College of Applied Health Sciences
Culture and Climate Survey Committee
Full Report

I. Introduction

The AHS Inclusive Excellence Task Force was created in fall 2020. It included representatives from each Applied Health Sciences (AHS) department and unit and was tasked with developing an "ideology of inclusive excellence" within the College. According to the American Association of Colleges and Universities, inclusive excellence is defined as integrating the principles of inclusion, equity and educational quality to facilitate universal access, student success and high-quality learning for underserved and underrepresented students. More specifically, the task force was asked to assess the recruitment, admissions, learning and work contexts for underrepresented students, staff and faculty.

Through discussions, the task force decided to begin the evaluation process with an in-depth SWOT analysis of the following areas, with respect to the College of AHS and individual departments: (1) Training, Developing and Mentoring; (2) Enrollment and Persistence Management; (3) Faculty and Staff Promotion and Recognition; and (4) Sustainability of DEI practices. Reflection on the feedback of this process led to the next step of deciding where the task force wanted to focus their efforts. It was decided that evaluating the admissions processes of each department and conducting a climate survey for students, staff and faculty would be beneficial for informing future steps of the College. The task force self-selected into two committees: the Admissions Review Committee or the Culture and Climate Survey Committee (hereafter referred to as the survey committee).

The charter of the survey committee was to conduct the survey and analyze the data with every effort towards transparency, confidentiality, and thoughtfulness. The analysis aimed to address the lived experiences related to culture and climate that emerged in responses by AHS faculty and staff. Readers of the report should keep in mind that this report is delivering the information and experiences that were collected from AHS colleagues. Some of the information may come as a surprise, be difficult to read, or it may validate previous experiences. While this survey indicated that a majority of us feel a sense of belonging and experience positive micro-cultures within our departments, there are also disturbing reports of harm and abuse of power. We encourage you to engage with this content respectfully and as you are comfortable.

As the College of Applied Health Sciences continues to strive towards embodying the CAHS mission and reach for new heights, we must identify and address any cracks in our foundation to ensure that we can individually and collectively move forward towards achieving success.

II. Methodology

A. Survey Development

The survey committee decided to begin with a survey focused on collecting experiences from AHS faculty and staff and to conduct a student survey at a future date. The committee reviewed many resources to help direct the guiding principles of the survey content and the survey format. Resources utilized included the following: UIC Mosaic for Transformation, the University of Michigan Climate Survey and the University of Ottawa and the Perceptions of Campus Diversity and Inclusive Climate Survey.

The development of the survey questions took approximately 100 hours. The UIC Office of Diversity, Equity and Engagement served as a partner in the survey development and in the formation of the committee's recommendations. A pilot of the survey was given to the Inclusive Excellence Admissions Review Committee members for feedback. The survey was also shown to the AHS Executive Committee and AHS Department Heads prior to distribution. Information on the survey distribution and the data review process is included in the methodology section below.
The survey report is available for all university affiliates to review.

B. Survey Delivery and Data Collection

The survey was sent to 374 CAHS employees. Below is the breakdown by department.

Department	Faculty Count	Staff Count
BHIS	51	8
OT	30	11
KN	48	20
DHD	55	61
PT	34	16
OFD	0	33
Rehab Sciences	7	0

On February 7, 2022 the first message was released and responses were collected through March 7, 2022, providing one month for individuals to respond. Initially messages were sent by the Associate Dean, Jon Santanni, and follow up reminders were subsequently sent by committee chair, Kirsten Straughan. Sending multiple reminders increased the response rate. Department Chairs were reminded to share and encourage feedback within their units.

Of the 374 CAHS employees who received the survey link, 150 individuals responded (40% response rate). Below you will see the breakdown of responses by department.

Department	Faculty & Staff Count	# of Responses	% Response Rate
BHIS	59	26	44%
OT	41	17	41%
KN	68	35	51%
DHD	116	38	33%
Rehab Sciences	7	2	29%
PT	50	14	28%
OFD	33	18	55%

The data reflects information from 6 of the 7 units. Rehabilitation Sciences is not included in the reporting as we are unable to ensure anonymity due to small numbers of staff and faculty.

C. Data Analysis

1. Quantitative

Minimal personal information was obtained from participants. Question 1 asked about their department/unit affiliation and question 2 asked participants whether they identify with a marginalized group. In questions 3-10 and 13, a Likert scale was used to survey participants' DEI-related perceptions and experiences in their departments and in the college. The full wording of Q 3-10 is presented in Appendix A. Two, four-member teams of the survey committee reviewed and analyzed the qualitative and quantitative data, respectively, obtained from responses to questions 3-10.

For each of these survey questions, data is first presented at the college level. The total number of responses and the number of responses for each possible answer is provided. The results are then disaggregated by department. This disaggregated data for each department is presented as the percent of respondents from that department who selected

each possible answer. This was done to prevent identification of individuals (especially when an answer is selected by a small number of respondents from a specific department), while at the same time ensuring that all responses are included in the report.

We categorized the quantitative data based on the percentages of respondents reporting in order to use consistent terminology. We use the following terms:

Significant majority = 85% above
Majority 51% = 84.9%
Near majority = 40-50.9%
A concerning number of respondents = below 40%

2. Qualitative

Three questions in the survey request narrative descriptions of participants' experiences. A 4-member team of the survey committee reviewed and organized each of the qualitative responses and then read and coded questions 11, 12, and 14 of the survey. Question 15, which asks for respondents' suggestions, was analyzed separately. Due to the level of detail and time this process required, the 4-member team that reviewed and organized the quantitative data processed Question 15, which asked respondents to provide recommendations to the committee. The full wording for each of the questions is below:

Q11: Please share any experiences of microaggressions, stereotyping, and overt harassment, discrimination or oppression within your department as you feel comfortable. As a reminder your response will be kept confidential.

Q12: Please share any other experiences of microaggressions, stereotyping, and overt harassment, discrimination or oppression within the AHS college (outside your home department) as you feel comfortable. As a reminder your response will be kept confidential.

Q14: To any of the previous questions, please share your experiences as you feel comfortable. As a reminder, your response will be confidential.

Q15: Do you have suggestions for your department and/or college to facilitate or support diversity, equity, and/or inclusion?

Respondents provided rich and detailed commentary that, for clarity and conciseness, and to ensure anonymity, the taskforce has synthesized within this report. Details that had the potential to identify respondents have been removed, observations were consolidated into larger thematic umbrellas, and direct quotes have been judiciously identified to feature in the report. Detailing the process by which we reviewed this material and made these choices provides the necessary transparency and credibility to make the recommendations within this report.

