Mission of the Fine Arts Diversity Committee

The Fine Arts Diversity Committee supports and collaborates with the College of Fine Arts units in the design and implementation of strategies that advance diversity. By actively establishing and fostering a culture of inclusivity throughout the College community, the committee assists in the development of recruitment and retention strategies for underrepresented students, faculty and staff; provides forums for mutual respect, an appreciation of differences, and cross-cultural understandings; and prepares our community for a changing global society.

Executive Summary

During the spring 2012 semester, the Fine Arts Diversity Committee worked with the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement’s (DDCE) Campus Diversity and Strategic Initiatives portfolio to develop and administer the College of Fine Arts Climate Assessment. The assessment was part of a diversity planning pilot process that the college has undertaken with DDCE staff serving as consultants and as ex-officio members of the Fine Arts Diversity Committee. Results of the assessment will be used along with other data collected by the committee to inform future efforts that will promote inclusivity and diversity within the college.

All students, faculty and staff in the college received an e-mail invitation to participate in the 20-question survey and a total of 702 individuals out of 2,676 who received an invitation completed the survey, yielding an overall response rate of 26 percent. By employing both quantitative (multiple-choice questions) and qualitative (open-ended questions) components, the
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survey utilized a mixed-methods approach to offer a more complete picture of the college climate than would be available by using either method in isolation.

This summary highlights all statistically significant findings in the assessment. The full report includes cross-tabulations by various demographic groups for each survey item.

Respondent characteristics

- Responding at the highest rates were faculty members (67 percent) and graduate students (31 percent).
- Respondents from Art and Art History numbered 279; there were 209 respondents from the Butler School of Music; and 124 respondents from Theatre and Dance. A total of 32 respondents were from Texas Performing Arts and 35 represented the Office of the Dean.¹
- Overall, women and men responded to the survey in proportion to their representation in the college, with women outnumbering men, about 60 percent to 40 percent.
- Forty-six percent of survey takers indicated they do not identify with a religion; 22 percent came from or currently considered themselves low-income; 15 percent were born or raised outside of the U.S; 12 percent identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual or queer; and 6 percent said they have a cognitive, physical or psychological disability.

¹ For the purposes of this report, the two academic departments (Art and Art History and Theatre and Dance), one academic school (Butler School of Music) and two administrative units (Texas Performing Arts and Office of the Dean) are all referred to throughout as departments, reflecting the language used in the survey instrument.
### Overall Respondent Demographics

- **White**: 76%
- **Female**: 62%
- **Do not identify as religious**: 46%
- **Male**: 40%
- **Undergraduate**: 33%
- **Graduate student**: 28%
- **Person of color**: 24%
- **Religious minority**: 24%
- **Low-income**: 22%
- **Faculty**: 20%
- **Staff**: 15%
- **International**: 15%
- **Lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer**: 12%
- **Person with a disability**: 6%
- **Administrator**: 2%
- **Adjunct faculty**: 2%
- **Transgender, genderqueer**: 1%

---
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Curriculum and performances/events

- Across all groups, respondents generally agreed that skills related to diversity are essential for the professional success of COFA graduates.
  - Butler School of Music respondents were more likely than those from the other four departments to be neutral or disagree that diversity skills are needed in the professions\(^2\) and 20 percent responded as such. The effect size, however, was small (.128), indicating a weak relationship.

- Most respondents (60 percent) agreed that the college/departmental curriculum prepares students for careers that recognize the needs of diverse populations.
  - People of color and those who identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer and low income were significantly more likely than their counterparts to disagree with that assessment, though small effect sizes indicated the relationships were weak.\(^3\)
  - Thirty-nine percent of people of color and 20 percent of white people did not think diversity was well integrated into the required core curriculum of the college.
  - Forty-four percent of lesbian, gay, bisexual and queer respondents said diversity was not well integrated into required coursework.
  - Respondents from the Department of Theatre and Dance were more likely those from other departments to disagree that the curriculum prepares students for diversity, though the effect size was minimal.\(^4\) (About a quarter disagreed or strongly disagreed.)

- Two-thirds of COFA respondents felt comfortable engaging in or leading discussions of diversity in the classroom/workplace. Comfort for engaging in these discussions was higher outside of formal settings, particularly for lesbian, gay, bisexual and queer respondents.

---

\(^2\) \(\chi^2 (df=2, n=671)=10.93, p=.004\)

\(^3\) People of color: \(\chi^2 (df=2, n=617)=11.29, p=.004, \text{ effect size}=.135\); LGBQ: \(\chi^2 (df=2, n=616)=10.98, p=.004, \text{ effect size}=.133\); low-income: \(\chi^2 (df=2, n=620)=12.30, p=.004, \text{ effect size}=.141\)

\(^4\) \(\chi^2 (df=2, n=634)=6.98, p=.031, \text{ effect size}=.105\)
While nearly two-thirds of white respondents believed diversity is adequately reflected in productions, performances and exhibitions, less than half of respondents of color agreed.

