



The University of Texas at Austin
Campus Climate
Response Team

2015-2016

CAMPUS CLIMATE TREND REPORT

LEAD TEAM MEMBERS

Dr. Denny Bubrig

ASSOCIATE DEAN OF STUDENTS
OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF STUDENTS

Liz Elsen

INTERIM DIRECTOR
GENDER AND SEXUALITY CENTER

LaTonya "LT" Robinson

PROGRAM MANAGER
RESIDENCE LIFE DIVISION OF HOUSING
AND FOOD SERVICES

Ixchel Rosal

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
STUDENT DIVERSITY INITIATIVES

Dr. Audrey Sorrells

ASSOCIATE DEAN OF STUDENTS
OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF STUDENTS

Dr. Betty Jeanne Taylor

ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT
OFFICE FOR INCLUSION AND EQUITY

LIAISON TO THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR DIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Dr. Betty Jeanne Taylor

ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT
OFFICE FOR INCLUSION AND EQUITY

Executive Summary

Jointly coordinated by the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement (DDCE) and the Division of Student Affairs, the Campus Climate Response Team (CCRT) is a university-wide team that responds to reports of bias incidents affecting The University of Texas at Austin community. Launched in March 2012, the CCRT serves as a coordinated point of contact when bias incidents are reported, gathering information about the incidents and connecting students, faculty, and staff with university resources as appropriate. The team also supports campus community members when bias incidents reports are submitted, communicating with involved parties when possible and serving as a repository of information about such incidents. By connecting the university community to an array of resources, collecting data, and considering short- and long-term responses to bias incidents, the CCRT aims to foster a more welcoming, inclusive campus culture for all.

During the 2015-2016 academic year (defined as September 1, 2015-August 31, 2016), the CCRT received **194 reports regarding 104 distinct bias incidents**. This represents a **39% increase** in distinct incidents reported over the 2014-2015 academic year, during which the CCRT received reports of 75 total incidents. Awareness on campus of the CCRT and its reporting function affects the number of reports received by the team and means that raw numbers of reports and incidents must be interpreted with caution (i.e., a higher volume of incidents *reported* does not necessarily signal a higher volume of incidents *occurring*).

This report examines most of the data in two different sections: *Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports* and *Incidents with 10 or More Reports*. Separating the data in this way lends a better view of campus climate trends overall and throughout the year while still giving all data full consideration.

Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports (135 Reports, 104 Incidents)

The CCRT received reports on 104 distinct incidents tallying fewer than 10 reports each.

Roughly one quarter of reports in this category were filed anonymously, and witnesses to bias incidents were more likely to make reports than victims. Seventy percent of all incidents reported were identified as incidents that had occurred on campus. Students submitted the vast majority of reports (64%), followed by staff (22%).

More than half of 2015-2016 CCRT reports in this category cite race/ethnicity-motivated bias (59%), followed by gender (21%) and sexual orientation (18%)¹. The most prevalent type of incident in this category is online harassment (24%). Other

¹Those reporting had the opportunity to select more than one response in several areas, so percentages may total more than 100%. See the data contained in the report for more information.

common incident types are verbal harassment/slurs (19%), complaints about faculty members (19%), and complaints about offensive flyers (8%). For the first time in 2015-2016, CCRT included distribution of offensive flyers as a type of incident tracked. The most popular response or follow-up preferred by those submitting reports in this category is disciplinary action (15%), followed by policy change/reform (10%).

Given the sensitive nature of bias incidents, the CCRT responds within two business days to any report that includes valid contact information. After making initial one-on-one contact with the person who submitted the report to discuss the incident, the CCRT coordinates with the individual to direct them to the appropriate sources of support and/or coordinates with a university entity as appropriate. Examples of responses to reported incidents include continuing conversations with off-campus residence halls regarding best practices for residential communities; facilitating conversation between those who were targeted by and those who initiated an incident; and making referrals to campus resources such as the UT Austin Police Department, the Office of the Dean of Students, and the Office for Inclusion and Equity (OIE).

