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Assessing Campus Climate

Definition
- Climate is defined by R&A as the current attitudes and behaviors of faculty, staff, administrators, and students, as well as institutional policies and procedures, which influence the level of respect for individual needs, abilities, and potential

Measurement
- 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 Mayhew, Rockenbach, Bowman, Seifert, & Wolniak, 2016; Shelton, 2019; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009; Crisp, Taggart, & Nora, 2015;
The personal and professional development of employees 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 and career attitudes and (2) workplace encounters with prejudice and lower health and well-being.³

¹ Gardner, 2013; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Smith, 2015; Urrieta, Méndez, & Rodríguez, 2015
³ Young, Anderson, & Stewart, 2014; Costello, 2012; Garcia, 2016; Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2006
Climate Matters
Climate Matters
What Are Students Demanding?

While the demands vary by institutional context, a qualitative analysis reveals similar themes across the 76 institutions and organizations (representing 73 U.S. colleges and universities, three Canadian universities, one coalition of universities and one consortium of Atlanta HBCUs.)

Chessman & Wayt explore these overarching themes in an effort to provide collective insight into what is important to today's students in the heated context of racial or other bias-related incidents on college and university campuses.

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016; http://www.thedemands.org/
Seven Major Themes

- Policy (91%)
- Leadership (89%)
- Resources (88%)
- Increased Diversity (86%)
- Training (71%)
- Curriculum (68%)
- Support (61%)

Source: Chessman & Wayt, 2016; http://www.thedemands.org/
Responses to Unwelcoming Campus Climates

What are students’ behavioral responses?
Lack of Persistence

30% of student respondents have seriously considered leaving their institution.

What do students offer as the main reason for their departure?

Source: R&A, 2015; Rankin et al., 2010; Strayhorn, 2012
University of Rhode Island (URI) 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).

URI will use the results of the survey 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
- **Survey**
  - Examine the climate
- **Follow-up**
  - Building on the successes and addressing the challenges
Transformational Tapestry Model

Assessment

Contextualized Campus Wide Assessment

Baseline Organizational Challenges
Systems Analysis
Local / State / Regional Environments

Advanced Organizational Challenges
Consultant Recommendations

Transformation via Intervention

Symbolic Actions
Educational Actions
Administrative Actions
Fiscal Actions

Access Retention
University Policies/Service
Transformed Campus Climate
Curriculum Pedagogy
External Relations
Intergroup & Intragroup Relations
Research Scholarship

External Relations
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Project Overview

Phase I
- Initial Meetings
- Outreach Plan
- Survey Tool Development and Implementation

Phase II
- Data Analysis

Phase III
- Final Report and Presentation
- Develop Actions
Phase I
Fall 2020 – Spring 2021

The URI Climate Study Working Group (CSWG) was created and included URI faculty, staff, and students.

Meetings were held with the CSWG to develop the survey instrument.

The CSWG reviewed multiple drafts of the survey and approved the final survey instrument.

The final survey was distributed in Spring 2021 to all URI faculty, staff, and students via an invitation from President David M. Dooley.
Phase II
Spring 2021

Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted
Phase III
Summer 2021 – Fall 2021

Report draft reviewed by the CSWG

Final report submitted to URI

Presentation to URI campus community

Identify process to develop actions
Online Survey Instrument

- 119 questions including 18 open-ended questions to provide commentary

Sample = Population

- All community members were invited to take the survey
- Available from March 2\textsuperscript{nd} through April 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2021
Structure of the Survey

Section

1: Personal Experiences of Campus Climate

2: Workplace Climate for Employees

3. Demographic Information

4. Perceptions of Campus Climate

5. Institutional Actions
Survey Limitations

Self-selection bias

Response rates

Social desirability

Caution in generalizing results for constituent groups with low response rates
Protecting Confidentiality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data were not reported for groups of fewer than 5 individuals where identity could be compromised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instead, small groups were combined to eliminate possibility of identifying individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some qualitative comments were redacted to protect confidentiality of respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Response Rates
Who are the respondents?

22.4% overall response rate

4,555 surveys were returned

Suggest caution in generalizing results for constituent groups with low response rates
Response Rates by Position

- 18% • Student \((n = 3,225)\)
- 42% • Faculty \((n = 510)\)
- 43% • Staff \((n = 820)\)
Response Rates by Racial/Ethnic Identity

- 32% • Asian Pacific Islander Desi American (APIDA, n = 261)
- 17% • Black/African/African American (n = 175)
- 13% • Latinx (n = 229)
- 86% • Additional Respondents of Color (n = 44)
Response Rates by Racial/Ethnic Identity

- **23%**
  - White \((n = 3,370)\)

- **ND**
  - Multiracial \((n = 331)\)
Respondents by Position (%)

- Student: 71%
- Faculty: 11%
- Staff: 18%
Respondents by Gender Identity and Position Status (%)

