



# 2022 Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey Report: Employees

Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS)

Employee Survey (170 respondents – not all respondents answered all questions)

## NEW: Comparative Data Provided by HEDS

The following comparisons were provided by HEDS.

Percent of Respondents who are Generally or Very Satisfied with Characteristics of the Campus Climate	LCC	2-year Public Institutions	All participation institutions
Overall Campus Climate	79%	79%	73%
Extent All Community Members Experience a Sense of Belonging	63%	65%	51%

Percent of Respondents who Agree or Strong Agree with Statements about Diversity on Campus	LCC	2-year Public Institutions	All participation institutions
Campus is Free from Tensions	53%	64%	45%
Diversity Improves Campus Interactions	94%	88%	89%

Percent of Respondents who are Somewhat or Very Comfortable with Sharing Views on Diversity and Equity	LCC	2-year Public Institutions	All participation institutions
Campus is Free from Tensions	62%	67%	67%

Percent of Respondents who Responded Yes or Unsure to Having Experienced Discrimination or Harassment	LCC	2-year Public Institutions	All participation institutions
Yes, experienced discrimination or harassment	20%	13%	19%
Unsure if experienced discrimination or harassment	7%	7%	9%

Percent of Respondents who Indicated They'd Experienced Discrimination or Harassment in the Past Year	LCC	2-year Public Institutions	All participation institutions
Yes, experienced discrimination or harassment	55%	51%	60%

Percent of Respondents who Identified These Groups as the Source(s) of Discrimination or Harassment	LCC	2-year Public Institutions	All participation institutions
Administrators	56%	39%	25%
Staff	56%	36%	27%
Faculty	33%	44%	40%
Students	22%	37%	61%
Local Community	6%	12%	21%

## Primary Survey Questions – Benchmark Indicators

*Note: benchmark indicators are derived from sets of individual survey questions. The benchmarks are:*

1. Climate (see “Satisfaction with Climate” on page 9 for individual questions)
2. Support (see “Level of Agreement with Support Statements” on page 9 for individual questions)
3. Remarks (see “Frequency of Hearing Insensitive or Disparaging Remarks” on page 12 for individual questions)
4. Discrimination/Harassment (this is based on a single “yes/no” question rather than a series of individual questions)

### Climate – Benchmark Indicator (overall satisfaction with climate questions)

Scale: 1 = very dissatisfied; 2 = generally dissatisfied; 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 4 = generally satisfied; 5 = very satisfied

### LCC Responses for Overall Climate Benchmark Indicator

(see “Satisfaction with Climate” on page 9 for individual questions)

*Note: groups that were less satisfied than all respondents as a whole include: gender-prefer not to respond; age-prefer not to respond; sexual orientation-LGBTQ+; race/ethnicity- multiple races/ethnicities; race/ethnicity-prefer not to respond; parent education-prefer not to respond; employee category-prefer not to respond; employee status-prefer not to respond.*

Disaggregated Data	Mean	n	Sig.*
All respondents	3.83	167	N/A
Gender: Man (cisgender)	3.73	39	N/A
Gender: Woman (cisgender)	3.97	110	N/A
Gender: Non-binary and/or transgender	redacted	redacted	N/A
Gender: prefer not to respond	3.27	15	Below
Age: Younger than 25	4.36	7	N/A
Age: 25-34	3.76	21	N/A
Age: 35-44	3.64	44	N/A
Age: 45-54	3.91	39	N/A
Age: 55-64	4.00	26	N/A
Age: 65 or older	4.33	13	Above
Age: Prefer not to respond	3.25	16	Below
Sexual orientation: LGBTQ+	3.47	25	Below

Disaggregated Data	<i>Mean</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Sig.*</i>
Sexual orientation: Straight (Heterosexual)	3.94	120	N/A
Sexual orientation: Prefer not to respond	3.60	21	N/A
Religion: Christian	3.99	76	N/A
Religion: Atheist/Agnostic	3.58	33	N/A
Religion: Spiritual, but not religious	3.95	20	N/A
Religion: Other	3.53	9	N/A
Religion: Prefer not to respond	3.62	25	N/A
Politics: Conservative	4.12	25	N/A
Politics: Middle of the road	3.93	49	N/A
Politics: Liberal	3.62	61	N/A
Politics: Prefer not to respond	3.85	30	N/A
Disability status: No disability	3.89	137	N/A
Disability status: Temporary disability	4.15	5	N/A
Disability status: Long-term disability	3.48	15	N/A
Disability status: Prefer not to respond	3.42	9	N/A
Race/ethnicity: White	3.95	119	N/A
Race/ethnicity: African American/Black	<i>redacted</i>	<i>redacted</i>	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Hispanic/Latino	3.65	5	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Asian	<i>redacted</i>	<i>redacted</i>	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Multiple races/ethnicities	3.19	13	<i>Below</i>
Race/ethnicity: All other races/ethnicities	4.10	5	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Prefer not to respond	3.37	17	<i>Below</i>
Citizenship status: Selected a citizenship status	3.84	161	N/A
Citizenship: Prefer not to respond	3.33	6	N/A
Parent education: Parent/s has/have no college education	3.96	25	N/A
Parent education: Parent/s has/have some college or undergraduate			N/A
Parent education: Parent/s has/have graduate or professional degree	3.64	50	N/A
Parent education: Prefer not to respond	3.25	9	<i>Below</i>
Employee category: Faculty	3.83	45	N/A
Employee category: Staff/Administrator	3.95	102	N/A
Employee category: Other	<i>redacted</i>	<i>redacted</i>	N/A
Employee category: Prefer not to respond	3.12	15	<i>Below</i>
Years worked: Less than 1 year	3.97	19	N/A
Years worked: 1-4 years	4.28	28	<i>Above</i>
Years worked: 5-9 years	3.86	33	N/A
Years worked: 10 or more years	3.86	63	N/A
Years worked: Prefer not to respond	<i>redacted</i>	<i>redacted</i>	N/A
Employee status: Part-time employee	4.17	32	<i>Above</i>
Employee status: Full-time employee	3.88	110	N/A
Employee status: Prefer not to respond	3.00	5	<i>Below</i>

