

INTRODUCTION

As part of a series of reports generated from the Campus Climate for Diversity Survey, this report focuses on “The University as a Welcoming Environment” including students’ perceptions of how well they are treated on campus and within the community, the effort made by OSU to improve relations, and general impressions of the campus climate. The following findings relate to how men and women and how heterosexual and gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) students experience the campus. A separate report examines the same series of questions comparing differences by race/ethnicity.

Methodology

This report is generated from the Campus Climate for Diversity Survey, a comprehensive survey of the climate at OSU. The framework for the survey consisted of three categories:

1. Individual factors including demographic characteristics, the extent of contact students had with diverse populations prior to entering the University, and personal actions and beliefs regarding issues of diversity;
2. Environmental experiences including the University as a welcoming environment, the classroom environment, curriculum content and instructional methods, campus life experiences with diversity, experiences as a member of an underrepresented group, and support services;
3. Outcome perceptions including the impact of campus diversity of student learning and development, satisfaction and general impressions of campus since enrolling, and campus climate initiatives to address diversity issues.

The survey instrument was created by reviewing similar instruments from seven other schools and adapting them to Ohio State and the comprehensive nature of this study. Various members of the campus community reviewed the possible questions and offered suggestions on which questions and formats would provide the University with the most helpful data.

With the assistance of the Office of the Registrar, a stratified random sample of 4,000 Ohio State students was selected through the student database of all students at the end of winter quarter, 2000. Students who were scheduled to graduate in March or had not scheduled classes for the spring quarter were not included. African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino, and American Indian/Alaskan Native students were over sampled in order to be able to make comparisons across race/ethnicity. Because only 123 American Indian/Alaskan Native students attended Ohio State at the time of the survey, all were included in the sample.

The collection of the data was coordinated by the Office of the Registrar Testing Services. In this process, students selected were initially contacted during the first week of spring quarter by e-mail informing them that they had been selected to participate in the study. The first mailing of the survey occurred during the second week of April and a postcard reminder immediately followed. A second survey was sent at the end of the first week of May to students who had not yet responded and a final e-mail reminder was sent shortly after the second mailing of the survey. Bookstore gift certificates were offered as incentive for students to complete the survey.

A total of 1,223 surveys were received for a response rate of 30.6 %. Given the extensive length of the survey, the response rate is respectable.

Because certain racial/ethnic groups had a higher chance of selection than other members of the population and because women were more highly represented in the sample than in the population, appropriate weighting was required in order to generate accurate population representation. As such,

mathematical corrections have been made in order to bring the percentage of different racial/ethnic groups (including gender) to represent the percentage in the population. The weight can be thought of as the number of persons that each individual in the survey represents; in other words, each student's responses have been "weighted up" to represent the population totals.

Limitations

As with all survey research, this study has a number of limitations. First is the possible non-response bias and the lack of any controls for such a bias. It is possible that students who took the time to complete the survey are different from those who did not; for example, respondents may have had stronger feelings on issues surrounding diversity than non-respondents. However, the inclusion of the bookstore gift certificates may have provided the incentive for those students who otherwise would not have completed the survey to participate in the study. Second, in examining how certain groups responded to the survey, some comparisons are stronger than others. In some areas, there is low representation of certain groups. For example, students who indicated that they are gay, lesbian, or bisexual must be combined in order to make comparisons across sexual orientation. Other groups including American Indian/Alaskan Native students, international students, and students with disabilities are not highly represented. Third, all surveys are subject to potential sources of imprecision and bias which may be associated with the question wording and/or ordering and the length of the survey.

