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The Chancellor’s Diversity Action Committee (CDAC) asked Sine Anahita and Karen Taylor to collaboratively produce a qualitative analysis of the data from the 2011 Online Campus Climate Survey.

We used a four-pronged analysis approach. First, we examined the statistics produced by Nicole Cundiff. We then turned to the survey’s written comments. Taylor analyzed the data using the hermeneutical cycle. Anahita followed Taylor’s work by loose and focused coding of manifest content. Finally, we analyzed the numerical data using frequencies of occurrences and crosstabs, controlling for missing data. We counted and analyzed all cases, including those that appeared to be multiple submissions.

There are problems with the data that are inherent in online surveys. The most serious problem is that the sample is not representative of the UAF population. Readers are cautioned against making generalizations using the data as justification, and are instead urged to view the data as snapshots of the sample.

Staff represent the most common UAF constituent in the survey, followed by undergraduate students, then faculty. Three-quarters of the respondents are white, and women respondents outnumber men by more than two to one. The majority of respondents identify as heterosexual. Five percent of the sample say they have a disability. Ages of respondents are evenly distributed in the 18-64 years range.

The survey data indicate that 67% of respondents “rate UAF’s overall acceptance of diversity” as good to excellent. Differences in opinion surface when respondents’ answers are analyzed by respondents’ race/ethnicity, primary role, gender, sexual orientation, and dis/ability. The data demonstrate that there are also differences in opinion about which groups are “welcoming to diverse populations at UAF.” UAF students are most often viewed as the group that promotes a “very welcoming” environment. Much of these data are plagued with missing responses and “don’t know” responses.

Survey participants were asked if they would be willing to participate in a number of different diversity activities. A quarter of respondents are willing to attend a presentation by a leader on diversity or to attend a free workshop.

Respondents were asked which UAF units are “doing well in working with diverse populations.” The top cited units include, in ranked order: academic departments; Office of Multicultural Affairs and Diversity; Rural Student Services; College of Rural and Community Development; other specifically-named colleges and schools; Women’s Center; rural campuses; and Admissions. Respondents’ rankings of units that are doing well seem related to respondents’ primary role, respondents’ gender, and respondents’ race/ethnicity. The respondents identified several units that “need to improve in working with diverse peoples,” but few specifics are described.

Respondents wrote many suggestions on how to make UAF more welcoming to everyone. The top three themes that emerged include: embrace a genuine commitment to diversity; increase access for people with disabilities; and expand diversity and advocacy offices.

We draw a few carefully contextualized conclusions. First, UAF is congratulated for its diversity efforts, which seem to resonate with 67% of the survey respondents. Second, we urge the university to further explore the diversity issues raised by the data, and suggest triangulation with existing data. We suggest that the units that are ranked highly on working well with diversity be examined, and
their “best practices” illuminated. There is significant resistance to diversity revealed in the survey. We suggest examining the resistance, and possibly creatively engaging with resistance to increase the effectiveness of diversity initiatives. We recommend further study of diversity at UAF, perhaps through a series of professionally-facilitated focus groups. We specifically recommend a series of public discussions. This recommendation is strongly supported by the survey data.

Sine Anahita and Karen Taylor
September 7, 2011
Methodology

How the Survey Was Developed
The CDAC Climate Survey Subcommittee consisted of Donna Anger, Ginny Kinne, Jane Weber, Juella Sparks, and Kayt Sunwood. The Subcommittee took on the mammoth task of brainstorming the survey questions, fine-tuning them, and creating the survey itself. Alex Fitts and Sine Anahita assisted with survey development. Nicole Cundiff helped to shape the survey and assisted with its administration. Cundiff also provided the initial quantitative data analysis and conducted other data management tasks.

How The Survey Was Conducted
Data for the study were collected through an online survey using Survey Monkey. An email invitation to participate in the survey was sent to all members of the UAF community via their official UAF email accounts in March, 2011. In all, 966 surveys were submitted. The data collected from these 966 surveys form the basis of our analysis.

Problems With The Data
We acknowledge there are problems with the data, most of which are inherent in online surveys. CDAC did not have the resources to conduct a mailed survey, focus groups, or in-person interviews, which are other common social scientific methods. An online survey was the only viable option available to the Committee. The problems with the data are disclosed in Appendix A. The problems are interrelated and include: unknown population size; convenience sample; non-representative sample; non-response bias; voluntary response bias; and multiple submissions.

Readers are strongly cautioned against making generalizations based on the data obtained from the survey. Because of the problems with the data, it would be illegitimate to claim the data provide justification for major action items such as policy changes, expansion or discontinuation of programs, formal investigation into specific alleged incidents, or mandated training.

Analyzing the Data
Sine Anahita and Karen Taylor were tasked with writing a qualitative report to interpret the survey’s results, with a special focus on analyzing the survey’s written comments. We used multiple methods to do so. After obtaining the dataset in mid-July 2011, we first skimmed Cundiff’s initial quantitative analyses to obtain a sense of the data, and to set the context for our own work.

Taylor coded the written comments using the hermeneutic cycle (see e.g. Ricoeur 1983) to interpret the context within which the data emerged. Following Taylor’s work, Anahita analyzed the written comments using the qualitative data analysis techniques described by Berg (1995), including loose and focused coding by hand and by software. For the final analysis, we used objective coding categories, and coded manifest content, with Taylor’s use of the hermeneutic influencing our understanding throughout our work. In particular, the hermeneutic cycle helped us to hone our conclusions. Please see the Appendices for a fuller description of Taylor’s approach.

We also conducted simple statistical analysis of the collected data that were numerical in nature. We used SPSS and Excel to accomplish this task. Please see the Appendices for a more thorough discussion of our approach to the analysis.

Contextualizing the Data and Analyses
In spite of the acknowledged problems with the data, there is much information about the climate for diversity that can be discovered in the survey. Users of the data must be aware of the problems, carefully contextualize their interpretations, and avoid making unfounded generalizations. We encourage readers to look at the collected data as representing the beliefs, ideas, and perceptions of a small group of UAF constituents.
A total of 966 surveys were successfully submitted. In this section, we provide a profile of the respondents to contextualize our analysis of the data.

**Primary role at UAF**

Figure 1 organizes the respondents by their primary role. Staff members comprise the single largest group of respondents, with 357 participants identifying their primary role as staff. Over forty one percent (41.2%) of the respondents who identified their primary role said they were members of UAF’s staff. Staff had a low response rate, and thus the sample is not representative of UAF staff. Additionally, staff at UAF are scattered through the university, and have extremely varied degrees of contact with diversity programming. We can make no valid generalizations about staff opinions based on the survey data, and we urge those who seek to use the survey data to keep this in mind.

Undergraduate students make up the second largest group of respondents, with 209 identifying themselves as undergraduate students. Eighty respondents identified as graduate students. Taken together, one-third (33.3%) of the respondents identify as students, for a total of 289 respondents. Because students are the single largest group at the university, numbering over 11,000 during Spring 2011 when the survey was conducted, their small comparative number in this survey is disappointing. For a truly viable representative sample of students, the survey would have required a 50-70% response rate, or over 5500 student respondents. Over 97% of UAF students did not respond to the survey. Thus, no valid generalizations can be made about students’ opinions about diversity at UAF.

Faculty comprise the third largest group of respondents, with 147 (17%) identifying as faculty. Faculty response rates are also too

---

**Figure 1.** “What is your *primary* role at UAF?” Columns represent the number of respondents who identify as a member of each group.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>undergrad</td>
<td>grad std</td>
<td>staff</td>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>administrator</td>
<td>comm member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total responses: 866; Missing responses: 100. See Table 1 for details about “Other.”
Table 1. "What is your *primary* role at UAF?—Other"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>multiple roles</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alumni</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-degree seeking student</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: visiting; emeritus; adjunct; temp; unclear;</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off-topic response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be able to claim representativeness, and thus we can make no valid generalizations about faculty opinions.

Administrators comprise the fourth largest group of respondents. Numbering at 37 or 4.3% of respondents, administrators are the only group in the survey whose opinions may be claimed as representative. The current UAF organizational chart notes that there are 71 administrators, resulting in a 52% response rate. However, readers are urged to be cautious when making any claims about administrators’ opinions based on the survey data as people who believe themselves to do administrative work and therefore identified as administrators may, in fact, not appear on UAF’s organizational chart.

Respondents identifying as “Other” or as “community member” make up the smallest two groups of respondents. Twenty-eight respondents identified as “other”, and 8 as “community member.” Please see Table 1 for details.

Race/ethnicity

Respondents were asked to identify their race or ethnicity. The survey listed seven racial/ethnic categories, and offered respondents the option of clicking “Other” and writing in their response. See Figure 2.

