

Survey on Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) in the Department of Public Health Sciences

Executive Summary

Background

- In April 2021, the Queen's University Department of Public Health Sciences (PHS) Working Group on Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) set forth to develop and implement a department-wide survey on demographics, climate and experiences among PHS faculty, staff, students, and alumni.
- The survey was the first departmental attempt to shine a light on who we are as a department, including how PHS students, alumni, staff and faculty perceive the departmental climate, how we understand and personally experience EDI, and what action steps we consider important.
- The Working Group met together over a dozen times to design, distribute and analyze the survey. Questions for the survey were adapted from the Faculty of Health Sciences' EDI survey, the EAB Campus Climate survey, and other sources.
- Using the Department's email records, the survey was sent to all current PHS faculty, staff, and students, as well as PHS alumni from the past five years. Survey limitations are highlighted below.
- While survey analyses are on-going, this four-page summary highlights 10 key survey findings. A more detailed quantitative analysis of survey results is included in Appendix 1.

10 key survey findings

1. High survey response rate from PHS core faculty, staff and current students.

- Invitations to complete the survey were sent via email (n=411) to multiple departmental constituencies including PHS core faculty and staff, cross-appointed and adjunct faculty, current graduate students and alumni of our graduate programs from the past five years. The overall survey response rate was 31%.
- We observed very high survey response rates from core faculty and staff (90.5%) and current graduate students (65.4%), suggesting strong interest in learning more about EDI and PHS.
- Lower survey response rates were seen among persons who were less directly and less immediately linked to our department (e.g. adjunct and cross-appointed faculty, alumni).

2. Substantial level of self-reported demographic diversity.

- The survey was the PHS Department's first-ever effort to measure and document the demographic composition and diversity of our faculty, staff, students, and alumni.
- Approximately half of respondents (50.4%) self-identified as women and approximately one-quarter (24.4%) self-identified as a person of colour or member of a racialized group. Smaller percentages self-identified as sexual orientation other than heterosexual (8.7%), living with a disability (8.7%), and First Nations, Metis or Inuk/Inuit (3.1%).

3. Strong support for EDI as a departmental priority.

- Most respondents strongly agreed that EDI should be a leading priority for our department (mean 4.32 on a 5-point Likert scale).
- At the same time, scores were lower for whether respondents regularly apply EDI principles in their own work/learning/teaching (mean 3.84), suggesting a gap between prioritizing and actually implementing EDI in everyday practice.

4. Opportunity to better operationalize EDI principles, particularly in the curriculum and classroom.

- Despite strong support for EDI within the department, respondents noted room for improvement. When asked whether the issues of EDI are “adequately addressed” by the department in various contexts, the lowest Likert scores were seen for department leadership (3.41), faculty (3.27), classroom setting (3.18), and curriculum (3.09).
- Faculty and staff tended to report higher values than students/alumni for each parameter, suggesting that student experiences may not mirror the faculty perceptions.

5. Opportunity to improve departmental culture by further embracing diversity principles.

- Respondents gave relatively higher Likert scores to questions about whether diversity is reflected in the student body (3.61) and whether respondents felt comfortable sharing their own perspectives and experiences in the department (3.58). However, lower Likert scores were seen for whether diversity is fully embraced in departmental culture (3.29) and whether diversity is reflected in PHS faculty and staff (2.77).
- These findings support the need to improve departmental culture with regard to EDI principles and work towards the goal of increasing diversity among the PHS faculty and staff.

6. Students and alumni expressed concern about the departmental climate for those who are socioeconomically disadvantaged or members of a racialized group.

- When asked about the climate within Public Health Sciences for persons who are members of different groups or communities, students and alumni reported significantly lower Likert scores than faculty and staff for people who are socioeconomically disadvantaged (3.09 vs. 3.86, $p < .01$) and people who identify as a member of a racialized group (e.g. Black, person of colour) (3.47 vs. 3.94, $p < .05$).
- These concerns were not evident in the larger combined-sample analysis, suggesting a difference in perception about the departmental climate for students in these groups.

7. A substantial number of persons reported feeling unwelcome or uncomfortable in the department because of their identity, status, or other personal characteristics.

