



Rankin & Associates
Consulting, LLC

California State
University, East Bay

Assessment of Climate for
Learning, Living, &
Working
Executive Summary

August, 2021

Executive Summary

History of the Project

This report provides the findings from a survey entitled “*Cal State East Bay Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working*,” conducted at Cal State East Bay (CSUEB). In the spring 2020 semester, CSUEB contracted with Rankin & Associates Consulting (R&A) to conduct a university-wide study. Twenty-two CSUEB faculty, staff, students, and administrators formed the Climate Study Working Group (CSWG). The CSWG worked with R&A to develop the survey instrument and promote the survey’s administration in fall 2020. Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic, CSUEB engaged in online learning and working environments. All members of CSUEB were encouraged to complete the survey.

Responses to the multiple-choice format survey items were analyzed for statistical differences based on various demographic categories (e.g., CSUEB position status, gender identity, religious/spiritual affiliation) where appropriate. Where sample sizes were small, certain responses were combined into categories to make comparisons between groups and to ensure respondents’ confidentiality. Throughout the report, for example, the Faculty category included tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, non-tenure-track academic appointments, and administrators with faculty rank.

In addition to multiple-choice survey items, several open-ended questions provided respondents with the opportunity to describe their experiences at CSUEB. Comments were solicited to (1) give “voice” to the quantitative findings and (2) highlight the areas of concern that might have been overlooked owing to the small number of survey responses from historically underrepresented populations. For this reason, some qualitative comments may not seem aligned with the quantitative findings; however, they are important data.

Two thousand seven hundred thirty-one (2,731) surveys were returned for a 23% overall response rate. Response rates by position status were 14% for Undergraduate Students, 13% for

Graduate Students, 31% for Faculty, and 35% for Staff. The sample and population figures, chi-square analyses,¹ and response rates are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Cal State East Bay Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Group	Population		Sample		Response rate
		N	%	n	%	
Position status ^a	Undergraduate Student	12,240	71.7	1,734	63.5	14.2
	Graduate Student	3,007	17.6	384	14.1	12.8
	Faculty	903	5.3	283	10.4	31.3
	Staff	931	5.5	330	12.1	35.4
Gender identity ^b	Women	10,454	61.2	1,917	70.2	18.3
	Men	6,627	38.8	728	26.7	11.0
	Trans-spectrum/Not Listed	ND	ND	54	2.0	N/A
	Missing	ND	ND	32	1.2	N/A
Racial/ethnic identity ^c	Latinx	5,006	31.1	696	25.5	13.9
	APIDA	4,816	29.9	680	24.9	14.1
	White	3,616	22.4	610	22.3	16.9
	Black	1,831	11.4	212	7.8	11.6
	Other Respondents of Color	79	0.05	65	2.4	82.3
	Multiracial	752	4.7	392	14.4	52.1
	Missing	ND	ND	76	2.8	N/A
Sexual identity	Queer-spectrum	ND	ND	556	20.4	N/A
	Heterosexual	ND	ND	2,015	73.8	N/A
	Missing/Not Listed	ND	ND	160	5.9	N/A
Citizenship status	U.S. Citizen-Birth	ND	ND	2,097	76.8	N/A
	U.S. Citizen-Naturalized	ND	ND	315	11.5	N/A
	Non-U.S. Citizen	ND	ND	280	10.3	N/A
	Missing	ND	ND	39	1.4	N/A
Disability status	At Least One Disability	ND	ND	406	14.8	N/A
	No Disability	ND	ND	2,299	84.2	N/A
	Missing	ND	ND	26	1.0	N/A

¹ Chi-square tests were conducted only on those categories that were response options in the survey and included in demographics provided by CSUEB.

Table 1. Cal State East Bay Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Group	Population		Sample		Response rate
		<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Religious affiliation	Christian Affiliation	ND	ND	1,092	40.0	N/A
	Additional Affiliation	ND	ND	328	12.0	N/A
	No Affiliation	ND	ND	1,038	38.0	N/A
	Multiple Affiliations	ND	ND	84	3.1	N/A
	Missing	ND	ND	189	6.9	N/A

Note: The total *n* for each demographic characteristic may differ as a result of missing data.

^aND: No data available

^a $\chi^2(3, n = 2,731) = 392.4, p < .001$

^b $\chi^2(1, n = 2,731) = 141.2, p < .001$

^c $\chi^2(4, n = 2,731) = 281.4, p < .001$

The population data categories used at CSUEB reflect the categories used for federal reporting requirements. These were not the categories used for analyses in this report. With the CSWG’s approval, following are the categories for racial identity, gender identity, citizenship/immigration status, spiritual/religious identity, and sexual identity that were re-coded for the analyses. Some of the response choices in the survey were combined for comparative analyses. For a full list of responses, please refer to Appendix B.

It is important to note, and unique to CSUEB, that we are able to examine differences in more detail due to the diversity of the CSUEB population. For example, in most climate assessments it is rare to be able to examine differences by specific racial identities (e.g., APIDA, Black, Latinx). More commonly, these analyses are offered by combined categories (e.g., Respondents of Color). Therefore, the findings are more useful in examining the successes and challenges offered by these more nuanced variables. A table of the recoded variables is offered on page xxvii of the Executive Summary.

The following analyzed demographic categories showed statistically significant differences² between the sample data and the population data as provided by CSUEB.

- By position status, Undergraduate Students and Graduate Students were underrepresented in the sample. Faculty and Staff were overrepresented.

² Significance = $p < .05$

- By gender identity, Women were overrepresented in the sample. Men were underrepresented in the sample.
- By racial identity, Latinx, Asian Pacific Islander Desi American (APIDA), and Black respondents were underrepresented in the sample. Other Respondents of Color and Multiracial respondents were overrepresented.

Following are the highlighted findings from the report. The findings in this summary are offered in the order the questions appeared in the survey. The numbering does not reflect a hierarchy as all of these are “key” findings and of equal importance. More information is available for each finding in the full narrative and hyperlinks are provided for ease of navigation to the section of the report that provides those details. The initial section offers areas of concern suggesting opportunities for improvements. The second section offers areas of strength suggesting sustaining efforts in these areas. Overall, the findings both parallel the findings of other climate studies and the experiences of marginalized constituent groups offered in the literature.³

Key Findings – Opportunities for Improvement

1. Members of several constituent groups indicated lower levels of comfort with the campus, workplace, and classroom climate at CSUEB.

