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Introduction

In fall 2016, UMass Amherst conducted an extensive Campus Climate Survey to help the university better understand the challenges of creating a respectful and inclusive campus environment. The Campus Climate Survey Abridged Report, released in May 2017, describes the conceptual framework that guided development of the survey and communicates a portion of the results for the university’s four main populations – undergraduates, graduate students, staff, and faculty. The Abridged Report focuses primarily on compositional diversity and the psychological dimension of campus climate. Part One of this report focuses on survey results for staff that were not included in the Abridged Report, including results of questions specific to the staff version of the climate survey. Although most of Part One focuses on these staff-specific questions, it also covers additional findings related to “common core” survey questions that were asked of all four campus populations. Part One communicates results related to compositional diversity, as well as the psychological and behavioral dimensions of campus climate.

Part Two of this report focuses on the results of a qualitative study of staff responses to open-ended questions about experiences with unfair treatment and specific suggestions for change.

The Abridged Report details survey methods, efforts undertaken to maximize the response rate, response rates achieved, and how closely survey participants match target populations on key demographics. Given this report’s focus on staff, it is important here to review the response rate and the demographic representativeness of staff survey participants.

The overall participation rate for the Campus Climate Survey was a robust 41 percent, but the rate for staff was higher—49 percent (n=2731). Staff survey participants differ from the population as follows: 1) women are overrepresented (61 percent of participants versus 52 percent of the population) and men are underrepresented (39 percent versus 48 percent), 2) White staff are overrepresented (82 percent versus 74 percent), and 3) part-time staff are underrepresented (9 percent versus 13 percent). Because 17 percent (n = 475) of staff participants did not report their major work unit, representativeness on this characteristic is difficult to assess. However, among those who did report their unit, administration and finance staff are underrepresented (30 percent of survey participants versus 46 percent of the population). Survey participation rates for staff by executive area are included in the Campus Climate Unit Reports.

[link to Abridged Report]
[link to Unit Reports]
Part One: Quantitative Analyses

Considering Context

Because this section focuses on survey questions specific to staff, it is important first to consider some distinctive aspects of the campus context for this population. Second to the undergraduate population in size, staff constitute approximately 17 percent (N = 5,620) of the total campus community. There are more than three times as many staff as faculty at UMass Amherst.

One of the most distinctive aspects of the campus context for staff is the heterogeneity of organizational roles. Staff members include groundskeepers, chefs, office managers, residence directors, administrators, academic advisors, maintainers, coaches, information technology specialists, police officers, procurement specialists, personnel officers, administrative assistants, engineers, and electricians—to name a small fraction of the myriad staff positions.

University staff are represented by several collective bargaining units, and compensation levels vary substantially by position type. In some work contexts, formal and informal hierarchies based on position, education level, and socioeconomic status can be a source of tension and division among staff.

Year-round employment is another distinctive aspect of the campus context for most staff. Whereas most faculty have nine-month contracts, the vast majority of staff are contracted to work throughout the full calendar year. A related aspect is that most staff are required to work regularly scheduled hours on campus (whereas most faculty have substantially more flexibility about when and where they do their work). Although most staff work standard daytime hours, many of those engaged in service work—including custodial staff, police, and dining services staff—work weekends and evening and/or overnight shifts. A few hundred staff members are university-designated “essential employees” who must report to work even when the campus is officially closed.

Although some staff positions entail routine movement about campus (e.g. police officers, groundskeepers, technicians), most staff work in positions that require them to spend sustained time in particular physical locations on campus. Staff who work in managerial or professional positions (about one-third of all staff) are typically assigned an individual office, but the vast majority of staff work in more communal settings that afford limited personal space and privacy. Some staff members venture out of their immediate work location quite routinely to attend meetings, but others’ spheres of movement are much more constrained. The day-to-day work of most staff members entails considerable interaction with other staff members on their work team or in their office or unit.

Given that the campus context for most staff work is both continuous and place-bound, this population may be more invested than others in striving to develop, foster, and sustain a campus climate of mutual respect and inclusion.
Who We Are: Additional Aspects of Compositional Diversity

The Campus Climate Survey Abridged Report highlights data illustrating the compositional diversity of staff survey participants, including race/ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, religious identity, age, English first-language status, and military status. The climate survey gathered additional data pertaining to the demographic characteristics of staff, including major work unit, position type, length of university employment, supervisory status, full- or part-time status, and permanent or temporary/seasonal worker status. These data – including some intersections of these particular characteristics – are included here.

Because the staff survey was conducted anonymously, data pertaining to major work unit and position reflects only the self-reports of survey participants. Figure 1 shows the distribution of staff survey participants across the university’s executive area units, which vary considerably in size.

Slightly more than one-quarter of staff survey participants indicated that they work in Academic Affairs (AA) – either in a college or school or in another unit. Altogether, AA employs 45 percent of the university’s 1,748 professional staff and 57 percent of its 858 administrative support staff. Slightly more than one-quarter of staff indicated that they work in Administration & Finance (A&F), the unit that includes both Facilities and Campus Services (e.g. Physical Plant, Transportation Services) and Auxiliary Enterprises (e.g. Dining Services, Campus Center). A&F employs approximately three-quarters of the university’s 1,685 service and maintenance workers. Eleven percent of survey participants indicated that they work in Student Affairs & Campus Life (SACL) – the only other major work unit comprised of several hundred employees. SACL employs 26 percent of the university’s skilled crafts staff, 12 percent of its professional staff, and 11 percent of its service and maintenance workers.

Figure 1: Executive area affiliation

- Administration & Finance (A&F) (n=676): 26%
- Academic Affairs -- in a College or School (n=468): 18%
- Student Affairs & Campus Life (SACL) (n=296): 11%
- Academic Affairs -- in another unit type (n=206): 8%
- Information Services & Strategy (IT) (n=174): 7%
- Research & Engagement (R&E) (n=175): 7%
- Athletics (n=88): 3%
- Development & Alumni Relations (n=77): 3%
- University Relations (n=60): 2%
- Chancellor’s Area (n=36): 3%
- Other (n=315): 12%
- I’m not sure (n=70): 3%
Figure 2 shows the intersection of executive area (ordered by size) and gender (for women and men). As illustrated, the gender distribution is least balanced in Academic Affairs. (Note: the numbers of trans or genderqueer staff, and staff of another gender identity, are too small to include for intersections).

**Figure 2: Intersection of major work unit and gender**

![Bar chart showing gender distribution by major work unit.]

Figure 3 shows the intersection of work position and gender for men and women staff survey participants. As illustrated, the distribution of women and men is most unbalanced within the category of administrative support positions.

**Figure 3: Intersection of work position and gender**

![Pie chart showing work position and gender distribution.]

I'm not sure
Figure 4 shows the intersection of work position and race/ethnicity for staff survey participants. As illustrated, staff who are not ALANA are more likely than ALANA staff to be in administrative support positions, managerial positions, or professional positions. ALANA staff are much more likely to be in maintenance positions than staff who are not ALANA.

![Figure 4: Intersection of work position and race/ethnicity](image)

Figure 5 shows that one-quarter of staff survey participants have worked at the university for fewer than three years, and 55 percent have worked at the university for 10 years or fewer.

![Figure 5: Years employed at UMass Amherst](image)
Figure 6 shows percentages of staff who supervise others, are employed temporarily or seasonally, and are employed part-time, broken down by race/ethnicity. As illustrated, ALANA staff and staff who are not ALANA are about equally likely to work part time. However, staff who are not ALANA are more likely than ALANA staff to work in a supervisory capacity. Also, ALANA staff are much more likely than staff who are not ALANA to work in a temporary or seasonal capacity.

**Figure 6: Supervisory, temporary/seasonal, and part-time status, by race/ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervise other employees</th>
<th>Temporary or seasonal worker</th>
<th>Part-time worker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALANA</td>
<td>Not-ALANA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58% 10% 9%
Perceptions of Immediate Work Environment

The staff version of the Campus Climate Survey included a set of eight Likert-type items (agree/disagree) aimed at gauging their perceptions of their immediate work environment. Figure 7 illustrates staff responses to each of these individual items and shows that the vast majority are clear on their role and responsibilities, perceive that people care about them, and feel appreciated. However, Figure 7 also shows that more than one-third of staff disagreed (either somewhat or strongly) that they are “encouraged to grow” in their current work position, and nearly one-third disagreed (either somewhat or strongly) that they have the resources they need to do well.

**Figure 7: Quality of work environment**

(responses to 8 individual items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am encouraged to grow in my position.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources I need to do well.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences among people are valued.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a spirit of cooperation.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities to do what I do best.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel appreciated.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People seem to care about me.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am clear on my role and responsibilities.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To facilitate intergroup comparisons, responses to all eight of the items pertaining to immediate work environment were combined as a composite measure of work environment quality. Figure 8 shows that ratings of work environment quality vary somewhat by length of employment.

