EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEYS 2013

The University of Wisconsin-La Crosse is currently the only school in the UW-System that has conducted three consecutive campus climate surveys in order to assess students' as well as faculty, staff, and administrators' personal experiences on campus and attitudes towards diversity and inclusion. "Campus climate" is a measure of the campus environment as it relates to interpersonal, academic, and professional interactions (UC Regents, Campus Climate Report). This dedication to assessing the campus climate at UW-L every four to five years reflects our commitment to fostering a learning community that is welcoming and inclusive of all persons.

Further, UW-L has a strong track record of utilizing responses from campus climate surveys to create positive changes on our campus. For example, responses from previous UW-L surveys in 2004 and 2008 led to the creation of new campus offices and increased funding for diversity and inclusion initiatives, including the Research & Resource Center for Campus Climate, hate/bias response (Hate Response Team and online reporting form), Awareness through Performance, funding for a Violence Prevention Specialist, and employee morale retreats. The purpose of the 2013 surveys was to assess whether the climate at UW-L had changed since 2008 and address any new concerns related to diversity and inclusion.

From January through December 2012, the Campus Climate Survey Team, led by Principal Investigators, Associate Dean Barbara Stewart and Dr. Laurie Cooper Stoll, worked to design and pilot surveys for students and employees; advocate for survey incentives; and launch an advertising campaign to increase survey response rates. Conducting a university-wide campus climate survey requires the work of many. UW-L was fortunate to have several talented and dedicated individuals on the survey team including Nizam Arain, Patrick Barlow, Chris Coppess, Chris Dziekan, Graciela Engen, Matt Evensen, Amanda Goodenough, Thomas Harris, Yang Cha Thao, Karmin Van Domelen, and Will Van Roosenbeek. From this larger group several subgroups were formed with team leaders assigned to

those subgroups. Those subgroups were as follows: Marketing, Survey Development, and Survey Incentives.

Those subgroups met on their own and reported back to the large group meetings. It was through the work of these small groups that the survey launch was coordinated.

After a year of laying the groundwork, in February 2013, all students and employees at UW-L were invited to take the campus climate survey. Students and employees who completed the survey were given the option to enter to win several gift certificates for food, entertainment, and other local services. The prizes for students were provided by the Residence Hall Association Council (RHAC) and the Campus Pepsi Fund.

In the end, 1,835 students and 518 faculty, staff and administrators completed a survey. Once the campus climate surveys were closed, the arduous task of cleaning and analyzing the data began. Thankfully, Dr. Enilda Delgado was willing to come onboard to run the advanced statistical analyses.

During the 2013-2014 academic year we are looking to these findings to think through ways that we can make improvements at UW-L. In particular, our findings indicate that bullying and stereotyping regarding race, disability, sexual orientation, and gender, are problems that should be addressed. Further, the underreporting of sexual assault is a concern we believe demands our attention. Everyone at UW-L has a stake in the findings from the campus climate surveys and the policies and programs we develop in response. As such, students and employees were invited to several open forums to hear the results from the 2013 campus climate surveys, to ask questions about the findings, and learn where we go from here. Because the surveys contained a number of sensitive measures, open forums were held separately for students and employees. In addition, Barbara Stewart and Laurie Cooper Stoll recorded a video presentation of the findings and uploaded it the Campus Climate web site .

Based on the findings of the Campus Climate Survey, several sub committees were formed to further explore survey findings and make short and long term recommendations. Those subcommittees were as formed around the following topics: Race/Ethnicity, LGBTQ/Gender Issues, Returning Adult Students, Campus Climate and Sexual Assault Prevention. The committee members completed their work in spring of 2014 and submitted their final reports to the office of Diversity and Inclusion during the summer of 2014. In the next section please see the quantitative and qualitative results of the survey.

QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS
ANALYSIS OF CAMPUS CLIMATE EMPLOYEE DATA
Completed by Dr. Enilda Delgado on 5/29/13

Coding of Dependent Variables

· **Bullying** = Recoded A4 to RBULLY

0 = No (Never)
1 = Yes (Once, Sometimes, Regularly)

· **Stereotyped** = Recoded A15 to RSTEREOTYPE

0=No (2)
1=Yes (1)

· **Discrimination** = Recoded A19 to RDISCRIMINATE

0 = No (Never)
1 = Yes (Once, Sometimes, Regularly)

· **Verbal Attack** = Recoded A8 to RVERATTACK

0 = No (Never)
1 = Yes (Once, Sometimes, Regularly)

· **Satisfaction with Employment** = Recoded A73 to RSATISFACTION

0 = Highly Dissatisfied (1), Dissatisfied (2) or (3) Neither Dissatisfied nor satisfied
1= Satisfied (4) or Highly Satisfied (5)

· **Considered Leaving UWL**= Recoded A74 to RLEAVEUWL

0 = No (2)
1= Yes (1)

· **Sexual Harassment** = Recoded A51 to RSEXHARASS

0 = No (Never)
1 = Yes (Once, Sometimes, Regularly)

· **Campus Climate Comfort** = Recoded Q120 to RCLIMATE

0 = Not comfortable/Neutral

1= Comfortable

· **Emphasis on Diversity** = Recoded A94 to REMPHASISDIVERSITY

0= Enough/ Too Much
1= Not enough
Missing = Not sure

· Variables dealing with **campus communication and effective teaching of diversity** A191_1 to A191_9 recoded individually

0= 1,2 = Disagree
1= 3 = Neutral
2= 4, 5 = Agree

Coding of Independent Variables

· **Classification** = Computed new variable from A107_1 to A107_15 to RCLASSIFICATION

0 = Assistant Professor (_3)
1= Associate Professor (_4)
2= Full Professor (_5)
3 = Classified Staff (Includes Classified Exempt (_7) and Classified Non-Exempt (_8)
4 = Non-Instructional Academic Staff (_9)
5 = Instructional (Includes Adjunct Prof.(_1), Instructional Academic Staff (_2), Limited Academic Staff (_10) Lecturer (_11)
6 = Other (Includes Limited Term Employee (_6), Non-Contract Employee (_12), Administrator (_13), Visiting Scholar (_14), Other (_15))
Since this is a select all that apply, categories were created in the numeric order presented. Thus, if a professor (_5) identifies as an administrator (_13), s/he is placed under administrator.

· **Division** = Computed new variable from A110_1 to A110_11 to RDIVISION

0= CBA (_1)
1= CLS (_2 or _4 or *5*)
2= SAH (_3)
3= Academic Affairs (_6)
4= Administration and Finance (_7), Advancement (_8), Executive (_9)
5= Student Affairs (_10)
6= Other (_11)
Since this is a select all that apply, categories were created in the numeric order presented. For example, it an individual identified themselves as a member of SAH and also an administrator, they were placed under administrator.

Age = Recoded A113 to RAGE.

0 = 32 and under
1 = 33-42
2 = 43-51

3 = 52-60
4 = 61+
Missing= Prefer not to identify

· **Relationship Status** = Computed new variable from A116_1 to A116_11 to RRELATIONSHIP

0 = Not in a relationship (Includes Single (_1), Dating (_2), Separated (_5), Divorced (_6), Partner/Spouse Deceased (_8), self-identify (_10)
1= Yes, in a partnered/legal relationship. (Includes Partnered in a domestic partnership or civil union (_3), Married (_4), remarried (_7), partner/spouse employed in another town or state (_9),
Missing = Prefer not to identify (_11)
Since this is a select all that apply, category 0 was first created and then category 1. This ensures that anyone that is a partnered relationship is captured.

· **Caregiver Status** = Computed new variable from A115_1 to A115_9 to RCAREGIVER

0 = Not a caregiver (Includes Single parent of adult child(ren) (_3), Co-parent with a partner/spouse of adult chid(ren) (_5), Co-parent with a partner/spouse that works in another town or state (_6), Self-identify (_7), Not applicable (_9))
1= Yes, Caregiver (Includes Caregiver of adult family member (_1), Single parent of child(ren) under 18 (_2), Co-parent with partner/spouse of child(ren) under 18 (_4)
Missing = Prefer not to identify (_8))
Since this is a select all that apply, category 0 was first created and then 1. This allows anyone who is a caregiver to be accurately categorized even if they selected another non-caregiver status.