Climate is defined as “the current attitudes, behaviors, and standards, and practices of employees and students in an institution” (Rankin and Reason, 2008, p. 264).

Marginalized, underrepresented, and/or underserved groups at CSUEB indicated that they were less comfortable with the climate of the campus and workplace than their majority counterparts. Significant differences also emerged for respondents’ levels of comfort in their classrooms. Statistically significant differences are provided on the following pages.

³ Guiffreda et al. (2002); Harper & Hurtado (2007); Harper & Quaye (2004); Hurtado & Ponjuan (2005); Rankin & Reason (2005); Sears (2002); Settles et al. (2006); Silverschanz et al. (2008); Yosso et al. (2009)

Statistically Significant Findings for Overall Climate at CSUEB. Significant differences emerged in the review regarding how comfortable all respondents were with the overall climate at CSUEB.

- By Gender Identity:
 - Women respondents (26%) and Trans-Spectrum respondents (9%) are less comfortable with the overall campus climate at CSUEB than Men respondents (33%) (p. 71).
- By Position Status:
 - Staff respondents (11%) and Faculty respondents (13%) are less comfortable than Graduate Student respondents (31%) and Undergraduate Student respondents (30%) with the overall climate at CSUEB (p. 67).
- By Racial Identity:
 - Black respondents (17%), Multiracial respondents (23%), and White respondents (23%) are less comfortable with the overall campus climate at CSUEB than Latinx respondents (32%) and APIDA respondents (27%) (p. 73).

Statistically Significant Findings for Workplace Climate at CSUEB. Significant differences emerged regarding how comfortable all faculty and staff respondents were with the workplace climate at CSUEB.

- By Position Status
 - When analyzed by position status, no significant differences emerged between Faculty and Staff respondents nor among Faculty regarding their comfort levels with the climate in their department/program or work unit (p. 69).
 - When examining Staff respondents, Non-Exempt Staff respondents (10%) are less comfortable with the climate in their department/program or work unit at CSUEB than Exempt staff respondents (27%) (p. 69).

- By Racial Identity
 - Multiracial Faculty and Staff respondents (26%) and Faculty and Staff Respondents of Color (18%) are more uncomfortable with the climate in their department/program or work unit than White Faculty and Staff respondents (9%) (p. 75).
- By Years of Employment
 - Faculty and Staff Respondents Employed 6 to 10 Years (9%) are more uncomfortable with the climate in their department/program or work unit than Faculty and Staff Respondents Employed 5 Years or Less (3%) (p. 85).

Statistically Significant Findings for Classroom Climate at CSUEB. Significant differences also emerged regarding how comfortable all students and faculty respondents were with the classroom climate at CSUEB.

- By Gender Identity
 - Women Faculty and Student respondents (27%) and Trans-Spectrum respondents (12%) are less comfortable with the climate in their classes than Men Faculty and Student respondents (33%) (p. 73).
- By Income Status
 - Low-Income Student respondents (26%) are less comfortable with the climate in their classes than Not-Low-Income Student respondents (32%) (p. 83).
- By Position Status
 - Undergraduate Student respondents (26%) are less comfortable with the climate in their classes than Graduate Student respondents (37%) and Faculty respondents (32%) (p. 69).
 - Transfer student respondents (49%) are less comfortable with the climate in their classes than First-Year student respondents (53%) (p. 70).

Qualitative analysis revealed the following themes related to comfort with campus climate.

Three themes emerged from all respondents: an overall positive campus climate, dissatisfaction with the institutional response to a faculty members' published research on eugenics, and

inadequate disability accommodations. One additional theme emerged from Graduate and Undergraduate Student responses, their inability to make an informed decision about the campus climate due to COVID-19's forced move to full-time online learning. For complete information on these themes and corresponding quotes, see pages 88-89 in the full report.

2. Members of several constituent groups indicated that they experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct in the past year at CSUEB.

Several empirical studies reinforce the importance of the perception of non-discriminatory environments for positive learning and developmental outcomes.⁴ Research also underscores the relationship between hostile workplace climates and subsequent productivity.⁵ Further, scholars have explored the experiences specific student populations have with microaggressions. For example, research⁶ points to six racial microaggression themes experienced by Black undergraduate students: segregation (particularly within student housing), lack of representation across institutional populations, campus response to criminality or an assumption of criminality, cultural bias in courses, tokenism, and pressures to conform to standards of whiteness. Additionally, research⁷ has examined the effects of various forms of racial microaggressions (including interpersonal microaggressions, racial jokes, and institutional microaggressions) on Latinx students. Relatedly, when only taking gender into consideration, campus climate research specific to women faculty revealed experiences with gender discrimination, professional isolation, lack of work-life balance, and disproportionate service expectations within campus environments (Grant & Ghee, 2015). Compared with their male colleagues, these experiences resulted in higher rates of institutional departure among women faculty (Gardner, 2013). Maranto & Griffin (2011) identified women

⁴ Dugan et al. (2012); Eunyoung & Hargrove (2013); Garvey et al. (2018); Hurtado & Ponjuan (2005); Mayhew et al. (2016); Oseguera et al. (2017); Pascarella & Terenzini (2005); Strayhorn (2012)

⁵ Bilmoria & Stewart (2009); Costello (2012); Dade et al. (2015); Eagan & Garvey (2015); García (2016); Hirshfield & Joseph (2012); Jones & Taylor (2012); Levin et al. (2015); Rankin et al. (2010); Silverschanz et al. (2008)

⁶ Mills (2020)

⁷ Yosso et al. (2009)

faculty's perceived lack of inclusion and support as primary contributors to their experiences of "chilly" departmental climates.

Collectively, the results from this assessment parallel the findings of other climate assessments of specific constituent groups offered in the literature, where higher percentages of members of historically underrepresented and underserved groups had experienced various forms of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct and discrimination than did percentages of those in the majority.⁸ Overall, 14% ($n = 379$) of respondents indicated that they personally experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct at CSUEB in the past year (p. 95). One-third of these respondents indicated that they experienced the conduct five or more times in the past year (p. 95).

Of these respondents, 29% noted that the conduct was based on their position status at CSUEB, 25% indicated that the conduct was based on their ethnicity, and 19% felt it was based on their gender identity (p. 96). See below for an overview of statistically significant findings.