- Eighty percent of Texas Performing Arts staff thought diversity is adequately reflected in performances/events.
### Overall Agreement with Diversity Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity is integrated into the required core curriculum</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum prepares students for careers recognizing diversity</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity is reflected in productions, performances, exhibitions and events</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable engaging in discussions about diversity in class/at work</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable engaging in discussions about diversity outside of class/work</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills related to diversity are necessary for the professional success of graduates</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable interacting with my peers who are different from me</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Diversity is integrated into the required core curriculum: 43%
- The curriculum prepares students for careers recognizing diversity: 60%
- Diversity is reflected in productions, performances, exhibitions and events: 61%
- I feel comfortable engaging in discussions about diversity in class/at work: 67%
- I feel comfortable engaging in discussions about diversity outside of class/work: 79%
- Skills related to diversity are necessary for the professional success of graduates: 86%
- I feel comfortable interacting with my peers who are different from me: 96%
Involvement with and perceptions of diversity

- Years at COFA and status both had a moderate relationship with knowledge of the college’s diversity efforts, with faculty, staff and administrators and those who had been at COFA for a longer period of time indicating more familiarity with the efforts.\(^5\)
  - About 14 percent of all respondents considered themselves very familiar with COFA activities related to diversity, with faculty (22 percent) and administrators (50 percent) indicating the most familiarity.
  - Those who had been at COFA 16 or more years were most likely to be familiar with diversity activities, with 90 percent indicating they were somewhat or very familiar.
- Faculty members, administrators, people of color, international respondents and Theatre and Dance respondents were more likely to indicate that they were personally involved in diversity activities than their counterparts.\(^6\)
  - There was a small to moderate relationship between status and personal involvement in diversity efforts. The relationship was weaker between department, race and national origin with personal involvement in diversity.
  - Undergraduate students, staff and adjunct faculty members were least likely to be personally involved with diversity efforts.
- Faculty members and people of color were significantly more likely than their counterparts to believe in the importance of COFA diversity activities, though the effect sizes for both groups were small.\(^7\) Ninety percent of people of color thought the college’s diversity activities were important, versus 76 percent of white people.

---

\(^5\) Years at COFA: \(\chi^2\) (df=10, n=679)=47.75, p<.001, effect size=.268; status: \(\chi^2\) (df=10, n=680)=56.56, p<.001, effect size=.288

\(^6\) Faculty/administrators: \(\chi^2\) (df=5, n=676)=49.52, p<.001, effect size=.271; people of color: \(\chi^2\) (df=1, n=657)=7.35, p=.007, effect size=.106; international: \(\chi^2\) (df=1, n=656)=5.81, p=.016, effect size=.094; Theatre and Dance: \(\chi^2\) (df=4, n=675)=20.09, p<.001, effect size=.173

\(^7\) Faculty: \(\chi^2\) (df=10, n=679)=34.86, p<.001, effect size=.227; people of color: \(\chi^2\) (df=2, n=661)=15.64, p<.001, effect size=.154
Respondents of color and low-income, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender respondents said they were less satisfied with the COFA experience as it relates to diversity than their counterparts.

I am personally involved in activities related to diversity in my department/school and/or COFA

- Men of color: 44%
- International: 39%
- Women of color: 34%
- Lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer: 32%
- Low-income/poverty: 32%
- Do not identify as religious: 29%
- Person with a disability: 28%
- White men: 28%
- White women: 24%
- Religious minority: 23%
Intergroup relations and discrimination

- Members of marginalized groups were more likely than their counterparts to say they had experienced or witnessed discrimination on campus. People of color and women were more likely to say they had experienced discrimination and LGBQ people were more likely to say they had witnessed discrimination, though effect sizes of these relationships were relatively weak.\(^8\)

- Respondents indicated that students, faculty and staff in the college interacted most positively across three types of diversity: sexual orientation, national origin and disability.
  - They interacted less positively across differences of socioeconomic status, religion, race/ethnicity and gender (though more than two-thirds of respondents still believed interactions across these dimensions were positive).
  - Disagreement about positive interaction was most polarized about race and gender.
  - In general, respondents in a particular targeted category were less likely to indicate that interaction was positive. For example, people with disabilities were significantly less likely to believe interactions across disability/ability were positive.\(^9\)
  - Across multiple categories, faculty members, Theatre and Dance respondents, respondents with disabilities and those who identify as low-income, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender appeared to rate interactions as less positive than others.
  - Women were significantly less likely than men to believe interactions were positive across gender and national origin.\(^10\)