Trans-spectrum respondents (n = 123) – sample n too small to conduct some subsequent analyses
Responses with n < 5 are not presented in the figure.
### Respondents by Racial Identity (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Identity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/European American</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx/Chicano</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian American</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African/African American</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A racial/ethnic identity not listed</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
CSWG assisted R&A in recoding variables where sample size was insufficient for monoracial analyses.
Respondents by Sexual Identity and Position Status (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Identity</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queer-spectrum</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses with n < 5 are not presented in the figure.
18% \((n = 836)\) of Respondents Had a Condition that Influenced Their Learning, Living, or Working Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top conditions for those with a disability</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental health/psychological condition</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning difference/disability</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic diagnosis or medical condition</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only top disabilities/conditions listed here. For details on all disabilities/conditions, please refer to report. Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses.
Respondents by Religious/Spiritual Affiliation (%)

- No Affiliation: 43%
- Christian Affiliation: 42%
- Additional Affiliation: 5%
- Multiple Affiliations: 4%
- Jewish: 2%

CSWG assisted R&A in recoding variables where sample size was insufficient for analyses. Please refer to the report for the full list.
# Respondents by Citizenship/Immigration Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship/Immigration Status</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen by birth</td>
<td>3,995</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized U.S. citizen</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent immigrant status (e.g., lawful permanent resident, refugee, asylee, T visa, VAWA)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary resident – international student</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary resident – dual intent worker (e.g., H-1B visa holder) or other temporary worker status</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other legally documented status</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected status (no protections)</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents by Political Party Affiliation and Position Status (%)

Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Respondents by Current Political Views and Position Status (%)

Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Employee Respondents by Age ($n$)

Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Student Respondents by Age ($n$)

Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Employment Respondents by Caregiving Responsibilities (%)

Percentages are based on respondents who indicated that they had dependent care responsibilities.
Student Respondents by Caregiving Responsibilities (%)

Percentages are based on respondents who indicated that they had dependent care responsibilities.

- Children <= 5 years old: 22%
- Children 6 - 18 years old: 34%
- Children > 18 years old, legally dependent: 11%
- Children > 18 years old, independent: 7%
- Partner/spouse with a disability or illness: 3%
- Senior or other family member: 25%
- A parenting or caregiving responsibility not listed here: 8%
## Employee Respondents’ Length of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–6 years</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–10 years</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–20 years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30 years</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 years</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a list of Staff respondents’ primary division/college/department affiliations please see the full report. For a list of Faculty respondents’ primary college/academic unit affiliations please see the full report.
## Undergraduate Student Respondents’ Years at URI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three years</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four years</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five years</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or more years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a complete list of Undergraduate Student respondents’ majors refer to full report.
### Graduate Student Respondents’ Years at URI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth year</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth year</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth year or more</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--- *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a complete list of Graduate Student respondents’ academic divisions refer to full report.
Student Respondents Percentage of Classes Taken Exclusively Online

- 31% of students have taken all classes online.
- 53% have taken most of their classes online.
- 13% have taken some classes online.
- 3% have taken none of their classes online.
Student Respondents’ Income by Dependency Status

Responses with n < 5 are not presented in the figure.
## Student Respondents’ Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off campus in apartment or house</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate residence hall</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with family member/guardian</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Village</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorority house</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity house</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Engineering Program housing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing insecure (e.g., on a friend’s couch, sleeping in a car, sleeping in a campus office/laboratory)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top responses</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not participate in any clubs, organizations, or societies at URI.</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Life (e.g., Kappa Delta, Sigma Alpha Mu)</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/major (e.g., Psychology Club, CELS Seeds of Success [SOS], Society for Women in Marine Science [SWMS])</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a complete list of Student respondents’ participation in clubs/organizations refer to full report.
43% \((n = 1,133)\) of Undergraduate Student respondents experienced financial hardship while attending URI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top financial hardships</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books/course codes/materials</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a complete list of how Undergraduate Student respondents experienced financial hardship refer to full report.
38\% (n = 215) of Graduate Student respondents experienced financial hardship while attending URI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top financial hardships</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books/course codes/materials</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other campus fees (e.g., course fees, health services fees, lab fees, program fees)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a complete list of how Graduate Student respondents experienced financial hardship refer to full report.
How Student Respondents Were Paying For College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top sources of funding</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family member contribution</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship: University merit (e.g., athletic, presidential, university, music)</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal/state grant (e.g., Pell, Rhode Island Promise)</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contribution/job (resident assistant, off campus job)</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a complete list of how Student respondents were paying for college refer to full report.
### Undergraduate Student Respondents’ Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I work on campus</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–10 hours/week</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20 hours/week</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30 hours/week</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40 hours/week</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes, I work off campus</strong></td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–10 hours/week</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20 hours/week</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30 hours/week</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40 hours/week</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Student Respondents’ Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes, I work on campus</strong></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–10 hours/week</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20 hours/week</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30 hours/week</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40 hours/week</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes, I work off campus</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–10 hours/week</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20 hours/week</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30 hours/week</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40 hours/week</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours/week</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undergraduate Student Respondents’ Reported Cumulative GPA at the End of Fall 2020 Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No GPA at the time – first semester at URI</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75 – 4.00</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 – 3.74</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25 – 3.49</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 – 3.24</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75 – 2.99</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 – 2.74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 – 2.49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 2.24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.99 and below</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Student Respondents’ Reported Cumulative GPA at the End of Fall 2020 Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No GPA at the time – first semester at URI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75 – 4.00</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 – 3.74</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25 – 3.49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 – 3.24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75 – 2.99</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 – 2.74</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 – 2.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 2.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.99 and below</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents’ Primary Methods of Transportation to Campus (%)