Demographics

The survey respondents had the following characteristics: (See Appendix A for a complete demographic profile)

- **GENDER:** 59.4% were female; 39.6% male, and 0.2% transgender
- **SEXUAL ORIENTATION:** 92.4% reported that they were heterosexual; 2.7%, bisexual; 1.7% gay; 0.8% lesbian; and 2.3% other/no response
- **RANK:** 72% were undergraduate students; 18.1% were graduate students; 8.3%, professional; and 1.5% non-degree. Among the undergraduate students, 11.7% were Rank 1; 17.2% Rank 2; 18.1% Rank 3; and 24% Rank 4.
- **RACE/ETHNICITY:** With regard to race/ethnicity, students responded in the following ways: (Please note that students provided multiple responses when applicable)
 - 8.7% were African American/Black
 - 3.1% were American Indian/Alaskan Native
 - 2.0% were Appalachian
 - 8.0% were Asian/Pacific Islander
 - 8.7% were Hispanic American/Latino(a)
 - 65.6% were White/Caucasian
 - 3.8% were international students
 - 2.3% responded "other"
 - In addition, 3.3% responded that they were multi-racial, and 7.4% provided multiple responses.
- **GPA:** Among the undergraduate students 2.4% had a GPA of less than a 2.0; 39.2% had between a 2.0 and a 2.9; and 52.9% had a 3.0 or above. Among, the graduate and professional students, 0.4% had less than a 2.0; 6.0% had between a 2.0 and a 2.9; and 93.6% had a 3.0 or better. Other students did not provide their GPA.
- **"HOMETOWN":** When asked where they spent most of their lives before college, 22.5% of students responded that they were from a rural area or town, 19.7% from a small city; 25.3% from a large city or metropolitan area; and 32.5% from a suburb.

FINDINGS

Students' perceptions of how they are personally treated

Students were asked three general questions about how well they felt they were treated relative to other students on campus, in their classes, and in the Columbus community. (Tables 1.0-1.2)

- Although on average women felt they are treated “about the same” on campus, in their classes and in the Columbus community, they did rate the way they are treated as significantly worse than men’s ratings in all three areas.
- There were no noticeable differences between GLB and heterosexual students when rating how they personally are treated on the OSU campus.
- However, GLB students did rate the way they are treated in their classes and in the Columbus community as being significantly worse than heterosexual students. The differences are particularly noticeable in relation to the Columbus community, with over 17% of GLB students rating the way they are treated as being either “much worse” or “worse” relative to other students.

Table 1.0: How well do you think YOU have been treated relative to all other students: ON THE OSU CAMPUS?

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Much worse (1)	0.7	0.7	0.6	1.5	0.6
Worse (2)	4.6	4.4	4.8	5.2	4.4
About the same (3)	79.8	75.4	84.4	79.5	79.9
Better (4)	11.4	14.9	7.8	10.0	11.5
Much better (5)	3.5	4.6	2.3	3.8	3.5
Average Scores	3.12	3.18	▪3.06	3.09	3.13

Table 1.1: How well do you think YOU have been treated relative to all other students: IN YOUR CLASSES?

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Much worse (1)	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	0.4
Worse (2)	4.4	4.8	4.0	2.3	4.3
About the same (3)	79.8	76.1	83.7	84.9	79.7
Better (4)	11.7	14.0	9.3	11.4	11.8
Much better (5)	3.5	4.5	2.5	0.0	3.8
Average Scores	3.13	3.17	▪3.09	♦3.06	3.14

Table 1.2: How well do you think YOU have been treated relative to all other students: IN THE COLUMBUS COMMUNITY?

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Much worse (1)	1.3	1.0	1.5	3.2	1.2
Worse (2)	5.6	6.3	4.9	14.4	5.2
About the same (3)	76.4	73.5	79.6	70.5	76.6
Better (4)	13.8	15.8	11.6	10.5	14.0
Much better (5)	2.9	3.3	2.5	1.5	3.0
Average Scores	3.11	3.14	▪3.09	♦2.93	3.13

- Statistically significant at the 99% level between men and women.
- ♦ Statistically significant at the 99% level between GLB and heterosexual students.

Students' perceptions of how students of their gender or sexual orientation are treated

With regard to how students felt members of their gender or sexual orientation are treated on campus, the average responses were less favorable for female and GLB students than the average responses for how students rated the way they individually are treated on campus (data presented in Table 1.0). (See Table 2.0 and 2.1)

- With over 17% of women responding that female students are treated either “much worse” or “worse,” women rated the treatment of members of their gender as being significantly worse than how men rated their treatment.
- Over 55% of GLB students responded that students of their sexual orientation are treated either “much worse” or “worse” relative to other students on campus. Their average score, a score that is significantly different than heterosexual students' average response, indicates that as a group they feel they are treated “worse” than other students.

