1.43, SD = .68; M = 1.52, SD = .77; M = 3.00, SD = 1.41$. 

---
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Equal Opportunities for Student Leadership Positions (Q6)

Most students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “Equal opportunities for leadership positions (such as student organization officers, orientation leaders, resident assistants) are available to students who are (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 94%; n = 680, M = 1.67, SD = .61; (b) People of Color 95%; n = 695, M = 1.67; SD = .59; (c) people with disabilities 89%; n = 644, M = 1.61; SD = .68; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 96%; n = 694, M = 1.76; SD = .60; and (e) women 98%; n = 713, M = 1.59; SD = .54.”

Some of the students who participated disagreed or strongly disagreed that there are equal opportunities for leadership positions available to students who are (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 6%; (b) People of Color 8%; (c) people with disabilities 12%; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 4%; and (e) women 2%. Level of agreement with the statement was almost uniform across the subscales.

Q6 Mean Score

Q6 subscales were summed and averaged across students to arrive at Q6 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring whether equal opportunities for leadership positions are available to all students was 1.67 SD = .53.

Statistically Significant Differences in Student Q6 Mean Scores

There were no statistically significant differences between groups on Q6 mean score.

Statistically Significant Differences in Student Responses to Q6 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on student differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q6 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of students on campus.
**Academic class differences on Q6 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences in the number of students who responded negatively to Q6e based on academic class $F(5, 714) = 2.51, p = .03$. Significantly more Juniors than Sophomores disagreed or strongly disagreed that there are equal opportunities for leadership positions available to women $HSD = .051, p = .03$.

**Orientation differences on Q6 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between LGB/Q students and heterosexual students in their average response to Q6a $t(723) = -2.73, p = .01$. Heterosexual students agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.66, SD = .61$ than LGB/Q students $M = 1.93, SD = .68$ that there are equal opportunities for leadership positions available to Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered students.

In addition, significantly more LGB/Q students and heterosexual students disagreed or strongly disagreed that there are equal opportunities for leadership positions available to Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered students $\chi^2(1, 731) = 5.28, p = .02$.

**Racial/ethnic differences on Q6 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between Students of Color and White students in their average response to Q6b $t(718) = -3.00, p = .00$ and Q6d $t(715) = -1.95, p = .05$. White students agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.59, SD = .56$ than Students of Color $M = 1.81, SD = .78$ that equal opportunities for leadership are available for Students of Color and for students of all religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.65, SD = .59; M = 1.80, SD = .75$. In addition, more Students of Color disagreed or strongly disagreed that there are equal opportunities for leadership positions available to Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered students $\chi^2(1, 729) = 8.58, p = .00$; Students of Color $\chi^2(1, 720) = 29.67, p = .00$; and students of all religious/spiritual affiliations $\chi^2(1, 717) = 8.23, p = .00$.

**Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q6 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between students of different religious/spiritual affiliations in terms of the number of students who disagreed or strongly disagreed that there are
equal opportunities for leadership $F(2, 712) = 5.80, p = .00$. Significantly more non-Christian students than Christian students and more non-Christian students than students with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations disagreed or strongly disagreed that equal opportunities for leadership positions are available to Students of Color.
EMPLOYEE RESULTS

Employee Climate for Diversity at UWW

Grand Mean

Parallel scales and subscales making up the 2005 Campus Climate Survey were summed and averaged across employee participants to arrive at grand mean scores. The average employee response was 1.63 $sd = .36$. On average then, employees agreed that UWW does a good job of providing a safe, non-threatening, and accessible environment; that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature diverse populations; and that they had not been passed over for promotion, received low/no merit increases, had contracts not renewed, or been denied tenure because of their minority status. This score further indicates that most employees reported Never or Rarely experiencing incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access and most Never or Rarely witnessed others experiencing harassment, discrimination, or denied access.

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales or demographic features of employees. Many employees disagreed or strongly disagreed with positive statements about UWW; agreed with negative statements about UWW climate; and experienced and witnessed more frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access.

Statistically Significant Differences in Employee Responses to Grand Mean

There were no statistically significant differences between participants of different racial/ethnic backgrounds, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliations, or sex/gender identity in their grand mean scores. There were statistically significant differences in grand mean scores between employees of different orientations $\chi(121) = 3.30, p = .00$. 
Heterosexual employees agreed significantly more strongly than LGB/Q employees that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; and provides events that feature diverse populations. Heterosexual employees experience and witness significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access than LGB/Q employees $M = 1.61, SD = .33; M = 2.00, SD = .36$.

*Summary interpretation of grand mean.* In general, employees agreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; UWW provides events that feature diverse populations; and that they had not been passed over for promotion, received low/no merit increase, had contracts not renewed, or been denied tenure. This was less true for LGB/Q employees. LGB/Q employees agreed significantly less strongly than heterosexual employees that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; and UWW provides events that feature diverse populations. Compared to heterosexual employees who disagreed strongly, LGB/Q employees disagreed significantly less strongly that they had been passed over for promotion, received low/no merit increase, not had contracts renewed, or been denied tenure. In addition, LGB/Q employees reported experiencing and witnessing more frequent harassment, discrimination, and denied access.
Safe, Non-Threatening, and Accessible Atmosphere (Q1)

Most employees participating in the study agreed or strongly agreed that, "UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for: (a) LGB/Q people 81%; n = 181, M = 2.02, SD = .65; (b) People of Color 85%; n = 182, M = 1.94, SD = .63; (c) people with disabilities 86%; n = 183, M = 1.51, SD = .54; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 79%; n = 182, M = 2.02, SD = .69; and (e) women 87%; n = 186, M = 1.79, SD = .69."

Level of agreement was not uniform across the subscales. Many of the employees who participated disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW was providing a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for: (a) LGB/Q people 19%; (b) People of Color 14%; (c) people with disabilities 2%; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 20%; and (e) women 12%.

Q1 Mean Score

Q1 subscales were summed and averaged across employees to arrive at Q1 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring whether UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for minority employees was 1.85 SD = .50.

Statistically Significant Differences in Employee Q1 Mean Scores

There were statistically significant differences between groups on Q1 mean scores based on the employee’s orientation $t(163)=2.81, p = .01$; religious/spiritual affiliation $F(2, 163)=5.22, p = .01$; and sex/gender identity $F(165)=2.40, p = .02$. Heterosexual employees agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.83, SD = .48$ than LGB/Q employees $M = 2.21, SD = .56$; Christian employees agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.77, SD = .44$ than non-Christian employees $M = 2.12, SD = .41$ or employees with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 2.00, SD = .58$; and male employees agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.77,$
than female employees $M = 1.95, SD = .48$ that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for minority employees.

**Statistically Significant Differences in Employee Responses to Q1 Subscales**

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on employee differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q1 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of employees on campus.

**Orientation differences on Q1 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between heterosexual and LGB/Q employees in their average response to Q1a $t(164) = 2.40, p = .02$; Q1d $t(166) = 2.18, p = .03$; and Q1e $t(169) = 3.31, p = .00$. Heterosexual employees agreed significantly more strongly than LGB/Q employees that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $M = 2.00, SD = .58; M = 2.43, SD = 1.16$; people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 2.01, SD = .68; M = 2.43, SD = .76$; and for women $M = 1.76, SD = .65; M = 2.36, SD = 1.01$.

In addition, significantly more LGB/Q employees than heterosexual employees disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for LGB/Q people $\chi^2(1, 166) = 9.27, p = .00$; People of Color $\chi^2(1, 167) = 8.66, p = .00$; people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $\chi^2(1, 168) = 4.17, p = .04$; and women $\chi^2(1, 171) = 14.34, p = .00$.

**Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q1 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between employees based on religious/spiritual affiliation in their average response to Q1a $F(2, 163) = 4.50, p = .01$; Q1b $F(2, 164) = 4.00, p = .02$; and Q1d $F(2, 166) = 15.08, p = .00$. Christian employees agreed significantly more strongly than employees with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening,
and accessible atmosphere for Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $M = 1.92, SD = .59; M = 2.26, SD = .76$ and for People of Color $M = 1.85, SD = .58; M = 2.16, SD = .72$. Christian employees agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.87, SD = .59$ than non-Christian employees $M = 2.83, SD = .58$ and employees with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 2.21, SD = .73$ that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for people of all religious/spiritual affiliations.

In addition, there were statistically significant differences in the number of employees who disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $F(2, 165) = 5.17, p = .01$; People of Color $F(2, 166) = 5.72, p = .00$; and people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $F(2, 168) = 17.25, p = .00$. Significantly more employees who identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people and for People of Color than Christian employees. In addition, significantly more non-Christian employees than either Christian employees or employees identifying with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for people of all religious/spiritual affiliations.

**Sex/gender identity differences on Q1 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences between male employees and female employees in their average response to Q1c $t(168) = 4.27, p = .00$ and Q1e $t(171) = 2.85, p = .01$. Male employees agreed significantly more than female employees, that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for people with disabilities $M = 1.34, SD = .52; M = 1.68, SD = .52$ and women $M = 1.65, SD = .65; M = 1.94, SD = .72$. 
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Adequate Administrative Response to Harassment and Discrimination (Q2)

Most employees agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 88%; n = 155, M = 1.95, SD = .55; (b) People of Color 91%; n = 156, M = 1.88, SD = .61; (c) people with disabilities 95%; n = 154, M = 1.82, SD = .54; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 90%; n = 157, M = 1.97, SD = .59; and (e) women 93%; n = 158, M = 1.95, SD = .63.”

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. Many employees disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 12%; (b) People of Color 10%; (c) people with disabilities 5%; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 13%; and (e) women 14%.