Disaggregated Data	Mean	n	Sig.*
<i>*Statistically significant at the <math>P &lt; .05</math> level (using a one-tailed T-test for 2 independent means)</i>			

Support – Benchmark Indicator (level of agreement with support statements)

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree

LCC Responses for Support Benchmark Indicator

(see “Level of Agreement with Support Statements” on page 9 for individual questions)

Note: groups that disagreed or strongly disagreed at higher rates than all respondents as a whole include: gender-prefer not to respond; age-prefer not to respond; religion-other; disability status-long-term disability; race/ethnicity-prefer not to respond; parent education-prefer not to respond; employee category-prefer not to respond; years worked-prefer not to respond; employee status-prefer not to respond.

Disaggregated Data	Mean	n	Sig.*
All respondents	3.52	168	N/A
Gender: Man (cisgender)	3.43	37	N/A
Gender: Woman (cisgender)	3.67	110	N/A
Gender: Non-binary and/or transgender	redacted	redacted	N/A
Gender: prefer not to respond	2.97	15	Below
Age: Younger than 25	4.07	7	N/A
Age: 25-34	3.49	21	N/A
Age: 35-44	3.44	44	N/A
Age: 45-54	3.62	38	N/A
Age: 55-64	3.57	27	N/A
Age: 65 or older	3.92	13	N/A
Age: Prefer not to respond	2.97	17	Below
Sexual orientation: LGBTQ+	3.16	25	N/A
Sexual orientation: Straight (Heterosexual)	3.64	120	N/A
Sexual orientation: Prefer not to respond	3.34	22	N/A
Religion: Christian	3.81	77	Above
Religion: Atheist/Agnostic	3.24	33	N/A
Religion: Spiritual, but not religious	3.45	20	N/A
Religion: Other	2.83	9	Below
Religion: Prefer not to respond	3.23	25	N/A
Politics: Conservative	3.89	24	N/A
Politics: Middle of the road	3.76	50	N/A
Politics: Liberal	3.21	61	N/A
Politics: Prefer not to respond	3.49	31	N/A
Disability status: No disability	3.61	137	N/A

Disaggregated Data	Mean	n	Sig.*
Disability status: Temporary disability	3.70	5	N/A
Disability status: Long-term disability	2.98	15	Below
Disability status: Prefer not to respond	3.25	10	N/A
Race/ethnicity: White	3.65	120	N/A
Race/ethnicity: African American/Black	redacted	redacted	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Hispanic/Latino	3.05	5	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Asian	redacted	redacted	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Multiple races/ethnicities	3.19	13	N/A
Race/ethnicity: All other races/ethnicities	3.70	5	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Prefer not to respond	3.07	17	Below
Citizenship status: Selected a citizenship status	3.54	162	N/A
Citizenship: Prefer not to respond	3.21	6	N/A
Parent education: Parent/s has/have no college education	3.59	25	N/A
Parent education: Parent/s has/have some college or undergraduate degree	3.75	83	N/A
Parent education: Parent/s has/have graduate or professional degree	3.27	50	N/A
Parent education: Prefer not to respond	2.86	9	Below
Employee category: Faculty	3.34	45	N/A
Employee category: Staff/Administrator	3.70	103	N/A
Employee category: Other	redacted	redacted	N/A
Employee category: Prefer not to respond	2.95	15	Below
Years worked: Less than 1 year	3.62	19	N/A
Years worked: 1-4 years	4.14	27	Above
Years worked: 5-9 years	3.33	33	N/A
Years worked: 10 or more years	3.58	64	N/A
Years worked: Prefer not to respond	2.45	5	Below
Employee status: Part-time employee	3.73	32	N/A
Employee status: Full-time employee	3.61	111	N/A
Employee status: Prefer not to respond	2.40	5	Below
*Statistically significant at the $P < .05$ level (using a one-tailed T-test for 2			

Remarks – Benchmark Indicator (frequency of hearing insensitive or disparaging remarks)

Scale: 1 = never; 2 = rarely; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; 5 = very often

#### LCC Responses for Remarks Benchmark Indicator

(see “Frequency of Hearing Insensitive or Disparaging Remarks” on page 12 for individual questions)

Note: groups that reported a frequency of hearing insensitive or disparaging remarks at higher rates than all respondents as a whole include: age-prefer not to respond; religion-spiritual but not religious; religion-prefer not to respond; politics-liberal.

