

CSULB Campus Climate Surveys Comprehensive Report

Acknowledgement.....	30
Contributing Authors	31
Students.....	32
Entire Sample.....	32
Student Survey Respondents Descriptive Statistics	32
Engage All Students	32
Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor.....	32
Civic Engagement Factor.....	32
Social Agency Factor	32
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	33
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	33
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	33
Expand Access	33
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor	34
General Interpersonal Validation Factor.....	34
Summary of Expand Access	34
Recommendations related to Expand Access.....	34
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	35
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	35
Academic Self-Concept Factor.....	35
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor.....	35
Habits of Mind Factor.....	35
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	35
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	35
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	36
Build Community.....	36
Sense of Belonging Factor.....	36
Pluralistic Orientation Factor	36
Conversations Across Differences Factor	36
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor	36
Discrimination and Bias Factor.....	37
Harassment Factor	37
Summary of Build Community.....	37

Recommendations related to Build Community.....	37
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	37
Cultivate Resilience	37
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor	38
Civic Engagement Factor.....	38
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	38
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	38
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	38
Race/ethnicity.....	39
Engage All Students Beach 2030 Strategic Priority.....	39
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor.....	39
Social Agency Factor.....	40
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	40
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	40
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	41
Expand Access	41
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor	41
General Interpersonal Validation Factor	41
Summary of Expand Access	42
Recommendations related to Expand Access.....	42
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	42
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	42
Academic Self-Concept Factor	42
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor.....	43
Habits of Mind Factor	43
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	43
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	44
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	44
Build Community.....	44
Sense of Belonging Factor	44
Pluralistic Orientation Factor.....	45
Conversations Across Differences Factor.....	45
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor.....	46
Discrimination and Bias Factor	46
Harassment Factor	47

Summary of Build Community.....	47
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	47
Cultivate Resilience	47
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor.....	48
Civic Engagement Factor	48
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	48
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	48
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	49
Women of Color	50
Engage All Students	50
Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor	50
Civic Engagement Factor	50
Social Agency Factor.....	51
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	51
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	52
Expand Access	52
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor	52
General Interpersonal Validation Factor	53
Summary of Expand Access	53
Recommendations related to Expand Access.....	53
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	54
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	54
Academic Self-Concept Factor	54
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor.....	55
Habits of Mind Factor	55
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	56
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	56
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	56
Build Community.....	57
Sense of Belonging Factor	57
Pluralistic Orientation Factor.....	57
Conversations Across Differences Factor.....	58
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor.....	58
Discrimination and Bias Factor	59
Harassment Factor	59

Summary of Build Community.....	59
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	60
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	60
Cultivate Resilience	60
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor.....	60
Civic Engagement Factor	61
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	61
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	62
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	62
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	62
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	62
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	62
Sex.....	63
Engage All Students	64
Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor	64
Civic Engagement Factor	64
Social Agency Factor.....	65
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	65
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	65
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	65
Expand Access	66
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor.....	66
General Interpersonal Validation Factor	66
Summary of Expand Access	66
Recommendations related to Expand Access.....	67
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	67
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	68
Academic Self-Concept Factor	68
Habits of Mind Factor	69
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	69
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	69
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	70
Build Community.....	70
Sense of Belonging Factor	70
Pluralistic Orientation Factor.....	70

Conversations Across Differences Factor.....	71
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor.....	71
Discrimination and Bias Factor	71
Harassment Factor.....	72
Summary of Build Community.....	72
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	72
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	73
Cultivate Resilience	73
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor.....	73
Civic Engagement Factor	74
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	74
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	75
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	75
LGBTQIA+.....	76
Important Note Regarding Language:	76
LGBTQIA+ Students Overview	76
Engage All Students	78
Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor	78
Civic Engagement Factor	79
Social Agency Factor.....	80
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	81
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	81
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	81
Expand Access	82
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor	82
General Interpersonal Validation Factor.....	83
Summary of Expand Access	83
Recommendations related to Expand Access.....	83
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	83
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	84
Academic Self-Concept Factor	84
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor.....	85
Habits of Mind Factor	85
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	86
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	86

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	86
Build Community.....	86
Sense of Belonging Factor	87
Pluralistic Orientation Factor.....	88
Conversations Across Differences Factor.....	89
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor.....	89
Discrimination and Bias Factor	90
Harassment Factor	91
Summary of Build Community.....	91
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	91
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	92
Cultivate Resilience	92
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor	92
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	92
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	92
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	92
Disability status	94
Engage All Students	94
Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor	94
Social Agency Factor.....	95
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	95
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	95
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	96
Expand Access	96
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor	96
General Interpersonal Validation Factor.....	97
Summary of Expand Access	97
Recommendations related to Expand Access.....	97
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	97
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	97
Academic Self-Concept Factor	98
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor.....	98
Habits of Mind Factor	99
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	100
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	100

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	100
Build Community.....	100
Sense of Belonging Factor	100
Pluralistic Orientation Factor.....	102
Conversations Across Differences Factor.....	102
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor.....	104
Discrimination and Bias Factor	105
Harassment Factor	107
Summary of Build Community.....	107
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	107
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	107
Cultivate Resilience	107
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor.....	107
Civic Engagement Factor	108
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	109
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	109
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	109
Age.....	110
Engage All Students	110
Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor	110
Civic Engagement Factor	110
Social Agency Factor.....	110
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	111
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	111
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	111
Expand Access	112
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor	112
General Interpersonal Validation Factor	112
Summary of Expand Access	112
Recommendations related to Expand Access.....	112
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	113
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	113
Academic Self-Concept Factor	113
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor.....	113
Habits of Mind Factor	114

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	114
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	114
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	114
Build Community Sense of Belonging Factor.....	114
Pluralistic Orientation Factor.....	115
Conversations Across Differences Factor.....	116
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor.....	116
Discrimination and Bias Factor.....	116
Harassment Factor	117
Summary of Build Community.....	117
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	117
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	117
Cultivate Resilience	117
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor	117
Civic Engagement Factor.....	117
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	117
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	118
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	118
Dependent care responsibilities.....	119
Engage All Students	119
Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor.....	119
Civic Engagement Factor.....	119
Social Agency Factor	119
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	120
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	120
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	120
Expand Access	120
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor.....	120
General Interpersonal Validation Factor	121
Summary of Expand Access	121
Recommendations related to Expand Access.....	121
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	121
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	121
Academic Self-Concept Factor	121
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor.....	122

Habits of Mind Factor	122
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	123
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	123
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	123
Build Community.....	124
Sense of Belonging Factor.....	124
Pluralistic Orientation Factor.....	124
Conversations Across Differences Factor.....	124
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor	125
Discrimination and Bias Factor.....	125
Harassment Factor	125
Summary of Build Community.....	125
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	126
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	126
Cultivate Resilience	126
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor	126
Civic Engagement Factor.....	126
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	126
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	126
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	126
Part time and full time.....	127
Recommendations	127
Unanswered Questions.....	127
Political.....	128
Engage All Students	128
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor.....	128
Civic Engagement Factor Score	128
Social Agency Factor Score	128
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	129
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	129
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	129
Curriculum of Inclusion Factors	129
Academic Self-Concept Factors	129
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factors.....	130
Habits of Mind Factor	130

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	130
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	130
Build Community.....	131
Sense of Belonging, Pluralistic Orientation, Conversations Across Differences, Critical Consciousness and Action, Discrimination and Bias, and Harassment Factors	131
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	132
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	132
Cultivate Resilience	132
Institutional Commitment to Diversity and Civic Engagement Factors	133
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	133
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	133
Transfer status	134
Year in school.....	137
Degree Aspirations	143
Parental education	150
Income	152
Financial aid offered	155
Staff.....	162
Entire Sample Stateside Staff Descriptive Statistics	162
Entire Sample.....	163
Engage All Students	163
Action factor.....	163
Goal factors	163
Supervisor factors.....	163
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	164
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	164
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	164
Expand Access	164
Stress factor.....	164
General work stress	165
Personal Stress (emotional wellbeing, physical health).....	165
Childcare Stress.	165
Opinion institutional factor.....	165
I Feel Valued Factor.....	165
I feel a part of the campus community Factor.....	165

Sense of Belonging & Balance Factor.....	165
My Skills & Role are Clearly Defined & Align with Department Mission Factor	165
Summary of Expand Access	166
Job Satisfaction Compensation.....	166
Job Satisfaction Benefits.....	166
Professional development factor	166
General professional development.....	166
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	166
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	167
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	167
Build Community.....	167
Respect factor.....	167
Satisfaction Factor	167
Satisfaction Campus Climate for Diversity & Inclusion Factor	167
Discrimination	167
Experience Harassment/Discrimination Social Status Factor	168
Harassment engagements/witness	168
Harassment Served as a Resource Factor	168
Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor	168
Heard Racially Insensitive Remarks Factor.....	168
Climate opinion factor	168
Climate Opinion	168
Climate Opinion: Has a lot of racial tension.....	168
Summary of Build Community.....	169
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	169
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	169
Cultivate Resilience	169
Institutional priority	169
Recommend employer factor	169
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	169
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	169
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	169
Race/ethnicity.....	170
Engage All Students	170
Action factor (Not Significant).....	170

Goal factors (Not Significant)	170
Supervisor factor (Not Significant).....	170
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	170
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	170
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	170
Expand Access	171
Stress factor	171
Opinion institutional factor.....	171
Summary of Expand Access	171
Recommendations related to Expand Access	172
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	172
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	172
Job satisfaction overall factor	172
Job Satisfaction Compensation (Significant).....	173
Job Satisfaction Health and Retirement Benefits	173
Professional development factor	173
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	173
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	173
Build Community.....	174
Respect factor.....	174
Sense of Belonging	174
Climate Opinion Overall Climate for Engagement.....	174
Satisfaction Factors	174
Discrimination.....	175
Harassment engagements/witness.....	176
Climate opinion factor.....	176
Summary of Build Community.....	176
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	177
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	177
Cultivate Resilience	177
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	177
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	177
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	177
Women of Color	178
Engage All Students	178

Action factor.....	178
Goal factors	178
Supervisor	178
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	178
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	178
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	178
Expand Access	178
Stress factor.....	178
Opinion Institutional factor.....	179
Summary of Expand Access	179
Recommendations related to Expand Access	179
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	179
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	179
Job satisfaction Overall factor.....	179
Job Satisfaction	180
Job Satisfaction II Factor	180
Professional Development factor.....	180
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	180
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	180
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	180
Build Community.....	180
Respect	181
Satisfaction factors	181
Discrimination	181
Harassment Engagement/Witness Factor	182
Climate opinion factor	182
Summary of Build Community.....	182
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	182
Cultivate Resilience	183
Institutional Priority.....	183
Recommend Employer factor.....	183
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	183
Sex.....	184
Engage All Students	184
Action factor	184

Goal factors	184
Supervisor	184
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	185
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	185
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	185
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	185
Expand Access	185
Stress factor	185
Summary of Expand Access	186
Recommendations related to Expand Access	186
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access	186
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	187
Job satisfaction compensation factor	187
Job Satisfaction II	187
Professional Development factor	187
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	187
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	187
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	188
Build Community.....	188
Satisfaction factors	188
Discrimination	189
Harassment Engagements/Witness	189
Climate Opinion factor	189
Summary of Build Community.....	189
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	190
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	190
Cultivate Resilience	190
Institutional priority	190
Recommend employer factor	190
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	191
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	191
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	191
LGBTQIA+.....	192
Important Note Regarding Language:	192
LGBTQIA+ Staff Overview	192

Engage All Students	192
Action factor	193
Goal factors	193
Supervisor	193
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	193
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	194
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	194
Expand Access	194
Stress factor.....	194
Opinion institutional factor	195
Summary of Expand Access	196
Recommendations related to Expand Access	196
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	196
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	196
Job satisfaction overall factor.....	197
Job Satisfaction	197
Job Satisfaction	198
Professional development factor	198
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	198
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	198
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	199
Build Community.....	199
Respect	199
Satisfaction factors.....	199
Discrimination	200
Experience Harassment/Discrimination Social Status Factor	200
Harassment engagements/witness.....	200
Acted/served as a Harassment Resource.....	201
Climate opinion factor.....	201
Summary of Build Community.....	202
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	202
Cultivate Resilience	203
Institutional priority	203
Recommend employer factor	203
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	203

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	203
Age.....	205
Expand Access	205
Stress: Childcare Factor	205
Job Satisfaction Benefits Factor	205
Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor	205
Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor	206
Institutional Priorities Factor	206
Cultivate Resilience	206
Personal Stress Factor	206
Dependent care responsibilities.....	207
Engage All Students	207
Action factor.....	207
Goal factors	207
Supervisor	207
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	207
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	207
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	207
Expand Access	207
Stress factor.....	207
Stress: Childcare Factor	208
Stress Work Items Misc. Items General work stress Factor	208
Opinion institutional factors	208
Summary of Expand Access	209
Recommendations related to Expand Access	209
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	209
Job satisfaction overall factor.....	210
Job Satisfaction	210
Job Satisfaction II	210
Professional Development factor	210
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	210
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	210
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	210
Build Community.....	211
Respect Factor	211

Satisfaction factors.....	211
Discrimination	212
Harassment engagements/witness	212
Climate opinion: Has a lot of racial tension	212
Summary of Build Community.....	213
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	213
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	213
Cultivate Resilience	213
Institutional priority	213
Recommend employer factor	213
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	214
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	214
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	214
Political.....	215
Engage All Students	215
Action factor	215
Goal factors.....	215
Supervisor	215
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	216
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	216
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	216
Expand Access	216
Stress Factors	216
Opinion institutional factors	216
Summary of Expand Access	217
Recommendations related to Expand Access.....	217
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	218
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	218
Job satisfaction overall factor.....	218
Job Satisfaction	218
Job Satisfaction II	218
Professional development factor	218
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	218
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	218
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	219

Build Community.....	219
Respect	219
Satisfaction factors	219
Discrimination	219
Harassment engagements/witness.....	219
Climate opinion factor.....	220
Summary of Build Community.....	220
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	220
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	220
Cultivate Resilience	221
Institutional priority	221
Recommend employer factor	221
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	221
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	221
Engage All Students	222
Perceptions of Supervisor Factor.....	222
Staff Role in Student Development.....	222
Expand Access	222
Institutional Opinion My Skills & Role are Clearly Defined & Aligned with dept mission	222
Work Stress.....	222
Promote Intellectual Achievement	222
Career Advancement & Professional Development Satisfaction	222
Job Satisfaction Compensation	223
Job Satisfaction Benefits	223
Job Satisfaction Compensation & Benefits Overall	223
Professional Development Career Advancement	223
Specific Job Satisfaction Overall.....	223
Build Community.....	224
Acted/served as a Harassment Resource.....	224
Harassment Assistance & Experience	224
Institutional Opinion I feel a part of the campus community (professional community support, valued by those around me, valued by the campus community)	224
Institutional Opinion I Feel Respected	224
Institutional Opinion I Feel Valued	225
Climate Opinion Overall Climate for Engagement & Diversity.....	225

Satisfaction Timeliness of Administrative Response	225
Satisfaction with Outcome of Response	225
Cultivate Resilience	225
Institutional Priorities	225
Recommend to Work at CSULB	226
Years on campus	227
Engage All Students	227
Expand Access	227
Personal Stress	227
Stress: Child Care	227
Promote Intellectual Achievement	227
Career Advancement & Professional Development Satisfaction	227
Job Satisfaction Compensation	228
Build Community	228
Experience Discrimination Social Identity	228
Cultivate Resilience	228
Satisfaction with Compositional Diversity & Hiring Factor	228
Level of Education	229
Engage All Students	229
Staff Role in Student Development	229
Expand Access	229
Personal Stress	229
Work Stress	229
Promote Intellectual Achievement	229
Professional Development Career Advancement	229
Build Community	230
Harassment Assistance & Experience	230
Institutional Opinion My workload is manageable given the hours I'm scheduled to work	230
Racial Insensitivity; heard racially insensitive remarks	230
Cultivate Resilience	230
Institutional Priorities	230
Faculty	231
Entire Sample Descriptive statistics	231
Engage All Students	231

Student-Centered Pedagogy & Civic-Minded Practices	231
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	231
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	231
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	232
Expand Access	232
Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development & Mentor Self-Efficacy	232
Summary of Expand Access	232
Recommendations related to Expand Access	232
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	232
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	232
Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment; Scholarly Productivity; Science Identity; Science Self-Efficacy	232
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	232
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	232
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	233
Build Community.....	233
Respectful Climate; Civic-Minded Values; Civic-Minded Practices	233
Summary of Build Community.....	233
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	233
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	233
Cultivate Resilience	233
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus; Institutional Priority: Diversity; Institutional Priority: Prestige; Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement; Civic-Minded Values; Satisfaction with Compensation; Career-Related Stress	233
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	234
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	234
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	234
Race/ethnicity.....	235
Engage All Students	235
Student-Centered Pedagogy & Civic-Minded Practices	235
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	235
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	235
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	235
Expand Access	235
Summary of Expand Access	235

Recommendations related to Expand Access	235
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access	235
Promote Intellectual Achievement	236
Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment; Scholarly Productivity; Science Identity; Science Self-Efficacy	236
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement	236
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	236
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	236
Build Community	236
Respectful Climate; Civic-Minded Values; Civic-Minded Practices Factors	236
Summary of Build Community	236
Recommendations related to Build Community	237
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	237
Cultivate Resilience	237
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus; Institutional Priority: Diversity; Institutional Priority: Prestige; Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement; Civic-Minded Values; Satisfaction with Compensation; Career-Related Stress	237
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	237
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	237
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	237
Women of Color	238
Engage All Students	238
Student-Centered Pedagogy; Civic-Minded Practices Factors	238
Student-Centered Pedagogy Factor	238
Civic-Minded Practices Factor	238
Summary of Engaging All Students	238
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students	239
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	239
Expand Access	239
Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Group; Mentor Self-Efficacy Factors	239
Mentor Self-Efficacy Factor	239
Summary of Expand Access	239
Recommendations related to Expand Access	239
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access	240
Promote Intellectual Achievement	240

Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Factor.....	240
Scholarly Productivity Factor.....	240
Science Self-Efficacy Factor	240
Science Identity Factor	240
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	240
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	241
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	241
Build Community.....	241
Respectful Climate; Civic-Minded Values; Civic-Minded Practices Factors.....	241
Respectful Climate Factor.....	242
Civic-Minded Values Factor	242
Civic-Minded Practices Factor	242
Summary of Build Community.....	242
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	243
Cultivate Resilience	243
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus and Institutional Priority: Prestige Factors	243
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus Factor	243
Institutional Priority: Diversity Factor	244
Institutional Priority: Prestige Factor.....	244
Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement Factor	244
Civic-Minded Values Factor	244
Satisfaction with Compensation Factor	244
Career-Related Stress Factor	244
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	245
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	245
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	245
Sex (Status of Women)	246
Engage All Students	246
Student-Centered Pedagogy Factor	246
Civic-Minded Practices Factor	247
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	247
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	247
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	247
Expand Access	248

Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Factor	248
Mentor Self-Efficacy Factor.....	248
Summary of Expand Access	248
Recommendations related to Expand Access	249
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	249
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	250
Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Factor.....	250
Scholarly Productivity Factor.....	250
Science Self-Efficacy Factor	250
Science Identity Factor	250
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	250
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	250
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	250
Build Community.....	251
Respectful Climate Factor.....	251
Civic-Minded Practices Factor	251
Summary of Build Community.....	251
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	252
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	252
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	252
Cultivate Resilience	253
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus Factor.....	253
Institutional Priority: Diversity Factor	253
Institutional Priority: Prestige Factor.....	253
Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement Factor	253
Civic-Minded Values Factor	254
Satisfaction with Compensation Factor	254
Career-Related Stress Factor	254
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	254
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	254
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	255
Dependent care responsibilities.....	256
Engage All Students	256
Student-Centered Pedagogy Factor	256
Civic-Minded Practices Factor.....	256

Summary of Engaging All Students.....	256
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	257
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	257
Expand Access	258
Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Factor.....	258
Mentor Self-Efficacy Factor.....	258
Summary of Expand Access	258
Recommendations related to Expand Access.....	259
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	259
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	260
Scholarly Productivity Factor	260
Science Self-Efficacy Factor	260
Science Identity Factor	261
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	261
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	261
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	262
Build Community.....	262
Respectful Climate Factor	263
Civic-Minded Values Factor	263
Civic-Minded Practices Factor	263
Summary of Build Community.....	263
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	264
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	265
Cultivate Resilience	265
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus Factor	265
Institutional Priority: Diversity Factor	266
Institutional Priority: Prestige Factor.....	266
Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement Factor.....	266
Civic-Minded Values Factor	266
Satisfaction with Compensation Factor	266
Career-Related Stress Factor.....	267
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	267
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	268
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	268
LGBTQI	269

Important Note Regarding Language	269
LGBTQIA+ Faculty Overview	269
Engage All Students	269
Student-Centered Pedagogy	270
Civic-Minded Practices	270
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	270
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	270
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	270
Expand Access	271
Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Group.....	271
Mentor Self-Efficacy.....	271
Summary of Expand Access	271
Recommendations related to Expand Access	271
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	271
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	271
Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Group.....	272
Scholarly Productivity/Scholarly Productivity Group	272
Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Science Identity.....	272
Science Self-Efficacy	272
Science Identity Group.....	272
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	273
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	273
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	273
Build Community.....	274
Respectful Climate.....	274
Civic-Minded Values/Civic-Minded Values Group	274
Civic-Minded Practices/Civic-Minded Practices Group	274
Summary of Build Community.....	275
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	275
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community.....	275
Cultivate Resilience	275
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus Factor.....	276
Institutional Priority: Prestige	276
Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement.....	277
Civic-Minded Values.....	277

Satisfaction with Compensation	277
Career-Related Stress	278
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	278
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	278
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	279
Age.....	280
Dependent care responsibilities.....	281
Engage All Students	281
Student-Centered Pedagogy Factor	281
Civic-Minded Practices Factor	281
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	281
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	282
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	282
Expand Access	283
Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Factor.....	283
Mentor Self-Efficacy Factor	283
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	284
Science Self-Efficacy Factor	285
Science Identity Factor + Group.....	285
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	285
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	286
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	287
Build Community.....	287
Respectful Climate Factor	287
Civic-Minded Values Factor	287
Civic-Minded Practices Factor	288
Summary of Build Community.....	288
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	289
Cultivate Resilience	290
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus Factor	290
Institutional Priority: Diversity Factor	290
Institutional Priority: Prestige Factor.....	290
Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement Factor	291
Civic-Minded Values Factor	291
Satisfaction with Compensation Factor	291

Career-Related Stress Factor.....	291
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	291
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	292
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	293
Part time and full time.....	294
Engage All Students	294
Civic-Minded Practices	294
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	294
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	294
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	294
Expand Access	294
Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Group.....	295
Mentor Self-Efficacy.....	295
Summary of Expand Access	295
Recommendations related to Expand Access	295
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	295
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	295
Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Group.....	295
Scholarly Productivity/Scholarly Productivity Group.....	295
Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Science Identity.....	296
Science Self-Efficacy	296
Science Identity Group.....	296
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	296
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	296
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	296
Build Community.....	297
Civic-Minded Values/Civic-Minded Values Group.....	297
Civic-Minded Practices/Civic-Minded Practices Group	297
Summary of Build Community.....	297
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	297
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	298
Cultivate Resilience	298
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus	298
Institutional Priority: Diversity	298
Institutional Priority: Prestige.....	298

Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement	298
Civic-Minded Values	298
Satisfaction with Compensation	299
Career-Related Stress	299
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	299
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	299
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	300
Political	301
Engage All Students	301
Student-Centered Pedagogy	301
Civic-Minded Practices	301
Summary of Engaging All Students.....	301
Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.....	301
Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students	301
Expand Access	301
Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Group	301
Mentor Self-Efficacy	302
Summary of Expand Access	302
Recommendations related to Expand Access	302
Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access.....	302
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	303
Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment	303
Scholarly Productivity/Scholarly Productivity Group	303
Science Identity Group.....	303
Science Self-Efficacy	303
Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	303
Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	303
Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement	303
Build Community.....	303
Respectful Climate.....	303
Civic-Minded Values/Civic-Minded Values Group.....	304
Civic-Minded Practices/Civic-Minded Practices Group.....	304
Summary of Build Community.....	304
Recommendations related to Build Community.....	304
Unanswered Questions related to Build Community	304

Cultivate Resilience	305
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus	305
Institutional Priority: Diversity	305
Institutional Priority: Prestige.....	305
Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement	306
Civic-Minded Values	306
Satisfaction with Compensation	306
Career-Related Stress	306
Summary of Cultivate Resilience	307
Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience	307
Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience	307
Where we Excel	308
Where Campus Community Members Thrive.....	309
Where we Have Room to Grow.....	311
Recommendations for Campus Action	313
Engage All Students	313
Expand Access	314
Promote Intellectual Achievement.....	316
Build Community.....	319
Cultivate Resilience	321
Data Collection Summary	323
Response rates	323
Higher Education Research Institute	323
CSULB	323
Students	323
Staff	324
Faculty	324

Acknowledgement

The surveys from [UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute](#) (HERI) were launched early during the Spring 2020 term—right before the campus, our communities, state, nation, and the global community understood and began responding to what we now know is a once in generation global pandemic. So many have experienced heartbreaking losses due to the pandemic and while we hope the survey results will help improve the campus climate for all who are members of our campus community, it does not capture the losses or journeys experienced by our campus community with the covid 19 pandemic. Because the surveys were designed and launched by the UCLA HERI before the covid-19 pandemic, the survey did not ask questions about how students, staff, and faculty were affected by the pandemic or other generational events of 2020 and 2021. We know that the pandemic has had an impact on students, staff, faculty, and their families, loved ones and communities. Sadly, the loss of life among people of color during and after interactions with law enforcement is part of the fabric of life in the US. While most of the surveys had closed by the time Mr. George Floyd lost his life, summer of 2020 saw another generational event in the US with the wide-spread protests and activism promoting racial justice. With the US presidential election of November 2020 and subsequent Insurrection on January 6, 2021, the US experienced another generational event. Collectively, these generational events have shaped and will continue to shape current and future generations for years to come. Our hope is that the survey results, this report, and forthcoming reports and recommendations for equitable, transformation and change focused on justice will help make the campus more welcoming and equitable. Ultimately this report is an opportunity to join and continue a broader conversation in our campus community and beyond about who we are and who we want to be in the future.

The surveys could not have been launched without countless staff who made a tremendous effort to engage in this initiative. This includes, yet not limited to, staff colleagues in fiscal areas, mail services, printing services, marketing and communications and information technology from across the divisions of the university. Our colleagues who are responsible for ensuring this and other campus climate survey materials were accessible and ADA compliant are also acknowledged.

Questions about this report should be emailed to ccs@csulb.edu.

Contributing Authors

This report is the result of a massive effort of a number of shared governance bodies on campus. These bodies include: The Academic Senate, including the Executive Committee, the Campus Climate Committee and the LGBTQIA+ Campus Climate Committee. The President's Commissions on Equity and Change, Status of Women and Sustainably also contributed to the report. Contributing campus partners include Staff Council and initially representatives from the Divisions of Academic Affairs, Administration and Finance, and Students Affairs. Sandra Arevalo, Malia Baricuatro, Erin Jacobs, Angela Locks, Shae Miller, CJ Murphy, Julie Nguyen, and Alejandra Priede also contributed to the writing of the report through statistical analyses and other research expertise and support. The Center for Research on Educational Access and Leadership at California State University Fullerton provided research technical support and assistance. Members of these groups not only authored the report yet for many preceding years gave input on which survey products would best suit the campus needs, how to equitably offer incentives to students, staff, and faculty and members of the aforementioned bodies provided input on the organization of the report. That there is no single author to this report reflects the campus wide commitment to better understanding our campus climate so that we might reach our Beach 2030 goals.

Students

Entire Sample

Student Survey Respondents Descriptive Statistics

HERI Factor Score	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Sense of Belonging	3927	17.12	64.06	50.27	9.20
General Interpersonal Validation	3940	12.19	65.60	48.53	10.11
Academic Validation in the Classroom	3480	16.87	64.76	49.37	9.89
Institutional Commitment to Diversity	3772	14.14	64.69	52.49	8.93
Critical Consciousness and Action	3650	22.63	63.83	49.40	10.03
Harassment	3589	46.25	155.38	49.29	9.30
Discrimination and Bias	3620	42.76	106.38	48.78	9.27
Conversations Across Differences	3633	16.25	63.08	49.64	9.93
Curriculum of Inclusion	3277	37.73	75.64	49.93	10.50
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated)	3481	41.00	80.10	48.26	9.11
Habits of Mind	3561	17.01	63.78	49.14	10.20
Pluralistic Orientation	3864	-5.25	62.74	49.27	10.27
Civic Engagement	3486	36.08	80.10	48.86	9.87
Social Agency	3632	20.45	68.50	49.61	10.26
Academic Self-Concept	3890	8.75	70.83	49.68	9.84

Engage All Students

In examining the goal of engaging all students, three factors were addressed. These focused on student's participation in Co-curricular Diversity Activities (e.g., discussion on campus, events on campus focused on diversity), and Social Agency (e.g., the value students have on political and social involvement as a personal goal).

Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor

This factor involves participating in ongoing campus-organized discussions on racial/ethnic issues, participating in Campus Center activities like LGBTQ+, Racial/Ethnic, Disability Centers and attending events focused on diversity (e.g., presentations, performances, debates). On average, students reported low participation in such activities (n = 3481; mean = 48.26; standard deviation = 9.11; min = 41.00; max = 81.10).

Civic Engagement Factor

Civic Engagement is the extent to which students are involved in civic, electoral, and political activities. On average, students reported low participation in such activities ((n = 3486; mean = 48.86; standard deviation = 9.87; min = 36.08; max = 81.10).

Social Agency Factor

Social Agency is the extent to which students value political and social involvement as a personal goal. On average, students reported mid-level valuing of the importance of influencing the political structure, working to address social and economic inequalities and helping to promote racial understanding (n = 3632; mean = 49.61; standard deviation = 10.26; min = 20.45; max = 68.50).

Summary of Engaging All Students

While students generally reported low participation in both Co-curricular Activities and Civic Engagement, they reported mid-level valuing of the importance of their influence on politics, social inequities, and racial understanding.

This discrepancy between value and action may reflect students' newness in relation to political involvement both on and off campus. Many students enter college at a young age, and for those who are eighteen and older they may not have voted yet and feel like they don't have a direct impact on politics. Incoming college students may also be hesitant to discuss racial/ethnic issues or politics because society emphasizes not discussing issues that can potentially be divisive.

Students may be newly exposed to ideas about equity in the classroom and are still learning how to participate. Considering that the new students may be coming from a space where they did not have a voice and must listen to authority figures, they are still getting used to the idea that they are allowed to vocalize their viewpoints and participate in co-curricular activities as well as civic engagement. Students' beliefs in the value of impacting social change may also be checked by their ability to participate due to financial, time and other constraints associated with volunteering or other forms of political activity—including ability to participate in co-curricular on campus activities.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

To increase student participation in regard to discussions about racial/ethnic issues and participation in Co-curricular Diversity Activities like LGBTQIA+, Racial/Ethnic, Disability Centers, and attending events focused on diversity, there needs to be further outreach to students about these events. Although there needs to be a safe space for people of certain intersecting identities to meet with their own community, there can be different events held by each extracurricular group that teach others about these communities and different issues that they face.

Events like the Week of Welcome that provide meetings for people with different intersecting identities to meet each other are necessary and needed but are still only attended on a voluntary basis. There also needs to be mandatory discussions about diversity in the classroom. This can be done by having a representative come to the classroom to discuss diversity and provide an information as well as a space for people to safely discuss Racial/Ethnic, LGBTQIA+, and Disability Status around both people in and out of these communities. These representatives can inform more students about events that discuss diversity during this time. To further increase student participation in these events, there can also be an incentive for these students to attend.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

This section speaks to the student population as a whole, so this data does not tell us how students experience these factors across intersecting identities and experiences, This information can be assessed more clearly through other sections that include data speaking to differences across student populations such as age, race, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and disability status.

Expand Access

To examine the goal of Expanding Access, two factors were examined, Curriculum of Inclusion and General Interpersonal Validation. These factors focused on students' experiences with

curriculum that focused on diversity and how they viewed faculty and staff's attention to their development.

Curriculum of Inclusion Factor

This factor measures the number of courses a student has taken that include materials and pedagogy addressing diversity. On average, students reported taking few numbers of courses including materials and pedagogy that address diversity (n = 3277; mean = 49.93; standard deviation = 10.50; min = 37.73; max = 75.64).

General Interpersonal Validation Factor

This factor focuses on students' view of faculty and staff's attention to their development. On average, students who responded to the survey reported high beliefs that faculty and staff have taken an interest in their development or empower/encourage them to grow professionally (n = 3940; mean = 48.53; standard deviation = 10.11; min = 12.19; max = 65.60).

Summary of Expand Access

While students reported low enrollment in courses that include materials and pedagogy addressing diversity within the Curriculum of Inclusion Factor, students reported high beliefs in the General Interpersonal Validation Factor, viewing that faculty and staff have taken an interest in their educational development. The students may report lower enrollment in courses that address diversity due to the number of majors that do not include a curriculum that openly discusses diversity, for example, STEM classes. The students also have a set schedule that includes general education classes on top of the classes required for their major. There is not much time left in the schedule to fully explore other fields of study that is not considered an "elective" course since students will choose classes that are generally considered "easy" for their elective course slot. Another reason there may be low enrollment in the social sciences field, that typically covers diversity within the curriculum, is the emphasis that society puts on students to pursue one of the STEM majors for their educational and professional career. There is not much discussion about the Social Science and Humanities fields in K-12 causing many fields of study to be unknown to incoming college students.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

There should be more discussion about majors outside of the STEM field before students even enter college. There could be a representative of the school that goes to the local high schools to discuss different majors that students may not have heard about. *outreach/prep component//involvement in some sort of CSU connect program that links with local high schools. With the lack of diversity included in curriculum in majors outside the Social Sciences and Humanities, there needs to be a requirement within the General Education curriculum that includes requiring a course from within the Social Sciences and Humanities that discusses intersectionality and diversity. This course should be taught by professors in these departments due to their specialized training.

To increase enrollment in some Social Science and Humanities courses, the course names can be changed so it does not use a specialized language that makes the class seem more difficult to students.

We also recommend that students be a part of conversations about General Education that discuss which courses and in which fields of study will be required during their educational career.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

This section speaks to the student population as a whole, so this data does not tell us how students experience these factors across intersecting identities, or which disciplines they are enrolled in. This information can be more thoroughly assessed in other sections that include data speaking to differences across the student population such as age, race, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and disability status. This section also does not include data on which fields of study students are enrolled in.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

To examine the goal of Promote Intellectual Achievement, three factors were examined: Academic Self-Concept, Academic Validation in the Classroom, and Habits of Mind. These factors focused on students' beliefs about their own abilities, how they viewed being received by faculty, and behaviors and traits they engaged in that are associated with academic success.