The following process was used for reviewing the responses. The team read through all of the responses prior to meeting. In the first meeting, we agreed that in order to ensure coding reliability, at least three people must be present at all meetings. The team created a spreadsheet that included all the responses to each one of the qualitative questions. In our first meeting, we discussed the themes that emerged from our initial read-through of the responses and agreed to a set of generalized themes, iteratively divided into Themes of Promise and Themes of Concern (listed below). Using thematic analysis, we revised and added to these themes during the review process. Marks were added to the spreadsheet to indicate when a comment addressed each of the identified themes.

We have chosen not to report the frequency of qualitative comments in this report, although we did record this information in our coding and analysis (which can be found in appendix C). This decision is twofold: the survey collects quantitative data that captures information about most of the themes found in the qualitative feedback, and not all survey respondents provided qualitative feedback. Therefore, we felt that the quantitative data better addresses questions of scope and prevalence. Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, in the spirit of addressing issues of climate and culture, individual or less common experiences of harm equally signal problems that should be addressed. One of the themes that emerges from the qualitative responses is that there is a pattern of dismissing issues raised by faculty and staff as being singular, minor, or not pervasive enough to warrant mitigation or addressing. This has contributed to faculty and staff concerns about the lack of accountability after reporting, feelings of fear and powerlessness, and the overall "total harm" that the survey describes. Therefore, we have chosen not to quantify the number of comments that address each theme in order to ensure that all of the experiences shared within the qualitative section of the report be afforded substantive weight and concern.

There were specific people and positions repeatedly named and connected to themes of concern within the qualitative responses. For the purpose of confidentiality, names are not disclosed. Ultimately, through our recommendations, we genuinely strive to provide actionable, sustainable, and systemic next steps to address the themes of concern and minimize harm within AHS faculty and staff.

III. Results

A. Themes of Promise

Themes of Promise:

The themes of promise were identified as areas where respondents expressed awareness of themselves and the impact of collective behavior on their colleagues.

Themes and Definition
Perspective Taking: Responses indicated harm was observed or witnessed. The respondents were not the target of said harm but were able to name it. **Privilege Recognition:** Responses indicated the recognition of privilege. This included instances where harms were witnessed by others and awareness of privilege shown in responses. **Feeling of Value:** Responses indicated feelings of respect and belonging experienced during interactions within departmental activities.
Feedback from Qualitative Survey *"I appreciate the discussions we've been having as a college and university to help us better handle these situations."* *"I've observed overt harassment of non-white faculty and staff."*

"As a college of Applied Health Sciences, we are, of course, commitment to fostered health and wellbeing. Some of the messaging that emerges from other departments as well as at the college meetings veer into anti-fatness and ableism."

Feedback from Quantitative Data

- Only a small minority of respondents (3-13%) feel reluctant to disclose their gender identities, sexual orientation, disability identity, religious identity, and ethnic/cultural identities.
- A significant majority of respondents (90%) feel they have access to equitable resources that allow them to perform the tasks of their job.
- A significant majority (87%) of respondents reported that people from their racial and ethnic group and people from other racial and ethnic groups are valued by their colleagues.
- Aggregate data from all respondents show the majority of faculty and staff in the CAHS feel valued (81%) and a significant majority feel treated with respect (87%) and report a sense of belonging (87%) within their department. At the department level, there were two departments in which a majority of respondents reported lesser feelings of belonging (78%) and feeling respected and valued (72%).
- A majority of respondents believe that their faculty and staff colleagues (82% and 88%, respectively) are committed to racial/ethnical diversity and inclusion.
- A significant majority of respondents (85%) believe that their department head and program director are committed to respond to racial/ethnic issues.
- A majority of respondents felt that the department was inclusive in many of the areas related to sexual identity (76%), sexual orientation (80%), gender identity (74%), age (82%), height or weight (72%), social class (74%), religion (71%), racial or ethnic identity (73%), preferred language (73%), marital status (75%), national origin (75%), citizenship or immigration status (80%), SES (73%), education level (71%), disabilities (75%), tenure track faculty position (71%), tenured faculty position (76%), administrator position (73%), and students (76%).
- 78% of respondents do <u>not</u> feel there is too much emphasis placed on DEI in their department.
- More than a third of respondents indicated that they have witnessed identity-related microaggressions (41%), stereotyping (40%) and overt acts of identity related harassment, discrimination or oppression (24%). This indicates an awareness of harms.

Themes of Promise Summary: We frame the above stated themes as themes of promise because they indicate the presence of awareness and understanding by some faculty and staff. A recognition of privilege and self-reflexivity within faculty and staff are prerequisites to creating a more inclusive and welcoming environment.

B. Themes of Concern

Themes of Concern:

The themes identified are areas where respondents express discrimination-related concerns. The emerging themes presented below are interconnected. We disarticulate them to highlight specific examples and feelings identified by faculty/staff, and to identify areas for targeting intervention.

Accountability:

Responses indicate situations where reporting has taken place in either formal or informal ways, including reports on multiple levels [department, college, university, and state (IBHE)]. These structures have failed to produce "meaningful" and "substantive" action.

This category also captures a lack of trust that action (or meaningful) action will be taken to address harms.

Respondents report frustration that formal review processes for leadership are not treated seriously and lack transparency (repeated concerns shared in annual reviews were not addressed).

Feedback from Qualitative Survey

"When leadership is not held accountable and no efforts are made to address such behavior, it creates a culture of silence and discomfort that permeates throughout the department."

"Nothing was done in the last [XX] years to solve this, why would sharing my experience change anything now."

- This category also captures a lack of trust that action (or meaningful) action will be taken to address harms.
- Respondents report frustration that formal review processes for leadership are not treated seriously and lack transparency (repeated concerns shared in annual reviews were not addressed).

Employment Issues:

Responses indicated multiple employment-related issues or instances of harm that are tied directly to employment issues. These include, but are not limited to:

- Fears of retaliation
- Not reporting issue (s) due to job insecurity
- Instances of intellectual property theft
- Inequitable compensation
- Inequitable allocation of responsibility/workload/resources
- Explicit contract violation (FMLA)
- Instances of short-term contracts being used as tools of power and manipulation (ie: threaten job security)

These employment issues impact not only overall climate but willingness to report harms.