Figure 9 shows that work environment quality ratings do not vary by race/ethnicity (ALANA/Not-ALANA) or work position. However, staff who identified as another gender had a lower mean score (2.72) on this measure than did women staff (2.96) or men staff (2.95). Figure 9 also shows that staff ratings of work environment quality varied somewhat by major work unit.
Figure 8: Mean ratings of work environment quality by length of employment

- Less than 3 years: 3.1
- 3 to 10 years: 2.91
- 11 to 20 years: 2.84
- More than 20 years: 2.93

Figure 9: Quality of work environment by race/ethnicity, gender, job type, and work unit

- Overall: 2.95
- ALANA: 2.92
- Not-ALANA: 2.95
- Man: 2.94
- Woman: 2.96
- Another Gender: 2.70
- Administrative Support: 2.88
- Maintenance or Service: 2.94
- Managerial, Administrative, or Executive: 3.02
- Professional: 2.96
- Skilled Crafts or Technical: 2.88
- Other: 3.02
- Academic Affairs -- in a College or School: 3.05
- Academic Affairs -- in another unit type: 3.03
- Administration & Finance (A&F): 2.83
- Athletics: 2.91
- Chancellor’s Area: 3.23
- Development & Alumni Relations: 2.96
- Information Services & Strategy (IT): 2.80
- Research & Engagement (R&E): 3.15
- Student Affairs & Campus Life (SAACL): 2.86
- University Relations: 2.98
- Other: 2.96
- I’m not sure: 2.97

Overall mean: 2.95, Std. Dev.: .66
Likelihood of Recommending UMass Amherst to Others

Overall, the vast majority of staff indicated that they are somewhat likely (40 percent) or very likely (45 percent) to recommend UMass Amherst to others as a good place to work as a staff member. Figure 10 shows that responses to this question do not vary by race/ethnicity and vary only slightly by gender.

Across all executive areas, most staff indicated that they are likely to recommend UMass Amherst to others; however, IT staff were most likely to indicate that they would be unlikely to recommend UMass Amherst to others.

**Figure 10: How likely or unlikely are you to recommend UMass Amherst to others as a good place to work as a staff member?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>45%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALANA</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-ALANA</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Gender</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Academic Affairs -- in a College or School | 8% | 39% | 50% |
| Academic Affairs -- in another unit type | 11% | 37% | 49% |
| Administration & Finance (A&F) | 12% | 41% | 43% |
| Athletics | 14% | 45% | 38% |
| Chancellor’s Area | 6% | 34% | 57% |
| Development & Alumni Relations | 9% | 35% | 53% |
| Information Services & Strategy (IT) | 10% | 15% | 36% | 39% |
| Research & Engagement (R&E) | 9% | 39% | 51% |
| Student Affairs & Campus Life (SACL) | 6% | 13% | 43% | 39% |
| University Relations | 7% | 7% | 43% | 43% |
| Other | 10% | 45% | 42% |
| I’m not sure | 6% | 10% | 40% | 44% |
The *Abridged Report* revealed that, for staff, sense of belonging at UMass Amherst varies by social identity (see page 11). Figure 11 illustrates that likelihood of recommending UMass Amherst varies substantially by sense of belonging. Staff with a high sense of belonging (“to a great extent”) were much more likely to report being “very likely” to recommend the university than those who feel like they belong only “to some extent.” Not surprisingly, a majority of staff who do not feel like they belong indicated that they would be “very unlikely” or “somewhat unlikely” to recommend UMass Amherst to others.

**Figure 11: Likelihood of recommending UMass Amherst by sense of belonging**

- **To a great extent (n=982)**
  - Very Unlikely: 22%
  - Somewhat Unlikely: 74%
  - Somewhat Likely: 55%
  - Very Likely: 29%
- **To some extent (n=1341)**
  - Very Unlikely: 13%
  - Somewhat Unlikely: 55%
  - Somewhat Likely: 29%
- **Not at all (n=205)**
  - Very Unlikely: 35%
  - Somewhat Unlikely: 27%
  - Somewhat Likely: 10%
  - Very Likely: 27%

Very Unlikely  | Somewhat Unlikely  | Somewhat Likely  | Very Likely
Mistreatment & Supervisor Attention

The staff version of the Campus Climate Survey included a question that asked staff how often they experience mistreatment in their job. Figure 12 shows responses to this question by race/ethnicity, gender, job type, and work unit.

As illustrated, more than one-third of staff overall indicated that they experience mistreatment either “sometimes” or “often.” Rates of experiencing unfair treatment varied slightly by race/ethnicity, gender, and position type. However, rates of experiencing mistreatment varied most considerably by executive area, with rates highest in A&F, IT, and SACL.

Figure 12: How often staff experience mistreatment in their job
The staff version of the climate survey included a question about supervisor attention to workplace behavior. Figure 13 shows that slightly more than one-half of staff perceived that their supervisor pays attention to how people are treated “to a great extent” or “to a very great extent.” One-fifth of staff indicated that their supervisor pays attention to worker treatment “to a little extent” or “to a very little extent.” Staff perceptions of their supervisor’s attentiveness did not vary by race/ethnicity or gender.

Figure 13: To what extent does your supervisor pay attention to how people in your workplace are treated?
Impact of Unfair Treatment

The Campus Climate Survey Abridged Report includes survey results regarding staff experiences with unfair treatment on the basis of nine different aspects of social identity. All staff who reported having experienced unfair treatment during the fall 2016 semester (55 percent of staff overall) were asked a related pair of questions about the potential impact of unfair treatment on their job.

Figure 14 shows percentages of all survey participants who indicated that unfair treatment has negatively affected their job, broken out by race/ethnicity, gender, job type, and work unit. Overall, one-fifth of staff indicated that unfair treatment has negatively impacted their job.

As illustrated, the percentage of staff who indicated that unfair treatment has negatively impacted their job varies slightly by race/ethnicity and position type. However, the percentage varies considerably by gender and by executive area. Staff of another gender were much more likely than both women and men to indicate that unfair treatment has negatively affected their job. Staff in SACL and Academic Affairs (unit type other than college/school) were more likely than staff in other executive areas to indicate that unfair treatment has negatively affected their job.
Figure 15 shows the percent of all staff who indicated that particular aspects of their work have been negatively affected by unfair treatment. Slightly more than one-tenth of all staff indicated that their work environment has been negatively impacted, and one-tenth indicated that opportunity for promotion has been negatively affected. Nearly one-tenth indicated that their productivity has been negatively affected, and an identical percentage indicated that their ability to work with others has been negatively impacted. Analyses revealed minimal variation by race/ethnicity or gender.

**Figure 15: What aspects of your work have been affected?**
(% of all staff)

- Work environment: 14%
- Opportunity for promotion: 10%
- Productivity: 9%
- Ability to work with others: 9%
- Timely completion of tasks: 5%
- Attendance: 4%
- Other: 3%
Use of University Resources to Address Unfair Treatment

The *Abridged Report* includes survey results regarding experiences with unfair treatment on the basis of nine different aspects of social identity. All staff were asked a related question about their personal use of each of five university resources to address unfair treatment in the workplace. Figure 16 shows that union processes and the Faculty & Staff Assistance Program are the resources most likely to have been used by staff.

**Figure 16: Have you used any of these University resources to address an issue of unfair treatment in your workplace in the last five years?**

![Bar chart showing resource usage](chart.png)

Figure 16 shows percentages of staff who used at least one university resource to address an issue of unfair treatment in the last five years, broken down by race/ethnicity, gender, position type, and executive area. As illustrated, percentages are very similar by race/ethnicity and by position type. Although men and women were nearly equally likely to have used a resource, staff of another gender were more likely to have done so. Percentages of staff who used at least one resource to address unfair treatment were comparable across most executive areas, but were somewhat higher in SACL and University Relations.
Figure 17: Used at least one university resource to address an issue of unfair treatment in the workplace (in the last five years), by race/ethnicity, gender, position type, and executive area

- ALANA: 29%
- Not-ALANA: 27%
- Man: 26%
- Woman: 28%
- Another Gender: 36%
- Administrative Support: 30%
- Maintenance or Service: 31%
- Managerial, Administrative, or Executive: 26%
- Professional: 27%
- Skilled Crafts or Technical: 25%
- Other: 17%
- Academic Affairs -- in a College or School: 28%
- Academic Affairs -- in another unit type: 28%
- Administration & Finance (A&F): 27%
- Athletics: 22%
- Chancellor's Area: 31%
- Development & Alumni Relations: 27%
- Information Services & Strategy (IT): 30%
- Research & Engagement (R&E): 13%
- Student Affairs & Campus Life (SACL): 38%
- University Relations: 35%
- Other: 25%
- I'm not sure: 16%
Staff who indicated having used a university resource to address an issue of unfair treatment in their workplace were asked a follow-up question about perceived effectiveness of the response to their problem. Figure 18 shows that one-half of staff who had used a resource perceived the response to be “not too effective” or “not at all effective.”

Figure 18: From your perspective, how effective was the response to your problem?

- Very Effective: 20%
- Somewhat Effective: 34%
- Not too Effective: 30%
- Not at all Effective: 17%

Staff who responded to the question about effectiveness (n=733) were invited to elucidate their response via a follow-up, open-ended question. Among staff who rated the response to their problem as “not too effective” or “not at all effective,” the most common theme – overwhelmingly — was that “nothing happened” in response to their seeking recourse. For example, one staff member commented, “Nothing happens . . . They say things will change, but nothing has changed in 5 years.” Another shared, “NOTHING was accomplished except to have a venue to air my concerns.” Another commented, “No action could be taken by the union on the person I reported for harassment. There were other incidents reported over the years to the union about this same individual, but nothing came of it.” One staff member perceived that “resources are designed to give employees information, but they are not designed to assist employees to take action against people or processes that are discriminatory. The response from staff in these organizations is generally ‘We feel your pain, but there’s really nothing we can do about it.’” Several staff members who sought recourse for a problem reported having been advised “not to make waves,” to “suck it up and keep [their] mouth shut,” or to leave their current position.

A second main theme evident in staff members’ comments was lack of response and follow-through. Staff members who sought help reported that the office or service failed to return their call(s) or failed to follow up with them. For example, one staff member shared, “I brought each of these incidents to union members who promised to assist me. I was never assisted, nor did anyone ever follow up with me, even after email inquiries.” Another staff member reported that the Ombuds Office “collected information, but never followed up, never made a plan, and I never heard from them again . . .” Another staff member’s appraisal was that, “Things get lost in a big hole here.”
A third main theme was lack of timeliness of response, follow-through, and/or resolution. For example, one staff member commented, “I have filed a grievance against my boss and am currently waiting over two months now and have not been scheduled for a meeting yet.” Another observed, “It takes an incredibly long time for things to be investigated by EOD and Workplace Bullying. If someone feels that there is sexual harassment or racial discrimination in the workplace . . . they should not have to wait months for something to be done.” Another shared, “Our department has been in process with a personnel issue with an EO&D issue for nearly two years and it is still not resolved.”