Whites make up the largest racial/ethnic group among the survey respondents, with

Figure 2. “Please indicate your race/ethnicity.” Bars represent the percent of respondents who identify with a particular racial or ethnic category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wht</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmerInd or AKNat</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi/Multi</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisp or Lat</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Af Am</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NatHI or OPI</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total responses: 751; Responses coded as other, declined, off-topic, or missing: 215, or 22.3%. 


over 76% identifying as white. The next largest group of respondents are those who identify as Alaska Native or American Indian (8.5%). Just over five percent of respondents identify as biracial or multiracial. Respondents who identify as Asian comprise 3.5% of the sample, as do respondents who identify as Hispanic or Latino/a (3.5%). People who identify as Black or African American make up 2.5% of the respondents. The smallest racial/ethnic group among respondents are people who identify as Native Hawaiians or Other Pacific Islanders (.7%). Nearly one-quarter of the sample (22.3%) clicked Other or declined to respond to the question about race/ethnicity.

UAF does not readily provide statistics about the race/ethnicity of its workers, so a comparison of the racial/ethnic identities of faculty, staff, and administrators with university data is difficult. However, the university does publish streamlined data about the race and ethnicity of its students on its Factbook (http://www.uaf.edu/facts/#ethni). Readers are reminded that the survey sample is not representative of the university’s population, and a comparison of the university’s statistics about students’ race and ethnicity reinforce this fact. Please see Table 2.

As Table 2 indicates, although UAF Facts notes that 21% of students identify as Alaska Native or American Indian, only 10% of the survey’s respondents chose this identity. Native people then, are underrepresented in the sample and we cannot legitimately make claims about their opinions or perceptions. African Americans or blacks make up 2% of the university’s student population according to UAF Facts. Twice that proportion responded to the survey, resulting in overrepresentation of this population. Whites are also overrepresented in the survey sample. While whites (or Caucasians, as UAF Facts labels them) make up 56% of the university’s student population, they make up 63% of the student population in the survey. Asian students comprise 4% of the population according to UAF Facts, and 5% of the survey’s respondents. The university, however, counts Pacific Islanders among Asians, while the survey used the US census categorization scheme of including Pacific Islanders along with Native Hawaiians, thus comparison of the survey data with the UAF Factbook is not helpful. It is unclear from the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>UAF Facts %</th>
<th>Respondents %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native/Amer Indian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UAF Facts from www.uaf.edu/facts/#ethni

Note: UAF does not report statistics about the following racial/ethnic categories as separate categories on the above listed site: Hispanic or Latino/a; biracial or multiracial; Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. Also note that the CDAC survey used the term "white", while UAF Facts uses the term "Caucasian."
Figure 3. Race/ethnicity of respondents by primary role.

Note: Nearly one-quarter of respondents (22.3%) did not identify their race/ethnicity. Readers should keep this fact in mind as they attempt to interpret the data.
the university’s Facts website whether Native Hawaiians were included with American Indians and Alaska Natives. UAF Facts also does not specifically list Hispanics or Latino/as or biracial/multiracial as racial/ethnic categories on its Facts site.

The survey did not offer international respondents adequate types of categories to check. For example, although Asians from foreign nations may have been able to check the category “Asian”, people from other foreign nations often did not find a category that included them. In hindsight, this was a flaw of the survey. Many respondents selected “other” as their racial/ethnic identity and wrote in an international identity, calling our attention to this problem.

Gender

Women outnumber men by more than two to one in the survey sample. Figure 4 provides an illustration. Women make up the majority of respondents among students, faculty, and staff, and just under half of the respondents who identify as administrators. Nineteen percent (n=184) declined to identify their gender, and 1.3% (n = 10) identified as other, e.g. transgender or transsexual.

These proportions do not match the percentage of women in the actual population at UAF. For example, women represent 52% of full time undergraduate students (PAIR 2011, http://www.uaf.edu/pair/common-data-set/
see 2010-2011), compared to 68% of the women respondents who identify as undergraduate students in the survey. Women comprise approximately 40% of UAF faculty, while 62% of the faculty in the survey said they were women. Please see Figure 5.

The over-representation of women respondents perhaps indicates that women were more likely than men to respond to a survey that addressed the climate for diversity at UAF. The authors note that the over-representation of women probably skews the data, and interpretations must therefore be made within this context.

**Sexuality**

The survey asked respondents to say whether they identified as lesbian or gay, bisexual, heterosexual/straight, or other. Notably, nearly one-quarter of respondents (23%) declined to identify their sexuality.

Among the survey’s respondents, the vast majority identify as heterosexual or straight (87%). However, 8% identified as lesbian, gay, or bisexual (LGB). Because there is no accurate way to count the number of LGB people in the university population, whether this figure is representative or not is up for debate. However, we do think that the new UA inclusive non-discrimination clause that prohibits discrimination based on sexual orientation may have inspired more LGB respondents to note their sexual orientation. Please see Figure 6.

**Dis/ability**

Five percent of respondents reported that they had a disability, compared to 95% who said they do not have a disability. The university does not gather statistics about the proportion of its constituents who have a disability, so a comparison of the sample to the population is not possible. One-fifth of respondents (19.4%) skipped the question about disability. Disability and adequate ac-
cess to UAF facilities emerged as a key issue in some of the written comments on the survey, as is discussed later.

The survey did not inquire as to the nature of respondents’ disabilities, so it is impossible to determine what types of disabilities are most common among respondents, or what type of accommodation would best serve members of our community who have disabilities. Please see Figure 7.

Age
Respondents were asked their age, along with other demographic information as discussed previously. The age distribution of respondents is illustrated in Figure 8. The ages of respondents cluster in five major age groups, normal for a university population.

Not surprisingly, the majority of students are in the 18-34 range, with graduate students more likely to be 25-34. Staff are evenly distributed in three age ranges, with about one-quarter of staff in each of four age categories: 25-34 (23%); 35-44 (24%); 45-54 (25%); and 55-64 (22%). Faculty cluster in the age range of 35-64, with 81% of faculty saying their age falls within these ranges. Respondents who say they are administrators tend to be older than the rest of the UAF community: 83% of administrator respondents say they are between 45 and 64. No administrator in the survey identified as younger than 35.

Less than 3% of staff (2.8%), but 12% of faculty identify their age as over 65. No administrator or student identified their age as over 65.

Figure 8. Age distribution of respondents

Note: figure is based on the reported ages of 786 respondents, or 81.4% of the sample. n = 180 respondents declined to identify their age (18.6%).
Summary of the Statistics

The Chancellor and the Chancellor’s Diversity Advisory Committee (CDAC) are working to better understand the climate for diversity at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF). Over a period of several months, the CDAC Campus Climate Subcommittee worked on a survey that would begin to address the questions CDAC and the Chancellor had about diversity.

In this section, we statistically analyze the answers to four questions in the survey. We present several figures that illustrate the crosstab results from statistical analysis. The crosstabs themselves can be found in the Appendices. Readers are cautioned against making generalizations from the analyses presented here, for the reasons discussed in the methodology section and in the Appendices. Still, there are patterns in the data that may be useful to CDAC and UAF as we consider matters related to diversity at our university.

Overall Acceptance of Diversity

The first, and possibly the most revealing question on the survey asked respondents to rate UAF’s overall acceptance of diversity. See Figure 9 for an illustration of the respondents’ answers to this question. Counting all respondents together, across all categories of gender, race/ethnicity, primary role, dis/ability, and sexual orientation, over two-thirds (67%) of the survey’s respondents re-
port that the university’s overall acceptance of diversity is good to excellent. One-fifth (21%) say that UAF’s overall acceptance of diversity is fair. Six percent say the overall acceptance is poor to very poor, and the same percentage of respondents said they did not know.

But when we examined the data further by breaking down the responses by respondents’ race/ethnicity, primary role, gender, sexual orientation, and dis/ability, we discovered contrasting patterns. For example, in Figure 10 we illustrate the patterns of answers to the question about overall acceptance of diversity by considering respondents’ race/ethnicity. Although 67% of all respondents think UAF’s acceptance of diversity is good to excellent, only 44% of African American respondents think this is true. Only 46% of Latino/a respondents agree that the overall acceptance of diversity is good to excellent at UAF. Among Alaska Natives and American Indians, over half (58%) say that the university’s overall acceptance of diversity is good to excellent, while a slightly higher percentage of Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders (60%) and Asians (62%) agree. In contrast, nearly three fourths of white respondents (71%) think that the overall acceptance of diversity at UAF is good to excellent. Clearly, there are marked and significant differences of opinion among respondents that seem related to their racial/ethnic identity. We do caution against overemphasis of the importance of this finding, however, as the data from the survey are not representative of the university’s population, as described in the methodology section previously and further elaborated in the Appendices. For example, only five respondents who answered this question identified as Native Hawaiian/OPI, well below their proportion in UAF’s population. The one-fifth (20%) of Native Hawaiian/OPIs who report
the university’s overall acceptance of diversity is poor to very poor represents the opinion of only one person. In contrast, white respondents were over-represented in the survey data, with 568 answering this particular survey question. Still, the pattern in the data does offer food for thought as we consider the climate for diversity at our university.