Academic Self-Concept Factor

This factor focuses on students' beliefs about their abilities and confidence in academic environments. On average, students reported strong beliefs about their academic ability, intellectual self-confidence, and drive to achieve ($n = 3890$; mean = 49.68; standard deviation = 9.84; min = 8.75; max = 70.83).

Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor

This factor focuses on the extent to which students' view of faculty actions in class reflect concern for their academic success. On average, students reported strong feelings that faculty encouraged them to ask questions, valued their contributions or provided feedback that helped them in the classroom ($n = 3480$; mean = 49.37; standard deviation = 9.89; min = 16.87; max = 64.76).

Habits of Mind Factor

Habits of Mind are behaviors and traits associated with academic success. These behaviors are seen as the foundation for lifelong learning. On average, students reported frequent engagement in behaviors such as asking questions in class, seeking solutions for problems and explaining them to others, or accepting mistakes as part of the learning process ($n = 3561$; mean = 49.14; standard deviation = 10.20; min = 17.01; max = 63.78)

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

Under Promote Intellectual Achievement, students reported high scores across all factors. High Academic Self Concept Factor scores suggest that students' generally view themselves as having strong academic ability, intellectual self-confidence, and drive to achieve. Seeing as how students reported high in the General Interpersonal Validation factor that shows high beliefs that faculty and staff have an interest in their educational development, it is not surprising that students would report a high Academic Validation in the Classroom score which discusses the students' view of faculty reflecting concern for the students' academic success. Given students' high Academic Validation scores, it also makes sense that students would report high scores in the Habits of Mind Factor, which relates to levels of engagement and contributions from students in the classroom. These data suggest that a student-centered approach in the classroom is correlated with higher engagement and self-confidence among students.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Because investment and interest in student input is correlated with a higher sense of self-efficacy among students, we recommend continuing to use student-centered approaches both in and outside of the classroom. One mechanism for accomplishing this is to institutionalize

opportunities for students to provide feedback and ideas related to curriculum, campus resources, and other projects. For example, we might provide incentives to students for filling out surveys seeking their input and provide additional opportunities for students to participate in ongoing discussions on campus—including mentorship opportunities and funding/resources for student leadership. Given changes in curriculum development resulting from COVID-19, we also recommend seeking input from students about their needs and interests as they relate to online courses.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

This data speaks to the student population as a whole and does not address the experiences of students based on intersecting identities. This data can be thoroughly assessed in other sections that include data speaking to the student population across differences, such as age, race, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and disability status.

Build Community

Six factors were used to assess the goal of Build Community, which included Sense of Belonging, Pluralistic Orientation, Conversations across Differences, Critical Consciousness and Action, Discrimination and Bias, and Harassment. Specifically, these factors focused on how well students felt integrated on campus, how they thought their skillset was appropriate for engagement with a diverse society, as well as how frequent students had in-depth conversations on matters of diversity or self-reflected on their own biases. Within this section, students' experiences with harassment and bias on campus were also examined.

Sense of Belonging Factor

This factor represents the extent to which students feel a sense of academic and social integration on campus. On average, students reported strong feelings of being a member of the college community, sense of belonging and likelihood of recommending the college to others (n = 3927; mean = 50.27; standard deviation = 9.20; min = 17.12; max = 64.06)

Pluralistic Orientation Factor

This factor measures the skills and dispositions appropriate for living and working in a diverse society. On average, students reported frequent engagement in behaviors such as tolerance of others with different beliefs, openness to having views challenged, and ability to work cooperatively with diverse people or see the world from another's perspective (n = 3864; mean = 49.27; standard deviation = 10.27; min = -5.25; max = 62.74).

Conversations Across Differences Factor

This factor reflects how often students have in-depth conversations with diverse peers. On average, students reported frequently engaging in conversations about differences such as socioeconomic status, religion, sexual orientation, nationality, and disability compared to other student groups (n = 3633; mean = 49.64; standard deviation = 9.93; min = 16.25; max = 63.08)

Critical Consciousness and Action Factor

This factor reflects how often students critically examine and challenge their own and others' biases. On average, students reported frequently engaging in behaviors such as critically evaluating one's own privilege, making an effort to educate others about social justice, and recognizing the biases that affect one's own thinking compared to other student groups (n = 3650; mean = 49.40; standard deviation = 10.03; min = 22.63; max = 63.83).

Discrimination and Bias Factor

This factor measures the frequency of students' experiences with more subtle forms of discrimination. On average, students reported experiencing few acts of bias and harassment (e.g., verbal comments, exclusion, cyberbullying, witnessed discrimination) at CSULB (n = 3620; mean = 48.78; standard deviation = 9.27; min = 42.76; max = 106.38).

Harassment Factor

This factor reflects the frequency that students experience threats or harassment. On average, students reported experiencing few acts of harassment at CSULB (n = 3589; mean = 49.29; standard deviation = 9.30; min = 46.25; max = 155.38)

Summary of Build Community

Students reported high scores in the Sense of Belonging, Pluralistic Orientation, Conversations Across Differences, and Critical Consciousness and Action factors. Students may report higher scores in these factors due to the larger number of students on a university campus as opposed to the high school they are coming from or the community college they are transferring from. The larger number of students from varying backgrounds and communities create a higher chance of interacting with people with different intersecting identities and having conversations across differences.

The higher number of students that are from varying backgrounds introduces students to different issues that people with different intersecting identities can face and can open their minds to their own privileges and biases that they were not conscious of before.

Overall, students reported that they experience few acts of Discrimination and Bias or Harassment.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Although students as a whole report that they experience few acts of Discrimination and Bias or Harassment, this does not reflect the experiences of certain intersecting identities that have a high rate of Discrimination and Bias or Harassment against them. The conversations about Discrimination and Bias and/or Harassment toward certain communities need to be mandatory. This can be done by having these statistics added to the yearly Sexual Misconduct training that all students must take. The discussions can also be had in classrooms during the recommended conversations about diversity stated under the section Engage All Students.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

This data speaks to the student population as a whole and does not address how students experience these factors based on intersecting identities. The students' experiences of Discrimination and Bias or Harassment varies depending on their intersecting identities. This information can be more thoroughly assessed in other sections that include data speaking to differences across the student population, such as age, race, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and disability status.

Cultivate Resilience

To examine the goal of Cultivate Resilience, two factors were explored: Institutional Commitment to Diversity and Civic Engagement. These factors focused on how students perceived CSULB's commitment to diversity as well as student's involvement in civic related activities.

Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor

This factor reflects a students' perception of the campus' commitment to diversity. On average, students reported high perceptions regarding the institution's commitment to diversity (Civic Engagement is the extent to which students are involved in civic, electoral, and political activities. On average, students reported low participation in such activities ((n = 3772; mean = 52.49; standard deviation = 8.93; min = 14.14; max = 64.49).

Civic Engagement Factor

Civic Engagement is the extent to which students are involved in civic, electoral, and political activities. On average, students reported low participation in such activities ((n = 3486; mean = 48.86; standard deviation = 9.87; min = 36.08; max = 81.10).

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

In Cultivate Resilience, students reported high in Institutional Commitment to Diversity and low in Civic Engagement. Since students reported high perceptions regarding the institution's commitment to diversity, it is not surprising that students would have low engagement in civic, electoral, and political activities. If the students are already overall viewing the institution as having a commitment to equity and diversity, the students may feel like they are not required to actively participate in civic, electoral, and political activities. The students may feel the need to focus on their own schoolwork over extracurricular activities. Students may also not have as much time to focus on other schoolwork due to time and financial constraints.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

Based on these findings we recommend increased opportunities for course credit related to civic engagement for students who value but do not have the financial or time resources to participate in these activities. We also recommend that scholarships for students involved in civic engagement be made available across colleges on campus so that students have fewer barriers to opportunities for participation. Both measures will help to address student constraints regarding how to focus their time while still being academically successful. This will also help to address inequities for students who are involved in organizing on and off campus due to their own experiences of marginalization.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

This data speaks to the student population as a whole and does not speak to how students experience these factors based on intersecting identities. The perception of whether the institution has a commitment to equity and diversity can range depending on which specific group is surveyed. This information can be more thoroughly addressed in other sections that include data speaking to differences across the student population, such as age, race, gender, ethnicity, sexuality and disability status.

Race/ethnicity

Note: For group comparisons not listed there was no significant mean difference.

Engage All Students Beach 2030 Strategic Priority

In examining the goal of engaging all students, three factors were addressed. These focused on student's participation in Co-curricular Diversity Activities (e.g., discussion on campus, events on campus focused on diversity), and Social Agency (e.g., the value students have on political and social involvement as a personal goal).

Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated)	AANAPI	Black	-6.43037*	0.93540	0.000
		Hispanic	-1.73097*	0.38690	0.000
		Two + races	-1.77163*	0.49519	0.004
	Black	Hispanic	4.69940*	0.92835	0.000
		White	5.62568*	0.95830	0.000
		Two + races	4.65874*	0.97844	0.000

This factor involves participating in ongoing campus-organized discussions on racial/ethnic issues, participating in Campus Center activities like LGBTQ+, Racial/Ethnic, Disability Centers and attending events focused on diversity (e.g., presentations, performances, debates). Black students reported significantly higher average Co-curricular diversity scores than Hispanic, White, and students with 2+ races. Alternatively, Asian American, Native American and Pacific Islander (AANAPI) students reported significantly lower average Co-curricular diversity scores than Black, Hispanic, and students with 2+ races. Black students reported higher participation in events on campus that focused on racial/ethnic issues or other diversity activities factors, whereas there is a decline in participation of such activities by AANAPI students.

Social Agency Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Social Agency	AANAPI	Black	-5.59680*	0.99658	0.000
		Hispanic	-3.99116*	0.42085	0.000
		Two + races	-1.79811*	0.53944	0.009
	Black	White	6.01639*	1.02372	0.000
		Two + races	3.79869*	1.04412	0.003
	Hispanic	White	4.41074*	0.48161	0.000
		Two + races	2.19305*	0.52356	0.000
	White	Two + races	-2.21770*	0.58807	0.002

Social Agency is the extent to which students value political and social involvement as a personal goal. Black and Hispanic reported higher average Social Agency scores than White and students with 2+ races.

AANAPI and White students reported lower average Social Agency scores than students with 2+ races. Additionally, AANAPI students reported lower scores than Black and Hispanic students as well. While Black and Hispanic students value the importance of influencing the political structure, working to address social and economic inequalities and helping to promote racial understanding, other student groups do not view such topics as important.

Summary of Engaging All Students

Black students reported more involvement in Co-curricular diversity activities as well as have high personal goals that value political and social involvement compared to other groups. AANAPI students were one of the groups to report the lowest scores in all three factors. Thus, there is a need to engage students, particularly from AANAPI in activities on campus that allow for more diverse interaction, education, and involvement.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

CSULB can facilitate more campus-organized discussions, presentations, and events on racial/ethnic issues (particularly around the current climate such as Black Lives Matter, addressing anti-AAPI discrimination, and universally understanding microaggressions and the impact it has on students of color. Promoting civic engagement and helping students understand how they be able to get involved in civic, electoral and political activities is another way CSULB can engage students on campus. Particularly, holding workshops on aspects like registering to vote, how to learn more about political activities on campus and within the community. Utilizing more townhalls and hearing students' voices in committees within the university, such as the President's Committee for Equity and Change would be another strategy for students to address social and economic inequalities and promote engagement of all students. Including opportunities for students to further explore their own cultures and the cultures of others.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

Some unanswered questions about Engaging All students are:

- What will be done to ensure a safe environment for students to discuss and feel heard?
- How are we going to motivate students to participate in town hall meetings or presentations?
- What about the large portion of students who do not have the opportunity to attend events do to work commitments or have no connection to the university?

Expand Access

To examine the goal of Expanding Access, two factors were examined, Curriculum of Inclusion and General Interpersonal Validation. These factors focused on students' experiences with curriculum that focused on diversity and how they viewed faculty and staff's attention to their development.

Curriculum of Inclusion Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Curriculum of Inclusion	AANAPI	Hispanic	-2.05699*	0.46104	0.000
		White	-3.10531*	0.53981	0.000
		Two + races	-2.26212*	0.58851	0.001

This factor measures the number of courses a student has taken that include materials and pedagogy addressing diversity. AANAPI students reported lower average Curriculum of Inclusion scores than Hispanic, White, and students with 2+ races. Thus, AANAPI students are taking fewer courses that include material or opportunities to study and discuss factors such as race/ethnicity, privilege, gender identity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic class differences, and disability

General Interpersonal Validation Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
General Interpersonal Validation	AANAPI	White	-2.12064*	0.48081	0.000
		Two + races	-2.02195*	0.51953	0.001
	Hispanic	White	-1.39769*	0.46228	0.025

This factor focuses on students' view of faculty and staff's attention to their development. AANAPI and Hispanic students reported lower average General Interpersonal Validation scores than White students. Additionally, AANAPI students reported lower scores than students with 2+ races. AANAPI and Hispanic students have a lower belief that faculty and staff have taken an interest in their development or empower/encourage them to grow professionally compared to other student groups.

Summary of Expand Access

In terms of Expand Access, AANAPI students have lower experiences with curriculum that focused on diversity and a lower belief that faculty and staff take an interest in their development compared to other student groups. Thus, there is a need within AANAPI as well as Hispanic students to feel supported by faculty and staff in their development and encourage more curriculum in existing programs that address diversity.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

CSULB can increase the number of courses that focus on diversity such as race/ethnicity, privilege, gender identity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic class differences, and disability. This can include course revisions, course additions, or seminars offered to students as electives in which they may be able to select additional courses focus on diversity topics of interest.

Faculty and staff may benefit from additional trainings that promote empowering students of color or targeting aspects such as implicit bias training that may be impacting interactions with students of color.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

It is unclear of specific majors are impacting these results. More investigation is needed to determine if certain majors have a higher proportion of race/ethnicities that may be driving this data. If there are majors in which more AANAPI students are in that is leading to reduced curriculum of inclusion, then expansion of curriculum that focuses on diversity is needed within those majors.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

To examine the goal of Promote Intellectual Achievement, three factors were examined: Academic Self-Concept, Academic Validation in the Classroom, and Habits of Mind. These factors focused on students' beliefs about their own abilities, how they viewed being received by faculty, and behaviors and traits they engaged in that are associated with academic success.

Academic Self-Concept Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Academic Self-Concept	AANAPI	Black	-3.38154*	0.92351	0.003
		White	-3.07353*	0.46754	0.000
		Two + races	-2.02750*	0.50592	0.001
	Black	Hispanic	3.43614*	0.91459	0.002
	Hispanic	White	-3.12813*	0.44967	0.000
		Two + races	-2.08210*	0.48945	0.000

This factor focuses on students' beliefs about their abilities and confidence in academic environments. Black students reported higher Academic self-concept scores than Hispanic students. However, AANAPI and Hispanic students reported lower Academic self-concept scores compared to White and students with 2+ races. Additionally, AANAPI students reported lower scores than Black students. AANAPI and Hispanic students have lower beliefs about their

academic ability, intellectual self-confidence, and drive to achieve compared to other student groups.

Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Academic Validation in the Classroom	AANAPI	Hispanic	-1.90755*	0.41956	0.000
		White	-3.90913*	0.49273	0.000
		Two + races	-3.01514*	0.53738	0.000
	Hispanic	White	-2.00159*	0.47638	0.000

This factor focuses on the extent to which students' view of faculty actions in class reflect concern for their academic success. AANAPI and Hispanic students reported lower average Academic Validation in the Classroom scores than White students. Additionally, AANAPI students reported lower scores compared to Hispanic students and students with 2+ races. AANAPI and Hispanic students reported feeling faculty didn't encourage them to ask questions, value their contributions or provide feedback that helped them in the classroom as much as other student groups.

Habits of Mind Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Habits of Mind	AANAPI	Black	-6.06497*	1.02333	0.000
		White	-5.66878*	0.49468	0.000
		Two + races	-4.70489*	0.53813	0.000
	Black	Hispanic	4.96931*	1.01544	0.000
	Hispanic	White	-4.57312*	0.47815	0.000
		Two + races	-3.60923*	0.52298	0.000

Habits of Mind are behaviors and traits associated with academic success. These behaviors are seen as the foundation for lifelong learning. Black students reported higher average Habits of Mind scores than Hispanic students. AANAPI and Hispanic students reported lower scores than White and students with 2+ races. Additionally, AANAPI students reported lower scores than Black students. AANAPI and Hispanic students engaged in fewer behaviors such as asking questions in class, seeking solutions for problems and explaining them to others, or accept mistakes as part of the learning process compared to other student groups.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

Black students have a higher belief in their abilities and confidence in academic environments as well as engage in behaviors associated with academic success more so than Hispanic students. AANAPI students as well as Hispanic students have a lower belief that they receive

academic validation in the classroom and thus also engage in fewer behaviors related to academic success compared to other student groups.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Faculty can stimulate student’s intellectual effort by providing authentic, real-world tasks relevant to student’s academic life. Additionally, to promote intellectual achievement and student’s belief in themselves, faculty and staff may engage in a variety of strategies. These include providing reassurance of their potential and pathway to graduation, allowing second chances (e.g., midsemester grade meetings while continuing to affirm students), creating a space for vulnerability and risk taking (e.g., utilizing academic praise, modeling vulnerability in the classroom, making connections with students’ lived experiences, and demonstrating confidence in student’s academic ability). Faculty development opportunities could focus on active learning strategies that rely less on lectures and more on the participation of students in the classroom.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

None

Build Community

Six factors were used to assess the goal of Build Community, which included Sense of Belonging, Pluralistic Orientation, Conversations across Differences, Critical Consciousness and Action, Discrimination and Bias, and Harassment. Specifically, these factors focused on how well students felt integrated on campus, how they thought their skillset was appropriate for engagement with a diverse society, as well as how frequent students had in-depth conversations on matters of diversity or self-reflected on their own biases. Within this section, students’ experiences with harassment and bias on campus were also examined.

Sense of Belonging Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Sense of Belonging	AANAPI	Hispanic	-1.52283*	0.36967	0.000
		Two + races	-1.37084*	0.47303	0.038

This factor represents the extent to which students feel a sense of academic and social integration on campus. AANAPI students reported lower Sense of Belonging scores than Hispanic and students with 2+ races. AANAPI students have lower feelings of being a member of the college community, sense of belonging and likelihood of recommending the college to others compared to other student groups.

Pluralistic Orientation Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Pluralistic Orientation	AANAPI	Black	-3.89525*	0.95350	0.000
		Hispanic	-3.66929*	0.41282	0.000
		White	-3.96248*	0.48678	0.000
		Two + races	-4.18520*	0.52710	0.000

This factor measures the skills and dispositions appropriate for living and working in a diverse society. AANAPI students reported lower Pluralistic Orientation scores than Black, Hispanic, White, and students with 2+ races. AANAPI students may be lower in behaviors such as tolerance of others with different beliefs, openness to having views challenges, and ability to work cooperatively with diverse people or see the world from another's perspective.

Conversations Across Differences Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Conversations Across Differences	AANAPI	Black	-3.85171*	0.96273	0.001
		White	-5.40874*	0.47807	0.000
		Two + races	-4.50034*	0.51876	0.000
	Black	Hispanic	3.32110*	0.95478	0.005
	Hispanic	White	-4.87813*	0.46185	0.000
		Two + races	-3.96974*	0.50386	0.000

This factor reflects how often students have in-depth conversations with diverse peers. Black students reported higher average Conversations across Differences than Hispanic students. However, AANAPI and Hispanic student both had lower scores compared to White and students with 2+ races. Additionally, AANAPI students had lower scores compared to Black and Hispanic students. AANAPI students are engaging less frequently in conversations about differences such as socioeconomic status, religion, sexual orientation, nationality, and disability compared to other student groups.

Critical Consciousness and Action Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Critical Consciousness and Action	AANAPI	Black	-4.49618*	0.98974	0.000
		Hispanic	-1.99297*	0.41392	0.000
		White	-3.79802*	0.48857	0.000
		Two + races	-4.13234*	0.53074	0.000
	Hispanic	White	-1.80505*	0.47193	0.001
		Two + races	-2.13937*	0.51547	0.000

This factor reflects how often students critically examine and challenge their own and others' biases. AANAPI and Hispanic students reported lower Critical Consciousness and Action scores compared to White and students with 2+ races. Additionally, AANAPI students reported lower scores than Black and Hispanic students. AANAPI and Hispanic students are engaging less frequently in behaviors such as critically evaluating one's own privilege, making an effort to education others about social justice, and recognizing the biases that affect one's own thinking compared to other student groups.

Discrimination and Bias Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Discrimination and Bias	AANAPI	Hispanic	1.60465*	0.38583	0.000
	Black	Hispanic	4.01366*	0.92296	0.000
	Hispanic	White	-1.70179*	0.43997	0.001
		Two + races	-2.41697*	0.47956	0.000

This factor measures the frequency of students' experiences with more subtle forms of discrimination. AANAPI and Black students reported higher Discrimination and Bias scores than Hispanic students. Whereas Hispanic students reported lower scores than White and students with 2+ races. AANAPI and Black students are experiencing more acts of bias and harassment (e.g., verbal comments, exclusion, cyberbullying, witnessed discrimination) at CSULB compared to other student groups.

Harassment Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Harassment	AANAPI	Hispanic	1.76952*	0.39037	0.000
	Black	Hispanic	3.03095*	0.93943	0.013

This factor reflects the frequency that students experience threats or harassment. AANAPI students reported higher Harassment scores than Black students. However, Black students reported higher scores than Hispanic Students. AANAPI and Black students experience more acts of harassment (e.g., physical assaults/injuries, threats of violence, damage to personal property) at CSULB compared to other student groups.

Summary of Build Community

Build Community focused on how well students felt a part of the campus, interacted with others from diverse backgrounds and experienced a safe and welcoming space. AANAPI students reported lower scores than other groups in terms of a sense of belonging, having fewer skills appropriate for living and working in a diverse society, fewer in-depth conversations with diverse peers, and having less engagement in critically examining their own consciousness. Black students reported having more interactions with peers in conversations across differences, but along with AANAPI students reported experiencing more acts of discrimination, bias, and harassment on campus.

Recommendations related to Build Community

In order to better Build Community for students, particularly students of color, CSULB may benefit from using diverse peer mentors and student leaders to cultivate a sense of community. Additionally, administrators and staff have to be intentional in giving students' meaning opportunities to share their experiences, and demonstrate they are heard by following through with appropriate support. Another strategy that can be utilized is to increase collaboration to ensure that students are at the center of all decisions. Finally, demonstrating care and compassion for students' feelings, experiences, and circumstances is essential to cultivating a sense of student belonging.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

None.

Cultivate Resilience

To examine the goal of Cultivate Resilience, two factors were explored: Institutional Commitment to Diversity and Civic Engagement. These factors focused on how students' perceived CSULB's commitment to diversity as well as student's involvement in civic related activities.

Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Institutional Commitment to Diversity	AANAPI	Black	2.90103*	0.84256	0.006
		Hispanic	-1.08312*	0.36530	0.030
		White	-1.32097*	0.43327	0.023
	Black	Hispanic	-3.98415*	0.83420	0.000
		White	-4.22200*	0.86612	0.000
		Two + races	-3.74205*	0.88415	0.000

This factor reflects a students' perception of the campus' commitment to diversity. Black students reported higher Institutional Commitment to Diversity scores than Hispanic, White, and student with 2+races. AANAPI students reported higher scores than Black students, however, in comparison to Hispanic and White students, AANAPI scores were lower.

Civic Engagement Factor

HERI Factor Score	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Civic Engagement	AANAPI	Black	-4.69783*	0.99684	0.000
		Hispanic	-2.24953*	0.41598	0.000
		White	-4.63103*	0.48801	0.000
		Two + races	-3.68641*	0.53079	0.000
	Hispanic	White	-2.38150*	0.47262	0.000

Civic Engagement is the extent to which students are involved in civic, electoral, and political activities. AANAPI students reported significantly lower Civic Engagement scores than Black, Hispanic, White, and students with 2+ races. Additionally, Hispanic students reported significantly lower Civic Engagement scores than White students.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

Black students perceive CSULB as a space that promotes the appreciation for cultural differences, accurately reflects the diversity of the study body in publications and have campus administrators who regularly speak about the value of diversity. However, AANAPI students do not perceive CSULB as committed to diversity as other student groups. AANAPI and Hispanic students are engaging in lower behaviors such as discussing politics or publicly expressing opinions about a cause compared to other student groups.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

CSULB can increase their communication in the efforts that are being focused to create a diverse and inclusive campus environment. This may go beyond newsletters to students, but also in the promotion of events on campus that focus on cultivating diversity appreciation. For

example, engaging in more townhalls and forums for students to discuss and provide input on continual work done at CSULB to increase inclusivity.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

None

Women of Color

Engage All Students

This section reports results focusing on students' involvement in, and perception of involvement in, sociopolitical institutions and activities, including those that deal with diversity and equity.

Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 2 - Asian; 3 - Black; 5 - Hispanic; 7 - two or more races)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	Asian	Black	-6.43037*	0.000
		Hispanic	-1.73097*	0.000
		2 + races	-1.77163*	0.002
	Black	Hispanic	4.69940*	0.000
		2 + races	4.65874*	0.000

This factor measures students' past involvement with institutional programs focused on diversity issues. This includes having participated in ongoing campus-organized discussions on racial/ethnic issues, in campus center activities for identity-based affinity groups, and in events focused on diversity such as art exhibits and performances.

There results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between BIPOC women students and white women students.

Civic Engagement Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 2 - Asian; 3 - Black; 5 - Hispanic; 7 - two or more races)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Civic Engagement Factor Score	Asian	Black	-4.69783*	0.000
		Hispanic	-2.24953*	0.000
		2 + races	-3.68641*	0.000
	2 + races	Hispanic	1.43688*	0.030

2 Group Comparison			
BIPOC (1) or not (2 = White); BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Civic Engagement Factor Score	BIPOC women	1741	48.6126
	White women	401	51.2460

This factor measures the extent to which students respond that they are motivated and involved in civic, electoral, and political activities. This includes demonstrating for a cause, publicly communicating their opinion about a cause, discussing politics, and performing community service.

The results for our campus show that BIPOC women students have a lower average Civic Engagement Factor score in comparison to white women students.

Social Agency Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 2 - Asian; 3 - Black; 5 - Hispanic; 7 - two or more races)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Social Agency Factor Score	Asian	Black	-5.59680*	0.000
		Hispanic	-3.99116*	0.000
		2 + races	-1.79811*	0.005
	Black	2 + races	3.79869*	0.002
	Hispanic	2 + races	2.19305*	0.000

2 Group Comparison			
BIPOC (1) or not (2 = White); BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Social Agency Factor Score	BIPOC women	1827	50.8010
	White women	409	48.4213

This factor measures the extent to which students value political and social involvement as a personal goal. This includes wanting to influence the political structure, work to correct social and economic inequalities, influence social values, help to promote racial understanding, and work to achieve greater gender equity.

The results for our campus show that BIPOC women students have a higher average Social Agency Factor score in comparison to white women students.

Summary of Engaging All Students

The findings of this section are mixed. There was no significant difference between BIPOC and white women students in terms of past diverse curricular involvement. Although white

women students were more likely to report being motivated to practice civic engagement, BIPOC women students were more likely to value political and social involvement as a personal goal.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

There are concerns about relatively lower rates of civic engagement among students who identify as women of color even while they express that they personally value political and social involvement at higher rates than white women students. We recommend developing programming and offering resources to students, staff, and faculty to create opportunities focused on increasing civic engagement and political and social involvement on- and off-campus among women of color students in order to address these discrepancies.

Specifically, it is recommended to collaborate with the Community Partner, the American Association of University Women (AAUW) Long Beach Chapter to create and offer sponsored workshops and programming for increased civic engagement opportunities. We further recommend that the Center for Community Engagement explore ways to increase civic engagement opportunities for women of color students.

We also advise further study regarding the barriers women of color students face when it comes to their engagement and involvement in civic activities that could lead to specific interventions that could be taken to allow women of color students to participate in civic engagement.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

Expand Access

This section reports results focusing on expanding access by measuring students' perception of faculty and staff members as supportive figures in students' development and success and students' reporting on whether or not curricula address diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Curriculum of Inclusion Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 2 - Asian; 3 - Black; 5 - Hispanic; 7 - two or more races)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	Hispanic	Asian	2.05699*	0.000
	2 + races	Asian	2.26212*	0.001

2 Group Comparison			
BIPOC (1) or not (2 = White); BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	BIPOC women	1633	50.4650
	White women	379	52.6719

This factor measures the number of courses a student has taken that include materials and pedagogy addressing diversity, including readings about race/ethnicity, socioeconomic class

differences, privilege, sexual orientation, gender/gender identity, disability, and having opportunities to dialogue with students from different backgrounds and study and serve communities in need.

The results for our campus show that BIPOC women students have a lower average Curriculum of Inclusion Factor score in comparison to white women students.

General Interpersonal Validation Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 2 - Asian; 3 - Black; 5 - Hispanic; 7 - two or more races)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
General Interpersonal Validation Factor Score	2 + races	Asian	2.02195*	0.001

2 Group Comparison			
BIPOC (1) or not (2 = White); BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
General Interpersonal Validation Factor Score	BIPOC women	1984	48.4024
	White women	449	50.2036

This factor measures students' view of faculty and staff's attention to their development. This includes beliefs that at least one faculty or staff member has taken an interest in their development, that faculty believe in their potential to succeed academically, that they empower them to learn, and that staff encourage them to get involved in campus activities.

The results for our campus show that BIPOC women students have a lower average General Interpersonal Validation Factor score in comparison to white women students.

Summary of Expand Access

The findings for this section reveal that not only did BIPOC women students report taking fewer courses with a focus on "addressing diversity" compared to white women students, BIPOC women students were also less likely to believe that faculty and staff are interested in their professional development compared to white women students.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

It is noted that women of color students shared that fewer of their courses address diversity and that they do not receive interpersonal validation from staff and faculty at the same rate as white women students. To address this lack in curricular offerings and in mentorship for women of color students, we recommend a greater investment in hiring faculty and staff of color to ensure that faculty and staff reflect the student body's racial and ethnic composition.

- It is recommended that existing diverse and inclusive curriculum be prominently featured by the university, colleges, and promoted by academic advisors across campus so that women of color students can more easily access this curriculum. The College of Liberal

Arts, for example, started featuring courses on the college website related to Black Lives Matter and antiracist pedagogy (<https://cla.csulb.edu/black-lives-matter/>).

- It is recommended to increase the promotion, access, and opportunities for students to participate in workshop programs and non-credit certification programs within possible Departments such as Student Life & Development, Housing & Residential Life and Office of Multicultural Affairs, it is recommended that Cross-Cultural Communication in-class opportunities be included in the curriculum of one or two of the Core classes within the A Category. Specifically, Intergroup Dialogue would meet this need.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

None.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

This section reports on the degree to which students display and have confidence in their own academic abilities, as well as the degree to which they feel supported by faculty to succeed in academic environments and endeavors.

Academic Self-Concept Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 2 - Asian; 3 - Black; 5 - Hispanic; 7 - two or more races)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	Black	Asian	3.38154*	0.002
		Hispanic	3.43614*	0.001
	2 + races	Asian	2.02750*	0.000
		Hispanic	2.08210*	0.000

2 Group Comparison			
BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	BIPOC women	1960	48.5762
	White women	443	51.0500

This factor measures students' beliefs about their abilities and confidence in academic environments, including academic ability, intellectual self-confidence, a drive to achieve, and mathematical ability.

The results for our campus show that BIPOC women students have a lower average Academic Self-Concept Factor score in comparison to white women students.

Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	Asian	Hispanic	-1.90755*	0.000
		2 + races	-3.01514*	0.000

2 Group Comparison			
BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	BIPOC women	1737	49.1765
	White women	403	51.8364

This factor measures students' views of the extent to which faculty actions in class reflect concern for their academic success. This includes how often students felt that their contributions were valued, that faculty provided them with feedback that helped them assess their progress in class, that faculty encouraged them to ask questions and participate in discussion, and that faculty were able to determine their level of understanding of course material.

The results for our campus show that BIPOC women students have a lower average Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor score in comparison to white women students.

Habits of Mind Factor

HERI Factor		Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Habits of Mind Factor Score		Asian	Black	-6.06497*	0.000
			2 + races	-4.70489*	0.000
		Black	Hispanic	4.96931*	0.000
		2 + races	Hispanic	3.60923*	0.000

2 Group Comparison			
BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	BIPOC women	1775	48.1874
	White women	410	52.1094

This factor measures the behaviors and traits associated with academic success, which are foundational for lifelong learning. These include seeking solutions to problems and explain them to others, evaluating the quality or reliability of information received, supporting opinions with a logical argument, seeking alternative solutions to a problem, taking a risk because they feel more is to be gained, asking questions in class, exploring topics that may not be required for a class, accepting mistakes as part of the learning process, and looking up scientific research articles and resources.

The results for our campus show that BIPOC women students have a lower average Habits of Mind Factor score in comparison to white women students.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

Each of the factors for this section indicate lower BIPOC women student averages compared to white women students. In sum, BIPOC women students were less likely to believe in their own abilities to do well academically, were less likely to perceive faculty members' actions as taking their academic success into consideration, and less likely to practice behaviors that tend to be associated with lifelong learning.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

It is recommended continuing to celebrate the differences and achievements of all students involved in the Cultural Organizations while creating an annual event/symposium that brings all of the Organizations in a unified manner and possibly participate in The CSULB Intergroup Dialogue Seminar(s).

Promotion and attention towards opportunities for BIPOC women:

- Clubs
- Scholarships
- Advertisements
- Acknowledgement of work from BIPOC students in newsletter, advertisement, etc.

There are concern about lower rates of academic self-concept, academic validation, and academic success skills reported by women of color students when compared to white women students. To address these areas for improvement, we recommend programs that offer mentorship and support for women of color students. We also suggest a greater investment in hiring faculty and staff of color to ensure that faculty and staff reflect the student body's racial and ethnic composition, which has been shown to improve sense of belonging and help students of color develop an academic identity. Additionally, we recommend training faculty and staff across the university in inclusive practices. The university should also provide resources and set basic standards for inclusive syllabi and course materials.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Is there a reason clarified in the surveys to why BIPOC women students have a tendency to believe that their impact, academic success, and value is lower than white women students?

Given that the campus climate survey can only provide cross-sectional results as to *what students'* experiences are as opposed to *why* that is the case, it is recommended and supported to (1) a follow-up survey with open-ended questions that allow participants to further elaborate on their responses and (2) qualitative research methods such as interviews and focus groups

led by researchers sharing the same identities as participants to encourage dynamic conversations to add even more context to their initial open-ended responses.

Build Community

This section reports on the degree to which students engage in the kinds of critical assessments, actions, and interactions that promote diversity as well as the degree to which students feel that they are members of the campus community.

Sense of Belonging Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Sense of Belonging Factor Score	Asian	Hispanic	-1.52283*	0.000
		2 + races	-1.37084*	0.021

This factor measures the extent to which students feel a sense of academic and social integration on campus. This can include feeling a general sense of membership and belonging on campus and feeling compelled to recommend the college to others.

There results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between BIPOC women students and white women students.

