Climate In Higher Education

Assessing Campus Climate

What is it?
- Campus Climate is a construct

Definition?
- Current attitudes, behaviors, and standards and practices of employees and students of an institution

How is it measured?
- Personal Experiences
- Perceptions
- Institutional Efforts
Campus Climate & Students

How students experience their campus environment influences both learning and developmental outcomes.¹

Discriminatory environments have a negative effect on student learning.²

Research supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty on enhancing learning outcomes.³

² Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Hagedron, 1999; Feagin, Vera & Imani, 1996; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005
The personal and professional development of employees including faculty members, administrators, and staff members are impacted by campus climate.\(^1\)

Faculty members who judge their campus climate more positively are more likely to feel personally supported and perceive their work unit as more supportive.\(^2\)

Research underscores the relationships between (1) workplace discrimination and negative job/career attitudes and (2) workplace encounters with prejudice and lower health/well-being.\(^3\)

---

1Settles, Cortina, Malley, and Stewart , 2006, Gardner, S. (2013); Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, J. 2009
2Costello, 2012; Sears, 2002; Kaminski, & Geisler, 2012; Griffin, Pérez , Holmes, & Mayo  2010
3Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2007; Waldo, 1999
Projected Outcomes

University of Florida will add to their knowledge base with regard to how constituent groups currently feel about their particular campus climate and how the community responds to them (e.g., work-life issues, curricular integration, inter-group/intra-group relations, respect issues).

University of Florida will use the results of the assessment to inform current/on-going work.
Setting the Context for Beginning the Work

Examine the Research
- Review work already completed

Preparation
- Readiness of each campus

Assessment
- Examine the climate

Follow-up
- Building on the successes and addressing the challenges
Project Overview

Phase I
• Assessment Tool Development and Implementation

Phase II
• Data Analysis

Phase III
• Final Report and Presentation
Phase I
Spring/Summer 2015

UF created the Climate Study Working Group (CSWG; comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators)

CSWG met to develop the survey instrument, reviewed multiple drafts, and approved the final survey instrument.

The survey was distributed to faculty and staff of the UF community via an invitation from President W. Kent Fuchs.
Instrument/Sample

Final instrument
- 79 questions and additional space for respondents to provide commentary (17 qualitative, 62 quantitative)
- On-line or paper & pencil options

Sample = Population
- All faculty and staff of UF’s community received an invitation to participate.
Survey Limitations

- Self-selection bias
- Response rates
- Social desirability
- Caution in generalizing results for constituent groups with low response rates
Method Limitation

Data were not reported for groups of fewer than 5 individuals where identity could be compromised.

Instead, small groups were combined to eliminate possibility of identifying individuals.
Phase II
Winter 2015/Spring 2016

Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted
Phase III
Spring 2016

Report draft reviewed by the CSWG

Final report submitted to UF

Presentation to UF campus community
Results

Response Rates
Who are the respondents?

5,590 people responded to the call to participate
36.1% overall response rate
Response Rates by Position

- Faculty ($n = 2,037$)
  - 36%

- Staff ($n = 3,277$)
  - 37%

- Postdoctoral Associate ($n = 117$)
  - 19%

- University Athletic Association ($n = 159$)
  - 40%
Response Rates by Gender Identity

- **40%**
  - Woman (*n* = 3,244)

- **31%**
  - Man (*n* = 2,248)

- **N/A**
  - Genderqueer (*n* = 22)

- **N/A**
  - Transgender (*n* < 5)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- 26% • Asian/Asian American/South Asian ($n = 302$)
- 23% • Black/African American ($n = 358$)
- 23% • Latin@/Chican@/Hispanic ($n = 256$)
- 39% • White ($n = 4,213$)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

- **44%** • First Nation/American Indian/Indigenous (n = 16)
- **N/A** • Middle Eastern/North African (n = 27)
- **46%** • Pacific Islander (n = 5)
- **>100%** • Multiple Race (n = 219)
Results

Additional Demographic Characteristics
Respondents by Position (%)

- Faculty: 36%
- Postdoctoral Associate: 2%
- Staff: 59%
- University Athletic Association: 3%
Respondents by UF Location and Position Status (%)

Gainsville: 93% Staff, 82% Faculty, 82% Postdoctoral Associate
Jacksonville: 4% Staff, 0% Faculty, 2% Postdoctoral Associate
Not Listed: 13% Staff, 17% Faculty, 5% Postdoctoral Associate
Respondents’ Racial/Ethnic Identity (%)
(Duplicated Total)