Table 2.0: How well do you think students of YOUR GENDER are usually treated relative to all other students ON THE OSU CAMPUS?

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)
Much worse (1)	0.4	0.5	0.4
Worse (2)	11.0	5.5	16.7
About the same (3)	74.6	73.6	75.6
Better (4)	12.2	17.4	6.7
Much better (5)	1.8	3.0	0.6
Average Scores	3.04	3.17	2.91

- Statistically significant at the 99% level between men and women.

Table 2.1: How well do you think students of YOUR SEXUAL ORIENTATION are usually treated relative to all other students ON THE OSU CAMPUS?

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Much worse (1)	1.1	12.5	0.5
Worse (2)	3.8	43.3	1.5
About the same (3)	59.4	41.1	60.2
Better (4)	27.4	1.5	29.2
Much better (5)	8.3	1.5	8.7
Average Scores	3.38	2.36	3.44

- ♦ Statistically significant at the 99% level between GLB and heterosexual students.

Students' perceptions regarding diversity at OSU

Students were asked about the effort OSU has made to improve relations between people of different sexual orientations. (See Table 3.0) (This question was not asked with regard to gender.)

- Almost 65% of GLB students responded that the efforts OSU is making are “too little.”
- Heterosexual students' responses to the statement varied with 22% responding that “too little” was being done and, at other extreme, almost 28% indicating “too much” effort was being made.

Table 3.0: The effort made by OSU to improve relations and understanding between people of different SEXUAL ORIENTATIONS is:

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Too little (1)	25.0	64.7	22.1
About right (2)	48.7	33.4	50.0
Too much (3)	26.3	1.9	27.9
Average Scores	2.01	♦1.37	2.06
Don't know	24.7	12.6	25.1

♦ Statistically significant at the 99% level between GLB and heterosexual students.

Students were also asked to rate their level of agreement with a series of statements regarding diversity on campus. Please note in this section the lower the mean, or average score, the greater the agreement expressed.

The majority of students did not agree that diversity at OSU was one of the reasons they chose to enroll here. (See Table 4.0)

- Women and GLB students were significantly more likely to agree that diversity was one of the reasons they chose to attend OSU than were men and heterosexual students respectively.

Table 4.0: Diversity at OSU was one of the reasons why I chose to come here.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	7.6	7.4	7.9	17.4	7.0
Agree (2)	16.6	13.9	19.4	19.5	16.5
Neutral (3)	17.9	18.2	17.7	9.4	18.5
Disagree (4)	25.8	26.7	24.8	25.3	26.0
Strongly disagree (5)	32.1	33.8	30.3	28.5	32.0
Average Scores	3.58	3.65	♦3.50	♦3.28	3.59
NA/ No opinion	11.5	11.2	11.9	6.3	11.7

▪ Statistically significant at the 99% level between men and women.

♦ Statistically significant at the 99% level between GLB and heterosexual students.

Students were also asked to express their level of agreement with the statement, “OSU does not promote respect for diversity.” Thus, to disagree with such a statement infers that they believe OSU does promote respect for diversity. Overall, students tended to disagree with the statement. (See Table 5.0)

- Men were significantly less likely than women to agree that OSU promotes respect for diversity.
- GLB students were significantly more likely than heterosexual students to believe that OSU does not promote respect for diversity.

Table 5.0: OSU does not promote respect for diversity.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	1.2	0.8	1.6	5.1	1.0
Agree (2)	5.6	5.4	5.1	5.6	5.6
Neutral (3)	16.4	16.3	14.5	32.2	15.2
Disagree (4)	49.6	44.6	49.4	38.5	50.4
Strongly disagree (5)	27.3	22.6	29.5	18.6	27.7
Average Scores	3.96	3.92	4.00	3.60	3.98
NA/ No opinion	8.5	8.8	8.2	4.8	8.6

- Statistically significant at the 99% level between men and women.
- ♦ Statistically significant at the 99% level between GLB and heterosexual students.