Pluralistic Orientation Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	Asian	Black	-3.89525*	0.000
		Hispanic	-3.66929*	0.000
		2 + races	-4.18520*	0.000

2 Group Comparison			
BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	BIPOC women	1941	49.0298
	White women	440	50.2251

This factor measures students' skills and dispositions appropriate for living and working in a diverse society, which includes tolerance of others with different beliefs, openness to having their own views challenged, the ability to discuss and negotiate controversial issues, and the ability to see the world from someone else's perspective.

There results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between BIPOC women students and white women students.

Conversations Across Differences Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	Asian	Black	-3.85171*	0.001
		2 + races	-4.50034*	0.000
	Black	Hispanic	3.32110*	0.004
	2 + races	Hispanic	3.96974*	0.000

2 Group Comparison			
BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	BIPOC women	1814	49.6999
	White women	415	53.8457

This factor measures how often students have in-depth conversations with diverse peers. This includes interacting with those from a different socioeconomic class, of a different sexual orientation, from another country, with a disability, and whether students discuss issues related to sexism, gender differences, or gender equity.

The results for our campus show that BIPOC women students have a lower average Conversations Across Differences Factor score in comparison to white women students.

Critical Consciousness and Action Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	Asian	Black	-4.49618*	0.000
		Hispanic	-1.99297*	0.000
		2 + races	-4.13234*	0.000
	2 + races	Hispanic	2.13937*	0.000

2 Group Comparison			
BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	BIPOC women	1827	50.2319
	White women	413	52.3038

This factor measures how often students critically examine and challenge their own and others' biases. Such actions include making an effort to educate others about social issues, critically evaluating their own privilege on an issue in regards to race/ethnicity, class, or immigration status, recognizing the biases that affect their own thinking, challenge others on issues of discrimination, feeling challenged to think more broadly about an issue, and making an effort to get to know people from diverse backgrounds.

The results for our campus show that BIPOC women students have a lower average Critical Consciousness and Action Factor score in comparison to white women students.

Discrimination and Bias Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	Hispanic	Asian	-1.60465*	0.000
		Black	-4.01366*	0.000
		2 + races	-2.41697*	0.000

This factor measures the frequency of students' experiences with more subtle forms of discrimination, including verbal comments, witnessing discrimination, cyberbullying, exclusion, and offensive visual images or items.

There results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between BIPOC women students and white women students.

Harassment Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Harassment Factor Score	Hispanic	Asian	-1.76952*	0.000
		Black	-3.03095*	0.009

This factor measures the frequency that students experience threats or harassment, which include physical assaults or injuries, threats of physical violence, anonymous phone calls, damage to personal property, and frequency of reporting sexual harassment incidents or discrimination incidents to a campus authority.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between BIPOC women students and white women students.

Summary of Build Community

Of the six factors for this section, two resulted in significant differences between BIPOC women students and white women students. On average, BIPOC women students reported fewer

instances of having in-depth conversations with “diverse” peers and fewer instances of critically examining and challenging their and other’s biases, compared to white women students.

There were no significant differences between BIPOC and white women students in terms of having a sense of belonging, have the skills to live and work in a diverse society, in experiences with discrimination or experiences with harassment.

Recommendations related to Build Community

There are two specific recommendations for students to Build Community. First, students can participate in the Women’s & Gender Equity Center and PCSW co-sponsored workshop certificate program “Recognizing and Remaking Everyday Interactions for Gender-Inclusivity”. Secondly, students can participate in the CSULB Intergroup Dialogue workshop series.

BIPOC women students should be provided information about the cultural groups on campus as well as the Women’s & Gender Equity Center, which host many events for students to engage in dialogue, such as the Womxn's Collective, which is meant to be a space for empowering community among womxn students of color at CSULB. BIPOC women may not be finding these resources on their own. Direct outreach is recommended.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

As with the other sections, it would be useful to follow up with BIPOC women students to collect qualitative data about their knowledge of existing campus resources, need or desire for additional campus resources, to facilitate building community.

Cultivate Resilience

This section reports on students’ perception of the campus’ commitment to diversity and the extent to which students report being motivated and involved in civic, electoral, and political activities

Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor Score	Asian	Black	2.90103*	0.004
		Hispanic	-1.08312*	0.018
	Black	Hispanic	-3.98415*	0.000
		2 + races	-3.74205*	0.000

2 Group Comparison			
BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor Score	BIPOC women	1896	52.5414
	White women	421	53.7303

This factor measures a student’s perception of the campus’ commitment to diversity. This includes perceptions that the campus promotes the appreciation of cultural difference, has a long-standing commitment to diversity, accurately reflects the diversity of the student body in publications (e.g., brochures, website), and has campus administrators who regularly speak about the value of diversity.

The results for our campus show that BIPOC women students have a lower average Institutions Commitment to Diversity Factor score in comparison to white women students.

Civic Engagement Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Civic Engagement Factor Score	Asian	Black	-4.69783*	0.000
		Hispanic	-2.24953*	0.000
		2 + races	-3.68641*	0.000
	2 + races	Hispanic	1.43688*	0.030

2 Group Comparison			
BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Civic Engagement Factor Score	BIPOC women	1741	48.6126
	White women	401	51.2460

This factor measures the extent to which students respond that they are motivated and involved in civic, electoral, and political activities. This includes demonstrating for a cause, publicly communicating their opinion about a cause, discussing politics, and performing community service.

The results for our campus show that BIPOC women students have a lower average Civic Engagement Factor score in comparison to white women students.

Summary of Engaging All Students

This section reports results focusing on students’ involvement in, and perception of involvement in, sociopolitical institutions and activities, including those that deal with diversity and equity. Overall, men students are less likely to value political and social involvement as a personal goal and are less likely to report involvement with civic, electoral, and political activities and institutional programs focused on diversity issues in comparison with women, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students. Overall, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students are most likely to report valuing and being involved in sociopolitical institutions and activities, as defined above.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

- Develop targeted outreach, programming, and messaging to motivate and increase men students' involvement in, and perception of involvement in, sociopolitical institutions and activities, including those that deal with diversity and equity. Consider an allyship focus.
- Learn more about the specific institutions, programs, initiatives, and messaging that is/are working to motivate and increase women, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students' involvement in, and perception of involvement in, sociopolitical institutions and activities.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

- Why is men students' involvement in, and perception of involvement in, sociopolitical institutions and activities less likely, as reported?
- Why are women, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students' involvement in, and perception of involvement in, sociopolitical institutions and activities more likely, as reported?

It is often assumed that those whose current gender identity places them in a position of gender-based marginalization in a given socio-cultural system or context will gravitate towards political and social involvement because it may be personally advantageous, while those whose current gender identity does not place them in a position of gender-based marginalization will not gravitate towards political and social involvement because it has fewer personal benefits. Such assumptions are amplified when this political and social involvement is focused on diversity and equity.

However, asking the questions above are important for understanding, rather than assuming, why this involvement and perception of involvement is more/less likely among these specific populations. Finding these answers will create conditions for more successful outreach as well as more successful resource distribution and program development to achieve desired outcomes.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

The results for this section indicate that BIPOC women students were less likely to perceive that the campus is committed to diversity. And as reported in an earlier section of the report, BIPOC women students were less likely to report being motivated to practice civic engagement.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

It is recommended that students have the in-class (through Curriculum) or University 100 type of course to engage in semester or year-long ongoing curriculum related to diversity, inclusion, cross-cultural dialogue and civic-mindedness, these opportunities could include the Women's & Gender Equity Center and PCSW co-sponsored workshop certificate program "Recognizing and Remaking Everyday Interactions for Gender-Inclusivity" and the CSULB Intergroup Dialogue Workshop Series.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

Could it be that BIPOC women students feel or perceive that they are at a disadvantage in comparison to white women students?

As for other sections, it would be useful to follow-up with BIPOC women students to collect qualitative data about how the university could better support them and their academic success.

Sex

Here we include an important note regarding language and the following points should be considered when interpreting the results for this section (drafted in partnership between PCSW and LGBTQIA+CC).

- Sex is generally used to refer to the category people are assigned at birth, primarily based on genitalia (male, female, intersex), whereas gender refers to a person's gender identity (man, woman, genderqueer, nonbinary, etc.). The categories in this section refer to people's gender identities, but the language in the survey used to reference gender was "sex". To match with the survey data, we use sex when referencing data but also use gender to discuss possible explanations for findings.
- Options on the survey collapsed "man/trans man" and "woman/trans woman" as categories. Further disaggregation of the data revealed significantly fewer data points from trans identified men and women, specifically. Although these data were included in the analysis, it should be noted that the findings are overwhelmingly representative of cis identified women's and men's climate perceptions. There were genderqueer (et....name the options), which means we are able to speak to some extent on the potential impacts for people whose gender is considered to fall outside of social expectations.
- For more analysis on potential impacts and explanation for genderqueer and nonbinary people, there is further discussion in the LGBTQIA+ section of the report.

Further, readers should note the HERI DLE survey options available to students for gender were:

- Woman/trans woman
- Man/trans man
- Non-binary
- Genderqueer/Gender non-conforming and
- "Other" gender identity

Though we acknowledge the effort to be inclusive, by grouping men/trans men and women/trans women together the survey dismisses the specific types of gender marginalization that transgender people face. The combining of trans and cisgender men and women results in a lack of data speaking to differences in experiences of transgender and cisgender students, both on and off campus, in the context of a cisnormative society. Similarly, genderqueer and gender non-conforming are not always used to describe the same or similar identities and so their conflation may skew data. We also do not know the identities of the students who chose the "other" gender option, or how students in each of these categories are read and interacted with on campus. For example, genderqueer students will likely have drastically different experiences depending on whether they are read as cisgender, as feminine, as masculine, as trans, and so on. General recommendations for gender inclusive surveys suggest a "check all that apply" approach, with transgender and cisgender options separated from specific gender identities, allowing for more accurate representation of participant identities. These recommendations also include a free response option so that people can document their identities rather than being categorized as "other", a practice that may impact engagement with surveys.

Engage All Students

This section reports results focusing on students' involvement in, and perception of involvement in, sociopolitical institutions and activities, including those that deal with diversity and equity.

Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor

HERI Factor (Groups Man, Woman, Genderqueer/ Nonconforming/ other)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	Man	Woman	-.83767*	0.046
		Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity	-2.71690*	0.000
	Woman	Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity	-1.87923*	0.003

This factor measures students' involvement with institutional programs focused on diversity issues. The results for our campus show that genderqueer, gender non-conforming, "other" gender identified students have a higher average Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor score in comparison to women students and men students. Furthermore, women students have a higher average Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor score in comparison to men students.

Civic Engagement Factor

HERI Factor (Groups Man, Woman, Genderqueer/ Nonconforming/ other)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Civic Engagement Factor Score	Man	Woman	-1.18054*	0.005
		Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity	-2.63488*	0.000

This factor measures the extent to which students respond that they are motivated and involved in civic, electoral, and political activities. This includes demonstrating for a cause, publicly communicating their opinion about a cause, discussing politics, and performing community service.

The results for our campus show that genderqueer, gender non-conforming, "other" gender identified students and women students have a higher average Civic Engagement Factor score in comparison to men students.

Social Agency Factor

HERI Factor (Groups Man, Woman, Genderqueer/ Nonconforming/ other)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Social Agency Factor Score	Man	Woman	-2.96760*	0.00 0
		Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity	-4.27046*	0.00 0

This factor measures the extent to which students value political and social involvement as a personal goal. This includes wanting to influence the political structure, work to correct social and economic inequalities, influence social values, help to promote racial understanding, and work to achieve greater gender equity.

The results for our campus show that genderqueer, gender non-conforming, “other” gender identified students and women students have a higher average Social Agency Factor score in comparison to men students.

Summary of Engaging All Students

In all areas concerned with Engaging All Students, gender marginalized students (such as genderqueer, gender non-conforming, “other” gender identified, and women students) scored higher than those who were identified as men. This suggests that students who are gender marginalized are more likely to be motivated to be involved in, advocate for, and have an interest in influencing causes related to social equity.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Because gender marginalized students are more likely to be involved in co-curricular and other social justice and diversity causes, we recommend continued and increased support for these efforts, including further opportunities for students to earn credit or scholarships for their involvement in diversity work. It is likely that their experiences of gender marginalization have attuned these students to the importance of advocating for justice and equity, and that they are personally invested in these issues. In order to increase the interest and investment of men students on campus, we recommend increased attention to social equity in general education, including increases in the diversity requirements for General Education; and we recommend that these courses be offered by those departments in the Social Sciences and Humanities, which specialize in theories and practices related to social inequities.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

While we have data about students’ gender identities, we do not know if the men and women in this data are cisgender or transgender. This is due to the structure of the survey, which included only two options for men and women: “man/trans man” or “woman/trans woman”. The combining of trans and cisgender men and women results in a lack of data speaking to differences in experiences that students have, both on and off campus, in the context of a cisnormative society. We also do not know the identities of the students who chose the “other” gender option, or how students in each of these categories are read and interacted with on campus. For example, genderqueer students will likely have drastically different experiences

depending on whether they are read as cisgender, as feminine, as masculine, as trans, and so on.

Expand Access

This section reports results focusing on expanding access by measuring students' perception of faculty and staff members as supportive figures in students' development and success and students' reporting on whether or not curricula address diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Curriculum of Inclusion Factor

HERI Factor (Groups Man, Woman, Genderqueer/ Nonconforming/ other)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	Man	Woman	-3.30322*	0.000
		Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity	-3.72755*	0.000

This factor measures the number of courses a student has taken that include materials and pedagogy addressing diversity, including readings about race/ethnicity, socioeconomic class differences, privilege, sexual orientation, gender/gender identity, disability, and having opportunities to dialogue with students from different backgrounds and study and serve communities in need.

The results for our campus show that genderqueer, gender non-conforming, "other" gender identified students and women students have a higher average Curriculum of Inclusion Factor score in comparison to men students.

General Interpersonal Validation Factor

This factor measures students' view of faculty and staff's attention to their development, including the perception of interest in students' development, belief in students' potential to succeed, cultivation of students' feelings of empowerment, and encouragement to get involved in campus activities.

Under the General Interpersonal Validation Factor, there was no significant difference between genderqueer, gender non-conforming, "other" identified students and women students in comparison to men students.

Summary of Expand Access

This section reports results focusing on expanding access by measuring students' perception of faculty and staff members as supportive figures in students' development and success as well as by considering students' exposure to pedagogy and materials that address diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Overall, there were no significant findings regarding students' perception of faculty and staff members as supportive figures in students' development and success. However, genderqueer,

gender non-conforming, other identity students and women students are more likely to notice or be exposed to materials and pedagogy that address diversity in comparison to men students.

While there were no significant differences between genderqueer, gender non-conforming, “other identified students, women and men under the General Interpersonal Validation factor, in the Curriculum of Inclusion factor, genderqueer, gender-nonconforming, “other” gender identified students, and women students scored higher in comparison to men students. Considering the different courses that fall below the General Education requirements do not typically focus on intersectionality, it is not surprising that gender marginalized students would seek curriculum that prioritizes discussions and work about intersectionality and diversity.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Based on these findings we recommend inclusion of diversity requirements within general education curricula, and that these courses be offered specifically within disciplines whose faculty have expertise in these areas (for example in the humanities and social sciences, particularly ethnic studies).

Continue to monitor and regularly assess students’ perception of faculty and staff members as supportive figures in students’ development and success.

Gather additional data about students’ perception of faculty and staff members as supportive figures in students’ development and success (see below).

Continue to monitor and regularly assess students’ exposure to pedagogy and materials that address diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Gather additional data about students’ exposure to pedagogy and materials that address diversity, equity, and inclusion (see below).

Learn about campus co-curricular activities that augment and/or provide additional positive academic learning and student development outcomes; subsequently, then promote these programs/activities

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

We do not know which courses students are referencing or thinking of in their curriculum of inclusion scores. It would be useful to know which departments students are in, and which classes they are taking, in order to better understand the contexts where curriculum of inclusion are highest.

- Are materials and pedagogy that address diversity absent from curricula or are they not being noticed/being forgotten?

If students are asked to reflect broadly on the presence or absence of materials and pedagogy that address diversity, they are being asked to recall specific information about course content from across their entire academic career. Clarifying if this recall, and subsequent response, was based on what was most impactful to them and/or if this indicates the presence/absence of this material and pedagogy will be important for determining recommendations for intervention.

It may also be helpful to ask additional questions about students’ perception of the quality of these materials and/or what they learned from exposure to these materials.

- How do students define development, academic success, and empowerment?

- What kinds of actions and interactions do students perceive to be supportive, encouraging, and/or empowering?

Knowing that there may be variability in the understanding of terms/phrases such as “development,” “empowerment,” “support,” and “academic success,” and the needs of differently positioned students, it may be advantageous to follow up with specific narrative or focus group studies on how differently positioned students may understand these terms in the context of their own lives. Identifying the kinds of actions and interactions that may be positively valued may also reveal trends that can help to shape programs and interventions.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

This section reports on the degree to which students display and have confidence in their own academic abilities, as well as the degree to which they feel supported by faculty to succeed in academic environments and endeavors.

Academic Self-Concept Factor

HERI Factor (Groups Man, Woman, Genderqueer/ Nonconforming/ other)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	Man	Woman	2.43593*	0.000
		Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity	3.23276*	0.000

This factor measures students’ beliefs about their abilities and confidence in academic environments, including academic ability, intellectual self-confidence, a drive to achieve, and mathematical ability.

The results for our campus show that genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students and women students have a higher average Academic Self-Concept Factor score in comparison to men students.

Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor

This factor measures students’ views of the extent to which faculty actions in class reflect concern for their academic success. This includes how often students felt that their contributions were valued, that faculty provided them with feedback that helped them assess their progress in class, that faculty encouraged them to ask questions and participate in discussion, and that faculty were able to determine their level of understanding of course material.

There were no differences in Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor scores based on gender. There were no significant findings for this factor when comparing genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students, women students, and men students.

Habits of Mind Factor

This factor measures the behaviors and traits associated with academic success, which are foundational for lifelong learning. These include seeking solutions to problems and explain them to others, evaluating the quality or reliability of information received, supporting opinions with a logical argument, seeking alternative solutions to a problem, taking a risk because they feel more is to be gained, asking questions in class, exploring topics that may not be required for a class, accepting mistakes as part of the learning process, and looking up scientific research articles and resources.

There were no significant findings for this factor when comparing genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students, women students, and men students.

There were no differences in Habits of Mind Factor scores based on gender.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

This section reports on the degree to which students display and have confidence in their own academic abilities, as well as the degree to which they feel supported by faculty to succeed in academic environments and endeavors.

Overall, there were no significant findings regarding students' behaviors and traits associated with lifelong learning nor were there significant findings related to the perception of faculty members as supportive figures in students' academic success. Results show that genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students and women students have more confidence in their academic abilities than men students.

While there were no gender differences for levels of academic validation in the classroom or habits of mind factor scores, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, "other"-identified, and women identified students scored higher for the Academic Self-Concept factor. This suggests that students of all genders experience similar validation from course instructors and content, and rate themselves similarly on their studying and academic engagement skills. However, gender marginalized students have higher confidence in their academic abilities and drive to achieve.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

These data suggest that our campus provides a supportive and encouraging learning environment for gender marginalized students to the extent that they report high confidence in their academic capabilities. We recommend continued attention to the prevalence of women and other gender marginalized students in STEM, and more detailed analysis of the specific contributions to student self-concept in order to continue to promote high academic self-concept among these students.

Engage in routine review and program assessment to ensure that all students display behaviors and traits associated with lifelong learning and feel supported by faculty members.

Gather additional data about students' confidence in their academic abilities (see below). Learn more about the specific institutions, programs, initiatives, and messaging that is/are working to bolster confidence in academic abilities among women, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students. Probe reasons for lower confidence among men students.

Promote and encourage students to engage in campus research programs and departments such as the Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program's Research Symposium, Graduate

Research Center's Research Program and the PCSW Annual Women's Research Colloquium and the President's Sustainability Commission's Annual Student Competition and promote the Beach Scholarships Program and opportunities

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

We do not know the college or department associated with different scores. Because of patterned gender differences in enrollment and participation across disciplines, it would be useful to see which departments are associated with higher academic self-concept for gender marginalized students.

- What specific institutions, programs, initiatives, and messaging that is/are working to bolster confidence in academic abilities among women, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students?
- Why is there lower confidence in academic abilities among men students?

Determining why there is lower confidence among a segment of the student population that is often predicted to have higher confidence, comparatively, and determining what is promoting confidence in academic abilities among a segment of the student population that is often predicted to have lower confidence, comparatively, as well as the reasons behind their confidence, can help the university to put target resource distribution. Namely, they can put resources into institutions, programs, initiatives, and messaging that is/are already working and expand on those that can support men students, as well.

- How and why do students feel supported by faculty members?

Knowing that there may be variability in the understanding of terms/phrases such "support" and "academic success," and the needs of differently positioned students, it may be advantageous to follow up with specific narrative or focus group studies on how differently positioned students may understand these terms in the context of their own lives. Identifying the kinds of actions and interactions that may be positively valued may also reveal trends that can help to shape programs and interventions.

Build Community

This section reports on the degree to which students engage in the kinds of critical assessments, actions, and interactions that promote diversity as well as the degree to which students feel that they are members of the campus community.

Sense of Belonging Factor

This factor Measures the extent to which students feel a sense of academic and social integration on campus. This can include feeling a general sense of membership and belonging on campus and feeling compelled to recommend the college to others.

There were no significant findings for this factor when comparing genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students, women students, and men students.

Pluralistic Orientation Factor

This factor measures students' skills and dispositions appropriate for living and working in a diverse society, which includes tolerance of others with different beliefs, openness to having their own views challenged, the ability to discuss and negotiate controversial issues, and the ability to see the world from someone else's perspective.

There were no significant findings for this factor when comparing genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students, women students, and men students.

Conversations Across Differences Factor

HERI Factor (Groups Man, Woman, Genderqueer/ Nonconforming/ other)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	Man	Woman	-2.40195*	0.000

This factor measures how often students have in-depth conversations with diverse peers. This includes interacting with those from a different socioeconomic class, of a different sexual orientation, from another country, with a disability, and whether students discuss issues related to sexism, gender differences, or gender equity.

The results for our campus show that women students have a higher average Conversations Across Differences Factor score in comparison to men students.

Critical Consciousness and Action Factor

HERI Factor (Groups Man, Woman, Genderqueer/ Nonconforming/ other)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	Man	Woman	-3.97813*	0.000
		Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity	-3.71235*	0.000

This factor measures how often students critically examine and challenge their own and others' biases. Such actions include making an effort to educate others about social issues, critically evaluating their own privilege on an issue in regards to race/ethnicity, class, or immigration status, recognizing the biases that affect their own thinking, challenge others on issues of discrimination, feeling challenged to think more broadly about an issue, and making an effort to get to know people from diverse backgrounds.

The results for our campus show that genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students and women students have a higher average Critical Consciousness and Action Factor score in comparison to men students.

Discrimination and Bias Factor

This factor measures the frequency of students' experiences with more subtle forms of discrimination, including verbal comments, witnessing discrimination, cyberbullying, exclusion, and offensive visual images or items.

There were no significant findings for this factor when comparing genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students, women students, and men students.

Harassment Factor

HERI Factor (Groups Man, Woman, Genderqueer/ Nonconforming/ other)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Harassment Factor Score	Man	Woman	1.10057*	0.005

This factor measures the frequency that students experience threats or harassment, which include physical assaults or injuries, threats of physical violence, anonymous phone calls, damage to personal property, and frequency of reporting sexual harassment incidents or discrimination incidents to a campus authority.

The results for our campus show that women students have a lower average Harassment Factor Score Factor score in comparison to men students.

Summary of Build Community

This section reports on the degree to which students engage in the kinds of critical assessments, actions, and interactions that promote diversity as well as the degree to which students feel that they are members of the campus community.

Results in this section were mixed. Overall, there were no significant findings regarding students’ skills and dispositions appropriate for living and working in a diverse society and the extent to which students feel a sense of academic and social integration on campus. There were also no significant findings regarding students’ experiences with more subtle forms of discrimination; however, men students report experiencing threats and harassment more frequently than women students.

On the degree to which students engage in the kinds of critical assessments, actions, and interactions that promote diversity, women students report more often having in-depth conversations with diverse peers than men students and genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students and women students report more frequently engaging in critical examination and challenging of their own and others’ biases.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Gather additional data to monitor and probe positive findings (e.g. no significant results in feeling integrated on campus) and to further explain results (see below).

Learn more about the specific institutions, programs, initiatives, and messaging that is/are working to make students feel integrated on campus and that are lowering the frequency of students’ experiences with harassment and more subtle forms of discrimination.

Continue to promote and offer the Student Life & Development, Associated Students, Inc, and Division of Student Affairs Programs and Leadership Academy as well as the Office of Multicultural Affairs Cultural Resource Centers programming

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

Learning more about the specific institutions, programs, initiatives, and messaging that is/are working to make students feel integrated on campus may help to sustain such feelings of integration.

- What specific institutions, programs, initiatives, and messaging that is/are working to make students feel integrated on campus?
- What is the nature of critical examination for those who are not reporting conversations across difference?

Determining how students are reporting that critical examination of their own biases is taking place may be helpful for developing future initiatives. This is especially true given the seeming mismatch between those who report that they interact with others as part of this critical examination given that there is less reporting on conversations across difference.

- What specific institutions, programs, initiatives, and messaging that is/are working to lower the frequency of students' experiences with harassment and more subtle forms of discrimination?
- Why are men students experiencing harassment? What is the nature of this harassment?

Determining why there is more potential for harassment among a segment of the student population that is often portrayed as having fewer experiences with harassment, comparatively, and determining what is preventing discrimination and harassment among a segment of the student population that is often portrayed as having more experiences with harassment, comparatively, as well as determining what is being identified as discrimination and harassment (or not) can help the university to put target resource distribution.

Cultivate Resilience

This section reports on students' perception of the campus' commitment to diversity and the extent to which students report being motivated and involved in civic, electoral, and political activities.

Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor

HERI Factor (Groups Man, Woman, Genderqueer/ Nonconforming/ other)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor Score	Woman	Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity	1.55598*	0.011

This factor measures a student's perception of the campus' commitment to diversity This includes perceptions that the campus promotes the appreciation of cultural difference, has a long standing commitment to diversity, accurately reflects the diversity of the student body in publications (e.g., brochures, website), and has campus administrators who regularly speak

about the value of diversity.. The results for our campus show that genderqueer, gender non-conforming, and “other”-gender identified students have a lower Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor score in comparison to women students.

Civic Engagement Factor

This factor measures the extent to which students respond that they are motivated and involved in civic, electoral, and political activities. This includes demonstrating for a cause, publicly communicating their opinion about a cause, discussing politics, and performing community service.

The results for our campus show that genderqueer, gender non-conforming, “other”-gender identified students and women students have a higher average Civic Engagement Factor score in comparison to men students.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

It is recommended that students have the in-class (through Curriculum) or University 100 type of course to engage in semester or year-long ongoing curriculum related to diversity, inclusion, cross-cultural dialogue and civic-mindedness, these opportunities could include the Cultural Resource Centers Programming and Student Organizations of The Multicultural Center and Student Life & Development as well as the Women’s & Gender Equity Center and PCSW co-sponsored workshop certificate program “Recognizing and Remaking Everyday Interactions for Gender-Inclusivity” and the CSULB Intergroup Dialogue Workshop Series.

- Gather additional data about what and why genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students do not necessarily perceive the campus as being committed to or representative of diversity in comparison to women students. Learn more about the specific institutions, programs, initiatives, and messaging that is/are contributing to this perception.
- Develop targeted outreach, programming, and messaging to motivate and increase men students’ involvement in, and perception of involvement in, civic, electoral, and political activities. Consider allyship focus.

This section reports on students’ perception of the campus’ commitment to diversity and the extent to which students report being motivated and involved in civic, electoral, and political activities.

Results of this section indicate that genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students do not necessarily perceive the campus as being committed to or representative of diversity in comparison to women students. However, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students and women students are more motivated and involved in civic, electoral, and political activities than men students.

For the Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, and “other”-gender identified students scored lower than women students. Discussions about genderqueer, gender non-conforming, and “other”-gender identifies have only been recently developed while the women’s rights movements have been ongoing for a more significant amount of time.

Under Civic Engagement Factor, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, and “other”-gender identified students and women students scored higher than men students. It is not surprising

that gender marginalized students scored higher under a factor that discusses involvement in civic, electoral, and political activities. Marginalized people would be more motivated to support causes that will help increase representation and resources for their communities.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

The data suggests that the campus does not show as much of an institutional commitment to diversity for genderqueer, gender non-conforming, and “other”-gender identified students as opposed to women students. We recommend that the institution provide more support and resources for gender marginalized people. This can be done by investing more money into the campus’ LGBTQIA+ resource center in an accessible area with full-time paid staff whose expertise is in this area in order to provide a safe space for gender marginalized people. Professional development for faculty and staff to learn about gender diversity should also be required as part of these efforts.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

We do not know the college or department associated with these different scores. Because of the patterned gender differences in enrollment and participation across disciplines, it would be useful to see which departments are associated with the lower scores under the Institutional Commitment to Diversity factor.

- What specific institutions, programs, initiatives, and messaging is/are contributing to the perception of campus’ commitment to and representation of diversity?
- Why do genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students not perceive the campus as being committed to or representative of diversity in comparison to women students?

Determining what is being identified as representative of commitments and representations of diversity, and determining why genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other identity students do not perceive the campus as being committed to or representative of diversity, in comparison to women, can help the university to develop or amplify programming and initiatives and target resource distribution to meet diversity goals.

- Why are men students’ on campus less involved in civic, electoral, and political activities?

While an initial recommendation might be the development and promotion of allyship programming, determining why there is lower involvement among this segment of the student population, comparatively, as well as the reasons behind their lower involvement, can help the university to target resource distribution. Namely, they can put resources into institutions, programs, initiatives, and messaging that is/are already working and expand on those that can support men students, as well.

LGBTQIA+

Important Note Regarding Language:

People who participated in this survey had the option to identify as Asexual, Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Pansexual, Queer, or “Other” (ABGLPQ+). As a result, we cannot speak to identities commonly included within LGBTQIA+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, Asexual+) groups, including people who identify as Transgender, Nonbinary, Intersex, or Two Spirit. This mirrors the frequent conflation of gender and sexual identities, which leads to inaccurate assessments of community experiences and needs. To this end, we articulate varying possibilities throughout the report as they pertain to score interpretations across both gender and sexual identities. We wish to note that this language has the potential to impact participation in and responses to survey questions, and that lack of recognition and inclusion may skew the results and participation of faculty. In addition, smaller numbers of faculty and the ability to cross reference data across discipline and other intersecting identities may have led to hesitancy to participate for fear of answers to questions being identifiable. To reflect the language of the survey, we use the acronym ABGLPQ+ when discussing specific findings. However, when talking about broader patterns of inequity, community, or resistance in society and across campus, we use the acronym LGBTQIA+.

LGBTQIA+ Students Overview

There is a history of LGBTQIA+ student activism at CSULB, much of which has resulted in the development of long-standing programs and resources for the LGBTQIA+ community. A Gay & Lesbian Student Union (GLSU) was established in the 1970s and was advised by Rowland Kerr, a staff member within Student Affairs. The GLSU hosted weekly meetings, coordinated social events for community building, and participated in community service. While we do not have data on genderqueer or nonbinary students in this section, there is data discussed in the section on sex.

The LGBT Resource Center at CSULB (now the LGBTQ Student Cultural Resource Center) was established in 1989 as a result of student activism and faculty/staff collaboration. Students lobbied the administration for a safe space on campus. The Acting President, Dr. June Cooper designated Room 165 in Faculty Offices, Building 4 as the LGBT Resource Center. CSULB was one of the first California State Universities to establish an LGBT Resource Center on campus.

During the late 1980s and 1990s CSULB students were active in national organizations such as ACT UP and QUEER NATION which was reflected in the collectivist model used to manage the LGBT Resource Center as it was getting started. Vince Nico was the first Student Program Coordinator for the LGBT Resource Center, followed by Carol Haas, under work-study positions. Faculty members Dr. Michael Johnston (CAPS) and Dr. Patricia Rozee (Psychology & WGSS) were the first advisors to the LGBT Resource Center. Students were also responsible for establishing a local chapter of Delta Lambda Phi (DLP) (a gay fraternity) in 1990. DLP was established by gay men and is open to men of all sexual identities and gender expressions.

Throughout the 1990s and early 2000s, students continued to contribute to campus pride through a range of events and programming that related to the broader Long Beach community. For example, in 1996, CSULB hosted the first Annual Long Beach Gay & Lesbian Film Festival (now known as QFilms) in the University Student Union. One of the most impactful of these was the establishment of the first CSULB Coming Out Week and the first CSULB Lavender Graduation Ceremony in 2007, supported in large part by Dr. Kirstyn Chun from CAPS. Lavender Graduation, a graduation ceremony held specifically for LGBTQIA+ students, was

organized in large part by CSULB student organizers, one of whom went on to teach and provide continued resources to queer students on campus through 2018.

In 2008, Associated Students established a position for a Secretary for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersexual and Queer Affairs—a position that is still active and that has contributed to the development of groups like the student-led campus-wide LGBTQIA+ coalition, which hold regular meetings to connect students, faculty and staff across various campus constituencies. In 2013, the Queer Studies minor was developed, providing an academic space for the exploration of critical gender and sexuality studies on our campus. The first CSULB gender-neutral campus housing was established in 2014, and an LGBTQIA+ living community in Campus Housing was created in 2018.

The Rainbow Café, a drop-in support group for LGBTQIA+ students, was established by Dr. Lauren Jensen in CAPS in 2014, and What's the Tea, a queer student of color support group was established by Dr. Jonathan Higgins through the Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA) in 2015. The trans student support group started in 2016 by CSULB alum, Dr. Loretta LeMaster, continued until her departure from campus in 2018. It was re-established by Drs. Shae Miller and Abraham Weil. Students took over organizing of trans empowerment spaces during the 2019-2020 academic year and have continued to hold these spaces—even maintaining the group virtually through COVID-19. In 2021, they became an officially recognized student organization, Trans Empowerment and Advocacy (TEA). The long-standing student organization, Queers & Allies, is also an important part of the campus community, often providing the first visible indicator of queer community to incoming students. As of 2018, students can change their names and their pronouns for their campus roster, BEACH ID, and BeachBoard.

All these examples provide a small representation of the powerful contributions made by LGBTQIA+ students, and the resources that faculty and staff have worked to provide them with. These have led to a steady increase of the Campus Pride Index Score for CSULB to 4.5/5, and provide the context for the data in the following sections. However, it is also important to note that some of these resources have been diminished over the years, and core resources are still missing. For example, the LGBTQ Student Cultural Resource Center is in disrepair and is far removed from the center of campus where it could be more accessible. Regarding accessibility, there are still an inadequate number of all gender restrooms on campus, particularly in centrally located buildings like Brotman Hall. This necessitates greater attention to intersectional organizing and recognition of the varied experiences of students on our campus. This was also demonstrated through attempts by queer students of color to establish a queer student of color organization during the 2015-16 school year, who were met with challenges related to having to “prove” that their needs were distinct from those provided by Q&A. Instead, students relied on La Raza and other ethnic/race-based student orgs to create queer community and address LGBTQIA on-campus politics and concerns. This underlines the importance of additional collecting additional data on how sexuality and gender intersect with other social categories.