Another interesting pattern emerges when we analyzed respondents’ answers about the overall acceptance of diversity by respondents’ primary roles. The primary roles we examine here include: undergraduate student, graduate student, staff, faculty, and administrator. As mentioned earlier, students are vastly under-represented in the survey sample, and while staff are also under-represented in the sample, at 37% they also make up the majority of the survey’s respondents. Thus readers are once again cautioned against using the survey data to make any generalizations about UAF’s population.

As Figure 11 demonstrates, a slight to strong majority of respondents consider UAF to have an overall good to excellent acceptance of diversity. Graduate students in the survey tend to rate UAF’s acceptance of diversity the lowest, but at 56% the majority still finds acceptance of diversity to be in the good to excellent range. Fifty-nine percent of faculty rate the university’s overall acceptance of diversity as good to excellent, as do 68% of staff. Administrators and undergraduate students in the survey both rate the university quite highly on this measure, with nearly three-quarters of both of these groups (73%) saying the acceptance for diversity is good to excellent. Note that no administrator in the survey rated the university’s overall acceptance of diversity as poor, although a handful of respondents in all other categories did rate the university as poor.
We also examined the opinions of respondents split into three gender categories of women, men and other. Figure 12 provides an illustration. While the opinions about the overall acceptance of diversity of men and women respondents are parallel, there are still enough differences to discuss. In particular, 66% of women compared to 71% of men rate the university as good to excellent on this measure, meaning that men respondents are more likely to rate the university as good to excellent when compared to women. Men are also less likely to rate the university as fair or poor to very poor compared to women. The modal response for people who identified their gender as “Other” is to rank the university as fair. Note that there are only ten respondents in the sample who identified their gender as other, and that nearly 20% of the sample declined to identify their gender.

A more marked split in opinion is revealed when we examine the opinions about the overall acceptance of diversity by respondents’ sexual orientation. Figure 13 illustrates the opinions of respondents who identified themselves as heterosexual or straight, or lesbian, gay or bisexual (LGB). A substantial majority (70%) of straight respondents say that UAF’s overall acceptance of diversity is good to excellent, compared to only half of LGB respondents (52%) who believe this about UAF. One-fifth of heterosexual respondents think that the overall acceptance of diversity at UAF is only fair, while a third of LGB respondents (33%) rate acceptance of diversity as fair. LGB respondents are also twice as likely to rate UAF’s overall acceptance of diversity as poor to very poor compared to heterosexual respondents. Among respondents, those who say they have a disability are less likely to rate the university as good to excellent on overall acceptance of diversity.
Figure 13. Respondent’s answers to the question: “How would you rate UAF’s overall acceptance of diversity?” By respondents’ sexual orientation.

n = 773. Het/straight n = 637; LGB n = 66. Other n = 30. Missing n = 233 (26% of sample).

diversity when compared to those respondents who do not have a disability. Figure 14 illustrates this difference. While over two-thirds of people without a disability (67%) say the university’s overall acceptance of diversity is good to excellent, just over half of respondents with disabilities (56%) note acceptance of diversity as good to excellent. Proportionate to their population, people with disabilities and people without disabilities are roughly in agreement about ranking the university’s overall acceptance of diversity as fair. People with disabilities are markedly more likely to rate the overall acceptance of diversity as poor to very poor when compared to people without disabilities.

**Promoting a Welcoming Environment**

CDAC sought to discover which constituents are viewed as promoting a welcoming environment to diverse populations at UAF, and which ones are perceived as not welcoming. Figure 15 illustrates the patterns of the responses to this question on the survey.

Note that UAF students are viewed by the survey’s respondents as most likely to promote a “very welcoming” environment to diverse populations at UAF (43%). Students are followed very closely by staff and faculty, with 40% of respondents saying staff promote a “very welcoming” environment to diverse populations, and 39% saying that faculty are “very welcoming.” Less than one-third of respondents (32%) perceive that administrators promote a “very welcoming” environment. Note, however, the very high rates of respondents who report that they “don’t know” whether particular UAF constituents promote a welcoming environment.

We found interesting patterns when we more closely examined the question of who promotes a welcoming environment by looking at respondents’ primary role. Figure 16 illustrates the pattern. Within each primary role, both undergraduate students (46%) and graduate students (53%) most often report that faculty are “very welcoming.” In contrast, faculty (39%), staff (49%), and administrators (41%) are more likely to rank students as “very welcoming”. Undergraduates
Figure 14. Respondent’s answers to the question: “How would you rate UAF’s overall acceptance of diversity?” By respondents’ dis/ability status.

*n = 773. Has disability n = 39; does not have disability n = 734. Missing = 193.*

Figure 15. Percentage of respondents who say UAF administrators, staff, faculty, and students are “very welcoming” or “not at all welcoming to diverse populations at UAF.” Also included: “don’t know.”

*n = 966*
Figure 16. Percentage of respondents who say that students, faculty, staff, and administrators are “very welcoming”, by respondents’ primary role.

Undergrad n = 208; graduate std n = 80; faculty n = 146; staff n = 352; administrator n = 37.
Undergrad DK range: 5-19%, with highest DK on how welcoming staff are to diverse populations.
Graduate DK range: 6-22%, with highest DK on how welcoming administrators are to diverse pops.
Faculty DK range: 7-27%, with highest DK on how welcoming administrators are to diverse pops.
Staff DK range: 7-25%, with highest DK on how welcoming administrators are to diverse populations.
Administrators DK range: 5-8%, with highest DK on how welcoming staff are to diverse populations.

(39%), graduate students (35%), faculty (28%), and staff (29%) rate administrators the lowest among the other primary roles for being “very welcoming.” The lowest ranking for being “very welcoming” is given by administrators for staff. Less than one-third of administrators (30%) say that staff are “very welcoming” to diverse populations. The highest ranking is found for faculty among graduate students, over half of whom (53%) think that faculty are “very welcoming.” Note that there are comparatively large percentages of responses of “don’t know” among all groups.

Willingness to Participate
The survey asked respondents if they would be willing to participate in a number of different diversity activities, such as attending free workshops, lobbying the Board of Regents, or joining a student club that works on issues related to diversity. The results of this question appear in Figure 17. Note that nearly half of the survey’s sample—46% (n=446) declined to answer the question about diversity activities. We interpreted respondents’ non-response to the question about which diversity activities they would be interested in participating in as not willing to participate in any of those suggested, and coded accordingly.

A quarter of the survey’s respondents say they would be willing to attend a presentation by a leader in diversity studies (24%) or to attend a free workshop on diversity (24%). Nearly one-fifth (18%) report a willingness to talk to friends about diversity and discrimina-
tion, while 17% will read free brochures about diversity. Among respondents, there is less willingness to take 1-credit pass/fail classes or 3-credit classes on diversity, or to lobby the Board of Regents for policy changes, but the proportion of respondents who are willing to participate in these diversity activities is still significant.

**Opportunities to Succeed**

The survey asked respondents to consider how well UAF offers opportunities to succeed for a number of groups, including ethnic minorities, whites, gender groups, people with disabilities, and veterans. Given the problems with the data that are compounded by questions of reliability and validity of the survey question, we elected not to analyze this question.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the majority of respondents believe that UAF is doing well in terms of diversity. Some of the answers to the survey questions, however, reveal that many respondents simply do not know the particulars about diversity at UAF and so choose not to respond to the survey at all, or to skip questions in the survey that are designed to get at their opinion.

However, even with the problems with the data, there are still valuable insights that can be gained from a close analysis of the data. We encourage readers to pull what they can from the data and from our analyses, and use the ideas presented as food for thought, and as impetus for further study and analysis.

**Figure 17.** Percent of respondents who say they would be willing to participate in specified diversity activities.
Descriptive Report

The survey asked respondents to say which units at UAF are doing well, and which units need to improve the way they work with diverse populations. In this section, we present analyses of the written responses to these two questions. Because of the nature of the data, and the problems with the data (explained in depth in the Appendices), most of our focus is analyzing the patterns in the responses to the questions about which units are doing well.

Units doing well
The survey asked respondents to identify which UAF offices, centers, departments, and units are doing well in working with diverse populations. Of the 966 surveys submitted, 866 wrote at least one comment in response to this question. In this section, we analyze those comments, using loose and focused coding, and the categories described in the methodology section in the appendices.

There are three specific explanations

Figure 18. Top Twenty Units cited 10 or more times as “doing well in working with diverse populations.”
about our coding scheme that are necessary. First, a note about our coding process: after we conducted the initial loose coding process, we realized that respondents had listed academic departments, non-diversity service offices, and colleges and schools as well as listing diversity offices. When we undertook the time-consuming process of focused coding, we included all units that appeared in the written comments more than one time. The coding categories thus emerged over time, and were not inflexibly set at the beginning of our work.

