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**Introduction**

One of the initiatives of Binghamton University’s strategic plan, *Road Map to Premier*, was the creation of a senior-level division – the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (ODEI) that would lead campus efforts around diversity and inclusion policies and programs. The mission of the ODEI is to advance a teaching, research and service environment that is committed to excellence by working collaboratively throughout the institution with faculty, staff and students to promote a campus climate that values diversity, equity and inclusion. One of the early tasks of ODEI was to conduct a campus-wide “Campus Climate Survey” to gather a variety of data related to institutional climate, inclusion and work-life issues to inform development of programs and policies to enhance diversity and inclusion. This report presents the methodology used to create the survey questions and collect the data, a description of the respondents, the results of the responses for those questions where meaningful insight is provided, an interpretation and analysis of the data, observations gained, and recommendations of how to use these result in developing programs and policies. In addition, work that has been in process since the creation of ODEI is presented to indicate actions already initiated to enhance the campus climate around issues of diversity and inclusion.

**Methodology**

The development of the survey instrument was a collaborative effort between ODEI and Divisional Diversity Officers (DDO), who are comprised of faculty, staff and administrators representing the divisions of academic affairs, operations, advancement, research and student affairs and athletics (names are listed in the Appendix). We also paired with Sean Massey, associate professor of Women, Gender & Sexuality Studies, who had worked with a group of LGBTQ students to develop an LGBTQ climate survey that was consolidated into the larger, more comprehensive survey instrument. Focus groups of students, senior officers, faculty senators, Professional Employee Council members, and union leadership tested and provided feedback on the survey before it was distributed to the campus.

The survey process was divided into three phases:

- **PHASE I (fall 2013-spring 2014) Assessment tool development and implementation**
  Meetings were held with ODEI, Divisional Diversity Officers and staff to develop the survey instrument. The ODEI team examined various survey modules and reviewed multiple drafts of the survey. Focus groups were held with student leaders, faculty and staff to evaluate the survey purpose and goals. The ODEI team approved the final survey instrument that was made available to the entire University community from April 1 through April 30, 2014.

- **PHASE II (summer 2014-fall 2014) Data analysis**
  Quantitative and qualitative analyses were conducted on the data from the survey.

---

1 LGBT stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people. When written as LGBTQ, the Q indicates either queer or questioning. These are all variations of sexual identity.
• **PHASE III (spring 2015) Final report and presentation**

Presentation of survey results to the campus community through a report drafted by ODEI and implementation of next steps and initiatives for campus.

The Binghamton University Campus Climate Survey contained 117 questions on a variety of topics, including several open-ended questions for respondents to provide commentary. The survey was offered in English and was available from April 1 through April 30, 2014. The survey data were analyzed to compare the responses of various groups. Descriptive statistics were calculated by group memberships (e.g., campus status, gender identity, racial identity, etc.) to provide additional information regarding participant responses. Meaningful and notable findings are included in this report based on descriptive and inferential analyses. For the purposes of this report, content analyses were conducted on questions for which limited quantitative data was collected.

The survey was anonymous and participation was voluntary. The survey included questions addressing issues relevant to a large number of campus groups as well as questions that addressed unique experiences of each group.

All participants responded to questions addressing:

- Demographics including race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, citizenship, disability status and institutional status – staff, faculty, administration, student.
- General assessment of campus climate with items addressing topics including ethnic, gender, religious, and sexuality diversity; comfort level interacting with those from different cultural backgrounds or who are differently abled; importance of multicultural awareness, competency, and fluency; work/learning environment; attitude about race and prevalence of racism on campus; and assessment of Binghamton University’s ability to deal with problems related to discrimination and harassment.
- Experiences of harassment and discrimination while living, learning or working on campus; and the nature, source and location of those experiences.
- Questions about the experiences of participants with disabilities and the availability of campus resources for students with disabilities.
- Specific questions were also asked about the unique experiences on campus for those who identified as LGBTQ, minorities, and persons with disabilities. Student respondents also answered questions addressing their attitudes toward lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender students and attitudes toward people of color.

Survey participants were eligible for prizes such as an iPad, Binghamton University Barnes & Noble Bookstore gift card, Binghamton BUC$, 2014-15 season tickets to Binghamton Bearcats men’s and women’s basketball, and parking garage access cards; these incentives were donated by various campus divisions.
The survey had several limitations associated with the self-selection of respondents, the quantitative nature of the survey and the anonymous nature of the survey. These are illustrated in the figure below.

**Limitation of Method**

**Self-selecting sample**
- Respondents are more highly motivated
- Some demographic categories can have small response rates and reduce statistical significance.
- ...and may have more extreme, positive & negative attitudes

**Predominantly quantitative data**
- Limited information about the meaning of observed differences in experiences across groups

**Anonymous survey**
- Limits ability to follow up on findings.

**Description of the sample at Binghamton University**

Members of the Binghamton University community completed 2,042 surveys for an overall response rate of 11 percent. Response rates by constituent groups are summarized in Table 1 and 2. The percentages shown in Table 1 are based on the respondents in the sample for the specific demographic characteristic.