When asked if they agreed that student publications and promotional materials are screened for racist, sexist, and homophobic content, approximately one third of the respondents had no opinion. (See Table 6.0)

- Women were significantly less likely to agree that publications are screened than men were, with over 33% of women disagreeing with the statement.
- Over 40% of GLB students disagreed that publications are screened for racist, sexist, and homophobic content.

Table 6.0: Student publications and promotional materials are screened for racist, sexist, and homophobic content.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	4.7	6.2	3.1	2.2	4.9
Agree (2)	32.7	36.1	29.1	21.8	33.6
Neutral (3)	32.8	31.4	34.4	34.9	32.2
Disagree (4)	18.4	16.4	20.6	22.7	18.2
Strongly disagree (5)	11.3	9.9	12.9	18.4	11.0
Average Scores	2.99	2.88	3.11	3.33	2.97
NA/ No opinion	31.1	29.7	32.5	31.4	30.9

- Statistically significant at the 99% level between men and women.
- ♦ Statistically significant at the 99% level between GLB and heterosexual students.

Students' perceptions of their interactions with others

Overall, Students tended to remain neutral when asked about the ease of getting to know people with different sexual orientations and when asked if OSU students are resentful of others whose sexual orientation is different from their own. (See Tables 7.0 & 7.1)

- GLB students generally agreed that it is easy to get to know people with different sexual orientations. This response is significantly different compared to how heterosexual students responded.
- At the same time, over 60% of GLB students agreed that students are resentful of others whose sexual orientation is different from their own.

Table 7.0: At OSU, getting to know people with different SEXUAL ORIENTATIONS has been easy.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	9.5	29.5	8.4
Agree (2)	35.7	45.6	35.1
Neutral (3)	29.5	16.0	30.2
Disagree (4)	17.6	5.2	18.4
Strongly disagree (5)	7.7	3.6	7.9
Average Scores	2.78	♦2.08	2.81
NA/ No opinion	16.1	11.3	16.4

♦ Statistically significant at the 99% level between GLB and heterosexual students.

Table 7.1: At OSU, students are resentful of others whose SEXUAL ORIENTATION is different from their own.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	10.2	31.8	8.9
Agree (2)	34.6	29.3	35.0
Neutral (3)	24.0	25.6	23.6
Disagree (4)	24.4	10.4	25.3
Strongly disagree (5)	6.9	2.8	7.2
Average Scores	2.83	♦2.23	2.87
NA/ No opinion	12.8	7.8	12.9

♦ Statistically significant at the 99% level between GLB and heterosexual students.

Students' perceptions regarding campus grievance procedures

Tables 8.0 to 8.4 present the findings regarding a series of questions pertaining to the campus procedures for addressing discriminatory or harassing behavior.

- As a group, students seemed to slightly agree or remain neutral that there are clear procedures for addressing instances of discrimination based on gender and sexual orientation.
- Women, with an average score of 2.61, were significantly more likely to agree that there are clear procedures for addressing instances of sex discrimination than men were, with an average score of 2.72.
- GLB students, with over 38% disagreeing, were significantly more likely to disagree that there are clear procedures for addressing instances of discrimination based on sexual orientation than heterosexual students were.
- While all subgroups of students scored between “agree” and “neutral” when asked whether the campus community is aware of the grievance procedures, women and GLB students were significantly more likely to disagree with the statement than were men and heterosexual students respectively.
- Even though they tended to remain “neutral,” women were significantly less likely to agree that campus assistance is given in cases of discrimination than men were.
- With over 32% of GLB students disagreeing that campus assistance is given in cases of discrimination, they were significantly less likely to agree that assistance is provided than heterosexual students were.
- Women were significantly less likely to trust the outcomes of grievance procedures than men were.
- GLB students were significantly less likely to trust the outcomes of grievance procedures than heterosexual students were with average scores of 3.49 and 3.06 respectively.

