AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. On-Line Test Site Survey Review

A. CSWG member reviews of the on-line test site

- Undergraduate student
  Megan – 20 minutes
  Lisa – 20 minutes

- Graduate student
  Crystal – 25 minutes
  Carine – 20 minutes
  Ana – 25 minutes

- Non-degree student
  Tim – 31 minutes
  Michael – 31 minutes

- Faculty
  Liliana – 30 minutes
  Karen – 50 minutes

- Staff
  Juan – 25 minutes
  Carol – 30 minutes

- Senior administrator/Executive
  Jennifer – no time give, but commented that it took “a while to finish”
  Kevin – 24 minutes

1. Average time for survey - 20 minutes-30 minutes (in IRB consent materials)

2. Please see attached for:
   - Revisions made based on review and requests from the committee at the 7-23 meeting
   - Additional requests from the committee following the 7-23 meeting
III. Review of *Frequently Asked Questions* Document
   
   A. Review of revised document

IV. Review of Marketing & Communication Plan
   
   A. Review of Proposed Time-line
      1. Survey administration dates:
         Wednesday October 24-Friday November 9
   
   B. Review of Proposed Marketing & Communication Plan

V. Schedule Fall Meetings
   
   *Please bring your Fall calendars to the August 7 meeting*
1. **Add following note before Question #1**

   You may use the back button to return to previous pages on the survey, however, any responses will be deleted and you will have to re-enter your response.

2. **Definitions**
   Add a hyperlink for the definitions so that respondents only see the list of definitions if they click on the link.

3. **Question #1**
   Participants must respond to Q#1 before moving through the survey as in previous surveys

4. **Question #15**
   Please move “don’t know” to the top of the list of response choices and remove the frequency options.
   
   If this is not possible (based on the limits of the software), remove the “don’t know” option from the list

5. **Question #23**
   Remove repeated “sexual assault” in the question header

6. **Question #67**
   Revise last response choice in the drop down menu to read:
   
   More than 31 hours/week

7. **Question #74**
   Response choice #4.
   
   Revise Umass Boston to UMass Boston

8. **Question #76**
   Revise “Don’t know the source” to:
   
   “Don’t know target”

9. **Question #82**
   Add new response choice after “I was angry”
   
   I intervened/assisted the targeted person
10. Question #96
Duplicate response – please remove one

I think UMass Boston faculty are genuinely concerned about my welfare.

11. Question #99
Move “Walkways and pedestrian paths” to the physical accessibility section.

12. Question #103
Revise question to read:

Before I enrolled, I expected that the campus climate would be
______________for people who are/have...

13. Question #107
Revise header to read:

How would each of the following affect the climate at UMass Boston?
Additional revisions requested by the committee following the July 23rd meeting

Michael:
Question #65 - request for committee discussion

Not sure of the difference between responses of “non-campus housing” and “independently in an apartment/house” – may be confusing to student respondents

Karen:
Question #16
Should this be part of faculty questionnaire: “I feared getting a poor grade because of a hostile classroom environment”? Perhaps this should be “I feared getting poor course evaluations because of a hostile classroom environment”?

Sue’s response:
This list is for all respondents (faculty, students, and staff) so participants only choose those that are applicable to them.

If you are suggesting that we add the following response choice it will require CSWG discussion and approval.

“I feared getting poor course evaluations because of a hostile classroom environment”

Question #16
I wonder if there should be something about rumors or reports of others’ remarking on you? That is, not a formal negative performance evaluation but something that is more about the social climate or that may have negative implications for advancement and such?

Sue’s response:
I believe that you are requesting that we add another response choice to this list. Since you didn’t offer a suggestion, I recommend something like the following. Requires CSWG discussion and approval

I was the target of rumors that negatively affected my promotion/tenure process.

Karen’s follow-up recommendation:

I was the target of rumors that negatively affected my work experience or evaluation.
Question #19 and Question #82
If you choose “I did nothing” it clears all other responses. But this is problematic, because a respondent may have multiple incidents, in one of which they do nothing, but in others they do respond. So how might this work?

Sue’s response:
This is a “mark all that apply” question so the respondent can check multiple responses. The “I did nothing” response can be revised so that respondents can check this response along with others from the list if the committee desires.

Question #19 and Question #82
The only choice for reporting is a “formal complaint” but there are other ways of reporting, and actually the University policy prioritizes things that are NOT a formal complaint. How do we address this?

Sue’s response:
We had a lengthy discussion at one of our meetings where it was recommended that the following response choice be removed.

I made an informal complaint (e.g., campus website, ombudsperson)

Karen’s follow-up recommendation after speaking with Juan:

I consulted with university officials and followed the policy procedure for informal resolution of a discriminatory dispute.

Question #23
Can we reverse the order of the examples, so that the least severe comes first?
Question #32
Questions like this were difficult for me:
*My research interests are valued by my colleagues.*
I think this is true, but partly because of the units I am in. I know there are other faculty who don’t feel this because of the specific units they are in and I sometimes feel if I go outside my sub-discipline or specialty within my discipline, that it is not true. So the word “colleagues” is difficult

Karen’s follow-up recommendation
* I would suggest that we change that response and add one other:  
  *My research interests are valued by my colleagues in my department/unit.*  
  *My research interests are valued by other faculty in the university.*

Question #43
Karen’s recommendation to revise the question header

Although the categories listed below may not represent your full identity or use the language you prefer, for the purpose of this survey, please indicate which group-area below most accurately describes the origin of your ethnic identification. (Mark all that apply)

Question #52:
Karen’s recommends adding “Intercollegiate Program”
Asian American Studies is an intercollegiate program that is not housed in any of the colleges. So faculty in that area would not be able to indicate their affiliation at all.

Question #105
I struggled with these questions because I didn’t know whether I was saying that this was actually done regularly and had an effect or whether this was saying that if this were done, or when it is done (sometimes rarely) what effect would it have. That is, is it asking my opinion (how WOULD this affect the climate) or is it asking to what extent does the actual provision of each of these things affect the climate?

Sue’s response:
The committee had a lengthy discussion regarding this question and decided to remove the first column which read:
*Not currently offered at UMass Boston*

Karen’s recommendation is to review the question and discuss alternative response choices.