- **Student:**
  - Walking: 7% (1%)
  - Bicycle: 3% (2%)
  - Driving alone: 3% (9%)
  - Scooter/Moped: 14% (3%)
  - Public Transportation: 48% (12%)
  - Motorcycle: 22% (15%)
  - Get a ride from friend/family not from URI: 0% (1%)

- **Faculty:**
  - Walking: 7% (1%)
  - Bicycle: 3% (2%)
  - Driving alone: 3% (9%)
  - Scooter/Moped: 14% (3%)
  - Public Transportation: 75% (12%)
  - Motorcycle: 2% (1%)
  - Get a ride from friend/family not from URI: 1% (1%)

- **Staff:**
  - Walking: 7% (1%)
  - Bicycle: 3% (2%)
  - Driving alone: 3% (9%)
  - Scooter/Moped: 14% (3%)
  - Public Transportation: 84% (12%)
  - Motorcycle: 2% (1%)
  - Get a ride from friend/family not from URI: 1% (1%)

Legend:
- Blue: Walking
- Gray: Bicycle
- Orange: Driving alone
- Green: Scooter/Moped
- Gray with orange cross: Public Transportation
- Gray with green cross: Carpooling
- Red: Get a ride from friend/family not from URI
Challenges and Opportunities
Comfort With Climate

- Overall climate (all respondents): 69%
- Climate in departments, division, or college (employees): 70%
- Climate in classes (students and faculty): 73%
Less comfortable with the overall climate (all respondents)

- Students
- Trans-spectrum
- Women
- Black/African/African American
- Multiracial
- Queer-spectrum
- Disability
- Low-Income Students
Less comfortable with the department, division, or college climate (employee respondents)

- Women
- Multiracial
Less comfortable with the classroom climate (faculty and student respondents)

Students  
Women  
Black/African/African American  
Bisexual  
Disability
Respondents who experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct that had interfered with their ability to learn, live, or work at URI within the past year

15% \( (n = 685) \)
Number of Instances of Experienced Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

- 1 instance: 20%
- 2 instances: 24%
- 3 instances: 20%
- 4 instances: 6%
- 5 or more instances: 30%
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Gender (%)

Overall experienced conduct

- Women: 16%
- Men: 12%
- Trans-spectrum: 20%

Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, indicated they experienced this conduct because of their gender identity

- Women: 23%
- Men: 7%
- Trans-spectrum: 33%
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Position (%)

Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, indicated they experienced the conduct because of their position status:

Overall experienced conduct: 11% (Students), 29% (Faculty), 22% (Staff)

Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct because of their position status: 15% (Students), 30% (Faculty), 40% (Staff)
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Age (%)

![Bar Chart: Overall experienced conduct and Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, indicated they experienced this conduct because of their age.]

- **Overall experienced conduct**:
  - 10% (18-19)
  - 11% (20-21)
  - 12% (22-24)
  - 20% (25-34)
  - 23% (35-44)
  - 22% (45-54)
  - 23% (55-64)
  - 18% (65-74)
  - 7% (75 and older)

- **Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, indicated they experienced this conduct because of their age**:
  - 5% (18-19)
  - 8% (20-21)
  - 16% (22-24)
  - 18% (25-34)
  - 16% (35-44)
  - 7% (45-54)
  - 19% (55-64)
  - 23% (65-74)
  - 23% (75 and older)
Personal Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct as a Result of Race (%)

Of those who experienced exclusionary conduct, indicated they experienced this conduct because of their racial identity.
Respondents’ Top Bases of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Gender identity; Position</th>
<th>Mental health/psych disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> (40%)</td>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong> (30%)</td>
<td><strong>Student</strong> (19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct ($n = 685$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
Staff Respondents’ Top Forms of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

Reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct \((n = 685)\). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
Faculty Respondents’ Top Forms of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

Reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct ($n = 685$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Conduct</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignored/excluded</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silenced</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile work environment</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated/left out</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated/bullied</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct ($n = 685$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
Student Respondents’ Top Forms of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

Reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct ($n = 685$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
Respondents’ Top Locations of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

- In meeting with a group of people (65%)
- On phone calls/text messages/email (37%)
- In campus housing (26%)

Staff
Faculty
Student

Reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct \( n = 685 \). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
Respondents Top Source of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

- Supervisor/Manager (46%)
- Coworker/colleagues (38%)
- Student (55%)

Reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct \( n = 685 \). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
How did you feel after experiencing the conduct?

