Key Findings Derived from UM-Flint Fall 2016 Climate Study

Prepared by Hiba Wehbe-Alalam, PhD

Thank you for soliciting [at the September 15, 2017 governing faculty meeting] the feedback of the governing faculty in relation to the results of the Fall 2016 campus climate study. Please note that as a member of the Climate Study Committee, I am one of the 4 members who read the entire document in its raw form before names, identities, and any other potentially revealing data was edited out of the document before sharing it with the entire campus community. I have summarized below Key findings and considerations as related to the survey results.

Disclaimer: The information provided below is presented in good faith. If there are any errors in this document in relation to numbers, dates or events, they were not intentional and are attributed to being human. Sources and page numbers from climate study report were included, whenever possible, to reference provided statistics and findings. Readers may refer to climate study report housed on the university’s website for additional information.

- Timing of survey is significant, both in relation to when other survey results were released (Chancellor, Deans, Senior Vice Provost) and in consideration of the ongoing work and effort engaged by the FC, CACBSP, Ad-Hoc Committee, and other leadership groups on campus, during 2016-2017 academic year and to date. The work of all these committees began the process of addressing some (but not all) of the concerns outlined in the climate study survey results [even though these results were not yet available] simply because some of the concerns in the climate study were a duplication of concerns revealed in survey evaluations of chancellor, Deans, etc. which were taken and discussed prior to taking the Climate study survey. To simplify, consider this sequence of events:
  - March 7-14, 2016: Chancellor, Deans, & Senior Vice Provost surveys launched [Source: several emails from Sue Fabbro on behalf of FC Chair S. Selig dated March 7, 2016]
  - April 7, 2016: Results discussed at Governing faculty meeting and formulation of ad-hoc committee [Source: April 7, 2016 Governing Faculty minutes];
  - October 4-November 4, 2016: Campus Climate survey launched; [Source: Email from Chancellor S. Borrego]
  - May 3, 2017: Ad-hoc Committee report highlighting positive outcomes shared with governing faculty as e-mail attachment in preparation for a May 5th Governing Faculty Meeting; Report not discussed at meeting. [Source: Email from Jill Hibbard on behalf of FC chair R. Alfaro]
  - May 15, 2017: Campus Climate presentation by Susan Rankin;
  - June 28, 2017: entire Climate Study report uploaded to website after resolving technical issues [Source: Email from Chancellor S. Borrego].

- 17% overall response rate: n= 1,578, including:16% (n = 248) faculty members [162 tenure track & 86 non tenure track]; 20% (n = 317) Staff members; 51% (n = 810) Undergraduate Students, and 12% (n = 188) Graduate Students (pp. ii & iii)

Positive Findings:
1. High levels of comfort with the climate at the UM-Flint with 71% \((n=1115)\) of survey respondents comfortable or very comfortable (pp. v; 133)

2. Eight-five percent \((n = 1,060)\) of Student respondents and Faculty respondents were “comfortable” or “very comfortable” with the climate in their classes (p. 133)

3. Most Faculty and Staff respondents generally hold positive attitudes about University of Michigan-Flint policies and processes (p. 208)

4. Related to Faculty:
   a) 79% \((n = 126)\) Tenured/tenured track and 80% \((n = 68)\) of non-tenure-track felt that teaching were valued by University of Michigan-Flint (p. v);
   b) 53% \((n = 85)\) Tenured/tenured track and 69% \((n = 58)\) of non-tenure-track felt that research was valued by University of Michigan-Flint (p. v);
   c) 54% \((n = 86)\) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the criteria for tenure were clear; (p. 172)
   d) 45% \((n = 71)\) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” felt supported and mentored during the tenure-track years (p. 172)
   e) 66% \((n = 57)\) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the criteria used for contract renewal were clear (p. 179)
   f) 45% \((n = 38)\) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the criteria used for contract renewal was applied equally to positions. 63% \((n = 52)\) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that expectations of their responsibilities were clear (p. 179).
   g) 68% \((n = 58)\) of non-Tenure Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” they have sufficient uninterrupted blocks of time to complete the responsibilities of my position (p. 180)
   h) 51% \((n = 43)\) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they believed that faculty opinions were valued within University of Michigan-Flint committees (p. 182)
   i) 72% \((n = 178)\) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that retirement/supplemental benefits were competitive (p. 184)
   j) 54% \((n = 135)\) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” they believed that the performance evaluation process was clear and 49% \((n = 121)\) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the performance evaluation process was fair (p. 188)
   k) 60% \((n = 149)\) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that University of Michigan-Flint provided them with resources to pursue professional development (p. 188)
   l) 54% \((n = 135)\) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” they would recommend University of Michigan-Flint as a good place to work (p. 188)
   m) 65% \((n = 166)\) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by other faculty at University of Michigan-Flint (p. 195)