Differences Based on Position Status, Ethnicity, and Gender Identity. Significant differences emerged regarding the experiences of all student, faculty, and staff respondents who indicated that they had personally experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

- By Gender Identity
 - 35% of Trans-spectrum respondents reported experiencing this conduct in the past year significantly more than Men respondents (15%) and Women respondents (12%) (p. 99).
 - Of these respondents, 58% of Trans-spectrum respondents indicated that the conduct was based on their gender identity (p. 99).

⁸ Harper, 2015; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Ellis et al., 2018; Kim & Aquino, 2017; Leath & Chavous, 2018; Museus & Park, 2015; Pittman, 2012; Quinton, 2018; Seelman et al., 2017; Sue, 2010

- By Position Status
 - 32% of Faculty respondents and 28% of Staff respondents reported experiencing this conduct significantly more than Undergraduate Student respondents (10%) and Graduate Student respondents (9%) (p. 97).
 - 46% of Staff respondents indicated that the conduct was based most often on their position status (p. 97).
 - 32% of Faculty respondents indicated that the conduct was based most often on their gender identity (p. 97).
 - 24% of Student respondents indicated that the conduct was based most often on their ethnicity (p. 97).
- By Racial Identity
 - 25% of Other Respondents of Color, 18% of Multiracial respondents, and 17% of Black respondents, and 16% of White respondents reported experiencing this conduct significantly more than Latinx respondents (9%) (p. 98).
 - In the survey, race and ethnicity were combined. However, subsequent analyses yielded statistically significant differences by racial identity for the percentage of respondents who stated their experience of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct was based on their racial identity (p. 98).
 - 53% of Black respondents compared with 7% of White respondents indicated that the conduct was based on their racial identity (p. 98).
 - 30% of APIDA respondents compared with 7% of White respondents indicated that the conduct was based on their racial identity (p. 98).
 - 28% of Multiracial respondents compared with 7% of White respondents indicated that the conduct was based on their racial identity (p. 98).
 - 21% of Latinx respondents compared with 7% of White respondents indicated that the conduct was based on their racial identity (p. 98).

Qualitative analysis revealed the following themes related to experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. For complete information on these themes and corresponding quotes, see pages 112-115 in the full report.

- None-reporting due to a fear of repercussions (e.g., retaliation, loss of employment, receipt of a lower grade) was a common theme across all faculty, staff, and student respondents (p. 113).
- Unaware of process/resources where such conduct could be reported at CSUEB (p. 114).
- Lack of trust in the CSUEB leadership to do anything to change the reported behavior (p. 113).
- Faculty and Staff respondents shared various accounts suggesting that the institutional response to their reports was inadequate (p. 114).
- Microaggressive behaviors experienced on campus (p. 115).
- Microaggressive behaviors were addressed outside of “official” channels (p. 112).

3. Sizeable percentages of Faculty respondents, Staff respondents, and Student respondents seriously considered leaving CSUEB.

Campus climate research has demonstrated the effects of campus climate on faculty and student retention.⁹ Research specific to student experiences has found that a sense of belonging is integral to student persistence and retention.¹⁰ Paralleling such scholarship, noteworthy percentages of respondents indicated that they seriously considered leaving CSUEB within the past year.

⁹ Blumenfeld et al. (2016); Gardner (2013); Garvey & Rankin (2016); Johnson et al. (2014); Kutscher & Tuckwiller (2019); Lawrence et al. (2014); Pascale (2018); Ruud et al. (2018); Strayhorn (2013); Walpole et al. (2014)

¹⁰ Booker (2016); García & Garza (2016); Hausmann et al. (2007)

Undergraduate Student Respondents

- 20% of Undergraduate Student respondents seriously considered leaving CSUEB (p. 241). Undergraduate students offered several reasons why they seriously considered leaving CSUEB. The top five reasons follow.
 - Personal reasons (e.g., mental health, family emergencies and/or obligations (34%) (p. 242).
 - Lack of a sense of belonging at CSUEB (33%) (p. 242).
 - Lack of social life at CSUEB (31%) (p. 242).
 - Wanted to transfer to another institution (31%) (p. 242).
 - Financial reasons (30%) (p. 242).
- Subsequent analyses conducted on the selected demographic variables yielded the following:
 - By Transfer Status
 - First-Year Student respondents (30%) seriously considered leaving the institution significantly more often than Transfer Student respondents (14%) (p. 241).

Graduate Student Respondents

- 12% of Graduate Student respondents seriously considered leaving CSUEB (p. 241). Graduate students offered several reasons why they seriously considered leaving CSUEB. The top 5 reasons follow.
 - Personal reasons (e.g., mental health, family emergencies and/or obligations (36%) (p. 243).
 - Campus climate not welcoming (36%) (p. 243).
 - Lack of a sense of belonging (26%) (p. 243).
 - Financial reasons (21%) (p. 243).
 - Move to a virtual environment due to shelter in place order (21%) (p. 243).

- Subsequent analyses conducted on the selected demographic variables yielded the following:
 - By Sexual Identity
 - Queer-spectrum Graduate Student respondents (19%) seriously considered leaving the institution significantly more often than Heterosexual Graduate Student respondents (10%) (pp. 241-242).

Qualitative analysis revealed the following themes related to Student respondents' reasons for seriously considering leaving CSUEB: Lack of faculty support, moving to full-time on-line instruction, financial challenges, family challenges, lack of a sense of belonging, and lack of institutional support. For complete information on these themes and corresponding quotes, see pages 244-247 in the full report.

Faculty Respondents

- 52% of Faculty respondents seriously considered leaving CSUEB (p. 202). Faculty offered several reasons why they seriously considered leaving CSUEB. The top five reasons follow.
 - Low salary/pay rate (70%) (p. 205).
 - Increased workload (48%) (p. 205).
 - Cost of living (45%) (p. 205).
 - Lack of institutional resources (34%) (p. 205).
 - Lack of a sense of belonging (30%) (p. 205).
- Subsequent analyses conducted on the selected demographic variables yielded the following:
 - By Years of Service
 - 63% of Faculty Respondents with 6-10 Years of Employment seriously considered leaving CSUEB significantly more often than Faculty Respondents with 5 or less Years of Employment (41%) (p. 206).

