

Executive Summary

- Surveys were distributed to a total of 1,070 support staff, field faculty/agents, specialists/campus faculty, exempt staff, paraprofessionals/technicians, and administrators. Six hundred eighty (680) people submitted completed surveys for a response rate of 64 percent.
- Twenty-one percent of the respondents participated in diversity training within the past year.
- Most respondents (more than 88%) rarely heard any employees make insensitive or disparaging remarks about various populations. Among all job classifications, there was a higher incidence of having heard insensitive or disparaging remarks about women and inability to speak English than based on the other characteristics listed.
- Nineteen percent of the respondents indicated that they had experienced conduct that had interfered unreasonably with their ability to work or learn on campus (harassment). These experiences were primarily due to gender (46%) and race (25%).
- The harassment experienced was in the form of derogatory remarks (58%) and experienced most often in local (49%) or campus offices (46%).
- The respondents also indicated they observed conduct on campus that created an offensive, hostile, or intimidating working or learning environment mainly due to gender (40%), race and ethnicity (20%), age (15%), and “other” (32%).
- Few respondents reported experiencing discriminatory hiring (7% or fewer), firing (less than 3%), or promotion (10% or fewer) based on any of the characteristics presented.
- Sixty-nine percent of the respondents had little or no contact with people with mental disabilities. Just about half of the respondents had little or no contact with LGBT people, Middle Easterners, and people with physical disabilities.
- The majority of respondents indicated that they would feel comfortable being a close friend of, sharing an office with, and being supervised by people from various backgrounds. The percentages of respondents who felt comfortable interacting with a transgender man or woman, an openly lesbian woman or gay man, a person with HIV or AIDS, or a person with a mental illness were considerably lower.
- Just over half of the respondents believed the campus thoroughly addressed issues related to ethnicity (59%), race (58%), physical disability (57%), gender (56%), and English as a second language (52%). They were less likely to agree that issues related to age (49%), veteran status (47%), SES (44%), religion (43%), sexual orientation (40%), mental disability (37%) and gender identity (36%) were addressed.
- A substantial portion of the respondents (62%) felt that the campus’ leadership has visibly fostered diversity.

- Slightly more than 39 percent of the respondents made adjustments in programming strategies as a result of the increased diversity of clients across the state.
- Almost three-quarters believed the workplace climate was welcoming for clients from underrepresented groups.
- Roughly two-thirds of the respondents believed that management within their work units demonstrated a commitment to diversity, diversity among staff and clients created increased benefits for the organization, and the workplace environment was welcoming for employees from underrepresented groups.
- Close to three-quarters of the respondents indicated that the campus climate overall was accepting of all of the groups listed. Fewer respondents believed the organizational climate was accepting of persons with mental disabilities (45%), openly LGBT persons (47%), and Middle Easterners (64%).

Introduction

The Change Agent States for Diversity (CASD) project represents a catalytic step in leading change within the Land Grant University System. In December 1998, the National Sub-Committee on Extension Diversity (SED) developed this visionary project in which eight states were selected to participate in a pilot effort focusing on diversity. In October 1999, representatives from the eight states and selected members of the SED began working together to develop and implement a plan of action to address diversity in their organizations and institutions. The Assessment Subcommittee of the CASD was charged with developing plans, related tools, and an implementation strategy for the eight states individually, and the CASD as a whole, to use in determining the organizations' status and climate as it relates to diversity. The committee determined that the first step in this process was an internal assessment of the current climate at each location.

Beginning in the fall 2000 semester, CASD contracted with an outside consultant¹ to identify challenges confronting the CASD community with respect to underrepresented groups through an internal assessment. The assessment was a proactive initiative by CASD cooperating members to review the climate for underrepresented groups in their respective organizations. This report includes the results of the internal assessment, which will be used to identify specific strategies for addressing the challenges and supporting positive diversity initiatives.

¹ *Rankin & Associates Consulting* was contracted as the outside consultant for this project.