Table 8.0: There are clear procedures for addressing instances of discrimination based on GENDER.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)
Strongly agree (1)	11.4	10.9	13.1
Agree (2)	41.4	39.2	43.1
Neutral (3)	24.7	26.2	21.8
Disagree (4)	14.4	14.8	15.3
Strongly disagree (5)	8.2	9.0	6.7
Average Scores	2.67	2.72	2.61
NA/ No opinion	22.6	20.1	27.2

Table 8.1: There are clear procedures for addressing instances of discrimination based on SEXUAL ORIENTATION.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	8.4	9.8	8.3
Agree (2)	35.5	33.9	35.6
Neutral (3)	29.7	18.0	30.4
Disagree (4)	18.3	21.6	18.0
Strongly disagree (5)	8.2	16.7	7.7
Average Scores	2.82	3.02	2.81
NA/ No opinion	26.2	21.4	26.4

Table 8.2: The campus community is aware of the grievance procedures for discriminatory or harassing behavior.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	3.9	3.1	4.9	1.8	4.1
Agree (2)	25.5	26.1	24.9	13.2	26.4
Neutral (3)	23.3	25.9	20.5	26.5	23.0
Disagree (4)	31.6	31.0	32.4	41.7	31.0
Strongly disagree (5)	15.6	14.0	17.3	16.7	15.5
Average Scores	3.29	3.27	3.32	3.58	3.27
NA/ No opinion	20.7	19.4	22.1	15.4	21.0

Table 8.3: Campus assistance is given in cases of discrimination based on race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or religion.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	4.1	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.1
Agree (2)	37.7	39.7	35.3	11.4	39.5
Neutral (3)	35.6	34.7	36.6	52.5	34.1
Disagree (4)	15.6	15.6	15.7	21.0	15.4
Strongly disagree (5)	7.0	6.0	8.2	11.1	6.8
Average Scores	2.84	2.80	2.88	3.24	2.81
NA/ No opinion	33.9	30.1	37.9	24.1	34.8

▪ Statistically significant at the 99% level between men and women.

♦ Statistically significant at the 99% level between GLB and heterosexual students.

Table 8.4: The outcomes of the grievance procedures for discriminatory or harassing behavior are trusted.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	3.5	2.9	4.3	2.2	3.7
Agree (2)	22.1	26.3	17.1	5.5	23.5
Neutral (3)	46.5	44.1	49.4	47.3	46.0
Disagree (4)	18.1	17.8	18.5	30.7	17.3
Strongly disagree (5)	9.8	8.9	10.8	14.3	9.6
Average Scores	3.09	3.04	▪ 3.14	♦3.49	3.06
NA/ No opinion	39.4	36.0	43.0	30.3	40.0

- Statistically significant at the 99% level between men and women.
- ♦ Statistically significant at the 99% level between GLB and heterosexual students.

Students' perceptions of visible leadership for fostering campus diversity

In the last series of questions in the section on the University as a Welcoming Environment, students were asked their level of agreement with the visible leadership provided by various campus personnel for fostering campus diversity. (See Table 9.0 for average scores; see Appendix B for frequency tables)

- Among all respondents, students slightly agreed that all groups provide some visible leadership for fostering campus diversity. Students most strongly agreed that the staff in the residence halls provides such leadership while they found the student government to be least likely to demonstrate leadership for fostering campus diversity.
- Women were significantly less likely to agree that the president and other OSU administrators and that the staff in the residence halls provide visible leadership for fostering campus diversity than men were. However, they were significantly more likely to agree that the student government provided such leadership.
- Across the board, GLB students were significantly less likely to agree that the various campus constituencies provided visible leadership for fostering diversity than heterosexual students were. The differences in the average scores between GLB students and heterosexual students are most noteworthy in the cases of the president and other OSU administrators, the staff in the residence halls, and the student government.