· **Gender**= Recoded A120 to RGENDER

0= Woman
1= Man
Missing = Transgender, Gender question, Self-Identify and Prefer not to identify. Only 3 individuals were Trans or gender questioning total, thus a separate category is useless for statistical analysis.

· **Sexual Orientation** = Recoded A121

0 = Heterosexual
1 = Other (includes asexual, bisexual, gay, lesbian, queer, pansexual, questioning, self-identify)
Missing = Prefer not to identify

· **Race** = Computed new variable from A119_1 to A119_19 to RRACE

0= White (includes White (_8) and European (_9)
1= Non-White (Includes African(_1), African American (_2), Alaskan Native (_3), Asian (_4), Southeast Asian (_5), Southeast Asian (_6), Caribbean/West Indian (_7), Hmong (_10), Hmong American (_11), Indian subcontinent (_12), Latino(a)/Hispanic (_13), Middle Eastern (_14), Native American Indian (_15), Pacific Islander (_16), Multiracial (_17), Self-identify (_18)
Missing = Prefer not to identify (_19)

· **Disability**= Recoded A122 to RDISABILITY

2=0=> No

1=1=>Yes

· **Religion**= Recoded A117 to RRELIGION

0= Non Christian (includes Agnostic, Atheist, Buddhist, Hindu, Hmong Faith, Jewish, Muslim, Spiritual/Non-religious, No affiliation, Self Indentify)

1= Christian (includes Baptist, Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Episcopalian, Jehovah's Witness, LDS, Lutheran, Methodist, Non-denominational Christian, Pentecostal, Presbyterian, 7th Day Adventist, Unitarian Universalist,)

Missing= Prefer not to identify

BIVARIATE ANALYSIS – CROSSTABS/CHI-SQUARE
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

Individuals significantly most likely to be bullied:

· Non-Whites
· Those 43-51 years of age
· Those with a disability,
· Non-heterosexual
· Caregivers of adults or children under 18
· Members of CLS

Individuals significantly most likely to be stereotyped:

· Those with a disability

Individuals significantly most likely to be discriminated against:

· Non-Whites
· Those 43-51 years of age
· Those with a disability
· Those who are caregivers of adults or children under 18

Individuals significantly most likely to be verbally attacked:

· Those with a disability
· Non-heterosexuals
· Members of CLS

Individuals significantly most likely to have thought of leaving UW-L:

· Those 33-42
· Those with a disability
· Associate Professors- Most likely of all classifications

Individuals significantly dissatisfied with employment at UW-L

- Those with a disability
- Individuals in Administration/Finance/Advancement/Executive division

Individuals significantly uncomfortable or neutral with campus climate:

- Non-Whites
- Those with a disability
- Non-heterosexual
- Full Professors
- Non-Christians
- Members of CLS

Individuals who are significantly more likely to express that there is enough or too much emphasis on diversity:

- Whites
- Heterosexuals
- Classified Staff
- Individuals who are married or Domestic Partnership
- Christians
- Individuals in the College of Business Administration and individuals in Administration/Finance/Advancement/Executive division

Individuals significantly more likely to disagree with: "UW-L does a good job of preparing students to function well in an increasingly diverse society"

- Non-Whites, non-heterosexuals, non-Christians, Assistant Professor (but all Professors in general relative to Classified Staff)

Individuals significantly more likely to disagree with: "UW-L is committed to creating a more diverse workplace."

- Non-Whites, individuals with disabilities and non-Christians

Individuals significantly more likely to disagree with: "UW-L's senior administrators (deans and above) explain the benefits of diversity for the campus community."

- Non-heterosexuals, Assistant and Full Professors, Non-Christians and members of CLS and Student Affairs.

Individuals significantly more likely to disagree with: "UW-L teaches students how to work effectively across differences."

- Non-Whites, those with a disability, non-heterosexuals, Full Professors.