Disaggregated Data	Mean	n	Sig.*
All respondents	1.83	167	N/A
Gender: Man (cisgender)	1.92	37	N/A
Gender: Woman (cisgender)	1.76	109	N/A
Gender: Non-binary and/or transgender	redacted	redacted	N/A
Gender: prefer not to respond	1.97	15	N/A
Age: Younger than 25	1.60	7	N/A
Age: 25-34	2.10	21	N/A
Age: 35-44	1.70	44	N/A
Age: 45-54	1.79	38	N/A
Age: 55-64	1.77	26	N/A
Age: 65 or older	1.72	13	N/A
Age: Prefer not to respond	2.24	17	Above
Sexual orientation: LGBTQ+	2.05	24	N/A
Sexual orientation: Straight (Heterosexual)	1.79	120	N/A
Sexual orientation: Prefer not to respond	1.89	22	N/A
Religion: Christian	1.61	77	Below
Religion: Atheist/Agnostic	1.86	33	N/A
Religion: Spiritual, but not religious	2.17	20	Above
Religion: Other	2.24	8	N/A
Religion: Prefer not to respond	2.10	25	Above
Politics: Conservative	1.45	23	Below
Politics: Middle of the road	1.67	50	N/A
Politics: Liberal	2.07	61	Above
Politics: Prefer not to respond	1.91	31	N/A
Disability status: No disability	1.83	136	N/A
Disability status: Temporary disability	1.50	5	N/A
Disability status: Long-term disability	2.06	15	N/A
Disability status: Prefer not to respond	1.73	10	N/A
Race/ethnicity: White	1.78	119	N/A
Race/ethnicity: African American/Black	redacted	redacted	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Hispanic/Latino	2.14	5	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Asian	redacted	redacted	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Multiple races/ethnicities	1.88	13	N/A
Race/ethnicity: All other races/ethnicities	1.94	5	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Prefer not to respond	2.05	17	N/A
Citizenship status: Selected a citizenship status	1.82	161	N/A
Citizenship: Prefer not to respond	2.20	6	N/A
Parent education: Parent/s has/have no college education	1.67	25	N/A
Parent education: Parent/s has/have some college or undergraduate degree	1.82	83	N/A

Disaggregated Data	Mean	n	Sig.*
Parent education: Parent/s has/have graduate or professional degree	1.91	49	N/A
Parent education: Prefer not to respond	2.02	9	N/A
Employee category: Faculty	1.94	45	N/A
Employee category: Staff/Administrator	1.75	102	N/A
Employee category: Other	redacted	redacted	N/A
Employee category: Prefer not to respond	2.11	15	N/A
Years worked: Less than 1 year	1.54	19	Below
Years worked: 1-4 years	1.53	27	Below
Years worked: 5-9 years	1.95	32	N/A
Years worked: 10 or more years	1.90	64	N/A
Years worked: Prefer not to respond	2.00	6	N/A
Employee status: Part-time employee	1.58	31	Below
Employee status: Full-time employee	1.85	111	N/A
Employee status: Prefer not to respond	2.30	5	N/A
*Statistically significant at the $P < .05$ level (using a one-tailed T-test for 2 independent means)			

### Discrimination/Harassment – Benchmark Indicator (experience with discrimination/harassment)

Scale: this is a yes/no question rather than a scale (based on experiences with discrimination or harassment on campus, at an off-campus resident, or at an off-campus program/event affiliated with this institution)

### LCC Responses for Discrimination/Harassment Benchmark Indicator

(this is based on a single “yes/no” question rather than a series of individual questions)

Note: groups that reported a frequency of experiencing discrimination or harassment at higher rates than all respondents as a whole include: age-25 to 34; sexual orientation-LGBTQ+.

Disaggregated Data	Yes	n	Sig.*
All respondents	19.41%	170	N/A
Gender: Man (cisgender)	5.13%	39	Below
Gender: Woman (cisgender)	21.82%	110	N/A
Gender: Non-binary and/or transgender	redacted	redacted	N/A
Gender: prefer not to respond	28.57%	14	N/A
Age: Younger than 25	0.00%	7	N/A
Age: 25-34	38.10%	21	Above
Age: 35-44	20.45%	44	N/A
Age: 45-54	12.82%	39	N/A
Age: 55-64	21.43%	28	N/A

Disaggregated Data	Yes	<i>n</i>	<i>Sig.*</i>
Age: 65 or older	0.00%	13	N/A
Age: Prefer not to respond	31.25%	16	N/A
Sexual orientation: LGBTQ+	44.00%	25	<i>Above</i>
Sexual orientation: Straight (Heterosexual)	14.88%	121	N/A
Sexual orientation: Prefer not to respond	19.05%	21	N/A
Religion: Christian	13.92%	79	N/A
Religion: Atheist/Agnostic	30.30%	33	N/A
Religion: Spiritual, but not religious	20.00%	20	N/A
Religion: Other	22.22%	9	N/A
Religion: Prefer not to respond	20.83%	24	N/A
Politics: Conservative	8.00%	25	N/A
Politics: Middle of the road	10.00%	50	N/A
Politics: Liberal	29.51%	61	N/A
Politics: Prefer not to respond	23.33%	30	N/A
Disability status: No disability	15.94%	138	N/A
Disability status: Temporary disability	20.00%	5	N/A
Disability status: Long-term disability	40.00%	15	N/A
Disability status: Prefer not to respond	30.00%	10	N/A
Race/ethnicity: White	16.39%	122	N/A
Race/ethnicity: African American/Black	<i>redacted</i>	<i>redacted</i>	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Hispanic/Latino	40.00%	5	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Asian	<i>redacted</i>	<i>redacted</i>	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Multiple races/ethnicities	23.08%	13	N/A
Race/ethnicity: All other races/ethnicities	20.00%	5	N/A
Race/ethnicity: Prefer not to respond	23.53%	17	N/A
Citizenship status: Selected a citizenship status	23.53%	136	N/A
Citizenship: Prefer not to respond	16.67%	6	N/A
Parent education: Parent/s has/have no college education	16.00%	25	N/A
Parent education: Parent/s has some college/undergrad degree			N/A
Parent education: Parent/s has/have graduate or professional degree	29.41%	51	N/A
Parent education: Prefer not to respond	25.00%	8	N/A
Employee category: Faculty	23.91%	46	N/A
Employee category: Staff/Administrator	15.38%	104	N/A
Employee category: Other	<i>redacted</i>	<i>redacted</i>	N/A
Employee category: Prefer not to respond	35.71%	14	N/A
Years worked: Less than 1 year	10.53%	19	N/A
Years worked: 1-4 years	10.71%	28	N/A
Years worked: 5-9 years	30.30%	33	N/A
Years worked: 10 or more years	18.75%	64	N/A
Years worked: Prefer not to respond	0.00%	5	N/A