Feedback from Qualitative Survey

"I have been told not to say anything because my career will be harmed because the reach of these individuals extends beyond UIC, and I've already seen this...it has harmed job prospects..."

"The lack of transparency over the department's budget allocations creates an environment where the most precarious faculty are often working far over 100% of time in real work, with differences in how their time is allocated on paper versus work assignments."

Fear/Powerlessness:

Responses indicated fear that impacted respondents' willingness to informally or formally report or address harms and feelings of powerlessness to facilitate change.

Fear includes, but is not limited to, fear of retaliation and elements of employment (I.e.; compensation, P&T etc.). Several respondents decline to provide additional details, citing fear.

Feedback from Qualitative Survey

". . . Furthermore, it has left me feeling anxious and targeted w/i my job, such that I am afraid to bring up any issues (current, or past) for fear of undue retaliation. This has stifled my career."

"I do not feel comfortable to speak up and do not always know who to trust to go to when I struggle with something related to my work. I am afraid for repercussions due to the hierarchical nature of academia and short employment contracts. I worry I will lose my job, or will not find community with colleagues."

- Note the qualitative responses of people reporting fear in taking the survey and reporting their individual experiences. This was also reported verbally to members of the committee.

Leadership:

Responses indicate experiences in which leadership is the cause of harm or leadership is present during instances of harm and no action is taken. Some instances of leadership's inaction in the face of harm, including members of leadership:

- Discouraging reporting
- Encouraging staff/faculty to ignore instances of harm/oppression/microaggressions

Feedback from Qualitative Survey

"I witnessed a senior member of faculty expressing not understanding the use of they/theirs/them pronouns, and judging people's race based on how they look [stereotypical assumptions about race- based appearance]"

"Many of the harmful and offensive practices come from our HR director and representatives. Most complaints are to go HR, so I'm not confident that anything helpful would be done without severe retaliation."

- Some instances of leadership's inaction in the face of harm, including members of leadership discouraging reporting, encouraging staff/faculty to ignore instances of harm/oppression/microaggressions.
- Cases of direct retaliation after reporting were also noted by participants.

Feedback from Quantitative Data

- A concerning number of respondents (more than a third) do not believe their department climate encourages free and open discussion of difficult topics.
- 20% of respondents have considered leaving their department because they felt DEI was not fostered.

Identity-based Discrimination:

Responses indicate instances of oppression or discrimination that is clearly related to or tied to marginalized identities. Experiences of identity-based discrimination are reported being experienced by people in leadership positions illustrating identity-based discrimination transcended power-dynamics.

Some examples include:

- Explicit racism
- Sexism
- Ableism
- Homophobia
- Requests for accommodations for meetings being treated as burdensome
- Hierarchizing of identities (dismissing bisexuality, some racial and ethnic minorities, and religious beliefs)

Feedback from Qualitative Survey

"Blatantly racist views and opinions expressed during department meetings"

"I attended meetings where ____made jokes about individuals' appearance if they were overweight make fun of disabilities, using nicknames reducing faculty and staff to a single aspect of their disability."

"I am aware of and have witnessed tension, possibly to the level of harassment, directed at people in our department who are in leadership roles."

Feedback from Quantitative Data

- About a third of respondents report that they experience identity related microaggressions (28%) and identity related stereotyping (30%).
- A significant majority of respondents indicate that their identities do not prevent them from attending college or department meetings (88%).
- 22% of respondents reported feeling reluctant to attend social events in the college or their department due to their identity or identities.
- A majority of respondents feel that there is exclusion based on veteran status and political orientation.

Total Harm:

Responses indicate two or more instances of oppression or repeated microaggression-based discrimination that compromises the well-being, safety, and/or livelihood of faculty/staff.

This category also captures qualitatively significant feelings of despair, resignation, and/or hopelessness expressed in responses.

Feedback from Qualitative Survey

"I truly don't have enough space to write about the many forms of discrimination I have experienced in AHS. Plus, it's too late to discuss them. I will say they there should be person's available to support staff, because you should not have to be afraid of losing job over these matters."

"I cannot respond without identifying myself and am [not] safe since perpetrators include people in the Office of the Dean. This culture comes from the top down. Microaggressions are common have been hurled at us from invited commencement speakers and Dean-level appointees. An outside party needed to conduct this survey; I have no faith that knowledge will be met with meaningful action."

Feedback from Quantitative Data

- A concerning number of respondents (15%) report that they experienced overt acts of harassment, discrimination or oppression.

Absence of Value and Belonging:

Responses indicate individuals' experiences of not feeling valued, respected, or feeling as if they do not belong in their department.

Respondents also indicate tensions present in their department related to individual or group differences and a low level of perceived commitment to DEI.

Feedback from Quantitative Data

- A concerning number of respondents (15-20%) report not feeling valued, not feeling a sense of belonging and not feeling they are treated with respect by their department.

- A concerning number of respondents (25-40%) indicate they feel they cannot perform up to their full potential, they do not feel they have opportunities for professional success like their colleagues and that they need to work harder to be valued.

- A concerning number of respondents (12-18%) indicate they do not feel that their faculty and staff colleagues and department leadership (including department head and program director) are committed to racial/ethnic diversity and inclusion.

- A concerning number of respondents (31%) do not think their department provides sufficient resources to foster success of a diverse faculty.

- A near majority of respondents (close to 40%) report tensions related to individual or group differences in their department. Over one-third of respondents do not feel that the climate in their department encourages free and open discussion of difficult topics.

- A concerning number of respondents (21%) report exclusions based on non-tenure track faculty status and a concerning number of respondents (30%) feels excluded based on staff member status.

Other Areas of Concern

INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

In the qualitative data, specific individuals are repeatedly named within respondents' narratives of harm. Due to confidentiality, members of the Climate & Culture subgroup cannot name said individuals within the formal report or in conversations centered around the report or responses.

DEPARTMENT LEVEL

Quantitative and qualitative data illustrate substantive harm leading to the disruption of departmental climate in the following departments: Biomedical and Health Information Sciences, Disability and Human Development, and Physical Therapy

Themes of Concern Summary

We framed the above-stated themes as themes of concern because they reflect direct or indirect microaggressions, oppressions, or discriminatory acts of harm to constituents of our community and are of grave concern.

We would like to impress upon the Office of the Dean, department heads, and staff and faculty to recognize the significant impact that individuals can have, and that even a single action, if left unresolved, can cause tremendous harm. While we recognize that existing reporting systems are insufficient, they remain useful tools to be utilized in conjunction with other recommended systemic changes. However, policies and procedures will not create lasting change without a strong commitment from collective stakeholders, guided and materially supported by leadership.