Individuals significantly more likely to disagree with "UW-L teaches employees how to work effectively across differences."

- Non-Whites, those with a disability, non-heterosexuals and individuals in Administration/Finance/Advancement/Executive Division

Individuals significantly more likely to disagree with "UW-L is responsive to reports of discrimination or harassment."

· Non-Whites and those with a disability.

Individuals significantly more likely to disagree with: "Open communication regarding diversity and inclusion is encouraged at UW-L."

· Non-Whites and non-Heterosexuals.

Individuals significantly more likely to disagree with: "Chancellor Joe Gow communicates effectively about topics of diversity and inclusion to the campus."

· Non-Whites, Associate and Full Professors.

Individuals significantly more likely to <u>agree</u> with: "I would like to receive more communication(s) about diversity and inclusion at UW-L."

· Non-Whites, women, individuals without a disability, non-heterosexuals, non-instructional staff, individuals in student affairs.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Bullying, Discrimination, Leave UW-L, Campus Climate and Diversity Emphasis had significant predictors in multivariate statistical analysis. Further analysis is below.

Verbal Attack, Stereotyped, Sexual Harassment and Employment Satisfaction did **not** have significant predictors in multivariate analysis. No further analysis is done on these variables.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: BULLLYING

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of being bullied are 250% higher for non-whites relative to Whites. Said differently, you are 3 1/2 times more likely to be bullied if you are non-White than if you are White.

· The odds of being bullied are 235% higher if you have a disability relative to those without a disability. In other words, you are 3.3 times more likely to be bullied if you have a disability.

· The odds of being bullied are 128% higher for non-heterosexuals relative to heterosexuals. An individual is over two times more likely to be bullied if you are not heterosexual relative to those who are heterosexual. This is after holding all other IVs constant.

· The odds of being bullied are 300% higher for Full Professors relative to Assistant Professors. Full Professors are 4 times more likely to be bullied than Assistant Professors, all else being equal.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: DISCRIMINATION

· Non-Whites are over 4 times (or 328%) more likely to experience discrimination than Whites, holding all independent variables constant.

· The odds of experiencing discrimination are nearly 4 times greater for employees 43-51 relative to those under age 32, holding all independent variables constant.
· Individuals with a disability are over 3 ½ times (or 279%) more likely to experience discrimination relative to individuals without a disability, holding all independent variables constant.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: LEAVE UW-L

· The odds of contemplating leaving UW-L are nearly 4 times greater for employees 33-42 relative to those under age 32, holding all independent variables constant.
· Individuals with a disability are nearly 3 times (or 184%) more likely to contemplate leaving UW-L relative to individuals without a disability, holding all independent variables constant.
· The odds of contemplating leaving UW-L are over 4 times (340%) greater for employees in Administration/Finance/Advancement/Executive division relative to those in CBA, all else being constant.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: CAMPUS CLIMATE

· The odds of being comfortable with the campus climate are 78.3% lower for non-Whites than for Whites, holding all independent variables constant.
· The odds of being comfortable with the campus climate are 80.1% lower for those with a disability than for those without a disability, holding all independent variables constant.
· The of being comfortable with the campus climate are 105% higher for Christian relative to non-Christians, holding all independent variables constant.
· The odds of being comfortable with the campus climate are 89% lower for individuals in Administration/Finance/Advancement/Executive relative to those in CBA, all independent variables being held constant.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: DIVERSITY EMPHASIS

· Non-Whites are 7.74 times (674%) more likely to express that there is not enough emphasis on diversity on campus relative to whites, while holding all other independent variables constant.
· Individuals who are not heterosexual are 3.3 times (230%) more likely to express that there is not enough emphasis on diversity on campus relative to white, all other independent variables being held constant.
· The odds of stating that there is not enough emphasis on diversity on campus are 81.5% lower for Individuals in the "Other" Classification category (includes Limited Term Employee, Non-Contract Employee, Administrators and 'Others') relative to Assistant Professors, all other independent variables being held constant.