The comments of staff who perceived the response to their problem to be somewhat or very effective revealed two common themes: acknowledgement of help or support received and effective problem resolution.

Some employees highlighted the helpfulness or supportiveness of particular offices or services in addressing their problem. For example, one employee commented, “The Faculty and Staff Assistance Office provided useful consultation on how to deal with a situation where a staff member felt she was being unfairly treated because of her rank and race.” Another lauded the Ombuds Office for its “excellent service and professional staff.” Another noted, “The union was VERY helpful in addressing a bullying issue.”

Some staff indicated that the problem that they sought help with was resolved effectively. For example, one staff member commented, “The union was able to clarify the process, which prior to inquiry was unknown. They helped resolve the problem completely!” Another staff member commented, “EO&D response and support provided the institutional backing, information, knowledge, and training necessary not only to provide a solution to the problem, but ongoing training and support to effectively create the environment necessary for civility and inclusion.”

It is important to acknowledge that the comments of staff who perceived the response to their problem to be somewhat or very effective reveal pervasive ambivalence. For example, some staff members noted helpfulness on the part of the campus resource they used, but also acknowledged that little or nothing could be done to resolve their problem. Several others highlighted the effectiveness of a particular office or service as well as the ineffectiveness of another. And some staff members referenced negative aspects of processes that were ultimately effective, such as a lack of timeliness and/or stressful dynamics. One staff member commented, “I went to the FSAP and the person was nice but I think it wasn’t clear what they could do to help me except listen. Listening is good, it made me feel less alone with my problem, but it couldn’t change the problem itself.” In a somewhat different vein, another staff member shared, “[I] am noting the response was somewhat effective – as it seemed the problem escalated to a level that should have been managed and resolved at a lower level. It took over a year to resolve and was highly stressful over the course of time.”
Experiences with Unfair Treatment: Additional Insights

Up to this point, the report has focused mainly on Campus Climate Survey questions particular to staff. The last four sections of Part One of this report highlight staff responses to questions that were part of the survey’s “common core” items directed to all four main campus populations.

The climate survey queried staff about their experiences with unfair treatment during the fall 2016 semester based on 12 specific aspects of social identity (see Abridged Report, p. 45). Figure 19 shows that overall, slightly more than two-fifths of staff did not report experiencing any type of social identity-based unfair treatment during fall 2016, whereas approximately one-fifth experienced four or more different types. Figure 20 shows that mean campus climate ratings are highest for those who did not experience social identity-based unfair treatment and lowest for those who experienced four or more different types.

Figure 19: Cumulative types of unfair treatment experienced during fall 2016

Figure 20: Perception of campus climate by cumulative types of unfair treatment experienced
The *Abridged Report* revealed that the most prevalent types of unfair treatment reported by staff were unfair treatment on the basis of job level, status, or rank; unfair treatment on the basis of gender; and unfair treatment on the basis of age. Here, we focus on these specific types of unfair treatment and intersections of position type, gender, age, and race/ethnicity.

Figure 21 shows that percentages of women and men who reported experiencing unfair treatment on the basis of job level during fall 2016 are comparable among staff in administrative support positions or in skilled crafts or technical positions. Among staff in maintenance or service positions, men were more likely than women to indicate unfair treatment on the basis of job level. In contrast, women in managerial or professional positions were more likely than their men counterparts to report having experienced unfair treatment on the basis of job level.

**Figure 21: Experienced unfair treatment on the basis of job level, status, or rank, by position and gender**

![Bar chart showing percentages of staff experiencing unfair treatment by position and gender.](chart)

Figure 22 illustrates percentages of staff who reported experiencing unfair treatment on the basis of job level during fall 2016, broken down by position type and race/ethnicity. Among staff in administrative support positions, maintenance or service positions, and skilled crafts or technical positions, ALANA staff and staff who are not ALANA were about equally likely to have reported experiencing unfair treatment on the basis of job level. However, among staff in managerial and professional positions, ALANA staff were more likely than staff who are not ALANA to have reported having experienced unfair treatment on the basis of job level.
Figure 22: Experienced unfair treatment on the basis of job level, status, or rank, by position and race/ethnicity

Figure 23 shows percentages of staff who reported experiencing unfair treatment on the basis of gender during fall 2016, broken down by gender and position. As illustrated, women who work in managerial positions, professional positions, and skilled crafts or technical positions were much more likely than their men counterparts to indicate having experienced gender-based unfair treatment.

Figure 24 shows percentages of staff who reported experiencing unfair treatment on the basis of age during fall 2016, broken down by age and gender. As illustrated, in all but the middle two age categories, women were more likely than men to report having experienced age-based unfair treatment.
Figure 23: Experienced unfair treatment on the basis of gender, by gender and position

![Bar chart showing experienced unfair treatment on the basis of gender and position.](chart1.png)

- Overall: 17% Man, 32% Woman
- Administrative Support: 24% Man, 25% Woman
- Maintenance or Service: 25% Man, 29% Woman
- Managerial, Administrative, or Executive: 16% Man, 35% Woman
- Professional: 13% Man, 36% Woman
- Skilled Crafts or Technical: 13% Man, 36% Woman

Figure 24: Experienced unfair treatment on the basis of age, by age and gender
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- Overall: 22% Man, 26% Woman
- 24 or younger: 26% Man, 35% Woman
- 25 to 34: 35% Man, 35% Woman
- 35 to 44: 35% Man, 22% Woman
- 45 to 54: 20% Man, 19% Woman
- 55 to 64: 20% Man, 22% Woman
- 65 or older: 30% Man, 17% Woman
Negative Remarks Related to Social Identity

The climate survey asked participants to indicate how often they hear (or see) negative remarks or comments related to social identity in a variety of settings. Figure 25 shows that very small percentages of staff indicated that they hear such negative remarks “often.” Staff are most likely to hear negative remarks in public spaces outdoors on campus or in their immediate work environment. More than one-third of staff indicated that they encounter negative remarks or comments on social media, and slightly more than one-fifth indicated that they hear (or see) negative remarks in administrative offices. More than one-quarter of staff members indicated that they encounter negative remarks in downtown Amherst.

Figure 25: How often staff members hear (or see) negative remarks or comments related to social identities in particular locations

- Public spaces outdoors on-campus: 33% Sometimes, 3% Often
- Immediate work environment: 29% Sometimes, 4% Often
- Social media related to people at UMass: 21% Sometimes, 6% Often
- Administrative offices: 21% Sometimes
- Dining Commons or retail dining: 14% Sometimes, 3% Often
- Sports venues: 14% Sometimes
- On the bus: 11% Sometimes
- Residence halls: 9% Sometimes
- Online campus communications: 8% Sometimes
- Off-campus housing/apartments: 8% Sometimes
- Libraries: 8% Sometimes
- Other campus location: 6% Sometimes
- Downtown Amherst: 25% Sometimes
Staff were asked a follow-up question about the aspects of social identity that are the targets of the negative remarks that they hear (or see). Figure 26 shows that the two most common targets identified by staff are political view and racial/ethnic identity.

Figure 26: Social identity aspects that are targets of the negative remarks

Staff who indicated that they hear or see negative remarks were asked how often they hear particular categories of people making negative remarks or comments related to social identity. Figure 27 shows that staff are most likely to hear remarks from individuals not perceived to have a university affiliation. However, approximately one-third of staff reported that they hear staff members or administrators making negative remarks either sometimes or often. Thirty percent indicated that they hear non-employee students making negative remarks either sometimes or often.

Figure 27: How often staff members hear or see negative remarks or comments made by members of particular campus populations
Perceived Impact of Campus Interactions across Social Identity Differences

One set of items asked survey participants to reflect on the interactions they have had at UMass Amherst with people whose social identities are different from their own – and to report their perceptions of how much these interactions impacted them in particular ways. In this section, we include staff responses to three of the items in this set, broken down by executive area. Each of the figures in this section is comprised of a main chart and a supplementary chart that shows the varying, and sometimes considerable, percentages of staff who indicated “no basis for judgment.” It is important to keep in mind that differences in compositional diversity and mission likely underlie some of the variation in responses.

Figure 28 shows that a vast majority of staff members perceive that their campus interactions across difference have increased their ability to work effectively with other people either “some” or “quite a bit.” Athletics staff were more likely than staff in other areas to respond to this question by indicating that they had “no basis for judgment.”

**Figure 28: How much interactions across difference have increased staff members’ ability to work effectively with others**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Area</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>No Basis for Judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs -- in a College or School</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs -- in another unit type</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Finance (A&amp;F)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor’s Area</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development &amp; Alumni Relations</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services &amp; Strategy (IT)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Engagement (R&amp;E)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs &amp; Campus Life (SACL)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Relations</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m not sure</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A vast majority of staff – across all executive areas – perceive that their campus interactions across difference have helped them be more thoughtful about their use of language pertaining to social identity either “some” or “quite a bit” (see Figure 29). Athletics staff were more likely than staff in other areas to respond to this question by indicating that they had “no basis for judgment.”

**Figure 29: How much interactions across difference have helped staff members be more thoughtful about their use of language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>36%</th>
<th>47%</th>
<th>15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs -- in a College or School</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs -- in another unit type</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Finance (A&amp;F)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's Area</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development &amp; Alumni Relations</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services &amp; Strategy (IT)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Engagement (R&amp;E)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs &amp; Campus Life (SACL)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Relations</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m not sure</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 30 shows that a vast majority of staff – across all executive areas – perceive that their campus interactions across difference have helped them recognize biases that affect their own thinking either “some” or “quite a bit.”