Q2 Mean Score

Q2 subscales were summed and averaged across employees to arrive at Q2 mean scores. The average employee response to the five combined subscales measuring whether UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against minority people was 1.90 SD = .49.

Statistically Significant Differences in Employee Q2 Mean Scores

There were no statistically significant differences between groups on Q2 mean scores.

Statistically Significant Differences in Employee Responses to Q2 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on employee differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q2
subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between
groups of employees on campus.

**Orientation differences on Q2 subscales.** There were statistically significant
differences between heterosexual and LGB/Q employees in their average response to
Q2a $t(141) = 1.98, p = .05$ and Q2d $t(143) = 2.27, p = .03$. Heterosexual employees agreed significantly
more strongly $M = 1.95, SD = .48$ than LGB/Q employees $M = 2.27, SD = .91$ that UWW
administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination
against Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people or people of all
religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 1.96, SD = .54; M = 2.36, SD = .81$. In addition, significantly more
LGB/Q employees than heterosexual employees disagreed or strongly disagreed that
UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and
discrimination against Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $\chi^2(1, 143) = 7.60, p = .01$
and people of different religious/spiritual affiliations $\chi^2(1, 145) = 5.66, p = .02$.

**Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q2 subscales.** Significantly more non-
Christian than Christian employees disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW
administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination
against people of all religious/spiritual affiliations $\chi^2(2, 145) = 6.50, p = .04$.

**Sex/gender identity differences on Q2 subscales.** There were statistically significant
differences between male employees and female employees in their average response to
Q2e $t(144) = 3.06, p = .00$. Male employees agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.81, SD = .46$ than
female employees $M = 2.11, SD = .70$ that UWW administration adequately responds to
incidents of harassment and discrimination against women.

In addition, significantly more female employees than male employees disagreed
or strongly disagreed that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of
harassment and discrimination against women $\chi^2(1, 146) = 12.86, p = .00$. 
Providing Events That Feature Diverse Populations (Q3)

Most employees agreed or strongly agreed that "UWW does a good job of providing events, such as speakers, art, and music that feature (a) LGB/Q people 75%; n = 157, M = 2.10, SD = .71; (b) People of Color 91%; n = 179, M = 1.80, SD = .70; (c) people with disabilities 64%; n = 182, M = 2.11, SD = .72; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 69%; n = 178, M = 2.21, SD = .76; and (e) women 91%; n = 178, M = 1.88, SD = .68."

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. Many employees disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature (a) Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people 25%; (b) People of Color 9%; (c) people with disabilities 35%; (d) people of all religious/spiritual affiliations 31%; and (e) women 10%.

Q3 Mean Score

Q3 subscales were summed and averaged across employees to arrive at Q3 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring whether UWW does a good job of providing events that feature diverse populations was 2.01 SD = .54.

Statistically Significant Differences in Employee Q3 Mean Scores

There were statistically significant differences between groups on Q3 mean scores based on the employee's orientation $t(138) = 2.87, p = .01$ and religious/spiritual affiliation $F(2, 137) = 3.67, p = .03$. Heterosexual employees agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.99, SD = .50$ than LGB/Q employees $M = 2.45, SD = .65$ and Christian employees agreed significantly more strongly $M = 1.96, SD = .50$ than employees identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 2.19, SD = .54$ that UWW provides events, such as speakers, art, and music, that feature diverse populations.
Statistically Significant Differences in Employee Responses to Q3 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on employee differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q3 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of employees on campus.

Orientation differences on Q3 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between LGB/Q employees and heterosexual employees in their average response to Q3a $\chi^2(1, 143) = 3.58, p = .00$ and Q3e $\chi^2(162) = 2.79, p = .01$. Heterosexual employees agreed significantly more strongly than LGB/Q employees that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people $M = 2.06, SD = .65$; $M = 2.82, SD = .98$ and women $M = 1.85, SD = .65$; $M = 2.38, SD = .77$. There were also differences between LGB/Q and heterosexual employees that approached statistical significance in their average response to Q3d $\chi^2(162) = 1.91, p = .06$. Heterosexual employees agreed more strongly $M = 2.21, SD = .72$ than LGB/Q employees $M = 2.62, SD = .96$ that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature people of all religious/spiritual affiliations. Finally, there were statistically significant differences in the number of LGB/Q and heterosexual employees who disagreed or strongly disagreed with Q3a $\chi^2(1, 145) = 10.14, p = .00$; Q3d $\chi^2(1, 164) = 11.02, p = .00$; and Q3e $\chi^2(1, 164) = 6.99, p = .01$. Significantly more LGB/Q employees than heterosexual employees disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people, people of all religious/spiritual affiliations, and women respectively.

Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q3 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between people of different religious/spiritual affiliations in their average response to Q3a $F(2, 142) = 5.39, p = .01$; Q3d $F(2, 161) = 6.33, p = .00$; and Q3e $F(2, 161) = 4.78, p = .01$. Christian employees agreed significantly more strongly $M = 2.01, SD = .63$ than employees
with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations $M = 2.39, SD = .76$ that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people. Christian employees were significantly stronger in their agreement $M = 2.13, SD = .72$ than non-Christians $M = 2.91, SD = .94$ that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature people of all religious/spiritual affiliations. Christian employees $M = 1.78, SD = .56$ were significantly stronger in their agreement than non-Christian employees $M = 2.25, SD = .97$ that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature women.

In addition, significantly greater numbers of employees who identified as Christian differed in their perceptions from non-Christian employees and those employees who identified no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations on Q3a $\chi^2(1, 145) = 12.46, p = .00$; Q3d $\chi^2(2, 164) = 11.02, p = .00$; and Q3e $\chi^2(1, 162) = 6.99, p = .01$. Significantly more employees identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations than Christian employees disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature Gay, Lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people. Significantly more non-Christian employees than Christian employees disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature people of all religious/spiritual affiliations. Finally, significantly more non-Christian employees than Christian employees or employees identified with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations disagreed or strongly disagreed that UWW does a good job of providing events that feature women.
Frequency of Experienced Harassment, Discrimination, or Denied Access (Q4)

Most UWW employees reported they had either Never or Rarely been harassed, discriminated against, or denied access because of their (a) perceived or actual sexual orientation 97%; n = 176, M = 1.22, SD = .52; (b) race/ethnicity 94%; n = 177, M = 1.19, SD = .60; (c) disability 97%; n = 178, M = 1.11, SD = .42; (d) religious/spiritual affiliation 93%; n = 176, M = 1.20, SD = .55; or sex/gender identity 86%; n = 183, M = 1.48, SD = .86.

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. A number of employees reported they had been Occasionally or Regularly harassed, discriminated against, or denied access because of their (a) perceived or actual sexual orientation 4%; (b) race/ethnicity 8%; (c) disability 4%; (d) religious/spiritual affiliation 8%; (e) sex/gender identity 14%.

**Q4 Mean Score**

Q4 subscales were summed and averaged across employees to arrive at Q4 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring frequency of experienced harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of minority status was 1.23 $SD = .37$.

**Statistically Significant Differences in Employee Q4 Mean Scores**

There were statistically significant differences between groups on Q4 mean scores based on the employee’s orientation $t(152) = 4.59, p = .00$ and sex/gender identity $t(154) = 1.94, p = .05$. Heterosexual employees reported experiencing significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access $M = 1.18, SD = .29$ than LGB/Q employees $M = 1.62, SD = .57$. Male employees reported experiencing significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access than $M = 1.16, SD = .25$ female employees $M = 1.26, SD = .40$. 
Statistically Significant Differences in Employee Responses to Q4 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on employee differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q4 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of employees on campus.

Orientation differences on Q4 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between heterosexual employees and LGB/Q employees in the average frequency of experienced incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation $t(162) = 5.48, p = .00$ and sex/gender identity $t(168) = 3.49, p = .00$. Heterosexual employees experienced significantly less frequent $M = 1.14, SD = .44$ incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access than LGB/Q employees $M = 1.92, SD = .79$ because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation and sex/gender identity $M = 1.39, SD = .78; M = 2.23, SD = 1.30$. In addition, significantly greater numbers of LGB/Q employees than heterosexual employees reported experiencing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation $\chi^2(1, 164) = 16.73, p = .00$ and because of their sex/gender identity $\chi^2(1, 170) = 11.10, p = .00$.

Racial/ethnic differences on Q4 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between employees of different racial/ethnic backgrounds in the average frequency of experienced incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their race/ethnicity $t(163) = -4.95, p = .00$ and disability $t(164) = -2.08, p = .04$. White employees experienced significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, and denied access $M = 1.11, SD = .48$ than Employees of Color $M = 1.92, SD = 1.08$ because of their race/ethnicity. White employees also experienced significantly less frequent $M = 1.08, SD = .35$ incidents of harassment, discrimination, and denied access than
Employees of Color because of their disability $M = 1.31, SD = .63$. In addition, significantly greater numbers of Employees of Color than White employees reported experiencing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their race/ethnicity $\chi^2(1, 165) = 22.76, p = .00$.

Disability status differences on Q4 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between employees of different disability status in the average frequency of experienced incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of sex/gender identity $F(3, 179) = 4.28, p = .01$. Employees with no reported disabilities $M = 1.41, SD = .80$ or invisible disabilities $M = 1.39, SD = .77$ experienced significantly fewer incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access than employees with both visible and invisible disabilities $M = 2.19, SD = 1.17$ because of their sex/gender identity. In addition, significantly greater numbers of employees with visible disabilities than employees without disabilities reported occasional or regular harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on sex/gender identity $\chi^2(1, 59) = 4.85, p = .03$.