Disaggregated Data	Yes	n	Sig.*
Employee status: Part-time employee	6.25%	32	N/A
Employee status: Full-time employee	21.43%	112	N/A
Employee status: Prefer not to respond	20.00%	5	N/A
<i>*Statistically significant at the <math>P &lt; .05</math> level (using a two-tailed Z score for 2 population proportions)</i>			

## Primary Survey Questions – Individual Survey Questions

### Satisfaction with Climate

Scale: 1 = very dissatisfied; 2 = generally dissatisfied; 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 4 = generally satisfied; 5 = very satisfied (\*questions that make up the “climate” indicator)

All Respondents	Mean
<b>Overall campus climate.*</b>	3.99
<b>The campus experience/environment regarding diversity at the institution.*</b>	3.79
<b>The extent to which you experience a sense of belonging or community at this institution.*</b>	3.95
<b>The extent to which you feel all community members experience a sense of belonging or community at this institution.*</b>	3.57

\*questions that make up the “climate” indicator

### Level of Agreement with Support Statements

Scale: 1 = very dissatisfied; 2 = generally dissatisfied; 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 4 = generally satisfied; 5 = very satisfied

All Respondents	Mean
<b>The campus environment is free from tensions related to individual or group differences.*</b>	3.37
<b>Recruitment of historically marginalized students, faculty, and staff is an institutional priority.*</b>	3.52
<b>Retention of historically marginalized students, faculty, and staff is an institutional priority.*</b>	3.60
<b>Senior leadership demonstrates a commitment to diversity and equity on this campus.*</b>	3.61

\*questions that make up the “support” indicator

### Frequency of Interactions (with different groups)

Scale: 1 = not at all/not that I'm aware of; 2 = a few times; 3 = monthly; 4 = weekly; 5 = daily

All Respondents	Mean
People who have a racial and/or ethnic identity other than your own.	4.14
People from a socioeconomic background other than your own.	4.35
People who have a sexual orientation other than your own.	3.60
People whose gender differs from yours.	4.63
People for whom English is not their native language.	3.74
People from a religious background other than your own.	3.90
People with a disability.	3.11
People who are undocumented immigrants.	2.09
People from a country other than your own.	3.47
People who hold a political affiliation, philosophy, or view that differs from yours.	4.15
People who are significantly older or younger than you.	4.55

### Level of Comfort Interacting (with different groups)

Scale: 1 = very uncomfortable; 2 = somewhat uncomfortable; 3 = neither comfortable or uncomfortable; 4 = somewhat comfortable; 5 = very comfortable

All Respondents	Mean
People who have a racial and/or ethnic identity other than your own	4.85
People from a socioeconomic background other than your own.	4.83
People who have a sexual orientation other than your own.	4.78
People whose gender differs from yours.	4.88
People for whom English is not their native language.	4.73
People from a religious background other than your own.	4.70
People with a disability.	4.77
People who are undocumented immigrants.	4.70
People from a country other than your own.	4.88
People who hold a political affiliation, philosophy, or view that differs from yours.	4.36
People who are significantly older or younger than you.	4.89

### Level of Agreement with Improvement via Diversity

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree

All Respondents	Mean
Extent you agree that diversity on campus improves experiences and interactions within the classroom, the workplace, and the overall community.	4.67

### Level of Comfort Sharing Views on Diversity

Scale: 1 = very uncomfortable; 2 = somewhat uncomfortable; 3 = neither comfortable nor uncomfortable; 4 = somewhat comfortable; 5 = very comfortable

All Respondents	Mean
Overall, how comfortable would you be sharing your views on diversity and equity at this institution?	3.69

### Impact of Engagement in Activities for Support of Diversity and Equity

Scale: 0 = have not engaged in this activity; 1 = greatly decreased my support; 2 = somewhat decreased my support; 3 = somewhat increased my support; 4 = greatly increased my support

All Respondents	Mean
Performed community service.	2.50
Engaged in discussions or activities concerning political issues.	1.67
Attended presentations, performances, or art exhibits related to diversity.	2.29
Participated in discussions, training, or activities on racial/ethnic issues.	2.94
Participated in discussions, training, or activities on gender issues and/or gender identity issues.	2.58
Participated in discussions, training, or activities on sexual orientation issues.	2.29
Participated in discussions, training, or activities on socioeconomic status issues.	2.73
Participated in discussions, training, or activities on religious diversity issues.	1.54
Participated in discussions, training, or activities on disability issues.	2.57
Participated in discussions, training, or activities on immigration issues.	2.16

Frequency of Hearing Insensitive or Disparaging Remarks (how often have you heard insensitive or disparaging remark about...)