- White: 77%
- Black/African/African American: 7%
- Hispanic/Latino/Chicano: 6%
- Asian/Asian American: 6%
- American Indian: 1%
- Middle Eastern: 1%
- Pacific Islander: <1%
- Native Hawaiian: <1%
- Alaskan Native: <1%
- Racial Identity Not Listed: 1%

Note: Responses with n < 5 are not presented in the figure.
Respondents’ Racial/Ethnic Identity (%) (Unduplicated Total)

- White: 75%
- Asian/Asian American: 5%
- Black/African American: 6%
- Latin@/Chican@/Hispanic: 5%
- Other People of Color: 1%
- Mixed Race: 4%
- Race, Other/Missing/Unknown: 4%
Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (%)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Respondents by Sexual Identity and Position Status ($n$)

- Faculty
- Postdoctoral Associate
- Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGBQ</th>
<th>Heterosexual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>2849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
9% \((n = 511)\) of Respondents Had Disabilities that Substantially Affected Learning, Working, or Living Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic diagnosis or medical condition</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health/psychological condition</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disability</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/mobility condition that affects walking</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing impaired or deaf</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A disability/condition not listed here</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/mobility condition that does not affect walking</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually impaired or blind</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/communication condition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired/traumatic brain injury</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asperger’s/Autism spectrum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Faith-Based Affiliation (%)

- Christian Affiliation: 54%
- No Affiliation: 32%
- Multiple Affiliations: 6%
- Other Faith-Based Affiliations: 5%
- Other: 0%
## Citizenship Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen, birth</td>
<td>4,754</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen, naturalized</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Resident</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visa holder (such as J-1, H1-B, and U)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other legally documented status</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee status</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently under a withholding of removal status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAPA (Deferred Action for Parental Accountability)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Military Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have not been in the military</td>
<td>5,210</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active military</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservist/National Guard</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Age and Position Status ($n$)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Respondents’ Dependent Care Status by Position Status (%)

- **Faculty**:
  - No dependent care: 49%
  - Children under 18 yrs: 56%
  - Dependent child 18 yrs or older: 51%
  - Independent child 18 yrs or older: 37%
  - Sick/disabled partner: 9%
  - Senior/other: 55%

- **Postdoctoral Associate**:
  - No dependent care: 44%
  - Children under 18 yrs: 37%
  - Dependent child 18 yrs or older: 8%
  - Independent child 18 yrs or older: 3%
  - Sick/disabled partner: 2%
  - Senior/other: 2%

- **Staff**:
  - No dependent care: 55%
  - Children under 18 yrs: 9%
  - Dependent child 18 yrs or older: 8%
  - Independent child 18 yrs or older: 3%
  - Sick/disabled partner: 2%
  - Senior/other: 13%

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Findings
Comfort Levels with Climate

- Overall Campus (73%)
- Department or Work Unit (70%)
- Classroom or learning environment (85%)
Comfort With Overall Campus Climate

Respondents who had a Christian Affiliation or Other Faith-Based Affiliations more comfortable than respondents who had No Affiliation or Multiple Faith-Based Affiliations

Women and Men respondents more comfortable than Transgender/Genderqueer/Other respondents
Comfort With Overall Campus Climate

Respondents with No Disabilities more comfortable than respondents with Disabilities

U.S. Citizens, Non-U.S. Citizens, and respondents with Multiple Citizenships more comfortable than Naturalized U.S. Citizen respondents

Asian/Asian American, Latin@/Chican@/ Hispanic, Other People of Color, and White respondents more comfortable than Black/African American and Multiracial respondents
Comfort With Department/Work Unit Climate

Men respondents more comfortable than Women respondents

Asian/Asian American, Latin@/Chican@/Hispanic, Other People of Color, and White respondents more comfortable than Black/African American and Multiracial respondents
Comfort With Department/Work Unit Climate

U.S. Citizens, Non-U.S. Citizens, and respondents with Multiple Citizenships more comfortable than Naturalized U.S. Citizen respondents

Respondents with No Disabilities more comfortable than respondents with Disabilities
Comfort With Classroom/Learning Environment Climate

Faculty respondents more comfortable than Postdoctoral Associate and Staff respondents

Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents with Other Faith-Based Affiliation, No Affiliation, and Multiple Affiliations more comfortable than respondents who had Christian Affiliations