- A total of 33 respondents (26.0%) reported feeling unwelcome in at least one category, and the majority of these persons (24/33) felt unwelcome in multiple categories.
- The top selected categories for feeling unwelcome or uncomfortable were racial identity ($n=12$), socioeconomic status ($n=12$), and ethnocultural identity ($n=10$).
- These responses are important because they reflect personal, lived experiences of individuals within our department. Importantly, they give us an opportunity to reflect upon and address these experiences with an eye toward rectifying the causal circumstances.

- 8. A smaller but substantial number of persons reported they were the subject of incidents of harassment or discrimination within the department.**
- At total of 15 respondents (11.8%) stated they experienced at least one incident of harassment or discrimination, and nearly half of these (7/15) reported two or more incidents.
 - The top selected incidents were being deliberately ignored or excluded (n=7), instructor making verbal comments which were hostile or offensive (n=7), and being the target of racial or ethnic profiling (n=4).
 - In most cases, respondents experiencing harassment or discrimination did not report these episodes or seek assistance (11/15).
 - These troublesome findings demonstrate a need for greater discussion and education to identify, disclose, and eliminate harassment and discrimination within Public Health Sciences, and to destigmatize reporting and improve the effectiveness of reporting systems.
- 9. Respondents provided actionable suggestions to help improve the climate within the department.**
- The top three ideas for actions to improve departmental climate were to:
 - Recruit more individuals from under-represented, historically disadvantaged, or equity-deserving groups for leadership, faculty and staff positions (55.9%)
 - Teach about racism as a health issue and science issue, including new methodologies for studying race and racism (55.1%), and
 - Incorporate issues of EDI and cross-cultural competence more effectively into the curriculum (48.0%).
 - PHS leadership can use this information to help develop strategies for improving the climate for all persons within our department.
- 10. Open comments shed additional light and provide context about respondents' perceptions of departmental climate, personal experiences, and opportunities for improvement.**
- Some respondents provided positive and supportive comments thanking the department for prioritizing EDI and taking the time to listen; others offered suggestions for actions and activities which would help extend EDI principles and practices across the department.
 - Notably, several respondents also took the time to provide greater depth about their own personal and painful stories of harassment or discrimination in the department.
 - Additional analyses of qualitative responses are ongoing.

Limitations

- It is important to recognize that these findings emanate from the analysis of survey data, and as such we are careful to recognize several limitations.
- The small number of completed surveys (n=127) and the limited response rates from certain subgroups (e.g. adjunct /cross-appointed faculty, alumni) limit our ability to generalize these findings beyond those individuals who took the time to respond.
- The targeted email outreach to selected PHS community members (faculty, staff, students, alumni) could have also resulted in selection bias. Those with personal experiences or strong opinions may be more likely to participate. The survey also did not reach others (e.g. parents, partners, friends) who may have additional information to share and stories to tell.

- Information bias may have resulted from our use of unvalidated and modified questions taken from other EDI surveys, and recall bias may have been introduced when asking people to report on perceived episodes of discrimination or harassment.
- Other limitations may emerge from the composition of the Working Group itself, whose members represent a limited set of diversity and lived experience. The Working Group sincerely regrets any errors or harms connected to the survey.
- Having recognized these potential limitations of this internal survey, we still feel the survey has generated an impressive amount of important, new information about equity, diversity and inclusion within Public Health Sciences which will help the department improve and grow.

Next steps

The survey highlighted several areas where PHS could intensify its efforts to advance EDI principles in our research, education, and service. While departmental culture change is a long-term project, we propose the following actionable, accountable responses which will keep the department moving forward and help sustain the momentum.

