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# Introduction

## Background and Purpose

Clark College administered the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) Diversity and Equity Campus Climate survey in April 2022 in compliance with [RCW 28B.10.147](https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=28B.10.147). While Clark College has included diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in previous climate surveys, this recent survey intentionally focused on DEI. The College plans to administer a DEI-focused climate survey every two years through a collaboration between Clark College’s [Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion](https://www.clark.edu/campus-life/student-support/diversity-and-equity/diversity_center.php) and the [Office of Assessment and Institutional Research](https://clarknet.clark.edu/air/index.php).

Survey findings will shape the Power, Privilege, and Inequity (PPI) and Anti-Racist training programs for students and employees who are required to meet the expectations of Washington Senate Bill 5227. Additionally, this feedback provides insights from students, faculty, staff, and administrators as it relates to the success of Clark College’s efforts towards equity and inclusion and how the institution may improve in these areas.

## Instrumentation

Clark College selected the HEDS Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey, which is a nationally sourced survey created and managed by the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) Consortium. The Climate survey measures the perceptions of students, faculty, staff, and administrators regarding the institution’s climate and support for diversity and equity, and experiences of the campus community with discrimination and harassment. The survey instrument contains 20 areas with multiple choice questions in each section, including 22 demographic and open-ended questions.

## Methodology

The Climate survey was administered for two weeks in April 2022 and was sent via email and shared on social media. Announcements were posted in the College’s Penguin Digest to all students, faculty, staff, and administrators at Clark College. HEDS compiled the data and conducted the analysis. The results spreadsheet includes 17 worksheets with a linked table of contents to easily access different sections in the survey results. The analysis also includes comparisons with 4-year public institutions and all other institutions that administered the survey on their campuses. HEDS also provided responses to open-ended questions.

## Demographic Profile of Survey Respondents

The number of individuals responding to the survey included 208 faculty, 237 staff and administrators, and 419 students. The survey results may not be generalizable, due to the lower numbers uncovered when disaggregated by demographic characteristics. Results do represent the opinions of those who responded to the survey.

Table 1 displays the respondent data disaggregated by race and ethnicity. In Table 2, the gender identity of survey respondents is presented.

### Table 1. Survey Respondents by Race and Ethnicity and Role at Clark

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Students | Faculty | Staff & Administrators |
|  | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| African American/Black​ | 8 | 2​ | 4 | 2​ | 7 | 3 |
| Asian​ | 23 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 3 |
| Hispanic/Latinx​ | 22 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| International​ | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Other races/ethnicities​ | 11 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 3 |
| Multiple races/ethnicities​ | 73 | 19 | 19 | 10 | 36 | 17 |
| White​ | 234 | 61 | 144 | 79 | 149 | 70​ |
| Total | 385 | 100 | 183 | 100 | 212 | 100 |

### Table 2. Survey Respondents by Gender Identity

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Students | Faculty | Staff & Administrators |
|  | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Male | 106 | 27 | 67 | 36 | 54 | 25 |
| Female | 246 | 64 | 115 | 62 | 155 | 72 |
| Non-binary and/or transgender | 35 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| Total | 387 | 100 | 186 | 100 | 214 | 100 |

Table 1 displays the respondent data disaggregated by race and ethnicity. The demographics of the survey respondents show similar numbers amongst the 3 responding groups.

# Key Findings

## Indicators Summary and Discussion

Respondents evaluated a series of survey items using Likert-scales. Four indicators of diversity and equity were constructed based on these survey items:

* Campus Climate for Diversity and Equity,
* Institutional Support for Diversity and Equity,
* Insensitive or Disparaging Remarks, and
* Discrimination or Harassment.

Figure 1 presents the Four Indicators for Diversity and Equity simultaneously on the chart—using different colors to indicate the different indicators. The indicator mean scores are disaggregated by race and ethnicity for students, faculty, staff, and administrators.

The figure contains two types of indicators:

* Positive numbers for Campus Climate for Diversity and Equity and Institutional Support for Diversity and Equity, and
* Negative numbers for Insensitive or Disparaging Remarks, and Discrimination or Harassment.