ANALYSIS OF CAMPUS CLIMATE STUDENT DATA
Completed by Enilda Delgado on 6/5/13

<u>Coding of Dependent Variables</u>

· **Bullying** = Recoded Q4 to RBULLY

0 = No (Never)

1 = Yes (Once, Sometimes, Regularly)

· **Stereotyped** = Recoded Q15 to RSTEREOTYPE

0=No (Never)

1=Yes (Once, Sometimes, Regularly)

· **Discrimination** = Recoded Q19 to RDISCRIMINATE

0 = No (Never)

1 = Yes (Once, Sometimes, Regularly)

· **Verbal Attack** = Recoded Q8 to RVERATTACK

0 = No (Never)

1 = Yes (Once, Sometimes, Regularly)

· **Social Media Attack**= Recoded Q12 to RSOCIALMEDIA

0 = No (Never)

1 = Yes (Once, Sometimes, Regularly)

· **Observed Graffiti** = Recoded Q28 to RGRAFFITI

0 = No

1 = Yes

· **Offensive E-Mail** = Recoded Q32 to ROFFEMAIL

0 = No

1 = Yes

· **Feared Bad Grade Due to Hostile Class?** Q36 to RHOSTILECLASS

0 = No

1 = Yes

· **Physically Attacked?** Q38 to RPHYSICALATTACK

0 = No

1 = Yes

· **Sexually Assaulted?** Q61 to RSEXASSAULT

0 = No

1 = Yes

· **Sexually Harassed?** Q50 to RSEXHARASS

0 = No

1 = Yes

· **Satisfaction with UWL** = Recoded Q77 to RSATISFUWL

0 = Highly Dissatisfied (1), Dissatisfied (2) or (3) Neither Dissatisfied nor satisfied
1= Satisfied (4) or Highly Satisfied (5)

· **Considered Leaving UWL**= Recoded Q78 to RLEAVEUWL

0 = No
1= Yes

· **Campus Climate Comfort** = Recoded Q72 to RUWLCLIMATE

0 = Not comfortable/Neutral
1= Comfortable

· **Classes Climate Comfort**= Recoded Q74 to RCLASSESCLIMATE

0 = Not comfortable/Neutral
1= Comfortable

· **Emphasis on Diversity** = Recoded A94 to REMPHASISDIVERSITY

0= Enough/ Too Much
1= Not enough
Missing = Not sure

· Variables dealing with **campus communication and effective teaching of diversity** A90_1 to A90_5 recoded individually

0= 1,2 = Disagree
1= 3 = Neutral
2= 4, 5 = Agree

Coding of Independent Variables

· **Gender**= Recoded Q116 to RGENDER

0= Woman
1= Man
Missing = Transgender, Gender question, Self-Identify and Prefer not to identify.

· **Sexual Orientation** = Recoded Q117

0 = Heterosexual
1 = Other (includes asexual, bisexual, gay, lesbian, queer, pansexual, questioning, self-identify)
Missing = Prefer not to identify

· **Disability**= Recoded Q118 to RDISABILITY

2=0=> No

1=1=>Yes

· **Race** = Computed new variable from A119_1 to A119_19 to RRACE

0= White (includes White (_8) and European (_9)

1= Non-White (Includes African(_1), African American (_2), Alaskan Native (_3), Asian (_4), Southeast Asian (_5), Southeast Asian (_6), Caribbean/West Indian (_7), Hmong (_10), Hmong American (_11), Indian subcontinent (_12), Latino(a)/Hispanic (_13), Middle Eastern (_14), Native American Indian (_15), Pacific Islander (_16), Multiracial (_17), Self-identify (_18)

Missing = Prefer not to identify (_19)

· **Age** = Recoded Q109 to RAGE.

0 = 19 OR UNDER

1 = 20-21

2 = 22-25

3 = 26+

Missing= Prefer not to identify

· **Academic Status** = Computed new variable from Q100_1 to A107_13 to RACASTATUS

0 = Bachelor's Degree (_4)

1= Masters (_5), Doctorate(_6), Professional (_7)

2= Transfer(_1), Associates (_2), Youth Options (_3), Second Degree (_8), Certificate (_9), Special non-degree (_10), ESL (_11), International (_12)

Since this is a select all that apply, categories were created in the reverse numeric order presented. Thus, if a transfer student also identifies as an working on Bachelors degree, s/he is placed under Bachelor's.