Finally, organizations that are led primarily by students often fall apart when student leaders graduate, further demonstrating the need for full-time staff for the center and a full time Director of LGBTQIA+ affairs. Without this funding and a permanent position to support this work, the extensive activities and investments of LGBTQIA+ students are often dependent upon voluntary labor of students and their staff and faculty supporters and are not consistent with the level of progress being made by student on our campus.

Finally, it is important to note that low response rates on this survey may reflect hesitation to participate amongst students. It is also possible that the limited gender and sexuality language in the survey discouraged participation by LGBTQIA+ students. This includes the lack of a specific category or option for trans, nonbinary, and intersex students – for example, man/trans man and woman/trans woman were condensed so that no useful information could be gleaned regarding differences between the experiences of cisgender and transgender men and women—and lack of a “free response” option. Because the dataset did not include questions specific to trans, nonbinary and intersex people, there is a large amount of information missing. It is also possible that not having their identities listed in the options at the start of the survey resulted in a lower general overall sense of inclusion for students in the “other” category. We also do not know the racial, ethnic, religious, disability, socioeconomic status, class, citizenship status, or gender identities, which could further account for scores in each of these areas.

Engage All Students

Engaging all students means providing opportunities for students to participate in social, political, and diversity related activities both on and off campus. In the Campus Pride Index, CSULB scored 4.5 out of 5 and is ranked highly compared to other California institutions. The school has a LGBTQIA+ resource center and as well as student organizations on campus such as Queers & Allies that hold regular meetings when school is in session. CSULB also holds a Lavender graduation to celebrate LGBTQIA+ students’ achievements that started in 2007. ABGLPQ+ identified students reported higher scores across the board than their non ABGLPQ+ identified counterparts. In the following section we discuss differences and similarities between students across sexual identities.

Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	Queer	Asexual	9.70341*	0.000
		Bisexual	6.93096*	0.000
		Gay	6.91478*	0.003
		Lesbian	7.75193*	0.003
		Pansexual	5.99968*	0.024
		Not listed above [Free response]	9.20208*	0.002

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	Non LGBTQI+	2748	47.6346
	LGBTQI+	689	50.7863

Co-Curricular Diversity Activities measures students’ involvement with institutional programs focused on diversity issues. ABGLPQ+ (Asexual, Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Pansexual and Queer) identified students report higher involvement with institutional programs focused on

diversity issues than non-ABGLPQ+ identified students. This is likely due to LGBTQIA+ students' experiences of exclusion or tokenization, which means they also likely have more awareness about diversity issues and programming. Due to an increasing number of gender/sexuality alliances in K-12 schools, they are also more likely to be aware of and seek out campus organizations structured to support their identities than non-LGBTQIA+ students.

Students who identify as queer have higher average involvement with institutional programs focused on diversity issues than students who identify as asexual, bisexual, gay, lesbian, pansexual, and those who identify with a group not listed in the ABGLPQ+ answer options. Because queer tends to be a politicized identity, queer-identified students may be more likely to seek out organizations and programming invested in diversity work or may have come to identify specifically as "queer" through their involvement in political spaces that are also focused on not only gender and sexuality but also on broader social justice issues including racial, ethnic, and class justice.

Civic Engagement Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Civic Engagement Factor Score	Queer	Asexual	9.28690*	0.000
		Bisexual	6.08059*	0.003
		Gay	6.30152*	0.015
		Lesbian	7.64061*	0.005
		Not listed above [Free response]	11.99335*	0.000

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Civic Engagement Factor Score	Non LGBTQI+	2748	48.0958
	LGBTQI+	694	51.9376

Engaged citizens are a critical element in the functioning of our democratic society. Civic Engagement measures the extent to which students are motivated and involved in civic, electoral, and political activities. ABGLPQ+ identified students have higher average Civic Engagement scores than non-LGBTQIA+ identified students. Similar to this pattern in relation to on-campus activities, this is likely due to LGBTQIA+ students' experiences in the broader socio-cultural and political climate. They are likely compelled to become involved because these issues directly impact them across LGBTQIA+ and intersecting racial, ethnic, and class identities. Their involvement was also likely sparked by the high stakes political climate that preceded the distribution of this survey in early 2020, and the legislative and other state initiatives targeting LGBTQIA+ people in the U.S.

Within the ABGLPQ+ group, students who identify as queer have higher average Civic Engagement scores than students who identify as asexual, bisexual, gay, lesbian, and those

who identify with a group not listed in the ABGLPQ+ answer options. Because queer tends to be a politicized identity, queer-identified students may be more likely to seek out civic engagement in a range of political spaces and activities. Queer is also often used as less of an identity-specific term, and as more of an issue-based claim, which is likely reflected in the higher level of reported civic-engagement within this group. It is also possible that students involved in political groups have come to identify specifically as “queer” through involvement in political spaces that are focused on not only gender and sexuality but also on broader social justice issues including racial, ethnic, and class justice.

Social Agency Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Social Agency Factor Score	Asexual	Bisexual	-4.66854*	0.035
		Gay	-5.97339*	0.012
		Pansexual	-5.81229*	0.020
		Queer	-7.59397*	0.002
	Not listed above [Free response]	Gay	-6.41710*	0.050
		Queer	-8.03767*	0.009

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Social Agency Factor Score	Non LGBTQI+	2881	49.3162
	LGBTQI+	710	50.9389

This factor reflects the extent to which students perceive themselves as directly involved in and capable of bringing about social change.

ABGLPQ+ identified students have higher average Social Agency scores than non-ABGLPQ+ identified students. This pattern might reflect a sense of agency developed due to their participation in the above-mentioned areas. This may also relate to the ways that their sexual and gender identities are perceived as reflecting some level of political value in the current socio-political and cultural context.

Within the ABGLPQ+ group, students who identify as asexual have lower average Social Agency scores than students who identify as bisexual, gay, pansexual, queer. This might reflect the patterned exclusion, overlooking, or lack of understanding of asexuality within political spaces, which could result in asexual students being less likely to identify with the broader LGBTQIA+ community and other political and social entities.

Students who identify with a group not listed in the ABGLPQ+ survey options reported lower average Social Agency scores than students who identify as gay or queer. Students whose identities are less likely to be reflected in acronyms describing gender, sexual, and romantic communities may also be likely to experience their identities as less politicized and as less

involved or included in the social group. Students who were categorized as “other” within the survey options may also have been primed to view themselves as less involved in political and social life throughout the remainder of the survey.

Summary of Engaging All Students

Across all factors related to “Engage All Students” ABGLPQ+-identified students scored higher than their non ABGLPQ+-identified peers. This reflects an overall higher level of engagement among LGBTQIA+ students in social justice work both on and off campus, as well as in political and electoral work. Within the ABGLPQ+ group, queer-identified students scored higher for both the Co-Curricular Diversity Activities and Civic Engagement Factors, reflecting a heightened politicization of queer-identified students—or adoption of a “queer” identity by those students who are more politicized. Meanwhile, asexual students and students whose identities were not included in the ABGLPQ+ options scored lower in the Social Agency Factor, but not in the other two factors. Because the Social Agency Factor reflects students’ perceptions that they can bring about social change, these lower scores may reflect lower levels of visibility, recognition, and inclusion within political spaces.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Given the overall higher engagement across factors among LGBTQIA+ students on our campus, we recommend further investment by the university in LGBTQIA+ students’ Co-Curricular, Civic, and other sociopolitical forms of engagement—particularly in ways that support them academically at the same time. In order to expand LGBTQIA+ student engagement across co-curricular diversity activities, civic engagement, and social agency activities, we recommend that the University continue to invest in and expand resources related to those factors. Specifically, we recommend investment in an LGBTQIA+ campus center with full-time paid staff whose expertise is in these areas, in order to properly resource a student base who has been engaging in activism and education on and off campus with limited resources at their disposal. We also recommend that a Director of LGBTQIA+ Student Affairs be hired to work directly with students and to oversee student organizations, providing administrative support such as scheduling and budgeting, as well as readily available crisis counseling, trained advocacy, and guidance. Based on these findings, we also suggest that further action be taken to increase education about and awareness and inclusion of asexual, trans, intersex, nonbinary, and additional groups within the LGBTQIA+ community who are often unaccounted for in institutional practice and engagement. We also note that despite their political and social engagement, LGBTQIA+ students, including those identifying specifically as queer, are likely doing so in relation to the institutions inability to address their needs directly. As a result, we recommend the establishment of scholarships, grants, and research opportunities for students in support and recognition of their academic pursuits and their potential for producing long term social change as active and engaged citizens.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

Because the dataset did not include questions specific to trans, nonbinary and intersex people, there is a large amount of information missing. It is also possible that not having their identities listed in the options at the start of the survey resulted in a lower general overall sense of inclusion for students in the “other” category. We also do not know the racial, ethnic, religious, class or gender identities, which could further account for scores in each of these areas. We don’t know which events and political spaces students are involved in, how they are involved, and how they are prioritizing their activities. We also don’t know whether these are connected to their home departments, and whether they are organizing on the basis of sexual, gender, and/or other identities.

Expand Access

Expand Access involves the institution's dedication to providing courses and curriculum that is inclusive and resonates with the students as well as staff and faculty that gives validation to the students and their educational development. CSULB offers a Queer Studies minor within the Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies program, while also including LGBTQIA+ sexualities within Human Sexualities courses. ABGLPQ+ identified students report having taken a higher number of courses that include materials and pedagogy addressing diversity over their non-ABGLPQ+ identified peers. Meanwhile there were no significant differences between the two groups when it came to their views of validation from staff and faculty at CSULB.

Curriculum of Inclusion Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	Queer	Asexual	7.29463*	0.019
		Gay	6.02031*	0.041

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	Non LGBTQI+	2586	49.3725
	LGBTQI+	653	52.0446

This factor represents the extent to which pedagogy and course content resonates with students' identities and helps students feel valued and affirmed as learners. Curriculum of Inclusion measures the number of courses a student has taken that include materials and pedagogy addressing diversity.

ABGLPQ+ identified students report having taken a higher number of courses including materials and pedagogy addressing diversity than non-ABGLPQ+ identified students. With the lack of representation of LGBTQIA+ content in general or introductory courses, those who identify as LGBTQIA+ are more likely to seek out courses that include content relating to diversity and social justice issues. On the contrary, non-LGBTQIA+ students may be accustomed to being represented, at least in terms of sexuality, within the classroom and therefore not experience it as affirmation. Because college is a time when students are exploring their identities students may be more likely to seek out courses that affirm their identities, and LGBTQIA+ students may either self-select into courses that focus on diversity or develop the language, knowledge, and vocabulary to explore their LGBTQIA+ identities through participation in those courses.

Students who identify as queer have higher average Curriculum of Inclusion scores than students who identify as asexual, and students who identify as gay. Because queer is frequently used as an umbrella term in courses that include materials and pedagogy addressing diversity, students who have taken more of these classes may be more likely to identify as queer as a result. It is also possible that the content resonates more with queer identified students than with

those who identify as asexual or gay. Because asexuality is often underrepresented in LGBTQIA+ discussions and advocacy, asexual identified students may be less affirmed in these courses than those who identify as queer. Students who identified as gay may also be more likely to be white, cisgender men who are more broadly represented in the mainstream media and politics, and so may be less likely to feel the need to seek out affirmation through courses addressing inclusion and diversity.

General Interpersonal Validation Factor

General Interpersonal Validation measures students' view of faculty and staff's attention to their development. There were no significant differences in students' perception of faculty and staff's attention to their development for ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ students. There were also no differences in perceptions across various identities within the ABGLPQ+ categories. These sexual identities are often unknown to faculty and staff unless disclosed by a student, and so may not be known across all situations. Since sexual identities are more personal identities, students may not disclose them across a range of contexts. It is possible that trans students would disclose for gender affirming reasons, but since we do not have data on trans students, it is impossible to speak to any differences in experience. Again, this points to the ways that conflating gender and sexual identities within survey tools reduces in a loss of significant information about the experiences and needs of participants.

Summary of Expand Access

ABGLPQ+ students report having taken a higher number of courses that include materials and pedagogy addressing diversity than non-ABGLPQ+ students. Within the ABGLPQ+ categories, queer students report having taken a higher number of courses with materials and pedagogy addressing diversity than those who identified as asexual or gay. There were no significant differences in students' perceptions of validation from faculty and staff.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Given that ABGLPQ+ students have taken a higher number of courses including materials and pedagogy addressing diversity, it is likely that these courses serve an important purpose for marginalized students. However, timely graduation requirements and advising practices that place limits on units often discourage students from exploring curricula outside of their discipline. As such, we recommend maintaining existing courses in these areas while adding additional interdisciplinary and cross-listed courses in these areas. We also recommend that the process to include curricula in general education requirements be restructured to prioritize diversity and inclusion courses, adding more of these to the listings. Increasing student exposure to a range of disciplines starting at Student Orientation, Advising, and Registration (SOAR) is likely to enrich student learning and engagement. Therefore, we also recommend shifting the focus of staff and faculty during advising from timely graduation restrictions towards an emphasis on cultivating community, student development and experiences on campus. Expanding student opportunities to explore, and even change, majors is a necessary component of supporting the BEACH 2030 mission, along with allowing them to go above the required units without penalty.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

Because the dataset did not include questions specific to trans, nonbinary and intersex people, there is a large amount of information missing. It is also possible that not having their identities listed in the options at the start of the survey resulted in a lower general overall sense of inclusion for students in the "other" category. We do not have data on the race and gender of people who selected specific identities under the ABGLPQ+ category, which may also be explanatory factors in their selection into or experiences within courses emphasizing inclusion

and diversity. In terms of validation scores, we do not know if students disclose their sexual identities in interactions with faculty and staff and are likely not to do so if they sense that it would negatively impact their interactions. Trans students may also selectively identify themselves to staff and faculty if they feel that it will not negatively impact their experiences, but data does not include information on the gender of students. These data do not include intersecting identities such as race, which may impact interpersonal validation but not necessarily require disclosure by the student.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Promote Intellectual Achievement addresses self-awareness in students and their beliefs about their abilities and confidence in academic environments, whether the faculty shows concern for the students' academic success, as well as the students' behaviors and traits that are considered a foundation for lifelong learning. ABGLPQ+ identified students reported higher scores than non ABGLPQ+ identified students within the Academic Self-Concept and Habits of Mind factors. Meanwhile there was no significant difference between the two groups within the Academic Validation in the Classroom factor.

Academic Self-Concept Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	Gay	Asexual	5.79337*	0.018
		Not listed above [Free response]	8.74550*	0.001

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	Non LGBTQI+	3091	50.0164
	LGBTQI+	752	48.2555

This factor measures self-awareness and confidence in academic environments, which helps students learn by encouraging their intellectual inquiry. Academic Self-Concept is a unified measure of students' beliefs about their abilities and confidence in academic environments.

LGTBQIA+ identified students have higher average Academic Self-Concept scores than non-ABGLPQ+ identified students. Building off earlier interpretations that suggest ABGLPQ+ students are likely to pursue classes that resonate with their experiences, and to seek out extracurricular community spaces, it is possible that involvement in, and support from, these contexts increase their intellectual self-confidence levels, their perception of their academic abilities, and their drive to achieve. Even in courses do not include LGBTQIA+ specific content, supportive networks and practices may increase confidence in other areas.

Moreover, students tend to show patterns of success or challenges across all their courses so it is unlikely that they would be doing well across multiple courses but not doing well in math. In

seeking out courses that affirm their identities, students may also be seeking out role-models who demonstrate to them that success across these areas is possible, leading to greater overall confidence and drive. Within the ABGLPQ+ group, asexual identified students and students whose identities were not included in the ABGLPQ+ answer options reported lower average Academic Self-Concept scores than students who identified as gay. Given their lower overall representation in LGBTQIA+ politics and communities, they may not have access to the support systems and role-models that gay students do.

Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	Asexual	Gay	-5.80609*	0.019
		Queer	-6.99145*	0.008

This factor measures faculty interactions in the classroom, which can foster students' academic development. Academic Validation measures students' views of the extent to which faculty actions in class reflect concern for their academic success.

There was no difference in the reported Academic Validation between ABGLPQ+ identified and non-ABGLPQ+ identified students. Because sexual identity is not likely to be disclosed in every context, it is unlikely to have a primary impact on whether or not faculty validate students in the classroom. That said, students have access to a lot of information about courses and faculty in advance of enrollment based on peer feedback or online forums. Therefore, the similarity in scores may reflect students' self-selection into courses with professors whose teaching style resonates with them.

Among ABGLPQ+ identified students, those who identify as asexual have lower average Academic Validation in the Classroom scores than students who identify as gay or queer. This reflects a larger overall pattern of lower sense of belonging and other related factors among asexual identified students. They may therefore be coming into these spaces already experiencing lower levels of validation.

Habits of Mind Factor

2 Group Comparison			
Not LGBTQI+ (1) or LGBTQI+ (2)		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	Non LGBTQI+	2824	48.7267
	LGBTQI+	695	50.8316

Habits of Mind is a unified measure of the behaviors and traits associated with academic success. These learning behaviors are seen as the foundation for lifelong learning. ABGLPQ+ identified students have higher average Habits of Mind Factor scores than non-ABGLPQ+ identified students. As a result of systematic exclusion and bias in society, LGBTQIA+ students

are more likely to have exercised many of the behaviors and traits associated with academic success in their daily lives. For example, they are more likely than non-LGBTQIA+ students to have to independently seek out information about and representations related to their sexual and romantic communities. These processes are often sought out independently but fostered through community channels and resource sharing, which prepares them for application of these same strategies in an academic setting.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

The higher scores for LGBTQIA+ students within the Habits of Mind and Academic Self-Concept factors suggest that because they have had to take care of and support themselves, they have developed the skills and resilience to succeed in academic contexts. However, these skills do not appear to be accompanied by higher Academic Validation in the Classroom scores and may not result in overall higher academic achievement. In addition, as reflected in other categories, asexual students had generally lower scores than other LGBTQIA+ identified students.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

In order to promote intellectual achievement among LGBTQIA+ students, we recommend that students be included in campus-wide discussions with faculty around equity including anti-racist, anti-sexist, anti-ableist, anti-classist, and anti-heterosexist practices in the classroom. Although LGBTQIA+ students report higher scores in Habits of Mind and Academic Self-Concept, it is important to attend to the lower overall scores of asexual identified students, and those whose identities were not included in the LGBTQIA+ answer options. Therefore, any attempts to promote intellectual achievement among LGBTQIA+ students must deploy an intersectional, community-based approach rather than assessing the individual performance of students and faculty. We advise hiring and retention of a full-time staff member who is trained in crisis-management and institutional approaches to diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) to oversee the LGBTQIA+ Center and related resources. This person could serve as a liaison between faculty and students, helping to identify the ongoing needs of our student body and to provide resources to faculty so that they can better serve their students. We recommend that the LGBTQIA+ Center on campus be revitalized and relocated to a more central and accessible space on campus so that barriers to resources for LGBTQIA+ identified students are reduced and that. Drawing in students from a variety of different departments across campus to collaborate in the marketing and development of our center would also provide opportunities for students who have not taken courses that have benefited students.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Although the data speak to patterns among lesbian, gay, bisexual, pansexual and asexual students, there is no information on intersex students, transgender students, or other students within the broader LGBTQIA+ umbrella. We also do not have data on the gender, race, class, ethnic, religious, citizenship, (dis)ability, or age statuses on students in this sample. We also do not have information about students' majors or their class standing, which are both likely to impact their intellectual achievement. Therefore, there are likely other factors at play in students' self-evaluations and experiences of validation in the classroom that we cannot account for in this section, and which would allow for more complete recommendations.

Build Community

This category measures students' perceptions of the community on campus, as well as their orientations towards various communities. ABGLPQ+ identified students reported higher scores than their non ABGLPQ+ identified counterparts when it came to Discrimination and Bias and Harassment. This reflects the lower Sense of Belonging from the ABGLPQ+ identified students

at the institution despite scoring higher in Pluralistic Orientation, Conversations across Difference, and Critical Consciousness and Action. These factors address the rates of which ABGLPQ+ identified students engage in situations that include a wider range of diverse people and their abilities to challenge their own and others' beliefs.

Sense of Belonging Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Sense of Belonging Factor Score	Asexual	Gay	-5.68081*	0.012
	Not listed above [Free response]	Gay	-7.24750*	0.007

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Sense of Belonging Factor Score	Non LGBTQI+	3121	50.5223
	LGBTQI+	759	49.2345

The campus community is a powerful source of influence on students' development. Sense of Belonging measures the extent to which students feel a sense of academic and social integration on campus. ABGLPQ+ students report a lower overall sense of belonging than non-ABGLPQ+ students, reflecting broader patterns of LGBTQIA+ exclusion in higher education. Students who identified as gay reported the strongest sense of belonging, while those who filled in the free responses reported the lowest sense of belonging. Students who identify as asexual have a lower sense of belonging than those who identify as gay, and those who identify with a sexual identity group not listed in the ABGLPQ+ answer options have lower average Sense of Belonging scores than students who identify as gay or queer. This reflects larger patterns of belonging among asexual people in the U.S., who are often stigmatized in the U.S. where sexual desires and intimacies are normalized. Moreover, LGBTQI+ people are more likely to feel a sense of belonging when they see their identities reflected in the language of the institution.

Pluralistic Orientation Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	Asexual	Bisexual	-5.47107*	0.002
		Gay	-6.12347*	0.004
		Pansexual	-6.77092*	0.001
		Queer	-6.55035*	0.009

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	Non LGBTQIA+	3072	49.0450
	LGBTQIA+	746	50.2626

Pluralistic Orientation measures skills and dispositions appropriate for living and working in a diverse society and has a great deal to do with perspective-taking. ABGLPQ+ identified students have higher average Pluralistic Orientation scores than non-ABGLPQ+ identified students. Given LGBTQIA+ students' higher Civic Engagement Scores, it is likely that participation in civic, electoral, or political activities have contributed to more opportunities for pluralistic engagement. LGBTQIA+ people tend to be familiar with controversies surrounding LGBTQIA+ rights, and the range of intersecting identities and experiences among members within LGBTQIA+ communities means that perspectives vary even within larger groups.

It makes sense that these circumstances would lead them to be more tolerant of others with different beliefs, open to having their views challenged, able to work cooperatively with diverse people, discuss controversial issues, and see the world from others' perspectives. Students who identify as asexual have lower average Pluralistic Orientation scores than students who identify as bisexual, gay, pansexual, or queer. Given the pattern of exclusion asexual people from broader LGBTQIA+ organizing and politics, as well as their invisibilization within a society that privileges sexual relationships, it is not surprising that asexual students reported lower pluralistic orientation scores.

Conversations Across Differences Factor

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	Non LGBTQI+	2877	48.8911
	LGBTQI+	713	52.7733

Conversations Across Difference measures how often students have in-depth conversations with diverse peers. Students who engage with diverse peers are more likely to achieve change across a wide range of student learning outcomes. LGTBQIA+ identified students report a higher frequency of engagement with diverse peers than non-LGBTQIA+ students. Given LGBTQIA+ students' higher Curriculum of Inclusion Scores, suggesting that they are more likely to enroll in courses addressing issues of diversity, it is no surprise that they also have higher Conversations Across Differences Scores than non-LGBTQIA+ students. Exploration of diversity within the classroom is likely coincide with more diverse engagement outside of the classroom, and more discussions about differences among diverse peers. Because heterosexual identities are often assumed in our society and non-heterosexual identities are "othered", LGBTQIA+ students often learn to be receptive to and aware of differences, and to refrain from making assumptions about those differences. Particularly when it comes to interactions across difference, LGBTQIA+ students are more likely to be involved in conversations about the nuances of identity, experience, and combatting stereotypes across groups.

Critical Consciousness and Action Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	Asexual	Pansexual	-5.55267*	0.008
	Queer	Asexual	7.74473*	0.000
		Bisexual	4.53870*	0.010
		Gay	4.66407*	0.044
		Not listed above [Free response]	7.40272*	0.006

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	Non LGBTQI+	2891	48.6346
	LGBTQI+	716	52.5494

This is a unified measure of how often students critically examine and challenge their own and others' biases. ABGLPQ+ identified students have higher critical consciousness and action factor scores than non-ABGLPQ+ identified students. We live in a heteronormative society where it is assumed that the default is heterosexual and monosexual. Because of this any marginalized communities feeling that discrimination are likely to feel inclined to reach out to and get to know other marginalized groups, be willing to (and have experiences with) having their thinking challenged, and to have participated in discussions challenging issues of discrimination. We saw that conversations across groups tend to be higher among LGBTQIA+ identified students, which is likely to correlate with higher critical consciousness and action—these conversations create more opportunities for them to critically evaluate their own and others' perspectives on issues.

Students who identify as queer have higher average Critical Consciousness and Action scores than students who identify as asexual, bisexual, gay, or who identify with a group not listed in the ABGLPQ+ answer options. In addition to having lower average Critical Consciousness and Action scores than those who identify as queer, students who identify as asexual also have lower scores than students who identify as pansexual. As we have discussed, using the term queer can be used by people to align themselves politically with diverse social justice and inclusion efforts, as a result, students identified as queer may be more likely to be engaged in political discussions, take classes, and engage in discussions that challenge their critical consciousness. The continued lack of representation that asexual people experience, paired with the pressure to have to explain/justify their identities and experiences may discourage them from reaching out and discussing these things, either within or beyond, the LGBTQIA+ community.

Discrimination and Bias Factor

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	Non LGBTQI+	2864	48.3076
	LGBTQI+	712	50.7142

This factor measures the frequency of students' experiences with more subtle forms of discrimination. ABGLPQ+ identified students report a higher frequency of subtle forms of discrimination and bias than non-ABGLPQ+ students. Because of the types of discrimination represented in this factor, such as verbal comments, general exclusion, offensive imagery or items, or witnessing harassment, these scores likely speak to an overall climate of bias against LGBTQIA+ students. While these are described as "subtle", and are often characterized as microaggressions, we know that they impact students' well-being and academic achievement in a variety of ways. Their lower scores follow the trend represented in ABGLPQ+ students' lower Sense of Belonging scores and suggest that discrimination is more prevalent for LGBTQIA+ students than for non-LGBTQIA+ students.

This is not surprising given that we live in a heteronormative and cissexist society in which anti-LGBTQIA+ language and symbols are normalized, taken for granted, and often perceived as innocuous. For example, gender-specific language, examples used in classrooms and trainings

that presume heterosexuality, the division of gendered spaces that also presume heterosexuality, the centering of heterosexual and cisgender realities that serve to invalidate and “other” LGBTQIA+ students, and the treatment of LGBTQIA+ issues as outside the purview of everyday conversation and engagement, as well as in classes whose content is not specifically LGBTQIA+ centered.

Harassment Factor

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Harassment Factor Score	Non LGBTQI+	2841	49.1411
	LGBTQI+	706	49.9761

This factor measures the frequency that students experience threats or harassment. ABGLPQ+ identified students report higher Harassment Factor Scores than non-ABGLPQ+ students. These scores reflect the frequency of threats or harassment, including direct assault and physical violence against LGBTQIA+ students. Because we live in a heteronormative society, non-LGBTQIA+ people are less likely to be harassed on the basis of their sexual identities. Moreover, we live in a society that privileges violence as a form of power and control that is often directed towards marginalized communities. Therefore, it is unsurprising that these patterns play out on the campus, which is in many ways a microcosm of the larger society in which it is situated.

Summary of Build Community

The data show that ABGLPQ+ identified students have higher overall scores than non-ABGLPQ+ students when it comes to Pluralistic Orientation, Frequency of Conversations Across Difference, and Critical Consciousness and Action. Despite their higher levels of engagement in all of these areas they still report lower overall Sense of Belonging scores, with higher Discrimination and Bias scores, and higher Harassment scores. These findings indicate that LGBTQIA+ students are doing a lot of work on campus to create community and reach out to others across difference but are nonetheless experiencing harassment and bias paired with a lack of inclusion on our campus.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Despite our campus scoring high on the Campus Pride Index (4.5 out of 5 as of 2021), ABGLPQ+ students still report a lower overall Sense of Belonging than non-ABGLPQ+ students and are therefore less likely to recommend our campus to their friends. These findings suggest that there is a disconnect between campus efforts and reporting of LGBTQIA+ centered resources and students' perceptions, and that our campus should expand upon resources and opportunities for affiliation among LGBTIQ+ students. Increased funding, and dissemination of information on resources and programming in a cohesive and readily available way would contribute to these goals, along with a fully staffed and outfitted LGBTQIA+ Resource Center housed in an accessible space on campus. Professional development for faculty and staff to learn about gender and sexual diversity should also be required as part of these efforts. Attempts to bring together students from across the campus will also contribute to a greater sense of belonging for LGBTQIA+ students in various departments. We must also acknowledge that with these changes, there is additional work to be done in raising awareness and inclusion

for asexual students, transgender students, and other groups whose experiences are less recognized and understood.

While ABGLPQ+ students report higher Pluralistic Orientation and Conversations Across Difference scores, there is still work to be done within LGBTQIA+ communities to address intersecting racial, gender, class, religious, national, ethnic and (dis)ability inequities. Therefore, staff, faculty and students involved in developing programming and spaces should be trained to effectively engage in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion work. Higher experiences of bias and harassment among LGBTQIA+ identified students may reflect a lack of consequences for those expressing and enacting bias and harassment. However, we recommend a community-based approach to interventions over an increase in police presence since LGBTQIA+ students are likely to be disproportionately targeted and criminalized by the state.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

Because we do not have data on race, socioeconomic status, religion, disability status, gender, ethnicity, or other intersecting factors, we do not know what other contributing factors may be present in these data. It is important to be able to consider how, for example, homophobia and transphobia are racialized, classed, and gendered. We do not know who the harassment is coming from and in what contexts. We also don't have data on transgender status of students in the survey. While there may be specific individuals or groups engaged in anti-LGBTQIA+ harassment, these data could also indicate a general sense of lack of belonging or support within student support services.

Cultivate Resilience

Cultivate resilience addresses the students' perceptions of the Institution's Commitment to Diversity. There were no reported differences between ABGLPQ+ identified and non ABGLPQ+ identified students in their perceptions of the institution's commitment to diversity. Meanwhile ABGLPQ+ identified students scored higher in Civic Engagement.

Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor

This is a measure of a student's perception of the campus' commitment to diversity. There was no significant difference in the reported scores between ABGLPQ+ identified students and those who were not ABGLPQ+ identified. Typically, non-marginalized groups are less likely to be attuned to diversity work being done around marginalized groups.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

Seeing as though ABGLPQ+ identified students scored higher in Civic Engagement, it is surprising that there were no reported differences between ABGLPQ+ and non ABGLPQ+ identified students regarding the Institution's Commitment to Diversity.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

Given the ambiguity of this data, we recommend collection of further data on this specific topic, and analysis of LGBTQIA+ students' perceptions of the campus commitment to diversity.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

Because we do not know if students reported a generally high or low perception of the campus' commitment to diversity, it is difficult to speak to how this campus cultivates resilience among LGBTQIA+ students. It is likely that, overall, if the campus was perceived as engaging in LGBTQIA+ diversity work, LGBTQIA+ students would report a higher perception than non-LGBTQIA+ students, but this may be tempered by other intersecting identities—for example, racial, gender, and class marginalized identities—that would lead non-LGBTQIA+ students to be

attuned to other measures of diversity commitment. Given the diversity of our student population, it is unlikely that a majority of students in this sample identified as white and wealthy, for example, and are therefore likely to be attuned to racial and class issues.

Disability status

Engage All Students

In terms of disability status, the following categories were included: learning disability, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), chronic illness, psychological disorder, Autism Spectrum Disorder, other, or multiple disabilities. In examining the goal of engaging all students, three factors were addressed. These focused on student's participation in Co-curricular Diversity Activities (e.g., discussion on campus, events on campus focused on diversity), Civic Engagement (e.g., students' involvement in civic, electoral, and political activities), and Social Agency (e.g., the value students have on political and social involvement as a personal goal).

Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	No disability	2332	47.5354
	1 or more disabilities	1149	49.7184

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Learning disability (dyslexia, etc.)		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	No	3259	48.0997
	Yes	115	51.3868

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	No	3160	48.0126
	Yes	210	51.0131

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Chronic illness (cancer, diabetes, autoimmune disorders, etc.)		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	No	3207	48.0503
	Yes	149	50.8988

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	No	2553	47.6941
	Yes	818	49.8724

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	No	3204	48.1266
	Yes	162	49.8373

Students with 1 or more disabilities scored significantly higher on Co-Curricular Diversity Activities compared to students with no disabilities. In further examination, students with a learning disability, ADHD, chronic illness, or psychological disorder all reported higher participation in ongoing campus-organized activities surrounding diversity compared to students with no disabilities. There were no significant differences for students with other disabilities or students with Autism Spectrum Disorder compared to students with no disabilities regarding Co-curricular Diversity Activities.

Social Agency Factor

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Social Agency Factor Score	No	2509	49.2357
	Yes	801	50.3016

Students with psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.) scored significantly higher on Social Agency compared to students with no disabilities; however, there were no other significant differences between students with any other disability compared to students with no disability for this factor.

Summary of Engaging All Students

Students with disabilities participated more in Co-curricular diversity activities and had higher involvement in civic, electoral and political activities compared to students without disabilities. Students with psychological disorder did score higher on Social Agency than students without disabilities; however, there were no other differences among students with disabilities compared to students without disabilities on how they value political and social involvement as a personal goal.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

CSULB can promote more allyship workshops and trainings to engage students without disabilities to attend more functions related to co-curricular diversity activities and civic

engagement. Additionally, all students, regardless of disability status, may benefit from discussions, presentations, or workshops that value the importance of influencing the political structure, working to address social and economic inequalities and helping to promote racial understanding.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

How can the campus help build awareness and respect for students with disabilities?

In some instances, it feels that students with disabilities are attended to in a "hushed" manner. How can we create an environment where it can be addressed comfortably for everyone?

Expand Access

To examine the goal of Expanding Access, two factors were examined, Curriculum of Inclusion and General Interpersonal Validation. These factors focused on students' experiences with curriculum that focused on diversity and how they viewed faculty and staff's attention to their development.

Curriculum of Inclusion Factor

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	No disability	2208	49.0736
	1 or more disabilities	1069	51.6970

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)		N	Mean
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	No	2902	49.7120
	Yes	203	52.5626

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Chronic illness (cancer, diabetes, autoimmune disorders, etc.)		N	Mean
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	No	2947	49.7524
	Yes	142	52.7648

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	No	2351	49.1403
	Yes	752	52.3414

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	No	2947	49.8095
	Yes	153	51.5574

Students with 1 or more disabilities scored significantly higher on Curriculum of Inclusion compared to students with no disabilities. In further examination, students with ADHD, chronic illness, or psychological disorder all reported higher participation in taking courses that included materials and pedagogy addressing diversity compared to students with no disabilities. There were no significant differences for students with learning disabilities, other disabilities or students with Autism Spectrum Disorder compared to students with no disabilities regarding Curriculum of Inclusion.