**Figure 30: How much interactions across difference have helped staff members recognize biases that affect their own thinking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>No Basis for Judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs -- in a College or School</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs -- in another unit type</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Finance (A&amp;F)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor’s Area</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development &amp; Alumni Relations</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services &amp; Strategy (IT)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Engagement (R&amp;E)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs &amp; Campus Life (SACL)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Relations</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m not sure</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions of Commitment to Inclusion

Staff were asked to report their perceptions of commitment to inclusion—both on an institutional level (Figure 31) and among those they work with most closely (Figure 32).

Figure 31 shows that a vast majority of staff members across race/ethnicity, gender identities, and executive area affiliations perceive that UMass Amherst as an institution is either somewhat or very committed to inclusion. Differences by race/ethnicity, gender, and executive area are negligible.

Figure 31: How committed or uncommitted to inclusion is UMass as an institution?
Figure 32 shows that a vast majority of staff members across race/ethnicity and gender identities, and executive area affiliations, perceive that the people with whom they work most directly with are somewhat or very committed to inclusion. Differences by race/ethnicity and position type are negligible, but some modest differences exist by gender identity and by executive area.

**Figure 32: How committed or uncommitted to inclusion are those you work with most directly?**
Part Two: Qualitative Analyses

Background and Methods

This section presents results of a qualitative analysis of staff survey participants’ responses to the climate survey’s open-ended questions. Analysis of these rich and extensive comments (2,066 total comments from 1,333 staff members) provides a nuanced description and understanding of the experiences of staff at the university and reveals common themes in their suggestions for how to make UMass Amherst more welcoming and inclusive.

The qualitative data analysis team was comprised of three researchers who each assumed primary responsibility for coding the data of a specific population or populations (undergraduates, graduate students, staff, and faculty). The team used NVivo™ software to code and analyze the four sets of open-ended data. Initially, each team member read through their entire set(s) of comments and identified key themes question by question. The team worked together as a group to develop an initial set of codes/themes. For example, insensitivity and bias surfaced in survey participants’ descriptions of unfair treatment, and each of these themes was designated as a code.

Next, each researcher coded all of the comments in their assigned data set(s). The data coding and analysis process was both iterative and comprehensive. The team revised the initial data coding scheme, adding specificity to or combining similar themes. Ultimately, all comments across the four data sets were coded completely. In addition, data pertaining to survey participants’ social identity characteristics (e.g. gender, position, race/ethnicity) were linked to the comments and used to run “matrix coding” to explore and identify patterns within and among subgroups. Once all of the data were coded, each team member crafted a set of question-specific memos that summarized the themes present in the set(s) of comments they analyzed. The research team discussed each of these memos and one team member initially crafted four separate narratives that each communicated the findings for a specific campus population. Thereafter, the report was reviewed by another research team, who revisited the original data and coding memos, iteratively editing the report, to ensure clarity for a broader audience.

The staff version of the climate survey included two open-ended questions that were part of the survey’s “common core” of items, and one question that was asked of staff and faculty who reported having used university resources to report unfair treatment.

The first of these questions is a follow-up posed to survey participants who reported experiencing unfair treatment on the basis of social identity during fall 2016. The wording is as follows: You indicated that you have personally experienced unfair treatment based on social identity. Please describe your experience(s) with unfair treatment – for example, the context(s) and impact on you. Note: your anonymous comments may appear in public reports exactly as
worded. Of the 1500 staff members who received this follow-up question, 707 (47 percent) provided a comment (26 percent of all staff survey participants).

The second open-ended question, which was asked of all survey participants, solicited suggestions for change. The wording of this question is as follows: From your perspective, what specific things need to change to make UMass Amherst a more welcoming and inclusive place for all? This question yielded 1,135 comments from staff (41 percent of all staff survey participants).

Lastly, staff and faculty who reported having used a university resource to address unfair treatment were asked: From your perspective, how effective was the response to your problem? Please provide any additional information that will help us to understand your response. Of the 758 staff members who received this follow-up question, 259 (34 percent) provided a comment (9 percent of all staff survey participants).

We also note that in all cases, quotations are taken from the survey. If a staff member used all capitals or had a misspelling, we left the wording as written. Where a particularly long quotation was truncated, ellipses (...) are used to signify that gap in the quotation. Finally, if within a quotation, a particular name or phrase could possibly identify the speaker or someone named in the quotation, an additional step was taken to maintain anonymity, any adaptation to the quotation is marked by brackets to signify [replacement text] that differs from the staff member’s original text.

A note on intersectional identity. Although the quantitative data presented unfair treatment by social identity singularly (e.g., race, gender, disability, etc.), in the open-ended comments staff described layered experiences of unfair treatment. All staff possess multiple social identities, across intersections of race, class background, sexuality, English language, job position, and religion. However, staff who possessed multiple marginalized identities (i.e. younger/older women who speak English as a second language) described experiences of unfair treatment of a stronger degree or intensity because their experiences represented an accumulation of unfair treatment. For example, gender was a primary social identity by which unfair treatment was illustrated, with an emphasis on women being treated with less respect and devalued. Younger women, older women, women with children, and women of lower rank, in particular, described experiences of insensitivity, disrespect, and exclusion.

Illustrating the Nature of Unfair Treatment

The primary themes that illustrate the nature of unfair treatment experienced by staff include: 1) insensitivity, 2) disrespect, 3) exclusion, and 4) hostility. In some cases, the same staff member experienced insensitivity, disrespect, and exclusion, whereas in other cases, only one
type of unfair treatment was described. Beyond describing the nature of their unfair treatment, staff also described the impact of the unfair treatment on them.

**Insensitivity.** One primary way that staff members described unfair treatment was in terms of insensitivity. Insensitivity referred to lack of regard for others, often demonstrated through inappropriate or cruel comments, or through a lack of consideration for diverse views and opinions. Insensitivity was experienced in the treatment by both other staff members and supervisors. Staff also experienced insensitivity when they thought their presence had little impact, and they were not being taken seriously.

Gender was one social identity category where insensitivity was particularly pervasive. Women staff members describe their appearance and body being commented on by others, or note they are assigned work by gender as opposed to their skills.

*Male colleagues have made comments about my body, clothing, age, or relationship status that would not be made about men. I am talked over during meetings by male colleagues, my ideas are routinely dismissed by my male colleagues, and I have been overlooked by male division leaders for leadership roles within my working unit.*

*Colleagues inappropriately commenting on my looks and/or what I am wearing in a sexually charged way.*

*Comments about my hair and the way I dress or comments about how tired/exhausted I am as a bad thing as opposed to being sensitive about how I feel.*

*I am the only woman in an area of my department in which all of the colleagues at my level are men. My supervisor on multiple occasions has referred to me as a “Girl.” Although my position has had more task variety than others’, which I appreciate, I have also been saddled with what appears to be a disproportionate amount of low-level data entry and follow-up to other people’s work, despite my having the highest level of education of anyone in my area.*

Further, gender intersected with age, so that women who are or look young recount negative interactions with colleagues who do not recognize their experience or contributions.

*There have been several times on campus where I have been disregarded due to the perceived lack of knowledge or ability due to what others have believed my age and level of experience is. I look much younger than I am, but I have nine years of experience within my current position. As a woman I have had negative interactions with older white men on campus when I have questioned policies, procedures, or provided suggestions to help them accomplish one of their goals.*

*There have been many occasions in my time at UMass that I have not been taken seriously or have been made to feel uncomfortable because of my gender and age. The*
most embarrassing and most common example is when I experience male colleagues comment on my appearance in front of an alum or donor and making jokes about why I am successful at my job.

Race was another area in which staff described experiencing insensitive treatment. Staff members of color point to how they are asked to serve on committees that aim to represent diverse perspectives. Knowing that their white colleagues are less likely to be asked to carry out such work left ALANA staff members feeling “othered” by their colleagues.

As one of the few minorities in my college, I often get asked to serve in search committees, in some cases for positions where I feel I lack real knowledge and expertise of the workings of that position. This can have an impact on the time that I have to complete my work and meet deadlines. I don't mind helping out and providing services for the college by participating in committees but sometimes it has been fairly evident that I get asked to be in many more committees than my peers who are not minorities. This reinforces a feeling that I am different, an "other."

Religion was also a basis for insensitive treatment. Staff members noted that their religious holidays are not recognized on the university calendar. For contract workers, this means they must take unpaid leave to celebrate major holidays.

I don't think I have ever been unfairly treated outright as a secular Muslim woman (I do not wear the hijab and do not pray 5 times/day), but on the other hand, I do celebrate the two main Muslim holidays. These holidays are not a regularized holiday in the system - -I have to take a day off to celebrate them, and because I am a contract employee, I don't get paid for days off.

I have been told that I had to take my head scarf off and expose my arms. After working many 8 1/2 hour shifts I was denied my last 15 minutes break and that break I needed to pray the third prayer of the day and when my shift ended the prayer time was already over.

I believe that as a place focused on inclusiveness, holding classes on the Jewish holidays of Yom Kippur and Rosh Hashanah is hypocritical. A lot of other state schools give students a day off to observe these very important holidays. Most high schools do the same.

Staff members with disabilities shared that asking for accommodations was a source of insensitive treatment, where they were critiqued or subjected to ridicule.

I also have disabilities that have been overlooked or questioned by colleagues. When I have asked for accommodations, without officially having to seek them through Disability Services, I was told there was nothing that my department was able to do for
me. I spoke to my supervisor and they gave a solution, but I didn't feel supported in the efforts by the department or other colleagues to rectify the situation thoroughly.