Second, the College of Rural and Community Development (CRCD) was originally coded as a <college or school> in our coding scheme, but was cited so often as “doing well” that we decided to place it in its own category to enable us to analyze specific patterns associated with CRCD.

Third, a problem with analysis arose when we tried to determine respondents’ intent when they listed Student Support Services, Student Activities, Student Services, and Wood Center. We understand that there is overlap among these units, but we could not determine if respondents understood the overlap. We thus coded mention of these units exactly as respondents wrote, following the principle of objectively coding only manifest content.

Over 50 units appeared in the written comments as “doing well in working with diverse populations” in the survey. The respondents were not given a checklist, but instead wrote their own ideas about which units are doing well. This is notable because of the considerable consensus about which units are considered by respondents to be “doing well,” even though the survey did not provide a list to which respondents could refer.

Approximately 30 units were listed as “doing well” more than once but less than ten times, with 54 units mentioned only once. Fifty one respondents said that most or all units are doing well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units cited 10 or more times as &quot;doing well&quot;</th>
<th>Primary role of those who most often cite this unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acad depts</td>
<td>undergraduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMAD</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or School</td>
<td>faculty &amp; staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRCD</td>
<td>faculty &amp; staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Center</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural campuses</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intl Prog</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Svcs</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Cntr</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>undergrad &amp; staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar/Registration</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC/TVC</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>undergraduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Svcs</td>
<td>faculty &amp; staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabability Svcs</td>
<td>undergrads &amp; staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad Advising Cntr</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top Twenty Units

There are 20 units that were cited ten or more times as “doing well in working with diverse populations.” We call this group of units the Top Twenty Units, and provide an illustration of their ranking in Figure 18. Interestingly, among the survey’s respondents, staff, faculty, students, and administrators differed in their opinions about which units were “doing well.”
Table 4. The unit most commonly cited by each group as “doing well”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group, as defined by primary role</th>
<th>Unit most often cited by this group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>undergraduates</td>
<td>specifically named academic departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate students</td>
<td>specifically named academic departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff</td>
<td>OMAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>specifically named academic departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>Rural Student Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 3, we list each unit that was cited more than ten times, noting which primary role—students, staff, faculty, or administrators—most commonly cited the unit as “doing well.”

Because 41% of the survey’s respondents are staff, it is not surprising that staff are most often listed as the group who most often cite units as “doing well.” The respondents who most often cite a specific academic department as “doing well in working with diverse populations” are undergraduate students, followed closely by faculty. Among administrators, Rural Students Services (RSS) is most often cited as “doing well.” Staff most commonly say that the Office of Multicultural Affairs and Diversity (OMAD) is “doing well.” Table 4 illustrates which unit is most commonly cited as “doing well” among each of the groups defined by their primary role.

Top Cited Units

Eight units were cited by 30 or more respondents. We call these the Top Cited Units. See Table 5. Two of the Top Cited Units—academic departments and college and school—are categories into which multiple sub-units are collapsed. Later, we list the sub-units, but first we generally discuss the Top Cited Units in terms of respondents’ primary role, gender, and race/ethnicity to reveal the patterns in the data.

Top Cited Units and primary role

The primary role of respondents is associated with which units respondents rated as “doing well in working with diverse populations.” Figure 19 illustrates the range of pri-

Table 5. Top Cited Units, in ranked order by total respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Cited Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic departments—specifically named</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Office of Multicultural Affairs &amp; Diversity (OMAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rural Student Services (RSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College or School (not including CRCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. College of Rural and Community Development (CRCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Women’s Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rural campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Admissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 19. Top Cited Units, by respondents’ primary role

Figure 20. Male and Female respondents’ opinions combined to produce the ranking of the Top Cited Units
Faculty most often rank academic departments as “doing well”, followed by college or school, and College of Rural and Community Development (CRCD). Undergraduate students most often cite academic departments as “doing well”, followed by the Office of Multicultural Affairs and Diversity (OMAD). Staff in the survey most often list OMAD, followed by Rural Student Services (RSS). Administrators most often cite RSS, followed by CRCD.

Figure 21. Comparison of opinions about the Top Cited Units by respondents’ gender.

Figure 22. Top Cited Units by respondents’ race/ethnicity.
Top Cited Units and gender

Over two-thirds of respondents in the survey sample who identified their gender are women (69%), which is disproportionately higher than their presence in the university’s actual population. Women are thus over-represented in the sample, as discussed in the methodology section, and this fact must always be kept in mind. In particular, because of the over-representation of women, women’s opinions are over-represented in the survey data, and thus no generalizations can legitimately be made based on the data.

Among the respondents, men’s and women’s opinions about which units are “doing well” converge on five units, and diverge on three, as illustrated in Figure 21. If men were represented in the survey sample in numbers that were proportional to their presence in the university population, we might have seen other differences in opinion about which units respondents believe are “doing well in working with diverse populations.” Alternately, we might have seen even more convergence on opinions between genders.

Among the respondents, both men and women agree about the identity of the eight top cited units, and both men and women agree that academic departments and OMAD are the top two units who are “doing well.” But opinions diverge on other items. Notably, men rank a college or school as third, while women rank Rural Student Services as third. Men rank RSS fourth. Men also ranked Admissions higher than women respondents.

Figure 21 illustrates the differences as well as the convergence of opinions among men and women.
For the purposes of our analysis of the Top Cited Units, we combine men’s and women’s opinions to create the list of eight.

**Top Cited Units and race/ethnicity**

As mentioned earlier, the survey failed to offer sufficient racial and/or ethnic categories for all of the respondents. Specifically, we failed to include categories that would have included foreign nationals who do not identify with the American racialized system. For example, although foreign students, faculty, staff, and administrators from Asian nations might use the category “Asian” as their racial/ethnic identity, or Latino/a respondents to use the category “Hispanic or Latino/a”, respondents from other international ethnicities were often unable to locate their category in the survey. Many respondents selected to check the “other” box and to write in their racial/ethnic identity, raising our awareness of the survey’s failure to present categories that are inclusive and exhaustive. Nearly one-fifth of respondents (19%, n = 185) declined to identify their race/ethnicity.

That said, significant differences emerged among racial/ethnic groups about which units are “doing well”, as Figure 22 illustrates. As you can see, whites dominate every category, and altered the ranking of the units.

Because we are particularly interested in the opinions of respondents of color, we analyzed the racial/ethnic patterns of the top cited units by excluding whites. Please see Figure 23, keeping in mind the fact that there are comparatively few respondents of color, and thus the bar height is exaggerated. Also, note Table 6, where the differences in ranking between white respondents and respondents of color are listed.

Notably, in Figure 23, Asian respondents most often rank academic departments as “doing well in working with diverse populations.” In contrast, African American or black respondents most commonly rank the Office of Multicultural Affairs and Diversity as “doing well.” Alaska Natives and American Indians most commonly rank Rural Student Services as “doing well,” followed by the College of Rural and Community Development and UAF’s rural campuses such as the Interior Aleutians campus. OMAD enjoys the widest diversity, with respondents from all six non-white racial/ethnic identities contributing to its high ranking as the second most cited unit.

The opinions of Native Hawaiians or Other Pacific Islanders (OPI) are nearly invisible in the survey, as there were few respondents who selected this category as their racial/ethnic identity. Hispanics or Latino/as are also comparatively invisible, also due to their low participation in the survey.

**Top Cited Unit: academic departments**

Specifically named academic departments comprise the category of units that ranks the highest in number of citations as “doing well” by the survey’s respondents. Fourteen aca-

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>whites' ranking</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>non-whites' ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>academic depts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>acad depts &amp; OMAD (tied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMAD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CRCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRCD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>rural campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college or school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Women's Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Center</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural campuses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>college or school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Comparison of whites’ and non-whites’ rankings of Top Cited Units
Academic departments were cited three or more times as “doing well.” Figure 24 illustrates the pattern. Top among these are Engineering and the Department of Alaska Native Studies and Rural Development. Note that of the 14 academic departments cited multiple times as “doing well”, half are in the College of Liberal Arts. These include, in order of the number of citations: Sociology, Psychology, Foreign Languages, English, Communication, Social Work, and Anthropology.

Top Cited Unit: colleges and schools

There are nine colleges and schools at UAF. All nine are listed as “doing well” by at least three respondents. However, most bragging rights accrue to the College of Rural and Community Development, which stands out as the most most often cited college or school who is “doing well in working with diverse populations.” In fact, at 41 individual citations, CRCD overshadows the next highest ranked colleges and schools by nearly six times. See Figure 25.

Non-academic units who are “doing well”

Although academic units take top honors for “doing well” in the survey, there are several non-academic units that appear in the eight Top Cited Units. These include:

Figure 24. Academic departments most often cited as “doing well.”