Men Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents more comfortable than Women Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents
Comfort With Classroom Climate

Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents with No Disabilities more comfortable than Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents with Disabilities

U.S. Citizen, Naturalized U.S. Citizen, and Non-U.S. Citizen Faculty, Postdoctoral Associate, and Staff respondents more comfortable than respondents with Multiple Citizenships

Asian/Asian American, Latin@/Chican@/ Hispanic, Other People of Color, and White respondents more comfortable than Black/African American and Multiracial respondents
Challenges and Opportunities
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

1,325 respondents indicated that they had personally experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct at University of Florida in the past year.
Personally Experienced Based on…(%)

- Position (n=470)
- Educational credentials (n=275)
- Age (n=259)
- Gender/gender identity (n=248)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 1,325).
Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
## Top 6 Forms of Experienced Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienced a hostile work environment.</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignored or excluded.</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied.</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated or left out.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of workplace incivility.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of derogatory verbal remarks.</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 1,325). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Position Status (%)

- **Overall experienced conduct**¹
  - Faculty: 23% (n = 465)¹
  - Staff: 25% (n = 818)¹

- **Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, indicated they experienced conduct as a result of position status**²
  - Faculty: 23% (n = 108)²
  - Staff: 42% (n = 347)²

¹ Percentages are based on total n split by group.
² Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Educational Attainment (%)

- Overall experienced conduct¹
- Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, indicated they experienced conduct as a result of their educational attainment²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct¹</th>
<th>Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, indicated they experienced conduct as a result of their educational attainment²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed HS/GED or Some College</td>
<td>23% (n = 595)¹</td>
<td>21% (n = 137)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Tech Cert/Associates</td>
<td>24% (n = 454)</td>
<td>24% (n = 110)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's/Some Grad Work</td>
<td>26% (n = 1,266)¹</td>
<td>26% (n = 325)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>22% (n = 1,194)¹</td>
<td>24% (n = 260)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/Doctoral/Professional</td>
<td>23% (n = 2,008)¹</td>
<td>15% (n = 469)²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages are based on total n split by group.
² Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Age (%)

- **Overall experienced conduct**¹
- **Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, indicated they experienced conduct as a result of their age**²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Overall Experienced Conduct</th>
<th>Experienced as a Result of Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>20% (n = 95)¹</td>
<td>63% (n = 19)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>23% (n = 956)¹</td>
<td>32% (n = 218)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>25% (n = 1,218)¹</td>
<td>16% (n = 298)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>24% (n = 1,371)¹</td>
<td>6% (n = 324)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>24% (n = 1,304)¹</td>
<td>22% (n = 314)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>15% (n = 1,218)¹</td>
<td>44% (n = 48)²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages are based on total n split by group.
² Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Gender Identity (%)

- Overall experienced conduct

Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, indicated they experienced conduct as a result of their gender identity

Men
- Overall: 19% (n = 435)
- Gender identity: 7% (n = 29)

Women
- Overall: 27% (n = 859)
- Gender identity: 24% (n = 208)

Trans/Genderqueer/Other
- Overall: 29% (n = 10)
- Gender identity: (n < 5)

1 Percentages are based on total n split by group.
2 Percentages are based on n split by group for those who believed they had personally experienced this conduct.
## Location of Experienced Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While working at a UF job</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a UF administrative office</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with one other person</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a faculty office</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n = 1,325$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Position Status (%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct ($n = 1,325$).
Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Source of Experienced Conduct by Position Status (%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 1,325). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?
Emotional Responses

- Felt uncomfortable (77%)
- Was angry (62%)
- Felt embarrassed (38%)
- Was afraid (20%)
- Ignored it (19%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct \((n = 1,325)\). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?
Support

- Told a family member (43%)
- Told a friend (39%)
- Didn’t do anything (34%)
- Avoided the person/venue (34%)
- Didn’t know to whom to go (21%)
- Contacted an on-campus resource (19%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct \( n = 1,325 \). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do? Reporting

Felt that it was not responded to appropriately (67%)

While the outcome was not what I had hoped for, I felt as though my complaint was responded to appropriately (20%)

Felt satisfied with the outcome. (13%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct (n = 1,325). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Theme