Incidents with 10 or More Reports (59 Reports, One Incident)

The CCRT received 59 reports pertaining to a demonstration at an event hosted by the Institute for Israel Studies of the Schusterman Center for Jewish Studies. This event accounts for 30% of all reports received by CCRT during the 2015-2016 academic year.

All reports related to the incident were submitted via the form available on the CCRT website. Fourteen percent of reports were submitted anonymously. Students provided the vast majority of reports (66%), followed by alumni (15%). The top three motivations for bias reported from this event were national origin (81%), followed by race/ethnicity (75%), and religion (63%). Approximately 22% considered citizenship a bias motivation. A plurality of respondents (37%) wished for disciplinary action against individuals involved in the incident. Other preferred responses included issuing an administrative statement (12%), promoting awareness on campus regarding the event (5%), and receiving an apology from those involved (7%). Staff affiliated with the CCRT met with faculty and student leaders involved with the event as well as those planning responses. There was a review of the incident by the OIE and the Dean of Students Office.

Preliminary Four-Year Campus Climate Trends

This report is the fourth annual UT Austin Campus Climate Trend Report released by the CCRT. When comparing CCRT report data for the 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016 academic years (excluding incidents receiving more than 10 reports), bias related to race/ethnicity is the most common type of bias identified during all three periods (46%, 42%, 42%, and 59% respectively). Reports citing gender (21%, 30%, 33%, 21%) were part of the three most common types of bias across years. While sexual orientation was in the top three types of bias for the first two years (31%, 28%), reports of sexual orientation bias in the third year (16%) dropped

to the fifth most commonly reported form of bias. However, in the fourth year, sexual orientation (16%) was again in the top three types of bias incidents reported.

During 2015-2016, for the first time, online harassment was the most commonly reported type of incident (24%). Verbal slurs were the most commonly reported type of incident across the first three years of reports (47%, 48%, 28%). For the first time in the 2014-2015 reporting year, the CCRT categorized complaints about faculty members (16%) which increased to 19 percent in the 2015-2016 report. Across all four years, students were most likely to report bias incidents (78%, 77%, 73%, 64%), and faculty, parents, and visitors were among the least likely to report bias incidents across time. Almost all reports received were filed online in all four years, although those reporting incidents are also given the option of telephoning either the Office of the Dean of Students or the OIE to file reports or set up appointments to discuss reports in person.

Given the data outlined in this report, the CCRT recognizes that bias incidents continue to negatively affect The University of Texas at Austin's campus community and that swift responses from administration and campus members can significantly influence the outcomes of such incidents. Overall, bias incidents are underreported on college campuses, and the incidents discussed herein are presumed to reflect only a fraction of all occurrences at UT Austin. The CCRT entreats all members of the campus community to take personal responsibility to help eliminate bias and hate on campus. The team is committed to sustaining and exploring new methods for promoting bias incident reporting, leveraging opportunities to provide diversity education on campus, encouraging communication between campus community members, and assessing internal processes so that the CCRT can have the greatest impact.

Contents

About the CCRT

The History of the CCRT	6
CCRT Members	7
Reporting Form and Data Collection	8
Response Process	10

2016-2016 Campus Climate Trend Data

Overview of Reports Received	11
Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports	12
Reports Received	12
Report Attributes	12
Types of Bias Reported	13
Types of Incidents Reported	14
Responses Preferred by Those Reporting	15
CCRT and Coordinated Responses	16
Incidents with 10 or More Reports	18
Reports Received	18
Speaker Event Protest	18
Report Attributes	18
Types of Bias Reported	19
Responses Preferred by Those Reporting	20
CCRT and Coordinated Responses	21
Preliminary Four-Year Campus Climate Trends	22