Note: many respondents reported “engineering”, but did not indicate a specific engineering program. We tried to interpret respondents’ intent, and coded citations to “engineering” as CEM, knowing that this is an imperfect category.
Figure 25. Colleges and Schools cited as “doing well in working with diverse populations.”

Figure 26. Non-academic units cited more than 30 times as “doing well in working with diverse populations.”
OMAD, Rural Student Services, the Women’s Center, and Admissions. See Figure 26. Because three of these units—OMAD, RSS, and the Women’s Center—have special responsibilities to promote and support diverse populations, we believe it is useful to further examine these units.

The Office of Multicultural Affairs and Diversity (OMAD), heads the list of non-academic units cited most often as “doing well.” OMAD was cited 91 times in the written survey comments as “doing well”, including several times when Ana Richards, the manager of OMAD, was specifically named.

Figure 27 illustrates the primary role of those respondents who cite OMAD as “doing well.” Like the RSS and the Women’s Center, nearly half of the respondents who say that OMAD is “doing well” are staff. Undergraduate students are the next most common group to cite OMAD.

Rural Student Services appears next in the rank order of non-academic units who are cited as “doing well” in the survey. Like OMAD and the Women’s Center, the majority of respondents who say RSS is doing well are staff. However, RSS also enjoys significant faculty support, with nearly a quarter of faculty respondents citing RSS as “doing well” (22%). Fourteen percent of the respondents identifying RSS as “doing well” report that they are administrators.

For the Women’s Center, staff comprise nearly half of the respondents (49%) who cite the Women’s Center as “doing well.” Undergraduate students make up a significant proportion of the respondents who say the Women’s Center is “doing well,” at 24%. Faculty, too, are an important constituent for
Figure 28. Respondents who cite OMAD, RSS, and Women’s Center as “doing well”, by gender

Figure 29. Respondents who cite OMAD, RSS, and Women’s Center as “doing well”, by race/ethnicity
the Women’s Center, with 16% of the respondents who say the WC is “doing well” identifying themselves as faculty.

For all three of these Top Cited Units that are non-academic, women make up the majority of respondents. See Figure 28. This is not at all surprising, given the fact that the survey sample is overwhelmingly female, and thus non-representative of the university’s population. As readers will note, all three of the Top Cited non-academic Units have about the same proportion of female and male respondents who say the units are doing well.

The race/ethnicity of respondents shows a similar skewed pattern, which we illustrate in Figure 29. Note first that most respondents are white, as are the majority of the survey sample. Next note that although all three units are cited by respondents from multiple racial/ethnic identities, OMAD is cited by at least one respondent from all of the racial/ethnic identities specifically included in the survey, while RSS enjoys more support from respondents who identify as Alaska Native or American Indian. The Women’s Center is cited by respondents from seven of the eight major race/ethnic groups.

As you attempt to interpret these data, please keep in mind the fact that the survey data are not representative of the university’s population, and thus no generalizations can legitimately be drawn.

**Units That “Need to Improve”**

The survey asked respondents “which UAF offices, centers, departments, and units need to improve in working with diverse peoples?” In all, just over one-third of the survey respondents (38%, n = 363) of the 966 survey respondents answered this question. Of those who wrote comments, just over half (56%) criticized one or more units. About one-quarter (22%) answered that they did not know or wrote some variation of N/A. Twelve percent reported that all or most units need to improve, and 9% said that no units need to improve. About 1% of the comments were coded “off topic” and were not coded. (See “Analyzing the Data” in the Appendices for an alternate coding scheme.) See Figure 30.

Because of the problems with the survey data, as briefly described earlier and in the Appendices, we cannot make generalizations about the university population, nor can action items be determined using the survey data as justification. That said, there are some comments about the units that “need to improve” that are useful as CDAC and others consider the issues related to diversity at UAF. We discuss them here.

An analysis of the "needs improvement" responses suggests that there are a few units in which expectations are higher, and are not being met/satisfied. Fairly extensive anger gets directed at offices which have diversity-related responsibilities that respondents feel are not addressed with satisfaction. Thus the Disabilities Services office was named seven times, perhaps in part because the expectation is higher and in part because the single office
gets blamed for failings across many parts of campus, many of which, such as snow removal or the placement of ramps, are not within the unit’s purview. Similarly, Residence Life is frequently criticized, and some of that criticism is probably based on troubles that are not strictly under their control. Yet they get held responsible because they are supposed to manage the campus living experience for students. Similar reasoning seems to at least partially explain why the Business Office gets criticized so frequently as needing improvement. The troubles listed regarding Financial Aid are more complex. Yes, certainly they get criticized for things that are not under their control, such as the lack of scholarships or the high cost of tuition or fees. But they also get criticized by some respondents who perceive an attitude that does not distinguish individuals and their unique contexts. The Chancellor’s Office gets criticized for non-actions rather than for attitude, and gets held responsible for broader problems with the system. All of the most-criticized units are listed above, and all of these units are singled out perhaps because they are expected to have above-average responsibility for diversity.

The Women’s Center, Rural Student Services, and the Office of Multicultural Awareness and Diversity (OMAD) were also mentioned as “needing to improve.” As these three offices are charged by the university’s administration for celebrating and promoting diversity, as well as providing services essential to diverse populations, it is important to examine the critical comments in more depth. OMAD was mentioned four times, but two of the comments seemed supportive of OMAD’s mission, urging the university to increase its support of OMAD. The other two comments were vague, but seemed to indicate respondents’ dissatisfaction with OMAD’s perceived focus on only a narrow range of diverse populations. Rural Student Services mostly enjoys kudos, but one respondent sug-

![Figure 31. Academic departments who are noted by respondents as “need to improve”](image)

![Figure 32. Other academic units cited as “needing to improve.”](image)
gested the name should be changed from “rural” to “Alaska Native to better reflect its mission, and another criticizing RSS as not being inclusive of people who are not Alaska Native. Others generally seemed supportive of RSS, calling for increased funding and resources. Two of the five criticisms of the Women’s Center centered on the fact that there was no comparable men’s center at UAF. Three other criticisms of the Women’s Center were quite vehement, but they seem to be multiple submissions from the same respondent (Appendix for analysis of the problems with multiple submissions.)

The second tier of frequent criticisms targets academic units. Fourteen academic departments are specifically named as needing to improve; nine are named more than once. See Figure 31. In most cases, specific reasons for respondents’ criticism are not elaborated.

Of the nine departments pointed out as “needing improvement,” two are criticized five times. Eight of the nine departments who are pointed out as “needing to improve” teach required core courses, so some of the discontent from students may originate more from the course material or from individual instructors as opposed to problems that are identified within the department itself. One criticism of the Department of Philosophy, for example, noted that the respondent’s instructor taught about a topic that contradicted the respondent’s religious beliefs.

Colleges and schools are also cited by respondents as “needing to improve.” Please see Figure 33. As can be expected, all nine of UAF’s colleges were cited as “needing to improve” by at least one respondent. The School of Education (SOE) is most often cited as “needing to improve”, followed by the School of Management. Usually, respondents give no specifics about what needs to be improved, although some of the criticism leveled against the SOM focuses on perceived discrimination against women and ethnic minorities. The SOE and CRCD are also criticized for what respondents perceive as reverse discrimination, specifically favoritism towards Alaska Natives. No specific reasons are given for the criticism of CLA or CNSM.

A handful of other academic units are mentioned by respondents as “needing to improve,” including the Geophysical Institute, Athletics, Honors Program, and Arctic Region Supercomputer Center (ARSC). Please see Figure 32. All in all, criticism of individ-
ual academic departments, schools and colleges, and other academic units pales in comparison with the number of respondents who criticized other parts of UAF.

In addition to the units criticized multiple times, there are many many units that get criticized only once or twice. Some of the reasons given share quite distressing individual experiences. Perhaps another study might investigate such experiences, such as asking in a future survey if respondents would be willing to participate in a follow-up interview. Certainly the problems with the survey data do not allow an investigation into allegations made in the survey, but UAF would do well to include questions that would get at the heart of such issues in future studies.

Many of the comments about which units “need to improve” reveal an underlying concern about reverse discrimination. Several respondents noted in this section and elsewhere that they felt that whites, men, heterosexuals, and conservative Christians experienced discrimination at UAF. Several respondents note their concern with an over-emphasis on providing services and support to Alaska Natives.

It is also important to note that 12% of respondents reported that the units that need to improve are "all of them" or "all faculty" or the "student body as a whole." Reasons given are unfortunately generally vague; responses such as "just look around" or "walk the walk don't talk the talk" give little guidance to improve our practices. However, these responses do help underscore the importance of considering these issues, and suggest that there might be significant interest in more public discussions.