C. Department Summaries

Each of the summaries below presents the qualitative and quantitative data relevant to a specific department/unit, with a focus given to areas of opportunity. To streamline the summary, data from Q 6-9 of the survey have not been included here unless the results reflect a significant result (20% or higher). This decision was made because these questions go into a level of detail and depth that are best viewed in table form (see Appendix C). Quantitative data about specific positions'/roles' commitment to DEI is also not included within the departmental summaries (see Appendix C). The report also includes some evaluation of these findings. This evaluation brings to bear the Taskforce's year-long preparatory work in familiarizing ourselves with broader DEI and university climate literature, identifying survey questions that reflect UIC's

Mosaic of Transformation, and familiarizing ourselves with broader DEI and university climate literature. The evaluations included also reflect an in-depth analysis of survey results.

1. AHS/Office of the Dean

The Office of the Dean (OFD) data reflects key opportunities to bolster the climate and culture of the unit. A significant portion of staff and faculty respondents identify the need for greater investment in support for professional growth and resources, including those for diverse faculty. Most concerning is the high incidence of experiencing and witnessing discrimination, microaggressions, and stereotyping, which can significantly contribute to feelings of value, equitable opportunities for professional growth, and the cultivation of an environment free from tensions. Details of the unit's survey responses are summarized and evaluated in the paragraphs below.

83% of respondents report feeling valued and treated with respect, but this means that 17% do not. Despite this, 89% report finding community within OFD. A minority of respondents (16%) do not feel DEI is valued, but this number increases to 22% of respondents who have considered leaving OFD as a result of DEI not being fostered enough. The discrepancy between these numbers may indicate a recognition that DEI is valued but still not sufficiently fostered. Relatedly, 38% of respondents report feeling that the OFD does not provide sufficient programing or resources to support diverse faculty, and an equal percentage (38%) feel they have to work harder than their peers to be valued equally. More broadly, 22% of respondents report not feeling that they can perform up to their full potential, and 28% do not feel they have equitable opportunities for professional success. Further, 18% feel that they do not have equitable access to resources *because of* one or more of their identities.

83% of respondents indicate that OFD has had a positive impact on their professional growth (17% do not). However, 27% do not feel the unit provides an opportunity for open and free dialogue of difficult topics. An even greater percentage (33%) of respondents disagree that OFD is free of tensions related to group difference. This is also reflected in 27% feeling that people from their racial and ethnic group are not valued and 11% indicating that people from other racial/ethnic groups are not valued. A significant portion of respondents indicate reluctance to disclose some aspects of their identity: disability (29%), and ethnic/cultural (22%). Identity disclosure reluctance is an important additional measure of how welcoming and/or inclusive a departmental/unit is to diverse faculty.

A significantly concerning number of respondents have both experienced and witnessed identity-based microaggressions (50% on both accounts). 50% of respondents indicate experiencing identity-based stereotyping and 56% report witnessing such stereotyping. 28% have experienced overt acts of harassment, discrimination, or oppression, and 39% have witnessed such overt acts. The qualitative data underscores these results, with reported experiences of overt harassment of non-white faculty, denigration of nonbinary students and faculty, and those with disabilities.

Several other key findings emerged from the qualitative data from the Office of the Dean. At least one faculty/staff has experienced retribution and/or punishment for *reporting* harms that have occurred. Multiple comments relate to issues of policies and procedures being used as a tool of discrimination and bias.

Examples provided include: mobilizing “other job duties” in expansive ways for some faculty/staff, blocking access to tools needed to complete job duties, unequally applying policies, and requiring additional paperwork for which other faculty/staff in similar positions or situations are not responsible. Faculty/staff specifically understand these barriers and policy decisions to be the direct result of stereotyping and discrimination. While staff and faculty in the Office of the Dean report an overall general knowledge of how to report harms, a concerning number of respondents indicate a lack of trust in the fair administration of processes to address complaints or the outcomings of reporting resulting in restorations of feelings of safety. This latter metric, notably consistent across departments/units, highlights the need for greater accountability across the college. The OFD results indicate the importance of transparent policies and procedures as well as accountability for their equitable application. Respondents feedback indicate the need for specific attention to be paid to areas of professional growth that are both equitable and supportive of diverse faculty/staff.

2. Biomedical and Health Information Sciences

Responses from BHIS faculty and staff reveal several key areas of opportunity within the department to better address its culture and climate. Roughly a quarter of faculty and staff respondents express concerns related to DEI, faculty well-being (value, respect, belonging), and equitable opportunities for professional growth. The number of faculty and staff respondents that report experiencing or witnessing micro-aggressions, stereotyping and over acts of harm is equally high, in some cases over a third of respondents. Details of the department’s survey responses are summarized and evaluated in the paragraphs below.

Around a quarter of BHIS faculty and staff do not feel valued (28%), that they belong (22%), or are respected (23%) within the department. Slightly more (30%) do not feel that they have found community within their department. While roughly 70% of respondents feels that the department is committed to DEI (11% disagreed while 19% were uncertain), 23% have considered leaving because DEI is not sufficiently fostered. Relatedly, 30% indicate the department does not provide sufficient programing or resources to foster diverse faculty. A similarly substantive number (33%) of respondents do not feel their department is free from tensions related to individual or group identity, and 19% responded in disagreement that colleagues from their own and other racial/ethnic identities are valued. A significant minority of respondents (23%) indicate reluctance to attend departmental or college social events. Nearly a quarter of respondents from BHIS (23%) also report the department is not inclusive of Non-Tenure Track faculty.

34% of respondents do not feel that their department allows them to perform up to their full potential while 26% do not feel they have similar opportunities for professional success their colleagues. 34% of respondents disagree with the statement that the department has had a positive impact on their professional growth, and 40% note that the department does not encourage free and open dialogue of difficult topics. Notably, 35% of the faculty/staff respondents report experiencing identity-related microaggressions, and 38% indicate witnessing them. 31% of respondents indicate experiencing identity-based stereotyping, and 35% report witnessing such stereotyping. Finally, 23% of respondents report experiencing overt acts of oppression, discrimination, and/or harassment, with 31% indicating they have witnessed such acts.