List of Tables

Overview of Reports Received

Table 1. Number of CCRT Reports Received, 2012-2016 11

Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports

Table 2. CCRT Reports Received, by Month, 2015-2016 12

Table 3. CCRT Report Attributes, 2015-2016 13

Table 4. Types of Bias Reported to CCRT, 2015-2016. 14

Table 5. Types of Incidents Reported to CCRT, 2015-2016 15

Table 6. Responses Preferred by Those Reporting, 2015-2016 16

Incidents with 10 or More Reports

Table 7. Total Reports Received by CCRT by Incident, 2015-2016 18

Table 8. Report Attributes, Speaker Event 19

Table 9. Type of Bias Reported to CCRT, Speaker Event 20

Table 10. Responses Preferred by Those Reporting, Speaker Event 21

About the CCRT

The History of the CCRT

In summer 2009, President William Powers Jr. requested that Vice President for Diversity and Community Engagement Gregory J. Vincent and Vice President for Student Affairs Juan C. González investigate whether the university's dispute resolution procedures were sufficient to handle any outbreaks of hateful or violent speech in a coordinated, campus-wide manner; how diversity programming on campus could be more robust; and how best to advance diversity on campus. As part of this charge, Dr. Vincent created the Campus Climate Response Work Group in fall 2009, composed of representatives from the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement (DDCE) and the Division of Student Affairs. The group's final report recommended creating a response team to ensure a more coordinated campus-wide response to incidents of bias and hate.

In spring 2011, President Powers requested that Dr. Vincent establish the Campus Climate Response Team (CCRT). Comprised of a group of staff members from across the university, the CCRT facilitates appropriate responses to campus climate incidents affecting the UT Austin community and serves as a repository for reports of bias. The team reports to the Office of the Vice President for Diversity and Community Engagement, and it is jointly coordinated through the DDCE and the Division of Student Affairs.

The primary goal of the CCRT is to create a more inclusive, welcoming campus community by connecting community members to the appropriate resources when bias incidents occur and by developing short- and long-term responses in partnership with university departments. Through the work of the CCRT, gaps in UT Austin's policies and procedures can be identified, and bias incidents can be swiftly addressed in order to foster a more welcoming and inclusive campus culture.

THE CORE FUNCTIONS OF THE CCRT INCLUDE:

- Receiving reports and coordinating responses to the reported incidents
- Supporting the individuals involved, including those targeted by the incident and those initiating the incident
- Connecting individuals with support and/or educational services that best fit their needs
- Evaluating the response process following each incident
- Coordinating, when appropriate, activities with other campus-wide entities, especially those involved with crisis management
- Exchanging information between the CCRT and staff members' departments via representatives on the team

CCRT Members

CCRT members include representatives from the DDCE, the Division of Student Affairs, the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, and University Operations. Depending upon the campus climate incident, representatives from other university offices and departments, as well as the Austin community, may be involved in the process of resolving a particular incident.

CCRT LEAD TEAM MEMBERS (2015-2016)

Dr. Denny Bubrig

Associate Dean of Students, Office of the Dean of Students

Liz Elsen

Interim Director, Gender and Sexuality Center

LaTonya “LT” Robinson

Program Manager, Residence Life, Division of Housing and Food Services

Ixchel Rosal

Executive Director, Student Diversity Initiatives

Dr. Audrey Sorrells

Associate Dean of Students, Office of the Dean of Students

Dr. Betty Jeanne Taylor

Assistant Vice President, OIE*

CCRT MEMBERS (2015-2016)

Leslie Blair

Executive Director of Communications, Community and External Relations, DDCE

Stephanie Bullick

Disabilities Services Coordinator, Services for Students with Disabilities

Brooke Bulow

Director of Communications, Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs

Dr. Kimberly Burdine

Burdine, Diversity Coordinator, Psychologist III, Counseling and Mental Health Center

Karen Chawner

Director III, Human Resource Services

* Dr. Taylor served as CCRT liaison to Dr. Gregory J. Vincent, Vice President for Diversity and Community Engagement from 2015-2016.

Edna Dominguez

Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs, Strategic Initiatives,
Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs

Brandelyn Franks-Flunder

Director, Multicultural Engagement Center, Student Diversity Initiatives, DDCE

Capt. Gonzalo Gonzalez

Executive Assistant to the Chief of Police, UT Police Department

Virginia Luehrsen

Student Affairs Specialist, Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs

Margaret Luevano

Associate Director, International Student and Scholar Services

REPORTING FORM AND DATA COLLECTION

All students, faculty, staff, alumni, and campus visitors are requested to report bias incidents, regardless of whether they experience, witness, or are informed of the incidents as a third party. These reports can be submitted online via an interactive form on the CCRT website (<http://www.utexas.edu/diversity/ccrt>), or by phone and in person with the DDCE, the Office of the Dean of Students, or the Office for Inclusion and Equity (OIE).