Experienced Exclusionary Conduct

Supervisor/Administrator incivility

Coworker incivility

Negative environment

Concerns with reporting incivility
## Facilities Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-campus transportation/parking</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways, pedestrian paths, crosswalks</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevators/lifts</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom buildings</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Technology/Online Environment Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology/Online</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible electronic format</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic forms</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic signage</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructional Campus Materials Barrier for Respondents with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Campus Materials</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents Who *Seriously Considered* Leaving University of Florida

- **63%** of Faculty respondents \((n = 1,287)\)
- **54%** of Staff respondents \((n = 1,746)\)
- **56%** of Postdoctoral Associate respondents \((n = 76)\)
Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving University of Florida by Select Demographics

- 62% of Transgender/Genderqueer/Other respondents
- 62% of Men respondents
- 53% of Women respondents

- 69% of respondents with Disabilities
- 56% of respondents with No Disability
Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving University of Florida by Race

- 58% of White respondents
- 58% of Mixed Race respondents
- 54% of Other Respondents of Color
- 55% of Black/African American respondents,
- 51% of Latin@/Chican@/Hispanic respondents
- 43% of Asian/Asian American respondents
Respondents Who
*Seriously Considered Leaving* University of Florida by Faith-Based Affiliation

65% of respondents with Multiple Affiliations
61% of respondents with No Affiliation
54% of respondents with Christian Affiliations
52% of Other Faith-Based Affiliation respondents
Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving University of Florida by Age

- 58% between ages 35 and 44 years
- 57% between ages 55 and 64 years
- 56% between ages 45 and 54 years
- 53% between ages 25 and 34 years
- 52% age 65 years old and older
- 47% between ages 22 and 24 years
### Top 7 Reasons Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving University of Florida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons (salary, resources, etc.)</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in a position at another institution/employer</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate was not welcoming</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited or offered a position at another institution/employer</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table includes answers from only those respondents who indicated that they considered leaving ($n = 3,171$).
Qualitative Themes for Respondents
Why Considered leaving…

Lack of compensation (benefits, salary, workload)

Negative work environment

Lack of professional development

Top-down leadership – Lack of voice
Perceptions
Respondents who observed conduct or communications directed towards a person/group of people that created an exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile working or learning environment…

27%  \( (n = 1,488) \)
## Top 7 Forms of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory remarks</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person experienced a hostile work environment</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person isolated or left out</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person deliberately ignored or excluded</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was the target of workplace incivility</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person received a low performance evaluation</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 1,488). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct Based on…(%)
Source of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct (%)

- Coworker (27%)
- Faculty member/instructional staff (26%)
- Supervisor (24%)
- Staff member (18%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 1,488).
Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Target of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct (%)

- Staff member (33%)
- Faculty member/instructional staff (22%)
- Student (18%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 1,488). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Location of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While working at a UF job</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In UF administrative office</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a public space at UF</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 1,488). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)

- **LGBQ (n = 364)**: 40%
- **Heterosexual (n = 4,872)**: 26%
- **Other (n = 53)**: 26%
- **Trans/Genderqueer/Other (n = 34)**: 47%
- **Women (n = 3,230)**: 29%
- **Men (n = 2,237)**: 23%
- **No Disability (n = 5,037)**: 25%
- **Single Disability (n = 508)**: 42%
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Select Demographics (%)

- Multiple Citizenships (n = 81) 24%
- Non-U.S. Citizen (n = 319) 18%
- U.S. Citizen, Naturalized (n = 459) 22%
- U.S. Citizen (n = 4,659) 28%
- Multiple Affiliations (n = 256) 33%
- No Affiliation (n = 1794) 29%
- Other Faith-Based Affiliation (n = 332) 22%
- Christian Affiliation (n = 2986) 25%
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Race/Ethnicity (%)
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Position (%)

- **Faculty (n = 2,026)**: 27%
- **Postdoctoral Associate (n = 117)**: 21%
- **Staff (n = 3,261)**: 28%
What did you do?

Emotional Responses

- Felt uncomfortable (75%)
- Was angry (54%)
- Felt embarrassed (30%)
- Was afraid (11%)
- Ignored it (8%)
- Felt somehow responsible (8%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 1,488). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
What did you do?