**Table 1: Campus Climate Survey demographics by campus status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percent of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Staff*</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2042</strong></td>
<td><strong>11%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were allowed to self-identify as administration or staff. However, because of the sometimes unclear distinction between staff and administration it was decided to combine these respondents. For the remainder of this report the term administration/staff will refer to those respondents who self-identified as staff or administration.*

Table 2 reports the number of completed surveys by the categories of gender, race, sexuality, citizenship, disability, and religion. Note that all questions could be skipped by a respondent; therefore the totals in Table 1 and 2 will not necessarily be the same.
Table 2: Campus Climate Survey respondent demographics by category*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex/Gender</th>
<th>Faculty Frequency</th>
<th>Faculty Percent</th>
<th>Admin/Staff Frequency</th>
<th>Admin/Staff Percent</th>
<th>Student Frequency</th>
<th>Student Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Queer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1412</td>
<td></td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>1419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1412</td>
<td></td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Faculty Frequency</th>
<th>Faculty Percent</th>
<th>Admin/Staff Frequency</th>
<th>Admin/Staff Percent</th>
<th>Student Frequency</th>
<th>Student Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1412</td>
<td></td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 continued:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Admin/Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Only</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>1427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Mostly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Somewhat More</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual and Homosexual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual Somewhat More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual Mostly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual Only</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer the term Bisexual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure/I don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
<td>1412</td>
<td></td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Admin/Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Religious/Atheist</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faith</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td>1134</td>
<td></td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
<td>1412</td>
<td></td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 continued:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Status</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Admin/Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
<td>1412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents were able to choose all that apply in this category

Table 3 provides a summary of the overall population at Binghamton University as of April 30, 2014, to allow an understanding of how the survey population relates to the larger campus community.

Table 3: Binghamton University demographics: April 2014*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender identity</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Admin/staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>8159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>7391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial identity</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Admin/staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>8173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship status</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Admin/staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>12502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-U.S. citizen</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Binghamton University Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
Results

The survey responses were analyzed to ascertain the experiences each constituent group was having on campus in relation to their identities and campus status as well as to gauge the overall campus climate. For the purposes of this analysis, administration and staff responses were combined and will be referred to as administration/staff. Undergraduate and graduate responses were also combined. The findings presented below are organized in three primary thematic categories: **diversity and inclusion**, **discrimination/harassment/incivility** and **campus resources**. These themes define areas of opportunity for Binghamton University to continue to improve the welcoming and supportive environment that promotes inclusive excellence. In analyzing the results, it became apparent that the terms discrimination and harassment, which have legal definitions, were used in a broad manner by respondents to identify personal experiences that had a negative impact on them and therefore the campus climate.

**Importance of Diversity and Inclusion**

Students, faculty and administration/staff scored the question: “How important do you believe it is to have a campus atmosphere that is open to and supportive of diversity?” (1=Extremely unimportant, 5=Extremely important) similarly as shown in Figure 1.

**Figure 1: Importance of Diversity and Inclusion.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin/Staff</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Awareness of policies on diversity

Faculty and administration/staff were also asked the yes/no question: “Are they aware that Binghamton University has a stated policy regarding diversity?” to which 81 percent of the faculty and 77 percent of the admin/staff responded yes.

Responses by faculty and Administration/staff to a series of questions addressing procedures of responding to negative experiences, commitment to diversity both by the institution and by individuals are show in Figure 2 on a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 indicates “not at all” and 7 indicates “absolutely”.

This figure shows that 7 of the 10 questions scored above a 4.8, with many above 5.0 and several above a 6.0. However, 3 questions scored below 3.6 by faculty and staff/administration. These questions included: “To what degree are you encouraged to provide feedback regarding the diversity of Binghamton University as a whole?” “To what degree are you encouraged to provide feedback regarding diversity by your direct supervisor?” “To what degree is your commitment to diversity part of your overall performance and evaluation as an employee?”

**Figure 2: Awareness of Binghamton University policies and practices, Faculty and administration/staff (students were not asked this question). Data for Figure 2 is shown in the Appendix in Table A-2**

Campus comfort level with diversity

The next series of questions was asked to students, faculty and Administration/staff about their overall comfort with the diverse cultures on campus. Figure 3 shows the responses to these seven questions on a 1 to 5 scale, where 1 indicated “totally uncomfortable” and 5 indicated “totally comfortable”. Scores by students, faculty, and Administration/staff were similar with all average scores above 4.0 and most above 4.5.

Figure 3: Comfort level with diversity. Data for Figure 3 is shown in the Appendix in Table A-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Admin/Staff</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whose religious beliefs are different from your own?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are of another gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who have a physical or mental disability?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose sexual orientation is different from your own?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose ethnic background is different from your own?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are from a social class other than your own?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose racial identity is different from your own?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Totally Uncomfortable to 5=Totally Comfortable

Recommendation of Binghamton University

All respondents were asked the question: “Would you recommend Binghamton University as a place to work (faculty and staff/administration) or to go to school (students).” Figure 4 shows the results of the responses for each group on a 1 to 7 scale.
Figure 4: Binghamton University as a place to be. Data in Figure 4 are shown in the Appendix in Table A-4.

Harassment and discrimination

A series of questions was asked to determine the frequency and characteristics of harassment and discrimination that students, faculty, administration/staff have experienced at Binghamton University. As mentioned previously, the terms discrimination and harassment can be interpreted as having formal legal definitions; however for the purpose of this survey the terms were interpreted more broadly as personal experiences that resulted from a person’s identity and negatively impacted that person or negatively impacted the campus climate. This difficulty of interpreting terms, led to the use of the phrase discrimination, harassment, or incivility as best describing these negative experiences caused by identity. In further sections of this report, the type of experience is further analyzed (verbal comments, threats, etc), which gives a better indication of the experience rather than the general term discrimination, harassment, or incivility.

Overall responses:

The response to the question “Have you ever felt harassed or discriminated against while at Binghamton University?” is analyzed in the following pages by status and identity of the respondents, as well as the characteristic of the experience including the type, location and source. It should be noted that when disaggregating the data on variables of identity and status, some questions had a relatively small number of responses. In some cases the number of responses may be too small to extrapolate the results over a larger population, without significant loss in confidence. While a more formal statistical analysis of the data is possible and could be conducted using the data provided in the Appendix, this document only
reports the data and does not make claims or estimates of how far the results can be superimposed over the various campus populations.