The data collected on the online form is as follows:

Name:

Local Address:

Phone Number:

Email Address:

* What is your association with the incident?

(please select one):

- Victim
- Witness
- Third Party
- Other

* What is your affiliation with The University of Texas at Austin?

(please select one):

- Student
- Faculty
- Staff
- Alumnus
- Parent
- Visitor
- Other

* Date of Incident (mm-dd-yyyy):

Approximate Time of Incident (if applicable):

* Did the incident occur on campus?

- Yes
- No

* Location(s) of Incident (be as specific as possible):

* Provide the facts of the incident in as much detail as possible.

Describe all comments, conduct, gestures, markings, physical injuries, property damage, etc. Identify alleged offender(s) by name and UT Austin affiliation, if known, or by physical appearance. List any possible witness(es) by name with contact information, if known, or if unknown please indicate if there were any witnesses.

* If the incident is bias-related, what is the perceived motive for the bias? Please select all that apply:

- Age
- Citizenship
- Disability
- Ethnicity/Race
- Gender
- Gender Expression
- Gender Identity
- National Origin
- Religion
- Sexual Orientation
- Veteran Status
- Unsure/Do Not Know
- Other (please specify):

Have you reported the incident to another University of Texas at Austin office (optional)?

- Yes (If so, please identify the office and person to whom you reported the incident)

- No

What response did you receive from the office to which you initially reported the incident (optional)?

What type of response would you like to see as a result of reporting this incident (optional)?

**Required Fields*

Response Process

Once a report is filed, with contact information provided by the reporting individual, the CCRT attempts to contact the reporting party within two business days. CCRT Lead Team members follow standard intake procedures to determine whether the situation, as reported, falls within the parameters of a campus climate incident and whether the incident should be referred to other response teams, such as the UT Austin Police Department, Critical Incident Response Team, Behavior Assessment Team, and Threat Assessment Team. Lead team members also determine if there is a possible violation of the university's *Institutional Rules on Student Services and Activities* or policies outlined in the General Information Catalog so that the incident may be addressed by the appropriate university entity.

If it is determined that the situation would best be managed by an entity other than the CCRT, CCRT Lead Team members partner and refer the incident to the appropriate party. For example, incidents involving individual students who have potentially violated institutional rules may be referred to Student Conduct and Academic Integrity in the Office of the Dean of Students; incidents involving student organizations engaged in possible violation of institutional rules may be forwarded to Student Activities. A case may also be referred to Division of Housing and Food Service staff if the incident involves university residence hall students. In addition, if the situation involves university faculty or staff possibly violating a university policy, the OIE responds to the reporting individual.

If it is determined that the situation is best managed by convening the broader group of university representatives that form the CCRT, a team meeting is called. The team evaluates the incident, providing when necessary:

- Coordination of responses to the reported incident
- Support and information to targeted student(s), staff, and faculty
- Support and information to student(s), staff, or faculty who initiated the incident
- Information and resources for the UT Austin community

2015-2016 Campus Climate Trend Data

OVERVIEW OF REPORTS RECEIVED

During the 2015-2016 academic year (including summer 2016), the CCRT received **194 reports regarding 104 distinct bias incidents**. This represents a **40% increase** in distinct incidents reported over the 2014-2015 academic year, during which the CCRT received reports of 75 total incidents. Awareness on campus of the CCRT and its reporting function affects the number of reports received by the team and means that raw numbers of reports and incidents must be interpreted with caution (i.e., a higher volume of incidents *reported* does not necessarily signal a higher volume of incidents *occurring*). All of the 2015-2016 reports were initially received through the online report form; no reports were made in person or by phone.

This report examines most of the data in two different sections: *Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports* and *Incidents with 10 or More Reports*. Separating the data in this way lends a better view of campus climate trends overall and throughout the year while still giving all data full consideration.