- Didn’t do anything (32%)
- Told a family member (23%)
- Told a friend (23%)
- Avoided the person/venue (15%)
- Didn’t know to whom to go (15%)
- Contacted an on-campus resource (14%)
- Confronted the person(s) later (12%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 1,488). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
21% of Respondents who Observed Conduct Reported It

Felt that it was not responded to appropriately (49%)

While the outcome was not what I had hoped for, I felt as though my complaint was responded to appropriately (28%)

Felt satisfied with the outcome. (22%)

Note: Only answered by respondents who observed harassment (n = 1,488). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Qualitative Themes

Observed Conduct

Response after conduct

Identification of the perpetrator of conduct

Basis of conduct
Employee Perceptions
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Hiring Practices

- 23% Faculty respondents
- 13% Postdoctoral Associate respondents
- 24% Staff respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Hiring Practices

Characteristics of candidates

Favoritism

Hiring process inefficient
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

- 14% Faculty respondents
- 6% Postdoctoral Associate respondents
- 14% Staff respondents
Qualitative Themes
Discriminatory Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

Authority as offender

Demographic characteristics of target

Fear of consequences
Employee Perceptions of Unfair/Unjust Practices Related to Promotion

- 31% Faculty respondents
- 13% Postdoctoral Associate respondents
- 26% Staff respondents
Qualitative Themes

Discriminatory Practices Related to Promotion

Unclear tenure process

Favoritism

Unfair promotion process
Most Common Bases for Discriminatory Employment Practices

- Friendship
- Position
- Nepotism
- Gender/Gender Identity
- Ethnicity
- Racial Identity
- Age
Positive views of campus climate were held by the majority of respondents.
90% indicated that UF was supportive of taking extended leave

89% believed that their supervisors were supportive of their taking leave
Staff Respondents
Examples of Successes

85% believed that UF provided them with resources to pursue training/professional development opportunities

85% agreed that UF policies (e.g., FMLA) were applied fairly across UF
83% had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it.

83% felt that their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance.
Staff Respondents
Examples of Challenges

67%
• Hierarchy existed within staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than others

60%
• Disagreed that there were clear procedures on how one can advance at UF

41%
• Performed more work than colleagues with similar performance expectations
Staff Respondents
Examples of Challenges

38%
- Felt that people who have children or elder care were burdened with balancing work and family responsibilities

27%
- Felt pressured by departmental/program work requirements that occurred outside of normally scheduled hours
Qualitative Themes
Staff Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Lack of work-life balance
Equal treatment
Inadequate performance evaluations
Family concerns (child care, maternity)
Qualitative Themes
Staff Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Lack of compensation

Concerns with “taking leave”

Staff devalued in university hierarchy

Family concerns (child care, maternity)
Tenured and Tenure-Accruing Faculty Respondents
Examples of Successes

88% felt that research was valued by UF

75% felt that criteria for tenure were clear

74% felt that they had opportunities to participate in substantive committee assignments
Tenured and Tenure-Accruing Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- **58%**
  - Disagreed that faculty opinions are taken seriously by senior administrators

- **50%**
  - Performed more work to help students than did their colleagues

- **42%**
  - Burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations
Qualitative Themes
Tenured and Tenure-Accruing Faculty Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

- Lack of respect
- Difficulty balancing research, service, and teaching
- Unclear tenure and promotion process
Non-Tenure-Accruing, Permanent Status, Permanent Status Accruing, and Adjunct Faculty Respondents

Examples of Successes

- 92% agreed that research was valued by UF
- 73% agreed that teaching was valued by UF
- 76% believed that clear expectations existed of their responsibilities
Non-Tenure-Accruing, Permanent Status, Permanent Status Accruing, and Adjunct Faculty Respondents

Examples of Challenges

- 48% felt pressured to do extra work that was uncompensated.
- 40% believed they performed more work to help students than did their colleagues.
- 38% felt burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations.
Qualitative Themes
Non-Tenure-Accruing, Permanent Status, Permanent Status Accruing, and Adjunct Faculty Respondents

Work-Life Attitudes

Lack of compensation for workload expectations

Unclear criteria for advancement

Value of research over teaching
Qualitative Themes
Non-Tenure-Accruing, Permanent Status, Permanent Status Accruing, and Adjunct Faculty Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Faculty voices ignored

De-valuing “Extension”
All Faculty Respondents Examples of Successes

- 76% believed they had job security
- 74% believed their colleagues included them in opportunities that will help their career as much as they do others in their position
- 75% reported that health insurance benefits were competitive
All Faculty Respondents
Examples of Challenges

65%
• Believed that people who have children or elder care were burdened with balancing work and family responsibilities