Staff Respondents

- 65% of Staff respondents seriously considered leaving CSUEB (p. 202). Staff offered several reasons why they seriously considered leaving CSUEB. The top five reasons follow.
 - Low salary/pay rate (72%) (p. 203).
 - Limited advancement opportunities (53%) (p. 203).
 - Cost of living (39%) (p. 203).
 - Push to return to campus post COVID-19 shelter in place orders (34%) (p. 203).
 - Increased workload (34%) (p. 203).
- Subsequent analyses conducted on the selected demographic variables yielded the following:
 - By Years of Service
 - 74% of Staff Respondents with 6-10 Years of Employment seriously considered leaving CSUEB significantly more often than Staff Respondents with 5 or less Years of Employment (58%) (p. 204).

Qualitative analysis revealed the following themes related to Faculty and Staff respondents' reasons for seriously considering leaving CSUEB: lack of compensation, limited advancement opportunities, lack of institutional vision, and increased workload. For complete information on these themes and corresponding quotes, see pages 206-208 in the full report.

4. Student respondents indicated challenges related to faculty and staff interactions.

One of the survey items asked Student respondents the degree to which they agreed with a series of statements about their interactions with faculty, other students, staff members, and senior administrators at CSUEB. Frequencies and significant differences based on student status (undergraduate vs. graduate), gender identity,¹¹ racial identity,¹² sexual identity, religious/spiritual affiliation, income status, and first-generation status revealed that students from backgrounds historically underrepresented at colleges held less

¹¹ With the CSWG's approval, gender identity was categorized to only Men and Women and sexual identity to LGBTQ/Queer-spectrum and Heterosexual to maintain response confidentiality.

¹² Owing to low numbers in some of the response categories, this variable was further collapsed into Respondents of Color (Respondents of Color and Multiracial) and White.

positive views of their experiences than did their peers from “majority” backgrounds. Examples of findings are presented below. A complete overview of significant differences is provided on pages 222–235 of the full report.

- By Gender Identity
 - A significantly higher percentage of Men Student respondents (17%) than Women Student respondents (13%) felt that faculty prejudged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background (p. 232).
- By Income Status
 - A significantly higher percentage of Low-Income Student respondents (15%) than Not-Low-Income Student respondents (13%) felt that staff prejudged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background (p. 233).
- By Position Status
 - Graduate Student respondents (41%) felt significantly more valued by other students in their learning environment than Undergraduate Student respondents (31%) (p. 226).
 - 18% of Graduate Student respondents and 13% of Undergraduate Student respondents felt that faculty prejudged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background (p. 232).
- By Racial Identity
 - 21% of White Student respondents, 20% of Other Students of Color, 17% of Multiracial Student respondents, 17% of Black Student respondents, and 16% of Latinx Student respondents felt that faculty prejudged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background (p. 232).
 - Other Students of Color (23%), APIDA Student respondents (16%), and Latinx Student respondents (16%) felt that staff prejudged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background significant more than White Student respondents (9%) (p. 233).

- **By Spiritual/Religious Affiliation**
 - Additional Religious Affiliation Student respondents (35%) and Christian Affiliation Student respondents (28%) felt significantly more valued by senior administrators than No Affiliation Student respondents (22%) (p. 223).
 - Additional Religious Affiliation Student respondents (20%.) felt that staff prejudged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background significantly more than Christian Student respondents (14%) and No Affiliation Student respondents (12%) (p. 233).
- **By Transfer Status**
 - Transfer Student Respondents (36%) felt significantly more valued by CSUEB faculty than First-Year Student Respondents (25%) (p. 222).
 - Transfer Student respondents (30%) felt significantly more valued by senior administrators than First-Year Student respondents (21%) (p. 223).

5. Staff respondents indicated challenges with work-life issues.

Staff respondents felt less positive about several aspects of their work life at CSUEB. It is important to note in these analyses that both low and high percentages indicate potential challenges. A complete overview of findings is provided on pages 179-201 of the full report.

Following is a summary of potential challenges for Staff respondents based on lower percentages of respondents agreeing to the statements.

- 8% of Staff respondents felt that child care benefits were competitive (p. 191).
- 15% of Staff respondents felt that clear procedures existed on how they could advance at CSUEB (p. 194).
- 22% of Staff respondents felt positive about their career opportunities at CSUEB (p. 194).
- 24% felt that CSUEB committees valued staff opinions (p. 193).
- 29% felt that CSUEB policies were fairly applied across CSUEB (p. 188).
- 33% felt valued by CSEUB senior administrators (p. 199).

Following is a summary potential challenges for Staff respondents based on higher percentages of respondents agreeing to the statements.

- 72% of Staff respondents felt that staff salaries were not competitive (p. 191).
- 54% of Staff respondents felt that a hierarchy existed within staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than others (p. 184).
- 53% of Staff respondents felt that that their workload has increased without additional compensation due to other staff departures (p. 184).
- 45% of Staff respondents felt that CSUEB was not supportive of flexible work schedules (p. 190).

Qualitative analysis revealed the following themes for Staff respondents: limited advancement opportunities, increased workloads, non-competitive compensation. For complete information on these themes and corresponding quotes, see pages 185-186 and pages 195-196 in the full report.

6. Faculty respondents indicated challenges with faculty work.

The survey results indicated that Faculty respondents felt less positive about several aspects of their faculty work at CSUEB. The following findings provide examples. A complete overview of findings is provided on pages 160-178 of the full report.

Tenured and Tenure-Track

- 50% of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt they were burdened by service responsibilities (e.g., committee memberships, departmental/program work assignments) beyond those of their colleagues with similar performance expectations (p. 163).
 - By Gender Identity
 - A significantly greater percentage of Women Faculty respondents (38%) than Men Faculty respondents (15%) felt that they were they were burdened by service responsibilities (p. 163).
- 53% of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt they performed more work to help students (e.g., formal and informal advising, thesis advising, helping with student groups and activities) than did their colleagues (p. 163).

- 38% of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that tenure standards/promotion standards were applied equally to faculty in their schools/divisions (p. 160).

Qualitative analysis revealed two themes for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents. Tenure-Track Faculty respondents suggested the criteria for gaining tenure at CSUEB are subjective, unclear, and confusing and do not follow outlined retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) policies subjective tenure criteria and that child care would improve the work-place climate. For complete information on this theme and corresponding quotes, see pages 165 -166 and page 174 in the full report.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

- 45% of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that the criteria used for contract renewal were applied equally to all positions (p. 167).
- 33% of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that they performed more work to help students (e.g., formal and informal advising, thesis advising, helping with student groups and activities) than did their non-tenure-track colleagues (p. 168).