Among survey respondents representing faculty, administration/staff and students (n =2042), 22 percent stated that they have had a negative experience at Binghamton University that they would classify informally as harassment and/or discrimination. When further analyzed by campus status, the results showed that 32 percent of faculty respondents, 29 percent of administration/staff respondents and 19 percent of student respondents stated that they experienced discrimination and/or harassment at Binghamton University. These results are shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Experiences of discrimination and/or harassment. Data in Figure 5 are shown in the Appendix in Table A-5

OVERALL:
HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED DISCRIMINATION OR HARASSMENT AT BINGHAMTON?

FACULTY:
HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED DISCRIMINATION OR HARASSMENT AT BINGHAMTON?
These results show that two out of every 10 of the approximately 2,000 respondents have had a negative experience that they would classify as discrimination and or harassment. Further questions, described below, show that the experiences could be more generally described as incivility, where incivility is “a lack of courtesy in behavior and speech.” Further analysis of the ways in which respondents have experienced these acts of discrimination/harassment/incivility will inform our next steps around educational and professional development activities that can impact the inclusiveness of our campus community.
Types of experience:

The survey next asked respondents to indicate the type of discrimination, harassment or incivility they experienced. The results of this question for each group are shown in Figure 6. There were 10 types of experiences to choose from: verbal comments, exclusion, discrimination, written comments, stares, threats of physical violence, negative writings in University publications, physical assaults or injuries, graffiti or other form(s). Respondents could select more than one; however, all faculty and administration/staff respondents who answered this question selected only one type, and only students selected more than one. Since respondents could select more than one type, the sum of the percentage in each pie chart can be greater than 100 percent.

The most prevalent type among all respondents was experienced through verbal comments, followed by exclusion. Among faculty and administration/staff respondents, discrimination was the third highest type of act experienced, while students cited stares as the third highest act. It is important to note that even when the data are disaggregated by race, gender and sexual orientation for faculty and administration/staff, the top three types of experiences are still verbal comments, exclusion and discrimination.

Figure 6: Types of discrimination/harassment/incivility experienced. Data shown in Figure 6 are in the Appendix in Table A-6.

FACULTY:
TYPE OF DISCRIMINATION/HARASSMENT REPORTED

![Diagram showing the distribution of discrimination/harassment types for faculty.]
ADMINISTRATION/STAFF:
TYPE OF DISCRIMINATION/HARASSMENT REPORTED

- Other Types: 26%
- Written Comments: 13%
- Discrimination: 17%
- Exclusion: 10%
- Verbal Comments: 39%

STUDENT:
TYPE OF DISCRIMINATION/HARASSMENT REPORTED

- Written Comments: 21%
- Other Types: 18%
- Negative Writings in University Publications: 9%
- Stares: 30%
- Exclusion: 13%
- Verbal Comments: 8%
Race and Gender:

Figure 7 shows the demographics by race of respondents who indicated they experienced discrimination, harassment, or incivility. The most prevalent racial groups among faculty respondents to indicate that they experienced these negative experiences were Black, Asian and faculty who indicated that they identify as some other racial group not listed in the survey. Figure 7 shows that among faculty, 67 percent of Black males, 60 percent of Black females and 50 percent of Asian females reported that they have experienced some form of discrimination, harassment, or incivility.

The number of respondents for this disaggregated data in many categories was low, with several being fewer than 10. While these small numbers make it difficult to extrapolate and superimpose these results on to the broader University population, the high percentages shown in Figure 7 for several identities are significantly large and identify opportunities where our climate can be improved.

The survey returned similar percentages across racial groups for administration/staff respondents, where responses among administration/staff indicated that 67 percent of black females, 50 percent of black males, and 50 percent of Native American females reported that they experienced some form of discrimination, harassment or incivility.

The survey returned similar percentages across racial groups for student respondents. Among student respondents, 67 percent of black males, 57 percent of black females followed by 25 percent of Native American females reported that they experienced some form of discrimination, harassment or incivility.

The survey revealed the prevalence of experiences of discrimination, harassment, or incivility in regards to race and gender across all campus groups. These negative experiences were reported in the survey in higher numbers among white female respondents. Among white faculty respondents to this question, white women account for 20 of 29 respondents (69 percent) who reported experiences of discrimination, harassment or incivility. Among white administration/staff respondents to this question, white women account for 81 of 101 respondents (80 percent) who reported having experienced some form of negative experiences. Among student respondents to this question, white women account for 69 of 115 respondents (60 percent) who reported having experienced some form of negative experiences.

_________________________

2 It is important to note characteristics specific to respondents who indicated they were Latino/Hispanic. Latinos can be White, Black and in other racial categories. Thus, the numbers presented reflect all respondents who indicated they were Latino as if the category were separate.

3 For the total number of faculty, admin/staff, and student respondents by race, see Table 2.
Figure 7: Race and gender of faculty, administration/staff, and student respondents who experienced discrimination, harassment, or incivility. Data shown in Figure 7 are in the Appendix in Table A-7.

FACULTY:
PERCENTAGE OF DISCRIMINATION AND/OR HARASSMENT BY RACE AND GENDER

ADMINISTRATION/STAFF:
PERCENTAGE OF DISCRIMINATION AND/OR HARASSMENT BY RACE AND GENDER
Sexual orientation:

Sexual orientation was reported on a scale ranging from “heterosexual only” to “homosexual only” to “not sure/don’t know.” For the purposes of this analysis these results were recoded as “exclusively heterosexual” and “not exclusively heterosexual”. Even minimal variation from exclusive heterosexuality has been found in other studies to correlate with different attitudes and experiences of discrimination, harassment, or incivility among respondents. The data in Figure 8 shows that among faculty respondents 29 percent who are exclusively heterosexual versus 46 percent of those faculty respondents who are not exclusively heterosexual indicated they experienced discrimination, harassment, or incivility. Among administration/staff, 28% of exclusively heterosexual respondents versus 32 percent of who are not exclusively heterosexual indicated that they experienced discrimination and/or harassment. And among student respondents 15% of who are exclusively heterosexual versus 30% who are not exclusively heterosexual indicated they experienced discrimination, harassment, or incivility.