1. **Review, revise and update existing departmental policies, practices and guidelines with an eye towards explicitly incorporating and operationalizing EDI principles.** We propose to first establish a web-accessible departmental repository of policies and procedures, with a commitment to review each one through an EDI lens and update as required. Currently no such central repository exists; creating one will help advance departmental action and accountability.
2. **Use an explicit EDI lens for the upcoming cyclical curriculum review (QUQAP) and identify where EDI principles may be included as routine pedagogical practice in all departmental course offerings.** Tasks may include reviewing syllabi, working with instructors to develop examples, case studies, problem sets, etc.
3. **Develop and implement a departmental communication strategy which explicitly considers EDI principles.** What we say as a department, how and to whom we say it – these things matter. Such a strategy will harmonize the PHS presence and messaging on our website, in departmental emails, on social media, and other venues where we communicate with ourselves and the larger community. One immediate example might be to provide greater visibility and signage for Carruthers Hall accessibility options (e.g., wheelchair elevator). Other examples will flow from the survey responses and initial steps.
4. **Strengthen and support efforts to diversify PHS faculty, staff, and students through targeted outreach to under-represented, historically disadvantaged or equity-deserving groups.** This is undoubtedly a longer-term project, but we can foreground the process by explicitly recognizing and embracing diversity and making a conscious effort to embody EDI principles in every aspect of department life.

- September 20, 2021

This report was prepared by Public Health Sciences Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Working Group:

Paul Boonmak, PhD Student

Sherri Dutton, PhD Student

Sareena McDonald, MSc student

Bren Melles, Co-Chair, Senior Program Officer and Adjunct Faculty

Brad Stoner, Co-Chair, Professor and PHS Department Head

Sidrah Zafar, MPH student.

PHS Faculty members Kristan Aronson and Colleen Davison also played an active role in the Working Group in the early stages.

Appendix 1 Analysis of quantitative responses, PHS EDI Survey

Total received surveys: 127

PART 1. DISTRIBUTION INFORMATION AND RESPONSE RATES

Contact category	Number of invitation emails sent	Number of surveys submitted (+ surveys received through an anonymous link)	Response rate
Core faculty	16	19	90.5%
Staff	5		
Cross-appointed faculty	22	18	36.0%
Adjunct faculty	28		
Total faculty and staff	71	37	52.1%
Current MPH students	34	25 (+9)	65.4%
Current MSc students	8		
Current PhD students	10		
Total current students	52	34	65.4%
MPH alumni	166	30 (+2)	11.1%
MSc alumni	110		
PhD alumni	12		
Total alumni	288	32	11.1%
Uncategorized	-	15 (+9)	-
Total	411	127	30.9%

Completed/partially completed surveys

Number of completed surveys	97	76.4%
Number of partially completed surveys	30	23.6%

PART 2. DEMOGRAPHICS

Gender and sexual orientation

	Gender*				
Sexual orientation	Woman	Man	Prefer not to answer	No response	Total
Bisexual	3	-	-	-	3
Bisexual and heterosexual	1	-	-	-	1
Bisexual, heterosexual, and questioning	1	-	-	-	1
Gay	-	3	-	-	3
Heterosexual or straight	49	25	3	1	78
Queer	2	-	-	-	2
Queer and pansexual	1	-	-	-	1
Prefer not to answer	5	1	8	-	14
No response	2	-	-	22	24
Total	64	29	11	23	127

* Woman and cisgender woman are grouped together as woman. Man and cisgender man are grouped together as man.

Do you self-identify as First Nations, Métis or Inuk (Inuit)?

Yes	4	3.2%
No	95	74.8%
Prefer not to answer	6	4.7%
No response	22	17.3%

Do you self-identify as a person of colour or a member of a racialized group?

Yes	31	24.4%
No	61	48.0%
Prefer not to answer	13	10.2%
No response	22	17.3%

What best describes your ethno-cultural background(s)?

Ethno-cultural background	Number of responses	Percentage*
Canadian	63	49.6%
Chinese	9	7.1%
White	9	7.1%
Scottish	6	4.7%
British	5	3.9%
First Nations	4	3.2%
Black	3	2.4%
European	3	2.4%
Italian	3	2.4%
Greek	2	1.6%
Middle Eastern	2	1.6%
Pakistani	2	1.6%
Polish	2	1.6%
South Asian	2	1.6%
American	1	0.8%
Asian	1	0.8%
Bangladeshi	1	0.8%
Brazilian	1	0.8%
Czech	1	0.8%
Dutch	1	0.8%
Eastern European	1	0.8%
English	1	0.8%
French	1	0.8%
French Canadian	1	0.8%
Immigrant	1	0.8%
Indian	1	0.8%
Indonesian	1	0.8%
Iranian	1	0.8%
Irish	1	0.8%
Japanese	1	0.8%
Jewish	1	0.8%
Latin American	1	0.8%
Mixed	1	0.8%
Norwegian	1	0.8%
Russian	1	0.8%
Sri Lankan	1	0.8%
No response	49	36.2%

* Denominator = 127

What best describes your ethno-cultural background(s) IF identified as a person of colour or a member of a racialized group?