The first set of indicators -- *Campus Climate for Diversity and Equity* which gauges respondents' satisfaction with the campus climate for diversity and equity, and *Institutional Support for Diversity and Equity* which focuses on the extent to which the campus community believes that the institution supports diversity and equity -- are presented as positive because they measure experiences and interactions that promote campus climate. Larger positive numbers indicate higher satisfaction with the campus climate or higher perceived institutional support.

The second set of indicators -- *Insensitive or Disparaging Remarks* which measures how often respondents heard insensitive or disparaging remarks aimed at people's identities, and *Discrimination or Harassment* which asked respondents how often they experienced discrimination or harassment are represented – are presented as negative values because these indicators measure experiences and interactions that harm campus climate. Larger negative numbers indicate more frequent incidences of insensitive or disparaging remarks or discrimination or harassment.

Data show that International and Asian respondents reported the highest overall mean scores for *Campus Climate and Institutional Support*, while African American/Black and All Other Races/Ethnicities had the lowest overall mean score for these indicators. These results suggest that African American/Black and All Other Races respondents are not experiencing campus climate and institutional support as positively as their peer respondents.

Data also show that African American/Black respondents reported the highest overall mean scores for the indicators, *Insensitive Remarks and Discrimination/Harassment*, while international respondents had the lowest overall mean scores. These results suggest that racial/ethnic identity impacts how one experiences the campus community at Clark.

### Figure 1. Indicator Scores: How Respondents with the Following Races/Ethnicities Experience Your Institution

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Campus Climate for Diversity and Equity** | 1=Very dissatisfied; 2=Generally dissatisfied; 3=Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. 4=Generally satisfied; 5=Very satisfied |
| **Institutional Support for Diversity and Equity** | 1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neither agree nor disagree; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree |
| **Insensitive or Disparaging Remarks** | 1=Never; 2=Rarely; 3=Sometimes; 4=Often; 5=Very often *(shown as a negative score on charts)* |
| **Discrimination or Harassment** | 1=0% have experienced discrimination or harassment; 2=25%; 3=50%; 4=75%; 5=100% *(shown as a negative score on charts)* |

## Survey Indicators and Sections Discussion of Results

### Indicator #1: Campus Climate for Diversity and Equity, and Comfort Interacting with Different Groups

This Campus Climate for Diversity and Equity indicator included four items that focused on satisfaction with the overall campus climate, and two items that measured survey respondents’ perceptions on whether diversity improves the college and their comfort with sharing their views related to diversity and equity. Respondents were asked to evaluate their comfort with interacting with different groups including various racial or ethnic identities, socioeconomic backgrounds, sexual orientations, etc. (To review the results, refer to the spreadsheet provided by HEDS and the worksheets labeled, 6. Campus Climate and 12. Comfort.)

Overall, student respondents were more satisfied with the campus climate than were faculty, staff, and administrators. For example, 77% of students reported they were very satisfied or generally satisfied with the campus climate as compared to 48% of faculty and 45% of staff and administrators.

In general, all respondents reported being comfortable interacting with different groups of people. For example, 94% of students, 98% of faculty, and 95% of staff and administrators were very comfortable or somewhat comfortable interacting with individuals that have *a different racial or ethnic identity*. Similarly, 89% of students, 97% of faculty and 92% of staff and administrators were very comfortable or somewhat comfortable interacting with *people who have a sexual orientation other than your own*.

Similar responses were reported for the other survey items except for *people who hold a political affiliation, philosophy, or view that differs from yours*. For this item, 77% of students, 75% of faculty, and 78% of staff and administrators reported they were very comfortable or somewhat comfortable with these types of interactions. While most respondents reported being very comfortable or somewhat comfortable, when compared to responses for other items, there is cause for concern.

### Indicator #2: Institutional Support for Diversity and Equity, and Impact of Different Activities on Support for Diversity and Equity

This Institutional Support for Diversity and Equity indicator included four questions in which respondents were asked the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with items such as: *The campus environment is free from tensions related to individuals or groups, prioritization of recruitment* and retention of students, faculty, staff, and administrators and leadership’s commitment to diversity and equity. This indicator was examined using with survey items on *Impact of Different Activities on Support for Diversity and Equity* that focused on the impact of different activities (i.e., attending presentations and trainings and performing community service) on support for diversity and equity. (To review the results, refer to the spreadsheet provided by HEDS and the worksheets labeled, 7. Institutional Support and 10. Impact.)