Of the 186 reports received, 57 reports pertain to a student group demonstration at an event hosted by an academic department. After excluding reports related to this event, the CCRT received a total of 129 reports on 96 distinct incidents. In the following section, *Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports*, these 96 reports are explored in greater depth. It should be noted that bias incidents are underreported on college campuses² and that this total is presumed to reflect only a fraction of all occurrences.

Table 1
NUMBER OF CCRT REPORTS RECEIVED, 2012-2016

Academic Year	Incident Type	# Reports	# Incidents
2015-2016	All reports	194	104
	Incidents with ≥10 reports	59	1
	Incidents with <10 reports	135	103
2014-2015	All reports	104	75
	Incidents with ≥10 reports	21	1
	Incidents with <10 reports	83	74
2013-2014	All reports	670	69
	Incidents with ≥10 reports	597	2
	Incidents with <10 reports	73	67
2012-2013	All reports	94	82
All years	All reports	1,062	330

²Wessler, S. L. (2004). Hate crimes and bias-motivated harassment on campus. In D. R. Karp & T. Allena (Eds.), *Restorative justice on the college campus* (pp. 194-202). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

INCIDENTS WITH FEWER THAN 10 REPORTS

REPORTS RECEIVED

Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports

In the category of incidents with fewer than 10 reports, the CCRT received 65 reports during fall 2015, 53 during spring 2016, and seventeen during summer 2016. Months with the highest number of incidents reported include November 2015 (29 reports), September 2015 (17 reports), and April 2016 (16 reports). Few bias incidents were reported during the summer and intersession. Fifteen incidents were reported multiple times, four of these were reported in multiple months.

Table 2
CCRT REPORTS RECEIVED, BY MONTH, 2015-2016
Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports

Month Reported	# Reports	% Reports	# Incidents by month
September 2015	17	10%	17
October 2015	11	8%	11
November 2015	29	21%	22
December 2015	8	6%	6
January 2016	4	3%	4
February 2016	13	10%	12
March 2016	12	9%	7
April 2016	16	12%	9
May 2016	8	6%	6
June 2016	3	2%	2
July 2016	5	4%	5
August 2016	9	7%	8
Total	135 reports		109 incidents*

Because four **distinct incidents were reported in **multiple months**, the total number of incidents shown in Table 2 is higher than the total number of distinct incidents overall. For example, one incident was reported initially in September, then once in October, and twice in November. Though it is counted as an incident in each of those three months, it is counted as only one distinct incident in the total number of incidents for 2015-2016.*

REPORT ATTRIBUTES

Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports

Although the CCRT encourages those reporting incidents to identify themselves so the team may follow up and gather additional information needed, anonymous reports are permitted because some individuals may fear retaliation or wish for the CCRT to simply have a record of an incident. All 135 of the 2015-2016 incident reports in this category were filed via the interactive form available on the CCRT website. Roughly one quarter of reports in this category were filed anonymously. Those reporting bias incidents were most willing to share their e-mail address (73%), followed by phone number (67%), and physical address (56%) as a means of contact. Seventy percent of all incidents reported were identified as having occurred on campus.

The form asks individuals to identify themselves in relation to the bias incident. Twenty-five percent of people reporting in this category self-identified as victims of an incident, while 32% identified as witnesses, and 26% identified as third parties (i.e., they heard about the incident but did not witness or personally experience it). Students provided the vast majority of reports (62%), followed by staff (22%).

Table 3
CCRT REPORT ATTRIBUTES, 2015-2016
Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports

		# Reports	% Reports
Reporting method	Reported online	135	100%
	Reported via e-mail	0	0%
	Reported via telephone	0	0%
Anonymous reporting	Reported anonymously	33	24%
Contact information	Included address	75	56%
	Included phone number	90	67%
	Included e-mail address	99	73%
Association to incident	Victim	34	25%
	Witness	46	34%
	Third party	36	27%
	Other	19	14%
Affiliation of reporter	Student	87	64%
	Faculty	4	3%
	Staff	30	22%
	Alumnus	4	3%
	Parent	1	1%
	Visitor	1	1%
	Other	8	6%
Incident location	On campus	95	70%
	Internet	30	22%
	Off Campus	40	30%
	Phone	1	1%
	Unsure/do not know	3	2%

TYPES OF BIAS REPORTED
Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports

More than half of 2015-2016 CCRT reports in this category cite race/ethnicity bias (59%), followed by gender(21%) and sexual orientation (18%), and national origin (15%). Respondents selecting “other” as the type of bias listed, among other examples, body type, mental health, political affiliation/beliefs, and social class. Respondents are given the option to report multiple forms of bias related to one incident, and many selected race/ethnicity and at least one other category, most often gender, national origin, and/or religion. Bias based on gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation tends to be reported in tandem.