Sex/gender identity differences on Q4 subscales. There were differences approaching statistical significance between male and female employees in the reported frequency with which they experienced incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access $t(170) = 1.88, p = .06$. Male employees experienced significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their sex/gender identity $M = 1.35$, $SD = .77$ than female employees $M = 1.59, SD = .93$. 
Frequency of Witnessed Harassment, Discrimination, or Denied Access (Q5)

Most employees reported they had either Never or Rarely “witnessed other students, staff, or faculty being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on (a) perceived or actual orientation 84%; n = 183, M = 1.52, SD = .76; (b) race/ethnicity 83%; n = 180, M = 1.56, SD = .80; (c) disability 93%; n = 179, M = 1.43, SD = .69; (d) religious/spiritual affiliation 89%; n = 178, M = 1.43, SD = .69; or (e) sex/gender identity 89%; n = 178, M = 1.70, SD = .88.”

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. Many employees reported having Occasionally or Regularly witnessed other students, staff, or faculty being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on (a) perceived or actual sexual orientation 17%; (b) race/ethnicity 17%; (c) disability 8%; (d) religious/spiritual affiliations 12%; or (e) sex/gender identity 20%.

Q5 Mean Score

Q5 subscales were summed and averaged across employees to arrive at Q5 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring frequency of witnessing others being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access was 1.52 SD = .63.

Statistically Significant Differences in Employee Q5 Mean Scores

There were no statistically significant differences between groups on Q5 mean scores.

Statistically Significant Differences in Employee Responses to Q5 Subscales

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on employee differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q5 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of employees on campus.
Orientation differences on Q5 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between heterosexual employees and LGB/Q employees in the average frequency of witnessed incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on sexual orientation $t(169) = 2.92, p = .00$. Heterosexual employees reported witnessing significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on sexual orientation $M = 1.46, SD = .72$ than LGB/Q employees reported witnessing $M = 2.08, SD = .95$. In addition, significantly greater numbers of LGB/Q employees than heterosexual employees reported witnessing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on perceived or actual sexual orientation $\chi^2(1, 171) = 11.21, p = .00$.

Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q5 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between employees of different religious/spiritual affiliations in the average frequency of witnessed incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on religious/spiritual affiliations $F(2, 165) = 3.04, p = .05$. Christian employees $M = 1.35, SD = .59$ witnessed significantly less frequent incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on religious/spiritual affiliation than non-Christian employees reported witnessing $M = 1.83, SD = 1.03$.

Sex/gender identity differences on Q5 subscales. There were statistically significant differences between male and female employees in the average frequency of witnessed incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on the sex/gender identity of the employee $t(167) = 1.93, p = .06$. Male employees reported witnessing significantly less frequent incidents $M = 1.57, SD = .75$ than female employees reported witnessing $M = 1.83, SD = .97$. In addition, significantly greater numbers of female employees than male employees reported witnessing occasional or regular incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access based on sex/gender identity $\chi^2(1, 169) = 5.52, p = .02$. 
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Being Passed Over for Promotion, Receiving Low/No Merit Increase, Not Having Contract Renewed, or Being Denied Tenure (Q6)

Most employees disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "I believe I have been passed over for promotion, received low/no merit increase, not had my contract renewed, or been denied tenure because of my (a) perceived or actual orientation 98%; n = 174, M = 1.28, SD = .58; (b) race/ethnicity 95%; n = 174, M = 1.27, SD = .54; (c) disability 97%; n = 173, M = 1.21, SD = .47; (d) religious/spiritual affiliation 97%; n = 175, M = 1.22, SD = .47; or (e) sex/gender identity 87%; n = 176, M = 1.44, SD = .80."

Level of disagreement was not uniform, however, across the subscales. A few employees agreed or strongly agreed that they had been passed over for promotion, received low/no merit increase, not had a contract renewed, or been denied tenure because of their perceived or actual orientation 3%; race/ethnicity 4%; disability 3%; religious/spiritual affiliation 2%; or sex/gender identity 13%.

Q6 Mean Score

Q6 subscales were summed and averaged to arrive at Q6 mean scores. The average response to the five combined subscales measuring employees' perceptions of whether they had been passed over for promotion, received low/no merit increase, not had a contract renewed, or been denied tenure because of their minority status was 1.27 SD = .45.

Statistically Significant Differences in Employee Q6 Mean Scores

There were statistically significant differences between groups on average responses to Q6 based on the employee's orientation $t(158) = 2.53, p = .01$ and sex/gender identity $t(160) = 2.31, p = .02$. Compared to heterosexual employees $M = 1.24, SD = .42$ and male employees $M = 1.19, SD = .34$ who disagreed strongly, LGB/Q employees $M = 1.57, SD = .56$ and female employees $M = 1.35, SD = .50$ disagreed significantly less strongly that they had been
passed over for promotion, received low/no merit increase, not had contracts renewed, or been denied tenure because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation or sex/gender identity respectively.

**Statistically Significant Differences in Employee Responses to Q6 Subscales**

A number of additional analyses were conducted to understand differences in perception based on employee differences in orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. Closer examination of Q6 subscale responses offers an even more specific picture of the differences between groups of employees on campus.

**Orientation differences on Q6 subscales.** There were significant differences between heterosexual and LGB/Q employees in their average response to Q6a $t(164) = 2.39, p = .02$; Q6d $t(165) = 2.18, p = .03$; and Q6e $t(169) = 3.21, p = .00$. Compared to heterosexual employees who disagreed strongly, LGB/Q employees disagreed significantly less strongly that they had been passed over for promotion, received low/no merit increase, not had contracts renewed, or been denied tenure because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation $M = 2.00, SD = .56$; $M = 2.43, SD = 1.16$; religious/spiritual affiliation $M = 2.01, SD = .68$; $M = 2.43, SD = .76$; or sex/gender identity $M = 1.75, SD = .69$; $M = 2.36, SD = 1.01$.

**Disability differences on Q6 subscales.** There were statistically significant differences in the number of employees who agreed or strongly agreed with Q6e based on employee disability status $F(3, 183) = 8.07, p = .05$. Significantly greater numbers of employees with visible disabilities and employees with both visible and invisible disabilities agreed or strongly agreed that they had been passed over for promotion, received low/no merit increase, had contracts not renewed, or been denied tenure because of their sex/gender identity than employees without disabilities.
**Religious/spiritual affiliation differences on Q6 subscales.** There were significant differences between employees of different religious/spiritual affiliations in the average response to Q6e $F(2, 163) = 3.01, p = .05$. Compared to Christian employees $M = 1.5, SD = .88$; $M = 1.18, SD = .46$ who disagreed strongly, employees with no current/other religious/spiritual affiliations disagreed significantly less strongly that they had been passed over for promotion, received low/no merit increase, had contracts not renewed, or been denied tenure because of sex/gender identity.

**Sex/gender identity differences on Q6 subscales.** There were significant differences between male and female employees in their average response to Q6c $t(168) = 4.27, p = .00$ and Q6e $t(171) = 2.85, p = .01$. Compared to male employees who disagreed strongly, female employees disagreed significantly less strongly that they had been passed over for promotion, received low/no merit increase, not had contracts renewed, or been denied tenure because of their disability $M = 1.34, SD = .52$; $M = 1.68, SD = .52$ and because of their sex/gender identity $M = 1.65, SD = .65$; $M = 1.94, SD = .72$. 
Discussion

Most students and most employees were generally positive about the UWW campus climate for diversity. On average, both students and employees agreed that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; that the UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination; and that UWW provides events, such as speakers, art, or music, representing the diverse populations present on the campus. Most students and most employees reported that they had never or rarely experienced harassment, discrimination, or denied access because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, disability, religious/spiritual affiliation, or sex/gender identity. Most students and most employees reported that they had never or rarely witnessed others being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on perceived or actual sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, disability, religious/spiritual affiliation, or sex/gender identity. Few students perceived limited leadership opportunities because of their perceived or actual sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, disability, religious/spiritual affiliation, or sex/gender identity. A small number of employees believed they had been passed over for promotion, received little or no merit increase, had contracts not renewed, or been denied tenure based on their perceived or actual sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, disability, religious/spiritual affiliation, or sex/gender identity. Overall, most students and most employees perceive the UWW campus to have a favorable climate for diversity.

Level of agreement was not uniform, however, across participant demographic groups. The overall perception of campus climate changed when the minority data and the majority data were grouped separately and compared. There were statistically significant differences in average perceptions between majority and minority participants indicating significantly less strong agreement from minority participants.
In addition, statistically significant numbers of minority students and employees did not agree that UWW campus climate for diversity was positive. Whenever statistically significant differences in perception were found, significantly more minority participants disagreed that UWW was providing a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; that UWW administration adequately responded to incidents of harassment and discrimination; and that UWW provided events, such as speakers, art, or music, that represent the diverse populations present on campus. Many students and employees reported experiencing occasional or regular harassment, discrimination, and denied access because of their perceived or actual orientation, race/ethnicity, disability, religious/spiritual affiliation, and or sex/gender identity. A substantial number of students and employees witnessed other students, staff, or faculty being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on perceived or actual sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, or sex/gender identity. Statistically significant numbers of those students and employees witnessing such incidents were from minority groups.