\(^8\) People of color: \(\chi^2 (df=2, n=645)=16.47, p<.001, \text{effect size}=.160\); women: \(\chi^2 (df=2, n=651)=11.67, p=.003, \text{effect size}=.134\); LGBQ: \(\chi^2 (df=2, n=645)=13.37, p=.001, \text{effect size}=.144\)

\(^9\) \(\chi^2 (df=2, n=654)=14.66, p=.001, \text{effect size}=.150\)

\(^10\) Gender: \(\chi^2 (df=2, n=666)=6.03, p=.049, \text{effect size}=.095\); national origin: \(\chi^2 (df=2, n=666)=8.19, p=.018, \text{effect size}=.111\)
People of color were significantly less likely to believe interactions were positive across national origin and race.11

Status appeared to have a relationship with one’s view of race relations, with faculty, administrators and graduate students significantly more likely than other groups to believe interactions across race were negative, though the effect size was small.12

- Nearly all respondents indicated comfort in interacting with peers who differ from themselves.

---

### I believe that COFA students, faculty and staff generally interact positively with each other across differences of ____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability/ability</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National origin</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

---

I believe that COFA students, faculty and staff generally interact positively with each other across differences of ____

- Socioeconomic status: 68%
- Religion: 69%
- Disability/ability: 77%

---

11 National origin: $\chi^2$ (df=2, n=660)=11.67, p=.003, effect size=.133; race: $\chi^2$ (df=2, n=657)=9.47, p=.009, effect size=.120

12 $\chi^2$ (df=10, n=676)=33.47, p<.001, effect size=.223
• Race/ethnicity: 79%
• Gender: 81%
• National origin: 82%
• Sexual orientation: 83%

Personally experienced discrimination or prejudice within their department, the College of Fine Arts and/or at UT

• Only respondents selecting “yes” or “not sure” to having personally experienced discrimination and prejudice were able to answer an open-ended response. Of the respondents having personally experienced discrimination or prejudice with their department, the College of Fine Arts and/or at UT, 117 provided written feedback.

• Respondents indicated personally experiencing discrimination or prejudice along the demographic characteristics of age, dis/ability, gender and gender identity, national origin, race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and the intersection of multiple dimensions.

• In several cases, respondents chose not to elaborate further on their experiences, citing discomfort.
Have you personally experienced discrimination/prejudice in your department, COFA and/or UT?

- Men of color: 26%
- Person with a disability: 25%
- Women of color: 22%
- Low-income/poverty: 21%
- Lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer: 20%
- Religious minority: 17%
- White women: 15%
- Do not identify as religious: 15%
- International: 14%
- White men: 7%
Witnessed discrimination or prejudice within their department, the College of Fine Arts and/or at UT

- Respondents selecting “yes” or “not sure” to having witnessed discrimination and prejudice were given the opportunity to provide an open-ended response. For the respondents who witnessed discrimination or prejudice, 140 provided comments.
- The demographic characteristics included gender and gender identity, national origin, race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and the intersection of multiple dimensions.
- Two demographic characteristics identified in the previous question by those who personally experienced discrimination or prejudice, age and dis/ability, were not mentioned by the respondents that witnessed discrimination or prejudice.
- As with the previous question, several respondents were reluctant to share specific details.

Identifying ways to improve the campus climate for diversity (survey question 19)

- Of the 702 responses to the survey, 323 respondents identified ways in which the College of Fine Arts could improve the campus climate for diversity.
- Respondents identified a wide range of ideas for improving the campus climate for diversity including recruiting and retaining a more diverse faculty, staff, and student body; becoming a model of excellence by valuing and articulating the benefits of diversity; committing resources and support to diversity initiatives and best practices; establishing a more inclusive and diverse working and learning environment; and increasing interdisciplinary collaborations with others within the college, university, and community.
- In addition, some respondents recommended deemphasizing the campus climate for diversity, while others felt the current climate was already supportive of diversity and expressed contentment.
Additional comments or thoughts not addressed elsewhere regarding diversity in the College of Fine Arts

- An additional 146 respondents expanded upon previous comments from earlier survey questions or provided feedback regarding diversity in the college not addressed elsewhere in the survey. In addition, two respondents sent feedback via e-mail that was included in the analysis.

- The majority of the respondents provided comments that were related to earlier responses in survey questions 17-19, including additional details or comments related to personally experiencing or witnessing discrimination or prejudice on campus; recruiting and retaining a more diverse faculty, staff, and student body; becoming a model of excellence by valuing and articulating the benefits of diversity; establishing a more inclusive and diverse working and learning environment; increasing interdisciplinary collaborations with others within the college, university, and community; deemphasizing the campus climate for diversity; feeling relatively content with the current climate for diversity; and noting discomfort with providing further details within the survey.