Qualitative analysis revealed two themes for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty shared that they are carrying a heavy workload for CSUEB without being fairly compensated for their contributions and that they had limited advancement opportunities. For complete information on this theme and corresponding quotes, see pages 169 and 174 in the full report.

All Faculty

- 57% of Faculty respondents did not feel that salaries for tenure-track faculty positions were competitive (p. 170).
- 62% of Faculty respondents did not feel that salaries for adjunct faculty were competitive (p. 170).
- 53% of Faculty respondents did not feel that CSUEB provided them with adequate resources to help them manage work-life balance (p. 171).
- 33% of Faculty respondents felt valued by senior administrators (p. 175).
- 29% of Faculty respondents felt child care benefits were not competitive (p. 170).

Qualitative analysis revealed one theme for all Faculty respondents. Faculty respondents shared that current compensation packages were not competitive and made living in the Bay Area a challenge. For complete information on this theme and corresponding quotes, see pages 173-174 in the full report.

7. Differences emerged in Student respondents' *Perceived Academic Success*.

How students perceive their academic success often contributes to their decision to persist in higher education. The survey included a series of questions to determine student perception of their academic success. The analyses revealed significant differences that are summarized here.

- Undergraduate Students
 - By Racial Identity
Latinx, APIDA, Other Respondents of Color, and Multiracial Undergraduate Student respondents had higher *Perceived Academic Success* scores did than Black Undergraduate Student respondents (p. 215).
 - By Generational Status
First-Generation Undergraduate Student respondents had higher *Perceived Academic Success* scores than Not-First-Generation Undergraduate Student respondents (p. 217).
 - By Gender Identity
Women Undergraduate Student respondents had higher *Perceived Academic Success* scores than did Trans-spectrum Undergraduate Student respondents (p. 214).
- Graduate Students
 - By Income Status
Not-Low-Income Graduate Student respondents had higher *Perceived Academic Success* scores than Low-Income Graduate Student respondents (p. 217).

Qualitative analysis revealed the following themes for Student respondents: inadequate academic advising, COVID-19 challenges, mental health issues, online learning challenges, work/school

balance, lack of course availability, financial challenges, and changing majors. For complete information on these themes and corresponding quotes, see pages 217-221 in the full report.

8. A meaningful percentage of respondents experienced unwanted sexual conduct.

A recent AAU report (2019) indicated that “non-consensual sexual contact by physical force or inability to consent since a respondent enrolled as a student at their school was 13 percent, with the rates for women and transgender, genderqueer, and non-binary (TGQN) students being significantly higher than for men” (p. vii-viii). The AAU report also indicated that the rate of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or inability to consent increased from 2015-2019 by 3 percentage points for undergraduate women, 2.4 percentage points for graduate and professional women, and 1.4 percentage points for undergraduate men. One section of the CSUEB survey requested information regarding respondents’ experiences with unwanted sexual conduct/contact.

- 4% of all respondents indicated they had experienced unwanted sexual contact/conduct while at CSUEB (p. 130).
 - 1% experienced relationship violence (e.g., ridiculed, controlling, hitting) (p. 131).
 - 2% experienced stalking (e.g., following me, on social media, texting, phone calls) (p. 135).
 - 2% experienced sexual interaction (e.g., unwanted sexual videos, text, etc., catcalling, repeated sexual advances, sexual harassment) (p. 139).
 - 1% experienced unwanted sexual contact (e.g., unwanted touching, fondling, rape, sexual assault, penetration without consent) (p. 145).
- Respondents identified CSUEB students, current or former dating/intimate partners, acquaintances/friends, and strangers as sources of unwanted sexual contact/conduct (pp. 132-146).
- A majority of respondents did not report the unwanted sexual contact/conduct (pp. 134-148).

9. A sizeable percentage of Student respondents experienced financial hardship, including housing and/or food insecurity, while attending CSUEB.

On the survey, 53% of Student respondents indicated they experienced financial hardship while attending CSUEB (p. 59).

- 56% of Undergraduate Student respondents experienced financial hardship (p. 59).
- 41% of Graduate Student respondents experienced financial hardship (p. 59).

Students indicated they experienced financial hardship in the following areas (p. 59).

- 66% had difficulty affording tuition.
- 65% had difficulty purchasing books/course materials.
- 42% had difficulty affording housing.
- 36% had difficulty affording food.
- 31% had difficulty affording parking.
- 24% had difficulty affording health care.
- 23% had difficulty affording technology (e.g., laptop, wireless).

10. Respondents held divergent opinions about the degree to which CSUEB does, and should, promote certain initiatives that would positively influence campus climate.

The survey asked Faculty, Staff, and Student respondents to indicate if they believed certain initiatives currently were available at CSUEB and the degree to which they thought that those initiatives would positively influence campus climate. Examples of overall findings for Faculty respondents, Staff respondents, and Student respondents are presented below. For each result, the majority of respondents felt that adding the initiative would positively influence the campus climate. A complete overview of findings related to institutional actions is provided on pages 252-271 of the full report.

Examples of Findings for Faculty Respondents

- 55% of Faculty respondents thought that comprehensive diversity, equity, and inclusivity professional development was available, and 45% of Faculty respondents thought that such professional development was not available (p. 253).
- 43% of Faculty respondents thought that supervisory training for faculty was available, and 57% of Faculty respondents thought that it was not available (p. 253).
- 53% of Faculty respondents thought toolkits for faculty to create an inclusive classroom environment were available, and 47% thought that these toolkits were not available (p. 253).
- 56% of Faculty respondents thought that mentorship for new faculty was available, and 44% thought it was not available (p. 254).
- 54% of Faculty respondents thought that a fair process to resolve conflicts was available, and 46% thought that such a process was not available (p. 254).

Examples of Findings for Staff Respondents

- 57% of Staff respondents thought that diversity, equity, and inclusivity workshops/professional development opportunities for staff were available at CSUEB, and 43% thought that they were not available (p. 258).
- 30% of Staff respondents thought that mentorship for new staff was available, and 70% thought that staff mentorship was not available (p. 259).
- 53% of Staff respondents thought that diversity, equity, and inclusivity-related professional experiences included as one of the criteria for hiring of staff was available, and 47% thought that it was not available (p. 260).
- 53% of Staff respondents thought that career development opportunities for staff were available, and 47% thought that they were not available (p. 260).