· **College major** = Computed new variable from Q102_1 to A102_4 to RCOLLEGE

0= CBA (_1)

1= CLS (_2)

2= SAH (_3)

3= OTHER (_4)

Since this is a select all that apply, categories were created in the reverse numeric order presented. For example, it an individual identified themselves as a member of SAH and also CBA, they were placed under CBA.

· **Full-time vs. Part-time** = Recoded Q103 to RFULLORPART

0= Part-time

1= Full-time

· **Working 20 + Hours** = Recoded Q104 to RWORKING

0 = No, not working 20 or more hours

1 = Yes, working 20+ hours

· **Residence** = Recoded Q105 to RONOROFF

0 = Off-campus

1= On-campus

· **Family Financial Assistance** = Q106 to RFAMFIANCIAL

0= No financial Assistance from Family

1= Some assistance

2= Full Financial Assistance from Family

· **Residence While Growing up** = Computed RRURALURBAN from Q107_1 to Q107_6

0 = Rural (Farm (_1), Rural Non-Farm (_2), Small Town (_3))

1= Urban (Suburban (_4), Urban (_5), International (_6)

Since this is a select all that apply, categories were created in the numeric order presented. For example, it an individual identified themselves as a growing up in a small town internationally, they were placed within the "urban" setting.

· Mother's Education and Father's Education = Computed from Q108 series to RMOMED and RDADED

0 = No HS (_1), High School (_2)

1 = Some College (_3), Tech Degree (_4), Associates (_5)

2 = Bachelor's (_6)

3 = Masters (_7), Doctoral (_8)

Since this is a select all that apply, categories were created in the numeric order presented. For example, it an individual identified their mother as having a Bachelor's and a Master's degree, it is counted under Master's.

· **Religion**= Recoded A117 to RRELIGION

0= Non Christian (includes Agnostic, Atheist, Buddhist, Hindu, Hmong Faith, Jewish, Muslim, Spiritual/Non-religious, No affiliation, Self Indentify)

1= Christian (includes Baptist, Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Episcopalian, Jehovah's Witness, LDS, Lutheran, Methodist, Non-denominational Christian, Pentecostal, Presbyterian, 7th Day Adventist, Unitarian Universalist,)

Missing= Prefer not to identify

BIVARIATE ANALYSIS – CROSSTABS/CHI-SQUARE
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

Students significantly most likely to be bullied:

· Non-Whites, those with a disability, non-heterosexuals, those who work over 20 hours per week and CLS students.

Students significantly most likely to be stereotyped:

· Non-Whites, women, 22-25 year olds, those with a disability, non-heterosexuals, non-Christians, those who work over 20 hours per week, CLS students and those who reside off-campus.

Students significantly most likely to experience discrimination:

· Non-Whites, women, those over the age of 26, those with a disability, non-Christians, those who work over 20 hours per week, CLS students, those who reside off-campus, those who do not receive any financial assistance from family and those who grew up in an urban setting.

Students significantly most likely to experience verbal attack:

· Non-Whites, 22-25 year olds, those with a disability, CBA students and those who reside off-campus.

Students significantly most likely to have thought of leaving UW-L:

· Non-Whites, those with a disability, non-heterosexuals, non-Christians, CLS students, those who grew up in an urban setting and those who are enrolled part- time.

Students significantly most likely to have been sexually harassed:

· Women, those 22-25 years old, non- Christian, off-campus residents and those who grew up in urban settings.

Students significantly most likely to be dissatisfied/neutral with UW-L:

· Non-Whites and non-Christians.

Students significantly most likely to be "not comfortable or neutral" about campus climate:

· Non-Whites, men, 26+ year olds, those with a disability, non-Christians, those who do not receive financial help from family and those of "other" academic status.