---

1 Please note that related text in climate study report has a typo and refers to this stat as related to tenure and tenure-track faculty. However, text is derived from table that shows correct information. See p. 180 in climate study report.
n) 76% (n = 177) of the Faculty respondents thought that flexibility for calculating the tenure clock was available (p. 234)

o) 62% (n = 140) of the Faculty respondents thought that recognition and rewards for including diversity issues in courses across the curriculum were available (p. 234)

p) 79% (n = 183) of the Faculty respondents thought that mentorship for new faculty was available (p. 236)

q) 65% (n = 150) of the Faculty respondents thought that a clear process to resolve conflicts was available and was fair (67% or n = 152) (p. 236)

r) 58% (n = 128) of the Faculty respondents thought that career-span development opportunities for faculty were available (p. 237)

5. Related to Staff:

a) Respondents believed that vacation and personal time benefits (79%, n = 251) and health insurance benefits (78%, n = 245) were competitive (p. 5)

b) 59% (n = 190) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they had supervisors who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it; (p. 145)

c) 82% (n = 230) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they had colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it. (p. 145)

d) 40% (n = 160) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they were included in opportunities that would help their careers as much as others in similar positions.

e) 51% (n = 163) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” the performance evaluation process was clear. 47% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” it was fair; 32% (n = 102) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” it was productive (p. 146)

f) 70% (n = 223) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance (p. 147).

5) 70% (n = 222) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” their supervisors were supportive of their taking leave (p. 155)

h) 74% (n = 237) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that University of Michigan-Flint provided them with resources to pursue training/professional development opportunities; 62% (n = 198) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” their supervisors provided them with resources to pursue training/professional development opportunities. (p. 155)

i) 56% (n = 180) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” they would recommend University of Michigan-Flint as a good place to work (p. 159)

j) 84% (n = 268) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” they felt valued by coworkers in their department; 70% (n = 224) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” they felt valued by their supervisors/managers; 54% (n = 167) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” they felt valued by University of Michigan-Flint faculty (p. 164)

k) 51% (n = 160) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” their department/program encouraged free and open discussion of difficult topics;

l) 63% (n = 200) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their skills were valued, and 61% (n = 192) felt that their work was valued.

m) 74% (n = 223) of the Staff respondents thought that career development opportunities for staff were available (p. 245)

6. Related to Students:
a) 89% (n = 780) of Student respondents felt valued by University of Michigan-Flint faculty and 74% (n = 733) felt valued by campus staff; 55% (n = 543) felt valued by senior administrators (e.g., chancellor, dean, vice chancellor, provost) (pp. vi, 215).

b) 80% (n = 796) of Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by University of Michigan-Flint faculty in the classroom (p. 217).

c) 70% (n = 690) of Student respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt valued by other students in the classroom and 62% (n= 613) outside of the classroom; Heterosexual Student respondents (46%, n = 379) were much more likely than LGBQ Student respondents (31%, n = 38) to “agree” that they felt valued by other students in the classroom (p. 218).

d) 73% (n = 718) of Student respondents noted that they believed the campus climate encourages free and open discussion of difficult topics (p. 220).

e) 73% (n = 725) of Student Respondents had faculty whom they perceived as role models and 62% (n = 608) had student colleagues as role models (p. 221). 59% (n = 584) had staff whom they perceived as role models (p. 222).

f) 81% (n = 765) of the Student respondents thought that diversity, inclusivity, and equity training for students was available (p. 250).

g) 81% (n = 737) of the Student respondents thought that increasing opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue between faculty, staff, and students were available (p. 252).

h) 89% (n = 814) of the Student respondents thought that effective academic advising at the Student Success Center was available as well as at the department level (88% or n = 806) (p. 253).

i) 78% (n = 716) of the Student respondents thought that affordable child care was available (p. 254).