I have certain accommodation due to a crippling disability which I almost never use because of the negative feedback I receive from co-workers and supervisors when I try. I receive irritation from supervisors and questioned if my disability is legitimate. [There is] no confidentiality on my disability, I hear regular staff and supervisor, making jokes out it, in front of me often.

Veterans also note that they have experienced insensitive comments from colleagues who disregard their experiences as veterans.

I am a proud, self-identified veteran of our armed forces. I have had colleagues make many, inappropriate analogies regarding my work. For example, there he goes, out on the "front-linelines, dying on the battle field."

Overall, insensitivity experienced by staff members cut across many aspects of social identity. Women described having colleagues comment on their bodies, both in ways that inaccurately sexualize them and draw attention to their appearance while others described regularly being critiqued and treated poorly based on their social identity. Staff also experienced insensitive treatment on the basis of religion, disability, race, and veteran status.

Disrespect. A second prominent theme within the open-ended comments pertained to disrespect. Staff described disrespect stemming from coworkers, supervisors, or the university at large. Disrespect, much like insensitivity, took the form of demeaning or rude comments which displayed disregard for the person affected by the unfair treatment. Being devalued was a particular type of disrespect staff members experienced when they felt they were being treated as someone with less value by someone in a higher position. Many accounts of unfair treatment from staff relate to their job level, other staff members, or their status in relation to faculty members or administrators. Staff note that the hierarchical structure of the university contributes to the sense of being devalued because they perceived that the disrespectful treatment they experienced was based on their rank within the hierarchy. Thus, disrespect is the overarching theme, based on job level or position, power relations, and treatment of one another.

Both men and women note that women staff members are not accorded respect in the workplace and contend with dismissive attitudes from both coworkers and superiors. Women, at times, describe feeling marginalized through expectations to act in feminine ways by coworkers, and sense they were challenged or disciplined when they did not comply. Women staff members also describe being interrupted by coworkers and being talked down to as if they were children. Women also recount instances where ideas they suggested were ignored, but when colleagues that were men repeated the same ideas, they were praised.
Sexism is not overt, but it is clear that many of the interactions especially with senior administration have a different manner of interacting with women, even those who hold senior roles. It is a highly male dominated culture and everyone seems socialized and scared enough to not appear to be discriminatory, but it comes through in a halting passive aggressive or dismissive or condescending manner that I find completely exhausting.

As a woman, I routinely feel as though I am considered a trouble maker. As a strong woman with knowledge, experience, passion and ideas, my colleagues are not interested in collaborating with me. When questions have been asked out loud in the office workspace and no one responds with an answer, I’ve responded if I knew the answer or a resource that would provide the answer. Colleagues are then upset that I responded even though I was able to answer their question or provide a resource. I’ve heard the whispering of "she thinks she knows everything." I no longer offer an answer/resource due to the negative response when I thought I was helping. Sexism exists in my office environment (by women towards a woman). If I was a man, there wouldn’t be an issue - I’m expected to behave in "womanly" ways. I cannot pretend to be someone I am not, so I am silent most of the time.

ALANA staff members also suggest that their perspectives are overlooked, in part because of their racial identities and in ways that intersected with age.

People often mistake me for a student and speak harshly or condescendingly to me because of my age. I often feel as if I am not being given full consideration when I speak on topics that relate to race, class, or gender because I am an ALANA woman. We all have our biases, and though I feel physically safe here, I don’t feel intellectually or emotionally safe.

Throughout the staff responses, job level and position surfaced as disrespectful treatment based on hierarchy. Lower-level employees described being treated poorly by those in higher-ranked positions or having supervisors “pull rank.”

In speaking specifically to my office, there is a very clear distinction between senior-level employees and those who are not senior-level. Opinions and feedback is not welcomed which inhibits creativity, productivity and efficiency. I respect levels of authority but given the positions within the association, there should not be such a divide. This pattern is also evident with employees who have been on campus for an extended number of years. There is definitely resistance to "new" employees which is unfortunate given the talents and skills they bring to the university.

I am constantly belittled, denigrated, and verbally assaulted by others working for the University, some staff, but especially faculty members, with no recourse for complaint or resolution. It is demoralizing, destabilizing, and depressing.
Like many educational institutions, there is clearly a class hierarchy on the employees side with top administrators at the peak, faculty next, professional administrative staff next, and clerical administrative staff on the bottom.

Overall, staff identify a variety of experiences with disrespectful treatment based on job level. These experiences occur for professional staff, as well as classified staff, and include poor treatment from supervisors, members of other units, and faculty. In these instances, the use of language in particular subjected staff to condescension. The negative impact was most apparent through people leaving their jobs.

There is a clear sense that staff are considered second class citizens. I have heard faculty and administrative leaders refer to individuals as "staff lackeys."

Once my boss told me, "my department is just a bunch of kids playing in the sandbox." In the past 11 months, everyone in my department has quit due to poor management and an unpleasant work environment. I am the only employee who hasn't left yet.

Some staff members feel particularly devalued by faculty members. Professional staff note that faculty devalue their contributions, assuming that they have few skills to offer. Other staff also describe feeling marginalized, discriminated against, and devalued for their contributions. For staff who work across the university, it can be difficult when they are mistreated and are insulted by that mistreatment.

Upper level administrators and professors, especially tenured professors, make a great deal more money than the support staff "below them". It is very hierarchical. Some opportunities are not available to the staff, some doors are not open to the associates, technicians, and post-docs based on job status and academic degree. It is exclusive. There is a saying, "The administrators and tenured professors make all the money and the support staff, adjuncts, grad. students, and post-docs do all the work. There is some truth to this.

I also resent that many faculty assume that because we are staff, we are not college-educated. I can’t say that I was treated unfairly because of that, but I’ve certainly been insulted by that assumption more than once.

There is a deep class divide that is palpable on campus between faculty and staff. Even though I am very accomplished in my field, I feel as though I am a tool for faculty to use to meet their own ends. I never felt the class divide in the non profit sector, but it sure is strong in academia.

Part-time workers also note that they feel devalued and find it difficult when their hours change frequently, and therefore their wages also are unpredictable. Staff members in “03”
positions, meaning temporary, nonbenefited positions, describe that they are doing the same work, but receive lower compensation and benefits than other staff. While these positions are meant to be temporary, some describe being kept in “03” positions long-term. While some of these workers feel appreciated by their immediate coworkers, they feel deeply devalued by the university.

*I work full time, year round between 40 to 55 hours a week but receive NO BENEFITS and NO access to a UNION. I am put in the system as an 03 "temporary" employee despite the fact that I work all year... This has caused major financial stresses in my life. It makes me feel extremely undervalued.*

*Based on my experience the 03 temporary position was improperly used (renewed multiple times when a permanent position should have been hired) and procedures for when and how 03s are used should be reviewed. I was on-campus for several years... without Union representation/ protections.*

Being devalued, however, was not an experience that only those in entry- or temporary-level positions experienced, although hierarchical positions were clearly salient. Women in supervisory positions also described having to work to prove that they deserve their position and the resistance they face from their subordinates. Even though their performance reviews are more positive than those of colleagues who are men, women perceive that their male colleagues have more opportunities to move up.

*The organization in which I work discounts the work of women who have equivalent credentials as those of the men. Several male staff members are treated with respect, their work heralded, and efforts are made to promote them. Several women, at equivalent levels and credentials, are treated with disdain, are manipulated, oppressed, and paid less than their male counterparts. The impact is high levels of stress and feelings of worthlessness. Instances of bullying by males toward females are ignored and not dealt with.*

Here race and gender intersected, with Black women expressing a sentiment that suggested a layered feature to being devalued. These experiences make women feel undervalued and unappreciated.

*Black faculty/administrators, especially women, are often assumed to be less intelligent and informed than their white colleagues, regardless of their publications, awards and scholars reputation. In short, many white faculty and students routinely underestimate the achievements and potential of faculty/administrators of color, especially women.*

Women who are mothers feel that colleagues and supervisors treat them as if they are less effective workers and provide fewer support to mothers. Age was also a dimension of feeling devalued. Older employees describe feeling supervisors hoped they would leave their jobs...
when they had health challenges. Younger workers describe facing negative assumptions about their abilities and skills, or are not taken seriously by coworkers, and are not valued for their experience.

As a mother who has sole responsibility for child care (Transportation etc), in the past years, comments have been made about my being out to care for my child. Additionally, when I spoke of applying for a higher position, comments about “May not be a good idea with your situation” were made. I have also been passed up for 5+ positions on campus, the positions were given to less experienced in years. I hold a masters degree with 30+ years in budget experience. I am convinced my age was a determining factor with it brings a higher salary another dept. would have to support.

I get comments on my age a lot by a specific colleague. When I first started working at UMass, I felt respected by her but when she found out my age, she starting making comments like: "you can be my daughter" "I see you differently now". Ever since that conversation, I feel like she completely lost respect for me because she now jokes about how young I am and doesn't take me seriously whenever I need her to work with me to get something done

Being a young person I find that people around me don't value me, and when I was going through hard financial times and an illness I was talked about and felt very uncomfortable.

In some accounts, there are challenging interdepartmental dynamics. Staff members report senior staff or administrators in different departments unexpectedly pressuring their departments to change their focus or mission, or for workers to shift the focus of their work without going through their supervisor. While staff members may rely on their union and emphasize the proper chain of command when such situations arise, they lead to tense interactions and a sense that the work in their units is not valued.

An administrator in another department had a view of what my job should be and how I should be doing it. It conflicted with my form 30 and they were singling me out, because I was not doing my job the way they wanted it done; However, my supervisor was very happy with how my job was being done. In one meeting, the administrator was very unhappy and was expressing disdain; We politely asked him to get clarification ... on my job change (to the way he wanted it); That administrator failed to ... and get the job change. Interactions are still tense with this administrator, as are the interactions of many others.

