Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working
Thank you!

- Thank you!
  - CSWG committee
  - CSWG committee leadership: Dr. A. Tamika Quick, Dr. Mia Zamora, and corresponding admin support
  - Hong Gao from Institutional Research
  - Margaret McCorry, with help from multiple others in coordinating communications and survey marketing
How students experience their campus environment influences both learning and developmental outcomes.¹

Discriminatory environments have a negative effect on student learning.²

Research supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty for enhancing learning outcomes.³

¹ Harper & Hurtado, 2009; Maramba & Museus, 2011; Mayhew et al., 2016; Patton, 2011; Strayhorn, 2012; Buckley & Park, 2019; Fernandez et al., 2019.
² Mayhew et al., 2016; Shelton, 2019; Yosso et. al., 2009; Crisp et al., 2015;
The personal and professional development of employees is impacted by campus climate.¹

Faculty members who judge their campus climate more positively are more likely to feel personally supported and perceive their work unit as more supportive.²

Research underscores the relationships between (1) workplace discrimination and negative job/career attitudes and (2) workplace encounters with prejudice and decreased health and well-being.³

¹ Gardner, 2013; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Smith, 2015; Urrieta, Méndez, & Rodríguez, 2015
³ Young, Anderson, & Stewart, 2014; Costello, 2012; García, 2016; Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2006
The Online Survey

**Instrument**
- 115 questions including 20 open-ended questions to provide commentary
- All community members were invited to take the survey by President Lamont O. Repollet
- The survey was available from March 2 – April 15, 2022.

**Structure**
- Personal Experiences of Campus Climate
- Workplace Climate for Employees
- Demographic Information
- Perceptions of Campus Climate
- Institutional Actions
Data were not reported for groups of fewer than 5 individuals where identity could be compromised.

Instead, small groups were combined to eliminate possibility of identifying individuals.

Some qualitative comments were redacted to protect confidentiality of respondents.
Response Rates by Position

14% overall response rate ($n = 1,971$)

- **Faculty**: 32% ($n = 408$)
- **Undergraduate**: 11% ($n = 1,066$)
- **Graduate**: 8% ($n = 169$)
- **Staff**: 53% ($n = 328$)
Response Rates by Gender Identity

14% overall response rate ($n = 1,971$)

- Women: 15% ($n = 1,359$)
- Men: 11% ($n = 546$)
Response Rates by Racial Identity

14% overall response rate ($n = 1,971$)

- Black/African American: 13% ($n = 332$)
- Hispanic/Latinx: 9% ($n = 353$)
- White: 14% ($n = 722$)
- Additional Racial/Ethnic: 23% ($n = 203$)
- Multiracial: 94% ($n = 274$)
Respondents by Position (%)

- Undergraduate Student: 54%
- Graduate Student: 17%
- Faculty: 21%
- Staff: 9%

The pie chart visually represents the distribution of respondents by position.
Respondents by Campus Location (%)

- Kean Ocean:
  - Undergraduate Student: 6%
  - Graduate Student: 3%
  - Faculty: 9%
  - Staff: 3%

- Kean Online:
  - Undergraduate Student: 3%
  - Graduate Student: 1%
  - Faculty: 3%
  - Staff: 0%

- Kean Skylands:
  - Undergraduate Student: 0%
  - Graduate Student: 0%
  - Faculty: 0%
  - Staff: 0%

- Union:
  - Undergraduate Student: 90%
  - Graduate Student: 96%
  - Faculty: 88%
  - Staff: 97%
# Analysis Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>FACULTY/STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer status</td>
<td>Faculty status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>Gender identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial identity</td>
<td>Racial identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual identity</td>
<td>Sexual identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-generation status</td>
<td>Years of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability status</td>
<td>Religious affiliation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recoded variables were approved by CSWG. For the purposes of some analyses, this report uses two gender identity categories (Men and Women), where Trans-spectrum was excluded owing to the low number of respondents and to protect their confidentiality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey response options</th>
<th>Recoded Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>Trans-spectrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender Man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender Woman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R&A uses “trans-spectrum” as an umbrella term to describe the gender identity of individuals who do not identify as cis-gender. Identities may include transgender, nonbinary, gender queer, transgender man, and transgender woman, in addition to other non-cis-gender identities.
R&A uses the term “queer-spectrum” to identify non-heterosexual sexual identities (excluding bisexual and asexual). Identities may include lesbian, gay, queer and/or pansexual as well as other sexual identities.
With the CSWG’s approval, the Additional People of Color category included respondents who identified as Alaska Native, American Indian/Native, American/Indigenous, Middle Eastern/North African/of Arab descent, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander. When comparing significant differences, all racial minorities are grouped together when low numbers of respondents existed (referred to, in this report, as Respondents of Color). Also, respondents who identified as more than one racial identity were recoded as Multiracial.
With the CSWG’s approval, the Additional Racial/Ethnic Respondents category included respondents who identified as Asian/Asian American, Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern, South Asian, Southeast Asian, Native Hawaiian, Alaska Native, or Jewish. When comparing significant differences, all racial minorities are grouped together when low numbers of respondents existed (referred to, in this report, as Additional Racial/Ethnic (including Hispanic/Latinx and Black/African American) Respondents).
13% \((n = 272)\) had a Condition that Influenced their Learning, Living, or Working Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top conditions for those with a disability</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental health/psychological condition</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning difference/disability</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic diagnosis or medical condition</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recoded variables were approved by CSWG. For the purposes of analyses, disability status was collapsed into five categories (No Disability, Multiple Disabilities, Learning and/or Attention Issues, Mental Health Issue/Condition, and Physical Disability/Condition). For the purposes of some analyses, this report further collapses disability status into two categories (No Disability and At Least One Disability), where Learning and/or Attention Issues, Mental Health Issue/Condition, and Physical Disability/Condition were collapsed into the At Least One Disability category.
51% \((n = 632)\) of Students Experienced Financial Hardship While Attending Kean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top financial hardships</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books/course materials</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting to campus</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a complete list of how Student respondents experienced financial hardship refer to full report.
Undergraduate Students’ Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Kean housing</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus housing</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing insecure (e.g., couch surfing, sleeping in car, sleeping in campus office/lab)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaced due to emergent situation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a complete list of how Student respondents experienced financial hardship refer to full report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than two years</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–5 years</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15 years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–20 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trans-spectrum respondents – sample too small to conduct some subsequent analyses.