7. R&A consulting concluded University of Michigan-Flint climate findings were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country (p. xiv):

**Challenges/Opportunities for Improvement:**

1. 22% (n=346) experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct based on their position status, gender/gender identity, ethnicity, or age (pp. vii; 68). 37 % (n = 116) of Staff respondents, 38% (n = 93) Faculty respondents, 11% (n = 21) of Graduate Student respondents, and 14% (n = 111) of Undergraduate Student respondents believed that they had experienced this conduct (p. 72). 24% (n = 371) of survey respondents observed exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct directed toward others (p. 91).

   a) 27 % (n = 94) of respondents who indicated that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct identified coworkers/colleagues as the source of the conduct; 27% (n = 94) identified faculty members and 25% (n = 87) identified students as the sources of the conduct (p. 78).

   b) Faculty respondents most often cited coworkers, faculty, senior administrators, and department chairs as the sources of the exclusionary conduct. Staff respondents most often cited coworkers, other staff members, supervisors, faculty, department chairs, and senior administrators as the sources of the exclusionary conduct (p. 81). Salaried Staff and Hourly Staff respondents identified coworkers, supervisors, department
chairs, senior administrators, faculty, and staff as their greatest sources of exclusionary conduct (p. 82). Students described incidents involving misconduct by fellow students (p. 88)

- 60% (n = 209) of respondents who experienced exclusionary conduct felt angry, 58% (n = 200) felt hurt, 42% (n = 146) embarrassed, 30% (n = 104) felt afraid, 21% (n = 71) ignored it, and 12% (n = 42) felt somehow responsible (p. 82). Three themes emerged from all responses: reporting process, racial issues, and fear of consequences (p. 85)
- For respondents who observed exclusionary conduct, four themes emerged: faculty behaving badly, reporting process, racial and ethnic identity, and administration concerns (p. 103).

2. 44% (n = 255) of Faculty and Staff respondents indicated that they had observed hiring practices at UM-Flint that they perceived to be unjust; 36% (n = 209) of Faculty and Staff respondents indicated they had observed unfair, unjust, or discriminatory practices related to promotion, tenure, reappointment, and/or reclassification. 29% (n = 164) of Faculty and Staff respondents indicated that they had observed employment-related discipline or action, up to and including dismissal, that they perceived to be unjust or would inhibit diversifying the community (p. 135)

3. 98 staff reported concerns in narratives related to overwhelming workload, inequity issues, work-family balance, & evaluation concerns (p. 150), 99 staff reported concerns related to job insecurity, workplace climate, and respect for staff opinions (p. 161); 59 tenure/tenure track faculty reported concerns related to faculty input, support for research, service requirements and inequities in the workplace (p. 176) and 64 faculty respondents shared concerns related to work environment, job security concerns, work responsibility burdens, and professional development support (p.191)

4. 30% of staff respondents (n = 96) and 23% (n= 36) tenured/tenure track faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” they felt valued by University of Michigan-Flint senior administrators (e.g., chancellor, dean, vice chancellor, provost) (pp. 164; 175)

5. 57% (n=140) of faculty and 63% of staff (n=199) considered leaving UM-Flint in the past year due to financial reasons (51%; n=176) and limited opportunities for advancement (47%; n=161) (p. xi). Other reasons included campus climate was unwelcoming (42%, n = 145), increased workload (36%, n = 124), tension with supervisor/manager (34%, n = 116), and tension with coworkers (30%, n = 102) (p. 203).

