To: Douglas Haynes and Frances Leslie  
From: Members of the Provost Leadership Academy Workgroup (Aileen Anderson, Mu-Chun Chen, Rainer Doemer, Dave Holmes, Seth Houston, Mary McThomas, Bryan L. Sykes, and Judy Tzu-Chun Wu)  
Re: Recommendations for the UCI Inclusive Excellence Campus Climate Surveys and Graduate Division Exit Surveys  
Date: 3 May 2019  

Overview:  
Our workgroup was charged with evaluating the UCI Inclusive Excellence Campus Climate Survey, which is being administered within Schools at UCI on a rotating basis, and making recommendations to improve this survey instrument. Doug Haynes shared with our group that the reviews were initiated in 2016 for three primary reasons.  
- To address an existing set of conflicts within a school at UCI  
- To provide a benchmark and encourage UCI deans to be proactive in addressing campus climate issues related to diversity  
- To provide a tool for the university in anticipation of potential conflicts that might emerge as the institution increasingly diversifies its faculty  

To complete our charge, our workgroup evaluated the Inclusive Excellence Unit Reviews for Biological Sciences, CTSA, Education, ICS, Physical Sciences, and Social Ecology, as well as the questions that were utilized in the survey. Particular members of our workgroup with expertise in statistical analysis also gained access to the raw data that generated the reviews. In addition, we also reviewed the Graduate Division Exit Surveys, which provide insights into climate issues as they relate to graduate education. When data was available, we compared the results of both surveys for the same schools at UCI.  

Below are our main recommendations for improving the Inclusive Excellence Unit Reviews, the Graduate Division Exit Surveys, and for the process of surveying campus constituents in general.  

A. Improving and validating the measurement instrument:  
The data generated by the campus climate survey has changed over time, as the Office of Inclusive Excellence adapted the survey. As a result there is not consistent data that is standardized and internally consistent, as the survey response options across schools have changed between academic years. This change in measurement raises a host of internal validity challenges that require a redesign of the survey instrument.  

1. We recommend that OIE review its survey in order to create a standardized, internally consistent survey instrument for all schools.  
2. Conduct pre-tests to identify potential problems with the new survey measures before administering the survey to schools.  

B. Improving the current survey questions
3. Provide explicit definitions: E.G. What is understood as diversity and inclusion?
4. Include general bullying as a question within the survey.
5. The free speech question needs to be rephrased and explained more, given micro and overt forms of aggression, which may be considered forms of free speech.
6. Add an explicit question regarding hostility in the work environment or work climate
7. Add a question: if you have filed or expressed a complaint in relation to diversity and inclusion, what was the response to this complaint? How would you rate the response?

C. Expand the survey to include questions related to diversity in research methods and fields

Our group discussed how resistance to demographic diversity can be linked to resistance to methodological and research field diversity. How might the devaluing of particular research approaches and subject matters at the department, school, or campus levels also lead to marginalization of faculty and students of particular backgrounds? How might the valuing of particular forms of research, connected to the ability to generate external sources of funding, reinforce these power dynamics within the university?

8. The climate survey could include questions that relate to these issues. One suggestion is to include the question, “Do you think your work/scholarship/contributions are valued in your department, the school, or the campus?” Additional questions might be generated and included as well.

D. Ideas to improve participation

9. Include professors of teaching and staff to include their perspectives and to minimize the ability to identify participants
10. Explicitly provide information about how the survey will protect anonymity in order to facilitate participation
11. Include information regarding the impact of the past survey: How has the climate changed since the last survey? What actions have been taken as a result of the past survey?
12. Discuss goals of the survey explicitly: It’s important to foreground the actions/plans that will result from the survey
13. Offer enticing incentives for participating in the survey

E. Improving the reports of the survey

14. Provide more specific instructions to the schools for their reports. Some are more detailed than others. Also, some provide vague generalizations rather than in-depth analysis of the results.
15. Charge the schools to analyze and report on their findings to members of the school and develop a plan of action in response
16. Monitor the plans/actions that stem from the results of the survey - climate committee
17. Develop a tool-kit to help schools to develop their analyses and action plans
18. Could the members of this workgroup serve as a resource in helping OIE and/or particular schools to evaluate the data of the climate survey and develop an action plan?

F. Relationship to other surveys

19. Our work group recommends that each school compare its campus climate survey results with the exit survey generated by the Graduate Division to note similarities and discrepancies in these results as they develop the school action plan.

20. We also recommend that the Exit Survey include questions that either exist in the Campus Climate survey or are necessary follow-up questions based on the results shared by the Graduate Division. We specifically recommend these questions below.
   1. Overall, how comfortable are you with the climate at UCI?
   2. Overall, how comfortable are you with the climate in your School?
   3. Overall, how comfortable are you with the climate in your classes?
   4. Did you change your advisor? If so, why?

21. Finally, our workgroup was informed that there are at least five surveys that are being conducted at UCI for students, staff, and faculty. Is there a way to consolidate/coordinate these efforts to standardize and share data as well as elicit greater participation?

Thank you for this opportunity to review these important survey instruments for the university. They perform an important function and provide valuable tools to help us create a more inclusive environment to enable all of us to strive towards excellence.