Figure 8: Sexual orientation of respondents who experienced discrimination, harassment, or incivility. Data shown Figure 8 is shown in the Appendix in Table A-8.
Disability status

The survey also contained the demographics by disability status of respondents who experienced discrimination, harassment, or incivility. Among faculty, Administration/staff, and student respondents who indicated they have a disability, 60 percent of faculty, 54% of Administration/staff, and 35% of students reported that they have experienced discrimination, harassment, or incivility. Figure 9 reports the disability status of respondents who have experienced discrimination, harassment, or incivility at Binghamton University. Table A-9 in the Appendix shows that the total number of respondents in some of the categories in Figure 9 is small and may make them less likely to be accurate predictors of the larger University community.

Figure 9: Disability status of respondents who experienced discrimination, harassment, or incivility. The data in Figure 9 are shown in the Appendix in Table A-9

OVERALL:
PERCENTAGE OF DISCRIMINATION AND/OR HARASSMENT BY DISABILITY STATUS
In reporting the source of discrimination/harassment/incivility, faculty respondents indicated that the most prevalent source was co-workers, followed by supervisors. Among administration/staff respondents, the most prevalent source was supervisors followed by co-workers. Student respondents cited other students as the largest source of their discrimination/harassment/incivility, followed by their professors/instructors and then administration/staff. Figure 10 reports the source of discrimination, harassment, or incivility experienced by faculty, administration/staff, and student respondents.

**Figure 10: Source of discrimination, harassment or incivility. Data is shown in the Appendix in Table A-10.**
Location of discrimination, harassment, or incivility

Survey respondents who experienced acts of discrimination, harassment or incivility were asked where the experience occurred. Faculty and administration/staff indicated it occurred in their immediate work environment, followed by a location within the organization but not in their immediate work environment. Figure 11 shows the results of this question.

Figure 11: Location where discrimination, harassment, or incivility occurred towards faculty and administration/staff. Data is shown in the Appendix in Table A-11.
Among student respondents who answered the question, the most prevalent location was in the classroom, followed by the residence halls. Figure 12, summarizes the results of this question to students.

**Figure 12: Location where discrimination/harassment/incivility occurred toward students.** Data is shown in the Appendix in Table A-12.
Knowledge of campus resources

Binghamton University faculty and administration/staff were asked about their knowledge of campus resources when they had a concern about discrimination, harassment or incivility. Only employee respondents were asked whether or not they sought assistance from a variety of offices on campus. Those offices included their immediate supervisor, the Office of the Ombudsman, the Office of Human Resources, the Affirmative Action Office and the Multicultural Resource Center. For those respondents who did seek assistance from any of these offices, they were asked about their satisfaction with the resolution of their concern. The results of these question are summarized in Table 4 for faculty and Table 5 for administration/staff respondents.

Table 4: Satisfaction of faculty when seeking assistance from campus resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource sought</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Satisfied or very satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied or very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate supervisor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman Office</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Office</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action Office</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Resource Center</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Satisfaction of administration/staff when seeking assistance from campus resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource sought</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Satisfied or very satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied or very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate supervisor</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman Office</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Office</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action Office</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Resource Center</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions of campus accessibility

Survey respondents who identified as having a disability were asked a series of questions on campus accessibility. Table 6 provides information regarding the type of disability status that student, faculty and administration/staff respondents reported.

Table 6: Disability status demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Students (undergraduate and graduate) – n</th>
<th>Employees (faculty, administration/staff) – n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Percent of Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Impairment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment/Blindness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADD/ADHD)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Disability</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Illness/Medical Disability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty, administration/staff

Faculty and administration/staff who identified with a disability, were asked to rate the accessibility of the campus on a scale of 1(poor) to 7 (excellent).

The results for faculty and administration/staff are shown in Figure 13. Although the number of respondents was small, the response shows that faculty members are less positive about the accessibility of the campus than are administration/staff members.
Students

Students who identified with a disability were asked to rate, from 1(poor) to 7(excellent), a variety of student-related spaces and services on campus. These results are shown in Figure 14. These results show a wide range of accessibility features and limitations of the campus; however, the number of responses was small, which may indicate limitations in drawing accessibility conclusions.

Figure 14: Campus accessibility: students. Data is shown in the Appendix in Table A-14.
Discussion

While averaging the results of this survey over the entire population of respondents would indicate that Binghamton University is a good place to work and attend school, the individual responses by identities state a need for improvement in the campus climate. The survey data provide us with direction for improvement under four primary areas:

- Discrimination/harassment/incivility
- Communication and transparency
- Professional/educational development
- Knowledge about campus resources regarding diversity/inclusion

Discrimination, harassment and incivility

As the data indicate, discrimination, harassment or incivility is a concern for our campus community. These experiences create barriers to achieving an enriched academic setting and an effective workplace. Our interactions within the environment must be free of barriers that impede human development. The data reflect discrimination, harassment, or incivility in both the classroom and workplace. Additionally, concerns have been raised about the University climate for LGBTQ individuals.

Classroom climate

Student respondents who indicated they experienced some form of discrimination, harassment, or incivility told us that the most prevalent place for these experiences to occur is in the classroom. Student respondents also indicated that experiences of discrimination came most often by way of verbal comments and the source is most often another student, followed by a faculty member. The findings suggest that faculty and students may benefit from assistance in creating an environment that engages various perspectives and maintains civility.