General Interpersonal Validation Factor

There were no differences between students with disabilities and students without disabilities on General Interpersonal Validation. Disability status was not a factor in how students view faculty and staff’s attention to their development.

Summary of Expand Access

Overall, students with disabilities participated in taking more courses that addressed diversity than students without disabilities, but there were no differences between the groups in terms of how students view faculty and staff’s attention on their development.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

CSULB can increase the number of courses that focus on diversity such as race/ethnicity, privilege, gender identity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic class differences, and disability. This should include course revisions, course additions, or seminars offered to students as electives in which they may be able to select additional courses focus on diversity topics of interest.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

None

Promote Intellectual Achievement

To examine the goal of Promote Intellectual Achievement, three factors were examined: Academic Self-Concept, Academic Validation in the Classroom, and Habits of Mind. These

factors focused on students' beliefs about their own abilities, how they viewed being received by faculty, and behaviors and traits they engaged in that are associated with academic success.

Academic Self-Concept Factor

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	No disability	2738	50.1077
	1 or more disabilities	1152	48.6546

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	No	3165	49.7768
	Yes	210	48.1399

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	No	2558	50.2027
	Yes	817	48.0263

Students with no disabilities had higher scores on Academic Self-Concept compared to students with 1 or more disabilities, students with ADHD and students with a psychological disorder. Students with no disability did not differ from students with a learning disability, students with chronic illness, other disabilities, or students with Autism Spectrum Disorder in their beliefs about their abilities and confidence in academic environments.

Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Other		N	Mean
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	No	3017	49.3908
	Yes	120	46.8514

Students with other disabilities had higher scores on Academic Validation in the classroom compared to students with no disabilities. There were no differences between students with any other disabilities compared to students with no disabilities in their view of actions by faculty in class reflecting concern for their academic success.

Habits of Mind Factor

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	No disability	2421	48.3978
	1 or more disabilities	1140	50.7307

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Learning disability (dyslexia, etc.)		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	No	3242	49.0564
	Yes	113	52.0652

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	No	3145	48.9743
	Yes	209	51.9281

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Chronic illness (cancer, diabetes, autoimmune disorders, etc.)		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	No	3189	49.0105
	Yes	149	52.2457

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	No	2547	48.6964
	Yes	807	50.6652

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	No	3187	49.0542
	Yes	161	51.6189

Students with 1 or more disabilities scored significantly higher on Habits of Mind compared to students with no disabilities. In further examination, students with ADHD, learning disability, chronic illness, or psychological disorder all reported more frequent behaviors associated with academic success, such as asking questions in class, seeking solutions for problems and explaining them to others, or accepting mistakes as part of the learning process compared to students with no disabilities. There were no significant differences for students with other disabilities or students with Autism Spectrum Disorder compared to students with no disabilities regarding Habits of Mind.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

Students with no disabilities had higher academic self-concept compared to students with particular disabilities. However, for some students with disabilities they felt greater academic validation in the classroom as well as engaged in more behaviors associated with academic success than their peers without disabilities.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

To facilitate intellectual achievement for students with disabilities, CSULB can recommend faculty and staff go through a training on Bob Murphy Access Center (BMAC) resources and services, so they can appropriately assist students.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

None

Build Community

Six factors were used to assess the goal of Build Community, which included Sense of Belonging, Pluralistic Orientation, Conversations across Differences, Critical Consciousness and Action, Discrimination and Bias, and Harassment. Specifically, these factors focused on how well students felt integrated on campus, how they thought their skillset was appropriate for engagement with a diverse society, as well as how frequent students had in-depth conversations on matters of diversity or self-reflected on their own biases. Within this section, students’ experiences with harassment and bias on campus were also examined.

Sense of Belonging Factor

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Sense of Belonging Factor Score	No disability	2779	50.7200
	1 or more disabilities	1148	49.1901

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)		N	Mean
Sense of Belonging Factor Score	No	3154	50.3716
	Yes	209	47.8357

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Sense of Belonging Factor Score	No	2546	50.8056
	Yes	817	48.5003

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Sense of Belonging Factor Score	No	3198	50.3278
	Yes	161	48.1035

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Other		N	Mean
Sense of Belonging Factor Score	No	3039	50.3449
	Yes	120	46.6197

Students with no disabilities had higher scores on Sense of Belonging compared to students with 1 or more disabilities, students with ADHD, students with a psychological disorder, students with other disabilities, and students with Autism Spectrum Disorder. Students with no disability did not differ from students with a learning disability or students with chronic illness in feeling a sense of academic and social integration on campus. Students with disabilities have a lower sense of belonging compared to students without disabilities, although this may not be the case for all types of disabilities.

Pluralistic Orientation Factor

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Learning disability (dyslexia, etc.)		N	Mean
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	No	3241	49.1382
	Yes	114	51.3771

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)		N	Mean
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	No	3146	49.1322
	Yes	207	50.8105

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	No	3186	49.1564
	Yes	162	50.8640

Students with a learning disability, ADHD, or psychological disorder had higher scores on Pluralistic Orientation compared to students with no disabilities. There were no differences between students with any other disabilities compared to students with no disabilities in the skills and dispositions appropriate for living and working in a diverse society.

Conversations Across Differences Factor

2 Group Comparison			
Disability Flag - 1 = No Disability vs 2 = 1 or More Disabilities		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	No disability	2484	48.5883
	1 or more disabilities	1149	51.9115

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Learning disability (dyslexia, etc.)		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	No	3251	49.4836
	Yes	112	53.8614

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	No	3151	49.3821
	Yes	210	53.3213

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Chronic illness (cancer, diabetes, autoimmune disorders, etc.)		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	No	3194	49.4360
	Yes	152	53.1983

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	No	2544	48.7270
	Yes	818	52.4665

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	No	3193	49.5070
	Yes	163	51.9932

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Other		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	No	3037	49.4940
	Yes	121	51.5359

Students with a disability (except for Autism Spectrum Disorder Autism Spectrum Disorder) reported significantly higher scores on Conversations Across Differences compared to students with no disabilities. Students with disabilities are having more frequent in-depth conversations with diverse peers than those without disabilities.

Critical Consciousness and Action Factor

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	No disability	2498	48.4744
	1 or more disabilities	1152	51.3940

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Learning disability (dyslexia, etc.)		N	Mean
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	No	3265	49.2821
	Yes	113	51.7267

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)		N	Mean
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	No	3166	49.1244
	Yes	211	52.9112

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Chronic illness (cancer, diabetes, autoimmune disorders, etc.)		N	Mean
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	No	3209	49.2582
	Yes	153	51.1484

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	No	2559	48.5223
	Yes	819	52.0843

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	No	3209	49.3186
	Yes	163	50.2660

Students with a disability (except for students with other disabilities or Autism Spectrum Disorder) reported significantly higher scores on Critical Consciousness and Action compared to students with no disabilities. Students with disabilities are more frequently critically examining and challenging their own and others' biases than those without disabilities.

Discrimination and Bias Factor

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	No disability	2467	47.9491
	1 or more disabilities	1153	50.5635

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Learning disability (dyslexia, etc.)		N	Mean
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	No	3263	48.6701
	Yes	116	51.9346

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)		N	Mean
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	No	3168	48.4868
	Yes	209	53.1213

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Chronic illness (cancer, diabetes, autoimmune disorders, etc.)		N	Mean
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	No	3212	48.5802
	Yes	150	51.9298

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	No	2556	48.0513
	Yes	821	50.9740

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	No	3211	48.6588
	Yes	162	51.1918

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Other		N	Mean
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	No	3053	48.5668
	Yes	122	53.2758

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Autism spectrum disorder		N	Mean
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	No	3325	48.7109
	Yes	38	52.9047

Students with a disability reported significantly higher scores on Discrimination and Bias compared to students with no disabilities. Students with disabilities have more frequent experiences with subtle forms of discrimination than those without disabilities.

Harassment Factor

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)		N	Mean
Harassment Factor Score	No	3134	49.0529
	Yes	212	51.9084

Students with ADHD reported higher Harassment scores than students without disabilities. There were no other differences between students with any other disabilities compared to students without disabilities in their experiences of harassment (e.g., physical assaults/injuries, threats of violence, damage to personal property) at CSULB.

Summary of Build Community

Students with disabilities had a lower sense of belonging on campus and experienced more acts of discrimination and bias compared to students without disabilities. For some students with disabilities, there was more use of skills appropriate for living and working in a diverse society, more conversations with peers across differences, and more critical consciousness and action compared to students without disabilities.

Recommendations related to Build Community

To build community, CSULB can increase their efforts to celebrate diversity. This can include creating campus activities around disability and highlighting student projects or artwork around campus.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

None

Cultivate Resilience

To examine the goal of Cultivate Resilience, two factors were explored: Institutional Commitment to Diversity and Civic Engagement. These factors focused on how students' perceived CSULB's commitment to diversity as well as student's involvement in civic related activities.

Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor Score	No	2535	52.7637
	Yes	815	51.8183

There were no significant differences between students with disabilities and students without disabilities for Institutional Commitment to Diversity.

Civic Engagement Factor

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Civic Engagement Factor Score	No disability	2331	47.9291
	1 or more disabilities	1155	50.7297

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Learning disability (dyslexia, etc.)		N	Mean
Civic Engagement Factor Score	No	3260	48.6997
	Yes	117	51.5902

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)		N	Mean
Civic Engagement Factor Score	No	3165	48.5314
	Yes	210	52.7711

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Chronic illness (cancer, diabetes, autoimmune disorders, etc.)		N	Mean
Civic Engagement Factor Score	No	3210	48.6339
	Yes	150	51.7281

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Civic Engagement Factor Score	No	2551	48.0464
	Yes	824	51.2296

2 Group Comparison			
Disability: Psychological disorder (depression, anxiety, PTSD, etc.)		N	Mean
Civic Engagement Factor Score	No	3209	48.7213
	Yes	161	50.4753

Students with 1 or more disabilities scored significantly higher on Civic Engagement compared to students with no disabilities. In further examination, students with a learning disability, ADHD, chronic illness, or psychological disorder all reported higher involvement in civic, electoral, and political activities compared to students with no disabilities. There were no significant differences for students with other disabilities or students with Autism Spectrum Disorder compared to students with no disabilities regarding Civic Engagement.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

Regardless of disability status, students had similar perceptions of the campus' commitment to diversity. Students with disabilities reported more involvement in civic, electoral, and political activities compared to students with no disabilities.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

CSULB can continue to engage in creative inclusive space on campus for students, regardless of disability status, to feel welcomed and included. This may include ensuring students have the ability to discuss their disability (if any) with academics and obtain the needed instructional and assessment adjustments, making sure students are aware of informal and formal services and supports and ensure students have the ability to access the needed information, services, or supports.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

None

Age

Engage All Students

Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	20 years old or younger	21-24 years old	-1.61434*	0.000
		25-29 years old	-1.64071*	0.007

Students who were 20 years old or younger had lower average Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) scores than students who were 21-29 years of age.

Civic Engagement Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Civic Engagement Factor Score	20 years old or younger	21-24 years old	-1.92540*	0.000
		30-39 years old	-2.84037*	0.001
		40 years and older	-4.02497*	0.002

Students who were 20 years of age or older had lower average Civic Engagement scores than students who were 21-24 years old and students 30 and older.

Social Agency Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Social Agency Factor Score	20 years old or younger	21-24 years old	-1.30702*	0.015
		25-29 years old	-2.60302*	0.000
	25-29 years old	20 years old or younger	4.47326*	0.001
		21-24 years old	3.16624*	0.046

Students who were 20 years old or younger had lower average Social Agency scores than students who were 21-29 years old.

Students who were 25-29 years old had higher average Social Agency scores than students who were 20 years old or younger and students 21-24 years old.

Summary of Engaging All Students

Students who were 20 or younger report being less civically engaged, feeling less social agency, and engaging in fewer co-curricular diversity activities sponsored by the University. Students who were 25-29 report feeling more social agency than their 20 and under and 21–24-year-old peers.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

First year seminar required for FTF students to engage them in the academic and cocurricular opportunities available, and to help them build networks

Review the existing FY experience courses, their content and breadth, to see if we have consistency across course/colleges

Note that transfer students who are older have different needs; these are specifically to address lower scores on engagement for students 20 and under.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

How many of our students fall into the 20 or younger age range

Are we talking about a small pool/population of students under 20? If at least 50% of our students are transfer students, it makes sense that the numbers (N) under 20 would be small. Are younger students limited by their GE and coursework available, and do older students engage in more cocurricular activities by the nature of their pathway through their degree programs/their location in LD or UD?

Does this breakdown differ by ethnicity?

Is it possible that transfer students already know more about getting engaged than traditional aged first-time freshman?

To what degree is it a problem that younger students are less engaged in these ways?

Do students 20 and under want to be more engaged in cocurricular activities but just can't find them/get connected? Or do they not want to be involved as much because they have other priorities (academics, finding their way, etc.)?

Are younger students (i.e., freshman) perhaps discouraged by faculty or mentors from getting more involved in this way in order to encourage them to get their bearings and see how they handle the new workload of navigating the college experience?

What are the other responsibilities these students have? Work? Family? Etc.?

Expand Access

Curriculum of Inclusion Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	20 years old or younger	21-24 years old	-3.24544*	0.000
		25-29 years old	-4.19249*	0.000
		30-39 years old	-4.33505*	0.000
		40 years and older	-4.59821*	0.001

Students who were 20 years old or younger had lower average Curriculum of Inclusion scores than all students who were 21 years of age or older.

General Interpersonal Validation Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
General Interpersonal Validation Factor Score	20 years old or younger	21-24 years old	-1.78013*	0.000
		25-29 years old	-3.53729*	0.000
		30-39 years old	-3.31277*	0.000
		40 years and older	-3.22973*	0.038
	21-24 years old	25-29 years old	-1.75716*	0.008

Students who were 20 years old or younger had lower average General Interpersonal Validation scores than all students who were 21 years of age or older.

Summary of Expand Access

Students who were 20 years old or younger had lower average Curriculum of Inclusion and General Interpersonal Validation Scores than students over 21 years old. This may indicate that students experience a greater sense that they are reflected in curriculum and that they are validated in the classroom over time. If this is the case, students' scores might reflect the courses they take later in their academic progress, which are more likely to align with their chosen majors/disciplines. Alternatively, students who enter college at a later age or who are transferring to campus may already have a stronger sense of self in relation to course materials and feel more comfortable engaging with professors in meaningful ways.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Because students 20 years old and younger reported both lower average Curriculum of Inclusion and General Interpersonal Validation Scores, we recommend focusing on expanding opportunities for younger students to take courses that resonate with their identities and experiences, and which may provide them a chance to connect with faculty whose research and teaching aligns with their interests. This could be achieved through learning communities among first-year students, and among transfer students. In addition, since Ethnic Studies and other Social Sciences and Humanities Courses often provide opportunities for students to

contextualize their own identities and experiences within broader social and political forces, offering these courses as requirements may increase incoming and younger students' scores in both the area of Curriculum of Inclusion and General Interpersonal Validation.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

While we can identify patterns in terms of age, we do not know the year of students in these age groups. For example, students may be first-year students, or they may be further long in their academic trajectory. We also do not know the majors of students, or their racial, ethnic, gender, sexual, religious, or other identities. All of these may account for the courses that students are taking, as well as the opportunities for inclusion and interpersonal validation in the classroom that they are exposed to.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Academic Self-Concept Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	20 years old or younger	21-24 years old	-1.24742*	0.014
		25-29 years old	-3.15856*	0.000
		30-39 years old	-3.30802*	0.000
	21-24 years old	25-29 years old	-1.91114*	0.002
		30-39 years old	-2.06060*	0.030
	40 years and older	20 years old or younger	7.05270*	0.000
		21-24 years old	5.80528*	0.000
		25-29 years old	3.89413*	0.005
		30-39 years old	3.74468*	0.020

As student age increased, their Academic Self-concept Scores increased as well. Younger incoming students appear to be gaining self-awareness and confidence in their academic skills, compared to older students.

Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	20 years old or younger	21-24 years old	-1.87566*	0.000
		25-29 years old	-4.34972*	0.000
		30-39 years old	-4.00388*	0.000
		40 years and older	-6.37873*	0.000
	21-24 years old	25-29 years old	-2.47406*	0.000
		30-39 years old	-2.12822*	0.020

		40 years and older	-4.50307*	0.000
--	--	--------------------	-----------	-------

Younger students appeared to have lower average scores of academic validations in the classroom than older students. These findings could be a result of the Age Friendly University Initiative, implemented in 2018, to assure that older students (age 25+) receive and seek the necessary resources for success.

Habits of Mind Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Habits of Mind Factor Score	20 years old or younger	21-24 years old	-2.39068*	0.000
		25-29 years old	-3.94743*	0.000
		30-39 years old	-5.62217*	0.000
		40 years and older	-6.74538*	0.000
	21-24 years old	25-29 years old	-1.55675*	0.027
		30-39 years old	-3.23149*	0.000
		40 years and older	-4.35471*	0.001

Older students demonstrated higher Habits of Mind scores than younger students. They were more willing to take risks in the classroom and investigate the evidence. Their critical thinking skills were further developed with age.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

Older students are more open, self-aware, eager to learn and grow and seek the needed resources to reach their goals in comparison to the younger student population.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

The recommendation is that all students are supported and offered resources so they too can feel equipped to reach their academic goals, this would be specifically geared towards our younger student population. A great way to do this is to buddy up younger students with older students, so they may learn from each other.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

We do not know the status of students in terms of whether they have transferred from city colleges, are continuing education students, or if they are training for a specific career. These are all things that are likely to impact student engagement in academic work and their orientation towards their academic progress.

Build Community Sense of Belonging Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
--	----------------	----------------	------------------------------	-------------

Sense of Belonging Factor Score	25-29 years old	20 years old or younger	1.42002*	0.040
---------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	----------	-------

Students who were 25-29 years old had a higher average sense of belonging scores than students who were 20 years old or younger. This may seem surprising, since older students are frequently returning to college and are less likely to have a cohort than younger students. However, this pattern of belonging may reflect the fact that our institution has a large population of non-traditional students, many of whom are older or transfer students who receive specific resources to support them in the process of entering our campus. This may also reflect the experiences of graduate students who enter their programs with a more specific focus and in smaller cohorts, who are also likely to feel more connected with their program and campus. While there are also resources for younger students, particularly for first-generation students, it is possible that younger students are less familiar with identifying and navigating institutional resources needed to connect with others and feel as though they belong on this campus.

** (distinct recommendations come at the end of the “Build Community” section)

Pluralistic Orientation Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	20 years old or younger	21-24 years old	-1.82282*	0.000
		25-29 years old	-3.21339*	0.000
		30-39 years old	-2.44193*	0.009
		40 years and older	-4.40918*	0.001

Students who were 20 years old or younger had lower average Pluralistic Orientation scores than all students who were 21 years of age or older. This may reflect younger students’ lack of exposure to people with perspective or from cultures different from their own. Older students may also be transfer students who have had previous exposure to experiences and ideas that differ from their own, for example through community colleges. Older students may also be adult re-entry students who have been in the workforce and have learned how to negotiate controversy and work cooperatively with people with diverse perspectives. On the contrary, younger students, for example those in their first year, may not have been exposed to curriculum or activities that reflect diversity and inclusion to prepare them for pluralistic engagement. College also serves a socialization purpose that exposes them to ideas and perspectives that contribute to their self-concepts beyond the scope of their early family and peer groups.

Conversations Across Differences Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	20 years old or younger	30-39 years old	-3.27274*	0.000
	21-24 years old	30-39 years old	-2.43208*	0.005
	40 years and older	20 years old or younger	5.35743*	0.000
		21-24 years old	4.51677*	0.000
		25-29 years old	4.20401*	0.002

Students who were 24 years of age or younger had lower average Conversations Across Differences scores than students who were 30-39 years of age. Students who were 40 years of age or older had higher average Conversations Across Difference scores than students 29 and younger. This is likely related to younger students' lower pluralistic orientation scores and may also relate to lack of exposure to the tools for engaging in dialogue across differences in class, religion, race, sexual orientation, nationality, and disability.

Critical Consciousness and Action Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	20 years old or younger	21-24 years old	-1.49118*	0.002
		25-29 years old	-2.13697*	0.001
		30-39 years old	-2.96750*	0.000

Students who were 20 years of age or younger had lower average Critical Consciousness and Action scores than students who were 21-39 years of age.

Discrimination and Bias Factor

Students who were 21-24 years of age had higher average Discrimination and Bias scores than students who were 25-29 years of age and students who were 40 years of age or older.

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	21-24 years old	25-29 years old	1.40395*	0.033
		40 years and older	2.99447*	0.028

Harassment Factor

HERI Factor (Groups 1 = less than 20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40+)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Harassment Factor Score	30-39 years old	21-24 years old	-2.11671*	0.009

Students who were 30-39 years of age or younger had lower average Harassment scores than students who were 21-24 years of age.

Summary of Build Community

Lower sense of belonging, pluralistic orientation, and critical consciousness and action scores for students 20 years old or younger may reflect their newness to the college environment, which could result in limited development of community as well as limited experiences interacting with people across different groups. Likewise, higher scores for students in older age groups in these areas may reflect an accumulation of experiences and exposure to differences based on time in college, including community college, and even from work experience outside of the campus. Lower average harassment and discrimination and scores for students in higher age categories when compared with those who were 21-24 years of age suggests that students in this group are experiencing more bias and harassment.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Based on these findings, we recommend learning communities and other collective spaces for incoming students—particularly for first-year students—so that they begin developing community bonds early on. We also recommend that these communities include introduction to and engagement in conversations across difference to prepare students for critical consciousness and action across their academic trajectories.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

Discipline or major may also impact sense of belonging, critical consciousness and action, and experiences of harassment or discrimination. These could also overlap with age. For example, students who are older may be more likely to have claimed a major and therefore feel a stronger sense of belonging. They may also be in graduate or professional programs that are more targeted towards applied work associated with civic engagement and action.

Cultivate Resilience

Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor

There was no difference in institutional commitment to diversity in relation to age.

Civic Engagement Factor

Students who were 20 years of age or older had lower average Civic Engagement scores than students who were 21-24 years old and students 30 and older.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

Lower civic engagement scores among students under the age of 20 may reflect limited opportunities to participate in political and social organizing. People don't always view their engagement as political, either, particularly when they are first getting involved. Younger

students may also be more focused on adjusting to the college campus and be less likely to participate in extracurricular activities.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

Based on these findings we recommend programming and activities that make clear for students how their involvement in political and social activities directly impacts their own lives and the lives of those around them. For example, it may be useful to invest in learning communities for first- and second-year students that are focused on particular areas of interest that connect with their academic and socio-political interests.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

Age differences may also reflect other variations across groups, such as year in school, graduate vs undergraduate status, major status, and experiences outside of campus.

Dependent care responsibilities

The following points should be considered when interpreting the results for this section:

- Dependent care responsibilities are not inherently gendered. However, these responsibilities, historically, have been disproportionately assumed to be the purview of women.
- Gender-based expectations for labor related to dependent care, both historically and in the present, more and less significantly impacts specific categories of women, based on other aspects of socio-political status, context, and identity.

Engage All Students

This section reports results focusing on students' involvement in, and perception of involvement in, sociopolitical institutions and activities, including those that deal with diversity and equity.

Factors within this category include Co-Curricular Diversity Activities, Civic Engagement and Social Agency. These factors measure students' participation in diversity activities both on and off campus, their civic engagement, and their likelihood of expressing beliefs about issues of diversity and equity. There were no significant differences in student scores as they related to dependent care responsibilities across any of these factors.

Co-curricular Diversity Activities Factor

This factor measures students' past involvement with institutional programs focused on diversity issues. This includes having participated in ongoing campus-organized discussions on racial/ethnic issues, in campus center activities for identity-based affinity groups, and in events focused on diversity such as art exhibits and performances.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between students with dependents under 18 and students without dependents.

No differences.

Civic Engagement Factor

This factor measures the extent to which students respond that they are motivated and involved in civic, electoral, and political activities. This includes demonstrating for a cause, publicly communicating their opinion about a cause, discussing politics, and performing community service.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between students with dependents under 18 and students without dependents.

No differences.

Social Agency Factor

This factor measures the extent to which students value political and social involvement as a personal goal. This includes wanting to influence the political structure, work to correct social and economic inequalities, influence social values, help to promote racial understanding, and work to achieve greater gender equity.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between students with dependents under 18 and students without dependents.

No differences.

Summary of Engaging All Students

There were no significant differences between students with dependents under 18 and students without dependents in terms of past involvement with programs focused on diverse issues, motivations to civically engage, or with valuing political and social involvement as a personal goal.

There were no significant dependent-care differences for any of the factors under Engage All Students.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Promote and offer opportunities for students with dependents to participate in the Pregnant and Parenting Students Organization which includes resources, services and support network.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

None.

Expand Access

This section reports results focusing on expanding access by measuring students' perception of faculty and staff members as supportive figures in students' development and success and students' reporting on whether or not curricula address diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Curriculum of Inclusion Factor

HERI Factor 1= 0 Dependents under 18, 2=1, 3=2, 4=3, 5=4+ Dependents under 18	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	No dependents	1 dependent/child under 18	-4.12671*	0.007

2 Group Comparison			
Dependents Under 18 - 1=No Dependents, 2=1 or more dependents under 18		N	Mean
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	1.00	3148	49.8150
	2.00	129	52.7188

This factor measures the number of courses a student has taken that include materials and pedagogy addressing diversity, including readings about race/ethnicity, socioeconomic class differences, privilege, sexual orientation, gender/gender identity, disability, and having opportunities to dialogue with students from different backgrounds and study and serve communities in need.

The results for our campus show that students with one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average Curriculum of Inclusion Factor score in comparison to students with no dependents. Specifically, students with one dependent/child under 18 have higher average Curriculum of Inclusion Factor score in comparison to students with no dependents.

General Interpersonal Validation Factor

2 Group Comparison			
Dependents Under 18 - 1=No Dependents, 2=1 or more dependents under 18		N	Mean
General Interpersonal Validation Factor Score	1.00	3797	48.4559
	2.00	143	50.4570

This factor measures students' view of faculty and staff's attention to their development. This includes beliefs that at least one faculty or staff member has taken an interest in their development, that faculty believe in their potential to succeed academically, that they empower them to learn, and that staff encourage them to get involved in campus activities.

The results for our campus show that students with one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average General Interpersonal Validation Factor score in comparison to students with no dependents.

Summary of Expand Access

The results for this section indicate that, in general, students with one or more dependents under 18 were more likely to believe that faculty and staff took interest in their professional development and had taken more courses that focused on "diversity" compared to students without dependents.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Promote and offer opportunities for students with dependents to participate in the Pregnant and Parenting Students Organization which includes resources, services and support network.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

Promote Intellectual Achievement

This section reports on the degree to which students display and have confidence in their own academic abilities, as well as the degree to which they feel supported by faculty to succeed in academic environments and endeavors.

Academic Self-Concept Factor

HERI Factor 1= 0 Dependents under 18, 2=1, 3=2, 4=3, 5=4+ Dependents under 18	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	1 dependent/child under 18	2 dependents/child ren under 18	-4.93987*	0.014

2 Group Comparison			
Dependents Under 18 - 1=No Dependents, 2=1 or more dependents under 18		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	1.00	3749	49.5666
	2.00	141	52.6228

This factor measures students' beliefs about their abilities and confidence in academic environments, including academic ability, intellectual self-confidence, a drive to achieve, and mathematical ability.

The results for our campus show that students with one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average Academic Self-Concept Factor score in comparison to students with no dependents. Furthermore, students with two dependents/children under 18 have higher average Academic Self-Concept Factor score in comparison to students with one dependent/child under 18.

Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor

2 Group Comparison			
Dependents Under 18 - 1=No Dependents, 2=1 or more dependents under 18		N	Mean
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	1.00	3339	49.2511
	2.00	141	52.2695

This factor measures students' views of the extent to which faculty actions in class reflect concern for their academic success. This includes how often students felt that their contributions were valued, that faculty provided them with feedback that helped them assess their progress in class, that faculty encouraged them to ask questions and participate in discussion, and that faculty were able to determine their level of understanding of course material.

The results for our campus show that students with one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor score in comparison to students with no dependents.

Habits of Mind Factor

HERI Factor 1= 0 Dependents under 18, 2=1, 3=2, 4=3, 5=4+ Dependents under 18	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Habits of Mind Factor Score	No dependents	1 dependent/child under 18	-4.43802*	0.001

2 Group Comparison			
Dependents Under 18 - 1=No Dependents, 2=1 or more dependents under 18		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	1.00	3418	48.9997
	2.00	143	52.6092

This factor measures the behaviors and traits associated with academic success, which are foundational for lifelong learning. These include seeking solutions to problems and explain them to others, evaluating the quality or reliability of information received, supporting opinions with a logical argument, seeking alternative solutions to a problem, taking a risk because they feel more is to be gained, asking questions in class, exploring topics that may not be required for a class, accepting mistakes as part of the learning process, and looking up scientific research articles and resources.

The results for our campus show that students with one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average Habits of Mind Factor score in comparison to students with no dependents. Specifically, students with one dependent/child under 18 have a higher average Habits of Mind Factor score in comparison to students with no dependents.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

The results show that there were significant differences between students with and without dependents, as well as between groups of students with one or more dependent under 18

Not only was it the case that students with one or more dependents under 18 were more confident in their academic abilities, students with two dependents under 18 had even higher scores than students with only one dependent.

Not only was it the case that students with one or more dependents under 18 had higher scores on practicing behaviors that tend to be associated with lifelong learning, students with one dependent under 18 had even higher scores than students without dependents.

And in general, students with one or more dependent under 18 tended to view their faculty as taking actions with the students' academic success into account, compared to students without dependents.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

There is recognition of the tenacity and achievements of students with dependents who have developed high levels of academic confidence, academic success, and life-long learning skills. We recommend continued and expanded support systems (childcare, flexible class scheduling, financial support, mentorship, etc.) that the university offers students with dependents and encourage the university to develop programs that help students who do not have dependent care responsibilities in order to nurture academic success skills among that student population. It may be useful to investigate the factors that have led to greater academic success skills among students with dependents.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

None.

Build Community

This section reports on the degree to which students engage in the kinds of critical assessments, actions, and interactions that promote diversity as well as the degree to which students feel that they are members of the campus community.

Sense of Belonging Factor

This factor Measures the extent to which students feel a sense of academic and social integration on campus. This can include feeling a general sense of membership and belonging on campus and feeling compelled to recommend the college to others.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between students with dependents under 18 and students with no dependents.

There were no significant differences in students' sense of belonging in relation to dependent care responsibilities.

Pluralistic Orientation Factor

2 Group Comparison			
Dependents Under 18 - 1=No Dependents, 2=1 or more dependents under 18		N	Mean
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	1.00	3722	49.1939
	2.00	142	51.2094

This factor measures students' skills and dispositions appropriate for living and working in a diverse society, which includes tolerance of others with different beliefs, openness to having their own views challenged, the ability to discuss and negotiate controversial issues, and the ability to see the world from someone else's perspective.

The results for our campus show that students with one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average Pluralistic Orientation Factor score in comparison to students with no dependents.

This factor measures skills and dispositions appropriate for living and working in a diverse society. The results for our campus show that students with one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average Pluralistic Orientation Factor score in comparison to students with no dependents.

Conversations Across Differences Factor

2 Group Comparison			
Dependents Under 18 - 1=No Dependents, 2=1 or more dependents under 18		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	1.00	3491	49.5366
	2.00	142	52.1647

This factor measures how often students have in-depth conversations with diverse peers. This includes interacting with those from a different socioeconomic class, of a different sexual

orientation, from another country, with a disability, and whether students discuss issues related to sexism, gender differences, or gender equity.

The results for our campus show that students with one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average Conversations Across Differences Factor score in comparison to students with no dependence.

This factor measures how often students have in-depth conversations with diverse peers. The results for our campus show that students with one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average Conversations Across Differences Factor score in comparison to students with no dependence.

Critical Consciousness and Action Factor

This factor measures how often students critically examine and challenge their own and others' biases. Such actions include making an effort to educate others about social issues, critically evaluating their own privilege on an issue in regards to race/ethnicity, class, or immigration status, recognizing the biases that affect their own thinking, challenge others on issues of discrimination, feeling challenged to think more broadly about an issue, and making an effort to get to know people from diverse backgrounds.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between students with dependents under 18 and students with no dependents.

Discrimination and Bias Factor

This factor measures the frequency of students' experiences with more subtle forms of discrimination, including verbal comments, witnessing discrimination, cyberbullying, exclusion, and offensive visual images or items.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between students with dependents under 18 and students with no dependents.

Harassment Factor

This factor measures the frequency that students experience threats or harassment, which include physical assaults or injuries, threats of physical violence, anonymous phone calls, damage to personal property, and frequency of reporting sexual harassment incidents or discrimination incidents to a campus authority.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between students with dependents under 18 and students with no dependents.

There were no differences in Critical Consciousness and Action Factor, Discrimination and Bias Factor, or Harassment Factor Scores for students based on caregiving status.

Summary of Build Community

Of the six factors for this section, two resulted in significant differences between students with one or more dependent under 18 and students without a dependent. On average, students with one or more dependent under 18 reported having more skills appropriate for living in a diverse society, and more instances of having in-depth conversations with "diverse" peers and fewer instances of critically examining and challenging their and other's biases, compared to students without a dependent.

There were no significant differences between students with one or more dependent under 18 and students without a dependent in terms of having a sense of belonging, critically examine themselves and others, or in experiences with discrimination or experiences with harassment.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

Cultivate Resilience

This section reports on students' perception of the campus' commitment to diversity and the extent to which students report being motivated and involved in civic, electoral, and political activities

Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor

This factor measures a student's perception of the campus' commitment to diversity. This includes perceptions that the campus promotes the appreciation of cultural difference, has a long standing commitment to diversity, accurately reflects the diversity of the student body in publications (e.g., brochures, website), and has campus administrators who regularly speak about the value of diversity.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between students with dependents under 18 and students with no dependents.

Civic Engagement Factor

This factor measures the extent to which students respond that they are motivated and involved in civic, electoral, and political activities. This includes demonstrating for a cause, publicly communicating their opinion about a cause, discussing politics, and performing community service.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between students with dependents under 18 and students with no dependents.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

There were no significant differences between students with dependents under 18 and students without dependents in terms their perception of the campus' commitment to diversity or with the extent that students will be civilly engaged.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

None.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

None.

Part time and full time

According to statistical analyses, there were no statistically significant differences between part-time and full-time students' scores on any of the DLE Factors.

Recommendations

The campus might focus less on students' status as part- or full-time as a source of potential difference and instead focus on other areas.

Unanswered Questions

Why doesn't the number of units a student takes cause differential scores/self-assessment factors?