Some large and many statistically significant differences in perceptions of the UWW campus climate were found among those who are part of the minority constituencies making up the diversity of the UWW campus. Some minority groups were farther apart from their majority counterparts in their perceptions of the campus climate than other minority groups. For example, LGB/Q employees and students differed significantly from heterosexual employees and students on six of six dimensions assessing heterosexism/homophobia on campus; employees with disabilities differed significantly from employees without identified disabilities on only one of the six dimensions measuring ableism on campus, but students with disabilities differed significantly from students without identified disabilities on five of the six dimensions measuring ableism on campus.
The results of this study and previous studies (e.g., Morgan, 1989, 1992, 1995; LGBTQ Task Force, 1994) are similar in that the UWW climate for diversity looks different depending on whether the observer is LGB/Q or heterosexual, a Person of Color or White person, a person with disabilities or a person without identified disabilities, other than Christian or Christian, or male or female or transgendered. In other words, as long as the person answering the question is not directly affected by the UWW climate for diversity, students and employees alike tend to think UWW has a pretty favorable climate for diversity. Of course, some heterosexual, White, able-bodied, Christian, male participants joined minority participants to indicate disagreement with the perception that the climate for diversity is favorable at UWW. Some heterosexual, White, able-bodied, Christian, male participants experienced and witnessed harassment, discrimination, and denied access. Still, the results of this study generally indicate that most majority participants are largely unaware of problems that LGB/Q people, People of Color, people with disabilities, non-Christians, and women perceive and experience. So, despite the overall positive results, UWW faces significant challenges when it comes to enfranchising its minority constituents.

Limitations of the Study

Two factors limit the utility of this survey: (a) the extremely broad questions, and (b) lack of continuity with previous campus surveys. These factors should be taken into account when interpreting the study results or when effecting change based on the study results.

Extremely broad questions. The quantity and specificity of the questions included in this survey was reduced from the original questions developed in consultation with UWW constituency groups (including the UWW Assistant to the Chancellor for AA/EO and the AA/EO committee) and research consultants. About one-fifth of the questions were utilized and these questions were made more general so as to fulfill Chancellor Miller's goal to “paint a very broad brush stroke” about the campus climate for
diversity. Two Assistants to the Chancellor for AA/EO (who have since resigned), the AA/EO committee, and the research consultants challenged the use of such a limited number of broad questions, citing that there would be no way to: (a) highlight areas, divisions, or departments where praise should be conferred, (b) provide sufficient detail to create programs or plans to improve campus response, or (c) conduct future tests to show improvement or regression. Some argued that the effect of such a limited survey might be its purpose—to maintain status quo in terms of campus climate for diversity. Some questioned the genuineness of the commitment to diversity at the highest levels of UWW administration.

Lack of continuity with previous campus surveys. Chancellor Miller determined to replace, rather than replicate or build on previous campus climate surveys, thereby creating a 2005 “snapshot” of the campus climate for diversity. By ignoring the comprehensive Morgan and LGBTQ surveys, no meaningful data comparisons can be made and no trajectories of improvement or regression offered.

Leonard Morgan’s studies highlighted differences in campus perceptions between White people and People of Color. Morgan collected data in 1989, 1992, and 1995, using the same or similar questions each time. Item continuity over time established trends in the campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity. Morgan’s comprehensive studies offer a rich, detailed picture of discrepancies between the perceptions of White students and Students of Color at UWW along many dimensions and across many programs. Only one item in the current survey is comparable to Morgan’s studies (i.e., “UWW is adequately providing events featuring People of Color”) and that item did not evaluate the more critical dimensions of racial/ethnic relations on the UWW campus. In a general way, however, this study did confirm continuing differences in perception and experience of the UWW campus based on race/ethnicity.
A group of LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer) and allied employees developed a 1993 study to assess the campus climate for LGBTQ students and employees. That survey offered a comprehensive investigation of the UWW climate for LGBTQ people across departments and divisions, and along a number of dimensions critical to an inclusive climate. Only two items in the current survey are comparable to the LGBTQ study.

I can't help but notice that both previous survey instruments gave very specific details about campus needs that were generally left out of this survey and that the parameters given for this survey allowed for no comprehensive examination of UWW's current status and no longitudinal examination of UWW trends in campus climate for diversity. In the past five years, UWW has hired and lost two Assistants to the Chancellor for AA/EO, one an out Lesbian and one a Person of Color. A Black researcher's previous survey items were largely excluded from this survey. Whether intended or unintentional, these observations appear to suggest challenges to diversity inclusion at UWW that should not be ignored.

Future Directions

Administrators should consider the results of this study as valid indicators of current campus climate in general, as well as valid challenges UWW currently faces in creating an inclusive, safe, equitable, and responsive climate for diversity. Future research should provide more detailed and ongoing assessment of campus climate for diversity in general, but should also specifically assess in greater depth concerns raised by the results of this study. Future studies should continue to analyze perceptions by examining both minority and majority groups on the UWW campus to get a fuller picture of the complexities and nuances of the UWW campus climate for diversity. Changes put in place should be formalized or they risk slipping away with changes in leadership or assigned responsibilities. The same is true of regular assessment studies.
Results of this study were intended to be shared with each of the advisory
groups representing the various constituencies at UWW, the AA/EO committee
representing many constituencies of the UWW campus, current and interested past
chancellors of UWW, and accreditation site visitors through publication and
presentation. It is my hope that the results of this study will benefit university
administrators, faculty, staff, and students by raising awareness of the climate of UWW,
by affirming strengths of some current policies and practices, and by facilitating
ongoing plans to enhance and augment diversity assessment and plans.

Administrators, employees, and students at UWW can feel proud of some
aspects of our campus climate for diversity. At the same time, it is imperative that we
continue efforts to provide a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere; respond
adequately to incidents of harassment and discrimination; provide events that feature
the diversity of our campus; and reduce rates of experienced and witnessed harassment
and discrimination based on perceived or actual sexual orientation, race/ethnicity,
disability status, religious/spiritual affiliation, and sex/gender identity. The UWW
campus community must work together toward continued improvement to ensure the
safety, equity, inclusivity, and institutional responsiveness for all students and
employees on our campus.
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Appendix A

At-a-Glance Tables

Table 1. Demographics at a Glance: UWW Population and 2005 Campus Climate Survey Sample

Table 2. Statistically Significant Differences at a Glance: UWW Combined Responses by Demographic Feature

Table 3. Grand Mean and Scale Means at a Glance: UWW Combined Responses by Demographic Feature

Table 4. Statistically Significant Differences at a Glance: UWW Student Responses by Demographic Feature

Table 5. Grand Mean and Scale Means at a Glance: UWW Student Responses by Demographic Feature

Table 6. Statistically Significant Differences at a Glance: UWW Employee Responses by Demographic Feature

Table 7. Grand Mean and Scale Means at a Glance: UWW Employee Responses by Demographic Feature
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>EMPLOYEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demographic Dimension</td>
<td>Population (10,215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>20.50%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>20.10%</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>26.10%</td>
<td>33.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>53.40%</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>46.60%</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No disability</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>68.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>31.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Statistically Significant Differences at a Glance
UWW COMBINED RESPONSES BY DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) LGBTQ people/ perceived or actual sexual orientation</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-C; N-O</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; N-C; N-O</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; N-C; N-O</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-O; F; T; Emp</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) People of Color/race/ethnicity</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; N-O; Emp</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; N-O</td>
<td>POC; N-C; F; Emp</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; T</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) People with disabilities/disability status</td>
<td>LGB/Q; F</td>
<td>LGB/Q</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-C</td>
<td>POC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) People of all religious/spiritual affiliations</td>
<td>POC; N-C; N-O; Emp</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; N-C; F</td>
<td>N-C; Emp</td>
<td>POC; N-C; N-O; T</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-C; N-O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Women/sex or gender identity</td>
<td>LGB/Q; F; Emp</td>
<td>F; Emp</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; N-C; N-O; F; Emp</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; PWID; F; Emp</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; F; Emp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to Abbreviations for Employee Demographic Feature**
- **LGB/Q**: Lesbian, Gay, bisexual or uncertain/questioning people
- **POC**: People of Color
- **PWID**: People with invisible disabilities
- **PWVD**: People with visible disabilities
- **PWBD**: People with both invisible and visible disabilities
- **N-C**: People with non-Christian religious/spiritual affiliation
- **N-O**: People with no current or other religious/spiritual affiliations
- **F**: Female
- **M**: Male
- **Stu**: Student
- **Emp**: Employee
Table 3. Grand Mean and Scale Means at a Glance
UWW COMBINED RESPONSES BY DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Grand Mean</th>
<th>Q1 Mean</th>
<th>Q2 Mean</th>
<th>Q3 Mean</th>
<th>Q4 Mean</th>
<th>Q5 Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagreed/agreed less strongly that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, accessible atmosphere</td>
<td>Disagreed/agreed less strongly that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment or discrimination</td>
<td>Disagreed/agreed less strongly that UWW provides events featuring diversity</td>
<td>More frequently experienced incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access</td>
<td>More frequently witnessed incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/Work Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (Emp)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>X (LGB/Q)</td>
<td>X (LGB/Q)</td>
<td>X (LGB/Q)</td>
<td>X (LGB/Q)</td>
<td>X (LGB/Q)</td>
<td>X (LGB/Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>X (POC)</td>
<td>X (POC)</td>
<td>X (POC)</td>
<td>X (POC)</td>
<td>X (POC)</td>
<td>X (POC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious/spiritual affiliation</td>
<td>X (N-C; N-O)</td>
<td>X (N-C)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (N-C; N-O)</td>
<td>X (N-C; N-O)</td>
<td>X (N-O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/gender identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Abbreviations for Employee Demographic Feature

