Spring 2020

Summary of Reports This summary provides information for Spring semester of 2020. During this reporting period from January through May, the bias reporting system received 110 reports for 64 incidents. When we receive multiple reports for one incident, we respond to all reporters to offer support. When applicable, these cases are referred to the appropriate resources or offices on-campus for follow-up. Of the 110 cases, 48 of the reporters documented Asian, Asian American, or Chinese identities being targeted. 22 of the cases were related to COVID-19. We received 25 reports on one incident related to COVID-19 that was targeted towards the Asian Community (chalking on or near campus).

Reporters are asked to identify the singular or multiple identities that the incident targeted, allowing for an intersectional viewpoint in collecting data. Out of the 110 reports, 58 reports indicated more than one identity being targeted in the incident. The data shows that the most common type of targeted identity was race/ethnicity with the second largest category being national origin. Gender identity/expression were the third largest category. Reporters are requested to indicate the location of the incident. Some reporters did not provide specific locations of the incident but gave a general sense of where the incident occurred. Overall, out of the 110 incidents that occurred, 67 were on campus (including residence halls), 6 occurred in residence halls or dining facilities, 20 incidents occurred off campus and 23 incidents occurred online or via social media. Reporters are also allowed to select multiple types of categories that best describe the nature of the incident. The categorization of public space was the largest descriptor with 59 reports. The second largest category was written with 55 cases. Microaggressions with 40 reports including it as a descriptor for the type of incident that occurred was third. While, verbal (non-threatening) exchanges was the fourth largest descriptor with 35 reports. Again, a reporter may indicate that an incident was a microaggression and a verbal (non-threatening) exchange as they are allowed to select multiple types of descriptor categories.

Demographics Summary The reporters vary in their role on campus and range from being targeted individuals themselves to bystanders or witnesses of bias or hate incidents. 30 of the cases the reporter were a witness and 69 were targeted towards them, 11 are unknown. Undergraduates were the largest category of reporters, followed by staff members of UWMadison. Of the 110 reporters only 28 wanted follow-up. Some changed their minds when the DoSO staff emailed a receipt of report. In most cases the reporter did not want contact, resources, or to pursue an investigation. DoSO staff find that reporters intend to inform the University about the incident rather than seek action. Actions Taken Reports to the DoSO staff have led to numerous interventions and responses on behalf of the University. The most common response to a bias or hate incident is a support meeting. This meeting provides a time and space for the targeted individual or reporter to share what happened, to receive support and guidance and get connected to campus resources/partners. This meeting allows the individual to share the impact that the incident had on them and provides guidance on how to move forward with an appropriate response. None of the 110 incidents were charged as hate crimes through the criminal justice process none were conduct violations through the UWS 17, non-academic misconduct process. It is important to note that targeted individuals or reporters may choose to not pursue the conduct process or file a criminal report. Additionally, the offender or respondent may not be known and may not be found guilty.
if an investigation occurs. DoSO staff also facilitated educational and restorative-based conversations as responses to bias or hate incidents. These conversations were requested on behalf of the targeted individuals and mutually agreed upon with the respondents. Educational conversations comprised the bulk of responses when engaging with the offender or respondent of an incident. Sometimes, emailed letters were sent out to particular residential communities when incidents occurred in Housing. When cases involved faculty or staff and DoSO staff collaborated with the Office of the Provost, Human Resources and the Office of Compliance on addressing the incident or concern. The DoSO staff also consulted with the Madison Police Department and UW Police Department on appropriate cases and with colleagues in the Office of Conduct and Community Standards.