Respondents by Religious Affiliation (%)

With the CSWG’s approval, religious/spiritual affiliation was collapsed into four categories: No Affiliation, Christian Affiliation, Multiple Affiliation, and Additional Affiliations.
Key Findings
Strengths & Successes
76% of the survey respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the *overall climate*.

71% of the survey respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the *climate in their department/program, or work unit*.

83% of Student and Faculty respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the *climate in their classes*. 
Students expressed positive views about their academic experiences.

74% felt valued by faculty in general

71% felt valued by staff

79% felt valued by faculty in the classroom
Faculty views about their workplace climate.

- **Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty**
  - Majority strongly agreed/agreed that research is valued (63%) and that teaching is valued (63%)

- **Not-on-Tenure-Track Faculty**
  - Majority strongly agreed/agreed that research is valued (74%) and teaching is valued (75%)
Staff views about their workplace climate.

- 74% strongly agreed/agreed that their colleagues/coworkers who gave them job/career advice when needed.
- 68% strongly agreed/agreed that their supervisor provided adequate support to manage work-life balance.
- 62% strongly agreed/agreed that Kean was supportive of flexible work schedules.
Key Findings
Opportunities for Improvement
Statistically Significant Findings by Select Demographics

OVERALL CLIMATE

• By Gender Identity:
  • Women respondents were less “very comfortable” than Men respondents
• By Position:
  • Staff respondents were less “very comfortable” than Faculty and Undergraduate Student respondents
  • Faculty respondents were less “comfortable” both Graduate and Undergraduate Student respondents
• By Racial Identity:
  • White and Multiracial respondents less “very comfortable” than Hispanic/Latinx and Additional Racial/Ethnic Identity respondents
  • Black respondents less “very comfortable” than Hispanic/Latinx and Additional Racial/Ethnic Identity respondents
Statistically Significant Findings by Select Demographics

OVERALL CLIMATE

- By Religious Affiliation:
  - No Affiliation respondents less “very comfortable” than Religious Affiliation respondents
- By Disability Status:
  - Respondents with At Least One Disability less “very comfortable” than Respondents with No Disability
16% \( (n = 308) \)

25% of these 308 respondents experienced the conduct five or more times in the past year.
Undergraduate Student Experiences with Conduct \((n = 119)\)

**Basis**
- Ethnicity
- Position
- Age
- Gender/gender identity

**Type of Experience**
- Ignored/excluded
- Silenced
- Isolated left out
- Felt others staring
- Hostile class environment

**Source of Experience**
- Student
- Faculty
- Staff
Graduate Student Experiences with Conduct

(n = 34)

Basis
- Position
- Racial Identity
- Age
- Political views

Type of Experience
- Silenced
- Hostile class environment
- Intimidated/bullied
- Ignored/excluded
- Isolated/left out

Source of Experience
- Faculty
- Student
- Staff
# Staff Experiences with Conduct ($n = 86$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Type of Experience</th>
<th>Source of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Ignored/excluded</td>
<td>Supervisor/manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>Hostile work environment</td>
<td>Coworkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Silenced</td>
<td>Senior administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/gender identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Experiences with Conduct ($n = 69$)

### Basis
- Position
- Age
- Length of service
- Gender/gender identity

### Type of Experience
- Ignored/excluded
- Silenced
- Hostile work environment
- Isolated/left out
- Workplace incivility

### Source of Experience
- Faculty/instructional staff
- Senior administrator
- Department chair
- Student
- Coworker
Of the 308 respondents, 15% officially reported, and of those 18% sought support from a Kean resource.