LGB/Q  Lesbian, Gay, bisexual or uncertain/questioning people
POC    People of Color
PWID   People with invisible disabilities
PWVD   People with visible disabilities
PWBD   People with both invisible and visible disabilities
N-C    People with non-Christian religious/spiritual affiliation
N-O    People with no current or other religious/spiritual affiliations
F      Female
M      Male
Stu    Student
Emp    Employee
Table 4. Statistically Significant Differences at a Glance
UWV STUDENT RESPONSES BY DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) LGBTQ people/ perceived or actual sexual orientation</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; N-O</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; Se</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; PWID; N-O; Se</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-O; F; T</td>
<td>LGB/Q; PWBD; N-O; T</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) People of Color/ race/ethnicity</td>
<td>POC; Se</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; Se</td>
<td>POC; N-C; N-O; F; Se</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; T; Se</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC</td>
<td>POC; N-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) People with disabilities/disability status</td>
<td>POC; PWID; Se</td>
<td>LGB/Q; PWBD; Se</td>
<td>LGB/Q; PWBD; Se</td>
<td>PWID; PWBD</td>
<td>LGB/Q; WBD; T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) People of all religious/spiritual affiliations</td>
<td>POC; PWID; N-C; Se</td>
<td>LGB/Q; PWID; N-O; F; Se</td>
<td>PWID; PWID; Se</td>
<td>POC; PWID; PWBD; N-C; N-O; T; Se</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-O</td>
<td>POC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Women/sex or gender identity</td>
<td>LGB/Q;</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; N-C; N-O; F; T</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; N-C; N-O; F; T</td>
<td>LGB/Q; POC; PWBD; N-O; T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ju</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Approaching significance

Key to Abbreviations for Employee Demographic Feature

LGB/Q Lesbian, Gay, bisexual or uncertain/questioning people
POC People of Color
PWID People with invisible disabilities
PWVD People with visible disabilities
PWBD People with both invisible and visible disabilities
N-C People with non-Christian religious/spiritual affiliation
N-O People with no current or other religious/spiritual affiliations

F Female
M Male
T Transgender
Fr Freshman
So Sophomore
Ju Junior
Se Senior
Gr Graduate students
Sp Special students
Table 5. Grand Mean and Scale Means at a Glance
UWW STUDENT RESPONSES BY DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Grand Mean</th>
<th>Q1 Mean</th>
<th>Q2 Mean</th>
<th>Q3 Mean</th>
<th>Q4 Mean</th>
<th>Q5 Mean</th>
<th>Q6 Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic/Work Classification</td>
<td>X (Se)</td>
<td>X (Se)</td>
<td>X (Se)</td>
<td>X (Se)</td>
<td>X (Se)</td>
<td>X (Se)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>X (LGB/Q)</td>
<td>X (LGB/Q)</td>
<td>X (LGB/Q)</td>
<td>X (LGB/Q)</td>
<td>X (LGB/Q)</td>
<td>X (LGB/Q)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>X (POC)</td>
<td>X (POC)</td>
<td>X (POC)</td>
<td>X (POC)</td>
<td>X (POC)</td>
<td>X (POC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious/spiritual affiliation</td>
<td>X (N-O)</td>
<td>X (N-O)</td>
<td>X (N-O)</td>
<td>X (N-O)</td>
<td>X (N-O)</td>
<td>X (N-O)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/gender identity</td>
<td>X (F)</td>
<td>X (T)</td>
<td>X (F; T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Abbreviations for Employee Demographic Feature

LGB/Q: Lesbian, Gay, bisexual or uncertain/questioning people
POC: People of Color
PWID: People with invisible disabilities
PWVD: People with visible disabilities
PWBD: People with both invisible and visible disabilities
N-C: People with non-Christian religious/spiritual affiliation

Key for Scale
N-O: People with no current or other religious/spiritual affiliations
F: Female
M: Male
T: Transgender
Fr: Freshman
So: Sophomore
Ju: Junior
Se: Senior
Gr: Graduate students
Sp: Special students
Table 6. Statistically Significant Differences at a Glance
UWW EMPLOYEE RESPONSES BY DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) LGBTQ people/ perceived or actual sexual orientation</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-O; F</td>
<td>LGB/Q</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-O</td>
<td>LGB/Q</td>
<td>LGB/Q</td>
<td>LGB/Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) People of Color/race/ethnicity</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) People with disabilities/disability status</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) People of all religious/spiritual affiliations</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-C; N-O</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-C</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LGB/Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Women/sex or gender identity</td>
<td>LGB/Q; F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LGB/Q; N-C</td>
<td>LGB/Q; PWVD; F</td>
<td></td>
<td>LGB/Q; PWVD; PWBD; N-O; F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Approaching significance

Key to Abbreviations for Employee Demographic Feature
- LGB/Q: Lesbian, Gay, bisexual or uncertain/questioning people
- POC: People of Color
- PWID: People with invisible disabilities
- PWVD: People with visible disabilities
- PWBD: People with both invisible and visible disabilities
- N-C: People with non-Christian religious/spiritual affiliation
- N-O: People with no current or other religious/spiritual affiliations
- F: Female
- M: Male
### Table 7. Grand Mean and Scale Means at a Glance
UWW Employee Responses by Demographic Feature

| Demographic     | Grand Mean | Q1 Mean                                                                 | Q2 Mean                                                                 | Q3 Mean                                                                 | Q4 Mean                                                                 | Q5 Mean                                                                 | Q6 Mean                                                                 |
|-----------------|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                 |            | Disagreed/agreed less strongly that UWW provides a safe, non-threatening, accessible atmosphere | Disagreed/agreed less strongly that UWW administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment or discrimination | Disagreed/agreed less strongly that UWW features diversity               | More frequently experienced incidents of harassment, discrimination, or denied access | Passed over for promotion, received low/no merit increase, contract not renewed, or denied tenure |
| Orientation     | X          | X                                                                       | X                                                                       | X                                                                       | X                                                                       | X                                                                       |
|                 | (LGB/Q)    | (LGB/Q)                                                                 | (LGB/Q)                                                                 | (LGB/Q)                                                                | (LGB/Q)                                                                | (LGB/Q)                                                                |
| Race/ethnicity  |            |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |
| Disability status|            |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |
| Religious/spiritual affiliation | X         |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |
|                 | (N-C; N-O) |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |
| Sex/gender identity | X        |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |
|                 | (F)        |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                         |

**Key to Abbreviations for Employee Demographic Feature**

- **LGB/Q**: Lesbian, Gay, bisexual or uncertain/questioning people
- **POC**: People of Color
- **PWID**: People with invisible disabilities
- **PWVD**: People with visible disabilities
- **PWBD**: People with both invisible and visible disabilities
- **N-C**: People with non-Christian religious/spiritual affiliation
- **N-O**: People with no current or other religious/spiritual affiliations
- **F**: Female
- **M**: Male
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Abstract

The past twenty years have seen increasing diversification in colleges and universities throughout the country (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2004) and recent trends toward even more inclusive models of higher education (Banks, 2003). As institutions of higher education have increased efforts to recruit and retain diverse students, staff, faculty, and administrators, the definition of diversity itself has become more inclusive. Those who have been traditionally understood to be included in diversity (e.g., those identified by race, ethnicity, or sex) as well as those marginalized by other differences such as culture or orientation (e.g., Lesbian and Gay people), ability (e.g., people with disabilities), religious/spiritual affiliation (e.g., non-Christian people), and economic background (e.g., people from working-class and lower income backgrounds; first generation college students) are diversifying the landscape of higher education.

Campus “climate” has emerged as one of the most important factors influencing retention rates, community cohesiveness, and satisfaction with the university experience for all students, but especially among diverse individuals thought to be most vulnerable to discrimination from the majority. As Alberto Cabrera (2003) notes, “exposure to a climate of prejudice and discrimination in the classroom and on campus has gained attention as the main factor accounting for differences in withdrawal behavior between minorities and non-minorities” (e.g., Fleming, 1984; Hurtado, 1992, 1996; Hurtado, Carter, & Spuler, 1996; Smedley, Myers, & Harrell, 1993). In our efforts to improve the success rate for all students, paying attention to the context in which education takes place is an important dimension that should not be overlooked or underestimated. This study will explore the campus climate specifically for minority persons at the University of Wisconsin–Whitewater (UWW).

For the purposes of this study, the term minority refers to anyone whose racial or ethnic background, sex or gender identity, sexual/affectional orientation, economic class, religious/spiritual beliefs, or ability has historically been ascribed to a subordinate position, afforded less access to resources or privileges, or has been regarded to be of “minor” standing in a stratified system (Poorman, 2003). Majority refers to anyone whose race, ethnicity, sex or gender identity, sexual/affectional orientation, economic class, religious/spiritual beliefs, or abilities have historically been ascribed to a dominant position, afforded them improved access to resources or privileges, or has been regarded as normative or of a “major” standing.

In the past 20 years, UWW has seen changes in terms of increasing numbers of people of color, women, “out” LGBTQ people, and people with disabilities (Institutional Research, 2003). The primary question being addressed in this study is: What is the current climate of the UWW campus for students, staff, faculty, and administrators who come from minority backgrounds, perspectives, and experiences? Even more specifically, we want to know which UWW policies and practices facilitate the safety, fairness and equity, inclusivity, institutional responsiveness, discrimination and harassment, and offer accurate representation of all students, faculty, and staff, and which policies and practices should be improved or implemented to augment these dimensions of our campus climate.

The purpose of this study is to develop a diagnostic tool that will be administered annually to determine perceptions of the climate on the UWW campus. The ongoing database will allow us to track change or lack of change, to more effectively target interventions, and to more precisely set campus priorities for action.