Workplace climate

While the majority of faculty and administration/staff who responded did not report cases of harassment, discrimination or incivility, there is a significant population among these employees that indicates having had negative experiences in the workplace. Thirty-two percent of faculty respondents in the survey indicated that they experienced incivility, discrimination and/or harassment and that the source was most often another co-worker, followed by a supervisor. Among administration/staff respondents, 29 percent indicated they experienced discrimination, harassment or incivility in the workplace and that the most frequent source was a supervisor, followed by a co-worker. Across all employees, verbal comments and acts of exclusion were the most prevalent types of experiences, followed by discrimination. These results indicate that the work environment can be improved with respect to isolation and exclusion based on gender, race and ability. Creating professional development opportunities to promote constructive conversations and intergroup dialogue about difficult issues in the workplace is one suggestion to reduce the instances where these negative experiences occur.
Climate for LGBTQ individuals

In an analysis of our open-ended questions in which we asked students how they would respond to anti-gay and anti-transgender comments, the most common response among students who answered the question regarding anti-gay comments indicated they would say something, educate and/or attempt to engage the person who made the comment (52 percent), followed by 19 percent of respondents who indicated that their reaction depended on the context. Additionally, the person making the comment often mattered along with the environment within which the comment was made. If the comment was a joke, the respondents may or may not laugh, while if the comment was serious, they were likely to remain silent. Respondents to this question also indicated that the third-highest response category was ignoring the comment or not addressing it at all. For the anti-transgender comment, respondents who answered the question told us that the most common response was to say something to educate or engage the person making the comment (47 percent), followed by 21 percent of respondents who indicated they were not sure or they did not know how they would respond to the comment. For this question, 14 percent of respondents indicated that their reaction depended on the context. The survey revealed that people who are not exclusively heterosexual do not feel as safe or comfortable in our community as exclusively heterosexual people do. Given the level of isolation, exclusion and discomfort people in our community who are not exclusively heterosexual may experience, the findings from the survey suggest that the development of a LGBTQ resource center and inclusion workshops would be beneficial. These initiatives would be a service worth providing to enhance the climate at Binghamton University.

Communication and transparency

The survey revealed that a large majority of respondents who experienced instances of discrimination, harassment or incivility did not report them. These findings could be indicative of a larger problem: respondents may not be aware of available resources or where they can report or address incidents. It is also possible for some not to report these incidences because they believe reporting experiences of discrimination does not lead to substantial change or may only make their experiences worse. The findings speak to the need for current campus resources to be proactive and transparent about their procedures regarding complaints, and to advocate and promote their services to the campus community more effectively. When complainants have a better understanding of the process for reporting concerns, how the information they share is used and the limitations within each reporting office, they will be more inclined to use the services. Equally, reporting entities can and must be more responsive to those who file complaints. There is a customer service component that would build trust among those who utilize these services.

Professional and educational developments

The potential of professional/educational development and programs is a recurring theme throughout the survey data. For Binghamton University employees, two types of training appear to be suggested by the survey results: 1) professional development as it relates to managing and supervision of other employees and 2) personal development as it relates to cultural competency, a professional skill set that equips
individuals to interact in a positive, empathetic manner with others of different cultural and socio-economic backgrounds.

In the survey’s open-ended questions, employees indicated that professionals in a supervisory capacity need more training and development in regards to managing a diverse population of employees. The managerial approach of a supervisor is a driving force in shaping the morale and community of the work environment for the people they supervise. Also, maintaining a high level of professionalism in office communications appeared to be an area that employees felt would improve office relations and work productivity. Employees have suggested that supervisors need assistance in managing multiple people from diverse backgrounds and in communicating with them.

Survey respondents indicated that cultural competency is also a missing component in the professional development and performance evaluation of employees and students. This was demonstrated by faculty and administration/staff who indicated that they have experienced discrimination, harassment, or incivility which has had a negative impact on them personally. The most prevalent type of incivility, discrimination and/or harassment was through verbal comments and exclusion. This experience was consistently demonstrated across race, gender, sexuality, and disability.

The responses from open-ended questions in the survey revealed that negative verbal comments in the workplace were directed at the respondent or at another employee. It is important to note that even when negative comments were not directed at the respondent, the comment was still damaging in the workplace environment.

In the open-ended questions of the survey, all respondents were asked “Is there anything you would like us to know about your experience at Binghamton University?” Thirteen percent of the respondents indicated a need for professional development training or a lack of professionalism among employees in the work environment.

Student respondents also believed that cultural competency development is needed for both students and employees. Student respondents indicated that they, too, were experiencing discrimination, harassment, or incivility through verbal comments and exclusion. The largest source of these experiences was from other students. Additionally, students expressed that these negative experiences were primarily based on their personal identities.

Knowledge about campus resources regarding diversity, equity and inclusion

The need for awareness of the resources available that are designed to address concerns about inclusion is prevalent in the data, as is the low rating of performance of these resources. The survey listed the resources for addressing issues or concerns about incivility, discrimination and/or harassment as the immediate supervisor of the respondent, the Office of Human Resources, the Office of the Ombudsman, the Affirmative Action Office and the Multicultural Resource Center. A majority of survey respondents who indicated that they experienced some form of negative experience did not seek assistance in addressing their experiences. Employees may be concerned about further straining relations with their colleagues if they seek assistance. A method to address these concerns would be to promote and
advocate for the services that are available to the campus community and to encourage their use as a means of addressing important issues and improving the campus climate. It is essential to inform the campus community of the availability of the resources that can help employees and students have an inclusive experience at Binghamton University.

**Moving forward: Campus initiatives**

To many, the results of this survey are not surprising. The importance of diversity, equity and inclusion is a commitment of the senior administration and most likely is shared by the majority of our students, faculty and staff. Thus it is not unexpected that activities have been ongoing for several years to improve our campus climate. The following section lists and describes many of those activities that are on-going, increasing, or just beginning. It is encouraging to see this level of effort, and more importantly the increasing levels with time.