Ethno-cultural background	Number of responses	Percentage*
Canadian	12	38.7%
Chinese	8	25.8%
Black	3	9.7%
Pakistani	2	6.5%
South Asian	2	6.5%
Asian	1	3.2%
Bangladeshi	1	3.2%
Indian	1	3.2%
Indonesian	1	3.2%
Iranian	1	3.2%
Latin American	1	3.2%
Sri Lankan	1	3.2%
No response	9	29.0%

* Denominator = 31

Do you self-identify as a person living with a disability?

Yes	11	8.7%
No	90	70.9%
Prefer not to answer	3	2.4%
No response	22	18.1%

How would you describe your disability (select all that apply)?

Disability	Number of responses	Percentage
Psychiatric disorder	4	36.4%
Psychiatric disorder and neurodiversity	1	9.1%
Visual, hearing, or speech disability	1	9.1%
Neurodiversity	3	27.3%
Another (unspecified)	1	9.1%
Prefer not to answer	1	9.1%
No response	0	0.0%

PART 3. UNDERSTANDING OF EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Mean*	s	Unsure	No response
I believe Equity, Diversity and Inclusion should be a leading priority for the Department of Public Health Sciences.	4.32	1.03	1	8
I have working knowledge of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion principles (e.g., anti-oppression, cultural safety, unconscious bias).	3.93	0.64	2	9
I regularly apply Equity, Diversity and Inclusion principles in my work/learning/teaching.	3.84	0.80	6	10

* Response ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

PART 4. EDI CLIMATE WITHIN PUBLIC HEALTH SCIENCES

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

I feel that issues of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion are adequately addressed by the Department of Public Health Sciences:

	Mean*	s	Unsure	No response
In the curriculum (e.g., course content, textbooks, readings)	3.09	1.06	17	12
In the classroom setting	3.18	1.09	18	14
By faculty	3.27	1.11	13	14
By Department leadership (e.g., Department Head, Program Directors)	3.41	1.12	14	13
In Department student organizations (e.g., PHSSA, other ad hoc groups)	3.60	1.02	20	13
In Department communications (e.g., website, handbooks, emails)	3.45	0.93	8	12

* Response ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Based on your own observations and experiences, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Mean*	s	Unsure	No response
Diversity is reflected in the student body in Public Health Sciences.	3.61	1.08	11	18
Diversity is reflected in the faculty and staff in Public Health Sciences.	2.77	1.23	7	19
Diversity is fully embraced within the departmental culture in Public Health Sciences.	3.29	1.12	8	19
All students feel welcome and supported in this department, regardless of background or identity.	3.47	1.19	19	19
I feel comfortable sharing my own perspectives and experiences in the Department (e.g., in class, meetings, seminars).	3.58	1.17	2	19
I feel I have to work harder than others to be perceived as a good student or colleague.	2.81	1.17	4	20

* Response ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Based on your own observations and experiences, how would you rate the climate within Public Health Sciences for:

	Mean*	s	Unsure	No response
People living with a learning disability (e.g., ADHD, dyslexia)	3.81	0.93	28	22
People living with a mental health condition (e.g., anxiety, bipolar disorder, depression)	3.83	0.99	17	22
People living with a physical disability	3.85	0.92	32	22
People who are religious/People of faith	3.80	0.88	25	22
People who identify as 2SLGBTQIA+ (Two-Spirit, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, asexual, +)	3.89	0.92	24	22
People who are international students	3.86	1.02	19	22
People who are socioeconomically disadvantaged	3.85	1.09	20	23
People who identify as a member of a racialized group (e.g., Black, a person of colour)	3.64	1.15	17	22
People who identify as Indigenous	3.77	1.01	31	22

* Response ranges from 1 (very disrespectful) to 5 (very respectful).

Have you ever felt unwelcome or uncomfortable in the Department of Public Health Sciences because of your ... (select all that apply)?