While we will invite all UWW faculty, staff, and students to participate, we will encourage participation by those deemed to be most vulnerable to discrimination due to social identity group affiliation based on ethnicity, sex/gender, religious/spiritual affiliation, disabilities, or sexual orientation since these students are those most likely to suffer from the effects of negative climate. Recognizing that campus climate is composed of different strata, we will also take the “temperature” of the climate in (a) classrooms, (b) residence halls, (c) other specific areas of the campus community, and (d) the Whitewater community. Being able to target more specifically where university members experience problems and where they do not will give us a more comprehensive picture of the different communities that our students inhabit and will also allow us to more precisely identify “problem areas.” We will also be able to compare the structures and “rules” of areas in which the climate is judged as relatively benign to those which are experienced as more hostile which will give us insight into what types of changes would be most effective.
We developed a primarily diagnostic survey instrument to gather descriptive data across various sub-groups within the university community, across several key dimensions, and in a number of contexts. While the instrument has been designed with the needs of the UWW campus in mind, when feasible, we replicated items used in existing studies of campus climate throughout the country and at UWW itself in studies conducted 10-15 years ago. Matching the language and structure of the questions with previously conducted survey items will allow for comparisons within and between institutions and may facilitate our contribution to the growing body of scholarly literature on campus climate and implementing diversity.

Survey items addressing attitudes and perceptions about diversity and UWW's climate were constructed utilizing prior research from peer-reviewed publications, previous studies conducted at UWW, interviews with similar constituency groups, and previously published survey instruments. The instrument has been designed to focus on several key dimensions of climate: (a) safety and non-threatening environment, (b) inclusivity or sense of belonging, (c) fairness and equity in the personal and professional environment, (d) first hand knowledge of discriminatory experiences/harassment based on social identity group, and (e) perceived responsiveness of the institution.

All students enrolled at UWW (who have reached the age of consent), staff, and faculty of UWW will constitute the pool of prospective participants. The principal investigators will specifically encourage minority constituencies to participate to ensure fuller participation, more viable data analysis, and more meaningful results.

All students, staff, and faculty will be contacted by broadcast email and invited to participate in the study. The broadcast email will be linked to a website that will contain the Letter of Invitations to Participants (see Appendices). The letter will include standard informed consent elements and additional information about safeguards of anonymity for online surveys and alternative methods for voicing their perspectives. The letter will contain a link to the survey. The introduction to the online survey will contain reminders to participants of their rights to informed consent. At the completion of the survey, participants will be reminded to close all browser windows to eliminate the possibility of unauthorized access to their responses. Completing and submitting the survey will be considered final consent to participate.

Survey responses will be stored in a response tally file (without names) that identifies each participant only by a number. The anonymous dataset allows for analysis of aggregated data and generation of summary reports. Data will be further sorted and analyzed statistically using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, Version 12; 2004). Analyses will include descriptive statistics (e.g., mean number of responses, numbers of participants with any given demographic characteristic who responded in a particular way, mean score on any given perspective, chi-square probabilities) as well as inferential statistics (e.g., multivariate analyses of variance-MANOVA to ascertain significant differences between the groups holding various perspectives; analyses of co-variance-ANCOVA to compare the means of the groups on specific items and improve the research design efficiency by adjusting the effect of variables that are related to dependent variables). Detail of scoring for each item can be found in the Appendix (see Appendix, Items, Scoring & Analyses).

Results of this study will be shared in aggregate form only with each of the advisory groups representing various diverse constituencies at UWW, the Chancellor of UWW, and through professional publication and presentation. Results of this study are expected to benefit university administrators, faculty, staff, and ultimately students by raising awareness of the climate of UWW, affirming strengths in current policies and practices, and by facilitating plans for enhanced institutional responses aimed at improving safety, equity, inclusivity, harassment and discrimination rates, and institutional responsiveness at UWW.
I. DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPANTS
   a. Participants in this study will include students, staff, and faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater (UWW).
      i. Students who are under 18 years of age will be excluded from participation. Some prospective participants (e.g., women, people of color, people with disabilities, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered people, non-Christians, non-traditional age students, first-generation college students) will be specifically encouraged to participate (e.g. personal reminders to organizations and advisory committees; a follow-up campus-wide broadcast email to encourage participation; allowing organizations or committees to forward announcements to members encouraging participation - see Appendix for Script of Meetings with Campus Organizations or Committees) to ensure full inclusion of diverse perspectives and maximize viability of statistical analyses and results.
      ii. The principal investigators are both faculty members at the UWW. Participants will all be affiliated with UWW as students, staff, faculty, or administrators.
      iii. Participants will not be excluded for any particular state of health. Some participants will be specifically encouraged to participate because they are people with mental and/or physical disabilities to ensure full inclusion of their perspectives and to maximize viability of statistical analyses and results.
   b. This study will exclude participants who are under age 18.
   c. N/A.

II. PROCEDURES
   a. All students, faculty, and staff at UWW will be contacted by broadcast email and invited to participate in the survey. Participants will be directed to a Website that will introduce the study. Key elements of informed consent will be repeated at the beginning of the survey. While there is no internal control over the possibility of a participant taking the survey more than once, the survey's length should prohibit most casual corruptors. Second, there is no compensation to act as incentive for taking the survey more than once. Finally, the likelihood of any survey administered in a classroom by one of many research assistants overseeing many sessions is at least as great. Completion and submission of the survey will constitute de facto consent. The directions indicate that participants may make alternative arrangements to take the survey. Dr. Poorman will administer paper and pencil versions of the survey available for anyone who wishes to take the survey in this way. Paper and pencil surveys will be stored in a secure envelope and then data will be entered by an assistant who did not administer the survey. Students with disabilities that require accommodations in order to participate will be able to do so through the Center for Students with Disabilities (see IV b. iii.).
   b. Participants indicate perceptions and attitudes by clicking on a particular spot in the program. Responses will be kept in a dataset that identifies
participants only by a number. All response information is completely separate from participant name or electronic address, in a database on a secure server specifically designed for survey purposes. After the study is complete, the dataset itself will also be erased.

c. The principal investigators are faculty members from the Psychology and Political Science Departments. Both have doctoral degrees and specific training in research methods, statistical analyses, professional ethical standards related to research activities, and compliance with federal regulations regarding research with human participants. A technical consultant, trained in research ethics and compliance guidelines, assists in the design of the Web-based survey and will consult re: the infrastructure of the survey. Any student assistants involved in the research process will be trained in research design, analysis, ethics, and compliance regulations by the principal investigators. No student assistant will have access to identifying information about participants.

d. Participants may take the survey from any computer location. They will be advised to take the survey at one time and a place where they can reasonably expect some privacy while taking the survey.

e. In the interests of maximizing the response rate, the survey has been designed to take no longer than 20 minutes for an average participant to complete. Pilot-testing confirms this time frame. Given that reading and computer skills may vary, it could take some participants longer. The survey will not be exhaustive, but instead will be refined to focus on questions that best capture the essence of dimensions key to determining campus climate conditions.

f. No participant will be compensated for his/her participation.

g. No invasive medical procedure or stress testing is involved in this study.

III. RISK/DECEPTION

a. The purpose of this study is to assess the perceived climate of UWW particularly for women, people of color, those from non-Christian religious and spiritual traditions, people with disabilities, and people who are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered. It is generally agreed that the best way to assess the perspectives of those who come from minority backgrounds is to ask those from minority backgrounds to directly comment on their experiences and perspectives (e.g., Renzetti & Lee, 1993). It is commenting on these experiences that informs meaningful interventions (e.g., policies and practices). It is possible that some (esp. minority) participants will be uncomfortable remembering and commenting on some of their experiences (e.g., barriers they’ve encountered or adverse circumstances they’ve faced such as sexual harassment or hate crimes). While these experiences are harmful, not all discomfort is harmful. Still, some participants may benefit from seeking professional assistance with their discomfort. University and area service providers will be advised of the study and the possibility that some participants could be uncomfortable. Participants will receive information about how to access such services.

b. Results of this study will benefit UWW administrators, faculty, staff, and students by raising awareness of the climate of UWW, affirming strengths
in current policies and practices, and facilitating plans for additional services and programs aimed at improving the climate at UWW. Some people have experienced a less than optimal climate here, and others have experienced harm. Knowing about these experiences is crucial to providing programs and services that will improve circumstances for those people and others like them. Without direct data about experiences and perceptions of discrimination, harassment, discomfort, or null environments, people will continue to face such experiences at UWW. It is only through knowing and understanding adverse circumstances faced by students, staff, faculty, and administrators, that the policies and practices necessary to creating a safe, equitable, and productive atmosphere in which to work and study can be implemented meaningfully.

c. No deception will be used in gathering data.

IV. SAFEGUARDING THE IDENTITY OF PARTICIPANTS

a. Items on the survey have been constructed to maximize anonymity, while still gathering demographic information important to assessing campus climate. NO names will be requested or accepted by the survey program. Responses to survey items are tallied in a secure dataset that includes no names of participants. The dataset only contains an identification number, variable names, and coded responses; no participant names appear. Since some of the groups being targeted are small (e.g., Native American students or faculty, disabled faculty, gay male faculty), every effort will be made to eliminate even potentially identifying information in presenting the results. The survey infrastructure can be accessed by the IT Administrator (Lorna Wong), IT consultant (Lisa Rowland), and the principal investigator only. The dataset can only be accessed by the principal investigator and co-investigator only. Only aggregated data will be used in future presentations and publications.

b. The following precautions will be undertaken to ensure the anonymity of the participants.

i. Upon completion of the study, the electronic dataset will be destroyed.

ii. During data collection, survey data will be kept in a database on a secure server designed specifically for survey purposes. This server has limited access, identifies participants only by number, and tallies only coded responses to variable names as stated above.