**Administrative initiatives**

- In 2013, Binghamton University embarked upon its Road Map strategic planning process that established comprehensive and strategic goals focused on several areas including diversity, equity and inclusion. As part of that strategic priority, a campus division was created with this as its focus. Included within this division are the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and the Multicultural Resource Center (MRC). This division includes staff members who are focused on campus diversity and inclusion issues: a chief diversity officer, associate chief diversity officer, diversity specialist, diversity fellow, MRC program coordinator, secretary and MRC student interns. Divisional Diversity Officers represent academic affairs, athletics, operations/human resources, student affairs, advancement and research.
- Hiring and recruitment training programs are being conducted to reduce the impact of unconscious bias in hiring and promotions, and to identify and remove institutional barriers to inclusion and career development. The Division of Operations, formally the Division of Administration, has created the Diversity Fellowship program, offering a pathway to recruit and retain young diverse professionals.
- Schools within Binghamton University have programs focused on attracting/retaining individuals from diverse communities (such as veterans, women, historically underrepresented ethnic populations, students with disabilities, low-income students or first-generation college students). The Thomas J. Watson School of Engineering and Applied Science has appointed a director of diversity and inclusion and developed an ambitious diversity plan. The School of Management has conducted a climate survey to assess diversity and inclusion within its departments and has developed strategies to recruit and mentor students of color. Harpur College has created a diversity committee that has conducted an extensive study of diversity issues in Binghamton University’s largest school.
- The University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has reviewed the cultural pluralism general education requirement and proposed changes to the Faculty Senate that will broaden the scope of “P” courses to include consideration of gender, sexual orientation, and sexual identity as well as race and ethnicity.
• The Office of Undergraduate Admissions has initiated strategies to increase applications from students of color, resulting in a 6 percent increase in applications from underrepresented minorities in 2015. It is also pursuing strategies designed to yield a higher proportion of underrepresented students who are admitted.

• The MRC has been providing support services for students, faculty and staff with a focus on certain populations such as historically underrepresented ethnic populations, the religious student community, the cultural Greek-lettered community, multicultural international students and the LGBTQ community. The MRC is in the process of establishing an emergency interpretation and translation program to assist students who face language barriers in accessing campus and community services. The LGBTQ Advisory Committee has been established in order to provide support for students, faculty and staff in this community.

• Administrative and faculty groups have been established to address campus climate issues. These include the Faculty and Staff of Color Association, the Sexual Assault Response Team and the Harpur College Diversity Committee.

• The University is the process of creating gender-inclusive housing and increasing gender-neutral bathroom facilities on campus.

Educational program initiatives

• Student internships related to multiculturalism, encouragement of utilizing campus services and workshops focused on staff development and professional services have been established.

• ODEI sponsored a conference in November 2014 titled “UDiversity: a Professional Development Leadership Conference for Diversity and Inclusion for the 21st Century.” The primary goal was to explore the Intergroup Dialogue (IGD), a diversity, equity and inclusion training model that provides a fundamental knowledge of cultural competency and its significance on campus and in the community.

• The UDiversity Educational Institute will begin at Binghamton University in summer 2015. The institute will design a curriculum for diversity and inclusion education for faculty, staff and students across the institution. The institute will also incorporate the IGD model into courses for credit, in addition to multi-level professional and educational development programs for faculty and staff. Workshops will focus on a variety of topics in inclusion work.

• The Broome County Promise Zone, a collaboration between the Broome County Mental Health Department, Broome-Tioga BOCES and Binghamton University, provides organization and support to family and community outreach efforts in order to improve access to K-12 education and campus and community resources for those who are economically disadvantaged.

• The Center for Learning and Teaching, in partnership with ODEI, will offer workshops for faculty to help them integrate the insights of cultural competency into courses they teach that fulfill the pluralism general education requirement.
Student-led and cultural activity initiatives

- Multicultural education programs, including workshops and coaching sessions, are available through various campus departments, sometimes focused on affinity groups.
- Speakers and films, as well as social justice events, are regularly held at Binghamton.
- Various programs and services are offered by the Multicultural Resource Center, year round
  - MRC Culture Connects Grant (supports cultural student groups and cultural events on campus)
  - MRC Culture Fair (provides an opportunity for all students to explore ways to get involved with the student cultural organizations)
  - MRC Global Fiesta (celebrates both religious and non-religious holidays around the world)
  - MRC Diversity Talk Show (provides a platform for students to discuss issues of concern to them in the news, politics and around the world)
  - Various educational trainings and workshops for students, faculty and staff.
  - Monthly newsletters support cultural events and local minority owned businesses
  - MRC Speaking Up & Getting Support (provides students with resources and techniques to promote mental health, especially for racial and ethnic minority students and international students)
  - MRC Home Away from Home Party (celebrates the holiday season with students who are unable to go home during the winter break)
  - MRC Alumni of Color Networking Event (provides an opportunity for current students to network with our alumni of color)
  - MRC Monthly Student Leaders meeting (brings our cultural student leaders together to discuss issues that they face and creates a community of support)
  - MRC supports programs observing Latin Heritage Month, Black History Month, Women's History Month, Asian Heritage Month and Pride Week.
  - MRC provides internship opportunities for both undergraduate and graduate students.
  - MRC weekly outreach tabling activity (reaches out to more students)
  - Students can also report incidents of hate or bias through MRC.