Scale: 1 = never; 2 = rarely; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; 5 = very often

All Respondents	Mean
<b>People who have a particular racial and/or ethnic identity.*</b>	1.66
<b>People of a particular sexual orientation.*</b>	1.65
<b>People of a particular gender or gender identity.*</b>	1.82
<b>People from a particular socioeconomic background.*</b>	1.95
<b>People from a particular religious background.*</b>	1.65
<b>People with a particular disability.*</b>	1.48
<b>People who are immigrants.*</b>	1.66
<b>People with a particular political affiliation/view.*</b>	2.62
<b>People of a particular age or generation.*</b>	2.05
<b>People for whom English is not their native language.*</b>	1.77
<b>Students*</b>	2.49
<b>Faculty*</b>	1.90
<b>Staff*</b>	2.07
<b>Administration*</b>	1.72
<b>Local community*</b>	2.76

\*questions that make up the “remark” indicator

Level of Agreement with Discrimination/Harassment Reporting Questions

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = agree

All Respondents	Mean
If I experienced or observed an act of discrimination or harassment while at this institution, I know whom to contact to report the incident.	4.29
The process for reporting acts of discrimination or harassment at this institution is clear to me.	4.27
The process for investigating acts of discrimination or harassment at this institution is clear to me.	3.86

Frequency of Discrimination/Harassment by Category (of 33 respondents reporting incidents)

Scale: 1 = never; 2 = rarely; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; 5 = very often

All Respondents	Mean
Because of my racial and/or ethnic identity.	1.52
Because of my sexual orientation.	1.52

All Respondents	Mean
Because of my gender or gender identity.	2.36
Because of my socioeconomic background.	1.58
Because of my religious background.	1.45
Because of my disability.	1.36
Because I am an immigrant.	1.03
Because of my political affiliation/views.	2.03
Because of my age or generation.	2.33
Because of my physical appearance.	1.88
Other aspect/s of my identity (optional written comments appear below where provided).	1.75
"Other" categories reported: (1) because of a failure to code-switch (2) perceived privilege based upon skin color or gender (3) level of education (4) union affiliation.	

### Timeframe of Discrimination/Harassment (of 33 respondents reporting incidents)

Scale: this is a yes/no question rather than a scale

All Respondents	Yes
Of the incidents reported, how many occurred in the past year?	54.55%

The following questions were asked as a follow-up to the previous questions regarding discrimination and harassment.

### Form of Discrimination/Harassment (of 18 responses reported in the past year)

Of the incidents reported that occurred in the past year, what form did the incident take? Note: multiple categories reported for some incidents.

All Respondents	Number
Stared at.	3
Deliberately ignored, isolated, left out, or excluded.	14
Singled out as the "resident authority."	1
Racial/ethnic profiling.	4
Graffiti or other forms of vandalism on campus.	0
Derogatory written comments.	3
Derogatory remarks.	7
Derogatory posts on social media.	0
Derogatory phone calls.	1
Derogatory/unsolicited e-mails.	2

All Respondents	Number
Received a poor grade because of a hostile classroom environment.	0
Received a low performance evaluation.	1
Denied service or access to resources.	0
Intimidated/bullied.	4
Threatened with physical violence.	0
Feared for your physical safety.	0
Feared for your family's safety.	0
Physical violence.	0
Sexual assault/harassment.	1
Other form of discrimination or harassment (written comments included where provided).	5
<p>"Other" categories reported: (1) Often my ideas are repeated again and received well when they are presented by a man. I have had my informed contributions to discussions dismissed for reasons I do not understand and that I attribute to gender. (2) Institutional systemic harassment for a white supremacist culture (3) Ridiculed to others in a taunting manner (4) I was denied entrance to my building/office because I didn't look like faculty. I am an adult woman. It took about 20 minutes with the health monitor before I was allowed to enter.</p>	

#### Location of Discrimination/Harassment (of 18 incidents reported in the past year)

Of the incidents reported that occurred in the past year, where did the incident take place? Note: multiple categories reported for some incidents.

All Respondents	Number
In a classroom.	1
In a departmental office or conference room.	10
In an individual faculty or staff member's office.	4
In on-campus housing/residences.	0
At a house or residence off-campus.	0
At a program/event affiliated with or sponsored by this institution.	2
At a dining hall, recreational space, or athletic facility.	1
Via the internet or social media.	6
Other location (written comments included where provided).	2
<p>"Other" categories reported: (1) online meetings/events (2) email.</p>	

#### Source of Discrimination/Harassment (of 18 incidents reported in the past year)

Of the incidents reported that occurred in the past year, was the source of the discrimination/harassment a member of the following groups? Note: multiple categories reported for

some incidents.

All Respondents	Number
Students	4
Faculty	6
Staff	10
Administration	10
Local community	1

## Demographics of Survey Respondents

Category	Percent
Gender: Man (cisgender)	22.94%
Gender: Woman (cisgender)	64.71%
Gender: Non-binary and/or transgender	<i>redacted</i>
Gender: Prefer not to respond	8.82%
Gender: Null	<i>redacted</i>
Age: Younger than 25	4.12%
Age: 25-34	12.35%
Age: 35-44	25.88%
Age: 45-54	22.94%
Age: 55-64	16.47%
Age: 65 or older	7.65%
Age: Prefer not to respond	10.00%
Age: Null	<i>redacted</i>
Sexual Orientation: LGBTQ+	14.71%
Sexual Orientation: Straight (Heterosexual)	71.18%
Sexual Orientation: Prefer not to respond	2.94%
Sexual Orientation: Null	11.18%
Religion: Christian	46.47%

Category	Percent
Religion: Atheist/Agnostic	19.41%
Religion: Spiritual, but not religious	11.76%
Religion: Other religious affiliation (Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Other)	5.29%
Religion: Prefer not to respond	redacted
Religion: Null	15.29%
Politics: Conservative	14.71%
Politics: Middle of the Road	29.41%
Politics: Liberal	35.88%
Politics: Prefer not to respond	18.24%
Politics: Null	redacted
Disability status: No disability	81.76%
Disability status: Temporary disability	2.94%
Disability status: Long-term disability	8.82%
Disability status: Prefer not to respond	5.88%
Disability status: Null	redacted
Race/ethnicity: White	71.76%
Race/ethnicity: African American/Black	redacted
Race/ethnicity: Hispanic/Latino	2.94%
Race/ethnicity: Asian	redacted
Race/ethnicity: Multiple races/ethnicities	7.65%
Race/ethnicity: All other races/ethnicities	2.94%
Race/ethnicity: Prefer not to respond	10.00%
Race/ethnicity: Null	redacted
Citizenship status: Selected a citizenship status	96.47%
Citizenship: Prefer not to respond	3.53%
Parent education: Parent/s has/have no college education	14.71%