Procedures

Surveys were distributed to a total of 1,070 support staff, field faculty/agents, specialists/campus faculty, exempt staff, paraprofessionals/technicians, and administrators during the spring 2002. Six hundred eighty (680) people submitted completed surveys for a response rate of 64 percent. Paper and pencil questionnaires were machine scanned and tabulated for appropriate analysis. Confidentiality of individual respondents was insured by the anonymous nature of the survey.

Description of the Sample

The majority of respondents were women (53%) (see Table 1 in Appendix B), aged 43 to 52 (32.4%) (Table 2), support staff (34.3%) (Table 3), and full-time employees (84%) (Table 4). Four percent (n = 30) reported the presence of a disability (Table 5); 7 percent were veterans (n = 47). Eighty-seven and seventy-four percent of the respondents identified their sexual orientation as heterosexual (Table 7) and their racial/ethnic identity as White/Caucasian, respectively (Table 8). Most of the respondents (83%) were U.S.-born citizens (Table 9). Sixty-two percent of the respondents were married (Table 10).

Thirty-four percent of the respondents earned an annual income less than \$29,999, while 13 percent earned in excess of \$75,000 (Table 11). Forty-nine percent of people completing the survey worked primarily on-campus (Table 12). Twenty-one percent of the respondents grew up in a small town, while 20 and 17 percent of the sample each were raised in an urban or suburban area, respectively (Table 13). Table 14 indicates that 8 percent (n = 51) were uncomfortable with the climate for diversity in their organization; 9 percent (n = 62) were uncomfortable with the climate for diversity in their work unit.

Organizational Experiences with Diversity

Over 90 percent of survey participants reported that administrators rarely – in the respondent’s presence – made insensitive or disparaging remarks about the various populations enumerated in the survey² (Table 15). Similarly, most people had rarely heard field faculty/agents (over 88%), specialists/campus faculty (more than 90%), or paraprofessionals/technicians (more than 90%) and support staff (more than 90%) make insensitive or disparaging remarks (Tables 16, 17, 18, and 19). Among all job classifications, there was a higher incidence of having heard insensitive or disparaging remarks about women or about the inability to speak English than based on the other characteristics listed. Forty-one percent of the respondents felt their communities had been sensitive to diverse audiences during the past year (Table 20). Most people (between 44% and 47%) were not sure if advisory groups, extension volunteers, local government representatives, or users groups/clientele exhibited the same sensitivity.

Experiencing Harassment

Nineteen percent of the respondents (n = 132) indicated that they had experienced conduct that had interfered unreasonably with their ability to work, learn, or otherwise participate in the workplace (i.e., harassment) (Table 21). Of those participants that have experienced harassment or discrimination, 46 percent (n = 61) suggested that the harassment was due to gender and 25 percent (n = 33) identified age as the motivating factor. The remaining respondents indicated that the conduct was based on “other” factors (35.6%), race (17%), physical characteristics (17%), SES (14%), ethnicity (13%), family status (9.1%), and religion (8%), among others (Table 22).

Derogatory remarks were the most common form of harassment (58%). Other forms identified by respondents were: being deliberately ignored (40%), “other” ways (39%),

² Characteristics of people named in the survey instrument include: age, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, inability to speak English, physical characteristics, race, religion, sexual orientation, socio-economic class, and veteran status.

and being excluded from activities (37%). One respondent had suffered an actual physical assault or injury (Table 23).

Among the venues listed in the survey, almost half of the harassing experiences occurred in local offices (49%) or in campus offices (46%) (Table 24). Approximately one-third of the respondents identified administrators (32%) or supervisors (30%) as sources of harassment, while almost as many were harassed by campus faculty/specialists (27%). Twenty-three percent suggested that support staff and field faculty/agents were the sources (Table 25). In response to the harassing conduct, 56 percent of the respondents were embarrassed. Forty-seven percent told a friend about the experience, 41 percent ignored it; others either avoided the harasser (36%) or left the situation immediately (37%). Furthermore, almost one-third considered changing jobs in response to the situation (Table 26).