- Angry: 63%
- Distressed: 56%
- Sad: 46%
- Embarrassed: 38%

Reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct \((n = 685)\). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
What did you do in response to experiencing the conduct?

- Told a friend: 42%
- Told a family member: 37%
- Avoided the person/venue: 35%
- Told a coworker: 27%

Reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct ($n = 685$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
13% ($n = 88$) Officially Reported the Conduct

- Felt it was not addressed appropriately (51%)
- Felt that it was addressed appropriately (11%)
- Felt satisfied with the outcome (20%)
- The outcome was not shared (10%)
- The outcome is still pending (9%)

Reports only responses from respondents who indicated on the survey that they experienced exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile (bullied, harassed) conduct ($n = 685$). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
Qualitative Themes – Experienced Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

Unwelcoming and hostile

Welcoming and supportive
Responses regarding accessibility based on gender identity from individuals who indicated on the survey that they were genderqueer, gender non-conforming, nonbinary, transgender, transman, and transwoman are not reported here. Please see full report for these findings.
Reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they had a disability ($n = 836$). For list of all barriers refer to full report.

### Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom buildings</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms, laboratories (including computer labs)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College housing</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus transportation/parking</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Technology/online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology/online</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brightspace/Sakai</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible electronic format</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Barriers for Respondents with Disabilities

Reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they had a disability ($n = 836$). For list of all barriers refer to full report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources/Support Services</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning technology</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic databases (e.g., e-Campus)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional/Campus Materials</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video-closed captioning and text descriptions</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Services</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations from faculty</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Qualitative Themes – Accessibility for Respondents with Disabilities

- Facilities and environments not conducive for those with physical disabilities
- Issues with services related to disability and mental health
- Problems with online learning
- Faculty and staff were not accommodating
Reports only responses from individuals who indicated their gender identity as genderqueer, gender non-conforming, nonbinary, transgender, transman, and transwoman ($n = 123$). For list of all barriers refer to full report.
Qualitative Themes – Accessibility for Genderqueer, Gender Non-Conforming, Nonbinary, Transgender, Transman, and Transwoman Respondents

Limited interactions

Exclusionary university practices
Unwanted Sexual Experiences

Trigger warning – the following slides address sensitive topics related to unwanted sexual experiences. If the material causes you discomfort or stress, please contact Violence Prevention and Advocacy Services (VPAS) at URI - 401.874.9131 or vpas@etal.uri.edu.
10% ($n = 457$) Reported Unwanted Sexual Experiences

- 1% ($n = 49$) → Relationship Violence
- 2% ($n = 88$) → Stalking
- 6% ($n = 280$) → Unwanted Sexual Interaction
- 3% ($n = 155$) → Unwanted Sexual Contact
Unwanted Sexual Experiences by Position Status ($n$)

Only some high-level findings for unwanted sexual experiences are published here. For detailed findings by each type of unwanted sexual experience refer to full report.
Relationship Violence

- 49% ($n = 24$) indicated it happened within the past year
- 50% ($n = 21$) noted that it occurred in their first year as an undergraduate student
- 31% ($n = 14$) indicated alcohol and drugs were involved
76% \((n = 37)\) indicated the perpetrator was a current/former dating/intimate partner.

69% \((n = 34)\) indicated the conduct occurred off campus and 43% \((n = 21)\) indicated on campus.

74% \((n = 36)\) felt distressed; 71% \((n = 35)\) felt sad; 47% \((n = 23)\) told a friend; 18% \((n = 9)\) officially reported the conduct.
Stalking

44% \((n = 39)\) indicated it happened within the past year

55% \((n = 41)\) noted that it occurred in their first year as an undergraduate student

9% \((n = 8)\) indicated alcohol and drugs were involved
Stalking

58% \((n = 51)\) indicated the perpetrator was a URI student

43% \((n = 38)\) indicated the conduct occurred off campus and 72% \((n = 63)\) indicated on campus

60% \((n = 53)\) felt distressed; 56% \((n = 49)\) felt afraid; 64% \((n = 56)\) told a friend; 28% \((n = 24)\) officially reported the conduct
Unwanted Sexual Interaction

60% \((n = 167)\) indicated it happened within the past year

72% \((n = 182)\) noted that it occurred in their first year as an undergraduate student

35% \((n = 97)\) indicated alcohol and drugs were involved
63% \((n = 176)\) indicated the perpetrator was a URI student.