Making UAF More Welcoming
The survey asked respondents to “share information (and) suggestions which will help us make UAF a more welcoming place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Top Ten Ideas from Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Ten Ideas to Make UAF More Welcoming to All</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embrace a genuine commitment to diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase access for people with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand diversity and advocacy offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute mandatory training for staff on issues of diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase attention to LGBT issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase opportunities for education on diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold UAF accountable to its own policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase support for Alaska Natives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower student costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus leaders should lead the way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for everyone.” Out of the total 966 surveys submitted, 250 contained comments to contribute to the discussion about making UAF more welcoming. Again, although the survey data is not representative of the university population, there are some patterns in the data that can be used by those interested in addressing issues of diversity at UAF. We discuss them here.

Table 7 lists the top ten ideas that were most commonly mentioned as responses on how to make “UAF more welcoming.” To create the list, we followed the coding procedure described in the Appendices.

**Embrace a genuine commitment to diversity**

A common theme that ran throughout the written comments on how to make UAF “a more welcoming place for everyone” is to urge the university community to embrace a genuine commitment to diversity. Respondents asked that invisible groups be discussed, and that equal attention be paid to all minority groups. There were several calls to make equity and diversity truly inclusive, and to move UAF beyond mere lip service to diversity. One respondent noted that UAF needs to experience a paradigm shift in its thinking about diversity. Above all, respondents urge the university to increase its fairness for all groups, and not to give preferential treatment to any group. Respondents suggest increasing enrollment of non-Native minority students, e.g. Hispanics and African Americans, by strategically marketing to these populations. Others note problems with UAF seemingly marketing to traditional college students only, and push the university to market to lesbians and gays and older students by including members of these groups in photos on websites and in brochures.

**Increase access for people with disabilities**

The second most common theme among the respondents is a call for the university to increase access to its physical and virtual sites for people with disabilities. Respondents noted the need to increase the number of ramps, and to locate ramps where they would be convenient for persons who need them. Many respondents noted problems with snow being dumped in paths and handicapped parking spaces, blocking access not only for people with disabilities, but for everyone else as well. Several people suggested better food labeling in Tilly and in Wood Center, saying that people with food sensitivities and/or religious or cultural traditions must know what is in their food. Other ideas included increasing bathroom accessibility, and installing handrails on slippery paths to aid people with walking disabilities now, but also to prevent future injuries. Many respondents noted problems with handicapped parking, including poor location and scarcity near busy buildings. Several called for increased funding to Disability Services, and better access to resources for students with disabilities.

**Expand diversity and advocacy offices**

The third most common theme that permeated the responses to the question about making UAF “more welcoming” is for the university to expand diversity and advocacy offices. Increased funding for OMAD is a common call, as are requests for specific services within OMAD such as an ESL instructor, trained advisors, and more staff. Respondents urged the university to encourage collaboration among diversity and advocacy offices, specifically noting the potential for collaborations among RSS, OMAD, the Women’s Center, and offices such as Career Services. There were suggestions of increasing the funding and support for the Women’s Center, including transforming the one part time staff position into a full time position. One respondent recalled that there had at one time been an advisory committee for the Women’s Center, and that this committee should be revived and supported by the university. Several respondents urged the univer-
sity to increase its support of RSS, noting the critical role RSS plays in the comfort level and success of rural and Alaska Native students. In this section and elsewhere in the survey, kudos were awarded to RSS for the important work that this office has been doing, along with exhortations to increase the resources that the university invests in RSS. Several respondents suggested that the university open an office that would support LGBT people as a strategy to combat the discrimination this population is perceived as experiencing. Kudos for the diversity and advocacy offices permeated the written comments as well.

**Institute mandatory training on diversity**

Many respondents desire the university to institute mandatory training on diversity, particularly for staff. Respondents asked that staff increase their customer service skills and their competence on matters related to diversity. Respondents asked that UAF require advisors to undergo training on diversity, and that administrators and faculty also be required to take diversity training. One respondent said that the diversity trainings should be conducted annually. In contrast, other respondents noted that trainings will not change attitudes.

**Increase attention to LGBT issues**

Many respondents exhorted UAF to increase attention to LGBT issues, noting the new inclusive non-discrimination clause, as well as the continuing discrimination this population is perceived as experiencing. Respondents encouraged the university to increase the visibility of LGBT persons, with three respondents asking the university to include transgender on the list of classes protected against discrimination by policy. People who addressed LGBT issues in the survey asked UAF to ensure a welcoming climate for lesbians and gays, and sought the university’s assistance in reducing prejudice and acts of discrimination, e.g. discriminatory hiring practices. The establishment of a new LGBT center as part of UAF’s advocacy and diversity offices was suggested.

**Increase diversity educational opportunities**

Several respondents advised that the university increase educational opportunities related to diversity. One respondent suggested putting up educational posters, another pointed to the value of banners that celebrate diverse cultural heritages. A couple of the written comments about increasing educational opportunities may have been intended as irony by the respondents, but because we coded for manifest content, and not latent content, we coded all comments nonetheless. A couple of respondents noted that formal classes on diversity, e.g. a pass-fail class, would be helpful to increase educational opportunities related to diversity. One respondent suggested inviting external speakers to speak on matters related to diversity, while another insisted that faculty at UAF are already experts on diversity, and that UAF should turn to its own community for expertise. A reinvigorated campus climate forum series was suggested.

**Hold UAF accountable to its own policies**

Many respondents suggested that UAF hold itself and its community accountable to its own policies. One respondent urged the university to shine a light on UAF practices, seeking to discover where existing practices contradict UAF policy, while another asked that UAF policies and regulations be reviewed to discover deficiencies related to diversity. Others suggested that administrators, directors, and other campus leaders be held responsible for ensuring compliance with university policies. Two people asked that problems within HR be addressed.

**Increase support for Alaska Natives**

Increasing advocacy for and support to
Alaska Natives is another important theme in the comments about how to make UAF “more welcoming to everyone.” Respondents mentioned fully integrating Alaska Natives into the university community, including its workforce. Others seemed to think that Alaska Natives may be better served with specialized programming, such as increased opportunities for Alaska Native students to gather socially, targeted advising, and tutoring services. There was a call for increased scholarship availability, and mandatory training for staff on Alaska Native culture as a strategy to increase staff sensitivity and increase staff success in working with Native students. One respondent noted that it is comparatively rare to witness Alaska Natives at events beyond performing song and dance. More than one respondent urged UAF to hire more Native faculty both as an equity issue and also as a strategy to increase the success of Alaska Native students.

Lower student costs

Several respondents asked UAF to reconsider fee and tuition increases, and to find ways to decrease expenses to expand possibilities for diverse students. There were many calls against instituting a “diversity fee”, suggested in the survey. Parking emerged as an issue of contention, with several respondents asking the university to make parking cheaper or even free, and more accessible. Free books and tuition were recommended.

Campus leaders should take the lead

A theme in the written comments is that the Chancellor, his administration, governance leaders, and other campus leaders should take the lead on diversity issues. One respondent urged the Chancellor to issue a zero tolerance policy on discrimination. Others asked that the administration, faculty and staff leaders, and governance leaders lead by example. A couple of respondents suggested the university hire and promote diversity within upper management, with one pointing out that the university’s leadership team is not as diverse in terms of gender as it used to be.

Resistance to diversity

Another theme that permeated the comments on how to make UAF “more welcoming to everyone” was resistance to the idea of diversity itself. Suspicion of reverse discrimination, particularly against whites, heterosexuals, men, non-Natives, Christians, Americans, and native English speakers was common. There were several calls to end diversity initiatives, including criticism of the survey itself as being racist, offensive, and biased. A couple of respondents urged UAF to eliminate the Women’s Center, RSS, and OMAD. Others noted that not everyone accepted diversity, and that some people preferred segregated workplaces and residence halls. One respondent suggested sunsetting CDAC.

Conclusion

A close reading and careful coding of the written comments along with statistical analysis of the numerical data demonstrate that although the majority of respondents rate UAF as doing well on matters related to diversity, there is significant discontent. Over one-fourth of respondents went to the effort of making quite detailed suggestions on how UAF could become more welcoming to eve-
Conclusion

The University of Alaska Fairbanks deserves kudos for the extent to which it successfully satisfies the need for diversity among its various constituencies. The majority of the respondents in our limited sample appear to feel like the university provides a welcoming environment. The university is given credit for its efforts towards promoting diversity.

That being said, many of the responses here indicate that there is still room for improvement of the climate for diversity, or at least further exploration. The top three suggestions offered by survey respondents might be especially considered. (See Table 7 and discussion, page 36.) At a minimum some efforts at triangulation to see if other forms of evidence would further confirm interest in such possibilities should be undertaken. The praise given to units who are doing well suggests that if the university is interested in looking further to identify “best practices” that are adapted to the specific UAF context, a good starting point might be to look at the top cited units.