Overall, the open-ended responses yielded a strong theme around disrespect, whether by coworkers or supervisors. In many of the responses, the threads of gender and age were apparent and noteworthy. Staff members referred to being devalued based on their location within the workplace hierarchy, where their position was related to how they were treated.
Staff members across positions felt their work was unnoticed and their contributions of less worth. Being devalued was especially prominent among entry-level and temporary staff, but also at supervisory levels, and intersected with gender, age, and race. Overall staff wanted the affirmation that they are effective members of the community and valued for their contributions.

**Exclusion.** A third theme from the open-ended comments pertained to exclusion. Exclusion referred to a lack of access or consideration, or being outside of the community. Exclusion pertained to promotional resources, workplace scheduling, and feeling stuck within the occupational ladder. Exclusion also pertained to assumptions about family status, national origin, and access to the campus for workers with disabilities.

Staff regularly noted how difficult they perceived it was to move up in the organization. Staff members also note that it is very difficult to earn a promotion, with some voicing that rather than being based on hard work and productivity, social networks and being “liked” by upper management plays a central role in who moves up. Moreover, staff also express anxiety about layoffs resulting from budget cuts and how they feel excluded from campus events, since attending such events might mean taking vacation time to do so.

*I have noticed that there are strong social networks and alliances that are formed and fostered outside of work (think golf leagues, social gatherings, PTO, worship communities, etc.) and these play out in the workplace with information sharing, professional support and, yes, favoritism.*

*I think I was not considered for a job opening because it was assumed because I was a woman that I would not be interested in a particular kind of work (marked as male) and because I am younger than several of the staff and a woman, it was seen as too senior of a position for me.*

Both younger and older workers suggest that they feel they are not viewed as viable candidates for promotion. Some workers describe feeling like they are being marginalized in ways that make it difficult for them to do well during their performance reviews. Women also describe feeling that men are more likely to win promotions, even if their performance is less strong, while hardworking women are less likely to have the opportunity to move up and tend to be paid less than men in similar positions. Some women note that they believe they receive unfair treatment on the idea that women with children are less committed or incapable.

*I believe sometimes in the workplace women are not as respected as men. I also believe, as a women, I am less likely to get a promotion than a man.*

*As a women who took time off during her career path to care for family I have experienced a lack of career opportunities on campus. Over the course of 10 years I have*
applied to 4-5 positions and have seen a number of those positions go to off campus applicants of less experience and age. I originally took this position so I could grow in my career--I am a UMass alum and it is hard for me to admit even now but my experience has shown that UMass promotes a culture of ageism, nepotism and discrimination based on job titles.

I have been criticized (by colleagues and supervisors) for taking full advantage of maternity leave, and for having multiple children "on the university's dime." As a young professional, I have often been assumed to not know things or to be incapable of certain skills/tasks. As a staff member with less seniority, I have been criticized for suggesting change because I don't have the experience or history in the unit to really get it.

Workers, who do not have access to parental leave, note that they are frustrated that they are not allowed the same opportunity. Staff members suggest that when they voice the need to care for family members, such as sick children, they are not viewed positively. Men also note that family status can disadvantage them; men who want to provide care may be viewed as less committed to their work. Moreover, some staff members convey that they feel that straight people with children are not expected to do evening and weekend work, leaving gay people without children “on the hook” for these events.

Management and colleagues are virtually childless, and so they often do not see the value (or need) to take time off for sick children, etc. especially for men. Men who place their children high in their lives will run into problems here.

Campus is structured in an overly heteronormative way. Being a queer person, assumptions are made about availability for various evening and weekend commitments. Straight couples with children are rarely, if ever, asked to support these initiatives first and the assumption is that my availability differs.

Another way that exclusion took form was based on national origin. Staff members describe experiencing xenophobia, even after living in the U.S. for decades, and experiences of staff members talking down to them based on their national origin, especially if English is not the first language spoken by the staff member.

Just this past week I was told that I could be deported because I'm Puerto Rican. Which shows a deep level of lack of education and knowledge around citizenship in this country. This is the first time in all my working years (and I am close to retirement), that I have had to justify my citizenship in the workplace.

I see many supervisors speak down towards many of my non american colleagues. They are treated as if they do not understand basic language as well as spoken to as if they
cannot follow basic instructions. It is very saddening to watch and honestly makes me wish I did not work with the supervisors that I work with.

Staff members describe challenges working in diverse settings, uncertain how to bridge cultural gaps. When these circumstances are evident, many staff note that it can create isolation for all involved and impact the workplace. Building understanding of diverse people and aiding their integration into the makeup of the workplace, staff note, is integral to alleviating alienation and patterns of exclusion.

Workers with disabilities describe how inaccessible the campus can be for them and how a lack of accommodations can mean that they cannot participate in campus activities. A number point to specific areas of campus that are difficult to access with mobility issues, in terms of handicapped parking, snow removal, and elevators out of service or nonexistent.

Most disturbing was the elimination of handicapped parking adjacent to Du Bois Library and the creation of such spaces a distance away (a disservice to mobility limited users and staff) and the failure to provide adequate numbers to accommodate the new occupants to the renovated South College. . . . The campus plan seems to have a blind eye to the needs of the physically handicapped; or wishes them away.

Overall, staff who noted instances of exclusion described feeling left out of the workplace culture but also left behind in the occupational mobility structure. Staff referred to social networks in the workplace that facilitated access to promotion opportunities; being excluded from those social networks was viewed as detrimental to their desired change. They also described exclusion in the form of negative treatment based on national origin and perceived citizenship status. Moreover, staff who referred to exclusion occurring in the workplace emphasized how this form of unfair treatment truly impacts the way that they can approach work, especially where resource allocation is concerned.

Hostility. A final theme within the open-ended comments pertained to hostility. Hostility was described in relation to negative experiences in the workplace to reflect claims of harassment, discrimination, or bullying or witnessing others experience those forms of unfair treatment. Further, hostility also referred to staff members feeling as though their rights as individuals were suppressed when they were not allowed to express views freely or, specifically, they experienced hostility because they viewed the institution as intolerant of politically conservative viewpoints.

A strong sentiment for staff was the experience of gender discrimination, primarily against women. Staff members across campus recount feeling that they are treated differently from men, and they must deal with harassment and discrimination because they are women.

I do feel that there is a hidden bias to promote men more often then women in certain areas of the university. There are a lot of women in leadership positions, but I do feel
that there still lingers a number of women that are getting paid less for the same job as a man.

I am aware that some men in my department make more money than some of the women who were hired before them. It feels like my boss (who is a man) is kinder to men and respects their opinion more. There have also been many comments made about my age. It feels inappropriate in a setting where we are supposed to be equals and my opinion is supposed to be as valued as theirs.

Staff often reported that the perpetrators of discriminatory behavior were supervisors or management, but this was not always the case. Discrimination also took the form of colleagues and in peer interactions and, in some cases, lower-level employees against managers.

I have experienced on several occasions negative references to my age and disability by my supervisor. Quite frankly, I feel harassed and set up to fail so as to minimize my work value in my PMP because of my age and disability.

Age-related and job level. Upper-level management has been disrespectful and bullying. The "manage up" philosophy on campus, with no checks and balances on managers, leaves too much opportunity for abuse of power. There is little effort made to make older staff members feel appreciated nor are their distinct needs addressed.

I don't want to seem overly negative. I love the work I do and the immediate team that I manage. But, to be treated like a professional and an adult would make it all so much more pleasant.

Staff members also described the experience of bullying as creating a hostile work environment.

I still hear about colleagues being bullied by supervisors. No one wants the stigma (and hassle) of reporting. Often the supervisors are in the inner circle . . . so it seems useless to report.

The workplace cultures within some areas on campus are rife with bullying, favoritism, lack of clarity, lack of respect, classism and confusion -- these areas could be impacted positively with knowledgeable, attentive and competent leadership in combination with grassroots dialog, support and training.

Over many years, I have been bullied by a co-worker (work status) and a faculty member (gender and work status). These behaviors make my workplace feel like a hostile work environment, even though I am appreciated by other faculty and staff, and the graduate students I work with.
I have been treated extremely unfairly due to socioeconomic factors and the choice that I made to be a parent. Heavy bullying is acceptable and seemingly encouraged... as long as immediate supervisors and those that are in higher rankings are clever and careful with wording and actions.

Several staff members who spoke English as their second language noted feelings of hostility:

The AFSCME union leadership has been allowed to be hateful toward anyone who is not white. They actively underrepresent people of color, staff members where English is not their primary language, and periodically demand that English be the only language anyone should speak in the work place. This behavior has been condoned for too many years by the University Human Resource Department and Labor Relations. It has contributed to a work environment that is unwelcoming towards anyone who is different and has fostered a work environment that is hostile for far too many. Intolerance, biased behavior, and hostility towards others slowly permeates the entire work culture in so many regretful and unfortunate ways.

Accounts of witnessing unfair treatment were also shared by staff, such as hearing epithets about LGBTQ people experiencing discomfort. In some cases, staff members particularly call out examples of discrimination and racial slurs against Black workers, as well as Asian and Latino/a workers, noting their experiences of oppression, bullying, and racism from supervisors, coworkers, and students. Some staff members also point to racist and sexist behavior and their observation that supervisors seem unwilling to challenge or address.

I heard comments and jokes that were racial and sexist frequently (monthly). A colleague had openly displayed articles and statements that were political and hateful towards minority groups.

I have been in the presence of staff members and students mocking "straight" people. In some instances "gay" topics and conversations are injected into conversations with the express intent of creating discomfort and/or intentionally shifting the topic.

I have observed bullying in other parts of the campus. Unfortunately, despite the mandatory workshops, staff have not seen accountability for middle managers. There is also no recourse for supervisors who are being bullied by their staff.