**Qualitative Themes**

**All Respondents**
- Fearing retaliation
- Feeling excluded and isolated from others
- Witnessing and experiencing identity-based discrimination

**Students:**
- Encountering problems with faculty
5% \( (n = 98) \) of all respondents indicated they had experienced unwanted sexual contact/conduct while a member of the Kean community

- 1% \( (n = 11) \) experienced relationship violence (e.g., ridiculed, controlling, hitting)
- 2% \( (n = 37) \) experienced stalking (e.g., following me, on social media, texting, phone calls)
- 3% \( (n = 61) \) experienced sexual harassment (e.g., catcalling, repeated sexual advances)
- 1% \( (n = 9) \) experienced forcible sexual assault (e.g., fondling, rape, sexual assault, penetration without consent)
- 0% \( (n = 0) \) experienced non-forcible sexual assault (e.g., incest or statutory rape)
Employee Perceptions

Workplace Climate Challenges
### All Faculty Challenges with Workplace Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Salaries for tenure-track faculty positions were competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Salaries for adjunct faculty were competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Salaries for not-on-tenure-track faculty were competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Kean supported Not-on-Tenure Track Faculty who were interested in transitioning to tenure track positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>They had job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for tenure was clear</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure standards/promotion standards were applied equally</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They were burdened by service responsibilities</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They performed more work to help students than did their colleagues</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Not-On-Tenure-Track Faculty Challenges with Workplace Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35% agreed that current senior administrators take not on tenure-track faculty opinions seriously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54% agreed that the criteria used for contract renewal were clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42% agreed that the criteria used for contract renewal were applied equally to positions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36% agreed that the performance evaluation process was productive

37% agreed that Kean provided adequate resources to help manage work-life balance

39% agreed Kean committees valued staff opinions

31% agreed that faculty valued staff opinions

44% that senior administrators valued staff opinions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45% disagreed that they felt positive about promotion/reclassification opportunities at Kean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59% agreed that they would recommend Kean as a good place to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% agreed that they had job security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Experiences

Challenges

Student Perceptions

Academic Experiences

Challenges
Students who hold minoritized identities (first-generation, students of color, trans-spectrum, with disability) held less positive views of the campus and their overall academic experience.
25% strongly agreed/agreed that their English-speaking skills limited their ability to be successful at Kean
Outcomes
22% \((n = 239)\) of Undergraduate Students and 17% \((n = 29)\) of Graduate Students indicated they had seriously considered leaving Kean University.

- 60% \((n = 160)\) in their first year
- 44% \((n = 117)\) in their second year
- 22% \((n = 45)\) in their third year
- 6% \((n = 20)\) in their fourth year
Higher percentages when compared with peer group within identity:

- Those Who Began College at Kean
- Trans-spectrum
- Bisexual and Queer-spectrum
- Black/African American and Multiracial
- With Disability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of social life at Kean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to transfer to another institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course availability/scheduling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Top Reasons Graduate Students Seriously Considered Leaving Kean University ($n = 29$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a sense of belonging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate was not welcoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences related to microaggressions, bias, prejudice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One hundred sixty-five Student respondents at Kean described why they seriously considered leaving the institution.

Qualitative Themes

- Cost of attending
- Discontent with faculty
- Experiencing and witnessing discrimination
- Lack of courses or specific programs
- Not feeling connected to the community at Kean
Self-Perceived Academic Success
Students’ Statistically Significant Differences

By Gender Identity
- Women Undergraduate Student respondents had greater Perceived Academic Success than Men Undergraduate Student respondents.

By Disability Status
- Undergraduate Student respondents with no disabilities had greater Perceived Academic Success than Undergraduate Academic Student respondents with multiple disabilities.

Note: Analyses were conducted by position, gender identity, racial identity, sexual identity, disability status, and first-generation status.
Undergraduate Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success

By Gender Identity
- Women and Men Undergraduate Student respondents had greater Student Sense of Belonging than Trans-spectrum Undergraduate Student respondents.

By Sexual Identity
- Heterosexual Undergraduate Student respondents had greater Student Sense of Belonging than Bisexual and Queer-spectrum Undergraduate Student respondents.

By Disability Status
- Undergraduate Student Respondents with No Disabilities had greater Student Sense of Belonging than Undergraduate Student respondents with multiple disabilities.

Note: Analyses were conducted by position, gender identity, racial identity, sexual identity, disability status, and first-generation status.
42% \((n = 170)\) of Faculty respondents and 60\% \((n = 197)\) of Staff respondents had seriously considered leaving Kean University in the past year.
Top Reasons Faculty Seriously Considered Leaving Kean University \((n = 170)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of institutional resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of retaliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of professional development opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low salary/pay rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low salary/pay rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of remote work options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension with supervisor/manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of professional development opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Voices of Employee Respondents

Seriously Considered Leaving – Employees

Qualitative Themes

- Being overworked and needing more compensation
- Concerns about career mobility and stability
- Issues with administration/leadership at the institution
- Lack of respect/support from managers and supervisors
Undergraduate Student Respondents’ Perceived Academic Success by Gender Identity

- Men Staff respondents had greater *Staff Sense of Belonging* than Women Staff respondents.

Note: Analyses were conducted by position, gender identity, racial identity, years of employment, religious affiliation, and sexual identity.
Next Steps