Students significantly most likely to have feared getting a poor grade in a class because of a hostile classroom environment:

· Non-Whites, 26+ year olds, those with a disability, those who work 20+ hours per week, off-campus residents and those who do not received financial help from family.

Students significantly most likely to have been sexually assaulted:

· Non-Whites, women, those 20-21 years old, those who work 20+ hours per week and off-campus residents.

Students significantly most likely to be physically attacked:

· Non-Whites, men, 22-25 year olds, non-Christians, those work 20+ hours per week, off-campus residents and those who grew up in an urban setting.

Students significantly most likely to be "not comfortable or neutral" about climate in classes:

· Non-Whites, those with a disability, non-heterosexuals, non-Christians, CLS students and those who do not receive financial help from family.

Students significantly most likely to state that there is "not enough" emphasis placed on diversity:

· Non-Whites, those with a disability, non-heterosexuals, non-Christians, CLS students, those who grew up in an urban setting and those whose mother's have a Bachelor's degree.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

All dependent variables, except for Satisfaction with UWL, had significant predictors in multivariate statistical analysis. Further analysis is below.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: BULLLYING

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of being bullied are 133% higher for non-white students relative to White students. Said differently, you are 2 1/3 times more likely to be bullied if you are non-White than if you are White.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being bullied are 2 ½ higher (150%) higher for those with a disability relative to those without a disability.

· Holding all IVs constant, students who work 20 or more hours per work are 1 ½ times (52%) more likely to be bullied relative to those who work less than 20 hours.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being bullied are 1.87 times (87%) higher for CLS students relative to CBA students.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being bullied are 1½ times higher (49%) for on-campus residents relative to off-campus residents

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: STEREOTYPE

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of being stereotyped are 2 1/2 (153%) higher for non-white students relative to White students.

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of being stereotyped are 28% lower for male students than female students.

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of being stereotyped are 52% and 75% higher, for 20-21 and 22-25 year olds respectively, relative to those 19 and younger.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being stereotyped are nearly 3 times (196%) higher for non-heterosexual students relative to heterosexual students.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: DISCRIMINATION

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of being discriminated are over 6 1/2 (556%) higher for non-white students relative to White students.

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of being discriminated are over 2 times (120%) higher for 22-25 year olds than for those 19 and younger.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being discriminated are nearly 2 ½ times (146%) higher for students with a disability relative to those without a disability.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being discriminated against are approximately 2 times (107%) higher for CLS student than for CBA students.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: VERBAL ATTACK

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of being verbally attacked are over 1.84 times (84%) higher for non-white students relative to White students.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being verbally attacked are nearly 1.83 times (83%) higher for students with a disability relative to those without a disability.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being verbally attacked are approximately 46% lower for students who live on-campus relative to those who reside off- campus.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: LEAVE UW-L

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of thinking of leaving UWL are over 1.92 times (92%) higher for non-white students relative to White students.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of thinking of leaving UWL are 53% lower for students who are over the age of 26 relative to those who are 19 and under.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of thinking of leaving UW-L are approximately 2 times higher (103%) for those with a disability relative to those without a disability.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of thinking of leaving UW-L are around 62% lower for full-time students relative to part-time students.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: SEXUAL HARASSMENT

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being sexually harassed are 89% lower for male students relative to female students.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being sexually harassed are 37% lower for Christian students relative to non-Christian students.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being sexually harassed are 1.44 times (44%) higher for students who grew up in an urban setting relative to those who grew up in a rural setting.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: SEXUAL ASSAULT

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being sexually assaulted are 3.10 times (210%) higher for non-White students relative to white students.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being sexually assaulted are 95.6% lower for male students relative to female students.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being sexually assaulted are 67.4% lower for students who reside on-campus relative to students who live off-campus.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being sexually assaulted are 334% higher for students whose father's highest education is some college/technical/associates degree relative to those whose father's have a high school education or less.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: CAMPUS CLIMATE

· The odds of being comfortable with the campus climate are 88% lower for non- Whites than for Whites, holding all independent variables constant.