For the Institutional Support indicator, student responses generally aligned with those of faculty and staff/administrators except for the item, *The campus environment is free from tensions related to individual or group difference*s. A higher percentage of students strongly agreed and agreed (78%) with this statement as compared to only 20% of faculty and 19% of staff and administrators. For the item, *recruitment of historically marginalized students, faculty, and staff is an institutional priority*, 54% of students, 51% of faculty, and 56% of staff and administrators strongly agreed or agreed with this statement.

In terms of the impact of activities on support for diversity and equity, *performing community service* appears to have a positive impact on support for diversity and equity with 54% of students, 49% of faculty, and 52% of staff and administrators reporting that it greatly increased or somewhat increase support for diversity and equity. Participating in discussions, training, or activities on diversity and equity also appeared to improve support for these issues.

**Recommendations:**

1. Ensure survey instrument includes demographic data that can be used for the next Climate survey to disaggregate student data and uncover how each student group responded.
2. Put forth a concentrated, deliberate effort to include more students (especially from all historically underserved groups) to take Climate surveys. (Self-Selection bias in the current data)
3. Offer more opportunities to engage in-person to increase awareness of issues discussed in the last 10 questions of the survey.
4. Recruitment of and retention of underrepresented students, faculty, and staff. This includes being clearer about goals, policies, and processes around the recruitment and retention of historically underrepresented students, faculty, and staff.
5. Improving college environment by supporting wellness at the College to better about ourselves and how we can help change the campus environment. (Less Zoom, more personal interactions)

### Indicator #3: Insensitive or Disparaging Remarks

For the Insensitive or Disparaging Remarks indicator, respondents reported the frequency with which they experienced or heard disparaging remarks around race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender or gender identity, socioeconomic background, religious background, disabilities, immigrants, political affiliation, age, and non-native speakers of English. In addition to these questions, the survey also asked about the source of insensitive or disparaging remarks to include students, faculty, staff, administration, and the local community. (To review the results, refer to the spreadsheet provided by HEDS and the worksheets labeled, 8. Disparaging Remarks.)

The percentage of students who reported hearing disparaging comments about different identity groups “never or rarely” ranged from 74% (people with a particular political affiliation or view) to 93% (people who are immigrants). The percentage of faculty who reported hearing disparaging comments about different identity groups “never or rarely” ranged from 40% (people with a particular political affiliation or view) to 83% (people with a disability, people from a particular socioeconomic background, and people of a particular sexual orientation, with a floor benchmark of 62%. The percentage of staff who reported hearing disparaging comments about different identity groups “never or rarely” ranged from 40% (people with a particular political affiliation or view) to 81% (people with a particular disability).

Additionally, respondents were asked if they were aware of someone making an insensitive or disparaging remark, how often the source of that remark came from a student, faculty, staff, administrator, or a local community member. Students responding “never or rarely” ranged from 68% (students) to 94% (administrators). Faculty responding “never or rarely” ranged from 46% (students and local community) to 79% (administrators). Staff and administrators responding “never or rarely” ranged from 55% (local community) to 71% (faculty).

All respondent groups (students, faculty, staff, and administrators) reported higher numbers of insensitive or disparaging remarks about people with a particular political affiliation or group.

Data shows a range of how respondents with different identities heard remarks about other identities. For example, 16% of white respondents reported sometimes, often, or very often hearing negative remarks about racial/ethnic identity, compared to 37% of African American/Black respondents, 28% of Asian respondents, and 24% of Hispanic/Latino respondents. This is replicated across many identity categories, with the dominant identity hearing remarks at lower rates than the non-dominant identities.

**Recommendations:**

1. Increased support and communication from college leadership for people on campus experiencing the impacts of disparaging remarks. Feedback in the qualitative data provided many examples where increased support was needed – either in the form of transparency in the reporting and investigation process, training on how to respond to these harmful remarks, or support for emotional and mental health.
2. Increased institution-wide training about microaggressions – how to identify them, what their impact is, and how to disrupt them when encountered. This training should have a focused follow-up from managers (for employees) and faculty (for students) to assist in the normalizing of disruption and advocacy.
3. People with non-dominant identities experiencing insensitive or disparaging remarks at a higher rate than those with dominant identities, the need for “safe spaces” and communities-- like affinity-based student clubs and employee resource groups--is apparent. These spaces offer community and fellowship, and an opportunity for attendees to be their authentic selves without having to adapt behavior to conform to White Supremacy Culture. With the understanding of how crucial these spaces are to both student and employee retention and morale, it is recommended that these spaces continue to be cultivated and supported.