iii. If a participant chooses to take the survey in paper and pencil version, Dr. Poorman will administer it, the survey will be kept in a sealed envelope, and another researcher or assistant (who did not see the person completing the survey) will enter the data at a later point. Students who are unable/less able to read print will be able to take the survey using reading software (e.g. Kurzweil, Drag & Dictate, JAWS) and their survey responses will still be confidential. These students will go to either the CSD computer lab or Project ASSIST computer lab to take the survey (much like they do with classroom surveys or exams). Except for an occasional assist in using the software, there is no other human involved or present. Data will not be linked to specific participant
names at any point during the survey process. Researchers will not have master lists of students, faculty, or staff names. Responses are kept in a dataset divorced from participants’ names and email addresses, so, responses are tallied anonymously and individual response sets are identified only by a number. The location of a participant’s Internet Provider Number (IP#) is the only possible trace connection between the participant and his or her data. In the case of surveys completed at one of the many UWW computer labs, all have the same IP#. With a subpoena, only the specific location of the computer used could be identified with a set of responses. For surveys completed at a location other than the campus, a subpoena could establish the name of the IP. Current legal precedent has allowed individual IP’s to refuse a subpoena for user information. Typical encryption programs for IP’s obscure information as simple as time and date stamps. In other words, even with a subpoena, one could only establish that responses were made using X computer from X Lab on campus or X IP and maybe X computer elsewhere. Neither would establish the identity or responses of the person taking part in the survey.

iv. Data will be used only in aggregate form, any identifying (and potentially identifying) information will be omitted from presentations or publications, and constituencies so small that individual participants’ identities could be assumed will be grouped with others to eliminate this possibility.

v. Data will not be linked to specific participant names at any point during the survey process. The program developed for this survey is designed to enter each participant’s data assigning only an identifying number to their responses to ensure that the response set can be aggregated by participant. All analyses will be conducted on group aggregate data. Results and conclusions will be about group aggregates.

V. INFORMED CONSENT

a. Project information and all elements of informed consent are contained in the letter of invitation to participants. (See attached Letter of Invitation to Participants.)

VI. APPENDIXES

a. Copy of the online Campus Climate Survey is attached.
b. Copy of IRB Minutes outlining required and requested modifications is attached.
   i. Copy of Email with additional modifications required and requested
c. Copy of Items, Scoring & Analysis is attached.
d. Copy of Letter of Invitation to Participants is attached.
e. Copy of Script for Meetings with Organizations and Committees
f. Copy of Script for Broadcast email
Dear [Name],

We are writing to tell you about a survey that will assess the climate of UW-Whitewater and to invite you to participate. For a number of years now, universities all over the country have been making efforts to recruit more diverse students, faculty, staff, and administrators. In this study, sponsored by Chancellor Miller, we would like to find out which policies and practices are working well to ensure the safety and welfare of all students, staff, faculty, and administrators at UWW and which policies and practices need improvement or elimination. We would like to know your perceptions about the campus climate. If you are willing to consider participation, please read further.

If you decide to take part, you can fill out an online survey that takes about 20 minutes to complete. If you would prefer to give your perspective verbally or on a hard copy survey, please contact Dr. Poorman, whose contact information is at the end of this letter.

We expect that the results of this survey will benefit UWW students, staff, faculty, and administrators by raising awareness of the climate of the university for those with diverse backgrounds and perspectives and by helping faculty, staff, and administrators plan programs and services that will better ensure the welfare, safety, and productivity of all within the UWW community.

We want you to know how we plan to protect your anonymity. When you go to the Website, you will not be asked for your name, email address, or information that would necessarily identify you. None of your responses will be linked to you at any point during the survey process. The responses you give in the survey will be kept in a secure file on a server specifically designed to secure survey information. That computer and the survey program can only be accessed by authorized research or technical associates connected with the project. Results of the survey will only be used in a summary form in any future presentations and publications. Since we are inviting some groups that are very small in number to complete the survey (such as, Native American students, disabled faculty), we will be making every effort to eliminate even potentially identifying information when we present the results. When the study is complete, the online file will be destroyed.

If you complete the survey at your home, only the location of your Internet Provider (IP#) could be identified and only with a subpoena. It is possible that your home computer address could be identified, though your responses to the survey could not. If you complete the survey at one of the many university computers, only the specific location of the computer you used to complete the survey could be identified and only with a subpoena. Your responses to the survey could not be identified. Whether you decide to take the survey at a campus computer or elsewhere, you can not be personally connected to your responses to the survey.
Since the survey is about experiences and perceptions that could have been uncomfortable or distressing, some of your recollections could also be uncomfortable or distressing. While not all discomfort or distress is harmful, if you’d like professional help to deal with this, students may contact the following for free services:

University Health Services and Counseling Services  
1002 Ambrose Health Center  
800 West Main Street  
Whitewater, WI 53190  
Phone: 262-472-1300

Faculty and staff may contact:  
Wisconsin Community Mental Health Counseling Centers  
143 Main Street  
Whitewater, WI 53190  
Phone: 262-473-6119

Walworth County Information and Referral  
County Trunk NN  
Elkhorn, WI 53121  
Phone: 741-2345.

We’ve contacted each center to let them know we are doing this survey and that some participants may want help with their reactions.

If you have any questions, concerns, or if you’d like to make alternative arrangements to give your perceptions about the climate of the UWW campus, please contact:

Paula B. Poorman, Ph.D.  
Psychology Department  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Whitewater, WI 53190  
Telephone: (262) 472-1026  
FAX: (262) 472-1863  
Email: poormanp@uww.edu

If you have questions or concerns about your rights or treatment in the research project, please contact:

Denise Ehlen, Certified Research Specialist  
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs  
2013 Roseman  
800 West Main Street  
Whitewater, WI 53190  
Telephone: (262) 472-5212  
FAX: (262) 472-5214  
Email: ehlen@uww.edu
Your participation in the survey is entirely voluntary and you can discontinue participation at any time. If you don’t participate or you decide to discontinue at any point, it will not result in any penalty or loss of any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

We hope you’ll decide to take part in this survey. Whether you take part or not, we appreciate your time and consideration of our invitation.

Sincerely,

Paula B. Poorman, Ph.D.  Paula R. Mohan, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Psychology  Instructor, Political Science

Completing and submitting the survey indicates that you are at least 18 years of age and give your informed consent to participate in this study. If you want to complete the survey go to: http://surveys.uww.edu/survey.php?name=Campus Climate when you have 20 minutes of relative privacy to complete this. The site will be available 24/7 until December 1, 2004. After you complete the survey, please be sure to close all browser windows to eliminate the possibility of unauthorized access to your responses.

Thank you.
Campus Climate Survey

This semester, a survey of the “climate” of UW-Whitewater is being sent to faculty, staff, and students who are over 18. A campus climate survey is an assessment of the environment of the university and includes questions about how safe you feel, how included you feel, how fairly you believe you are treated compared to others, whether you’ve experienced or witnessed discrimination and harassment, and your views about how responsive the university administration is to such concerns. It is a survey that will allow us to “take the temperature” of the university, specifically about how well the university serves students, staff, and faculty from diverse backgrounds. The information will be used in developing future programs and policies.

The survey is available online and in hard copy and you’ll get either an email or a letter telling you more about it. Your answers will be not be linked to you personally. The short version of the survey takes about 5 minutes to complete. The longer version takes about 15 minutes to complete. Half of the faculty, staff, and students have been randomly selected to receive each version. We hope you will take time to fill out the version you receive. Your viewpoints are valued and we want to make sure your voice is heard.

If you have any questions, the survey consultant working with Chancellor Miller is Dr. P.B. Poorman and she will be happy to answer your questions.

Please feel free to contact Dr. Poorman at poormanp@uww.edu, X5418, or visit her website for more contact information http://facstaff.uww.edu/poormanp.

Thanks for your time and participation in this important survey.
Script for Meeting with Campus Organizations and Committees

(Script may also be used by organizations mailing to members/constituencies)

I'd like to start by introducing myself. I'm [Dr. P.B. Poorman and I'm the principal investigator of the UW-W Campus Climate Survey/I'm ___ (name) and I'm ___ (state affiliation with) the Campus Climate Survey]. This semester, the university will be "taking the temperature" of our campus through an online climate study. A campus climate study is an assessment of the environment of the university. Specifically, we'll be trying to assess how well the university serves students, staff, and faculty from diverse backgrounds. The online survey will ask questions about how safe you feel, how included you feel, how fairly you believe you are treated compared to others, whether you've experienced or witnessed discrimination and harassment, and your views about how responsive the university is. All UW-Whitewater students who are 18 and older, staff, and faculty are invited to participate by filling out the survey.

If you haven't received one already, you will soon receive an e-mail telling you about the survey and how to access it online. There are a couple of things I want to tell you about right now. The survey takes about 20 minutes to complete. Your answers will be anonymous. If you want an alternate way to take the survey, you should contact Dr. Poorman to set this up.

If you have any questions, I'd/Dr. Poorman would be happy to answer them.

[PAUSE for questions, if oral presentation]

I hope you will take the time to go online and fill out the survey. We want to know how everyone feels about our campus environment—the classes, the res halls, city of Whitewater. We want to make sure your thoughts and viewpoints are included. A report will come out in January, 2005 describing the results.

If you think of any questions later, please feel free to contact [me/Dr. Poorman]. Here's [my/the principal researcher for the project's] business card.

[Distribute: PB's business card]

Thanks for your time.

[PB Poorman, if written]
Sample Broadcast Email re: Campus Climate survey

(SHORT DESCRIPTION)

This semester, a study of the climate of UW-Whitewater’s campus is being offered online to all faculty, staff, and students over 18. It will be available from ___ to ___.

(LONG DESCRIPTION)

The Campus Climate Survey, sent to all faculty, staff, and students over 18, will measure how members of the UW-Whitewater community experience our campus environment. Participation is voluntary and those who fill out the survey are assured anonymity. The online survey will be available from ___ to ___.