ODEI initiatives

- ODEI will launch an outreach and engagement effort in 2015, during which ODEI staff will meet with campus organizations and offices to present the survey findings, discuss next steps and get feedback on recommended actions. Action recommendations will be developed by fall 2015.
- ODEI is in the process of creating the UDiversity Educational Institute. The purpose of this institute is to provide faculty, staff and students with a variety of professional development activities, academic courses in the form of facilitated dialogues and professional support regarding equity and inclusion work. Among these professional development initiatives, ODEI is in the process of developing a new program (replacing the former Safe Zone program) focused on increasing awareness and inclusion of the LGBTQ campus community.
- ODEI will seek to partner with the Faculty Senate to create a sub-committee on diversity.
• ODEI Divisional Diversity Officer initiatives
• Academic Affairs: Creation and implementation of intergroup dialogue courses as a part of the UDiversity Educational Institute. Work with faculty to implement the curriculum into the first-year experience courses.
• Changing the hiring process to increase diversity in the candidate pool among faculty.
• Operations/Human Resources: Continue the support of diversity fellowships to increase diversity in the division. Human Resources staff to attend cultural competency trainings as provided by ODEI through the UDiversity Educational Institute. Division will examine ways to develop goals and activities around diversity and inclusion in January 2015.
• Advancement: Staff to attend cultural competency training as provided by ODEI through the UDiversity Educational Institute. Division will examine ways to develop goals and activities around diversity as they relate to fundraising and giving. ODEI to increase working with alumni of color networks in collaboration with the Office of Alumni Relations.
• Athletics: Staff attended cultural competency trainings as provided by ODEI through the UDiversity Educational Institute. Division will examine ways to develop goals and activities around diversity and inclusion. Athletics has created a divisional diversity committee to create an ongoing dialogue around diversity as it relates to the recruitment, retention and well-being of all student-athletes. Staff participated in a presentation in spring 2014 regarding “Sexual Orientation and LGBTQ Issues Related to Intercollegiate Athletics.”
• Research: Staff to attend cultural competency trainings as provided by ODEI through the UDiversity Educational Institute. Research division will examine ways to develop goals and activities around diversity and inclusion.
• Student Affairs: Created a divisional diversity committee in spring 2014. Division seeks to create dynamic programming within local community schools initiative to increase the educational pipeline for underrepresented students to college. Division also seeks to create collaborative programs within the division across various departments. Ongoing cultural competency trainings will be provided by ODEI through the UDiversity Educational Institute for various offices within the division as needed.
• ODEI to establish regular town hall meetings with faculty, and administration/staff, including the Faculty Senate, to discuss issues that are important to the campus community. Outreach ideas may include but are not limited to regular communications to the campus community via e-mail, social media, mail or other avenues.
• The creation of employee affinity groups like the Faculty and Staff of Color Association (established in fall 2014) will promote community among professionals and support the continued recruitment of diverse faculty and staff at Binghamton University.
Closing comments

Thank you for taking the time to read this report. The results will be helpful to move us forward as a community and as a University. The need for more work is evident, but in many ways the statement made by conducting this survey – the first of its kind conducted at Binghamton University – and its careful analysis speaks loudly about our commitment to progress. We thank the members of the campus community who completed the survey and shared their campus experiences around diversity, equity and inclusion. The data received has and will continue to provide insights into the areas of opportunity for the University to improve our diversity, equity and inclusion efforts. As Binghamton University moves to become the premier 21st century institution, strengthening its commitment and instituting initiatives to create a more welcoming, respectful and inclusive campus community are essential.
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Appendix

Divisional Diversity Officers
- Academic Affairs: Daryl Santos
- Advancement: Julia Quigley
- Athletics: Edward Scott
- Operations: Joseph Schultz
- Student Affairs: Nicole Sirju-Johnson
- Research: Lisa Gilroy