Table 4
TYPES OF BIAS REPORTED TO CCRT, 2015-2016
Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports

Type of Bias	# Reports	% Reports
Race/ethnicity	79	59%
Gender	28	21%
Sexual orientation	24	18%
National origin	20	15%
Gender expression	20	15%
Other	18	13%
Religion	17	13%
Gender identity	17	13%
Unsure/do not know	11	8%
Disability	7	5%
Citizenship	5	4%
Age	5	4%
Veteran status	0	0%

Note: The CCRT form allows for more than one response to this question.

TYPES OF INCIDENTS REPORTED
Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports

On the CCRT form online, respondents are asked to provide details about the bias incident in a dialogue box. Responses are then grouped and coded by incident type. For the 2015-2016 period, the most prevalent type of incident in this category is online harassment (24%). Other common incident types in this category are verbal harassment/slurs (19%), faculty conduct (19%), student organization conduct (6%), and graffiti/vandalism (7%). Also, in 2015-2016, the CCRT included “distribution of offensive flyers” as a type of incident tracked and 8% of incidents reported fell into this category. Two percent of incidents reported were not bias related.

Examples of the types of incidents reported to CCRT include:

- Insulting and insensitive posts on social media or group chat apps pertaining to race, gender identity, or sexual orientation
- Derogatory faculty and student commentary in the classroom
- Graffiti/vandalism on and off campus based on race, religion, and/or sexual orientation
- Hostile and insensitive treatment or interaction with a campus department/unit
- Messaging by the university that is insensitive or based upon negative stereotypes
- Physical harassment/assault

- Harassment by strangers or campus community members based on perceived sexual orientation
- Slurs and verbal/physical harassment on and off campus

Table 5
TYPES OF INCIDENTS REPORTED TO CCRT, 2015-2016
Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports

Incident Type	# Reports	% Reports
Online harassment	32	24%
Verbal harassment/slurs	25	19%
Complaint about faculty member	25	19%
Complaint about student organization	8	6%
Incident not bias related	3	2%
Graffiti/vandalism	10	7%
Offensive flyer	11	8%
Complaint about staff member	6	4%
Complaint about department	13	10%
Compilation of multiple incidents	2	1%
Physical harassment	4	3%

RESPONSES PREFERRED BY THOSE REPORTING
Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports

On the CCRT reporting form, respondents are asked to indicate in a dialogue box what kind of outcome they would prefer as a result of their reports. Responses to this question were grouped and coded with one or more types of preferred responses. Because the question is optional on the CCRT report form, percentages listed below are based upon only those respondents who provided a response.

Some respondents in the category (9%) indicated that they simply wanted to inform the CCRT of the incident for the sake of reporting and/or to share information about an incident with relevant campus stakeholders. These incidents were coded as awareness/information gathering. Respondents (7%) also suggested increased and/or targeted diversity education to help prevent future occurrences of bias. Some point specifically to departments, organizations, or individuals whom they believe would benefit from this education, while others describe a need for broader social justice and diversity education across the campus community.

Other frequently preferred responses include an administrative statement from the university (17%), disciplinary action (14%), and an acknowledgment/apology from the other party involved in an incident (7%). A limited number of reports specifically requested removal of graffiti/vandalism on university grounds (5%).

Table 6
RESPONSES PREFERRED BY THOSE REPORTING, 2015-2016
Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports

Preferred Response	# Reports	% Reports
Awareness/information gathering	12	9%
Diversity education	10	7%
Administrative statement	4	3%
Disciplinary action	20	15%
Unsure	2	1%
Acknowledgment/apology from other party	4	3%
Removal of graffiti	2	1%
Policy change/reform	13	10%

Note: This field is not required in the CCRT form, so this table reflects responses received.