Another recommendation that we offer is to examine the resistance to diversity that is quite evident in the survey. Future work might benefit from a closer analysis of the origins and manifestations of resistance. While it is easy for us to note that the resistance to diversity that surfaces in the survey is possibly part of a national backlash, examining the contexts of resistance to diversity here at UAF will help all of us understand how resistance might be managed, and even engaged to make diversity initiatives more effective (see, for example, Titus 2000.)

As stated, the sample here is small, and there are weaknesses endemic to on-line surveys that are notable in this data set as well. Thus any major changes to policy are not warranted based on the current research. The authors regard it as their charge to analyze the data, without making any specific policy recommendations; we leave to CDAC the responsibility to review this report and deliberate regarding any next steps.

One of the strongest intuitive insights provided by the data is the need for further research that would be of value to CDAC and to the university. We suggest that CDAC follow up the online survey project with a series of well-planned focus groups. Focus groups would be useful for providing depth of understanding and for generating creative, useful suggestions. Another alternative, and a suggestion offered by survey respondents, would be the use of public forums for to identify and discuss the issues that matter most to UAF constituents. We understand CDAC suggested a series of public forums at one of its last meetings in AY 10-11. Certainly the calls from the survey’s respondents for more public discussion of diversity issues make the idea of public forums even more persuasive. Public forums that are professionally facilitated can simultaneously provide further research opportunities for CDAC as well as build community for all of us.
Appendix A: Problems with the Data

As mentioned in the methodology section, there are serious problems with the data that resulted from the data collection process. Online surveys such as the one CDAC conducted are convenient and inexpensive, but there are problems inherent in online surveys that are difficult, if not impossible, to avoid. The CDAC Climate Survey Subcommittee understood from the outset the data problems that were likely to occur with an online survey, but the lack of monetary and staff resources and a dearth of other viable data collection options made the Subcommittee determine that an online survey was the best option. In the end, the analysts conclude that insufficient data is better than no data at all, and if used appropriately, the data does provide important insights about the climate for diversity at UAF.

The problems manifest in the data include: unknown population size; convenience sample; non-representative sample; non-response bias; voluntary response bias; and multiple submissions. In this section, we discuss each problem.

Unknown population size

Approximately 16,250 students, faculty, staff, and administrators were originally invited to participate. A number of recipients forwarded the link to others, including alumni and community members; the number of forwarded surveys is unknown. Additionally, many students and others at UAF do not commonly access their official UAF email account, and thus did not receive the invitation to participate in the survey. The result of these factors is that we cannot say with certainty how many people actually received invitations to participate in the survey.

The main problem with an unknown population size is that researchers cannot make probability statements and accurately predict the degree of error. We managed the problem by estimating the size of the population, relying upon UAF institutional data posted on the university’s websites. Additionally, we avoided conducting advanced statistical analyses that require an accurate prediction of population size.

Convenience sample

CDAC had to use a convenience sample for the survey. A convenience sample is a group that is selected from the population not on a random basis, but simply because it is an available, convenient group to use. In this case, the convenience sample was everyone at the university who had been assigned an official university email address. Convenience samples are inexpensive compared to random probability samples, but they come with their own set of problems. Chief among these problems is that the data are not representative of the population being sampled.

For this survey, respondents had to use their university email account to receive the original invitation to participate in the survey. Many students, however, do not commonly use their university email accounts, so likely never received the invitation to participate. This presents a problem for the study because students who do use their university email accounts often enough to have received the survey invitation and responded to it may be different in crucial ways from students who do not use their official university account, but the differences might not appear.

On the other hand, staff, faculty, and administrators do commonly use their university email accounts. This may account for their higher response rates compared to students, although staff and faculty also had extremely low response rates. Please see Figure 33 for details about how the number of respondents fall in the categories of student, faculty, staff, and administrator.

Non-representative sample

The result of the convenience sample is that it is not representative of the UAF community. Please see Figure 34 for comparisons of the survey sample with the actual population. Only 209 respondents identified themselves as undergraduate students, and 80 as graduate students, compared to 11,034 total students enrolled at UAF in Spring 2011 (http://www.uaf.edu/about/). This results in only a 2.6% response rate among students, and a 97.4% non-response rate.

There are several reasons why we think so
few students responded to the survey. First, as discussed, many students do not access their official university email, and thus never received the invitation to participate in the survey. Additionally, according to Lipka (2011), university students suffer from “survey fatigue, the main symptom of which is nonresponse.”

Part of the problem is that as the accountability movement requires universities to gather more data, students become tired of surveys and simply stop responding to them. While past survey projects yielded upwards of a 70% response rate, Lipka notes that universities all over the nation now bemoan the fact that response rates to student surveys commonly sink to the single digits. We believe it is likely that the CDAC campus climate study fell victim to students’ survey fatigue.

Staff response rates were also low. Only 357 respondents identified themselves as staff, compared to 4089 in the population (http://www.uaf.edu/facts/). This results in a 8.7% response rate, and a 91.3% nonresponse rate.

Faculty response rates were a bit higher, but still not in the range required to claim representativeness. Only 147 respondents identified themselves as faculty, compared to 1049 faculty in the actual population (http://www.uaf.edu/facts/). This results in a 14% response rate, and a 85% nonresponse rate.

For this survey, only respondents who identified themselves as administrators had a response rate that is acceptable to claim representativeness in a non-random sample. Thirty-seven respondents reported that their primary role at the university is as an administrator, compared to 71 in the actual population according to the latest organizational chart published by the university (http://www.uaf.edu/chancellor/administration/UAF.pdf). This means that administrators had a 52% response rate, an acceptable response rate for statistical purposes.

Because of the problem with the sample being non-representative of the
population, no generalizations can be made about any population except administrators. And even then, because the job category is so broad and the actual number of respondents claiming administrator status is so small (n=37), any generalizations made must be carefully contextualized. The undercoverage of students, staff, and faculty is especially problematic, as together, these groups make up 99.6% of the university’s population, but only 4.4% of the survey’s respondents. Even though the survey’s sample seems comparatively large at 966, the undercoverage of critical elements of the university’s population makes it impossible to generalize with any validity.

**Nonresponse bias**

Related to non-representational sample and convenience sample problems, non-response bias is also a problem with the survey data. Nonresponse bias happens when those who do not respond to a survey differ in significant ways from those who do.

Nonresponse to surveys is a problem that plagues online surveys of students, as discussed earlier. But nonresponse is also a problem when workers are asked their opinions about controversial topics such as the workplace climate for diversity. University employees may have been concerned about who was asking the questions, and who would have access to the data. Faculty and staff may be especially cautious about responding to a survey that asks questions about opinions about units that may be doing well or need improvement out of fear of workplace reprisal. A rational reaction to being asked volatile questions is not to respond.

Because the nonresponse rates are extremely high in this study, nonresponse bias is in all likelihood a major factor. We manage the nonresponse bias by carefully contextualizing our analysis of the survey data, and by avoiding generalizing the findings of the survey to the university population. We do this because the voices of those who did not respond to the survey, who probably view the climate for diversity differently than those who did respond, are absent. Readers are also cautioned not to generalize from the findings, and to keep the probability of nonresponse bias in mind as they use the findings.

**Voluntary response bias**

Yet another problem of the survey data is voluntary response bias. The problem of voluntary response bias is that respondents who volunteer to answer a survey tend to have strong opinions on the subject being studied. Respondents who have little to no interest in the topic generally do not complete surveys. The result is that

---

**Figure 34.** Percentage of students, staff, faculty, and administrators in the survey’s sample (left) compared to the actual percentages in the population (right).
respondents with strong opinions are over-represented, while those with weak opinions are under-represented.

Although we agree that voluntary response bias is present in this study, voluntary response bias might actually work to the benefit of CDAC. As readers will note, there are strong opinions noted in the survey. The survey touched a nerve, and gave many people a forum through which they could express their frustrations about issues related to diversity at UAF. Additionally, there are many comments that express robust positive opinions and pride about the climate for diversity at UAF. Clearly, the survey tapped into strong opinions, even if voluntary response bias is an issue that we must keep in mind as we use the findings.

**Multiple submissions**

One of the more vexing challenges with online surveys is managing the possibility that respondents will submit more than one survey. Survey results can be severely compromised and skewed towards false findings when respondents submit multiple surveys. But effective solutions to the problem of multiple submissions often interfere with respondents’ privacy needs. For example, respondents will typically refuse to participate in a survey if they are not assured of confidentiality. Respondents also will not state strong opinions about controversial issues if they have any doubt that their privacy will not be maintained. This is especially a problem for workers who perceive that their employer is probing into their opinions about controversial topics.