Examples of Findings for Student Respondents

- 91% of Student respondents thought that diversity and equity training for students was available at CSUEB, and 9% thought that it was not available (p. 264).

- 79% of Student respondents thought that a process to address student complaints of bias by faculty/staff in learning environments (e.g., classrooms, labs) was available, and 21% (thought that such a process was not available (p. 265).
- 78% of Student respondents thought that opportunities for cross-cultural dialogue between students were available, and 22% thought that these opportunities were not available (p. 266).
- 76% of Student respondents thought that mandatory class for all students focusing on social justice issues was available, and 24% thought that this class was not available (p. 265).
- 79% of Student respondents thought that effective faculty mentorship of students was available and 21% thought that it was not available (p. 266).

Key Findings – Areas of Strength

1. The survey suggested high levels of general comfort with the climate at CSUEB.

Climate is defined as “the current attitudes, behaviors, and standards, and practices of employees and students in an institution” (Rankin and Reason, 2008, p. 264). The level of comfort that students, faculty, and staff experiences is one indicator of campus climate. Top-level findings suggest high levels of comfort with the climate at CSUEB.

- 70% of all survey respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the overall climate (p. 66).
- 65% of Faculty and Staff respondents were comfortable with the climate in their departments/program or work units (p. 66).
- 77% of Student and Faculty respondents were comfortable with the climate in their classes (p. 66).

Notably, the statistics above do not tell the unique stories of student, faculty, and staff experiences at CSUEB as noted in the “Opportunities for Improvements” section of this document.

2. Student respondents generally expressed positive views about their academic experiences and their awareness of available resources.

The way students perceive and experience their campus climate influences their performance and success in college.¹³ Research also supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for improving learning outcomes.¹⁴ Attitudes toward academic pursuits are one indicator of campus climate.

- 74% of Student respondents felt valued by faculty (p. 222).
- 71% of Student respondents felt valued by staff (p. 222).
- 76% of Student respondents felt valued by faculty in their learning environment (p. 226).
- 75% of Student respondents felt valued by other students in their learning environment (p. 226).
- 96% of Student respondents were aware of the definition of Affirmative Consent (p. 149).
- 93% of Student respondents were aware of the role of the CSUEB Title IX Coordinators with regard to reporting incidents of unwanted sexual contact/conduct (p. 149).
- 69% of Student respondents indicated that the campus climate at CSUEB encouraged free and open discussion of difficult topics (p. 230).
- 91% of Student respondents thought that diversity and equity training for students was available at CSUEB (p. 264).

Although these findings are a general area of strength, they also highlight potential areas of opportunity as evidenced by the smaller percentages of Student respondents who felt valued by CSUEB faculty, staff, and senior administrators. Student responses also suggest students feel less valued by their peers outside of the classroom. Even more, students are not a monolith. As stated above, the campus experiences of students associated with historically underserved social/community/affinity groups (e.g., women,

¹³ For a review of extant literature, see Mayhew et al. (2016) and Pascarella & Terenzini (2005).

¹⁴ For a review of extant literature, see Mayhew et al. (2016) and Pascarella & Terenzini (2005).

People of Color, first-generation and/or low-income students, queer-spectrum and/or trans-spectrum individuals) differ from those of their majority counterparts.¹⁵ Summaries of significant differences based on student status (undergraduate vs. graduate), gender identity,¹⁶ racial identity,¹⁷ sexual identity, religious/spiritual affiliation, income status, and first-generation status are offered throughout the full report. Examples of statistically significant differences are also presented in the “Opportunities for Improvement” section of this document.

3. Faculty respondents generally expressed positive views about some aspects of their faculty work.

Tenured and Tenure-Track

- 81% of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty felt that teaching was valued at CSUEB (p. 162).
- 69% of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that they had opportunities to participate in substantive committee assignments. (p. 165).
- 54% of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that that service was valued at CSUEB (p. 162).

Non-Tenure-Track

- 70% of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that clear expectations of their responsibilities exist (p. 167).
- 67% of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that that teaching was valued at CSUEB (p. 168).

All Faculty

- 87% of Faculty respondents felt valued by students in their learning environment (p. 175).

¹⁵ Garvey et al. (2015); Goldberg et al. (2019); Harper & Hurtado (2007); Jayakumar et al. (2009); Johnson (2012); Means & Pyne (2017); Soria & Stebleton (2013); Rankin (2003); Rankin & Reason (2005); Walpole et al. (2014)

¹⁶ With the CSWG’s approval, gender identity was categorized to only Men and Women and sexual identity to LGBTQ/Queer-spectrum and Heterosexual to maintain response confidentiality.

¹⁷ Owing to low numbers in some of the response categories, this variable was further collapsed into Respondents of Color (Respondents of Color and Multiracial) and White.

- 76% of Faculty respondents felt valued by their department/program chair (p. 175).
- 65% of Faculty respondents felt valued by other CSUEB faculty (p. 175).

Significant differences in Faculty respondents' perception of their work based on their faculty status (Tenured Tenure-Track or Non-Tenure-Track), gender identity, racial identity, sexual identity, and years of employment at CSUEB are available on pages 160 - 167 in the full report. Areas for enhancement related to faculty work are also presented in the "Opportunities for Improvement" section of this document.

4. Staff respondents generally expressed positive views about some aspects of their staff work.

- 76% of Staff respondents felt valued by coworkers in their department (p. 182).
- 74% of Staff respondents felt that their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance (p. 184).
- 72% of Staff respondents felt they were given a reasonable time frame in which to complete assigned responsibilities (p. 199).
- 72% of Staff respondents felt valued by their supervisors/managers (p. 199).

Significant differences in Staff respondents' perception of their work based on their staff status (Exempt Staff or Non-Exempt Staff), gender identity, racial identity,¹⁸ sexual identity, years of employment, and commuting distance are available on pages 179-201 in the full report. Areas for enhancement related to staff work are also presented in the "Opportunities for Improvement" section of this document.