The qualitative data notably provides details that reflect a long history of experiences of microaggressions, oppression, and bullying by both some senior faculty members and past leadership. Bias and harassment related to gender, temporary disability status, and position were mentioned by multiple respondents. Additionally, a faculty member noted that those with “strong traditional faiths” experience open bias and

hostility. The notion of "fit" within the department and college was reported as being leveraged to encourage faculty/staff to find other positions or pressure faculty into less valued work like teaching over grant-writing, even when job duties required the latter for promotion and/or tenure. These more subtle forms of pressure, sidelining, or ostracizing created both compromised feelings of value and a fear of job security. Such qualitative responses may also reflect the quantitative results that reveal 26% of respondents feel that they have to work harder than their peers to be equally valued.

Perhaps most notably, multiple faculty report avoiding certain people in the course of their jobs, including explicit mention of active avoidance measures such as locking doors to achieve this. The unchecked nature of reported "aggressions," belittling actions, "abusive, bullying language," and harmful behaviors has left many faculty feeling hopeless, afraid, and in fear of both retaliation and their job security. Based on both the qualitative data and the lack of faith that reporting harms will result in restored feelings of safety, this hopelessness appears to stem from *repeated* and *pervasive* experiences of harm, across multiple people in leadership roles. Importantly, the qualitative data places many of these experiences in the past or enacted by people not currently working within the department. This may provide a key opportunity to rebuild faculty and staff trust. That said, the pervasiveness of concern expressed across both qualitative and quantitative data has led to the Taskforce recommendation that BHIS be prioritized for a third-party review in order to ensure the best opportunity for success in any rebuilding process.

3. Disability and Human Development

DHD appears to have a relatively low overall response rate for the survey (33%), but it is notable that DHD has a significantly higher number of faculty who received the survey link (116) and, compared to other departments and units within the college, DHD had the highest total number of respondents (38).

27% of the respondents do not feel valued, 22% do not feel they belong, and 27% do not feel they have found community within the department. 89% do feel that they are treated with respect. However, 35% of respondents indicate that they do not feel they can perform to their full potential, and 32% feel that they do not have similar opportunities for professional success as their colleagues. 32% of the respondents indicate they do not feel their department has a commitment to DEI issues, 29% has considered leaving their department because DEI is not sufficiently fostered, and 57% do not feel that the department provides sufficient resources or programming to support diverse faculty. Furthermore, 48% indicate that the department does not encourage free and open discussion of difficult topics. This is particularly significant given (and likely correlated to) the high number of faculty who identify as a member of a marginalized group (15) and the number who identify as belonging to multiple marginalized groups (11).

31% believe that colleagues from racial/ethnic groups different from their own are not valued, and a striking 61% report that their department has tensions related to individual or group differences. While the majority of faculty (about 80%) believe that faculty members are committed to racial/ethnic diversity and inclusion, 19% indicate that such commitment is lacking among faculty and 23% report that staff do not share this commitment. Questions that focus on specific identities reinforce these results: 30% of respondents report exclusionary attitudes towards racial/ethnic identities, 28% believe that their department is not inclusive of sexual identities, and 22% report exclusionary attitudes based on national origin. Exclusionary attitudes towards Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) were described by 36%, and 25% consider the department to be exclusionary toward staff. 22% indicated that they are reluctant to attend department or college social events due to their identity or identities.

Highly concerning is that 54% or respondents report that they have experienced identity-related microaggressions; and even greater percent (63%) report witnessing such microaggressions. Experiences of identity-related stereotyping are reported by 63% and were observed by 66%. Furthermore, 29% report that they experienced overt acts of identity-related acts of harassment, discrimination, or oppression, while 49% report that they witnessed such overt acts harassment, discrimination or oppression.

Qualitative data capture the severity and chronic nature of concerns regarding overall departmental climate and provide additional insight into the experiences reflected in the striking quantitative data reported above. Instances of identity-based discrimination noted by multiple respondents include experiences of "blatant" racism, ableism, and sexism that have occurred, even in public spaces, unchecked. Described as "too common to recount", "egregious", and "degrading", many note a years-long history of reporting such instances across differing modalities without action or follow up by leadership-- and that individuals engaging in, "permitting", and/or actively ignoring discriminatory behaviors hold senior status which has served as protection from individual consequences and also deterred meaningful DEI-related growth at the departmental level.

As a result, individuals describe feelings of powerlessness and a lack of safety, also stating that many colleagues may not feel comfortable enough to share their experiences at all due to fear of professional consequences. Respondents note that the seriousness and consistency of discriminatory incidents coupled with lack of accountability and leadership over time have led to a "toxic" culture of "silence and discomfort" in which individuals hesitate to share their views, identity-related information, or intervene during ongoing experiences of discrimination. Given the repeated and pervasive experiences of harm shared by respondents across quantitative and qualitative data, the Taskforce recommends that DHD be prioritized for third party review.

4. Kinesiology and Nutrition

KN had the highest departmental response rate in the college, with 51% of faculty/staff replying to the survey, indicating a commendable level of engagement. The large majority of staff and faculty within the department report feelings of belonging, respect, value, and community. However, some respondents did report otherwise, and these experiences should also be taken seriously as the department continues its investment in building an inclusive culture and climate. Details of the department's survey responses are summarized and evaluated in the paragraphs below.

84% of respondents report feeling valued; 95% feel belonging; 92% feel respected; and 92% feel a sense of community. A majority of staff/faculty (74%) feel the department has a strong commitment to DEI (with 11% being uncertain and 14% disagreeing). A notable 29% of respondents believe that too much emphasis is placed on DEI. A small number of respondents (11%) have considered leaving because DEI is not fostered more, and 17% do not feel that the department provides adequate programming or resources to support diverse faculty. Impressively, 98% of faculty report that their department is a place where they can perform up to their full potential. However, 29% do not feel they have the same opportunities as colleagues from other departments. A large minority (37%) report feeling that they have to work harder than their colleagues to be valued equally, indicating a potential target area for growth opportunities. 29% of respondents also disagree with the statement that their department encourages open and free dialogue of difficult topics, and the same percentage (29%) report feelings of tensions related to individual or group differences.

Respondents indicate experiencing identity-related microaggressions (18%) and stereotyping (30%) as well as witnessing both microaggressions (53%) and stereotyping (48%). Of equal concern to these significant numbers, a large minority (22%) of staff/faculty from KN have experienced overt acts of harassment, discrimination, or oppression (22%) and 33% have witnessed such acts.