Social desirability is another problem that emerges when respondents are not assured of confidentiality. Social desirability happens when respondents give answers that they think are expected. Questions about diversity, imbued with ideas about race, sexuality, gender, ethnicity, immigration, and other potentially volatile topics often stimulate respondents to answer questions falsely because of their concern with social desirability and their concerns about being identified. Researchers must thus balance respondent privacy with the need to prevent multiple submissions that may skew the survey’s results. For the CDAC Campus Climate Survey, respondents were assured of their confidentiality through the promise that their responses would not be linked to them as individuals. IP numbers were collected to identify multiple submissions. Unfortunately, the dataset sent to the analysts was incomplete, and only the last 158 surveys submitted were connected to an IP number. Still, even with this partial data, some noteworthy patterns emerged that must be taken into consideration when users attempt to interpret and to use the survey data.

Among the 158 surveys with IP numbers, 20 originated from IP numbers that submitted more than one survey. In fact, 12.6% of the 158 surveys were sent from only five computers. One IP address was used to submit eight surveys. This particular IP address is not located at UAF, but is located at a different governmental entity in Fairbanks. Four IP addresses were used to submit three or more submissions. One IP address was responsible for three survey submissions within a three-hour period. From this particular IP address, the written responses were too similar to be considered coincidental. In particular, the submissions singled out one unit for vehement criticism. The similarity of the criticism, coupled with the fact that all three responses originated from the same IP number makes us assume one respondent was responsible for all three submissions.

Interpreting and managing multiple submissions is a complicated matter. A possible explanation is that a lab computer or other shared computer accounts for some of the multiple submissions. Another possible explanation may be that technical or other problems were encountered, and some people accidentally submitted more than one survey. A third explanation may be that some respondents deliberately submitted multiple surveys, perhaps as a strategy to ensure that their opinions were clearly heard. Because too many multiple submissions skew otherwise good data, social scientists generally discount or eliminate multiple submissions unless the intent of the respondent is clear, e.g. a technical difficulty that obviously resulted in a resubmission. Because of the possibility that some respondents encountered technical problems or simply used a shared computer, we counted all of the submitted responses. We do, however, urge extreme caution to those who seek to use the data, keeping in mind the probability that the data are skewed.
The data were analyzed using a four-pronged technique. First, we examined Cundiff’s statistical analysis of the numerical data to set the context for our work. Taylor then used a hermeneutic cycle approach (described in detail and with an example from the data, below) to conduct a thorough content analysis of the data. Taylor wrote notes about her analysis, and posted them to the website we created to facilitate our collaboration. After studying Taylor’s ideas about the data, Anahita then coded the data using loose and focused coding techniques. Finally, we turned back to the numerical data, conducting simple statistical analysis. This four-pronged technique allowed us to incorporate multiple disciplinary approaches to data analysis, and we believe this collaborative approach resulted in a stronger report than would have been possible if only one analyst worked with the data.

Anahita created a codebook for the survey and used it to recode several of the columns in SPSS, e.g. recoding the different racial and ethnic identities into one column. For the written comments, she first coded into loose categories by hand. She coded based on manifest content (Berg 1995) only, meaning that she used objective categories and made no assumptions about what respondents might have meant. For example, only if the respondent specifically wrote the name of a department would that department be coded into the category “named academic department.” Following loose coding, Anahita then used focused coding to create specific categories into which to place written comments. She assigned numerical codes to categories, created new columns in the dataset in SPSS, and coded the data directly into SPSS. Anahita also used nVivo, primarily to review the entire dataset, and Excel and SPSS to create tables and graphs.

Though the code categories reported in this analysis are primarily the ones based upon manifest content and developed by Anahita, Taylor’s approach used a hermeneutic cycle (see e.g. Ricoeur 1983) that insists texts require context to be interpreted. The interpretation is guided by Gricean (1989) rules of intentionality. The procedure works as follows: read through everything, particularly with a focus on the wording of the question that the respondents are replying to. Then sort according to specific responses to that question, and then sort again to group higher levels of abstraction, similarity of argument, and to check for implicature (figures of speech like irony).

The results of this survey look significantly different if a greater role is acknowledged for a readers’ interpretation. For a single example, consider one of the items Anahita coded as an “off-topic” response to suggestions for making UAF more welcoming. The survey respondent wrote “the lion should lay down with the lamb, and the musk-ox should make friends with the wolves.” The respondent’s previous written responses had similarly talked about species other than human. In terms of manifest content the only thing to do with such a data-point is to toss it out, but a reader using a hermeneutic cycle approach might note the echoing of a Biblical passage (Isaiah 65:25), and recognize that the comment is likely intended ironically since the suggestion is presumably impossible (barring miracles of course). So another way of categorizing this would be to include it as another respondent arguing that further diversity efforts are unwarranted and potentially counter-productive.

As in all collaborative projects, the analysts engaged in “gentle arguing” (Taylor) over the final product, each of us contributing ideas from our disciplinary specialties to the project.
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# Appendix E: Coding categories (manifest only)

## Coding categories for units doing well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alphabetic order</th>
<th>Numerical order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Dept</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All or most doing well</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni office</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANKN Alaska Native Knowledge Network</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSEP AK Nat Science &amp; Engin Prog</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASUAF</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANHR</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Distance Education, CDE</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Health and Counseling</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's Diversity Action Comm</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's Office or Chancellor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Rural and Community Development</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or School, named</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com &amp; Tech College, Tanana Val Cam</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Services</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEO, Office of Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysical Institute</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAB</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARC</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Aleutians Campus; rural campuses</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named individual</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off topic (code elsewhere?)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of International Programs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Multicultural Affairs and Diversity</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued next page*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Program</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>ASUAF</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>IARC</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAHI</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>ANKN Alaska Native Knowledge Network</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmuson Library, Library</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Veterans Services</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar, Office of</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Geophysical Institute</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Student Services</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Disability Services</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>RAHI</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student organization, named or implied</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ANSEP AK Nat Science &amp; Engin Prog</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Recreation Center</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>CANHR</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Services Program</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>College of Rural and Community Development</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Sessions</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Interior Aleutians Campus; rural campuses</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear Reference</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Services</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Chancellor's Diversity Action Comm</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Center</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Summer Sessions</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Center</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Center for Distance Education, CDE</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Center</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: 2011 Online Campus Climate Survey

Campus Climate Survey

The Chancellor’s Diversity Action Committee (CDAC) wants your opinion on diversity at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF). Your responses will help the Chancellor and CDAC understand whether UAF is a welcoming campus for diversity, and what we can do to improve the climate.

Your answers to these questions will be held in confidence. There is no identifying information on this survey, and your answers will not be linked to you in any way. Please be honest in your answers. You may skip any questions that you prefer not to answer. This survey should take approximately 5 to 10 minutes to complete. We will close the survey on March 25.

If you have any questions about this survey, or about the Chancellor’s Diversity Action Committee, please contact Juella Sparks at 474-7115 or by email at juella.sparks@alaska.edu.

1. How would you rate UAF's overall acceptance of diversity?
   - Excellent
   - Good
   - Fair
   - Poor
   - Very poor
   - Don't know

2. Please rate the following on how well, in general, they promote a welcoming environment to diverse populations at UAF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very welcoming</th>
<th>Somewhat welcoming</th>
<th>Not very welcoming</th>
<th>Not at all welcoming</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAF students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Campus Climate Survey

#### 3. Please rate UAF on providing opportunities to succeed for each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Natives / American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians / Pacific Islanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens of countries other than the U.S.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please elaborate on who you mean by "other" or supply additional clarifying information if you choose.

---

#### 4. What is your "primary" role at UAF?

- Undergraduate student
- Graduate student
- Staff
- Faculty
- Administrator
- Community member
- Other (please specify)

Page 2
5. Which UAF offices, centers, departments, units are "doing well" in working with diverse populations?

6. Which UAF offices, centers, departments, units "need to improve" in working with diverse peoples?

7. Would you be interested in participating in any of the following activities?

- [ ] attend a free workshop on diversity
- [ ] take a 3-credit class on diversity
- [ ] take a 1-credit Pass/Fail class on diversity
- [ ] talk to my friends about diversity and discrimination
- [ ] attend a presentation by a leader in diversity studies
- [ ] read free brochures about diversity
- [ ] join a student club that works on issues of diversity
- [ ] pay an increased student fee (e.g., $10/semester) for diversity activities
- [ ] lobby the Board of Regents for policy changes
- [ ] Other (please specify)
Campus Climate Survey

8. How old are you?
- under 18
- 18 - 24
- 25 - 34
- 35 - 44
- 45 - 54
- 55 - 64
- 65+

9. Gender:
- Female
- Male
- Other (please specify)

10. Please indicate your race/ethnicity. You may select more than one, and/or fill in the "Other" blank.
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino/a
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Biracial or multiracial
- Other (please specify)
11. Do you identify as:
   - Bisexual
   - Heterosexual/straight
   - Lesbian or gay
   - Other (please specify)

12. Do you have a disability which requires accommodations?
   - yes
   - no

13. Please share information/suggestions which will help us make UAF a more welcoming place for everyone.

Thank you for your time!

You can find more information on the Chancellor's Diversity Action Committee at http://www.uaf.edu/cdac