Political

Engage All Students

Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	Conservative	Liberal	-3.07315*	0.000
		Far left	-6.22564*	0.000
	Middle of the road	Liberal	-1.61810*	0.000
		Far left	-4.77059*	0.000
	Liberal	Far left	-3.15249*	0.000

Civic Engagement Factor Score

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Civic Engagement Factor Score	Conservative	Far left	-7.53325*	0.000
	Middle of the road	Liberal	-2.94142*	0.000
		Far left	-9.33180*	0.000
	Liberal	Far left	-6.39039*	0.000

Social Agency Factor Score

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Social Agency Factor Score	Far right	Far left	-9.18160*	0.014
	Conservative	Liberal	-3.98259*	0.000
		Far left	-6.70283*	0.000
	Middle of the road	Liberal	-3.14787*	0.000
		Far left	-5.86810*	0.000
	Liberal	Far left	-2.72024*	0.001

Co-curricular Diversity Activities, Civic Engagement, and Social Agency Factors all revealed group differences across self-reported political perspectives. The further left on the political spectrum (far right—conservative—middle of the road—liberal—far left) students identify, the more engaged they are in co-curricular diversity activities. Similarly, the further left on the

spectrum students identify, the more civic engagement they report. In addition, the further left on the political spectrum students identify, the more social agency they feel they have. Since about 56% of our students identify as liberal or far left, and another 36% identify as middle of the road, this means that the majority of students are engaged in co-curricular diversity activities, feel civically engaged, and experience social agency. The small percentage of students who identify as conservative or far right (8%) are scoring lower on non-coursework activities that make the college experience meaningful.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

If we wish to engage all students, including those who identify as conservative and far right, we might try to find ways to reward students who engage in co-curricular activities. Co-curricular activities might be recognized as extra credit, or even built into syllabi for certain classes as coursework. Of course, then they're technically not co-curricular activities anymore, but that would be fine.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

What kinds of activities would be more meaningful to students who identify as conservative or far right? Will focusing energy and resources on this small number of students have a negative impact on the majority of students who already feel engaged?

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Curriculum of Inclusion Factors

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	Conservative	Liberal	-3.98158*	0.000
		Far left	-7.96780*	0.000
	Middle of the road	Liberal	-2.41293*	0.000
		Far left	-6.39914*	0.000
	Liberal	Far left	-3.98622*	0.000

Academic Self-Concept Factors

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	Far right	Conservative	-10.85014*	0.001
		Middle of the road	-8.74502*	0.009
		Liberal	-8.52422*	0.012
		Far left	-7.75064*	0.041
	Conservative	Middle of the road	2.10512*	0.021
		Liberal	2.32592*	0.005
		Far left	3.09949*	0.005

Academic Validation in the Classroom Factors

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	Middle of the road	Liberal	-1.28144*	0.007
		Far left	-2.60003*	0.002

Habits of Mind Factor

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Habits of Mind Factor Score	Middle of the road	Liberal	-1.14767*	0.031
		Far left	-2.70712*	0.002
	Liberal	Far right	5.81792	0.388

The data regarding intellectual achievement are inconclusive and seem to tell two different stories. On the one hand, students who identify as middle of the road have lower curricular inclusion scores than students who are liberal or far right and experience lower scores on validation in the classroom than those who identify as liberal or far left. At the same time, students who identify as conservative have higher average Academic Self-Concept scores than students who indicate they are politically middle of the road, liberal or far left.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

We should explore what we mean by ‘curricular inclusion’ as a campus and try to collect data on whether there is actual curricular inclusion as opposed to what students feel or report. We should see if there is a way to assess actual validation in the classroom. Perhaps even before that, we need to define more clearly and carefully what we mean by curricular inclusion (see below). Then, it seems that we need to improve our messaging on curricular inclusion and validation in the classroom for right-leaning students and work on academic self-worth for left-leaning students. The latter would require exploring why students who identify as liberal and far left report lower self-concept scores.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

What does “curriculum of inclusion” actually mean? What might it mean differently for an Engineering student, a Nursing student, a Chemistry student, a Dance major, or an English major? Are we talking about course titles, or standard course outlines, or syllabi, or individual assignments? Do faculty have an understanding of what inclusion might mean for their discipline and course? Why do students who identify as liberal and far left report lower scores on academic self-concept? Why do students who identify as conservative and far right have high self-concept scores? Are any group’s scores actually ‘high’ or are they just relatively higher? At what institutions do more students report high academic self-concepts, and what elements of their campus climate could we emulate?

Build Community

Sense of Belonging, Pluralistic Orientation, Conversations Across Differences, Critical Consciousness and Action, Discrimination and Bias, and Harassment Factors

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	Far right	Middle of the road	-8.88993 [*]	0.012
		Liberal	-10.05184 [*]	0.002
		Far left	-9.95680 [*]	0.004
	Conservative	Liberal	-2.82184 [*]	0.001
		Far left	-2.72679 [*]	0.034
	Middle of the road	Liberal	-1.16191 [*]	0.029

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	Far right	Liberal	-9.15288 [*]	0.005
		Far left	-11.12458 [*]	0.000
	Conservative	Liberal	-3.14484 [*]	0.000
		Far left	-5.11653 [*]	0.000
	Middle of the road	Liberal	-2.71307 [*]	0.000
		Far left	-4.68476 [*]	0.000
	Liberal	Far left	-1.97170 [*]	0.038

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig .
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	Far right	Middle of the road	-7.72534*	0.041
		Liberal	-11.74729*	0.000
		Far left	-15.75093*	0.000
	Conservative	Middle of the road	-2.09018*	0.018
		Liberal	-6.11213*	0.000
		Far left	-10.11577*	0.000
	Middle of the road	Liberal	-4.02195*	0.000
		Far left	-8.02559*	0.000
	Liberal	Far left	-4.00364*	0.000

Students who identify as far left, liberal, and middle of the road are more pluralistically oriented and have more conversations across differences than students who identify as conservative and far right. Campus community members should be pleased that the vast majority of students on our campus report a pluralistic orientation and experiences talking across differences; such perspectives enable the building of a strong shared community and allow for rigorous discussions across difference.

Recommendations related to Build Community

It might be useful to reach out specifically to conservative and far-right students, try to find out how they understand the term 'difference,' and ask what would get them to have conversations across difference. Again, though, there is a danger in committing resources disproportionately to a small group of students if that has a negative impact on resources for the vast majority of students.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

Given the small percentage of students who identify as conservative and far right and thus the small percentage of students who do not have a pluralistic orientation, we would like to know if there is causation or just correlation (if these are the right words?) between a lack of experience with conversations across differences and a non-pluralistic orientation towards campus life. What are the sources of the low scores on these two factors for conservative and far right students? How do those groups' low scores impact other students? And, as noted above, are liberal and far left students actually engaging with their far right and conservative peers if the latter groups do not report having conversations across differences?

Cultivate Resilience

(Not applicable—civic engagement up above, no data for institutional commitment to diversity)

Institutional Commitment to Diversity and Civic Engagement Factors

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor Score	Middle of the road	Far left	1.80299*	0.046
	Liberal	Far left	2.74141*	0.000

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

None.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

None.

Transfer status

Note Regarding Language: The survey used the language of “freshman” to refer to first-year students. However, in keeping with the Academic Senate Resolution on gender-inclusive language in reports and policies, we use the term “first-year” to refer to students completing coursework or entering the University with entry-level status. Data is provided below.

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Social Agency Factor Score	I started here as a first-time freshman	I started at a 2-year college	-1.65076*	0.000

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	I started here as a first-time freshman	I started at a different 4-year college	-2.50104*	0.000
	I started at a 2-year college	I started at a different 4-year college	-1.53066*	0.040

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
General Interpersonal Validation Factor Score	I started here as a first-time freshman	I started at a 2-year college	-1.42260*	0.000
		I started at a different 4-year college	-1.96632*	0.000

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	I started here as a first-time freshman	I started at a 2-year college	-.88060*	0.034
		I started at a different 4-year college	-3.47138*	0.000
	I started at a 2-year college	I started at a different 4-year college	-2.59078*	0.000

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	I started here as a first-time freshman	I started at a 2-year college	-2.50089*	0.000
		I started at a different 4-year college	-4.25372*	0.000
	I started at a 2-year college	I started at a different 4-year college	-1.75282*	0.005

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Habits of Mind Factor Score	I started here as a first-time freshman	I started at a 2-year college	-1.93272*	0.000
		I started at a different 4-year college	-3.94356*	0.000
	I started at a 2-year college	I started at a different 4-year college	-2.01084*	0.001

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Sense of Belonging Factor Score	I started at a 2-year college	I started at a different 4-year college	1.33796*	0.021

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	I started here as a first-time freshman	I started at a 2-year college	-1.74526*	0.000
		I started at a different 4-year college	-2.02409*	0.000

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	I started here as a first-time freshman	I started at a different 4-year college	-2.29842*	0.000
	I started at a 2-year college	I started at a different 4-year college	-2.14874*	0.000

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	I started here as a first-time freshman	I started at a different 4-year college	-2.29706*	0.000
	I started at a 2-year college	I started at a different 4-year college	-1.66091*	0.009

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	I started here as a first-time freshman	I started at a 2-year college	1.87028*	0.000
		I started at a different 4-year college	1.83149*	0.001

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Harassment Factor Score	I started here as a first-time freshman	I started at a 2-year college	1.49370*	0.000
		I started at a different 4-year college	1.47643*	0.008

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor Score	I started at a 2-year college	I started at a different 4-year college	1.45686*	0.009

Year in school

Note Regarding Language: The survey used the language of “freshman” to refer to first-year students. However, in keeping with the Academic Senate Resolution on gender-inclusive language in reports and policies, we use the term “first-year” to refer to students completing coursework or entering the University with entry-level status.

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Sense of Belonging Factor Score	Sophomore/second year	Graduate/Professional student	-1.77832*	0.021

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
General Interpersonal Validation Factor Score	Freshman/first year	Fifth-year senior or more	-2.14734*	0.030
	Sophomore/second year	Junior/third year	-2.00192*	0.003
		Senior/fourth year	-2.48427*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	-3.33988*	0.000
		Graduate/Professional student	Freshman/first year	4.46396*
	Sophomore/second year	Sophomore/second year	5.65651*	0.000
		Junior/third year	3.65459*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	3.17224*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	2.31663*	0.009

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	Freshman/first year	Junior/third year	-1.84381*	0.013
	Sophomore/second year	Junior/third year	-2.79032*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	-2.50778*	0.000
	Graduate/Professional student	Freshman/first year	5.71563*	0.000
		Sophomore/second year	6.66214*	0.000
		Junior/third year	3.87182*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	4.15436*	0.000
Fifth-year senior or more	4.52535*	0.000		

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Institutional Commitment to Diversity Factor Score	Freshman/first year	Sophomore/second year	1.84444*	0.019
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	Freshman/first year	Junior/third year	-2.07351*	0.003
		Senior/fourth year	-2.21480*	0.002
		Fifth-year senior or more	-2.54379*	0.006
	Sophomore/second year	Senior/fourth year	-1.75745*	0.039
	Graduate/Professional student	Freshman/first year	4.56182*	0.000
		Sophomore/second year	4.10447*	0.000
		Junior/third year	2.48831*	0.000
Senior/fourth year		2.34702*	0.000	

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Harassment Factor Score	Graduate/Professional student	Senior/fourth year	-1.65457*	0.019
		Fifth-year senior or more	-2.21987*	0.011

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	Freshman/first year	Senior/fourth year	-2.44729*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	-2.95567*	0.000
	Junior/third year	Senior/fourth year	-2.07191*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	-2.58029*	0.000
	Senior/fourth year	Graduate/Professional student	1.80824*	0.006
	Fifth-year senior or more	Graduate/Professional student	2.31662*	0.005

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	Freshman/first year	Junior/third year	-1.75481*	0.021
		Senior/fourth year	-2.55006*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	-2.52417*	0.006
	Graduate/Professional student	Freshman/first year	4.64451*	0.000
		Sophomore/second year	3.43339*	0.000
		Junior/third year	2.88970*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	2.09446*	0.002
	Fifth-year senior or more	2.12034*	0.032	

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	Freshman/first year	Junior/third year	-4.40618*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	-6.27858*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	-6.16678*	0.000
	Sophomore/second year	Junior/third year	-3.44788*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	-5.32028*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	-5.20848*	0.000
	Junior/third year	Senior/fourth year	-1.87240*	0.003
		Graduate/Professional student	-2.97155*	0.001
	Graduate/Professional student	Freshman/first year	9.13833*	0.000
		Sophomore/second year	8.18003*	0.000
		Junior/third year	4.73215*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	2.85975*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	2.97155*	0.001

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	Freshman/first year	Senior/fourth year	-2.58352*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	-2.84293*	0.000
	Sophomore/second year	Senior/fourth year	-2.17061*	0.001
		Fifth-year senior or more	-2.43002*	0.005
	Graduate/Professional student	Freshman/first year	2.85920*	0.000
		Sophomore/second year	2.44629*	0.000
Junior/third year		1.49062*	0.029	

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Habits of Mind Factor Score	Freshman/first year	Sophomore/second year	-0.07909	1.000
		Junior/third year	-2.80253*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	-3.35944*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	-3.36277*	0.000
	Sophomore/second year	Junior/third year	-2.72345*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	-3.28036*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	-3.28369*	0.000
	Graduate/Professional student	Freshman/first year	6.68124*	0.000
		Sophomore/second year	6.60215*	0.000
		Junior/third year	3.87870*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	3.32179*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	3.31846*	0.000

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	Freshman/first year	Junior/third year	-2.36518*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	-2.98849*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	-3.07242*	0.000
		Graduate/Professional student	-4.22141*	0.000
	Sophomore/second year	Junior/third year	-1.66491*	0.040
		Senior/fourth year	-2.28822*	0.001
		Fifth-year senior or more	-2.37215*	0.015
		Graduate/Professional student	-3.52114*	0.000
	Junior/third year	Graduate/Professional student	-1.85623*	0.005

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Civic Engagement Factor Score	Freshman/first year	Junior/third year	-2.28302*	0.001
		Senior/fourth year	-3.61983*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	-4.18016*	0.000
	Sophomore/second year	Senior/fourth year	-2.27919*	0.002
		Fifth-year senior or more	-2.83953*	0.002
	Junior/third year	Fifth-year senior or more	-1.89714*	0.045
	Graduate/Professional student	Freshman/first year	5.49630*	0.000
		Sophomore/second year	4.15567*	0.000
		Junior/third year	3.21328*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	1.87647*	0.009

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Social Agency Factor Score	Freshman/first year	Junior/third year	-1.99944*	0.007
	Sophomore/second year	Junior/third year	-1.87850*	0.015
	Graduate/Professional student	Freshman/first year	3.28750*	0.000
		Sophomore/second year	3.16657*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	2.02459*	0.005
		Fifth-year senior or more	1.32405	0.950

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	Freshman/first year	Junior/third year	-2.44479*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	-3.16671*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	-2.42417*	0.005
	Sophomore/second year	Senior/fourth year	-1.76833*	0.019
	Senior/fourth year	Freshman/first year	3.16671*	0.000
		Sophomore/second year	1.76833*	0.019
	Graduate/Professional student	Freshman/first year	6.06926*	0.000
		Sophomore/second year	4.67088*	0.000
		Junior/third year	3.62447*	0.000
		Senior/fourth year	2.90254*	0.000
		Fifth-year senior or more	3.64509*	0.000

Degree Aspirations

Students were asked about their degree aspirations and below data is provided about differences based on students' degree aspirations.

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	None	J.D. (Law)	-4.59979*	0.010
		Ph.D.	-3.48464*	0.000
	Associate (A.A. or equivalent)	J.D. (Law)	-4.80895*	0.008
		Ph.D.	-3.69380*	0.000
	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	J.D. (Law)	-5.15887*	0.000
		Ph.D.	-4.04372*	0.000
	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	J.D. (Law)	-4.18045*	0.005
		Ph.D.	-3.06531*	0.000
	J.D. (Law)	M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., etc. (Medical)	4.49990*	0.024
		Professional Doctorate (Ed.D., Psy.D., etc.)	5.31274*	0.047
	M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., etc. (Medical)	Ph.D.	-3.38475*	0.003

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	
Civic Engagement Factor Score	None	J.D. (Law)	-7.82139*	0.000	
		Ph.D.	-4.65839*	0.000	
	Associate (A.A. or equivalent)	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)		-3.11773*	0.008
			J.D. (Law)	-8.51994*	0.000
		J.D. (Law)		-5.35694*	0.000
			Ph.D.		
	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)		-1.62878*	0.006
			J.D. (Law)	-7.03099*	0.000
		J.D. (Law)		-3.86799*	0.000
			Ph.D.		
	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	J.D. (Law)	-5.40220*	0.000	
		Ph.D.	-2.23921*	0.000	
	J.D. (Law)	M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., etc. (Medical)	5.05776*	0.012	

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	
Social Agency Factor Score	None	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	3.07730*	0.013	
		Associate (A.A. or equivalent)	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	3.38381*	0.010
	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)		-2.06381*	0.000
			J.D. (Law)	-6.42169*	0.000
		J.D. (Law)		-4.67805*	0.000
			Ph.D.		
	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	J.D. (Law)	-4.35788*	0.016	
		Ph.D.	-2.61424*	0.000	

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	None	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-2.89062*	0.028
		J.D. (Law)	-7.02993*	0.000
		Ph.D.	-4.61236*	0.000
	Associate (A.A. or equivalent)	J.D. (Law)	-6.82083*	0.000
		Ph.D.	-4.40326*	0.000
	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-2.25071*	0.000
		J.D. (Law)	-6.39002*	0.000
		Ph.D.	-3.97245*	0.000
	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	None	2.89062*	0.028
		Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	2.25071*	0.000
		J.D. (Law)	-4.13931*	0.040
		Ph.D.	-1.72174*	0.044
	J.D. (Law)	M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., etc. (Medical)	6.67513*	0.001
	M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., etc. (Medical)	Ph.D.	-4.25755*	0.002

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
General Interpersonal Validation Factor Score	None	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-3.32809*	0.001
		Ph.D.	-5.24579*	0.000
	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-1.88713*	0.001
		Ph.D.	-3.80484*	0.000
	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	None	3.32809*	0.001
		Ph.D.	-1.91771*	0.003
	J.D. (Law)	Ph.D.	-4.66862*	0.006
	M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., etc. (Medical)	Ph.D.	-3.53179*	0.009

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	None	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-3.17099*	0.002
		Ph.D.	-5.94342*	0.000
	Vocational certificate	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-11.11998*	0.043
		Ph.D.	-13.89241*	0.002
	Associate (A.A. or equivalent)	Ph.D.	-4.97926*	0.000
		Professional Doctorate (Ed.D., Psy.D., etc.)	1.15708	1.000
	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-2.69031*	0.000
		Ph.D.	-5.46274*	0.000
	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	Ph.D.	-2.77243*	0.000
		Professional Doctorate (Ed.D., Psy.D., etc.)	3.36390	0.494
	Ph.D.	Professional Doctorate (Ed.D., Psy.D., etc.)	6.13633*	0.000

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	None	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-3.58316*	0.000
		Ph.D.	-4.94228*	0.000
	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-2.19916*	0.000
		Ph.D.	-3.55828*	0.000

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	None	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-2.71656*	0.038
		Ph.D.	-4.29522*	0.000
	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	Ph.D.	-2.89334*	0.000

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	None	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-3.91606*	0.000	
		Ph.D.	-5.95649*	0.000	
	Associate (A.A. or equivalent)	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	-2.93300*	0.041
			Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-4.75043*	0.000
		J.D. (Law)	-4.61480*	0.038	
		M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., etc. (Medical)	-3.94424*	0.032	
		Ph.D.	-6.79085*	0.000	
		Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-1.81743*	0.001
	Ph.D.		-3.85786*	0.000	
	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	Ph.D.	-2.04043*	0.001	

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	None	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-3.72865*	0.000
		J.D. (Law)	-6.43221*	0.000
		M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., etc. (Medical)	-4.66574*	0.002
		Ph.D.	-6.02739*	0.000
	Associate (A.A. or equivalent)	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-3.31336*	0.005
		J.D. (Law)	-6.01691*	0.001
		M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., etc. (Medical)	-4.25044*	0.012
		Ph.D.	-5.61209*	0.000
	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	-2.47172*	0.000
		J.D. (Law)	-5.17528*	0.001
		M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., etc. (Medical)	-3.40881*	0.008
		Ph.D.	-4.77046*	0.000
		Ph.D.	-2.29874*	0.000
	Ph.D.	Professional Doctorate (Ed.D., Psy.D., etc.)	5.27434*	0.009

HERI Factor	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	None	J.D. (Law)	-4.39228*	0.025
	Associate (A.A. or equivalent)	Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S., B.D., etc.)	-2.78887*	0.034
		J.D. (Law)	-5.69850*	0.001
		Ph.D.	-3.61111*	0.001
		Professional Doctorate (Ed.D., Psy.D., etc.)	-4.88211*	0.041
		Masters degree (M.A., M.S., M.B.A., etc.)	J.D. (Law)	-3.75950*
		Ph.D.	-1.67211*	0.009

Parental education

Students were asked about their parents' level of education and below data is provided about differences based on students' parents' education. Data is provided below.

2 Group Comparison			
First generation status based on parent(s) with less than 'some college'		N	Mean
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	Not 1st Gen	2286	49.2373
	1st Gen	1053	47.9077

2 Group Comparison			
First generation status based on parent(s) with less than 'some college'		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	Not 1st Gen	2280	50.4272
	1st Gen	1041	48.3795

2 Group Comparison			
First generation status based on parent(s) with less than 'some college'		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	Not 1st Gen	2283	47.8495
	1st Gen	1049	49.0733

2 Group Comparison			
First generation status based on parent(s) with less than 'some college'		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	Not 1st Gen	2275	49.7095
	1st Gen	1042	47.9967

2 Group Comparison			
First generation status based on parent(s) with less than 'some college'		N	Mean
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	Not 1st Gen	2272	48.8969
	1st Gen	1041	50.0503

2 Group Comparison			
First generation status based on parent(s) with less than 'some college'		N	Mean
Social Agency Factor Score	Not 1st Gen	2240	48.6874
	1st Gen	1034	51.1514

2 Group Comparison			
First generation status based on parent(s) with less than 'some college'		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	Not 1st Gen	2285	50.0177
	1st Gen	1050	49.0894

Income

Students were asked about their income and below data is provided about differences based on students' self-reported income.

2 Group Comparison			
INCOME_TWO	**1=BELOW 60K 2=60K OR MORE.	N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	Annual income below \$60,000	2010	48.7263
	Annual income \$60,000 or more	1348	47.5703

2 Group Comparison			
INCOME_TWO	**1=BELOW 60K 2=60K OR MORE.	N	Mean
Social Agency Factor Score	Annual income below \$60,000	1970	50.3016
	Annual income \$60,000 or more	1328	48.4176

2 Group Comparison			
INCOME_TWO	**1=BELOW 60K 2=60K OR MORE.	N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	Annual income below \$60,000	2013	49.0423
	Annual income \$60,000 or more	1345	50.5357

2 Group Comparison			
INCOME_TWO	**1=BELOW 60K 2=60K OR MORE.	N	Mean
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	Annual income below \$60,000	1993	49.5498
	Annual income \$60,000 or more	1343	48.8458

2 Group Comparison			
INCOME_TWO	**1=BELOW 60K 2=60K OR MORE.	N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	Annual income below \$60,000	2001	49.0876
	Annual income \$60,000 or more	1346	50.4440

Hours working per week

Students were asked about the numbers of hours they worked per week; below data is provided about differences based on students' self-reported numbers of hours per week spent working.

2 Group Comparison			
On campus work		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	Less than 30 hours/week	571	50.5795
	30 + hours/week	139	51.2282

Off campus work	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	16 + hours/week	0 hours/week	2.89566*	0.000
		1-15 hours/week	2.09098*	0.000

2 Group Comparison			
On campus work		N	Mean
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	Less than 30 hours/week	561	49.2907
	30 + hours/week	141	51.4929

2 Group Comparison			
Off campus work		N	Mean
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	Less than 30 hours/week	1021	49.4595
	30 or more hours/week	720	51.2958

Off campus work (1 = none; 2 = 1~15 hours; 3 = 16 +)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	16 + hours/week	0 hours/week	1.75274*	0.000

2 Group Comparison			
On campus work (1 = less than 30 hrs vs 2 = more than 30 hrs)		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	Less than 30 hours/week	573	51.1147
	30 + hours/week	139	53.0646

2 Group Comparison			
Off campus work (1 = less than 30hrs vs 2 = more than 30hrs)		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	Less than 30 hours/week	1024	49.7237
	30 or more hours/week	727	50.9955

Off campus work (1 = none; 2 = 1~15 hours; 3 = 16 +)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	16 + hours/week	0 hours/week	3.03966*	0.000
		1-15 hours/week	2.04177*	0.000

2 Group Comparison			
Off campus work (1 = less than 30hrs vs 2 = more than 30hrs)		N	Mean
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	Less than 30 hours/week	938	50.4105
	30 or more hours/week	665	51.5455

Off campus work (1 = none; 2 = 1~15 hours; 3 = 16 +)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Social Agency Factor Score	16 + hours/week	0 hours/week	3.01767*	0.000
		1-15 hours/week	2.18672*	0.000

2 Group Comparison			
Off campus work (1 = less than 30hrs vs 2 = more than 30hrs)		N	Mean
Social Agency Factor Score	Less than 30 hours/week	1002	49.8419
	30 or more hours/week	716	51.3459

Off campus work (1 = none; 2 = 1~15 hours; 3 = 16 +)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Civic Engagement Factor Score	0 hours/week	1-15 hours/week	-3.08416*	0.000
		16 + hours/week	-3.01961*	0.000

Off campus work (1 = none; 2 = 1~15 hours; 3 = 16 +)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Habits of Mind Factor Score	0 hours/week	1-15 hours/week	-1.31353*	0.021
		16 + hours/week	-1.77900*	0.000

Off campus work (1 = none; 2 = 1~15 hours; 3 = 16 +)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	0 hours/week	1-15 hours/week	-1.77590*	0.001
		16 + hours/week	-1.89594*	0.000

Off campus work (1 = none; 2 = 1~15 hours; 3 = 16 +)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	0 hours/week	1-15 hours/week	-1.18529*	0.024

Off campus work (1 = none; 2 = 1~15 hours; 3 = 16 +)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	0 hours/week	1-15 hours/week	-1.23396*	0.029
		16 + hours/week	-2.76912*	0.000
	16 + hours/week	1-15 hours/week	1.53517*	0.006

Off campus work (1 = none; 2 = 1~15 hours; 3 = 16 +)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	0 hours/week	1-15 hours/week	-1.16673*	0.041
		16 + hours/week	-1.39618*	0.001

Financial aid offered

Students were asked about the types of financial aid received; below data is provided about differences based on students' self-reported types of financial aid received.

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	No financial aid	1467	47.8488
	Received financial aid	2014	48.5525

2 Group Comparison			
Military or VA funding (GI Bill, Military tuition assistance, etc.)		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	No military or VA funding military or VA funding	2137	48.4794
	Received military or VA funding	69	45.6691

2 Group Comparison			
Work-study		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	Non-work study	1803	48.1921
	Work study	412	49.5320

2 Group Comparison			
Need-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	No need-based grants/scholarships	1253	47.9638
	Need based grants/scholarships	993	49.0598

2 Group Comparison			
Merit-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Co-curricular Diversity Activities (Campus-facilitated) Factor Score	No merit-based grants/scholarships	1625	48.0004
	Merit-based grants/scholarships	589	49.7037

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	No financial aid	1869	50.2489
	Received financial aid	2021	49.1488

2 Group Comparison			
Military or VA funding (GI Bill, Military tuition assistance, etc.)		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	No military or VA funding military or VA funding	2141	49.0692
	Received military or VA funding	68	51.9917

2 Group Comparison			
Pell Grant		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	No Pell grant	727	50.6246
	Pell grant	1547	48.4438

2 Group Comparison			
Merit-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	No merit-based grants/scholarships	1627	48.2506
	Merit-based grants/scholarships	591	51.8573

2 Group Comparison			
Loans		N	Mean
Academic Self-Concept Factor Score	No loans	817	47.9020
	Loans	1453	49.9135

2 Group Comparison			
		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	No financial aid	1627	49.9994
	Received financial aid	2006	49.3473

2 Group Comparison			
Pell Grant		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	No Pell grant	725	50.6610
	Pell grant	1534	48.8603

2 Group Comparison			
Need-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	No need based grants/scholarships	1242	48.8048
	Need based grants/scholarships	998	50.3280

2 Group Comparison			
Merit-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	No merit-based grants/scholarships	1621	49.0067
	Merit-based grants/scholarships	587	50.7241

2 Group Comparison			
Loans		N	Mean
Conversations Across Differences Factor Score	No loans	808	47.7543
	Loans	1450	50.5102

2 Group Comparison			
Military or VA funding (GI Bill, Military tuition assistance, etc.)		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	No military or VA funding military or VA funding	2124	48.7777
	Received military or VA funding	68	52.2111

2 Group Comparison			
Pell Grant		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	No Pell grant	715	50.1437
	Pell grant	1540	48.3847

2 Group Comparison			
Need-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	No need based grants/scholarships	1243	48.3561
	Need based grants/scholarships	990	49.7822

2 Group Comparison			
Merit-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	No merit-based grants/scholarships	1612	48.4400
	Merit-based grants/scholarships	590	50.3423

2 Group Comparison			
Loans		N	Mean
Habits of Mind Factor Score	No loans	812	47.5256
	Loans	1439	49.8063

2 Group Comparison			
Pell Grant		N	Mean
Civic Engagement Factor Score	No Pell grant	726	49.9126
	Pell grant	1547	48.3904

2 Group Comparison			
Need-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Civic Engagement Factor Score	No need based grants/scholarships	1253	48.4204
	Need based grants/scholarships	999	49.4717

2 Group Comparison			
Merit-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Civic Engagement Factor Score	No merit-based grants/scholarships	1633	48.4257
	Merit-based grants/scholarships	587	50.1695

2 Group Comparison			
Loans		N	Mean
Civic Engagement Factor Score	No loans	815	48.0277
	Loans	1454	49.3861

2 Group Comparison			
Pell Grant		N	Mean
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	No Pell grant	659	50.8489
	Pell grant	1418	49.7889

2 Group Comparison			
Need-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	No need based grants/scholarships	1140	49.6253
	Need based grants/scholarships	917	50.8482

2 Group Comparison			
Loans		N	Mean
Curriculum of Inclusion Factor Score	No loans	740	49.3636
	Loans	1331	50.7948

2 Group Comparison			
Pell Grant		N	Mean
General Interpersonal Validation Factor Score	No Pell grant	725	49.6413
	Pell grant	1547	47.9673

2 Group Comparison			
Merit-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
General Interpersonal Validation Factor Score	No merit-based grants/scholarships	1625	48.1896
	Merit-based grants/scholarships	592	49.3903

2 Group Comparison			
Pell Grant		N	Mean
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	No Pell grant	715	50.5388
	Pell grant	1528	48.7338

2 Group Comparison			
Merit-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	No merit-based grants/scholarships	1609	49.0368
	Merit-based grants/scholarships	580	50.0159

2 Group Comparison			
Loans		N	Mean
Academic Validation in the Classroom Factor Score	No loans	809	48.6652
	Loans	1430	49.5590

2 Group Comparison			
Pell Grant		N	Mean
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	No Pell grant	725	50.5976
	Pell grant	1545	48.7860

2 Group Comparison			
Need-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	No need based grants/scholarships	1252	48.8994
	Need based grants/scholarships	997	49.9112

2 Group Comparison			
Merit-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	No merit-based grants/scholarships	1626	49.0135
	Merit-based grants/scholarships	593	50.4486

2 Group Comparison			
Loans		N	Mean
Critical Consciousness and Action Factor Score	No loans	819	47.7433
	Loans	1448	50.3692

2 Group Comparison			
Need-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	No need based grants/scholarships	1253	48.4411
	Need based grants/scholarships	996	49.2152

2 Group Comparison			
Merit-based grants or scholarships		N	Mean
Discrimination and Bias Factor Score	No merit-based grants/scholarships	1626	48.3329
	Merit-based grants/scholarships	591	50.2009

2 Group Comparison			
Loans		N	Mean
Pluralistic Orientation Factor Score	No loans	808	48.5103
	Loans	1452	49.7267

Staff

(Stateside staff; Auxiliary will be reported separately in a supplemental report)

Entire Sample Stateside Staff Descriptive Statistics

CSULB Factors	n	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Role in Student Development Factor	653	1.00	4.00	2.89	0.69
Supervisor Factor	671	1.00	4.00	3.15	0.72
Stress: Child care	687	1.00	4.00	1.87	1.02
Personal Stress Factor	680	1.00	4.00	2.80	0.57
Work Stress Factor	674	1.00	4.00	2.66	0.59
Stress Work Items Misc. Items General work stress Factor	669	1.00	4.00	2.40	0.44
Job Satisfaction Compensation & Benefits Overall Factor	684	1.43	6.00	4.71	0.77
Job Satisfaction Benefits Factor	694	1.00	6.00	5.08	0.82
Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor	693	1.75	6.00	4.43	0.90
Specific Job Satisfaction Overall Factor	676	1.00	6.00	4.81	0.72
Professional Development Career Advancement Factor	668	1.00	4.00	3.00	0.73
Professional Development General Factor	664	1.00	4.00	3.34	0.57
Institutional Opinion I Feel Respected Factor	718	1.00	5.00	3.59	0.72
Institutional Opinion I Feel Valued Factor	698	1.00	4.00	2.96	0.60
Institutional Opinion I feel a part of the campus community Factor	691	1.33	4.00	3.20	0.45
Institutional Opinion Sense of Belonging & Balance Factor	705	1.00	4.00	2.99	0.60
Institutional Opinion My Skills & Role are Clearly Defined & Aligned w dept mission Factor	714	1.00	4.00	3.12	0.56
Action Staff Efforts to Engage Diversity Factor	694	1.00	5.00	2.50	0.88
Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor	680	1.00	6.00	2.30	0.83
Harassment Served as a Resource Factor	675	1.00	6.00	2.14	0.94
Heard Racially Insensitive Remarks Factor	691	1.00	6.00	2.30	0.91
Experience Harassment/Discrimination Social Identity Factor	685	1.00	4.00	1.21	0.43
Experience Harassment/Discrimination Social Status Factor	687	1.00	4.00	1.11	0.30
Satisfaction Compositional Diversity & Hiring Factor	718	1.00	6.00	4.43	0.99
Satisfaction Campus Climate for Diversity & Inclusion Factor	726	1.00	6.00	4.47	1.09
Satisfaction Timeliness & Outcome Admin Responses Factor	718	1.00	6.00	3.93	1.36
Satisfaction Timeliness of Administrative Response Factor	738	1.00	6.00	3.98	1.36
Satisfaction with Outcome of Response Factor	725	1.00	6.00	3.86	1.44
Recommend Work at CSULB Factor	699	1.00	4.00	3.15	0.66

CSULB Factors	n	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Institutional Priorities Factor	689	1.00	6.00	4.22	1.01
Career Advancement, Stability Professional Development Satisfaction Factor	692	1.00	6.00	4.07	1.07
Supervisor: Sets unrealistic expectations for my job	687	1.00	4.00	2.00	0.86
Supervisor: Lacks the skills or knowledge to support me in my job	688	1.00	4.00	1.94	0.92
Climate Opinion Overall Climate for Engagement & Diversity Factor	698	1.00	5.00	3.40	0.83
Climate Opinion: Has a lot of racial tension	727	1.00	5.00	2.69	1.07
Climate Opinion: Effectively communicates information about employee compensation and benefits	724	1.00	5.00	3.46	1.06
REV Climate Opinion Overall Climate for Engagement & Diversity Factor	702	1.00	5.00	3.39	0.87
Inst Opinion: I achieve a healthy balance between my personal life and my professional life	724	1.00	4.00	2.96	0.77
Inst Opinion: My workload is manageable given the hours I'm scheduled to work	719	1.00	4.00	2.90	0.80
Inst Opinion: I feel a sense of belonging to this campus	710	1.00	4.00	3.10	0.73

Entire Sample

Stateside staff response was high (47%) in response to the Staff Climate Survey. Over 800 stateside staff members and administrators contributed to the results discussed below.