56%
• Disagreed that salaries for adjunct professors are competitive

21%
• Believed that people who do not have children were burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children
Qualitative Themes
All Faculty Respondents
Work-Life Attitudes

Lack of competitive salaries/Decreasing benefits

Lack of faculty support

Work-life issues

Lack of job security
Faculty and Postdoctoral Associate Respondents
Examples of Successes

- 57% felt their research was valued
- 52% felt their service contributions were valued
- 53% felt their teaching was valued
Faculty and Postdoctoral Associate Respondents
Examples of Challenges

- 23% Thought that faculty in their departments pre-judged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background
- 18% Thought that their department chair/head chairs pre-judged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background
Institutional Actions
Faculty and Postdoctoral Associate Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate

- Mentorship for new faculty
- Access to adequate childcare
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Clear process to resolve conflicts
Faculty and Postdoctoral Associate Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate

- Career span development opportunities for faculty at all ranks
- Flexibility for stopping the tenure clock
- Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- Resources for reporting concerns
Faculty and Postdoctoral Associate Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Initiatives that Influenced Climate 

*Less Positively*

- Diversity-related professional experiences as one of the criteria for hiring of staff/faculty
- Equity and diversity training to promotion and tenure committees
- Equity and diversity training to search committees
- Diversity and equity training for faculty
- Recognition and rewards for including diversity issues in courses across the curriculum
Qualitative Themes
Faculty and Postdoctoral Associate Respondents
Institutional Actions

Diversity (mixed views)
Don’t know about initiatives
Lack of focus on family needs
Ineffective training
Staff Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate

- Career development opportunities for staff
- Mentorship for new staff
- Access to counseling for people who have experienced harassment
- A fair process to resolve conflicts
Staff Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Initiatives that Positively Influenced Climate

- Resources for reporting concerns
- Diversity and equity training for staff
- A clear process to resolve conflicts
- Access to affordable childcare
Staff Respondents’ Perceptions of Campus Initiatives that Influenced Climate *Less Positively*

- Diversity-related professional experiences as one of the criteria for hiring of staff/faculty
- Equity and diversity training to search/hiring committees
Qualitative Themes
Staff Respondents
Institutional Actions

Fear of retaliation

Ineffective training

Lack of focus on family needs
Summary

Strengths and Successes
Opportunities for Improvement
Although colleges and universities attempt to foster welcoming and inclusive environments, they are not immune to negative societal attitudes and discriminatory behaviors.

As a microcosm of the larger social environment, college and university campuses reflect the pervasive prejudices of society.

Classism, Racism, Sexism, Genderism, Heterosexism, etc.

Overall Strengths and Successes

- **70-73%** of respondents were comfortable with the overall climate and department/work unit climate at UF.

- **62%** of respondents were comfortable with the climate in their classes/learning environment.

- The majority of respondents expressed **positive perceptions** of the workplace climate.

- The majority of respondents **felt valued** and that **their work was valued** at UF.
Overall Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement

- 27% had observed exclusionary conduct within the last year at UF
- 33% of respondents felt valued by senior administration
- 24% had personally experienced exclusionary conduct within the last year at UF
- 57% of respondents seriously considered leaving UF
Next Steps
Process Forward
Sharing the Report with the Community
Spring 2016

Full Power Point available on UF website

Full Report available on UF website

http://president.ufl.edu/initiatives/uf-faculty-and-staff-climate-survey/
Join the Conversation!

YOUR VOICE. YOUR UF.
FACULTY & STAFF CLIMATE INITIATIVE
Faculty and staff forums moderated by members of UF’s Climate Study Work Group and the President’s Council on Diversity will provide the campus community with opportunities to:

- Review and discuss the results
- Share thoughts on the most salient results
- Brainstorm action items and next steps
“Save your spot” to attend one of these sessions by clicking on the registration link at:

http://president.ufl.edu/initiatives/uf-faculty-and-staff-climate-survey/next-steps/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 20</td>
<td>9 to 11 a.m.</td>
<td>Straughn Professional Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 11</td>
<td>9 to 11 a.m.</td>
<td>JWRU Rion Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 16*</td>
<td>1:30 to 3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Room 120, HRS Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 13</td>
<td>10 a.m. to noon</td>
<td>JWRU Rion Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10</td>
<td>3 to 5 p.m.</td>
<td>JWRU Rion Ballroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Video-streamed with an opportunity to participate electronically
Questions and Discussion