40% \((n = 112)\) indicated the conduct occurred off campus and 70% \((n = 197)\) indicated on campus.

51% \((n = 142)\) felt distressed; 50% \((n = 141)\) felt angry; 58% \((n = 162)\) told a friend; 11% \((n = 31)\) officially reported the conduct.
37% \((n = 57)\) indicated it happened within the past year, 36% \((n = 56)\) noted 13-23 months

54% \((n = 78)\) noted that it occurred in their first year as an undergraduate student

58% \((n = 87)\) indicated alcohol and drugs were involved
Unwanted Sexual Contact

- 56% ($n = 87$) indicated the perpetrator was a URI student.

- 54% ($n = 83$) indicated the conduct occurred off campus and 50% ($n = 77$) indicated on campus.

- 66% ($n = 102$) felt embarrassed; 67% ($n = 104$) told a friend; 9% ($n = 14$) officially reported the conduct.
Qualitative Themes – Reporting of Unwanted Sexual Experiences

- Handled independently
- Inaction after reporting / No consequence
- Downplayed the incident
- Consideration for the assailant
- Fear of retribution
Knowledge of Unwanted Sexual Contact/Conduct Definitions, Policies and Resources

91% agreed that they were aware of the definition of Affirmative Consent

75% agreed that they were generally aware of the campus resources listed in the survey

77% agreed that they were familiar with the campus policies on addressing sexual misconduct, domestic/dating violence, and stalking
80% agreed that they were generally aware of the role URI Title IX Coordinator with regard to reporting incidents of unwanted sexual contact/conduct.

63% agreed that they knew how and where to report such incidents.

92% agreed that they had a responsibility to report such incidents when they saw them occurring on campus or off campus.

Knowledge of Unwanted Sexual Contact/Conduct Definitions, Policies and Resources
Knowledge of Unwanted Sexual Contact/Conduct Definitions, Policies and Resources

16% agreed that URI standards of conduct and penalties differed from standards of conduct and penalties under the criminal law.

65% agreed that they knew that information about the prevalence of sex offenses (including domestic and dating violence) was available in Clery Act Reports.

67% agreed that they knew that Northwestern University sends a Time Warning/Public Safety Alert to the campus community when such an incident occurs.
Intent to Persist
Who has seriously considered leaving URI?

32% \( (n = 1,465) \)
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving URI (%)

- Faculty (n = 244) 48%
- Staff (n = 392) 48%
# Top Reasons Why Employee Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving URI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low salary/pay rate</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities or advancement</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with supervisor/manager</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low salary/pay rate</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of institutional resources</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low salary/pay rate</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of institutional resources</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table reports only responses from Employee respondents who indicated on the survey that they had seriously considered leaving URI ($n = 636$). For list of all response choices refer to full report.
Qualitative Themes for Employee Respondents - Why Considered Leaving…

- Issues with compensation and workload
- Conflicts with supervisors and coworkers
- Shortage of career advancement opportunities
Qualitative Themes for Employee Respondents - Why Considered Leaving…

- Issues with leadership
- Lack of commitment to equity
- Experiences of discrimination and marginalization
- Lack of respect for conservative ideologies
27% \( (n = 724) \) of Undergraduate Student respondents had seriously considered leaving URI … WHY?

- Lack of sense of belonging (51%)
- Wanted to transfer to another institution (47%)
- Lack of social life (46%)

Table reports only responses from Undergraduate Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they had seriously considered leaving URI \( (n = 724) \). For list of all response choices refer to full report.
38% \((n = 40)\) of Graduate Student respondents had seriously considered leaving URI … **WHY?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of sense of belonging</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate was not welcoming</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of social life</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table reports only responses from Graduate Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they had seriously considered leaving URI \((n = 40)\). For list of all response choices refer to full report.
When Student Respondents Seriously Considered Leaving URI

- 75% in their first year
- 38% in their second year
- 17% in their third year
- 10% in their fourth year +

Table reports only responses from Student respondents who indicated on the survey that they had seriously considered leaving URI \((n = 764)\).
For list of all response choices refer to full report.
Qualitative Themes for Student Respondents - Why Considered Leaving…

- Issues with the quality of and lack of support in academics
- Cost of attending URI
- Lacking a sense of social integration at the institution
- Experiences with marginalization on campus
Perceptions
Observations of conduct directed toward a person or group of people on campus that created an exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct learning or working environment.