The results below are a combination of factors and single questions from the HERI Staff Climate Survey. CSULB had to create these factors as HERI did not provide factors for the Staff Climate Survey in the same manner as the Diverse Learning Environment survey and the Faculty Survey.

Engage All Students

N/A (STUDENT-FOCUSED, NOT ON STAFF)

**There is a role in student development factor in the table (n = 653; mean = 2.88; standard deviation = 0.69; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).*

Action factor

Overall, staff reported a mid-level participation in diversity engagement. (n = 694; mean = 2.50; standard deviation = 0.88; min = 1.00; max = 5.00).

Goal factors

Overall, staff reported high levels of engagement in student development (n = 671; mean = 3.15; standard deviation = 0.72; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

Supervisor factors

The supervisor factor examined the following two areas of staff opinions. First, "Supervisor sets unrealistic expectations for my job". Overall staff reported feeling mid-level satisfaction with regards to supervisors setting unrealistic expectations (n = 687; mean = 2.00; standard

deviation = 0.86; min = 1.00; max = 4.00). Second, “Supervisor lacks the skills or knowledge to support me in my job”. Overall staff reported mid-level satisfaction with regards to supervisors lacking skills or knowledge to support them (n = 688; mean = 1.94; standard deviation = 0.92; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

Summary of Engaging All Students

On average, staff report mid-level participation in diversity engagement and high levels of engagement in student development. There are many different types of staff positions across campus, many of which are not student-facing. Despite these variations, the high scores for student development indicate that even staff in non-student-facing positions are providing a level of student support.

At the same time, staff report mid-level satisfaction with their supervisors’ expectations and abilities to support them in their jobs. It is important to note that staff did not report low satisfaction with their supervisors, and recommendations are not intended to suggest this. On the contrary, recommendations are intended to improve existing communication, expectations, and supportive dynamics between supervisors and staff so that students will benefit.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Because staff provide high levels of support for student development, we recommend focusing on increasing supervisory support for these duties. This includes increasing supervisor knowledge of how to support staff who are working with students, but also adjusting job expectations to account for the often-informal labor of student development that staff are involved in. In other words, high levels of student support reported by staff, paired with mid-level satisfaction with employer expectations, might suggest that staff are experiencing unreasonable expectations from employers who do not understand the full extent of the work that staff are engaging in. This may be remedied by clarity of reporting among staff, particularly in departments or divisions with multiple managers.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

Because not all staff are in student-facing positions, it is difficult to know how they are supporting student development, and thus how to support them in this work. Variations in departmental and division dynamics will drastically impact how supervisory relationships and expectations can be improved.

Expand Access

CSULB commits to reduce the obstacles to higher education in order to improve the social mobility of students. Two factors were considered to examine the goal of Expanding Access: Stress Factors and Institutional Opinion Factors. These factors focused on staff’s reported stress within and outside work (e.g., Work stress and childcare) and staff’s opinion of their relation to the university (e.g., A sense of belonging on campus.)

Stress factor

The stress factor consists of four reported areas that reflect on staff’s personal and work stress: Work Stress Factor (e.g., competing job priorities/deadline, increasing work responsibilities).

Overall staff reported high levels of work stress (n = 674; mean = 2.66; standard deviation = 0.59; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

General work stress

Overall staff reported high levels of general stress (n = 669; mean = 2.40; standard deviation = 0.44; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

Personal Stress (emotional wellbeing, physical health)

Overall staff reported high levels of personal stress (n = 671; mean = 2.80; standard deviation = 0.57; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

Childcare Stress.

Overall staff reported high levels of work stress (n = 674; mean = 2.66; standard deviation = 0.59; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

Opinion institutional factor

Opinion institutional factors explore staff opinion of the following areas: I Feel Respected Factor (e.g., I feel respected by senior administrators, other staff members, faculty, and/or students).

Overall staff reported high levels of feeling respected (n = 718; mean = 3.59; standard deviation = 0.72; min = 1.00; max = 5.00).

I Feel Valued Factor

(e.g., I feel my contributions are valued by my department, my direct supervisor, by senior administrators, by students),

Overall staff reported high levels of feeling valued (n = 698; mean = 2.96; standard deviation = 0.60; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

I feel a part of the campus community Factor

(e.g., professional community support, valued by those around me, valued by the campus community),

Overall staff reported high levels of feeling part of the campus (n = 691; mean = 3.20; standard deviation = 0.45; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

Sense of Belonging & Balance Factor

(e.g., a sense of balance between personal life and professional life),

Overall staff reported high levels of sense of belonging and balance (n = 705, mean = 2.99, standard deviation = 0.60; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

My Skills & Role are Clearly Defined & Align with Department Mission Factor

(e.g., My role is important to the overall success of my department).

Overall staff reported high levels of feeling that their skills and roles are clearly defined and aligned with the departments they work in (n = 714, mean = 3.12, standard deviation = 0.56; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

Summary of Expand Access

Overall, staff report high levels of stress both at work and in their personal lives. However, they report high levels of belonging and a sense of being appreciated on campus, as well as a strong sense of work/life balance.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Explore processes and procedures to include staff/administrators in budget planning/revisions and provide staff/administrators with professional development to manage competing work deadlines, which appear to be major causes of job-related stress. In addition, addressing staff/administrative needs in regard to parenting/adult care and career development/advancement might also lead to reducing job-related stress.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

How do budgeting restrictions, cuts, and/or processes impact stress and job satisfaction for staff/administrators?

Promote Intellectual Achievement

To build knowledge and skills for California and beyond, the CSULB campus community uses collaborative and interdisciplinary research, relevance, and data-informed decision making. As benchmarks to assess these areas, 4 factors were considered: Job Satisfaction Overall, Job Satisfaction Compensation, Job Satisfaction Health and Retirement Benefits, and Professional Development Factors.

Job satisfaction Compensation and Benefits overall factor

Overall staff reported high levels of job satisfaction with regards to compensation and benefits overall (n = 684, mean = 4.71, standard deviation = 0.77; min = 1.43; max = 6.00).

Job Satisfaction Compensation

Overall staff reported high levels of satisfaction with salary (n = 693, mean = 4.43, standard deviation = 0.90; min = 1.75; max = 6.00).

Job Satisfaction Benefits

Overall staff reported high levels of satisfaction with sick leave, vacation time, extended leave policies (e.g., paternity/maternity leave, caring for a family member, medical leave) (n = 694, mean = 5.08, standard deviation = 0.82; min = 1.00; max = 6.00).

Professional development factor

Professional development was examined in the following two areas:

Career advancement

Overall staff reported high levels of satisfaction with career advancement (n = 668, mean = 3.00, standard deviation = 0.73; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

General professional development.

Overall staff reported high levels of satisfaction with general professional development (n = 664, mean = 3.34, standard deviation = 0.57; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

Staff reported high overall satisfaction with compensation and benefits, as well as with opportunities for professional development.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Explore resources to provide and support staff/administrators with opportunities to expand workplace autonomy and independence.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Although based on differences in age, overall job satisfaction from staff/administrators reflects a slightly lower than average rate than in other institutions at a similar rate of difference as that between staff/administrator satisfaction with workplace autonomy and independence. Further inquiry into how workplace autonomy and independence intersect with employee satisfaction would be useful, especially in a survey distributed post-Pandemic.

Build Community

CSULB commits to supporting a compassionate community marked by a strong feeling of belonging, shared governance, and shared accountability. To examine how CSULB is meeting the goal to build community, five factors were examined: Respect (e.g., Staff concerns are considered when making policy), Satisfaction Factors, Discrimination factors, Harassment factors, and Climate Opinion Factors.

Respect factor

How staff perceive they are respected by administrators, faculty, other staff, and students.

Satisfaction Factor

Satisfaction factor explores staff opinion of two following areas:

Satisfaction Compositional Diversity & Hiring Factor (e.g., Racial and ethnic diversity of the faculty, staff, and student body)

Overall staff reported high levels of satisfaction with compositional diversity and hiring (n = 718, mean = 4.43, standard deviation = 0.99; min = 1.00; max = 6.00).

Satisfaction Campus Climate for Diversity & Inclusion Factor

(e.g., gender, religious, sexual orientation, and political differences).

Overall staff reported high levels of satisfaction with the atmosphere for gender, religious, sexual orientation, political differences, and individuals with disabilities.

(n = 726, mean = 4.47, standard deviation = 1.09; min = 1.00; max = 6.00).

Discrimination

Discrimination factors explore staff opinion of the two following areas: Experience Harassment/Discrimination Social Identity Factor.

Overall staff reported low frequency in experiences of harassment or discrimination based on a social identity (n = 685, mean = 1.21, standard deviation = 0.43; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

Experience Harassment/Discrimination Social Status Factor.

Overall staff reported low frequency in experiences of harassment and discrimination because of their social statuses, such as religious/spiritual beliefs, political beliefs, socioeconomic status, and citizenship status (n = 687, mean = 1.11, standard deviation = 0.30; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

Harassment engagements/witness

Harassment engagement factors explore three areas:

Harassment Served as a Resource Factor

Overall staff reported few experiences engaging in harassment serving as a resource (n = 675, mean = 2.14, standard deviation = 0.94; min = 1.00; max = 6.00).

Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor

Overall staff reported few experiencing harassment or assisting in a harassment experience (n = 680, mean = 2.30, standard deviation = 0.83; min = 1.00; max = 6.00).

Heard Racially Insensitive Remarks Factor.

Overall staff reported few experiences of hearing racially insensitive remarks (n = 691, mean = 2.30, standard deviation = 0.91; min = 1.00; max = 6.00).

Climate opinion factor

Climate opinion factor assess three areas as benchmarks. Overall staff reported there are campus administrators who regularly speak about the value of diversity (n = 698, mean = 3.40, standard deviation = 0.83; min = 1.00; max = 5.00).

Climate Opinion

Effectively communicate information about employee compensation and benefits.

Overall staff reported the campus effectively communicates information about employee compensation and benefits (n = 724, mean = 3.46, standard deviation = 1.06; min = 1.00; max = 5.00).

Climate Opinion: Has a lot of racial tension.

Overall staff reported the campus has mid-level racial tension (n = 727, mean = 2.69, standard deviation = 1.07; min = 1.00; max = 5.00).

Summary of Build Community

Overall, staff reported low frequency of experiencing harassment based on identity or social status, overhearing racially insensitive remarks, or of providing services or support for others who experienced harassment. They also reported a general belief that the campus and administrators regularly communicate about employee compensation and benefits, as well as about diversity. However, staff also reported that campus has mid-level racial tensions, suggesting that existing efforts to communicate about racial diversity might not be as effective as they could be at addressing racial inequities and tensions.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Based on the above findings, we recommend that communications about diversity be paired with action steps to improve equity on campus—particularly racial equity as reflected in staff perceptions of racial tension. It is significant that staff reported mid-level racial tensions despite reporting low frequencies of personal harassment or involvement in support for others who are harassed. This suggests that the campus should attend to institutional remedies to structural inequities rather than focusing solely on interpersonal and interactional remedies. In other words, efforts should be made to address policies, practices, and institutional logics that reproduce racial inequities and tensions on campus.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

None

Cultivate Resilience

CSULB endeavors to enrich the institution and the community through implementing creative, entrepreneurial, and forward-looking initiatives. Two Factors were assessed in this area: Institutional Priority Factors (e.g., improve or maintain the physical appearance of campus) and Recommend Work at CSULB Factors (e.g., recommend that a friend apply for a job at this institution and/or dept).

Institutional priority

Overall staff reported high levels of institutional priority (n = 689, mean = 4.22, standard deviation = 1.01; min = 1.00; max = 6.00).

Recommend employer factor

Overall staff reported high levels of recommending to others to work at CSULB (n = 699, mean = 3.15, standard deviation = 0.66; min = 1.00; max = 4.00).

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

Staff reported general satisfaction with campus as reflected in high likelihood of recommending CSULB as an employer, as well as their perception that CSULB prioritizes the physical appearance of campus.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

It is recommended that continued attention be paid to the maintenance and improvement of the campus through landscaping, art, and architecture that reflects the diverse community at CSULB, as these appear to correspond with staff members' satisfaction with CSULB as an employer.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

None

Race/ethnicity

Engage All Students

In a continuously changing economy and labor market, CSULB strives to prepare students for their paths to success. In examining the goal of engaging all students, three factors were addressed. These focused on staff's experiences with Action Staff Efforts to Engage Diversity Factors (e.g., participation in a coalition of different groups to address social justice issues), Role in Student Development Factor (e.g., help students develop personal values, provide for students' emotional development), and Supervisor Factors (e.g., perceptions of supervisor such as support with professional development).

Action factor (Not Significant)

There were no differences between People of Color (POC) staff and non-POC staff on Action Staff Efforts to Engage Diversity Factors. Race/Ethnicity was not a factor in how staff participates in diversity engagement.

Goal factors (Not Significant)

There were no differences between People of Color (POC) staff and non-POC staff on Role in Student Development. Race/Ethnicity was not a factor in how staff engages in student development.

Supervisor factor (Not Significant)

There were no differences between People of Color (POC) staff and non-POC staff on Role in Student Development. Race/Ethnicity was not a factor in how staff perceives their respective supervisors.

Summary of Engaging All Students

Regardless of Race/Ethnicity, CSULB staff had similar perceptions on the Action, Goal, and Supervisor Factors.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

CSULB can continue to encourage campus-organized conversations, presentations, and events on racial/ethnic problems to foster civic participation and assist employees in understanding how they might engage in addressing social justice issues. Another method CSULB can help staff keep their commitment to promote educational equality for students and aid in student development is by organizing townhalls and inviting staff perspectives onto university committees such as the President's Committee for Equity and Change. Invitation to these townhalls and committees can also maintain the staff perception of their supervisor's aid in professional development and demonstration of commitment to diversity and inclusion.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

As the results unfolded as no significant differences, a few unanswered questions can provide deeper insight into this area. As these results highlight the broad sense of staff reports within these three factors, future studies can narrow the scope to also include day-to-day interactions of student engagement. For example, there is an opportunity to further investigate if the staff members surveyed are working with students of color.

Expand Access

CSULB commits to reduce the obstacles to higher education in order to improve the social mobility of students. Two factors were considered to examine the goal of Expanding Access: Stress Factors and Institutional Opinion Factors. These factors focused on staff's reported stress within and outside work (e.g., Work stress and childcare) and staff's opinion of their relation to the university (e.g., A sense of belonging on campus.)

Stress factor

2 Group Comparison				
People of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Work Stress Factor	POC	413	2.6310	0.61629
	Not POC	237	2.7198	0.51600

The stress factor consists of four reported areas that reflect on staff's personal and work stress: Work Stress Factor (e.g., Competing job priorities/deadline, Increasing work responsibilities), Social & Environmental Work Stress (Relationship with supervisor and coworkers, Job Security, Review/promotion process), Personal Stress (emotional wellbeing, physical health), and Childcare Stress. There were no differences between POC staff and non-POC staff on Social & Environmental Work Stress, Personal Stress, and Childcare Stress. Race/Ethnicity was not a factor in staff stress in the areas mentioned above. POC staff reported lower scores of Work Stress than non-POC staff. Thus, non-POC staff is feeling a higher level of work stress in areas such as meeting deadlines, taking on additional responsibility, imposing high expectations, and attending meetings compared to POC staff.

Opinion institutional factor

Opinion institutional factors explore staff opinion of the following areas: I Feel Respected Factor (e.g. I feel respected by senior administrators, other staff members, faculty, and/or students), I Feel Valued Factor (e.g. I feel my contributions are valued by my department, my direct supervisor, by senior administrators, by students), I feel a part of the campus community Factor (e.g. professional community support, valued by those around me, valued by the campus community), Sense of Belonging & Balance Factor (e.g. a sense of balance between personal life and professional life), My Skills & Role are Clearly Defined & Align with Department Mission Factor (e.g. My role is important to the overall success of my department). Within the: I Feel Respected Factor, I Feel Valued Factor, I feel a part of the campus community Factor, and My Skills & Role are Clearly Defined & Align with Department Mission Factor, there was no significant difference between POC staff and non-POC staff. There was a significant difference within the I feel a Sense of Belonging to this Campus. POC staff reported lower levels of a Sense of Belonging. Thus, in addition to having lower levels of a sense of belonging specifically, they also feel their work is less likely to be manageable given their scheduled hours compared to non-POC staff. Furthermore, they feel less likely to maintain a healthy balance between their personal and work lives.

Summary of Expand Access

Two factors were analyzed to examine how CSULB staff members are expanding access for students through their personal and professional skills and resources. To see how CSULB staff are faring in this goal, Stress and Institutional Opinion were utilized as benchmarks. Work Stress was observed to be lower among POC staff than among non-POC staff. However, POC

staff feel a weaker sense of belonging to the campus than non-POC staff because they feel they do not feel their workload is manageable nor that they have a healthy work life and personal life balance.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

To support staff feeling Work Stress, CSULB continue to encourage cross-campus collaborations to lift the feeling of overwhelming responsibility by thus shifting it into a shared feeling of responsibility that is manageable. CSULB can increase support to develop and expand new and existing Staff Associations based on as race/ethnicity, gender identity and sexual orientation, and disability to increase a sense of belonging for POC staff members.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

This survey introduces important questions with regards to the disparity between the lived experiences of POC and non-POC in the workplace. To further this conversation, it would be useful to note the classifications of the staff members surveyed because as staff attain higher positions, their responsibilities, and possibly stress, increase as well.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

To build knowledge and skills for California and beyond, the CSULB campus community uses collaborative and interdisciplinary research, relevance, and data-informed decision making. As benchmarks to assess these areas, 4 factors were considered: Job Satisfaction Overall, Job Satisfaction Compensation, Job Satisfaction Health and Retirement Benefits, and Professional Development Factors.

Job satisfaction overall factor

2 Group Comparison				
People of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Satisfaction Compensation & Benefits Overall Factor	POC	418	4.6353	0.78313
	Not POC	243	4.8536	0.69804

There was a significant difference between POC staff and Non-POC reports within Job Satisfaction Overall Factor. POC staff members scored lower levels of overall job satisfaction. This demonstrates the POC staff members are less satisfied with collegiality among staff, professional relationships with coworkers and supervisors, and competence of coworkers. In comparison to Non-POC staff, POC staff feel less secure in maintaining their current roles and less satisfied with their workspace. Additionally, POC staff reports show that they are less satisfied with departmental support in work-life balance and departmental flexibility in relation to family matters or emergencies. Finally, Non-POC Staff reported the feel more autonomy and independence than POC staff.

Job Satisfaction Compensation (Significant)

2 Group Comparison				
People of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor	POC	422	4.3507	0.90979
	Not POC	248	4.5847	0.84496

Job Satisfaction: Compensation is another benchmark in which POC staff reports show lower scores than Non-POC Staff members. POC Staff members are less satisfied with sick leave, vacation time, extended leave policies (e.g., paternity/maternity leave, caring for a family member, medical leave), and salary.

Job Satisfaction Health and Retirement Benefits

2 Group Comparison				
People of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Satisfaction Benefits Factor	POC	425	5.0078	0.83987
	Not POC	245	5.2027	0.73129

In regards to the Job Satisfaction area within Health and Retirement Benefits, POC staff members reported lower levels of satisfaction than that of Non-POC staff members. These findings demonstrate that POC staff members are less satisfied with cost of health benefits, quality of health benefits, and retirement benefits.

Professional development factor

There were no differences between People of Color (POC) staff and non-POC staff on Professional Development. Race/Ethnicity was not a factor in how staff perceive their support of career advancement and professional development.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

After further examination of CSULB's goal to promote intellectual achievement, there is a discrepancy within the Job Satisfaction Overall, Job Satisfaction Compensation, and Job Satisfaction Health and Retirement Benefits benchmarks. POC staff reported lower levels in the previously mentioned areas than those of Non-POC staff. There were no differences between People of Color (POC) staff and non-POC staff on Professional Development.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

As future studies investigate the job satisfaction of staff members, it is critical to understand that staff do not feel that their professional growth is a reflection of skill or ability. Rather, staff may not have the educational degree for professional growth. To support staff professional growth,

formalized mentorship programs aimed to support staff during onboarding can increase the staff's knowledge and opportunities to grow professionally.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

To further explore how staff perceive the university is faring in promoting intellectual achievement, future studies can investigate if there is a parallel between faculty and staff professional development opportunities systemically for advancement within classifications.

Build Community

CSULB commits to supporting a compassionate community marked by a strong feeling of belonging, shared governance, and shared accountability. To examine how CSULB is meeting the goal to build community, five factors were examined: Respect (e.g., Staff concerns are considered when making policy), Satisfaction Factors, Discrimination factors, Harassment factors, and Climate Opinion Factors.

Respect factor

There were no differences between People of Color (POC) staff and non-POC staff on Respect. Race/Ethnicity was not a factor in how staff perceive they are respected by administrators, faculty, other staff, and students.

Sense of Belonging

Institutional Opinion I feel a part of the campus community (professional community support, valued by those around me, valued by the campus community)

2 Group Comparison				
People of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Inst Opinion: I feel a sense of belonging to this campus	POC	431	3.06	0.722
	Not POC	254	3.18	0.738

Climate Opinion Overall Climate for Engagement

2 Group Comparison				
People of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
REV Climate Opinion Overall Climate for Engagement & Diversity Factor	POC	422	3.3318	0.88371
	Not POC	255	3.5244	0.79248

Satisfaction Factors

2 Group Comparison				
People of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfaction Compositional Diversity & Hiring Factor	POC	435	4.3268	0.99520
	Not POC	257	4.6375	0.89542

2 Group Comparison				
People of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfaction Campus Climate for Diversity & Inclusion Factor	POC	439	4.4105	1.12000
	Not POC	262	4.6267	0.96230

Satisfaction factors explore staff opinion of the three following areas: Satisfaction Compositional Diversity & Hiring Factor (e.g., Racial and ethnic diversity of the faculty, staff, and student body) and Satisfaction Campus Climate for Diversity & Inclusion Factor (e.g., gender, religious, sexual orientation, and political differences). In both cases, POC staff reported lower levels of satisfaction. POC staff feel less satisfied with the commitment to hiring underrepresented racial/ethnic minorities and women. Non-POC staff feel more satisfied with the gender diversity of staff. Additionally, POC staff feel less satisfied with the Campus Climate for Diversity and Inclusion. Upon further examination, POC staff feel less satisfied with the atmosphere for gender, religious, sexual orientation, political differences, and individuals with disabilities.

Discrimination

2 Group Comparison				
People of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experience Harassment / Discrimination Social Identity Factor	POC	418	1.2364	0.48282
	Not POC	245	1.1592	0.31200

2 Group Comparison				
People of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experience Harassment / Discrimination Social Status Factor	POC	420	1.1280	0.33110
	Not POC	245	1.0827	0.24909

Discrimination factors explore staff opinion of the two following areas: Experience Harassment/Discrimination Social Identity Factor and Experience Harassment/Discrimination Social Status Factor. Non-POC staff reported lower scores in both areas. Thus, POC staff have higher experiences of harassment and discrimination because of their social identities, such as gender, age, race/ethnicity, ability/disability status, and sexual orientation. Additionally, POC staff reported having higher rates of experiences of harassment and discrimination because of their social statuses, such as religious/spiritual beliefs, political beliefs, socioeconomic status, and citizenship status.

Harassment engagements/witness

2 Group Comparison				
People of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Harassment Served as a Resource Factor	POC	410	2.2564	1.03342
	Not POC	243	1.9477	0.70862

Harassment engagement factors explore two areas: Harassment Served as a Resource Factor and Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor. Whereas there was no significance in the Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor, data shows that POC staff reported higher levels of experience within Harassment Served as a Resource Factor. POC staff are more likely to have reported an incident of discrimination or sexual harassment to a campus authority, assisted another staff member or student with a problem about discrimination, witnessed discrimination, and been sexually harassed.

Climate opinion factor

2 Group Comparison				
People of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Climate Opinion: Effectively communicates information about employee compensation and benefits	POC	440	3.42	1.124
	Not POC	258	3.60	0.887

Climate opinion factors assess three areas as benchmarks: Climate Opinion Overall, Climate Opinion: Effectively communicate information about employee compensation and benefits, and Climate Opinion: Has a lot of racial tension.

POC staff reported lower levels of Climate Opinion Overall. This demonstrates the POC staff feel do not feel as strongly as Non-POC staff that there are campus administrators who regularly speak about the value of diversity. Additionally, in comparison to Non-POC staff, POC staff members don't feel as strongly that the University provides the campus community with opportunities to share feelings about issues of concern. Non-POC staff are more likely to feel that the campus promotes the appreciation of cultural differences than POC staff. Furthermore, POC staff do not feel that the University encourages staff and students to have a public voice and share their ideas openly. POC staff also have lower opinions than Non-POC staff that the campus has effective hiring practices and policies that increase staff diversity and rewards staff for their participation in diversity efforts. Last, POC staff reported lower than Non-POC staff that the campus effectively communicates information about employee compensation and benefits. There was no difference in Climate Opinion: Has a lot of racial tension.

Summary of Build Community

POC staff members reports differ than those of Non-POC staff members in certain areas within building community. POC staff members reported more experiences of Discrimination factors, such as Experience Harassment/Discrimination Social Identity Factor and Experience

Harassment/Discrimination Social Status Factor, than Non-POC Staff Members. Additionally, POC reports within the Harassment Engagement Factors show that they are more likely to experience Harassment Served as a Resource Factor and Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor. Finally, POC staff reported lower opinions in the Climate Opinion Factor including: Climate Opinion Overall, and Effectively communicate information about employee compensation and benefits. There were no differences in the Respect Factors, Climate Opinion: Has a lot of racial tension.

Recommendations related to Build Community

To continue to support staff connect to the campus, the university should continue to increase awareness of the affinity groups available to staff members. Additionally, the university can increase inclusion by envisioning institutionalized community support, such as trainings that create dialogue that identifies issues and concerns distinct to CSULB staff members. These conversations will enable the university to create and implement staff community objectives to foster community building.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

This section can be further expanded by including related inquiries to assess current campus support to build community. This would allow investigator to explore whether or not current efforts are visible and accessible to the campus community.

Cultivate Resilience

CSULB endeavors to enrich the institution and the community through implementing creative, entrepreneurial, and forward-looking initiatives. Two Factors were assessed in this area: Institutional Priority Factors (e.g., improve or maintain the physical appearance of campus) and Recommend Work at CSULB Factors (e.g., recommend that a friend apply for a job at this institution and/or dept). There were no differences based on race/ethnicity for Institutional Priority Factors and Recommend Work at CSULB Factors.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

There were no differences between POC staff and non-POC staff in the priorities of the university, including the university physical appearance and institutional prestige, nor in recommending others to seek employment at CSULB.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

CSULB should continue to create a safe, welcoming environment that makes staff members feel comfortable to be a part of. This may include continuing to transparently communicate the institutional priorities and implementations.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

With no significant differences between these factors, the university can delve closer to examine if the results accurately display the day-to-day experiences of CSULB Staff members as these results demonstrate that staff members are in agreement with the overall optics of the university.

Women of Color

Engage All Students

Action factor

This factor measures how often staff have participated in activities that focus on diverse issues, differences, and issues of discrimination. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Goal factors

This factor measures the extent to which staff agreed that it was their role to help students develop personal values, provide for students' emotional development, enhance students' knowledge and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, develop students' moral character, encourage students to become agents of social change, prepare students for employment after college, prepare students for graduate or advanced education, and encourage respect for different beliefs. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Supervisor

This factor measures the extent to which staff agreed that their supervisor cares about their well-being, supports their professional development, sets unrealistic expectations for their job, demonstrates a commitment to diversity and inclusion, provides feedback that assists in performing job responsibilities, and advocates for them. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Summary of Engaging All Students

Overall, there were no significant differences between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color with respect to how often they have participated in activities with a "diversity" focus, how much they agree that their roles as staff are to help students develop personally and professionally, and how much they agree that their supervisor generally cares about and assists with their professional well-being.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Continue to promote the campus-wide events and professional development opportunities related to diversity as offered by the Employee Affinity Groups for staff and faculty and Staff Development through Human Resources and Staff Council.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

None.

Expand Access

Stress factor

This includes measures for degree to which staff have experienced stress due to personal, work-related, or other forms of stress. The Social & Environmental Work Stress Factor specifically measures other work-related facets that may cause stress, such as the physical work environment, workplace safety, and the review/promotion process. Child Care Stress is not a factor, but an individual item that measures the extent to which staff are stressed specifically because of childcare.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Opinion Institutional factor

These factors measure the degree to which staff agree that the institution makes them feel respected, valued, part of the campus community, in alignment between their skills/role and their respective department, and balanced & belonged. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Summary of Expand Access

Overall, there were no significant differences between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color with respect to how often they have experienced stress due to personal, work-related, environmental and child care related stress. There were also no significant differences in how much staff agreed to feelings of being respected, valued, and belonging between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Continue to promote and collaborate with the Faculty and Staff Assistance Program and Staff/HR for services and resources available to staff for health, well-being and child care support programs.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

None.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Job satisfaction Overall factor

2 Group Comparison				
Women of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Satisfaction Compensation & Benefits Overall Factor	WOC	255	4.6028	0.80432
	Not WOC	404	4.7744	0.73880

This factor measures staffs' satisfaction across several aspects of their job, including their relationships with co-workers and supervisors, balancing across work and life responsibilities, and the quality of their position overall.

The results for our campus show that Women of Color staff have a lower average Job Satisfaction Overall Factor score in comparison to staff who are not Women of Color.

Job Satisfaction

2 Group Comparison				
Women of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor	WOC	258	4.2674	0.94173
	Not WOC	410	4.5323	0.85378

This factor measures staffs' satisfaction across several aspects of compensation, including sick leave, vacation time, extended leave, and salary. The results for our campus show that Women of Color staff have a lower average Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor score in comparison to staff who are not Women of Color.

Job Satisfaction II Factor

This factor measures staffs' satisfaction across several aspects of health and retirement benefits, including cost of health benefits, quality of health benefits, and retirement benefits. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Professional Development factor

These factors measure the extent to which staff have participated in professional development opportunities, including diversity-related trainings or workshops, optional technical skill development, leadership development, enhancement of interpersonal skills, job benefits training, public safety/security training, health and wellness programs, mentorship, networking events, and policy and procedure training. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

The findings show mixed results across the factors for Intellectual Achievement. There are no significant differences between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color in terms of satisfaction with health and retirement benefits and engaging in professional development opportunities. However, Women of Color staff did significantly lower scores on average on overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with compensation compared to staff who are not Women of Color.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

It is recommended to increased communication campus-wide about engagement opportunities for professional development through presentations at PCSW Women's Research Colloquium, Leadership Fellows Program, and Staff/HR.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

None.

Build Community

Respect

This factor measures the extent to which staff agreed that they feel respected by faculty, other staff members, students, senior administrators, and whether they feel their concerns are considered when making policy.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Satisfaction factors

2 Group Comparison				
Women of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfaction Compositional Diversity & Hiring Factor	WOC	263	4.2649	0.99584
	Not WOC	426	4.5372	0.96195

2 Group Comparison				
Women of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfaction Campus Climate for Diversity & Inclusion Factor	WOC	266	4.3624	1.16597
	Not WOC	431	4.5508	1.02317

These factors measure staffs' satisfaction across several aspects of institutional practices and policies. The Satisfaction with Compositional Diversity & Hiring Factor measures staffs' perceptions of the institution's commitment to diverse hiring practices regarding race, ethnicity, and gender. The Satisfaction with Campus Climate for Diversity & Inclusion Factor measures staffs' perceptions of the institution's atmosphere for differences in gender, religious, sexual orientation, political, and disability status.

The results for our campus show that Women of Color staff have a lower average Satisfaction with Compositional Diversity & Hiring Factor score and a lower average Satisfaction with Campus Climate for Diversity & Inclusion Factor score in comparison to staff who are not Women of Color.

Discrimination

These factors measure the extent to which staff have been discriminated against or excluded from activities on the basis of their social identity (e.g., race/ethnicity, sexual orientation) or social status (e.g., dis/ability status, parent/guardian status). The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Harassment Engagement/Witness Factor

2 Group Comparison				
Women of Color		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Harassment Served as a Resource Factor	WOC	248	2.2753	1.05687
	Not WOC	405	2.0451	0.82701

These factors are a measure of how often staff have witness or have assisted others in response to their experiences with harassment on campus. The results for our campus show that Women of Color staff have a higher average Harassment Resource Factor score in comparison to staff who are not Women of Color. This specific factor is a measure for how often staff assisted with or had been sought after by students or other staff who have experienced harassment.

Climate opinion factor

This factor measures the extent to which staff perceive the campus as promoting opportunities for engagement and diversity. The results for our campus show that there were no significant differences between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Summary of Build Community

Of the factors in this section, Women of Color staff reported significantly lower scores for how satisfied they were regarding the institution's commitment to diverse hiring practices regarding race, ethnicity, and gender and for maintaining a positive atmosphere for differences in gender, religious, sexual orientation, political, and disability status, compared to staff who are not Women of Color.

Additionally, Women of Color staff reported significantly higher scores for how often they have either witnessed or assisted others with experiences with harassment on campus in comparison to staff who are not Women of Color.

And finally, there were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of how much they agreed to feeling respected by different campus populations (e.g., students, other colleagues) or in terms of their perceptions of the campus promoting opportunities for engagement and diversity.

Recommendations related to Build Community

It is recommended promoting the Employee Affinity Groups and work of the President's Equity and Change Commission that offer faculty and staff an opportunity to engage with colleagues in an organization.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

None.

Cultivate Resilience

Institutional Priority

These factors measure the extent to which staff believe their institution is committed to creating and sustaining partnership with surrounding communities, to increasing prestige, to professional development, to the physical appearance of the campus, and to building or modernizing campus facilities. The results for our campus show that there were no significant differences between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Recommend Employer factor

This factor measures the likelihood that staff would recommend that a friend apply for a job in their current department that a friend apply for a job at the institution, or that staff would apply or reapply for a position on campus themselves. The results for our campus show that there were no significant differences between Women of Color staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

The results across the two factors measuring Cultivate Resilience consistently show that there are no significant differences in beliefs about the various ways the institution prioritizes its commitments or in the likelihood of recommending a friend or themselves apply to a campus position between Women of Color Staff and staff who are not Women of Color.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

It is recommended continued professional development opportunities and promotion of the new Employee Affinity Groups and Involvement Policy that supports faculty and staff involvement in the organization.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

None.

Sex

The following points should be considered when interpreting the results for this section.