The qualitative data helps to contextualize some of the above results. Despite the KN department largely reporting feeling supported and valued by their colleagues and their leadership, other respondents' reports illustrate the lingering impact of previous harm. The comments shared by KN staff and faculty reveal experiences of harassment, racism, sexism, and ableism by former leadership and faculty internal and external to the department and college.

The lack of actionable results from reporting these incidents to HR and higher administration has impacted faculty and staff trust in both the college and the institution more broadly. KN staff and faculty generally demonstrate high comfort level with reporting harms, but a significant lack of trust that such reporting would result in a restored sense of safety or actions to address those harms. Paired with the qualitative data, prior experiences suggests that those in one or more marginalized groups do not feel comfortable reporting harms. Several comments reflect hesitancy to elaborate on experiences due to identifiability and/or a lack of trust that such comments would be taken seriously.

5. Occupational Therapy

The OT department had an impressive response rate (41%), and the OT department should be recognized for what respondents indicate is an overall welcoming and supportive work environment that shows a tangible investment in diversity, equity, and inclusion. There are, of course, still key areas of opportunities that respondents highlight. Details of the department’s survey responses are summarized and evaluated in the paragraphs below.

Staff and faculty respondents unanimously report feeling a sense of belonging and value within the department. A large majority report feeling a sense of community (94%). The quantitative data reflects a strong commitment to DEI (with 95% feeling it is highly valued). Even with this high rate, some faculty still report that they considered leaving because DEI is not fostered to a greater degree (12%) and a substantive minority (24%) indicate that the department does not provide sufficient programs or resources to support diverse faculty. However, some OT faculty and staff also report not feeling that they can fully perform up to their potential (12%) and that they do not have opportunities for professional success similar to their colleagues (33%). A concerning number of faculty (29%) report feeling that they have to work harder than their colleagues to be valued, and that their department does not encourage open and free dialogue of difficult topics (29%). A large minority (35%) of faculty do *not* feel that their department is free from tensions related to individual or group identity. The equitability of resource allocation, opportunities for professional growth, and openness to address tensions and difficult topics are issues to consider exploring further as the department continues to build on its overall positive departmental culture.

A large minority of staff/faculty have experienced identity related microaggressions (35%), and an even greater number have witnessed them (53%). Similarly, staff/faculty report experiencing identity-based stereotyping (35%), and a concerning majority have witnessed them (65%). The data reflect fewer but still concerning experiences of overt acts of harassment, discrimination, or oppression (18%), with more faculty/staff (24%) having witnessed such acts.

The department notably reports high levels of confidence that issues will be addressed and feelings of safety restored after harm has been reported. Respondents indicate that areas of opportunity exist, but at least one respondent indicates that they do not feel these related to DEI issues. Another respondent notes that if issues were to arise, they are unsure that what they perceive as significant would be treated as such. Some concerns over the potential for retaliation were expressed and a general recognition that non-white faculty/staff are viewed differently, including experiencing lower expectations/value, were shared in more generalized framings. One comment described witnessing tensions that verged on the level of discrimination directed *at* departmental leadership. One comment did, however, report experiencing harassment from a from a senior colleague in another department. The survey results from OT reveals the crucial nature of *both* departmental and college-level investments in creating a supportive culture and climate.

6. Physical Therapy

The data from the PT department reveals several key areas of opportunity that staff and faculty highlight, including indicators that greater equity of opportunity for professional growth be fostered. Data shows that faculty generally feel respected and survey respondents unanimously report that colleagues from their own and other racial and ethnic backgrounds are valued. Respondents also indicate their department experiences have had a positive impact on their professional growth. These more promising indicators are crucial building blocks from which areas of concern can be addressed. Details of the department's survey responses have been included below. In order to provide the most comprehensive picture of the departmental climate as reflected in survey results, this data is also further contextualized with relevant qualitative data from the survey as a whole.

Close to a quarter of respondents report they do not feel valued (21%), lack a sense of belonging (28%), and do not feel a sense of community (21%) in the department. Despite the number of respondents who report that the department has a positive impact on professional growth (93%), a significant number of faculty (42%) also report not feeling that the department is a place where they can perform up to their full potential or where they have similar opportunities as their colleagues (42%). A subsequent question reveals that a number of respondents (14%) do not feel that they had equitable access to resources *because of* their identity. A notable number of faculty (35%) do not feel that the department fosters free and open discussion of difficult topics. The potential relationship between this latter indicator and feelings of value, community, and belonging is an area of opportunity. While the large majority of faculty/staff report feeling that DEI is valued (86%), this has not translated into an equally high percentage of respondents feeling that adequate resources have been provided to foster the success of diverse faculty and staff (60%).[1] Some respondents indicate

[1] Note that these percentages are derived from Q 3.3 and 3.10 (respectively). The numbers are reported inversely in the summary table.

experiencing identity-related stereotyping (14%) and microaggressions (14%). 14% of respondents also report witnessing identity-related microaggressions, with 29% reporting witnessing identity-related stereotyping. Faculty and staff respondents do not report experiencing over acts of discrimination, harassment, or oppression, but a small number has reported witnessing such acts (7%).

Faculty and staff from PT did not provide much qualitative data. One comment expresses happiness with the level of training received regarding DEI issues; the respondent indicates that this helps to better identify reporting lines for issues that may arise. This point is reflected in the majority of responses from faculty and staff within the department, who report confidence in knowing where to go for help and how to report experiences. However, there is significantly less confidence that issues of harassment will be taken seriously and feelings of safety restored, which is consistent with other departmental responses.

Notably, PT has a low survey response rate, which raises concerns about how representative the data is of the climate and culture in the department. Further information is needed to fully understand the culture and climate of the department and to gather invaluable qualitative feedback that can help target any department-level action plans to build on the strengths reported and identify any additional areas of concern. Furthermore, it is important to note that qualitative data reported by faculty/staff from other units/departments indicates that issues of harassment and discrimination, including sexism, ableism, racism, anti-fatness, and religious discrimination may be present in PT. The lack of reliable data about the full scope of PT faculty/staff experiences alongside the seriousness of issues raised by members of the AHS community more broadly have led to the recommendation that the PT department be prioritized for third-party review.

IV. Recommendations

The following recommendations were formulated based on the issues identified from the survey data. Specific justifications are listed with each recommendation.

Recommendations

- Diverse Faculty and Staff Hiring
- Third Party Review
- Transparent Reporting Process
- Accountability Committee
- Transparent evaluation process of leadership and appointed positions
- Continuing Education

There are three justifications for immediate action on these recommendations:

- Issues identified in the AHS Culture and Climate Survey.
- Reporting from the UIC Bias Reporting Tool indicate that AHS made up 20% of the reports from the entire University during the first year of its implementation (April 2020-April 2021).