17% (n = 754)
Number of Instances of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct During the Past Year (%)

- 1 instance: 28%
- 2 instances: 23%
- 3 instances: 15%
- 4 instances: 4%
- 5 or more instances: 31%

Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct by Respondents’ Racial and Gender Identity (%)

- Multiracial: 24%
- Black/African/African Amer: 21%
- APIDA: 19%
- Latinx: 16%
- White: 15%

- Trans-spectrum: 27%
- Women: 17%
- Men: 15%
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct by Respondents’ Position and Sexual Identity (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Identity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queer-spectrum</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top Bases of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

Racial identity (30%)
Gender/gender identity (23%)
Ethnicity (22%)

Table reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct \((n = 754)\). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
Top Forms of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

Person ignored or excluded (33%)
Derogatory verbal remarks (33%)
Person isolated or left out (31%)
Person intimidated or bullied (30%)

Table reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 754). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
Target and Source of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

Target: Student (53%)

Source: Student (36%)

Table reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 754). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
Top Locations of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In an online meeting/class</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a meeting with a group of people</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 754). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
How *did you feel* in response to observing exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct?

- Angry: 62%
- Distressed: 39%
- Sad: 42%

Table reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (*n* = 754). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
What *did you do* in response to observing exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct?

- Told a friend: 32%
- Did nothing: 22%
- Told a coworker: 22%

Table reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 754). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
10\% (n = 70) Officially Reported the Conduct

Felt it was not addressed appropriately (39\%)
Felt that it was addressed appropriately (< 5)
Felt satisfied with the outcome (< 5)
The outcome was not shared (22\%)
The outcome is still pending (17\%)

Table reports only responses from individuals who indicated on the survey that they observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (n = 754). Percentages do not sum to 100 due to multiple responses. For list of all response choices refer to full report.
Qualitative Themes – Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

Race-based, LGBTQ-based, and gender-based discrimination

Marginalization by faculty members

Targeted comments toward conservative and white people
Employee Perceptions
Employee Perceptions of Unjust Hiring Practices

32% ($n = 162$) of Faculty

28% ($n = 229$) of Staff
Employee Perceptions of Unjust Promotion, Contract Renewal, Tenure, Reappointment, and/or Reclassification

27% \( (n = 137) \) of Faculty

28% \( (n = 229) \) of Staff
Employee Perceptions of Unjust Employment-Related Disciplinary Actions

11% ($n = 55$) of Faculty

12% ($n = 97$) of Staff
Most Common Perceived Bases for Unjust Employment Practices

For list of all response choices refer to full report.
Qualitative Themes – Unjust Employment Practices

- Barriers to advancement
- Gender biased practices
- Cronyism
Work-Life Issues
Successes & Challenges
Faculty expressed positive views about their work

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
- Majority felt that research (78%) and teaching (73%) were valued at URI

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
- Majority felt that the process for review (79%) and process for promotion (74%) were clear

PTF/per course faculty
- 74% felt that clear expectations of their responsibilities existed

We highlight combined percentages above 70 as a strength based on comparisons with similar institutions.
Faculty expressed positive views about their work

- Majority felt valued by other faculty (74%), staff (81%), and students (79%) at URI
- 77% felt that clear expectations of their responsibilities existed
- 71% felt that they were not pressured to change their research/scholarship agenda to achieve promotion

We highlight combined percentages above 70 as a strength based on comparisons with similar institutions.
Tenure-Track Faculty Challenges with Climate

41%
• Felt burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations

46%
• Felt that they performed more work to help students than did their colleagues
Non-Tenure Track and PTF/Per-Course Faculty Challenges with Climate

46%
- Tenure-Track Faculty felt pressured to do extra work that was uncompensated

43%
- PTF/per-course Faculty felt that performance evaluations were clear

45%
- PTF/per-course Faculty felt that procedures for PTF advancement were clear
All Faculty Challenges with Climate

- 20% Felt that URI provided adequate resources to manage work-life balance
- 14% Felt that salaries for adjunct faculty were competitive
- 35% Felt that salaries for tenure-track faculty were competitive
Faculty Respondents *Sense of Belonging*

By disability status:
Faculty Respondents with No Disability had greater *Sense of Belonging* than Faculty Respondents with At Least One Disability

Note: Analyses were run by gender identity, racial identity, years of employment, and disability status.
Qualitative Themes for Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty: Work-Life Issues

- Lack of clarity in promotion/tenure processes
- Issues with leadership
- Perceptions of workloads not being appropriately recognized
Qualitative Themes for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: Work-Life Issues

- Issues with unfair compensation and workloads
- Lack of representation in decision-making processes
- Unclear or unfair promotion and evaluation processes
Qualitative Themes for PTF/per-course Faculty: Work-Life Issues

- Unwelcoming and undervalued
- Welcomed and valued
- Lack of compensation
Qualitative Themes for All Faculty: Work-Life Issues

- Issues with low compensation
- Limited professional development opportunities and funds
- Lack of support for faculty with families
Staff expressed positive views about their work

- 72% felt that their coworkers/colleagues gave them job/career advice when needed
- 73% felt that their supervisor provided adequate support to manage work-life balance
- 71% felt that their supervisor was supportive of flexible work schedules