Table 9.0: Average Scores: Providing visible leadership for fostering campus diversity

Average scores	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
<i>...provides visible leadership for fostering campus diversity</i>					
The faculty	2.63	2.64	2.62	♦2.97	2.61
The staff.	2.68	2.67	2.70	♦3.00	2.66
The president and other OSU administrators	2.70	2.68	▪ 2.73	♦3.27	2.67
The student government	2.71	2.74	▪ 2.68	♦3.12	2.68
Staff in the residence halls	2.42	2.39	▪ 2.45	♦2.89	2.40
Academic advisors	2.65	2.65	2.65	♦2.82	2.64

Scale: 1=strongly agree, 2= agree, 3=neutral, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree

- Statistically significant at the 99% level between men and women.
- ♦ Statistically significant at the 99% level between GLB and heterosexual students.

Appendix A

Campus Climate for Diversity Respondent Demographics

- **GENDER**: 59.4% were female; 39.6% male, and 0.2% transgender
- **SEXUAL ORIENTATION**: 92.4% reported that they were heterosexual; 2.7%, bisexual; 1.7% gay; 0.8% lesbian; and 2.3% other/no response
- **RANK**: 72% were undergraduate students; 18.1% were graduate students; 8.3%, professional; and 1.5% non-degree. Among the undergraduate students, 11.7% were Rank 1; 17.2% Rank 2; 18.1% Rank 3; and 24% Rank 4.
- **AGE**:
 - 5.4% were 18 or younger
 - 29.9% were 19 or 20
 - 23.0% were 21 or 22
 - 11.0% were 23 or 24
 - 7.1% were 25 or 26
 - 5.2% were 27 or 28
 - 4.9% were 29 or 30
 - 3.5% were between the ages of 31 and 35
 - 3.0% were between the ages of 36 and 40
 - 3.5% were over 40
- **STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES**: 3.2% of the sample responded that they had a disability (visual, hearing, speech, mobility, psychiatric, or learning)
- **RACE/ETHNICITY**: (Please note that students provided multiple responses when applicable)
 - 8.7% were African American/Black
 - 3.1% were American Indian/Alaskan Native
 - 2.0% were Appalachian
 - 8.0% were Asian /Pacific Islander
 - 8.7% were Hispanic American/Latino(a)
 - 65.6% were White/Caucasian
 - 3.8% were international students
 - 2.3% responded “other”
 - In addition, 3.3% responded that they were multi-racial, and 7.4% provided multiple responses.
- **RELIGIOUS IDENTIFICATION**: (in descending order of frequency)
 - 27.3% Roman Catholic
 - 22.7% Protestant
 - 16.8% Non-religious
 - 6.9% Baptist
 - 4.7% Agnostic
 - 3.4% Christian
 - 2.9% Jewish
 - 2.2% Buddhist
 - 2.0% Atheist
 - 1.9% Hindu
 - 1.1% Muslim
 - 1.1% Non-denominational
 - 0.7% Pagan
 - 6.3% Other (including Eastern Orthodox, Greek Orthodox, Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints, Pentecostal, Jehovah Witnesses, Amish/Mennonite, Born Again Christian, Quarter, Zoroastrian, Disciples of Christ and more)

- **GPA:** Among the undergraduate students 2.4% had a GPA of less than a 2.0; 39.2% had between a 2.0 and a 2.9; and 52.9% had a 3.0 or above. Among, the graduate and professional students, 0.4% had less than a 2.0; 6.0% had between a 2.0 and a 2.9; and 93.6% had a 3.0 or better. Other students did not provide their GPA.
- **“HOMETOWN”:** When asked where they spent most of their lives before college, 22.5% of students responded that they were from a rural area or town, 19.7% from a small city; 25.3% from a large city or metropolitan area; and 32.5% from a suburb.
- **COLLEGE ENROLLMENT:**