Category	Number of responses	Percentage
Never felt unwelcome	62	48.8%
Prefer not to answer	5	3.9%
No answer	27	21.3%
Felt unwelcome at least in one category	33	26.0%
5 categories*	2	6.1%
4 categories*	3	2.4%
3 categories*	7	21.2%
2 categories*	12	36.4%
1 category*	9	7.1%
Category*		
Sex	6	18.2%
Family status	3	9.1%
Racial identity	12	36.4%
Ethnocultural identity	10	30.3%
Indigenous identity	2	6.1%
Language	8	24.2%
Religion/faith/creed	3	9.1%
Appearance	9	27.3%
Ability	5	15.2%
Sexual orientation	2	6.1%
Gender identity	0	0.0%
Socioeconomic status	12	36.4%
<i>Write-in options</i>	(4)	(12.1%)
Area of study	1	3.0%
Personal beliefs	1	3.0%
Academic and professional background	1	3.0%
World perceptions	1	3.0%

* Denominator = 33

What are the most important actions you think would improve the climate in the Department of Public Health Sciences (select up to five; add your own if not listed here)?

Category	Number of responses	Percentage
No response	24	18.9%
Have more multicultural events	25	19.7%
Recruit more individuals from underrepresented, historically disadvantaged, or equity-deserving groups for leadership, faculty and staff positions	71	55.9%
Strengthen screening at the recruitment stage	29	22.8%
Provide EDI education workshops	39	30.7%
Incorporate issues of EDI and cross-cultural competence more effectively into the curriculum	61	48.0%
Encourage research that challenges the status quo	49	38.6%
Teach about racism	70	55.1%
Encourage and facilitate classroom discussion	48	37.8%
<i>Write-on options</i>	15	11.8%

PART 5. PERSONAL EXPERIENCES IN PUBLIC HEALTH SCIENCES

Proceeded	83 (+ 21* = 104)	81.9%
Skipped to next section	23	18.1%

* If a participant did not explicitly skip, they were presented with the section.

Have you been the subject of incidents of harassment or discrimination in Public Health Sciences?

Response	Number of responses	Percentage*	Percentage from total**
Yes	15	14.42%	11.8%
No	65	62.50%	51.2%
Prefer not to answer	2	1.92%	1.6%
No response	22	21.15%	17.3%

* Denominator = 104

** Denominator = 127

What was the harassment or discrimination in Public Health Sciences that you experienced (select all that apply; this list is not exhaustive)?

Response	Number of responses	Percentage*
Harassment response selection	15	100.0%
6 responses	1	6.7%
5 responses	0	0.0%
4 responses	1	6.7%
3 responses	1	6.7%
2 responses	4	26.7%
1 response	8	53.3%
Response*		
I was deliberately ignored or excluded.	7	46.7%
I was the target of offensive humor.	3	20.0%
I received hostile or threatening comments or gestures.	1	6.7%
I was the target of racial or ethnic profiling.	4	26.7%
An instructor made verbal comments that were hostile or offensive to me.	7	46.7%
I received inappropriate or offensive written comments from a faculty member.	2	13.3%
I was the target of obscene or threatening language on an online platform (e.g., social media, message boards, communities).	0	0.0%
I received offensive personal email, text messages, or instant messages that targeted me personally.	2	13.3%
<i>Write-in options</i>	3	20.0%

* Denominator = 15

What do you believe the harassment or discrimination was based upon?

Response	Number of responses	Percentage*
Response selection	15	100.0%
5 responses	1	6.7%
4 responses	0	0.0%
3 responses	4	26.7%
2 responses	1	6.7%
1 response	9	60.0%
Response		
Appearance or physical characteristics	0	0.0%
Gender or gender identity	2	13.3%
Ethnicity (your cultural background and/or nationality)	6	40.0%
Race	6	40.0%
Age	1	6.7%
Country of origin (the country where you were born)	1	6.7%
Sexual orientation or sexual identity	0	0.7%
Political views	0	0.0%
Religious or spiritual views	0	0.0%
Socioeconomic status	2	13.3%
Immigrant status	1	6.7%
Write-in options	7	46.7%
Academic background	1	6.7%
Need for exam accommodations	1	6.7%
Jealousy	1	6.7%
Power imbalance between professors and students	1	6.7%
Invisible disability	1	6.7%
Perceived as a new immigrant/international student	1	6.7%
Professor only seeing white	1	6.7%

* Denominator = 15

Where did the incident(s) occur (select all that apply)?