Category	Percent
Parent education: Parent/s has/have some college or undergraduate degree	49.41%
Parent education: Parent/s has/have graduate or professional degree	30.00%
Parent education: Prefer not to respond	5.29%
Parent education: Null	<i>redacted</i>
Employee category: Faculty	27.06%
Employee category: Staff/Administrator	61.18%
Employee category: Other	<i>redacted</i>
Employee category: Prefer not to respond	8.82%
Employee category: Null	<i>redacted</i>
Years worked: Worked less than 1 year	11.18%
Years worked: Worked 1 to 4 years	16.47%
Years worked: Worked 5 to 9 years	19.41%
Years worked: Worked 10 or more years	37.65%
Year worked: Prefer not to respond	2.94%
Years worked: Null	12.35%
Employee status: Part-time employee	18.82%
Employee status: Full-time employee	65.88%
Employee status: Prefer not to respond	2.94%
Employee status: Null	12.35%

## Supplemental Survey Questions (developed by LCC Diversity Committee)

Supplemental questions 1-10: please rate the overall climate on the Lower Columbia College campus for the following dimensions.

Scale: 6 = never encounter; 5 = mostly never encounter; 4 = occasionally encounter; 3 = constantly encounter; 2 = don't know or no basis to evaluate (note: no "1" value in this scale)

	<i>Mean including don't know/ no basis to evaluate</i>	<i>Mean excluding don't know/ no basis to evaluate</i>
All Respondents		
Racism (a system of cultural messages, institutional policies, beliefs, and actions that benefits white people at the expense of people of color)	4.80	5.08
Sexism (a system of cultural messages, institutional policies, beliefs, and actions that benefits male-identified people at the expense of female-identified people)	4.81	5.05
Transphobia (a system of cultural messages, institutional policies, beliefs, and actions that benefits people who identify with the gender they were assigned at birth [cisgender] at the expense of transgender and gender nonconforming people)	4.88	5.27
Heterosexism (a system of cultural messages, institutional policies, beliefs, and actions that benefits straight/heterosexual people at the expense of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and pansexual people)	4.93	5.31
Age Bias (a system of cultural messages, institutional policies, beliefs, and actions that tends to disadvantage young people and elders)	4.77	5.05
Ableism (a system of cultural messages, institutional policies, beliefs, and actions that benefits able-bodied people at the expense of people with disabilities)	4.85	5.24
Classism (a system of cultural messages, institutional policies, beliefs, and actions that tends to advantage certain social and economic classes over others)	4.71	4.99
Political Bias (a system of cultural messages, institutional policies, beliefs, and actions that tends to advantage certain political positions over others)	4.55	4.78
Religious bias (a system of cultural messages, institutional policies, beliefs, and actions that tends to advantage certain religions over others)	4.93	5.34

All Respondents	Mean including don't know/ no basis to evaluate	Mean excluding don't know/ no basis to evaluate
Xenophobia/Anti-Immigrant Sentiment (a system of cultural messages, institutional policies, beliefs, and actions that tends to disadvantage immigrants)	4.90	5.30

Supplemental question 11: are there any areas or events on this campus where you have not felt welcome?

Scale: this series of questions is based on "check all that apply" - so count is duplicated

All Respondents	Number
In a meeting with peers	31
In a meeting with supervisor(s)	18
At a college athletic facility or locker room	4
In a restroom on the college campus	0
At the campus cafeteria	3
In a classroom or learning environment	8
In another location (Department not included or able to attend meetings or trainings on campus; LCC sponsored events like holiday parties, all staff meetings; Zoom meetings in which I cannot lipread and there is no captioning)	5
I have not experienced feeling not welcome	112

Supplemental questions 12-14: Extent of agreement with the statements below.

Scale: strongly agree = 5; agree = 4; neither agree nor disagree = 3, disagree = 2, strongly disagree = 1

All Respondents	Mean
I feel accepted, safe, and comfortable just being myself here at Lower Columbia College.	4.05
The current campus climate at Lower Columbia College encourages staff, faculty, and students to have a public voice and share their ideas openly.	3.44
Diversity and inclusion are currently primary values at Lower Columbia College.	3.82

Supplemental question 15: Which of the following (if any) have you avoided disclosing about yourself to others on campus due to fear of consequences?

Scale: check all that apply (duplicated count)

All Respondents	Number
Racial and/or ethnic identity	5
Sexual orientation	14
Gender identity	6
Socioeconomic background	16
Religious background	34
Disability status	10
National origin/Immigration status	3
Political perspective	63
Age or generation	9
Health condition	21
I have not avoided disclosing anything about myself	69

Supplemental question 16: What would you like to see done to improve diversity, equity, and inclusion at Lower Columbia College?

1) Hire more BIPOC individuals at all levels. 2) Create a campus community that can feel free to call out instances of white supremacy and allow them the ability to find and implement solutions. 3) Agree that the solution cannot come from the individuals who are creating and perpetuating the white supremacist culture.
Again, I think our enrollment process is the downfall of LCC. Through COVID I have seen a decrease in ELL students and students of a variety of ethnic backgrounds. I believe it is the biggest barrier. I think when people do get enrolled and are in classes they feel welcomed and valued.
Again. Stop prioritizing division and racism/sexism under the guise of "improving" things.
Allow dissenting opinions and questions about the social justice movement itself. Diversity and equity are good things, but it's not good to make dissenters and questioners feel like outsiders.
Allowing for more open discussion, even if viewpoints are not entirely correct. This allows for more group understanding and discussion.
An improved presence of on campus student customer services
Authentic discussions around and stronger community partnerships with a more diverse population.