CCRT AND COORDINATED RESPONSES
Incidents with Fewer Than 10 Reports

In response to every CCRT report that includes at least one piece of contact information, a team member makes at least two attempts to contact the individual by telephone or e-mail, the first attempt occurring within two business days of the report. In practice, team members prefer contact by telephone since it allows for an immediate exchange and offer of support. During this initial point of contact, team members offer to speak over the phone or in person to discuss the incident further and to discuss resources.

Examples of responses coordinated by CCRT in this category include:

- Personal contact to acknowledge the report, discuss the incident, share information on CCRT processes, share available resources and services, and schedule in-person meetings
- Educational conversations/meetings with those initiating an incident regarding the intent and impact of their actions
- Sharing information with relevant campus offices and departments to make them aware of incidents
- Communication with relevant constituencies regarding incidents and the CCRT's ongoing responses
- Ongoing conversations with off-campus/private residence halls regarding best practices for residential communities
- Referrals to campus resources, services, departments, and units

Examples of the responses by campus partners as a result of CCRT reports include:

- Investigation and resolution of incidents classified as a criminal act (coordinated with UT Police Department) or university policy violation (coordinated with the Office of the Dean of Students and the OIE)
- Initiation of an informal complaint resolution process (through the OIE)
- Diversity training and education with a department's staff, student organization members, and students enrolled in a course
- Educational conversations or meetings with those initiating an incident (particularly student organizations) regarding the intent and impact of their actions, how the incident aligns with the organization's goals or mission, etc.
- Adjusting ongoing programming (such as a student leadership training series) to incorporate education about bias incidents
- Public communications (such as a statement or press release) regarding incidents
- Documentation and removal of graffiti (in cooperation with UTPD, University Operations, and/or Facilities Services)

INCIDENTS WITH 10 OR MORE REPORTS

REPORTS RECEIVED

Incidents with 10 or More Reports

The CCRT received 57 reports pertaining to a speaker event on campus. This event accounts for 31% of all reports received by the CCRT during the 2015-2016 academic year. Because of the magnitude of reports received and their potential to skew the data across the entire year, these data are examined separately.

Table 7
TOTAL REPORTS RECEIVED BY CCRT BY INCIDENT, 2015-2016

Category	# Incidents	# Reports	% Reports
Incidents with fewer than 10 reports	103	135	70%
Incidents with 10 or more reports	1	59	30%
2015-2016 Total	104	194	100%

SPEAKER EVENT PROTEST

In November 2015 a speaker event on campus, hosted by an academic unit, was interrupted by a group that included students and resulted in a confrontation.

REPORT ATTRIBUTES

Speaker Event

CCRT received 59 reports in response to the altercation. All reports related to the incident were filed via the form available on the CCRT website. Fourteen percent of reports were filed anonymously. Students provided the vast majority of reports (66%), followed by alumni (15%).

The form asks individuals to identify themselves in relation to the bias incident. Eight percent of individuals self-identified as victims of the incident, while 7% identified as third parties (i.e., they heard about the incident but did not witness or personally experience it) and 10% identified as witnesses.

Table 8
REPORT ATTRIBUTES, SPEAKER EVENT

		# Reports	% Reports
Reporting method	Reported online	59	100%
Anonymous reporting	Reported anonymously	8	14%
Association to incident	Victim	5	8%
	Witness	6	10%
	Third party	28	47%
	Other	20	34%
Affiliation of reporter	Student	39	66%
	Faculty	1	2%
	Staff	3	5%
	Parent	0	0%
	Alumnus	9	15%
	Other	7	12%
	Visitor	0	0%

TYPES OF BIAS REPORTED

Speaker Event

Respondents are given the option to report multiple biases related to one incident. Many individuals that filed reports about the party indicated national origin as a primary bias concern (81%), and many selected at least one other category. A majority (75%) of respondents also selected race/ethnicity as a bias concern. Approximately 63 percent considered religion a bias concern.