- Qualitative and quantitative data from the AHS Culture and Climate Survey indicates experiences that are in direct conflict with Title IX: Preventing Harassment and Discrimination, including reports of harassment, bullying and abuse of power.

A. Diverse Faculty and Staff Hiring

Justification:
The survey results underscore the importance of university-wide efforts to increase the diversity of our faculty and staff, specifically around racial and ethnic diversity. A lack of diversity within faculty and staff creates the conditions under which bias and discrimination are fostered and/or go unchecked. Any effort at creating an inclusive and welcoming climate must begin (but not end) with ensuring a diversity of experiences, voices, and perspectives are both represented within the staff and faculty and given opportunities for leadership and advancement.

Recommendation:

- ❑ Invest in strategic hiring initiatives at the college level to increase the racial and ethnic diversity of staff and faculty.
- ❑ Create a college-level plan to increase the diversity of leadership (which should consider: dedicated professional development funding for multiply marginalized faculty, release time for staff and NTT faculty for professional development activities, and periodic reviews of workload allocations to ensure equitable access to opportunities).

B. Third Party Review

Justification:
Reports from the survey indicate experiences of abuse of power, a culture of fear, a culture of retaliation, bullying, and a culture of intimidation. Internal reporting mechanisms at all levels of the University have failed many individuals from the College of Applied Health Sciences. These issues are significant enough in both scale and degree to warrant a third-party review.

Recommendation:

- ❑ Hire an external third party to examine concerns raised, at minimum, in the departments where significant issues have been raised (BHIS, DHD, and PT).

C. Accountability Committee:

Justification:
An accountability committee should be formed to ensure that an action plan is formulated to address, in a timely and meaningful manner, the issues raised by and the recommendation presented based on an evaluation of the AHS Culture & Climate Survey.

For the same reasons as those listed in the justification for a third part review, this committee should create new processes that ensure transparent reporting, establish clear pathways for addressing the issues that are raised, and achieve overall accountability for DEI related actions.

The committee oversees the implementation of the following recommendations:

- ❑ Form a college-level reporting mechanism that captures individuals' experiences (as described in recommendation #3)
- ❑ Communicate these reports of harm to the broader college community (as described in recommendation #3)
- ❑ Create a 5-year action plan for:
    - Department/unit mitigation plans to address department specific issues raised in report.
    - Identification of areas of concern as well as best practices in areas of success.
    - Implementation of recommendations from third party review.
- ❑ Ensure that a Culture & Climate Survey is conducted and disseminated every 5 years

Considerations for selection and commitment of members:

- Committee includes department/unit representatives voted by faculty and staff that represent staff, clinical, TT and non-TT faculty.
- Non-voting member to provide logistical support and liaise with the College administration to the committee and to organize meetings.
- Members have rotating 2-years of service to ensure institutional memory of committee.
- Recognition of the substantive time commitment required of this committee be addressed in workload allocations.

D. Transparent reporting process

Justification:

Data from the survey indicates that individuals report instances of harm at multiple levels; including departmental HR, the College and the University level. Despite the reports, no action has been taken that directly addresses harms or that results in change and the issues and harm persisted. Creating a new transparent reporting process will move towards correcting the failures of the previous systems.

In an effort to rebuild trust and foster faith in the college's commitment to DEI issues, deliberate efforts are required to facilitate transparency regarding both the issues facing the college and college efforts to address these issues.

Reporting on the number of bias reports received provides a metric of larger issues and ensures culture and climate concerns remain a priority. The creation of a dual-reporting line for any College-level mechanism similarly facilitates accountability, a central concern shared by staff and faculty within the survey.

Recommendation:

- ❑ Form a college level reporting mechanism with a dual-reporting line:

- Should include the following:
  - Shared stakeholder/faculty and staff governance.
  - Department/unit resource for receiving reports of DEI related issues, other forms of harm (e.g., Faculty Advisory Committee, DEI committee). Should be entrusted and confidential resource.
  - Mediator from outside of AHS to address reports of harm (that do not rise to the level of the OAE reporting tool).

❑ Communicate reports of harm:

- The following communications should be updated each semester in an accessible format (ex. AHS Connections, website):
  - Number of reports from the UIC Bias Reporting Tool and Office of Access and Equity.
  - Number of reports from the newly formed AHS reporting mechanism. Include transparency metric re: # of complaints filed and # of resolutions/mediations.

E. Transparent evaluation process of leadership and appointed positions:

Justification:
As identified in the third recommendation above, data from the survey indicates that reports of harm were often left unresolved, and that individuals that caused harm were able to remain in positions of power.

Reports indicate both instances of willful disregard by those in leadership positions and passive acceptance of harmful behaviors that have allowed individuals causing harm to remain in positions of power. A more transparent evaluation process of those in leadership positions that include shared governance and accountability for addressing departmental and college culture and climate is needed.

Recommendations:

❑ Implement a more frequent review process of leadership (including department heads, deans, HR, DUS, business manager, etc.); can be less formal than the 5-year standard review. Identify best-practices that facilitate transparency and accountability.

❑ Include shared governance in the evaluation processes (e.g., Faculty Advisory Committees).

❑ Include DEI as part of tenure, promotion, and annual review processes. This would include assessment of reports filed against individuals, participation in DEI training, other activities that show commitment to improved culture.

❑ Analyze processes for how appointed positions are assigned and evaluated.

F. Continuing education

Justification:
It is recognized that continuing education training is not always effective, however, it should be part of the larger recommendations and targeted to specific concerns.

Recommendations:

- ❑ Require continuing education training with a focus on privilege awareness and power analysis.

- ❑ Offer incentives to participate in discussion forums/learning opportunities about DEI. For example, tie participation into annual reviews and promotion and tenure.
- ❑ Resources may include CATE and the Office of Diversity.

V. Considerations for Future Surveys

As illustrated throughout the report, the Inclusive Excellence Task Force has taken intentional steps to produce a comprehensive and equitably distributed survey. Throughout the data analysis and reporting process, we were able to identify a survey-based recommendation for the continued evaluation of culture and climate on a college wide level.