Further analysis examined the positive responses (participants who indicated that they had personally experienced harassment) by demographic categories (see following tables). A slightly higher percentage of women than men experienced harassment in the workplace (22% compared to 17%). In regard to position, the analyses indicate that approximately one-fifth of all employees with the exception of administrators have experienced harassment; 11 percent of administrators experienced harassment. In terms of race/ethnicity, a higher percentage of American Indian/Alaskan Natives (30%, n = 9) and Chicano/Latino/Hispanics (24%, n = 22) reported harassment than did the other categories. Among the responses by individuals of various sexual identities, a higher percentage of gay men (60%, n = 3) were subject to harassment than were bisexual persons, heterosexual persons, or people uncertain about their sexual identities. Neither of the two lesbians participating in the study had been harassed.

Relationship Between Experienced Harassment and Gender

Experienced Harassment	Gender			
	Female		Male	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Yes	22.3	79	17.2	48
No	77.7	276	82.8	231

Relationship Between Experienced Harassment and Position

Experienced Harassment	Position									
	Administrator		Field faculty or agent		Paraprofessional or technician		Campus faculty or specialist		Support staff	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Yes	11.4	5	24.4	19	20.7	18	17.6	32	22.5	51
No	88.6	39	75.6	59	79.3	69	82.4	150	77.5	176

Relationship Between Experienced Harassment and Race/Ethnicity

Experienced Harassment	Race/Ethnicity											
	African American or Black		Asian or Pacific Islander		Middle Easterner		American Indian or Alaskan Native		Chicano or Latino or Hispanic		White or Caucasian	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Yes	20.0	2	18.5	5	0.0	0	30.0	9	23.9	22	19.4	96
No	80.0	8	81.5	22	100.0	7	70.0	21	76.1	70	80.6	398

Relationship Between Experienced Harassment and Sexual Identity

Experienced Harassment	Sexual Identity									
	Bisexual		Gay		Lesbian		Heterosexual		Uncertain	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Yes	23.5	4	60.0	3	0.0	0	20.0	116	20.0	2
No	76.5	13	40.0	2	100.0	2	80.0	465	80.0	8

Observing Harassment

Twenty-one percent of the participants indicated that they had observed conduct in the organization campus that created an offensive, hostile, or intimidating working or learning environment (Table 27). The majority of experiences were primarily due to gender (40%), race and ethnicity (20%), age (15%), and “other” (32%) (Table 28). Further analyses comparing the relationship between observed harassment and position revealed that a slightly higher percentage of women than men observed harassment (24% versus 20%) (see tables below). Twenty-eight percent of campus faculty/specialists, 24 percent of paraprofessional/technicians and support staff, and 22 percent of administrators had observed harassment. In regard to race/ethnicity, 31 percent of Asian/Pacific Islanders, more than 22 percent of Chicano/Latino/Hispanics and Caucasians/Whites, and 20 percent of American Indian/Alaskan Natives witnessed harassment. Among the respondents of various sexual identities, a higher percentage of gay men (60%, n = 3) and people uncertain of their sexual identities (40%, n = 4) than heterosexuals, bisexuals, and lesbians observed harassment.

Relationship Between Observed Harassment and Gender

Observed Harassment	Gender			
	Female		Male	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Yes	23.8	84	19.9	55
No	76.2	269	80.1	222

Relationship Between Observed Harassment and Position

Observed Harassment	Position									
	Administrator		Field faculty or agent		Paraprofessional or technician		Campus faculty or specialist		Support staff	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Yes	22.2	10	28	21	24.4	21	17.4	32	24.4	55
No	77.8	35	72.0	54	75.6	65	82.6	152	75.6	170

Relationship Between Observed Harassment and Race/Ethnicity

Observed Harassment	Race/Ethnicity											
	African American or Black		Asian or Pacific Islander		Middle Easterner		American Indian or Alaskan Native		Chicano or Latino or Hispanic		White or Caucasian	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Yes	0.0	0	31.0	9	0.0	0	20.7	6	22.2	20	22.4	111
No	100.0	11	69.0	20	100.0	7	79.3	23	77.8	70	77.6	384