College Enrollment	Percent
Allied Medical Professional	1.3
Architecture	1.8
Arts	10.4
Biology	4.4
Business	7.5
Dentistry	1.2
Education	5.7
Engineering	10.6
Food, Agricultural, & Environmental Sciences	5.3
Human Ecology	5.0
Humanities	5.2
Law	1.8
Math & Physics	3.0
Medicine and Public Health	3.2
Nursing	2.2
Optometry	0.7
Pharmacy	1.2
Social & Behavioral Sciences	11.1
Social Work	1.9
UVC	12.1
Veterinary Medicine	1.8
Non-Degree	2.1

Appendix B

Visible Leadership Frequency Tables

Table 10.0: The faculty provides visible leadership for fostering campus diversity.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	8.2	7.6	8.7	10.6	7.9
Agree (2)	44.4	45.0	43.7	31.9	45.3
Neutral (3)	29.6	29.0	30.3	26.4	29.6
Disagree (4)	11.8	12.5	11.1	11.7	11.9
Strongly disagree (5)	6.1	5.9	6.2	19.4	5.3
Average	2.63	2.64	2.62	♦2.97	2.61
NA/ No opinion	13.2	12.7	13.8	6.1	13.5

Table 10.1: The staff provides visible leadership for fostering campus diversity.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	6.4	6.0	6.9	9.0	6.3
Agree (2)	42.7	45.4	39.8	27.4	43.7
Neutral (3)	33.0	30.9	35.3	31.8	32.8
Disagree (4)	11.9	11.4	12.4	18.2	11.6
Strongly disagree (5)	6.0	6.3	5.6	13.5	5.5
Average	2.68	2.67	2.70	♦3.00	2.66
NA/ No opinion	14.8	13.6	16.0	6.1	15.1

Table 10.2: The president and other OSU administrators provide visible leadership for fostering campus diversity.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	8.7	9.6	7.8	4.6	9.1
Agree (2)	39.0	40.2	37.6	19.8	40.4
Neutral (3)	32.0	29.3	35.1	38.2	31.4
Disagree (4)	13.6	13.9	13.3	19.2	13.2
Strongly disagree (5)	6.7	7.0	6.3	18.2	6.0
Average	2.70	2.68	■ 2.73	♦3.27	2.67
NA/ No opinion	19.5	16.0	23.2	18.0	19.3

Table 10.3: The student government provides visible leadership for fostering campus diversity.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	8.9	9.3	8.4	5.7	9.1
Agree (2)	40.6	40.1	41.3	32.9	41.2
Neutral (3)	30.2	28.7	31.9	26.5	30.0
Disagree (4)	11.4	11.8	11.0	14.2	11.3
Strongly disagree (5)	8.9	10.2	7.5	20.8	8.3
Average	2.71	2.74	▪ 2.68	♦3.12	2.68
NA/ No opinion	20.1	17.8	22.6	13.9	20.4

Table 10.4: Staff in the residence halls provides visible leadership for fostering campus diversity.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	13.1	13.4	12.6	13.0	13.2
Agree (2)	46.7	47.8	45.5	24.1	47.6
Neutral (3)	29.4	29.0	29.8	31.8	29.3
Disagree (4)	6.8	5.6	8.0	22.7	6.0
Strongly disagree (5)	4.1	4.2	4.1	8.5	3.9
Average	2.42	2.39	▪ 2.45	♦2.89	2.40
NA/ No opinion	30.7	29.7	31.7	35.2	30.6

Table 10.5: Academic advisors provide visible leadership for fostering campus diversity.

Responses by %	All Respondents (n=1223)	Men (n=484)	Women (n=730)	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (n=67)	Heterosexual (n=1130)
Strongly agree (1)	8.9	8.9	8.9	9.8	9.0
Agree (2)	39.6	39.0	40.2	35.2	39.7
Neutral (3)	35.3	36.4	34.1	29.7	35.5
Disagree (4)	10.0	9.3	10.8	13.9	9.8
Strongly disagree (5)	6.2	6.4	6.1	11.4	6.0
Average	2.65	2.65	2.65	♦2.82	2.64
NA/ No opinion	23.8	22.6	25.1	22.1	24.0

- Statistically significant at the 99% level between men and women.
- ♦ Statistically significant at the 99% level between GLB and heterosexual students.