I've personally witnessed female employees being treated unfairly by students, staff, and faculty as they are viewed as less worthy, experienced, or capable of handling the work. This impacts me both in having to handle the situation, which makes more work, but also in following up with the people who have been disparaged to make sure they are ok.

Racial slurs have been directed at me by students on and around campus.
Thus, unfair treatment with regard to race and sexual orientation appeared pervasive, and witnessing the treatment was also impactful even if the comments were not directed at the staff who witnessed that behavior because it contributed to the sense of a hostile work environment.

Staff described experiencing two political climates on campus, one among their work unit peers and the other among students and the broader campus. Depending on their political orientation, there were challenges of working with peers and engaging with students with different political values due to a strong sense of hostility to opposing viewpoints. Staff members describe being berated and sworn at by colleagues who view them as too liberal or who did not vote as coworkers did. Working in units where they are in a distinct minority, staff detailed regularly dealing with anger, resentment, and hostile treatment by colleagues.

I am a "liberal" in an office of moderates and conservatives. I also have a bachelor's degree which the other people in my office, for the most part, do not have. There is a culture of general "resentment" toward the "educated" -- which is often acted out openly, or more commonly, covertly, in passive-aggressive behavior. There is also one person who appears to get joy in taking about people behind their backs in order to inspire "group bullying."

To profess our faith or to talk about Trump will get us physically attacked and verbally attacked by the students . . . Because we are Trump supporters doesn’t make us racists, we do not deserve this kind of treatment by the students.

I am not a liberal or a democrat and I get a very hard time from faculty that I am an independent... I feel it is an infringement on my rights that they argue with me and call me names.

Staff members described being stereotyped, for example, as “uneducated” for taking more conservative positions. Conservative staff members feel dismissed and marginalized on campus, this was particularly true for straight white men, some of whom note that they feel demonized, suggesting that other groups are more protected on campus. Staff members who are religious and conservative also express this concern. These staff members suggest that the political climate on campus leans left, which makes it difficult to feel they are part of the larger community. The clash of political positions, however, among coworkers, faculty, and students at times meant that individuals of all political leanings (liberals, moderates, and conservatives) describe feeling unwelcomed on campus. When referring to coworkers, staff members were more likely to identify the challenge as being liberal. When referring to students and faculty, staff members were more likely to identify the challenge as being conservative.
Staff members also shared that supervisors and coworkers created an environment which inhibited their religious freedom when they were hostile to atheist or agnostic staff members.

There is a lack of acceptance in some circles for people who are atheist and agnostic. There is also a lack of acceptance for people who do not go along to get along...  This is particularly true in certain parts of the sister organizations I interact with.

Overall, staff experiencing workplace hostility, whether in the form of discrimination, bullying, harassment or cultures of intolerance, all note how much this leads to negative or hostile work environments. Numerous staff members commented in witness unfair treatment and the role it played in reinforcing this negative culture and vicariously experiencing hostility can further perpetuate an environment of resentment, stress, and anguish for those employed. Whether pertaining to one’s gender, race, sexual orientation, politics, or religion, this behavior was disturbing to targets and witnesses alike.

**Recommendations for Change**

Staff members shared suggestions for change that would make UMass more welcoming and inclusive. The recommendations were wide-ranging and concentrated in these five areas: 1) administrative accountability, transparency, and action, 2) respect and recognition, 3) diversity, equity, and inclusion, 4) working conditions, 5) training, and 6) community building.

**Administrative Accountability, Transparency, and Action.** A strong sentiment for staff members was that leaders needed to be held accountable for change to occur. One primary way to do this was to address the behavior of abusive supervisors in more transparent ways. Staff members described leaders who are bullying their subordinates and leaders who overlook bullying in their units. Staff members saw routine abuses, and yet little repercussion for such behavior. As a result, many complained that the anti-bullying efforts on campus are ineffective, in part because administrators at elevated levels are involved in bullying, which legitimate such practices.

Staff members describe that there appears to be little oversight of supervisors who mistreat their staff. They suggest that if staff or others routinely file grievances or bullying complaints against a supervisor who mistreats those around them, and the supervisor loses those grievances, that supervisor should not be able to continue in a leadership position. Generally, staff members identify the importance of ensuring that immediate supervisors, faculty, and higher-level administrators do not act abusively and address abusive practices in the units they lead. Many staff ask for higher levels of accountability and clear consequences that show that leadership is serious about improving campus climate. In some cases, this means that leaders should lose their jobs.

*People who are habitually treating other people with disrespect and racial discontent need to be removed from their jobs, especially if they are in a supervisory level position.*
Some staff suggest that, too frequently, injurious behavior is addressed by a slap on the wrist. They suggest that too many leaders pay lip service to inclusion and diversity, rather than really valuing their workers and doing the right thing. These concerns relate to some leaders’ perceived focus on the financial bottom line, rather than the quality of the institution.

A number of staff members emphasized the importance of listening to the concerns of staff members (as well as faculty and students) and acting in response. Some staff members particularly emphasized the importance of focusing on the experiences of the most vulnerable groups on campus. Staff members also note that, just as supervisors provide feedback to their workers, there need to be opportunities for workers to provide feedback to supervisors (a 360 review), especially with regard to creating an inclusive environment. For example, staff members would appreciate opportunities to identify their supervisors’ weaknesses and strengths, and have this information considered when evaluating leaders.

Staff should be able to evaluate their supervisors at least annually. This feedback should be used for their annual performance evaluation.

Staff members also ask that leadership be transparent and clear in how they address equity and inclusion. This includes when leadership reorganizes areas, how they use criteria for promotions, and how they address allegations of bullying and discrimination when they arise. Many staff note that if the administration makes a promise, they should keep it. Similarly, they should acknowledge mistakes when they occur.

There needs to be bi-directional evaluations in the workplace. Administrators in our unit need to be evaluated by their staff, and this feedback needs to be transparent and problems need to be addressed. We have no structured way to provide feedback to our directors. We are insulated from having any contact with higher level administrators, so there is no way to address problems in the workplace. Administrators are not transparent, there is no clear process in which decision-making occurs.

Overall, staff members ask that leaders be held accountable and develop transparent policies aimed at ensuring that all staff members feel respected and included on campus. The accountability around supervisors who are thought to be bullies were especially salient. They also raise the issue of how leadership is evaluated and the urgency in creating workplace climates and cultures that act in accordance with diverse and inclusive missions.

Respect and Recognition. The most important change staff members suggested that the university could make would be to respect staff members for the important contributions they make to campus. Staff ask that faculty and administrators understand that the university could not work without its staff and to value and respect their work.

Many staff feel fundamentally disrespected by their supervisors, administrators, and faculty. For many staff members, this translates into feeling undervalued, unrecognized, and even
scorned by their supervisors. These complaints are made both about administrators and about faculty members. Some staff members describe leaving one unit on campus, in hopes of identifying a less demeaning environment, and being disappointed to find the same lack of recognition in their new unit. The feeling of being belittled may drive some staff members to either become less productive or leave campus altogether.

Additionally, uncovering how gender and race bias contribute subtle but pervasive barriers to promotion and recognition is a difficult undertaking, but will result in more success for more people.

Staff members note that they often feel unrecognized for the work that they do. Staff members also wish for more opportunities for highly skilled and hardworking staff members to be thanked and appreciated for their work, whether at large events like Commencement or smaller departmental or unit events. Announcing the recipients of staff awards at large events and celebrating the recipients’ work helps, but many staff convey the importance of creating additional opportunities to recognize staff work.

There is little to make UMass a welcoming place for staff at all, so this also negates inclusivity. Not much recognition for all that staff do. I’ve worked here many years, many in my division being asked to do more (due to lack of adequate staffing), lots of working hours at home without adequate compensation or any appreciation outside of our area.

Staff members particularly underscore a lack of respect toward older workers, whose experience and knowledge may be disregarded, and a lack of respect based on class or job level. Unfair class distinctions that need to be rooted out include condescension, elitism, and unfair assumptions about the backgrounds and abilities of staff members. Staff members also call for more respect for women, people of color, and staff members from other countries, as well as for disabled workers. Treating all staff members with professionalism and respect would improve the climate for staff.

Supporting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. A third prominent theme among staff members who shared recommendations was the importance of supporting diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus to make UMass more welcoming and inclusive. Staff members noted the importance of devoting more resources to ensuring that staff members are compensated fairly and that approaches to diversity and equity are fully funded.

Staff members further called for increasing diversity through hiring and promotion, both among staff members and across the university more broadly. Many wish to see better recruitment efforts and more streamlined hiring processes. Staff members also point to the importance of retaining diverse people through intentional support. Yet, they also note that staff appear to be left out of the diversity strategic plan and should be recognized as another source of diversity on campus, rather than only aimed at serving to implement diversity practices.
A better, less stereotypical approach, might be to require diversity training and allow people certified in campus diversity/inclusion practices to be on search committees within appropriate campus inclusive search protocols. We need to figure out more balanced ways to handle personnel grievances that include better support for our supervisors.

Not all staff saw diversity, equity, and inclusion as important, however, some staff members said there is too much emphasis on diversity. In some cases, staff members suggested that students are too sensitive about social identity slights and focus on oppression, rather than recognizing common experiences.

Staff members also suggested that the current efforts around diversity require all people to accept a certain perspective. These staff members also suggest that the campus only focuses on creating inclusion for people of color, or for LGBTQ people, and not acting in ways that include all workers. Some suggest that diversity training tries to “shame” participants into one way of thinking, which can create a workplace culture of hostility, something that also needs to change.

Our diversity is our strength, so let’s take the time to learn what one another does (department and office open houses on a regular basis) so that we can be stronger together.