Table A-1: Importance of diversity

<p>| How important do you believe it is to have a campus atmosphere that is open to and supportive of diversity |
| (1=Extremely unimportant, 5= Extremely important) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Responses</th>
<th>Faculty Mean</th>
<th>Admin./Staff Responses</th>
<th>Admin./Staff Mean</th>
<th>Student Responses</th>
<th>Student Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-2: Awareness of Binghamton University policies and practices, faculty, administration/staff, and students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question asked</th>
<th>Faculty Responses</th>
<th>Faculty % yes</th>
<th>Admin/Staff Responses</th>
<th>Admin/Staff % yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware whether Binghamton University has a stated policy regarding diversity?</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there established procedures at Binghamton University for addressing instances of harassment and discrimination?</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there established procedures at Binghamton University for addressing instances hate incidents?</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree does Binghamton University publicly recognize their commitment to diversity through celebrations?</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree does Binghamton University reflect diversity in their publications?</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree does Binghamton University communicates expectations regarding appropriate behaviors in support of diversity?</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree is Binghamton University committed to diversity</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree is Binghamton university promoting diversity.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree is your commitment to diversity part of your overall performance and evaluation as an employee?</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what degree are you encouraged to provide feedback regarding the diversity of Binghamton University as a whole?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Responses</th>
<th>Faculty Mean</th>
<th>Admin/Staff Responses</th>
<th>Admin/Staff Mean</th>
<th>Student Responses</th>
<th>Student Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what degree are you encouraged to provide feedback regarding diversity by your direct supervisor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Responses</th>
<th>Faculty Mean</th>
<th>Admin/Staff Responses</th>
<th>Admin/Staff Mean</th>
<th>Student Responses</th>
<th>Student Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-3: Diversity and comfort level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items: How comfortable are you around individuals? (5= Totally Comfortable, 1= Totally Uncomfortable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose racial identity is different from your own?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are from a social class other than your own?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose ethnic background is different from your own?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose sexual orientation is different from your own?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who have a physical or mental disability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are of another gender?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose religious beliefs are different from your own?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-4: Binghamton University as a place to work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what degree: would you be likely to recommend Binghamton University to friends as a good place to work or go to school? (1=Lowest, 7= Highest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-5 Experiences of discrimination and/or harassment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever felt harassed or discriminated against while at Binghamton University? Answer: yes or no</th>
<th>Faculty (n = 134)</th>
<th>Admin/Staff (n = 417)</th>
<th>Students (n = 1039)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responding yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent yes</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-6: Types of discrimination, harassment, or incivility experienced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of discrimination, harassment, or incivility</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Admin/Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses n=43</td>
<td>n=118</td>
<td>n=199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal comments</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written comments</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stares</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to personal property</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous phone calls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats of physical violence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative writings in university publications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical assaults or injuries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-7: Race and gender of faculty, administration/staff, and student respondents who experienced discrimination, harassment, or civility. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Yes Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34.50%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37.80%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.20%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.60%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Queer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.20%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Latino?</th>
<th>Yes Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37.70%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62.30%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37.80%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62.20%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>76.90%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.60%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>76.40%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Queer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32.30%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67.70%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A-7 continued:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admin/Staff</th>
<th>Yes Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female White</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29.90%</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>70.10%</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.70%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31.10%</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>68.90%</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male White</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.80%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80.20%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total White</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>27.20%</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>72.80%</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>28.40%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>71.60%</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin/Staff</td>
<td>Latino?</td>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.60%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>30.60%</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>69.40%</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31.10%</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>68.90%</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.80%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78.20%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.10%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>78.90%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.40%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.60%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>28.30%</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>71.70%</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>28.40%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>71.60%</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Total Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female White</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>82.80%</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57.40%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.60%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.90%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84.10%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83.90%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>79.70%</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-7 continued:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.60%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.90%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87.10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>84.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87.10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.90%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.90%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>84.40%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76.90%</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Queer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>83.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61.50%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.60%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>85.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>79.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>19.50%</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>80.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |       |         |       |         |
| Missing        | 430   |         |       |         |
| Total          | 1412  |         |       |         |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.40%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82.60%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>20.60%</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>79.40%</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>79.60%</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.20%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77.80%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>83.40%</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Queer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.60%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.10%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78.90%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.10%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78.90%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>19.10%</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>80.90%</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>19.30%</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>80.70%</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants were allowed to skip questions*
Table A-8: Sexual orientation of respondents who experienced discrimination, harassment, or incivility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively Heterosexual</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.40%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70.60%</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Exclusively Heterosexual</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.50%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.50%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.30%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67.70%</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admin/Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively Heterosexual</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>72.50%</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Exclusively Heterosexual</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.60%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68.40%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>27.90%</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>72.10%</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively Heterosexual</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>14.70%</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>85.30%</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Exclusively Heterosexual</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>18.10%</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>81.90%</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-9: Disability status of respondents who experienced discrimination, harassment, or incivility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons w/ Disabilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons w/o Disabilities</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30.10%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69.90%</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.50%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67.50%</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admin/Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons w/ Disabilities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.40%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.60%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons w/o Disabilities</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>26.30%</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>73.70%</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>71.40%</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons w/ Disabilities</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons w/o Disabilities</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>18.20%</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>81.80%</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>19.20%</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>80.80%</td>
<td>1041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-10: Source of discrimination, harassment, or incivility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>% Cases</th>
<th>Admin/Staff</th>
<th>% Cases</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>% Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student(s)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>81.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor(s)/Professor(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.30%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistant(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Assistant(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisor(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker(s)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47.40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor(s)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53.40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Workplace/manager</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.80%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.40%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodians/Maintenance people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>166.70%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>160.30%</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>151.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Because multiple categories could be selected, percentage may exceed 100%

Table A-11: Location where harassment, discrimination, or incivility occurred toward faculty and admin/staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Admin/Staff</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your immediate work environment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within your organization but not in your immediate work environment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-12: Location where discrimination, harassment, or incivility occurred toward students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>% Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer lab/study area</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff office</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic facilities (i.e., basketball courts, tennis courts, etc.)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus sidewalk/street</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus job</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via phone calls</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>205.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Because multiple categories could be selected, percentage may exceed 100%

Table A-13: Campus accessibility: faculty, administration/staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on your disability, rate the accessibility of Binghamton University in the following areas: (7= Highest, 1=Lowest)</th>
<th>Faculty Responses</th>
<th>Faculty Mean</th>
<th>Admin./Staff Responses</th>
<th>Admin./Staff Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation/Manuals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web sites</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio visual presentations (i.e., PowerPoint, overheads, videos)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall accessibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-14: Campus accessibility: students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on your disability, rate the accessibility of Binghamton University in the following areas: (7= Highest, 1=Lowest)</th>
<th>Student Responses</th>
<th>Student Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Buildings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds (e.g., snow, construction, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational sports facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Halls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Union/Student Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-16: Responses by union status

| Faculty | Student Responses | | |
|---|---|---|
| UUP Faculty | n=142 | 98% |
| UUP Staff | n=2 | 1% |
| CSEA Staff | n=1 | 0.7% |

| Administration/Staff | Student Responses | | |
|---|---|---|
| UUP Faculty | n=8 | 2% |
| UUP Staff | n=256 | 61% |
| Management/Confidential | n=32 | 8% |
| CSEA OSU | n=27 | 7% |
| CSEA ISU | n=3 | 0.7% |
| CSEA ASU | n=85 | 20% |
| Police & Security | n=5 | 1% |
| PEF | n=2 | 0.5% |
Table A-17: Undergraduate students by class demographics (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First year</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A-18: Student residence status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-campus residence hall</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus apartment</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity/sorority house</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus/house rental</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House/apartment with parents/relatives</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own home</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A-19: Student participation in underrepresented cultural clubs or organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club/Organization</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Pride Union, Shades, Equality Project</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Student Union, Latin American Student Union, Caribbean Student Union, Asian Student Union, Women’s Student Union</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty three percent of respondents indicated that they have heard of these organizations
University recognized groups that are not Student Association (SA) chartered were not recognized in this survey