- 24% (n = 75) of staff “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that staff salaries were competitive (158)
- 29% (n = 73) of Faculty respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that salaries for tenure-track faculty positions were competitive and 27% (n = 65) of Faculty respondents thought that salaries for non-tenure-track faculty were competitive (p. 184).

6. 53% of tenured/tenure track faculty respondents burdened by service (p. xii); 27% (n = 43) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” they have sufficient uninterrupted blocks of time to complete the responsibilities of my position (p. 174).
7. 10% (n = 162) of respondents indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual conduct while at University of Michigan-Flint (p. 107).
   - 77% (n = 17) of respondents did not report relationship violence and (23%, n = 5) reported the incident (p. 110)
   - 3% (n = 41) of respondents indicated on the survey that they had experienced stalking (p. 112). Of these, 37% (n = 15) indicated they experienced stalking by a University of Michigan-Flint student (p. 115)
   - 5% (n = 77) of respondents indicated they experienced unwanted sexual interaction related to cat-calling, repeated sexual advances, and sexual harassment (p. 118). Unwanted sexual interaction perpetrators included strangers 56% (n = 43), University of Michigan-Flint student (30%, n = 23), acquaintances/friends (13%, n = 10), UM-Flint faculty member (12%, n = 9), and UM-Flint staff member (12%, n = 9) (p. 121).
   - 1% (n = 22) of respondents indicated they experienced unwanted sexual contact related to fondling, rape, sexual assault, and/or penetration without consent (p. 126).

8. 31% (n = 254) of Undergraduate Student respondents and 25% (n = 46) of Graduate Student respondents had seriously considered leaving the university: 27% (n = 82) for financial reasons, because they lacked a sense of belonging (25%, n = 76), the climate was not welcoming (21%, n = 64), they lacked a social life (21%, n = 62), and/or they had concerns for their personal safety (19%, n = 57) (p. 227). Other reasons included prefer another school, lack of support for students, unavailable major, and negative faculty experience (p. 229)

9. 20% (n = 37) of respondents with disabilities experienced temporary barriers with the campus transportation/parking, and 19% (n = 35) experienced barriers with the classroom buildings (p. 63); expressed desire for better mobility accommodations, including handicapped parking, elevator access, sidewalk accessibility, and handicapped doors (p. 66).

10. Answers of Transspectrum respondents, Women respondents, Undergraduate Student respondents, Salaried Staff respondents, Low-Income respondents, Non-U.S. Citizen respondents, employed respondents, respondents with Disability, People of Color and Multiracial Staff and respondents with No Religious/Spiritual Identities and Multiple Religious/Spiritual Identities were generally less positive than the responses of other groups (pp. 134; 209). White Faculty and Staff (32%, n = 138) were more likely to be “very comfortable” with the climate in their primary work areas than were Faculty and Staff Respondents of Color and Multiracial (26%, n = 30) (p. 55)

**Synthesis/Conclusion:**

- R&A consulting concluded University of Michigan-Flint climate findings were consistent with those found in higher education institutions across the country (p. xiv):
  - University of Michigan-Flint high levels of comfort with campus climate correlate with findings from investigations at higher education institutions across the country where 70% to 80% of respondents found the campus climate to be “comfortable” or “very comfortable” (p. 133)
22% (n = 346) of UM-Flint respondents noted that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct compared to 20-25% of individuals in similar investigations (p. 133)

- Experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct was attributed to numerous sources, mainly coworkers & colleagues, faculty, staff members, senior administrators, and department chairs.

**Future Direction:**

- Rankin & Associates recommended building on the successes and addressing the challenges uncovered in the climate study report (p. 262) and suggested choosing 3 issues of importance and working collaboratively to address them (Source: May 15th Presentation and meeting with Climate Study group)
- Let us recognize and build on the good and ongoing work initiated by numerous campus leadership groups since April 2016 to address concerns raised in the report.
- To succeed in our endeavor and move forward, collaboration and good will are key.

October 4, 2017
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