In some cases, staff members note that while they fully support efforts around diversity and equity, they feel that these issues are more rhetorical than real. One concern that staff members voice is that the university does not really want to diversify. They hope that the efforts toward inclusivity and equity are genuine and emphasize the importance of devoting resources to show that this is truly a strong commitment. They argue that while at some levels the commitment may be there, it needs to be embraced at the highest levels, as well as by the supervisors and managers in individual units.

We need to intentionally work to make everything we do here on campus to be inclusive. We need to make sure that inclusion is part of our structure and fabric of this institution.

Some staff members suggest that the university should identify what services and resources are being used by diverse members of the community, and then invest more in those resources. Staff members worry that staff who already have full workloads see these issues “tacked on,” creating insupportable workloads. For example, they ask that the offices that support diversity be fully staffed. Others call for resources to identify how staff members can be better engaged. For example, by setting up affinity groups for staff members from underrepresented groups and their allies, these groups might be able to provide recommendations and guidance for how to make the institution more equitable.
Another key resource would be a system where staff members could report mistreatment, without fear of reprisal or retaliation. To create a truly inclusive and equitable climate, these staff members point to the need for neutral parties to consider and address abuses. In many cases, staff members note that the person to whom they would report has close personal ties to the person they wish to report.

Staff members note that the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity appear to be underfunded or ineffective at carrying out its charge. Some claim that it takes an overly bureaucratic and unusually slow approach to extremely critical issues and, thus, undercuts diversity initiatives on campus.

In addition, staff members ask that resources be expended in clarifying avenues for reporting. Many staff members describe feeling trapped and helpless and unable to seek redress for workplace bullying and other offensive and unsafe behaviors. Employees who are not covered by a union contract express the most vulnerability, but even workers with union support note that they do not have confidence that they will not face retaliation.

Overall, most staff members emphasize that by bringing resources to diversity efforts, the campus can create a more inclusive environment. This means putting resources into recruiting and retaining diverse staff, faculty, and students, but also ensuring that there are clear resources and offices to deal with unfair treatment quickly and effectively.

**Working Conditions.** Another major theme within the open-ended comments related to recommendations focused on improving working conditions, ranging from bullying to job classification and compensation. Staff members want to be treated fairly for their work and have areas staffed in ways that reflect the workload.

Some staff members report filing bullying complaints, going to HR, going to their unions, but finding it difficult to get satisfaction. Staff voice concerns that the bullying policy does not always work effectively. Staff members also note that bullying procedures do not address circumstances when supervisors are being bullied by their subordinates. Some staff feel that these processes lead them to feel like they are disposable; they also do not feel comfortable advocating for others that are bullied, for fear that they might lose their jobs or become the target.

A number of staff members note that their workplace is short-staffed, which they often attribute to the hiring process being overly long, resulting in vacancies over a long term when remaining employees are expected to pick up the slack. Others simply note that the work is poorly distributed, with some staff members carrying a much larger workload than others, or that there are too few staff members expected to carry out the workload in their unit. The leadership structure is also viewed as too top-heavy, by many staff members, who note that there are too few staff who are carrying out the work of the university and too many who are directing staff work.
Workers also describe their frustration about distinctions between classified and professional workers, and the increased benefits that professional workers have access to. Some workers note that existing job distinctions make it nearly impossible to move from classified to professional positions, even when a staff member has the requisite skills. A large number of accounts focus on the distinctions between “03” and “01” workers, emphasizing that “03” workers are underpaid, unbenefted, and treated unfairly, and that while these positions are meant to be temporary, some staff members remain in them for extended periods.

Staff members complain about the hiring process, through Human Resources, which they view as being unnecessarily bureaucratic, and makes it difficult to attract, hire, and train top-quality talent. They also point to unfair differences in how positions are graded and leveled, so that members of the same staff may do the same job but be on a different pay grade. Even when their department or supervisor attempts to equalize these jobs, they are unsuccessful, leading workers to feel mistreated. Staff members also ask for an assessment of gender pay equity. Many staff members note gender inequalities in treatment and pay and would like to see an assessment and correction of any unfair gender pay gap.

Staff members further note that promotion criteria need to be reconsidered and evaluated to ensure that workers have opportunities for promotion. Staff members suggest that certain groups, such as white men, are more likely to be viewed as worthy of promotion, leaving women and staff members of color, in dead-end jobs. Along with these concerns are requests that the campus recognize that a reliance on off-campus hires may give long-standing workers less opportunity to advance in the campus workforce. Many staff call for more effective career ladders and approaches to promotion.

Staff members also suggest that Human Resources needs to ensure that its procedures around classifying positions do not take an excessive amount of time, and that performance review processes are used properly, with formal feedback provided to workers. In this way, workers can improve and develop in their careers.

Overall, workers have a number of requests regarding compensation and opportunities for promotion and how existing procedures may result in unfair, inequitable treatment for staff members.

**Training.** A fifth prominent theme was the need for training across campus, to create a more inclusive, and more functional, environment. Staff members described the need for training focused on leaders learning better management skills; while others focused on the need for training to ensure that managers act in equitable ways.

Managers in academic institutions may have leadership training, but they may not, as when faculty members become administrators. This may mean that people have supervisory status without being aware of the basic rules around governing personnel. For example, some staff members suggest that managers should receive training or support to use inclusive practices, or
professionally develop their staff members, perhaps through peer mentoring programs. Managers and leaders could be assessed and rewarded for success.

At the same time, staff members note that managers need training in how to communicate professionally and effectively with their staff. A lack of communication from supervisors also prevents staff from performing their work efficiently and effectively. Some staff members describe how destructive it is to have a poor manager and how much time and effort it takes to “manage up.” Staff note that this is particularly problematic given the potential for unequal treatment in which some staff members may be treated unfairly by underprepared leaders.

_The workplace cultures within some areas on campus are rife with bullying, favoritism, lack of clarity, lack of respect, classism and confusion -- these areas could be impacted positively with knowledgeable, attentive and competent leadership in combination with grassroots dialog, support and training._

Some staff members suggest that trainings aimed at addressing classism, sexism, racism, ageism, ableism, and other inequalities should be required of faculty and administrators. A number of staff members point to implicit biases — including class prejudice — as shaping how people are hired and promoted.

Staff members also recommend trainings for staff members to make sure that peers work toward cultivating a more inclusive environment. While staff members note that these trainings may not influence all staff members to change, they do make the space feel less socially isolating for those who are experiencing mistreatment.

_All staff need training on social identities and inclusion. UMASS should collect more data on the social identities of staff. Additional resources need to be directed to training and responding, especially in academic areas like STEM._

Yet some staff members critique existing training, including the bullying training, as not going far enough to address the problems that exist. Staff members suggest that more opportunities for workshopping and discussing challenges, in ways that might create a more inclusive community, would be more effective than one-sided presentations.

Overall, staff members have a wide array of recommendations for how to ensure that administrators, leaders, and staff members are well trained and can create fairer and more inclusive units on campus. Staff members also raise a number of other suggestions. For example, staff note that administrators and faculty appear to need additional training to ensure that they know how to lead fairly and inclusively. They suggest changes around working conditions, including staffing, pay, benefits, and promotions. Staff members call for investing more resources in inclusion and equity, working toward creating a more inclusive community.
Community Building. A final theme among staff recommendations for change were initiatives aimed at building community. Staff members described community-building efforts that included opportunities to bring together groups of staff, students, and faculty, both in small groups and in larger forums, aimed at valuing the contributions that everyone makes. Staff members shared that by helping people feel that they are united around causes or ideas, UMass will feel more like a community. Many believe that most members of the university community do have common values and commitments to higher education.

Community events, especially those aimed at celebrating diversity or bringing diverse groups together, are one common recommendation from staff members. Staff members also suggest simply developing more social events so that people interact and get to know one another. Staff members also suggest the importance of opportunities to network, interact, and socialize with other staff, as well as with others on campus.

We all work in our little bubble...we should have more events that support each other and create spaces to see each other... we should gather for positive and celebratory events and wins!

Some staff note that one of the efforts that the campus could make to build community with staff would be to hold more events that are open to all students, staff, and faculty. They also suggest that upper administrators should be more accessible to staff, visiting workplaces and meeting the staff who carry out the work of the university.

Staff members also ask that they be provided with opportunities to get to know others on campus. For example, some staff members note that they have no reason to interact with anyone else on campus, so they don’t – but this leaves them feeling emotionally burned out and alone. Others emphasized that the lack of community creates barriers to workplace productivity, as well as a shared sense of purpose. The sentiment was that the university could be stronger if people feel connected to one another.

Staff members also suggest providing more opportunities to open dialogue. Because there has often been a culture of silence around diversity and equity, staff members suggest building opportunities to openly discuss what it means to create an inclusive environment. Many staff members suggest that interactive experiences are much better than lectures or one-sided presentations.

All in all, staff members suggest the need for more events and opportunities to get to know other staff members, leaders, and members of the campus community, as well as opportunities for dialogue about inclusivity. A smaller group of staff suggest that change is not possible, characterizing university leaders as unwilling to make real change.

Staff members note that they respect authority, but wish for more engaged communication to ensure that work units are operating effectively. In some cases, staff members remember times
when they felt more integrated and included in decision-making. They suggest that effective communication, and willingness to listen to ideas from workers who are carrying out the work, leads to positive innovations and improvements to the work and makes staff members feel trusted and capable of making good choices.

**Conclusion**

Staff accounts provide some insight into the unfair treatment staff members experience and their suggestions for how to create a more inclusive environment. Staff members experienced unfair treatment based on their social identities, job level or status, as well as their political perspectives. When they turn to change, they suggest respecting staff members, providing more resources toward inclusion, providing better compensation and opportunities for advancement, training leaders, and creating community.

There are staff members who also note that they feel satisfied with the efforts that the university has made and believe it has become a more inclusive environment. Yet, the majority of workers still see these issues as a work in progress, particularly about ensuring that staff are treated fairly on campus.