We highlight combined percentages above 70 as a strength based on comparisons with similar institutions
Staff Challenges with Climate

- 53% Felt that a hierarchy existed within staff positions that allowed some voices valued more than others
- 48% Felt that their workload increased without additional compensation due to staff departures
- 35% Felt that they felt positive about their career opportunities at URI
Staff Challenges with Climate

22%

• Felt that salaries were competitive
Staff Respondents *Sense of Belonging*

By years of employment:
Staff respondents with Less Than 7 Years of Employment had greater *Sense of Belonging* than did Staff respondents with 7 to 15 Years of Employment and Staff respondents with More Than 15 Years of Employment.

Note: Analyses were run by gender identity, racial identity, years of employment, and disability status.
Qualitative Themes for Staff: Work-Life Issues

- Issues with inequitable work distributions
- Job responsibilities not in alignment with compensation
- Engaging in job responsibilities outside of one’s position description and work hours
Qualitative Themes for Staff: Work-Life Issues

- Lack of consistent evaluation
- Issues with supervisors
- A shortage of support for those with children
Qualitative Themes for Staff: Work-Life Issues

- Lack of career advancement opportunities
- Issues with compensation and benefits
- Lack of professional development opportunities
- Disconnect between faculty and staff
Student Respondents’ Perceptions
Students expressed positive views about the climate

66% of Student respondents felt that they belonged at URI

84% of Graduate students felt that they had adequate access to their advisors

72% of Graduate students felt that they were satisfied with the quality of advising they received from their departments
Students expressed positive views about the climate

Many Graduate students felt that their major professors (80%) and advisors (77%) provided clear expectations.
Students’ Challenges with Climate

31% felt that faculty prejudged their abilities based on their perceptions of their identity/background.

Statistical differences existed based on gender identity, racial identity, sexual identity, citizenship status, first-generation status, and disability status – where marginalized identities felt less welcome and more judged.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Support</th>
<th>Non-Academic Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain’s Association (43%)</td>
<td>Office of International Education (Study Abroad) (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Enhancement Center (26%)</td>
<td>Academic Advising (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College for Academic Success (25%)</td>
<td>Chaplain’s Association (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The majority of Student respondents indicated that they have not sought support from the resources listed in the survey.
Qualitative Themes for Students: Where They Felt Safe and Supported

- Everywhere on campus
- Classrooms and with faculty
- In residence halls
- With friends and in student organizations
Qualitative Themes for Undergraduate Students: Where They Did Not Feel Safe and Supported

- Athletic facilities
- The academic environment
- Greek life
- Campus pathways and lots
Qualitative Themes for Graduate Students: Where They Did Not Feel Safe and Supported

Spaces within their departments or academic homes

Campus pathways and lots

Everywhere
Qualitative Themes for Graduate Students: Perceptions of Advising, Professors, Staff

- Inadequate advising and support
- Adequate advising and support
- Issues attributed to the pandemic
Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success
Student Respondents’ *Perceived Academic Success*

By racial identity:

White Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *perceived academic success* than APIDA and Black/African/African American Undergraduate Student respondents.

White Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *perceived academic success* than Latinx and Multiracial Undergraduate Student respondents.

Note: Analyses were run by gender identity, racial identity, income status, and first-generation status.
Student Respondents’ *Perceived Academic Success*

**By income status:**
Not-Low-Income Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *perceived academic success* than Low-Income Undergraduate Student respondents.

**By first-generation status:**
Not-First-Generation Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *perceived academic success* than First-Generation Undergraduate Student respondents.

*Note:* Analyses were run by gender identity, racial identity, income status, and first-generation status.
Student Respondents’ *Perceived Academic Success*

By gender identity:
Women Undergraduate Student respondents had greater *perceived academic success* than did Men Undergraduate Student respondents.

Note: Analyses were run by gender identity, racial identity, income status, and first-generation status.
Student Respondents’ Sense of Belonging
Student Respondents *Sense of Belonging*

By racial identity:

White Student respondents had greater Sense of *Belonging* than APIDA and Black/African/African American Student respondents and Multiracial Student respondents.

Note: Analyses were run by gender identity, racial identity, first-generation status, and sexual identity.
Student Respondents *Sense of Belonging*

By gender identity:
Women Student respondents had greater *Sense of Belonging* than Men Student respondents.

By sexual identity:
Heterosexual Student respondents had greater *Sense of Belonging* than Queer-spectrum Student respondents and Bisexual Student respondents.