BE MORE UNDERSTANDING AND LISTEN MORE
Campus wide trainings that are open to everyone and free of charge.
Can't think of anything at the moment.
Consistent in-person training on diversity and equity. This has been impossible during COVID, but a renewed vision and effort must now be achieved. Offering a class each quarter is absolutely required. Black history, racism, sex & gender discrimination, political discourse, are but a few of the issues needing to be addressed. Informed and engaging speakers at least once a year for all of the LCC community,
Continue fostering services for ESL and TRiO and disability services- impressive
Continued progress to do better, learn more and assist others
Create inclusive opportunities for all individuals, not hyper-focusing on certain groups. I noticed that the sexism definition stated females being at a disadvantage over males, yet our male student population is significantly lower than our female population. Also, out of 5 VP's on campus, only 1 is male. While the focus on supporting female students and creating opportunities for female staff to advance is great, equal support should be given to male students and staff.
Culture Fair or exhibit
Curriculum reform, cultural competency training, accountability, systemic review of processes for barriers, meaningful support from campus leadership that moves from being defensive to wanting to take part.
Diversity, Equity and Inclusion is supposed to mean EVERYONE is valued and accepted but that is not the case at LCC.
Don't know
Don't pay lip-service to racial justice and climate. Acknowledge issues and tackle them head-on so people feel as though someone is listening to how they feel.
DONT KNOW

Efforts in recruiting more diverse faculty, staff, and students would improve diversity, equity, and inclusion at LCC by exposing the community to these different population and hopefully creating understand of the issues different population face.
financial investment in staffing, training, and initiatives. We need someone specifically hired to support faculty, staff, and students as it relates to diversity, equity, and inclusion. All of our executive leadership and most of the campus administrators are white presenting. We need representation at the executive level.
FIND NEW APPROACHES BASED UPON SHARED VALUES AND SHARED BELIEFS. WE MUST COME TOGETHER!!
Focus on diversity in hiring.
For me, improvements would include Zoom meetings with captioning and more classrooms that have excessive noise and echoes eliminated. Carpeting helps.
For the college and the companies collecting data to properly classify information and create questions and received data to determine actual impacts of racism on campus. Racism is not on white against other races. Racism can also occur against white people and political bias can occur against people who are not liberal or left. This survey identifies racism as "a system of cultural messages, institutional beliefs, and actions that benefits WHITE people at the expense of people of color" racism can happen from any race to any race. Racism is not exclusive as whites as the offenders and that is the data the school and this company is choosing to collect to alienate and create hate toward white people on campus and make them feel guilty for purely existing as white while no offense has been committed.
Have people come back to campus.
Hire a diversity officer and bring more accountability for decision making Honest and open conversations about climate and efforts to reduce gate-keeping mentality that negatively impacts people of color
Hiring more diversity.
Hiring, mentoring, empowerment.
Hold more diverse events.

holding events that would promote awareness of multicultural environment.
I don't know
I think a lot is already being done.
I think attracting and retaining staff, faculty, and students from outside the local area will benefit the campus culture.
I think that increasing the diversity of faculty and staff members would help improve a sense of inclusion at LCC. I would also like to see clubs or events specific to increasing awareness of marginalized groups in our community.
I think the college does the best it can given the demographics of the community.

<p>I think we have a good balance. Most of the issues I see are coming from students. We have to work within our community and our community does have some problems. I see faculty and administrators being clear about our values and I get the support I need from staff and faculty in dealing with issues arising with students when they have challenged me or been rude to others in my diversity class.</p> <p>I know that LCC is trying to hire more diverse staff and faculty, and to the extent we are as diverse as our students that makes sense, but we are already pushing our students to be open minded and challenging their stereotypes in the classroom- so we really are achieving many of those goals already. My students confide in me all the time about how certain classes have changed their views on race or gender- we do have some stellar teaching and learning happening. So, it's important to note that we are already making a difference in many people's lives.</p>
I understand white privilege, but I feel our current hiring practices disadvantage white applicants of our community in favor of diverse candidates, yet I feel we should support our community. It is a conundrum, as we also want to encourage diverse staff.
I want to see actual change in policies and procedures. I want to see actual accountability for folks who treat others badly. Right now, what we have is obligatory lip service to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
I would like to see continuing effort to hire more faculty of color.

I would like to see more minority students enrolled at the institution.

I would like to see more people from marginalized groups (specifically people of color) being hired in administrative and faculty roles.

I would like to see more people of color in power positions and in educator positions on campus. I would like to see more people of color period on campus. However, we live in a very white community. So, how can we better market ourselves to people from other cultures and diverse backgrounds to engage within the LCC community. Perhaps we need to invest more time and money into international education, consider more diverse language opportunities in Continuing Ed or the Humanities. Introduce areas of study that focus on the Arabic, Japanese, or Chinese languages. Offer jobs to more educators who can educate our very white community on racism and introduce us to amazing thinkers like W.E.B Du Bois, James Baldwin, Toni Morrison, Langston Hughes, Aminatta Forna, Nathan Hare, to name a few.

I would like to see more trainings showing how small things like listening to Christmas music without receiving consent from others working in an open area can be perceived as offensive to those whose beliefs or cultural upbringing is not in Christianity. I would also like to see more opportunities to learn about other cultures represented around campus and how to avoid faux pas to increase positive and respectful interactions.