Conclusion

CSUEB's climate assessment report provides baseline data on diversity and inclusion at the university, and addresses CSUEB's mission and goals. The results suggest that students, faculty, and staff generally are comfortable with the overall climate at CSUEB, and in some regards, they hold positive views about their academic and/or work experiences at CSUEB. However, positive

¹⁸ Owing to low numbers in some of the response categories, this variable was further collapsed into Respondents of Color (Respondents of Color and Multiracial) and White.

experiences and perspectives are not consistent across CSUEB constituent groups. For example, Faculty respondents, Staff respondents, and Student respondents associated with historically underserved social/community/affinity groups (e.g., People of Color, women, low-income students) were less comfortable with the climate at CSUEB. Members of groups that are minoritized at CSUEB also indicated specific challenges related to the campus climate, and noteworthy percentages of survey respondents had seriously considered leaving CSUEB.

While the findings presented in the report may guide decision-making regarding policies and practices at CSUEB, it is important to note that the cultural fabric of any institution and unique aspects of each campus's environment must be taken into consideration when deliberating additional action items based on these findings. The climate assessment findings provide the CSUEB community with an opportunity to build upon its strengths and to develop a deeper awareness of the challenges ahead. CSUEB, with support from senior administrators and collaborative leadership, is in a prime position to actualize its commitment to promote an inclusive campus and to institute organizational structures that respond to the needs of its dynamic campus community.

It is imperative that the voices of those who experience the most oppression and exclusion at CSUEB are placed at the center of action items and decisions in order to move the institution forward. Research demonstrates that, “student body diversity in institutions of higher education is important not only for improving the economic and educational opportunities for underrepresented students, but also for the social, academic, and societal benefits that diversity presents for all students and communities. Diverse learning environments help students sharpen their critical thinking and analytical skills; prepare students to succeed in an increasingly diverse and interconnected world; break down stereotypes and reduce bias; and enable schools to fulfill their role in opening doors for students of all backgrounds” (U.S. Department of Education, 2016, p. 5). Everyone benefits from a more inclusive campus. To create a more inclusive campus environment, CSUEB is required to acknowledge areas of opportunity and take responsibility for restoring, rebuilding, and implementing action that prioritizes those most negatively impacted in the current structure.

Variable Recodes by Selected Demographic Characteristics	
Racial Identity*	
Variable name	Identities from survey responses
APIDA	Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander/South Asian
Black	Black/African/African American
Latinx	Hispanic/Latinx/Chicanx
White	White/European American
Biracial/Multiracial	Respondents who identified as more than one racial identity
Other Respondents of Color	Alaskan Native/American Indian/Native American/Indigenous/ Middle Eastern/Native Hawaiian
Gender Identity	
Men	Men
Women	Women
Transspectrum	Genderqueer/Nonbinary/Transgender
Sexual Identity	
Heterosexual	Heterosexual
Queer Spectrum	Asexual/Bisexual/Gay/Lesbian/Pansexual/Queer/Questioning
Generational Status	
First-generation	No high school/Some high school/Completed High School/ GED/Some College/Business/Technical Certificate/Associates degree
Not-first-generation	Bachelor's degree/Some graduate school/Master's degree/Specialist degree/Doctoral degree/Professional degree
Income Status	
Low-income	\$29,999 and below/\$30,000-\$49,999/\$50,000-\$69,999
Not-low-income	\$70,000 and above
Religious/Spiritual Identity**	
Christian Affiliation	African Methodist Episcopal/African Methodist Episcopal Zion/ Assembly of God/Baptist/Catholic or Roman Catholic/Christian Methodist Episcopal/Christian Orthodox/Christian Reformed Church (CRC)/Church of Christ/Church of God in Christ/Episcopalian/ Evangelical/Greek Orthodox/ Jehovah's Witness/Lutheran/ Mennonite/Moravian/ Nondenominational Christian/ Oriental Orthodox (e.g., Coptic, Eritrean, Armenian)/Pentecostal/Presbyterian/ Protestant /Protestant Reformed Church (PR)/Quaker/Reformed Church of America (RCA)/ Russian Orthodox/Seventh Day Adventist/The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints/United Church of Christ/United Methodist
Additional Affiliation	Baha'i/Buddhist/Confucianist/Druid/ Hindu/Jain/Jewish/Muslim/ Native American Traditional Practitioner or Ceremonial/Pagan/ Rastafarian/Scientologist/Secular Humanist/Shinto/Sikh/Taoist/ Tenrikyo/Unitarian Universalist/Wiccan
No Affiliation	Agnostic, Atheist, No affiliation, Spiritual but no religious affiliation
Multiple Affiliations	Respondents who identified as more than one religious/spiritual affiliation
Years of Employment	
Variable name	Identities from survey responses
Less than 5 years	Less than 1 year/1-2 years/3-5 years
6-10 years	6-10 years
More than 11 years	11-20 years/21 or more years

*Note: When comparing significant differences, all racial minorities are analyzed using the individual variables offered here. Where individual respondent numbers were too low in an individual variable, respondents were grouped and referred to, in this report, as Other Respondents of Color. For a listing of all respondent's choices for racial identity, please refer to Appendix B.

**For a listing of all respondent's choices for religious/spiritual affiliation, please refer to Appendix B.

References

- Aguirre, A., & Messineo, M. (1997). Racially motivated incidents in higher education: What do they say about the campus climate for minority students? *Equity & Excellence in Education, 30*(2), 26–30.
- Allen, C. C. Alleman, N. F. (2019). A private struggle at a private institution: Effects of student hunger on social and academic experiences. *Journal of College Student Development, 60*(1), 52–69.
- Blumenfeld, W. J., Weber, G. N., & Rankin, S. (2016). In our own voice: Campus climate as a mediating factor in the persistence of LGBT students, faculty, and staff in higher education. In E. A. Mikulec & P. C. Miller (Eds.), *Queering classrooms: Personal narratives and educational practices to support LGBTQ youth in schools* (pp. 187–212). Charlotte: IAP Information Age Publishing.
- Booker, K. (2016). Connection and commitment: How sense of belonging and classroom community influence degree persistence for African American undergraduate women. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education, 28*(2), 218–229.
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Harps, S., Townsend, R., Thomas, G., ... & Madden, K. (2019). Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and misconduct. *Association of American Universities*.
- Eunyoung, Kim, & Hargrove, D. T. (2013). Deficient or resilient: A critical review of Black male academic success and persistence in higher education. *The Journal of Negro Education, 82*(3), 300–311.
- Ellis, J. M., Powell, C. S., Demetriou, C. P., Huerta-Bapat, C., & Panter, A. T. (2018). Examining first-generation college student lived experiences with microaggressions and microaffirmations at a predominantly White public research university. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 25*(2), 266–279.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000198>
- Flowers, L., & Pascarella, E. (1999). Cognitive effects of college racial composition on African American students after 3 years of college. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 669–677.