- Furthermore, several new themes emerged from the responses, including sharing appreciative comments about the opportunity to participate in the survey, communicating key definitions and overall purpose of the diversity committee, feeling that the focus should be on other college issues, identifying additional ideas or best practices for improving the climate for diversity, offering general comments about the state of diversity and/or the campus climate, and providing general observations about the survey.
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Methodology

During the spring 2012 semester, the Fine Arts Diversity Committee worked with the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement’s (DDCE) Campus Diversity and Strategic Initiatives portfolio to develop and administer the College of Fine Arts Climate Assessment. The survey was adapted from an assessment utilized by the University of Washington Evans School of Public Affairs Diversity Committee.

On April 5, 2012, all students, faculty and staff in the college (N=2676) received an e-mail invitation to participate in the 20-question survey. Those who had not yet responded received email reminders on April 24 and April 27. A total of 702 students, faculty, staff and administrators completed the survey, yielding an overall response rate of 26 percent. Because all survey questions were optional, the results for any single survey item do not add up to 702. The survey was managed electronically through the university’s Survey Station tool.

By employing both quantitative and qualitative components, the survey utilized a mixed-methods approach\textsuperscript{13} to offer a more complete picture of the college climate than would be available by using either method in isolation. Please see the appendix for the survey instrument.

Respondents for this survey voluntarily elected to participate after receiving the e-mail invitation. No rewards or inducements were offered and completing the survey was not a condition or requirement for any person. Because the sample is based on those who initially self-selected for participation rather than a probability sample, no estimates of sampling error can be calculated.

Quantitative analysis employed use of IBM SPSS Statistics, version 20.0, and Microsoft Excel. Each survey item was cross-tabulated with various demographic groups and initial chi-square tests of independence and column proportions tests were conducted to detect statistical significance. For those relationships initially identified as statistically significant, Cramer’s V was calculated to determine effect size.

The cross tabulations of survey items presented in this report (with the exception of respondent characteristics) include only categories with more than five participant entries in each cell. Categories with five or fewer participants in any single cell were excluded from this report to protect respondent confidentiality.

Some variables were recoded to facilitate greater statistical power and ease of analysis and interpretation, particularly those questions on a 5-point Likert scale. For example, several questions asked participants to select strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree or strongly disagree. For the purposes of much of this analysis, strongly agreed and agreed were often recoded together, as were disagreed and strongly disagree. Such recoded variables are noted with each table. Additionally, in three questions, participants had the option to select do not know/unable to assess. For the purposes of this analysis, these responses were not analyzed, as noted in the relevant tables.

Analysis of the qualitative responses to survey questions 17-20 occurred with an open ended coding process informed by the constant comparative method\(^{14}\) using HyperResearch, a qualitative research software program. All of the responses were reviewed multiple times before developing a preliminary search for correspondence and patterns, followed by the identification of emerging patterns and themes, which were then clustered together and given an initial coding. After subsequent rounds of coding, this process led to the development of a master-coding list with response categories. Each coding received a final review in order to verify that the findings and emerging themes were consistent with the data. For the purposes of this report, minor adjustments were made to the open-ended question responses in order to ensure identifiable information was omitted to maintain anonymity (e.g. names, specific programs) and when readability was affected (e.g. spelling, spacing, capitalization). Whenever possible, the responses were left unaltered in order to preserve the spirit of the text.

A note on demographic categories and intersectional analysis

Demographic categories used in this assessment do not always mirror the categories used for university reporting purposes and found in documents such as the Statistical Handbook. In some categories, this decision was made in an attempt to be more inclusive of lived experiences and identities. For example, students and employees are classified as female or male in university records, while in this assessment, respondents could identify as female, male and/or transgender/genderqueer. In other categories, the decision was made in order to give the dataset the greatest statistical power possible while maintaining confidentiality. For example, the university uses nine race/ethnicity categories in compliance with federal regulations, while this assessment asked respondents whether they self-identify as people of color.

Throughout this analysis, survey items are examined by various demographics and through an intersectional lens of race and gender. Accordingly, each survey item lists results by women of color, men of color, white women and white men. These four categories were constructed based on respondents’ answers to three separate questions: whether one self-identifies as female, male, and as a person of color. Additional intersectional analyses can be applied to the dataset (i.e. examining disability status and race, or socioeconomic status and sexual orientation). However, because many self-identified groups were relatively small, these analyses will lack statistical power and/or could compromise respondent confidentiality (i.e. there may be fewer than five participants in any given intersectional category).