Table 9
**TYPE OF BIAS REPORTED TO CCRT,
 SPEAKER EVENT**

Type of Bias	# Reports	% Reports
National origin	48	81%
Race/ethnicity	44	75%
Religion	37	63%
Other	14	24%
Citizenship	13	22%
Age	8	14%
Veteran status	3	5%
Sexual orientation	1	1%
Unsure/do not know	1	1%
Gender identity	0	0%
Disability	0	0%
Gender	0	0%
Gender expression	0	0%
Gender identity	0	0%

Note: The CCRT form allows for more than one response to this question.

RESPONSES PREFERRED BY THOSE REPORTING *Speaker Event*

On the CCRT reporting form, respondents are asked to indicate in a dialogue box what kind of outcome they would prefer as a result of their reports. Responses to this question were grouped and coded with one or more types of preferred responses. Percentages listed below are based upon those respondents who provided a preferred response. The question is optional on the CCRT report form.

A plurality of respondents (37%) wished for disciplinary action. Other preferred responses included issuing an administrative statement (12%), promoting awareness on campus regarding the event (2%), and receiving an apology from the group that interrupted the event (7%).

Table 10
RESPONSES PREFERRED BY THOSE REPORTING,
SPEAKER EVENT

Preferred Response	# Reports	% Reports
Disciplinary action	22	37%
Administrative statement	7	12%
Awareness/information gathering	3	5%
Acknowledgment/apology from other party	4	7%
Diversity education	1	2%
Policy change/reform	2	3%
Removal of graffiti	0	0%

Note: The CCRT form allows for more than one response to this question.

CCRT AND COORDINATED RESPONSES

Incidents with 10 or More Reports

In response to every CCRT report that includes at least one piece of contact information, a team member makes at least two attempts to contact the individual by telephone or e-mail, the first attempt occurring within two business days of the report. The CCRT’s response to the speaker event reports followed this pattern.

Responses to incidents with 10 or more reports include:

- If they supplied a phone number, individuals reporting the incident received a phone call. If they only supplied an e-mail address, they received an e-mail message inviting them to contact a member of the team to discuss their report.
- In response, the CCRT worked with campus partners to coordinate appropriate activities, including providing advice and input related to public messaging from the university.
- Staff affiliated with the CCRT and the Office of the Dean of Students met with student leaders involved with the event as well as those planning additional protests or responses.
- The CCRT tracked the volume of responses to both incidents and worked with the vice president for diversity and community engagement and senior administration as the incidents and reports developed.
- Staff affiliated with the CCRT who work within the Office of the Dean of Students continued to provide information and support to all students interested in engaging this issue from a variety of perspectives.

PRELIMINARY FOUR-YEAR CAMPUS CLIMATE TRENDS

This report is the fourth annual UT Austin Campus Climate Trend Report released by the CCRT. The raw number of reports received in 2015-2016 (194 reports) increased from the number of reports in 2014-2015 (104 reports). Furthermore, the CCRT received reports of a higher number of distinct bias incidents in 2015-2016 (104 incidents) compared to 75 distinct incidents reported in 2014-2015 and 69 distinct incidents reported in 2013-2014.

When comparing CCRT report data for the 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016 academic years (excluding incidents receiving more than 10 reports), bias related to race/ethnicity is the most common type of bias identified during all four periods (46%, 42%, 42%, and 59% respectively). Reports citing gender (21%, 30%, 33%, and 21%) were part of the three most common types of bias across the years. While sexual orientation (31%, 28%) was in the top three types of bias for the first two years and dropped to the fifth most commonly reported form of bias the third year (16%), it reemerged as the third most reported bias type in 2015-2016 (18% of reports).

For the first time in the 2015-2016 reporting year, online harassment reports comprised the bulk of the reports (24%), followed by verbal slurs (19%) which had been the most commonly reported type of incident for the previous three reports.

Students were most likely to report bias incidents (78%, 77%, 73%, and 64%), while faculty, parents, and visitors to campus were among the least likely to report bias incidents across time. Almost all reports received were filed online in all four years.

To access previous Campus Climate Trend Reports, please visit <http://www.utexas.edu/diversity/campus-culture/campus-climate-response-team>.