Response	Number of responses	Percentage*
Response selection (excluding “prefer not to answer”)	14	93.3%
3 responses	1	6.7%
2 responses	4	26.7%
1 response	9	60.0%
Response		
An in-person teaching venue such as the classroom	7	46.7%
During committee meeting(s)	2	13.3%
An administrative workplace setting	1	6.7%
A research setting (e.g., lab or a remote facility)	1	6.7%
Online setting (e.g., Microsoft Teams, Zoom)	2	13.3%
Informal setting (e.g., hallways, lounge)	2	13.3%
<i>Write-in options</i>	(4)	(26.7%)
Email or phone	2	13.3%
Individual meeting	1	6.7%
Office	1	6.7%

* Denominator = 15

Who was/were the perpetrator(s) of the incident(s) (select all that apply, but do not include any specific names)?

Response	Number of responses	Percentage*
Response selection (excluding “prefer not to answer”)	14	93.3%
2 responses	3	20.0%
1 response	11	73.3%
Response		
A PHS educator, faculty member, or staff member	14	93.3%
Another (non-PHS) educator, faculty member, or staff member	0	0.0%
A PHS student	2	13.3%
<i>Write-in options</i>	0	0.0%

* Denominator = 15

Did you report it or seek assistance?

Yes	4	26.7%*
No	11	73.3%*

* Denominator = 15

How did you report it or seek assistance (select all that apply)?

Response	Number of responses	Percentage*
Response selection	4	100.0%
2 responses	2	50.0%
1 response	2	50.0%
Response		
Formally (including policies and procedures internal to FHS and Queens University, as well as the Queens Human Rights and Equity Office)	0	0.0%
Informally (including an administrator, colleague, mentor, family, and friends)	4	100.0%
Through counselling (including Employee Assistance Programs and external professional counselling)	2	50.0%
<i>Write-in options</i>	0	0.0%

* Denominator = 4

Were you satisfied with the response?

Yes	0	0.0%
Somewhat	2	50.0%
No	2	50.0%

* Denominator = 4

Did any of the following thoughts or concerns cross your mind when you were deciding whether or not to share or report your experience (select all that apply)?

Response	Number of responses	Percentage*
Response selection	14	93.3%
10 responses	1	6.7%
9 responses	1	6.7%
8 responses	1	6.7%
7 responses	1	6.7%
6 responses	0	0.0%
5 responses	2	13.3%
4 responses	2	13.3%
3 responses	2	13.3%
2 responses	1	6.7%
1 response	3	20.0%
Response		
Unaware of the available policies and processes	6	40.0%
Available policies and processes insufficient/inappropriate	3	20.0%
Lack of trust in the process (belief that the process favours the institution)	8	53.3%
Fear of negative career and reputation outcome	10	66.7%
Fear of blame/disbelief	8	53.3%
Did not want anyone to know what happened	3	20.0%
Fear of retaliation	7	46.7%
Belief that sanctions (e.g., punishment, penalties) are inadequate	3	20.0%
Did not want to get the person in trouble (e.g., disciplinary action, legal charge, arrest)	4	40.0%
Did not think it was serious enough to report	8	53.3%
<i>Write-in options</i>	(3)	(20.0%)
Nothing is going to change	1	6.7%
Fear of graduating	1	6.7%
Embarrassed	1	6.7%

* Denominator = 15

Have you ever witnessed incidents of harassment or discrimination in Public Health Sciences against others?