Note: Analyses were run by gender identity, racial identity, first-generation status, and sexual identity.
Institutional Actions
Campus Initiatives Faculty Respondents Thought Were Available Which Positively Influenced Climate

- Mentorship for new faculty
- Affordable child care
- Access to resources for people who have experienced harassment
- Toolkits for faculty to create an inclusive classroom environment
- Diversity, equity, and inclusivity training for faculty
Campus Initiatives Faculty Respondents Thought *Were Not Available* But Would Positively Influenced Climate

- Clear process to resolve conflicts
- Ongoing mentorship for new faculty
- Access to resources for people who have experienced harassment
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Mentorship for new faculty
Campus Initiatives Staff Respondents Thought *Were Available* Which Positively Influenced Climate

- Access to resources for people who have experienced harassment
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Career development opportunities for Staff
- Mentorship for new staff
- Diversity, equity, and inclusivity training for staff
Campus Initiatives Staff Respondents Thought *Were Not Available* But Would Positively Influenced Climate

- Supervisory training for supervisors/managers
- Support during staff transitions (e.g., staff to supervisor)
- Mentorship for new staff
- Fair process to resolve conflicts
- Career development opportunities for staff
Campus Initiatives Student Respondents Thought *Were Available* Which Positively Influenced Climate

- Effective academic advising
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among students
- Diversity, equity, and inclusivity training for staff
- Effective faculty mentorship of students
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among faculty, staff, and students
Campus Initiatives Student Respondents Thought *Were Not Available* But Would Positively Influenced Climate

- Effective academic advising
- Opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue among faculty, staff, and students
- Effective faculty mentorship of students
- A process to address student complaints of bias by faculty/staff in learning environments (e.g., classrooms, laboratories)
Qualitative Themes for Employees – Campus Initiatives

- Improvements to the compensation package offered
- Training at the university
- Better measures of transparency
- Diversity recruitment
Qualitative Themes for Students – Campus Initiatives

No recommendations for improvement

Recommendations around trainings

Accessibility
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.

Successes: The majority of...

Faculty respondents felt valued by other faculty (74%), staff (81%), and students (79%) at URI

Staff respondents felt valued by other faculty (74%), staff (81%), and students (79%) at URI

Student respondents felt that they belonged at URI (66%)

Student respondents felt comfortable with the climate in their classes (76%)
Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement

30% of respondents who experienced and or observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct at URI in the last year said it happened more than five times.

49% of Faculty and 48% of Staff respondents seriously considered leaving URI.

31% of Student respondents felt that faculty prejudged their abilities based on their perceptions of their identity/background.

10% of all respondents indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact/conduct while at URI.
Next Steps
Access to Report and Additional Reports
Access to Report/Presentation

The full report, executive summary, and presentation slide decks are available at: https://web.uri.edu/climate-survey/

A hard copy of the report will be available in the Kingston Campus Library. Details to be communicated here: https://web.uri.edu/climate-survey/.
Development of Additional Reports

- College/Academic Unit Reports

Whereas all data collected is important, use discretion around issues of generalizability.

College/Academic Unit reports will be developed by Office of Institutional Research.

All data in the reports are aggregated (no n's with <5 respondents) to protect the confidentiality of respondents.

Rankin & Associates will provide the final data set to URI’s Primary Investigator (PI).

Whereas all data collected is important, use discretion around issues of generalizability.
### Development of Additional Reports

- **For Inquiries and Requests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6-month moratorium on additional reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective investigator forwards one-page proposal submitted to the Director of Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests will be reviewed by Institutional Research to ensure that confidentiality is maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If approved, the researcher is provided with a report specific to their research question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps
Developing Actions
Purpose of Community Forums

To review, discuss, and engage in the results of URI campus-wide Climate Survey

To identify successful initiatives and uncover challenges facing the URI community
Community Forums

- Forums facilitated by the CSWG
- The themes/suggestions received will be forwarded to the President’s Leadership Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Forum</td>
<td>November 2 (T)</td>
<td>10:30 am-12:00 pm</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 17 (W, virtual)</td>
<td>3:00-4:30 pm</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Forum</td>
<td>November 4 (R, virtual)</td>
<td>5:00-6:30 pm</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 5 (F, virtual)</td>
<td>12:00-1:30 pm</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 17 (W)</td>
<td>5:00-6:30 pm</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Forum</td>
<td>November 2 (T, virtual)</td>
<td>12:00-1:30 pm</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 9 (T)</td>
<td>10:30 am-12:00 pm</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Forums

Can’t attend a Forum??

Provide your suggestions for actions on the Climate Study Project Feedback site:

- https://web.uri.edu/climate-survey/
Community Forums
● Spring 2022

Action Updates

Updates on the progress of actions will be provided monthly to the URI community via the Campus Climate website
Questions..?

Thoughts..?
Thank You!

Genevieve Weber, PhD, LMHC
genevieve@rankin-consulting.com

Mitsu Narui, PhD
mitsu@rankin-consulting.com

Rankin & Associates Consulting, LLC
https://rankin-consulting.com/

Shape the future of URI.

THE UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
Speak your truth.