- García, Hugo A., & Garza, T. (2016). Retaining Latino males in community colleges: A structural model explaining sense of belonging through socio-academic integration. *The Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*, 23(2), 41–58.
- Gardner, S. K. (2013). Women and faculty departures from a striving institution: Between a rock and a hard place. *The Review of Higher Education*, 36(3), 349–370.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2013.0025>
- Garvey, Jason C., & Rankin, S. (2016a). The influence of campus climate and urbanization on queer-spectrum and trans-spectrum faculty intent to leave. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000035>
- Grant, C. M., & Ghee, S. (2015). Mentoring 101: Advancing African-American women faculty and doctoral student success in predominantly White institutions. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 28(7), 759–785.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2015.1036951>
- Guiffrida, D., Gouveia, A., Wall, A., & Seward, D. (2008). Development and validation of the Need for Relatedness at College Questionnaire (nRC-Q). *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 251–261. doi: 10.1037/a0014051
- Harper, C. E., & Yeung, F. (2013). Perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity as a predictor of college students' openness to diverse perspectives. *Review of Higher Education*, 37(1), 25–44.
- Harper, S., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2007(120), 7–24.
- Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (2004). Taking seriously the evidence regarding the effects of diversity on student learning in the college classroom: A call for faculty accountability. *UrbanEd*, 2(2), 43–47.
- Hausmann, L. R., Schofield, J. W., & Woods, R. L. (2007). Sense of belonging as a predictor of intentions to persist among African American and White first-year college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(7), 803–839.
- Hurtado, S., & Ponjuan, L. (2005). Latino educational outcomes and the campus climate. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 4(3), 235–251. doi: 10.1177/1538192705276548
- Kim, E., & Aquino, K. C. (2017). *Disability as diversity in higher education: Policies and practices to enhance student success*. Routledge.

- Johnson, Dawn R. (2012). Campus racial climate perceptions and overall sense of belonging among racially diverse women in STEM majors. *Journal of College Student Development, 53*(2), 336–346. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2012.0028>
- Johnson, D. R., Wasserman, T. H., Yildirim, N., & Yonai, B. A. (2014). Examining the effects of stress and campus climate on the persistence of students of color and White students: An application of Bean and Eaton’s Psychological Model of Retention. *Research in Higher Education, 55*(1), 75–100.
- Kutscher, E. L., & Tuckwiller, E. D. (2019). Persistence in higher education for students with disabilities: A mixed systematic review. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 12*(2), 136–155.
- Lawrence, J. H., Celis, S., Kim, H. S., Lipson, S. K., & Tong, X. (2014). To stay or not to stay: Retention of Asian international faculty in STEM fields. *Higher Education, 67*(5), 511–531. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9658-0>
- Leath, S., & Chavous, T. (2018). Black women’s experiences of campus racial climate and stigma at predominantly White institutions: Insights from a comparative and within-group approach for STEM and non-STEM majors. *Journal of Negro Education, 87*(2), 125–139. <https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.87.2.0125>
- Maranto, C. L., & Griffin, A. E. (2011). The antecedents of a “chilly climate” for women faculty in higher education. *Human Relations, 64*(2), 139–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726710377932>
- Mayhew, M., Rockenbach, A., Bowman, N., Seifert, T., & Wolniak, G. (2016). *How college affects students, Volume 3: 21st century evidence that higher education works*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Mills, K. J. (2019). “It’s systemic”: Environmental racial microaggressions experienced by Black undergraduates at a predominantly White institution. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000121*
- Museus, S. D., & Park, J. J. (2015). The continuing significance of racism in the lives of Asian American college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(6), 551–569. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2015.0059>
- Pascale, A. B. (2018). Supports and pushes: Insight into the problem of retention of STEM women faculty. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education, 11*(3), 247–264.

- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Diego: Jossey-Bass.
- Pittman, C. T. (2012). Racial microaggressions: The narratives of African American faculty at a predominantly White university. *Journal of Negro Education, 81*(1), 82–92.
<https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.81.1.0082>
- Quinton, W. J. (2018). Unwelcome on campus? Predictors of prejudice against international students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 12*(2), 156–169.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000091>
- Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of Student College Development, 46*(1), 43–61.
- Reynolds, A. L., Sneva, J. N., & Beehler, G. P. (2010). The influence of racism-related stress on the academic motivation of Black and Latino/a students. *Journal of College Student Development. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0120*
- Ruud, C. M., Saclarides, E. S., George-Jackson, C. E., & Lubienski, S. T. (2018). Tipping points: Doctoral students and consideration of departure. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 20*(3), 286–307.
- Sears, J. T. (2002). The institutional climate for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual education faculty. *Journal of Homosexuality, 43*(1), 11–37. doi: 10.1300/J082v43n01_02
- Seelman, K. L., Woodford, M. R., & Nicolazzo, Z. (2017). Victimization and microaggressions targeting LGBTQ college students: Gender identity as a moderator of psychological distress. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 26*(1–2), 112–125.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15313204.2016.1263816>
- Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Malley, J., & Stewart, A. J. (2006). The climate for women in academic science: The good, the bad, and the changeable. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*(1), 47–58. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00261.x
- Silverschanz, P., Cortina, L., Konik, J., & Magley, V. (2008). Slurs, snubs, and queer jokes: Incidence and impact of heterosexist harassment in academia. *Sex Roles, 58*(3–4), 179–191. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9329-7

- Strayhorn, T. L. (2013). Measuring race and gender difference in undergraduate perceptions of campus climate and intentions to leave college: An analysis in black and white. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 50(2), 115–132.
- Sue, D. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Wiley.
- Waldo, C. (1999). Out on campus: Sexual orientation and academic climate in a university context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 26, 745–774. doi: 10.1023/A:1022110031745
- Walpole, MaryBeth, Chambers, C. R., & Goss, K. (2014). Race, class, gender and community college persistence among African American women. *NASPA Journal about Women in Higher Education*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/njawhe-2014-0012>
- Whitt, E. J., Edison, M. I., Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Nora, A. (2001). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the second and third years of college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 172–204.
- Yosso, T. J., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. G. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(4), 659–690, 781, 785–786.