Response	Number of responses	Percentage*	Percentage from total**
Yes	17	16.35%	13.4%
No	63	60.58%	49.6%
Prefer not to answer	2	1.92%	1.6%
No response	22	21.15%	17.3%

* Denominator = 104 (the number of participants presented with this question)

** Denominator = 127

In response to this situation that I witnessed:

Response	Number of responses	Percentage*
Response selection (excluding “prefer not to answer”)	16	94.1%
4 responses	1	5.9%
3 responses	0	0.0%
2 responses	4	23.5%
1 response	11	64.7%
Response		
I told someone in a position of authority about the situation.	5	29.4%
I asked the person who appeared to be the target of the behaviour if they needed help.	8	47.1%
I confronted the person who appeared to be causing the situation.	1	5.9%
I asked others to defuse the situation.	1	5.9%
I did not do anything.	4	23.5%
<i>Write-in options</i>	(4)	(23.5%)
Heard about the situation after it had occurred	2	11.8%
Req prof dev training	1	5.9%
Mediated the issue among the students involved	1	5.9%

* Denominator = 17 (the number of participants that witnessed an incident of harassment)

PART 6. SUB-ANALYSES

[FACULTY + STAFF] COMPARED TO [STUDENTS + ALUMNI]

NUMBER OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS

	N	N (combined)
Core faculty of staff	19	37
Affiliated faculty	18	
Students	34	66
Alumni	32	

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Mean for faculty/ staff	Mean for students/ alumni	t	df	p
I believe Equity, Diversity and Inclusion should be a leading priority for the Department of Public Health Sciences.	4.43	4.57	-0.69	71.64	0.50
I have working knowledge of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion principles (e.g., anti-oppression, cultural safety, unconscious bias).	4.00	3.94	0.54	98.70	0.59
I regularly apply Equity, Diversity and Inclusion principles in my work/learning/teaching.	4.14	3.71	2.82	97.04	0.01

Response ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

I feel that issues of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion are adequately addressed by the Department of Public Health Sciences:

	Mean for faculty/ staff	Mean for students/ alumni	t	df	p
In the curriculum (e.g., course content, textbooks, readings)	3.27	3.02	1.02	49.17	0.31
In the classroom setting	3.36	3.13	0.94	51.09	0.35
By faculty	3.46	3.13	1.40	61.57	0.17
By Department leadership (e.g., Department Head, Program Directors)	3.74	3.26	2.13	74.41	0.04
In Department student organizations (e.g., PHSSA, other ad hoc groups)	3.75	3.47	1.31	58.48	0.19
In Department communications (e.g., website, handbooks, emails)	3.59	3.37	1.14	76.26	0.26

* Response ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Based on your own observations and experiences, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Mean for faculty/ staff	Mean for students/ alumni	t	df	p
Diversity is reflected in the student body in Public Health Sciences.	4.18	3.27	4.81	90.47	0.00
Diversity is reflected in the faculty and staff in Public Health Sciences.	3.11	2.60	2.06	81.76	0.04
Diversity is fully embraced within the departmental culture in Public Health Sciences.	3.45	3.25	0.89	76.75	0.38
All students feel welcome and supported in this department, regardless of background or identity.	3.86	3.31	2.24	66.30	0.03
I feel comfortable sharing my own perspectives and experiences in the Department (e.g., in class, meetings, seminars).	3.60	3.56	0.16	75.45	0.87
I feel I have to work harder than others to be perceived as a good student or colleague.	2.94	2.77	0.68	65.02	0.50

* Response ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Based on your own observations and experiences, how would you rate the climate within Public Health Sciences for:

	Mean for faculty/ staff	Mean for students/ alumni	t	df	p
People living with a learning disability (e.g., ADHD, dyslexia)	3.93	3.75	0.77	52.88	0.44
People living with a mental health condition (e.g., anxiety, bipolar disorder, depression)	3.83	3.84	-0.03	60.43	0.98
People living with a physical disability	4.03	3.74	1.35	64.31	0.18
People who are religious/People of faith	3.89	3.76	0.68	72.07	0.50
People who identify as 2SLGBTQIA+ (Two-Spirit, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, asexual, +)	3.94	3.88	0.28	66.93	0.78
People who are international students	3.97	3.78	0.86	79.30	0.39
People who are socioeconomically disadvantaged	3.86	3.09	3.40	65.95	0.00
People who identify as a member of a racialized group (e.g., Black, a person of colour)	3.94	3.47	2.02	82.13	0.05
People who identify as Indigenous	3.93	3.69	1.02	65.15	0.31

* Response ranges from 1 (very disrespectful) to 5 (very respectful).