We strongly encourage participation as the best means to give an accurate picture of our overall campus climate and its impact on all of us. For more details, please contact P.B. Poorman (poormanp@uww.edu).
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If you should make any changes in the protocol involving 1) method, 2) subjects, 3) informed consent, and/or 4) subject identification, you must resubmit the protocol. The case number assigned to this protocol is listed on the Protocol Coversheet; please reference this number in all future correspondence. You are responsible for submission of an Annual Progress Report (if necessary) and for maintaining all records related to this project for at least three years after completion of the research project.
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☑ EXEMPT (NUMBERS □ □ □)
☒ EXPEDITED REVIEW
☒ FULL BOARD REVIEW

PROTECTED POPULATIONS AND OTHER FULL BOARD DETERMINANTS
Please check all of the following descriptors, which apply to your research:
☑ Minors ☐ Fetuses ☐ Pregnant Women
☐ Prisoners ☑ Illegal Behavior/Sensitive Content
☑ Cognitively Impaired/Mentally Ill

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR FACULTY/STAFF SUPERVISOR CERTIFICATION
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Barbara R. Beaver, Ph.D.

TYPED/PRINTED NAME

SIGNATURE
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The modified protocol involves the following:
1) Using a subset of the questions approved in the original protocol. (see attached)
2) No further involvement of co-investigator named in the original submission.

PROTOCOL REVIEW
I have reviewed the protocol and determined that under rules governing protocol review, the project
☐ is EXEMPT from further oversight.

☐ qualifies for EXPEDITED review and is approved for one year without modification. Expiration date / /

☐ qualifies for EXPEDITED review and is approved contingent upon the following modifications: [Submit to UWW RSP for approval.]

☐ see attachment for details

☐ requires FULL BOARD REVIEW and will be included on the next IRB agenda / /

☐ must be RESUBMITTED with modifications/additional information as described below before a review decision is made

☐ see attachment for details

REVIEW OF PROTOCOL MODIFICATIONS (AND/OR CONDITION FULFILLMENT)
I have reviewed the modifications to the protocol and determined that the modified protocol
☐ is APPROVED. ☐ must be RESUBMITTED with modifications as described below. [Submit to UWW RSP for approval.]

☐ see attachment for details

REVIEW AUTHORIZATION

TYPED/PRINTED NAME IRB CHAIR/DESIGNEE SIGNATURE DATE
If you should make any changes in the protocol involving 1) method, 2) subjects, 3) informed consent, and/or 4) subject identification, you must resubmit the protocol. The case number assigned to this protocol is listed on the Protocol Coversheet; please reference this number in all future correspondence. You are responsible for submission of an Annual Progress Report (if necessary) and for maintaining all records related to this project for at least three years after completion of the research project.

DISTRIBUTED TO P1(s), STUDENT P1(s) ON/FR
AGENDA DATE AGENDA ACTION # REV # RAT DECISION MEMO SENT ON/FR
APR □ Y □ N FUL DATE
February 1, 2004

Dear UWW Students and Employees,

I am inviting you to complete a 5-minute survey sponsored by Chancellor Miller. To complete the survey, click on the LINK TO THE SURVEY at the end of this email.

The survey is going to randomly selected students and employees (18 years or older) to assess perceptions of our campus. I expect the results to benefit UWW by raising awareness of our campus climate, especially for those with diverse backgrounds and perspectives, and by helping UWW to plan programs and services that better ensure the welfare, safety, and productivity of all members of the UWW community.

Completing the survey is voluntary, and you can stop at any time. If you decide not to complete the survey, there is no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

To protect anonymity, you will not be asked for identifying information at the survey website. There will be no link between you and your responses, and all responses will be kept on a server designed to secure survey information. Only authorized research associates connected with the project can access the responses. Survey results will be used in summary form only and particular attention will be paid to eliminating possible unintentional identifying information from small groups. When the study is complete, the online file will be destroyed.

You cannot be personally connected to your survey responses if you complete the survey at home or on campus. If completed on a home computer, only the location of the Internet Provider (IP#) could be identified and only with a subpoena. If completed on a campus computer, only the location of the computer could be identified and only with a subpoena. If you would prefer to give your perspective verbally or on a hard copy survey, or if you'd like more information about the project, please contact Dr. Poorman poormannp@uwwm.edu. If you have concerns about your rights or treatment as a participant in this study, contact: ehlend@uwwm.edu.

Some survey questions are about experiences that may have caused distress, so recalling them may be distressing. If the survey questions cause you distress or discomfort and you'd like professional help to deal with this, click on this link for contact information: http://

Thank you for considering our invitation to take part in this survey.

To complete the survey now, click on this link: http://

Sincerely,

Paula B. Poorman, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Psychology
Appendix D

Campus Climate Survey:
Student-Short Form
Employee-Short Form
# Campus Climate Survey (Student-Short Form)

Completing and submitting the survey indicates that you are at least 18 years of age and give your informed consent to participate in this study. This site will be available until April 1, 2005.

1. **UW-W provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay, lesbian, bisexual,</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or transgendered people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of color</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of all religious</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affiliations/spiritual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **UW-W administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay, lesbian, bisexual,</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or transgendered people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of color</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of all religious</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affiliations/spiritual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **UW-W does a good job of providing events, such as speakers, art, and music that feature:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay, lesbian, bisexual,</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or transgendered people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of color</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of all religious</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affiliations/spiritual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campus Climate Survey (Student-Short Form)

4. I have been harassed, discriminated against, or denied access because of my:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived or actual sexual orientation</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or ethnicity</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation or spiritual beliefs</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex or gender identity</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I have witnessed other students, staff, or faculty being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on their:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived or actual sexual orientation</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or ethnicity</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation or spiritual beliefs</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex or gender identity</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Campus Climate Survey (Student-Short Form)

6. Equal opportunities for leadership positions (such as student organization officers, orientation leaders, resident assistants) are available to students who are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay, Lesbian, bisexual,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or transgendered people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of all religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affiliations/spiritual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Back] [Next] [Cancel]
Campus Climate Survey (Student-Short Form)

7. What is your academic class at UW-Whitewater?
   - Freshman
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior
   - Graduate Student
   - Other

8. Mark any visible or invisible disabilities you have. Mark ALL that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing Impairment</th>
<th>Visual Impairment</th>
<th>Mobility Limitation</th>
<th>Speech Impairment</th>
<th>Learning Disability</th>
<th>Mental Health Problem</th>
<th>Medical Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invisible</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What is your race?
   - Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native
   - Latino/Hispanic
   - Black (Non-Hispanic)
   - Asian or Pacific Islander
   - White (Non-Hispanic)
   - Biracial or Multiracial

10. What is your sex/gender identity?
    - Female
    - Male
    - Transgender

11. What is your sexual orientation?
    - Gay
    - Lesbian
    - Bisexual
    - Heterosexual/Straight
    - Uncertain/Questioning
12. What is your primary religious or spiritual affiliation?

- Catholic
- Protestant
- Christian
- Muslim
- Eastern Religion
- Unitarian
- Jewish
- Mormon
- Quaker
- Native American spiritual traditions
- Nature-oriented spiritual traditions
- Other, please specify

After completing the survey, please be sure to close all browser windows to eliminate the possibility of unauthorized access to your responses.
Campus Climate Survey (Employee-Short Form)

Campus Climate Survey - Employee

Completing and submitting the survey indicates that you are at least 18 years of age and give your informed consent to participate in this study. This site will be available until April 1, 2005.

1. UW-W provides a safe, non-threatening, and accessible atmosphere for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of color</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of all religious affiliations/spiritual beliefs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. UW-W administration adequately responds to incidents of harassment and discrimination against:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of color</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of all religious affiliations/spiritual beliefs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. UW-W does a good job of providing events, such as speakers, art, and music that feature:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered people</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of color</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of all religious affiliations/spiritual beliefs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Campus Climate Survey (Employee-Short Form)**

4. I have been harassed, discriminated against, or denied access because of my:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived or actual</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or ethnicity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation or</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiritual beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex or gender identity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I have witnessed other students, staff, or faculty being harassed, discriminated against, or denied access based on their:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived or actual</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or ethnicity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation or</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiritual beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex or gender identity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I believe I have been passed over for promotion, received low/no merit increase, not had my contract renewed, or been denied tenure because of my:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived or actual</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or ethnicity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation or</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiritual beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex or gender identity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campus Climate Survey (Employee-Short Form)

7. What is your position at UW-Whitewater?
   - Academic Staff (Non-teaching)
   - Academic Staff (Teaching)
   - Classified Staff
   - Faculty

8. Mark any visible or invisible disabilities you have. Mark ALL that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hearing Impairment</th>
<th>Visual Impairment</th>
<th>Mobility Limitation</th>
<th>Speech Impairment</th>
<th>Learning Disability</th>
<th>Mental Health Problem</th>
<th>Medical Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visible</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invisible</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What is your race?
   - Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native
   - Latino/Hispanic
   - Black (Non-Hispanic)
   - Asian or Pacific Islander
   - White (Non-Hispanic)
   - Biracial or Multiracial

10. What is your sex/gender identity?
    - Female
    - Male
    - Transgender

11. What is your sexual orientation?
    - Gay
    - Lesbian
    - Bisexual
    - Heterosexual/Straight
    - Uncertain/Questioning
12. What is your primary religious or spiritual affiliation?
   - Catholic
   - Protestant
   - Christian
   - Muslim
   - Eastern Religion
   - Unitarian
   - Jewish
   - Mormon
   - Quaker
   - Native American spiritual traditions
   - Nature-oriented spiritual traditions
   - I am not affiliated with an organized religion or spiritual tradition at this time
   - Other, please specify

After completing the survey, please be sure to close all browser windows to eliminate the possibility of unauthorized access to your responses.