Indicator #4: Experiences of Discrimination or Harassment

The Experiences of Discrimination or Harassment indicator asked the survey respondents if they had ever been discriminated against or harassed at Clark College or at a college event. Survey respondents were also asked whether they knew whom to contact and the process for filing a complaint at the College as well as the frequency and type of discrimination or harassment the respondent had experienced at Clark or at a college event. To review the results, refer to the spreadsheet provided by HEDS and the worksheets labeled, 9. Discrimination Harassment.

Most students, faculty and staff, and administrators survey respondents were aware of whom they should contact if they experience discrimination or harassment at Clark. However, only 48% of students indicated that the process for reporting acts of discrimination or harassment at Clark was clear.

In terms of the clarity of the process for investigating acts of discrimination or harassment at Clark, 43% of students, 47% of faculty, and 52% of staff and administrators strongly agreed or agreed with this statement.

When asked if they have been harassed or discriminated against on campus or at a campus event, 15% of students surveyed responded yes or unsure. Of these, 41% indicated the discrimination/harassment was associated with their political affiliation or political views. Of the faculty respondents who said yes (37%) 18% indicated the discrimination/harassment was associated with their race of gender identity. Of the staff/admin respondents who responded Yes (35%) to this item, 18% indicated the discrimination/harassment was associated with an aspect of their identity that is not listed in the survey.

Overall, 43% of the participants who responded “Yes” to having been discriminated against or harassed indicated they have been targeted within a year of taking the survey. The most common form of discrimination/harassment was being deliberately ignored, isolated, left out, or excluded.

Lastly, out of the incidents that have occurred within a year of taking the survey, 24% of students officially reported the incident, 45% of faculty reported, and 36% of staff admin reported.

# Recommended Actions

Twenty-six members from the Social Equity Advisory Council and the Climate Improvement Taskforce put forth recommended actions following the Collaborative Inquiry session.

1. Future Climate Surveys should ensure that more students respond by a) making the survey available at computer kiosks around the College for accessibility purposes, b) build trust and ensure students understand the survey is confidential, c) incentivize student participation.
2. Through focus groups and interviews, explore why faculty, staff and administrators are dissatisfied with campus climate and sense of belonging and seek solutions based on evidence gathered.
3. Disaggregate data further based on respondent groups (faculty with tenure vs. adjunct, admin vs. staff).
4. Improve education for staff, students, and faculty about discrimination and harassment. This should be a scalable process that can be integrated into employee onboarding, College 101, Welcome Days, etc. Integrate it into syllabi and post information around campus like the emergency posters.
5. Offer behavioral change training for bystanders by teaching individuals how best to support and assist others when they learn about and/or experience discrimination and harassment.
6. Explore other modalities and approaches for delivering changes.

## Limitations and Considerations

When reviewing the data, it is important to consider the following. Since the number of students who participated in the survey was much lower than expected, the results should be interpreted with caution. Be mindful of this as well for faculty, staff, and administrators’ responses as there are missing participants, based on the data submitted to HEDS.

It is also important to acknowledge that the current political climate in the U.S. may impact responses to certain items. The current national dialogue on political topics often results with the media and national leaders encouraging an “Us vs. Them" mentality.

The pandemic also polarized our society which through expressing differing opinions about COVID-19 policies and vaccination requirements. The reader should also be mindful that we all have different lived experiences or dominant identities that impact how we evaluate and respond to the HEDS survey items. For example, the HEDS survey instrument was not available in other languages for non-Native English speakers.

Additionally, the time an individual spends on campus may factor into their survey responses. For example, students may be on the physical campus for shorter periods of time, compared to the time that faculty, staff, and administrators typically spend on the campus. This could impact how each group feels about their experiences at Clark. One’s role at Clark may also be a factor.

Finally, it is important to consider this question when reviewing the results: Have we, as a society, normalized discrimination and harassment? If so, how might that impact the members of our community responding to this survey as well as their comfort with reporting, comfort with different groups, and creating a truly inclusive culture at Clark College?

# Appendices
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