I would like to see people in higher power positions transition away from the image bias that is currently in place. A person in a hooded sweatshirt is just as intelligent as the person in the collard shirt and tie. Equality in ALL aspects!!

I'm not sure what specifically should be done, but I would like to see all people feel included and free to be who they are at LCC.

In my short time here, I have felt comfortable just being myself on this campus. I am curious to see how I feel once the pandemic is over, and we start to have more people and events on campus,

It seems that the college tries really hard to include people with different sexual orientation at the expense of heterosexuals'. And tries extra hard to include people that identify as they/them at the expense of those that identify as she/her and he/him.

LCC as a whole community has been very welcoming

LCC continues to make strides to identify issues and improve diversity, equity and inclusion. I would like to see more diversity in faculty and administration, but there is the reality that we do not always have diverse persons applying for job openings. Our local community is not as diverse as other communities from which we can attract a more diverse student body, but we keep trying.

LCC has improved hiring practices which seem to have improved overall staff diversity. Now, we need to look at our systems in student services to ensure equity in our systems.

Leadership is completely disconnected from many of these issues. Focusing on providing resources and the economic/material conditions that disproportionately effect these communities would be a start.

Less silo mentality

Lighten up on pushing the subject at everyone

Make collage more affordable

Maybe a bi-annual survey similar to this one would help. Also online diversity/equity training is always a good refresher.

<p>More accommodation and adjustments to our placement and classroom expectation to account for disabilities, limited exposure to facts/academic skills, non-white race, and constant access to technology. Accommodating variations in grammar (English expectations for non-native or non-white students). By expecting them to speak in an educated (white) format, we are gatekeeping progress. Also students who cannot memorize multiplication tables and struggle with division when done by hand cannot demonstrated their true understanding of mathematical concepts and excel math courses when denied calculators at the pre-college level. When do students NOT have access to technology with a calculator when they would need to perform important calculations? Never, so why limit their ability to pass a math class and complete their degree?</p>
<p>More action behind words. LCC has some very thoughtfully crafted messaging related to DEI, but I don't often see these words being lived by members of the campus community.</p>
<p>More campus-wide training.</p>
<p>More conversations and training (professional development) which includes all levels of employees (specifically upper administration)</p>
<p>More DEI geared activities to highlight our students and staff's backgrounds</p>
<p>More diverse staff that can relate better to students. New and better leaders in leadership roles within the administration. Less pointless emails and more action done on campus. Get foreign students more involved with the students and give them a real college experience instead of isolating them. More diversity and equity means more innovation, it is not the 90s or 2000s anymore but the school still operates like it's students are from those times. More programs that support diversity and inclusion. LCC having a more public voice on social issues and things going on in the world.</p>
<p>more inclusion</p>
<p>More options for non- English speaking people.</p>
<p>More oversight in Head Start of how they are treating their staff.</p>
<p>More presentations/workshops</p>
<p>More required trainings in all areas.</p>

More resources in programming and the recruitment and retention of faculty/staff of color and resources for our students success
More support to different groups
More workshops on these topics, and more messages from top administrators celebrating the importance of diversity, equity, and inclusion.
N/A
n/a
NA
na
None
NONE
not sure
Not too much, would like to see politics as a more open discussion.
Nothing. There are opportunities for all to feel safe and valued.
on-going training versus annual training
Prof/Tech faculty take a more active role. As a whole, there also tends to be a lot of talk and education, but I feel we could do more to actively create an environment with less barriers that disproportionately impact underserved populations.
Provide discussion about cognitive dissonance and covid

Provide more time and structure to support deep learning, experimentation, and assessment of practices. We so often scratch the surface because we aren't given enough time and support to think deeply and critically about the impacts we could make.
Provide opportunities for public discourse - debates, panels, community conversations around a particular topic.
Remove any affirmative action policies.
Separate safety/COVID from politics
Sexism seems to be normalized and it is often chalked up to just coming from an "older generation" or "they were/I was just kidding" excuses. If you choose to address it, it is not taken seriously but then, it is frustrating because we like to talk about diversity/equity while sexism is still so prevalent and seen as a "non-issue."

Stop equating racism as being something that only whites are/have been guilty of. Acknowledge that the practice of racism knows no skin color. There can be/has been racism between many different racial groups or within a racial group's different groups. Racism was dying a steady death. So much progress had been made in the last 50 years. Now, it seems like we have back peddled a fair amount with all of the focus on it. People start thinking that they are oppressed because they are told that that should be their identity based on their skin color or that they are an oppressor only based on their skin color. We are not oppressed or oppressor based on what passed generations have done or had done to them, but based on our own current habits, thoughts, actions, and experiences.

Students need more equal access to financial resources to attend school. Better processes in Financial Aid ensuring all students get awarded timely, and actively finding those who aren't. More staff to help with timely processing.

Textbooks included in the cost of courses so aid can cover them up front.  
iBest based courses with Spanish/Russian supplemental instruction provided.

The discipline was not effective when handling harassments.

There needs to be change within the administration.

Things seem to be trending in the right direction.

This is a hard question, I have taken the classes and been part of the 21 day challenge. But I feel like since COVID much of the activities have been lacking and this is not a fault to the college, but it is something that needs to come back. I think with the inclusion it would great to see more of the Deans, VP and president as part of the activities.

This question is far too vast. Actionable steps. Intentional, actionable, public, bold steps.

We have training and tools, now we need to do more with implementing them and not just discussing them.

We will see what needs to be repaired once COVID restrictions are lifted. The public is not aware of how scarred we have become.