Relationship Between Observed Harassment and Sexual Identity

Observed Harassment	Sexual Identity									
	Bisexual		Gay		Lesbian		Heterosexual		Uncertain	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Yes	12.5	2	60.0	3	0.0	0	22.5	130	40.0	4
No	87.5	14	40.0	2	100.0	2	77.5	449	60.0	6

Table 29 indicates that the observed harassment was experienced most often in the form of derogatory remarks (76%), being ignored (30%) or excluded (27%). The experience occurred most often in a local office (52%), in a campus office (40%), or in a location “other” than those listed in the survey (9%) (Table 30). The majority of the respondents (34%) indicated that campus faculty/specialists were the source of the conduct. The remaining respondents identified support staff (29%), administrators (27%), field faculty/agents (27%), and supervisors (19%) as the sources (Table 31). In response to observing the harassing conduct, 34 percent of the respondents were embarrassed. Twenty-nine percent ignored the situation, 21 percent told a friend about the experience, 20 percent made a complaint to an official, and 13 percent considered changing their jobs (Table 32).

Tables 33 through Table 35 provide information about respondents’ experiences with regard to discriminatory practices. Few respondents reported experiencing

discriminatory hiring (7% or fewer), firing (less than 3%), or promotion (10% or fewer) based on any of the characteristics presented.

Attitudes and Actions Relative to Diversity Issues

Table 36 illustrates the amount of contact individuals generally have had with people of various backgrounds. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents had little or no contact with people with mental disabilities. Just about half of the respondents had little or no contact with LGBT people, Middle Easterners, and people with physical disabilities.

Respondents were in frequent contact with Caucasians/Whites (78%), persons of various ages (62%), Chicano/Latino/Hispanics (44%), and persons with religious backgrounds different from their own (43%).

The majority of respondents (over 80%) indicated that they would feel comfortable being a close friend of, sharing an office with, or being supervised by people espousing the various demographic characteristics. The percentages of respondents who felt comfortable interacting with a transgender man or woman (57%), or a person with a mental illness (70%), an openly lesbian woman (70%) or gay man (71%), or a person with HIV or AIDS (73%) were considerably lower (Table 37).

Respondents were also queried regarding their attitudes about the campus. Just over half of the respondents believed the organization thoroughly addressed issues related to ethnicity (59%), race (58%), physical disability (57%), gender (56%), and English as a second language (52%). They were less likely to agree that issues related to age (49%), veteran status (47%), SES (44%), religion (43%), sexual orientation (40%), mental disability (37%) and gender identity (36%) were addressed (Table 38).

A substantial portion of the respondents (62%) felt that the CALS' leadership visibly fostered diversity (Table 39). Almost three-quarters believed the workplace climate was welcoming for clients from underrepresented groups. Roughly two-thirds of the respondents believed that management within their work units demonstrated a

commitment to diversity, diversity among staff and clients created increased benefits for the organization, and the workplace environment was welcoming for employees from underrepresented groups. Fifty-one percent felt that programming within the CALS organization represented the contributions of people from underrepresented groups. In addition, 39 percent of the respondents made adjustments in programming strategies as a result of the increased diversity of clients across the state.

Table 40 reveals respondents' perceptions of the overall organizational climate for each particular group. Close to three-quarters of the respondents indicated that the campus climate overall was accepting of all of the groups listed. Fewer respondents believed the organizational climate was accepting of persons with mental disabilities (45%), openly LGBT persons (47%), and Middle Easterners (64%). Twenty-one percent of the respondents participated in diversity training within the past year (Table 41).

These responses correlated ($r = .399$ to $.562$) with the responses from question 2-11, which requested that respondents rate the overall campus climate for the various groups listed (Table 42). Selected correlation coefficients³ are provided in the following table.

Correlations Between Ratings of Acceptance and Climate for Selected Groups

Acceptance of:	Climate Characteristics		
	Non-Racist	Non-Homophobic	Accessible
African Americans/Blacks	.505 ¹		
LGBT		.562 ¹	
Physically Disabled			.399 ¹

¹ $p = .01$

³ Correlation coefficients indicate the degree to which two variables are related.