· The odds of being comfortable with the campus climate are 58% lower for those with a disability than for those without a disability, holding all independent variables constant.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: FEAR OF POOR GRADE DUE TO HOSTILE CLASS

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of fearing a poor grade due to a hostile class environment are 2.4 times (140%) higher for non-white students relative to White students.

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of fearing a poor grade due to a hostile class environment are 4.3 times (333%) higher for those students 26 and older relative to students 19 and younger.

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of fearing a poor grade due to a hostile class environment are nearly 3 times (195%) higher for students with disabilities relative to those without a disability.

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of fearing a poor grade due to a hostile class environment are 1.82 times (82%) higher for Christian students relative to non-Christian students.

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of fearing a poor grade due to a hostile class environment are 1.86 times (86%) higher for students who work 20+ hours per week relative to students who work less than 20 hours per week.

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of fearing a poor grade due to a hostile class environment are 1.90 times (90%) higher for students whose father has a Master's degree or higher relative to those whose father has a high school degree or less.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: PHYSICAL ATTACK

· Holding all independent variables constant, the odds of being physically attacked are 5.54 times (454%) greater for students ages 22-25 relative to students 19 and younger.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being physically attacked are 63% lower for Christians relative to non-Christian students.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: CLASSES CLIMATE

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being comfortable with the campus climate are 88% lower for non-Whites than for Whites.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being comfortable with the campus climate are 2.11 times (111%) higher for students 20-21 relative to those 19 and under.

· Holding all IVs constant, the odds of being comfortable with the campus climate are 75% lower for those with a disability than for those without a disability.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS: EMPHASIS ON DIVERSITY

· Holding all IVs constant, Non-White students are 4.06 times (306%) more likely to express that there is not enough emphasis on diversity on campus relative to white students.

· Holding all IVs constant, students with a disability are 1.74 times (74%) more likely to express that there is not enough emphasis on diversity on campus relative to students that do not have a disability.

· Holding all IVs constant, non-heterosexual students are 1.84 times (84%) more likely to express that there is not enough emphasis on diversity on campus relative to heterosexual students.
· Holding all IVs constant, Christians are 30% less likely to express that the is enough emphasis on diversity on campus relative to non- Christians.

Campus Climate Survey 2013
Qualitative Survey Summary

Notable Employee Themes
Bullying/Intimidation/Verbal Abuse within the workplace
Concerns over nepotism/favoritism
Sizeism
Classified Staff
Conservative/Liberal Tensions
Bottom Line v. Student Learning
Problems being "ignored"
Passive Aggression/Subtle Bullying/Microaggressions
Sexual Orientation Discrimination
Sexism
Racial Minority Concerns

Why Employees Consider Leaving/Choose to stay at UW-L
Consider Leaving
Walker
Compensation
Don't feel valued by Administrations/Department

Why They Stay
Loyalty to colleagues/students
Too many years spent in UW-System to leave
Family Considerations
No better offers/biding time

Notable Student Themes
Off Campus "Party Culture" – Subsequent problems
Stereotypes
Body Type
Activities/Involvements
Conservative Students feeling unappreciated/silenced
Belief in subjective, negative grading
Believe relationship with professor, professor personality type, or assumptions the professor has about them could negatively affect their grade
Students feel very comfortable going to their RA for issues related to the University Climate.
Students feel very comfortable with the overall climate
Concerns from/regarding the experience of minority students

Why Students Consider Leaving UW-L
Consider Leaving
Academic
Couldn't get into desired major at UW-L
Desired a program elsewhere
Most often a Nursing program
Environment
La Crosse/UW-L culture not a "fit"
Geography
Wanted to be closer/farther from support system
Student Services/Staff Rapport
Students displeased with their academic advising/relationship with professors

Why Students Chose to Stay at UW-L
Made connection to another student
Notable number of respondents noted joining an Student Org (Res Life, CRU, ATP)
Made connection to a student/new roommate
Found a better/more appropriate major
Loyalty to UW-L
Circumstances prevent leaving
Hassle of transferring, signing a lease
Still Considering Leaving?
Lack of program they desire
Still haven't made connection with peers
Looking for a "more prestigious" school

##########