Range of Dissemination: The following range of College of Applied Health Sciences (CAHS) job titles is representative of the CAHS employees who received the survey: academic advisor, adjunct clinical assistant professor, adjunct instructor, assistant professor, assistive tech specialist, associate dean, associate professor, associate project director, business/administrative associate, clerical medical office specialist, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, clinical instructor, clinical professor, customer service representative, department affiliate, instructor, medical office assistant, medical office associate, medical office specialist, office administrator, office support associate, professor, professor emerita, project coordinator, research specialist, research associate professor, research assistant professor, visiting assistant technology specialist and visiting research specialist.

While experiences from all of our colleagues are valued, there may be some positions and/or percent appointments where individuals might not have the same level of engagement with the college and/or department administrators, faculty and staff as other positions/appointments. When reviewing the survey response rate, this is something to be mindful of. For future surveys, communication from known and trusted colleagues encouraging survey participation might help to improve the response rate.

VI. Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Dean Fernhall and Associate Dean Taylor for supporting the dissemination of the survey and providing the platform to share the results of our analysis.
We would also like to thank our AHS colleagues for entrusting us with their experiences. For those of you who expressed fear in sharing your experiences, your voices were heard as well.
Michelle Manno from the Office of Diversity, Equity and Engagement served as a valued resource for our committee as we navigated the data evaluation and recommendations. Finally, a deep thank you to the Culture and Climate Survey Committee members: Whitney Harris, Viviana Kabbabe-Thompson, David Marquez, Shayna Oshita, Aly Patsavas, Orit Schwartz, Kirsten Straughan and Jennifer Wescott.
We believe that with everyone's commitment, we can strengthen the foundation of AHS and create a culture of belonging where everyone feels respected and valued.

VII. Appendices

A. Survey questions

1. What is your primary department/unit?
2. Do you identify as a member of a marginalized group? For example...gender, disability, religion, etc.

3. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements while considering your experiences and interactions, including during meetings and programs, that are organized by your department.
    a. I feel valued as an individual by my department.
    b. My department has a strong commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI).
    c. I have considered leaving the department because I felt DEI is not fostered.
    d. I am treated with respect within my department.
    e. My department is a place where I can perform up to my full potential.
    f. I have opportunities in my department for professional success that are like those of my colleagues.
    g. I have found community within my department.
    h. There is too much emphasis put on issues of DEI in my department.
    i. My department provides sufficient programs and resources to foster the success of a diverse faculty.
    j. I must work harder than others to be valued equally in my department.
    k. My experience in my department has had a positive influence on my professional growth.
    l. I believe my department climate encourages free and open discussion of difficult topics.
4. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.
    a. Colleagues (within my department) from MY racial/ethnic group are valued.
    b. Colleagues (within my department) from OTHER racial/ethnic groups are valued.
    c. My department is free from tensions related to individual or group differences.
    d. My faculty colleagues are committed to racial/ethnic diversity and inclusion.
    e. My staff colleagues are committed to racial/ethnic diversity and inclusion.
    f. My department head is committed to respond to racial/ethnic issues.
    g. My program director is committed to respond to racial/ethnic issues.
5. Based on one or more of your identities how would you rate your access to equitable resources that allow you to perform the tasks of your job?
6. Please rate your response for each option below using the following guide.
   Inclusive: Feelings of Fairness, Comfort.
   Exclusionary: Feelings of Bias, Tension
   Related to the following identities, my experiences or observations have been that the department is:
    a. Sex
    b. Gender identity of expression
    c. Sexual orientation
    d. Racial or ethnic identity
    e. Veteran status
    f. Marital status
    g. National origin
    h. Social class
    i. Political orientation
    j. Height of weight
    k. Religion
    l. Age
    m. Citizenship or immigration status
    n. Preferred language of use
    o. Socioeconomic status
    p. Level of education
    q. Disability
7. Please rate your response for each option below using the following guide.
   Inclusive: Feelings of Fairness, Comfort

Exclusionary: Feelings of Bias, Tension

Related to the following positions, my experiences or observations have been that the department is:

a. Non-tenure track faculty
b. Tenure track faculty
c. Tenured faculty
d. Administrator
e. Staff
f. Students

8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:
    a. I am reluctant to disclose my religious identity in my department.
    b. I am reluctant to disclose my gender identity in my department.
    c. I am reluctant to disclose my sexual orientation in my department.
    d. I am reluctant to disclose my ethnic/cultural identity in my department.
    e. I am reluctant to disclose my disability identity in my department.
9. Because of one or more of my identities, I have been reluctant or unable to attend:
    a. College and/or department social events
    b. College and/or department meetings
    c. Other (Please Specify)
10. Please use the following information to assist you with responding to the statements below in regard to your department. These questions address different types of harm that may be experienced.
    Identity may refer to gender, religion, or race, etc. Refer to question 6 for a list of identities. Microaggressions: Subtle verbal or nonverbal insults or denigrating messages communicated toward a marginalized person, often by someone who may be well-intentioned but unaware of the impact their words or actions have on the target (e.g., "You're so interesting looking – what are you?").
    Stereotypes: Automatic and exaggerated mental pictures that we hold about all members of a particular minority group (e.g., assuming that someone is good or bad at a certain type of activity because of their race).
    a. I have experienced identity-related microaggressions.
    b. I have witnessed identity-related microaggressions.
    c. I have experienced identity-related stereotyping.
    d. I have witnessed identity-related stereotyping.
    e. I have experienced overt acts of identity-related harassment, discrimination, or oppression.
    f. I have witnessed overt acts of identity-related harassment, discrimination, or oppression.
11. Please share any experiences of microaggressions, stereotyping, and overt harassment, discrimination, or oppression within your department as you feel comfortable. As a reminder your response will be kept confidential.
12. Please share any other experiences of microaggressions, stereotyping, and overt harassment, discrimination, or oppression within the AHS college (outside your home department) as you feel comfortable. As a reminder your response will be kept confidential.
13. If you were to experience harm related to one or more of your identities:
    a. Would you know where to go for help?
    b. Would you know UIC's formal procedures for complaints or harassment?
    c. Would you be comfortable to report an experience of harm?
    d. Would you have confidence that UIC would fairly administer the formal procedures to address complaints of harassment?
    e. Would you be confident that the outcome of your report leads to the restoration of your feelings of safety?
14. To any of the previous questions, please share your experiences as you feel comfortable. As a reminder, your response will be confidential.

15. Do you have suggestions for your department and/or college to facilitate or support diversity, equity, and/or inclusion?

B. AHS College Meeting Inclusive Excellence Taskforce Presentation
C. Quantitative Data Results
D. Qualitative Data Results: Themes Frequencies