Sex is generally used to refer to the category people are assigned at birth, primarily based on genitalia (male, female, intersex), whereas gender refers to a person's gender identity (man, woman, genderqueer, nonbinary, etc.). The categories in this section refer to people's gender identities, but the language in the survey used to reference gender was "sex". To match with the survey data, we use sex when referencing data but also use gender to discuss possible explanations for findings.

Options on the survey collapsed "man/trans man" and "woman/trans woman" as categories. Further disaggregation of the data revealed significantly fewer data points from trans identified men and women, specifically. Although these data were included in the analysis, it should be noted that the findings are overwhelmingly representative of cis identified women's and men's climate perceptions. There were genderqueer (et....name the options), which means we are able to speak to some extent on the potential impacts for people whose gender is considered to fall outside of social expectations.

For more analysis on potential impacts and explanation for genderqueer and nonbinary people, there is further discussion in the LGBTQIA+ section of the report.

Engage All Students

Action factor

2 Group Comparison				
Sex (Man vs. Woman)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Action Staff Efforts to Engage Diversity Factor	Man	211	2.3626	0.85360
	Woman	438	2.5588	0.88697

This factor measures how often staff have participated in activities that focus on diverse issues, differences, and issues of discrimination. The results for our campus show that women staff have a higher average Action to Engage Diversity Factor score in comparison to men staff.

Goal factors

This factor measures the extent to which staff agreed that it was their role to help students develop personal values, provide for students' emotional development, enhance students' knowledge and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, develop students' moral character, encourage students to become agents of social change, prepare students for employment after college, prepare students for graduate or advanced education, and encourage respect for different beliefs. There were no gender differences in Goal Factor scores.

Supervisor

This factor measures the extent to which staff agreed that their supervisor cares about their well-being, supports their professional development, sets unrealistic expectations for their job, demonstrates a commitment to diversity and inclusion, provides feedback that assists in performing job responsibilities, and advocates for them. There were no gender differences in Supervisor scores.

Summary of Engaging All Students

This section reports on factors related to staff participation in activities that focus on diverse issues, differences, and issues of discrimination, staff perception of their role in students' personal development, and staff perception of their supervisors' support.

The results for this section show that there is no significant difference between staff who are women and staff who are men relative to perception of role in students personal development and perception of supervisors' support. However women staff have participated in more activities that focus on diverse issues and discrimination.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Given the lack of significant findings, we recommend continued assessment and monitoring of staff members' perception of their role in students' personal development and supervisors' support.

Given the finding that women staff have participated in more activities that focus on diverse issues, we recommend additional inquiry to consider why this might be the case. Based on this additional information, we recommend targeted outreach, programming, and support to encourage all staff to participate in such programs, here with a potential allyship focus.

Women staff report higher levels of engagement in activities focused on diversity and discrimination than men staff.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Due to gender differences in the Action to Engage Diversity Factor scores, we recommend greater attention be paid to gender equity in the recognition and cultivation of participation in activities focused on diversity and discrimination. Due to the emotional labor that women are generally expected to engage in, these dynamics stand to contribute to greater gender inequity on our campus. Since women staff report higher overall engagement in these activities, we recommend that additional resources be allocated to already gender-marginalized staff who may be participating in uncompensated activities that contribute to the mission of the university. To address this inequity, we suggest implementation of material policies that support and recognize this work. This may include assigned time set aside as part of their hourly workweek that can be devoted to diversity and inclusion work. Alternatively, staff should be able to receive additional compensation or stipends for work done in support of diversity on our campus.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

None

Expand Access

Stress factor

2 Group Comparison				
Sex (Man vs. Woman)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Stress: Childcare	Man	211	1.99	0.986
	Woman	431	1.81	1.042

This factor measures the degree to which staff have experienced stress due to personal, work-related, or other forms of stress. The results for our campus show that there were no significant differences between women and men staff for Personal Stress, Work Stress, or Social & Environmental Stress factors. However, women staff did have a lower average score for the Child Care Stress item in comparison to men staff.

Opinion institutional factor

These factors measure the degree to which staff agree that the institution makes them feel respected, valued, part of the campus community, in alignment between their skills/role and their respective department, and balanced & belonged. There were no gender differences for Opinion institutional factor scores.

Summary of Expand Access

While staff generally report similar levels of work, personal, and other forms of stress, women staff report lower average stress pertaining to childcare. This is surprising since women are generally expected to do the bulk of childcare but may also reflect an internalization of those responsibilities resulting in a lower overall self-assessment of how childcare is impacting them. This may also reflect gender norms related to parenting in which men experience childcare as a greater additional stressor in their lives since they are not generally expected to provide childcare, which is characterized as women's work in our society.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Given the lack of significant findings, we recommend continued assessment and monitoring of women and men staff members' experience of stress and feelings of respect and value. We also recommend additional inquiry into what is working to mitigate this stress and promote value among staff members so that specific impactful programs and initiatives can be institutionalized and supported.

Because childcare stress is the only area where differences in stress were reported, we recommend that the campus review parental benefits and revise, where appropriate, to support staff who are parents. It is likely that differences in stress level are also a reflection of how people are responded to in relation to their parenting responsibilities. While parental leave and benefits may be gender equitable in policy, for example, in practice men may experience more pressures to prioritize work over family. At the same time, women may experience pressures or assumptions that they will prioritize family, which may result in reduced opportunities for promotions and professional development.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

It would be useful if we could identify what types of stress were associated with childcare—for example whether these were related to income, work expectations, family obligations, or other factors.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Job satisfaction compensation factor

2 Group Comparison				
Sex (Man vs. Woman)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor	Man	214	4.5339	0.85358
	Woman	434	4.3733	0.91075

This factor measures staffs' satisfaction across several aspects of compensation, including sick leave, vacation time, extended leave, and salary. The results for our campus show that women staff have a lower average Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor score in comparison to men staff.

Job Satisfaction II

This factor measures staffs' satisfaction across several aspects of compensation, including sick leave, vacation time, extended leave, and salary.

The results for our campus show that women staff have a lower average Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor score in comparison to men staff.

Professional Development factor

These factors measure the extent to which staff have participated in professional development opportunities, including diversity-related trainings or workshops, optional technical skill development, leadership development, enhancement of interpersonal skills, job benefits training, public safety/security training, health and wellness programs, mentorship, networking events, and policy and procedure training.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff who are women and staff who are men.

There was no significant gender difference in satisfaction with professional development opportunities in terms of gender.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

Gender differences across the Job Satisfaction Compensation Factors suggest that women staff are less satisfied with sick leave, vacation time, extended leave, salary, than men staff. However, there was no significant difference in scores for professional development. These findings are significant in that staff generally report high levels of satisfaction with these factors, including the perception that campus administrators regularly communicate about staff compensation and benefits. This contradiction suggests that campus communication about compensation and benefits is not enough to secure gender equity in these areas.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Given the lack of significant findings, we recommend continued assessment and monitoring of staff members' perception of their role in students' personal development and supervisors' support.

It is recommended to continue to promote opportunities for professional development, including staff research presentations at Research Colloquium across campus, the Leadership Fellows Program, the Data Fellows Program, and continued sponsorship opportunities for Professional Conferences across the campus.

Given that that women staff have a lower average level of satisfaction with compensation, we recommend additional inquiry into the specific nature of this dissatisfaction as part of a closer assessment of the ways in which women and men staff members are currently compensated. We also advocate for potential increases in compensation based on this additional inquiry.

Given that women staff report higher scores for Engaging All Students, it is possible that they are doing a larger amount of uncompensated labor than men staff are. This may be reflected in women staff's overall lower satisfaction with Compensation. They may also receive additional pressure not to take time off, use sick leave and vacation time, or request increases in salary. Given research that suggests women are less likely to advocate for themselves and are less likely to receive promotions when they request them – even when they outperform men or take fewer leaves of absence (Benson, Lee and Shue 2021) -- we recommend that regular salary increases be institutionalized across divisions. We also recommend that efforts be made to train supervisors and employees on actively countering bias, beyond implementation of implicit bias trainings and moving towards active countering of discriminatory practice and outcomes.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

None

Build Community

Satisfaction factors

2 Group Comparison				
Sex (Man vs. Woman)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfaction Campus Climate for Diversity & Inclusion Factor	Man	221	4.6226	0.90535
	Woman	455	4.4620	1.10606

2 Group Comparison				
Sex (Man vs. Woman)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfaction Timeliness of Administrative Response Factor	Man	225	4.1644	1.34891
	Woman	464	3.9260	1.35229

2 Group Comparison				
Sex (Man vs. Woman)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfaction with Outcome of Response Factor	Man	219	4.0685	1.38944
	Woman	459	3.7778	1.44577

These factors measure staffs' satisfaction across several aspects of institutional practices and policies. The first factor measures staffs' perceptions of the institution's atmosphere for differences in gender, religious, sexual orientation, political, and disability status. The second factor measures the extent to which staff are satisfied with how quickly administration responds to issues of sexual assault, discrimination/bias, and campus emergencies. The third factor measures the extent to which staff are satisfied with administration's outcome regarding the same issues.

These factors measure staffs' satisfaction across several aspects of institutional practices and policies. The results for our campus show that women staff have a lower average Satisfaction with Campus Climate for Diversity & Inclusion Factor score, a lower average Satisfaction with Timeliness of Administrative Response Factor score, and a lower average Satisfaction with Outcome of Response Factor score in comparison to men staff.

The first factor measures staffs' perceptions of the institution's atmosphere for differences in gender, religious, sexual orientation, political, and disability status. The second factor measures the extent to which staff are satisfied with how quickly administration responds to issues of sexual assault, discrimination/bias, and campus emergencies. The third factor measures the extent to which staff are satisfied with administration's outcome regarding the same issues.

Discrimination

These factors measure the extent to which staff have been discriminated against or excluded from activities on the basis of their social identity (e.g., race/ethnicity, sexual orientation) or social status (e.g., dis/ability status, parent/guardian status). The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff who are women and staff who are men.

Harassment Engagements/Witness

These factors are a measure of how often staff have witness or have assisted others in response to their experiences with harassment on campus. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff who are women and staff who are men.

Climate Opinion factor

This factor measures the extent to which staff perceive the campus as promoting opportunities for engagement and diversity. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff who are women and staff who are men.

Summary of Build Community

The results of this section are mixed. Although there are no significant findings of difference between women and men staff members' experience of respect, discrimination, harassment, and perception of campus climate, women staff report being less satisfied with institutional practices and policies that promote difference and/or respond to and bring about outcomes related to issues of sexual assault, discrimination/bias, and campus emergencies.

These findings suggest that women staff are generally less satisfied than men staff with the institution's atmosphere for differences in social status and identity, as well as with the efficacy of administrative responses to issues of sexual assault, discrimination bias, and campus emergencies. Because women occupy a gender marginalized status, they are more likely than men of the same race, disability status, or other intersecting identities, to have directly experienced discrimination. They are also far more likely to have experienced sexual assault or

harassment. As a result, they are more likely than men to have had direct negative experiences relating to gender, and to gender as it intersects with other significant identities and social statuses--- for example, while Black men may experience racism, Black women are likely to experience misogynoir, the distinct manifestation of anti-Black misogyny.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Given the lack of significant findings, we recommend continued assessment and monitoring of women and men staff members' experience of respect, discrimination, harassment, and perception of campus climate.

However, given the lack of satisfaction of women staff members as compared with men around institutional practices and policies related to issues of sexual assault, discrimination/bias, and campus emergencies, we strongly recommend additional inquiry so that targeted suggestions and recommendations can be made to advance diversity and inclusion goals.

Here, we also recommend additional inquiry into the following:

- What is working to promote respect?
- What is working to mitigate discrimination and harassment?
- How is this impacting perception of campus climate?

This information is important for targeting resources to institutionalize and support impactful programs and initiatives.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

In response to systemic gender inequity, we recommend the implementation of a self-study by our campus to assess how our campus responds to reports of sexual assault, discrimination, and harassment. We also recommend that efforts be made to train campus community members on actively countering bias, beyond implementation of implicit bias training, and move towards actively countering discriminatory practices and outcomes. We also recommend that additional resources be allocated to support people who experience sexual assault, harassment, and discrimination. This would include an increase in counselors, confidential advocates who can be accessed in a timely manner, and an expedited and transparent process for addressing sexual assault, harassment, and discrimination on our campus.

Cultivate Resilience

Institutional priority

These factors measure the extent to which staff believe their institution is committed to creating and sustaining partnership with surrounding communities, to increasing prestige, to professional development, to the physical appearance of the campus, and to building or modernizing campus facilities. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff who are women and staff who are men.

Recommend employer factor

This factor measures the likelihood that staff would recommend that a friend apply for a job in their current department that a friend apply for a job at the institution, or that staff would apply or reapply for a position on campus themselves. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff who are women and staff who are men.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

There were no gender differences in scores as they related to perceptions of Institutional Priority regarding maintenance and physical upkeep of campus, nor were there gender differences in scores as they related to whether staff would recommend CSULB as an employer.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

Given the lack of significant findings, we recommend continued assessment and monitoring of women and men staff members' perception of institutional commitment to creating and sustaining partnership with surrounding communities and likelihood that staff would recommend that friends apply to a job at the institution. We would also recommend engaging in follow-up data collection for insights about what may be working well for staff members so that impactful programs and initiatives can be maintained.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

None.

LGBTQIA+

Important Note Regarding Language:

People who participated in this survey had the option to identify as Asexual, Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Pansexual, Queer, or “Other” (ABGLPQ+). As a result, we cannot speak to identities commonly included within LGBTQIA+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, Asexual+) groups, including people who identify as Transgender, Nonbinary, Intersex, or Two Spirit. This mirrors the frequent conflation of gender and sexual identities, which leads to inaccurate assessments of community experiences and needs. To this end, we articulate varying possibilities throughout the report as they pertain to score interpretations across both gender and sexual identities. We wish to note that this language has the potential to impact participation in and responses to survey questions, and that lack of recognition and inclusion may skew the results and participation of faculty. In addition, smaller numbers of faculty and the ability to cross reference data across discipline and other intersecting identities may have led to hesitancy to participate for fear of answers to questions being identifiable. To reflect the language of the survey, we use the acronym ABGLPQ+ when discussing specific findings. However, when talking about broader patterns of inequity, community, or resistance in society and across campus, we use the acronym LGBTQIA+.

LGBTQIA+ Staff Overview

Staff have been consistently involved in LGBTQIA+ organizing and resource development on our campus. Dr. Kirstyn Chun of CAPS was central to establishment of the LGBTQ Task Force in 2008, which became the LGBTQIA+ Climate Committee in 2013. The establishment of procedures for name and gender updating forms has been facilitated by and beneficial to LGBTQIA+ staff on campus, and our staff are highly involved in supportive services and investment in LGBTQIA+ resources on campus. While we have had LGBTQIA+ staff within the Office of Multicultural Affairs, we have not had a specific staff member overseeing LGBTQIA+ Affairs on campus. That said, staff members across campus have been highly invested in the establishment and continuation of campus events like the yearly OUTtober celebration, Trans Days of Remembrance and Visibility, and other important programs. Overall, we have a highly visible and active network of LGBTQIA+ staff across campus. While we do not discuss data on genderqueer and nonbinary staff in this section, that data (where available) is discussed in the section on sex.

Engage All Students

This category looks at Staff’s role in engaging all students across a variety of factors. It is also important to note that there are a wide variety of staff roles throughout the university, not all of which are student-facing thus potentially affecting some of the scores. This is discussed further in the sections below.

Action factor

2 Group Comparison				
LGBTQI+		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Action Staff Efforts to Engage Diversity Factor	LGBTQI+	72	2.8056	0.91853
	Not LGBTQI+	607	2.4666	0.86818

This factor measures staff participation in diversity efforts. ABGLPQ+ staff reported higher overall scores than non-ABGLPQ+ staff for the Staff Diversity Engagement Factor. Because LGBTQIA+ staff are more likely to experience marginalization, and because the LGBTQIA+ community is diverse across intersecting identities and experiences, it is not surprising that they were more likely to engage in diversity efforts like participating in coalitions of different groups to address social justice issues, attend events focused on diversity, educate themselves about individuals who are different from them, and challenge others on issues of discrimination. These types of engagements with diversity tend to occur more frequently among people in marginalized groups.

Goal factors

This factor measures the extent to which staff see student development as central to their role in their jobs. There was no significant difference between ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ staff scores for the Staff Role in Student Development Factor. This is not surprising since not all staff members are in student-facing roles. The data might be different if we were only looking at LGBTQIA+ and non-LGBTQIA+ staff who are in student-facing positions because goals such as: helping students to develop personal values, providing for their emotional development, enhancing their knowledge and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, developing their moral character, encouraging them to become agents of social change, preparing them for employment after college or for graduate or advanced education, and encouraging respect for different beliefs are likely to be associated with specific job descriptions and divisions on campus. While the Divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs are student facing, for example, the Divisions of Administration and Finance, University Relations and Development, and Technology are generally not.

Supervisor

There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ staff members scores with regards to their perception of their supervisors, including perceptions that supervisors “set unrealistic expectations for their job” or “lacked the skills or knowledge to support” them in their job. There were also no significant differences in ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ staff perceptions of whether their supervisors cared about their well-being, advocated for them, supported their professional development, provided them with feedback that assisted them in their job responsibilities, and demonstrating commitment to diversity. This may reflect overall confusion among staff across divisions as to who supervisors are in various contexts and throughout interactions, including which are in the Union or not in the Union.

Summary of Engaging All Students

ABGLPQ+ Staff reported higher overall scores than non ABGLPQ+

Staff in the area of Staff Diversity Factor. However, there were no significant differences recorded between ABGLPQ+ staff and non- ABGLPQ+ staff when it came to student development factor and to perceptions of their supervisors.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

In order to better support staff in their goals relating to student development and in supporting the mission of the University, we recommend greater clarity on supervisory roles in comparison with other roles like “leads,” which can create confusion among staff as to where feedback and directions should be coming from. As a part of this, we recommend the development of a consistent structure of reporting across divisions so that staff can identify resources efficiently. Because ABGLPQ+ staff report higher scores for Diversity Engagement, we also recommend an increase in stipends available to LGBTQIA+ staff who are working across marginalized groups on campus, and who are providing additional labor that supports the diversity mission of the university. We also recommend developing resources for LGBTQIA+ staff through a campus LGBTQIA+ Resource Center, and through infrastructural support of social networking among LGBTQIA+ staff – for example, through the Committee on LGBTIQ+ Campus Climate.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

It was unclear whether LGBPAQ+ staff held more student-facing roles than non LGBPAQ+ staff. As noted earlier, not all staff positions at the university are student facing, and furthermore not all staff positions have an opportunity to engage with students in the same ways.

Expand Access

This category addresses staff members’ stress factors as well as their opinions of the institutions. There were significant differences between the personal stress levels of ABGLPQ+ when compared to non- ABGLPQ+ but no significant differences when it came to specific jobs stress. Furthermore, ABGLPQ+ staff reported a lower score when it came to sense of belonging on campus. We provide further explanation of each of these factors, as well as recommendations and unanswered questions.

Stress factor

2 Group Comparison				
LGBTQI+		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Personal Stress Factor	LGBTQI+	72	2.9479	0.54859
	Not LGBTQI+	596	2.7886	0.56544

2 Group Comparison				
LGBTQI+		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Stress: Child care	LGBTQI+	72	1.38	0.777
	Not LGBTQI+	601	1.94	1.035

ABGLPQ+ staff reported higher overall scores than non-ABGLPQ+ staff on the Personal Stress Factor. That ABGLPQ+ staff experienced higher levels of stress related to emotional well-being

and physical health is unsurprising given widespread anti-LGBTQIA+ bias in the health professions and limited LGBTQIA+-specific mental health care both on and off campus. Because we live in a heteronormative and ciscentric society, LGBTQIA+ staff are more likely to experience higher levels of personal stress across contexts. Mental and physical health are also likely to be impacted negatively by increased workload associated with diversity engagement that is uncompensated and unrecognized. Given that LGBTQIA+ staff reported lower overall scores than non-LGBTQ staff on the Child Care Stress Factor, we must look elsewhere for explanations of why LGBTQIA+ staff experience stress due to a lack of personal time and managing household responsibilities. As a result of heterosexism and cissexism LGBTQIA+ staff may not have the same access to family and social networks that non-LGBTQIA+ staff have access to, which can mitigate challenges around personal time and household responsibilities. Intersecting marginalized identities among LGBTQIA+ staff are also likely to result in higher levels personal stress—for example, among LGBTQIA+ staff of color the compounding effects of both racism and heterosexism. It is also possible that increased workload evident in the Engage All Students scores, which can be emotionally, intellectually, and physically taxing, also accounts for these higher personal stress scores.

The above interpretations are further supported by data that suggest there are no significant differences in stress levels for ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ staff when it came to things specific to their job descriptions and normal work expectations (work stress), or in relation to professional relationships, safety, institutional procedures, promotions, and job security (Social and Environmental Work Stress).

Opinion institutional factor

2 Group Comparison				
LGBTQI+		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Institutional Opinion My Skills & Role are Clearly Defined & Aligned w dept mission Factor	LGBTQI+	74	2.9505	0.60611
	Not LGBTQI+	625	3.1440	0.55588

2 Group Comparison				
LGBTQI+		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Inst Opinion: I feel a sense of belonging to this campus	LGBTQI+	74	2.91	0.779
	Not LGBTQI+	621	3.13	0.726

ABGLPQ+ staff reported overall lower scores than non- ABGLPQ+ staff when asked if their Skills & Role are Clearly Defined & Aligned with department mission. This is not surprising considering the higher reported scores among ABGLPQ+ staff when it came to Diversity Engagement beyond their job descriptions. It is likely that LGBTQIA+ staff are going beyond or are expected and or pressured to engage in work that goes beyond their job descriptions. Due to higher engagement across difference, LGBTQIA+ staff bring more diverse skills for working across marginalized communities, and for promoting engagement across these groups, but

these skills are not necessarily recognized and utilized in their position, resulting in lower scores relating to their own perceptions of the effective use of their skills and contributions to the success of their departments.

There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ staff for the I Feel Respected, I Feel Valued, I Feel a Part of the Campus Community, and Achieving a Healthy Balance between work and personal life. However, ABGLPQ+ staff reported lower scores for the Sense of Belong Factor than non-ABGLPQ+ staff. Given that the only significantly different scores for ABGLPQ+ staff in these areas reflect a lower sense of belonging on campus, it is likely that these scores reflect a heteronormative climate on campus. That is, while ABGLPQ+ staff report the same levels of professional and collegial experience on campus as non-ABGLPQ+ staff, they may still feel less like they belong because their gender and sexual identities are underrepresented, underacknowledged, or underappreciated as part of the institution and community.

Summary of Expand Access

ABGLPQ+ staff reported higher scores than non ABGLPQ+ staff in the personal stress factor but when asked about stress levels in relation to work (work stress) there was no significant difference. When asked if their skills and role are clearly defined, and aligned with department mission, ABGLPQ+ staff reported lower scores than non- ABGLPQ+ staff. In terms of feeling respected, valued and feeling like a part of community, ABGLPQ+ staff did not report differences when compared to non- ABGLPQ+. However, when asked about their sense of belonging on campus, ABGLPQ+ Staff reported lower scores than non- ABGLPQ+ staff. This lower score correlates with the higher scores of personal stress factors that LGBPAQ+ reported initially.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

LGBTQIA+ staff bring with them a large range of additional skills to the job which seemingly go unnoticed and underutilized. This compounded with higher levels of diversity engagement shows how LGBTQIA+ staff are ready to use these additional skills in their day-to-day jobs and in supporting students. It is not surprising to see that ABGLPQ+ staff reported a lower sense of belonging and higher levels of personal stress. Knowing all of this, we recommend expanded access to qualified mental health professionals who are skilled in working with LGBTQIA+ identified individuals. We also expanded training for supervisors and managers so that they can learn to value the additional skills that LGBTQIA+ staff bring to the workplace.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

These scores do not differentiate between staff member's other socio-cultural identities, including race, ethnicity, immigration status, class, and citizenship status, which combined with an LGBPAQ+ sexual identity can affect personal stress in a variety of ways. All other things equal, it seems as if LGBPAQ+ staff members are treated fairly when compared to non-LGBPAQ+ staff but are undervalued with regards to their skills and expertise.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Intellectual achievement pertains to rigor, relevance, and data-informed decision making as hallmarks of our campus community that enrich our development of knowledge and talent for California and beyond. This section provides data on staff perceptions about their overall workspace, including perceptions of job satisfaction, salary, supervisors, coworkers, time off policies, and health and retirement benefits. There are clear correlations between lower scores for factors that can potentially make LGBTQIA+ staff identifiable and factors that do not identify

LGBTQIA+ staff and thus are more equally available to all staff members, regardless of job title, department, or position.

Job satisfaction overall factor

ABGLPQ+ staff reported lower overall job satisfaction scores than non-ABGLPQ+ staff for the factors of collegiality among staff, departmental and institutional support for work-life balance, professional relationship with coworkers, flexibility in relation to family matters or emergencies, autonomy and independence, relationship with supervisor, workspace, job security, competence of coworkers, and quality of students. Given a culture of heterosexism both on campus and in our wider society, LGBTQIA+ staff may feel alienated and not represented in their respective departments. As previously discussed, ABGLPQ+ staff reported a greater staff diversity engagement factor, so we know that LGBTQIA+ staff members are active outside of their specific job descriptions in the workplace, however, even with a higher level of engagement, we see lower job satisfaction. Historically, those who identify as LGBTQIA+ population are less likely to have “traditional” families, and as a result, less access to family networks when compared to their heterosexual counterparts. This can explain why there were lower scores for departmental and institutional support for work-life balance as well as flexibility in relation to family matters or emergencies. Furthermore, given the limitations of what is considered as appropriate work-attire, most which is often heteronormative and binary standards of dressing, LGBTQIA+ staff may find themselves constantly having to “out” themselves in day-to-day interactions with colleagues in their greater departments. This constant need to affirm ones sexual or gender identity indicates that the workspace has rigid expectations that do not allow staff to be their authentic selves which can explain the lower scores for job security and workspace.

Job Satisfaction

2 Group Comparison				
LGBTQI+		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Satisfaction Compensation & Benefits Overall Factor	LGBTQI+	73	4.4736	0.90660
	Not LGBTQI+	597	4.7397	0.74776

2 Group Comparison				
LGBTQI+		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor	LGBTQI+	73	4.1438	1.01629
	Not LGBTQI+	606	4.4686	0.87790

ABGLPQ+ staff reported lower job satisfaction scores than non-ABGLPQ+ staff when asked about compensation including sick leave, vacation time, extended leave policies, and salary. As previously noted, ABGLPQ+ staff report a greater level of engagement with diversity initiatives, therefore performing additional job duties that go uncompensated. For example, LGBTQIA+ staff that work within the Student Affairs division are often the ones that support student groups with event planning such as Lavender Grad, OUTober, and serve as advisors for LGBTQIA+ student organizations in addition to their normal day-to-day duties. Furthermore, there is additional involvement that can occur within their divisions or college, for example, some colleges have

smaller staff committees that deal with both staff-specific issues as well as college wide involvement. It is likely that LGBTIQ+ staff have higher levels of involvement with these, as reflected in the Diversity Engagement factors. We have previously observed that LGBTIQ+ staff members reported lower scores for job security compared to non-LGBTIQ+ staff members, therefore there is the potential that LGBTIQ+ staff is more hesitant to use sick leave, vacation time, and extended leave policy for fear of losing their position. Furthermore, given the fact that LGBTQIA+ individuals as a whole are more attuned to greater societal inequities, including wage gaps, rising cost of living, stagnant minimum wages, and the overall failures of capitalism, it makes sense that LGBTQIA+ staff would report a lower job satisfaction for salary in a job climate where staff salary wage increases are not guaranteed annually, and where state funding is constantly at the mercy of the state budget and those who hold office.

Job Satisfaction

There were no significant differences between scores for ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ staff for Health and Retirement Benefits, including cost of health benefits, quality of health benefits, and retirement benefits.

Professional development factor

There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non- ABGLPQ+ staff when it came to Career Advancement such as enhancement of interpersonal skills, leadership development, mentorship, networking events, or optional technical skills development. Similarly, there were no differences in reported scores for general professional development, which includes health and wellness programs, public safety and security training, diversity related trainings/workshops, job benefits training and policy and procedure trainings. Opportunities for career advancement and general professional development are presented in more formal ways, and accessible to all staff during standard hours, which may explain why there were no reported differences between both groups. These formalized types of training which take place at specific dates and times within the regular 8am-5pm work hours are opportunities that anyone can take advantage of, regardless of sexual identity or gender identity.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

ABGLPQ+ staff reported lower overall job satisfaction than non- LGBTQIA+ staff in a wide range of areas including overall leave policies and salary. However, when asked about health and retirement benefits, as well as opportunities for professional development ABGLPQ+ staff did not report differences when compared to non-LGBTQIA+ staff. There is a clear pattern that can be observed when asked about individual aspects of the jobs, such as job satisfaction, family leave, sick leave, etc.; LGBTQIA+ staff may feel marginalized, or concerned about retaliation due to their sexual and/or identity therefore they may feel as though they cannot use these benefits as freely as non- LGBTQIA+ staff. In comparison, when asked about opportunities available to every staff member, regardless of individual circumstances, including circumstances that can make one's sexual identity identifiable, no differences were observed.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Given the clear differences between ABGLPQ+ staff and non- ABGLPQ+ staff for issues where more personal decisions need to be made such as when to take time off, in comparison to larger opportunities available, we recommend that Human Resources clarify the policies for taking time off and use inclusive language when explaining the policies. We further recommend the expansion of available training such as Safe Zone to not only be improved, but also required

by all staff members and supervisors, this training should include required refreshers every year.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Given that the sexual identity options available on the survey were limited, it is hard to know about response hesitancy from LGBTQIA+ staff members who may not feel represented by the survey. In addition, given that staff did have lower job security scores, there is a possibility that some may fear retaliation from the university or departments, and thus may have felt discouraged from completing the survey.

Build Community

Building Community measures support as part of a compassionate community characterized by a strong sense of belonging and shared governance with shared responsibility. Although ABGLPQ+ staff on campus have reported a lower overall sense of belonging on campus, they are active in building community and establishing safe places for vulnerable individuals to disclose instances of discrimination and harassment. In describing the campus climate as a whole and with regards to administrative response and outcomes to reports of discrimination/bias, there were not significant differences between ABGLPQ+ staff and non ABGLPQ+ staff. However, in the day-to-day instances of discrimination and bias either witnessed by, or disclosed to, staff, ABGLPQ+ staff were more likely to recognize both harassment and bias and were more likely to be trusted as a resource in assisting others who are dealing with discrimination, bias, and/or harassment.

Respect

This factor measures the extent to which staff feel respected by senior administrators, other staff members, faculty, and students. It also measures whether they believe that staff concerns are considered when making policy. There was no significant difference between ABGLPQ+ identified staff and non ABGLPQ+ identified staff.

Satisfaction factors

This factor measures staff satisfaction across a range of different areas pertaining to the campus climate and responses to various issues. There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ staff members' scores with regards to their perception of timeliness or outcomes of administrative response to reports of sexual assault, discrimination/bias, or campus emergencies. Given that LGBTQIA+ identified staff, faculty, and/or students are more likely to experience harassment, yet there are no significant differences in the staff's perception and satisfaction of administrative response to the discrimination and harassment, this can be interpreted as the institution not prioritizing an appropriate response to reported discrimination, harassment and assault on campus.

There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non-LGBT staff scores for Satisfaction with Campus Climate for Diversity and Inclusion Factor. Given that ABGLPQ+ identified staff does not report a significant difference from non-ABGLPQ+ identified staff regarding Satisfaction with Campus Climate for Diversity, this could be interpreted as the institution not prioritizing a diverse and inclusive campus climate that is representative of intersectional identities.

There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non-LGBT staff scores for Satisfaction with Campus Climate for Diversity and Hiring Factor. These results show that ABGLPQ+-identified staff view the institution as not prioritizing diversity in hiring practices.

Discrimination

This factor measures whether staff have experienced discrimination based on protected statuses. There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non-LGBT staff scores for the Experience Harassment/Discrimination Social Identity Factor. These results are surprising because we live in a heteronormative cissexist society that has historically discriminated against marginalized groups such as the LGBTQIA+ community. However, since this factor measures a score across all areas, it is possible that LGBTQIA+ staff experience discrimination due to sexual orientation (language used in the survey), for example, but not other measured categories. In this case, discrimination on the basis of gender or sexuality may be “hidden” behind the minimizing factors of other categories for which they do not experience harassment. Considering there are no significant differences within the Administrative Responses sections, LGBTQIA+ identified staff may be less likely to participate in these surveys if they were – especially if there has been little response from administration.

Experience Harassment/Discrimination Social Status Factor

This factor measures whether staff have experienced harassment or discrimination based on a social status. There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non-LGBT staff scores for the Experience Harassment/Discrimination Social Status Factor. Social Status might not typically be disclosed similarly to sexual identities. It is difficult to assess one’s social status regarding religious/spiritual beliefs, political beliefs, socioeconomic status, and citizenship status, without outright providing the information. This results in no significant differences regarding experiences Harassment/Discrimination due to social status.

Harassment engagements/witness

2 Group Comparison				
LGBTQI+		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor	LGBTQI+	72	2.4838	0.85450
	Not LGBTQI+	595	2.2759	0.82199

This factor measures the extent to which staff have provided assistance for others or witnessed others experiencing harassment. ABGLPQ+ staff reported higher overall scores than non-ABGLPQ+ staff on the Harassment Assistance and Experience Factor. Because ABGLPQ+ staff reported higher overall scores within Acted/Served as a Harassment Resource, it is not surprising that ABGLPQ+ staff would report higher scores with within this section as well. Being mandated reporters, with a higher rate of being used as a harassment resource, it is understandable that there would be higher reported scores of reporting incidents of harassment that are required to be reported. LGBTQIA+ staff may be more educated about what needs to be reported and more likely to be approached by queer students on campus.

Acted/served as a Harassment Resource

2 Group Comparison				
LGBTQI+		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Harassment Served as a Resource Factor	LGBTQI+	74	2.4189	0.93553
	Not LGBTQI+	589	2.0946	0.91180

This factor measures the different types of harassment that faculty have served as a resource around, including gender identity, racial/ethnic identity, and sexual orientation identity. ABGLPQ+ identified staff reported higher overall scores than non- ABGLPQ+ identified staff on the Harassment Served as a Resource Factor. These results are not surprising since other staff, faculty and/or students that are LGBTQIA+ identified, are more likely to seek out staff that are known to be LGBTQIA+ identified because they are more likely to be able to relate to sexuality and gender-specific harassment. With LGBTQIA+ identified staff being more likely to have experienced discrimination and harassment in their own personal lives, there is more likely to be shared understanding, which serves as a useful harassment resource.

Climate opinion factor

2 Group Comparison				
LGBTQI+		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Heard Racially Insensitive Remarks Factor	LGBTQI+	74	2.5169	1.00370
	Not LGBTQI+	606	2.2739	0.89411

2 Group Comparison				
LGBTQI+		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Climate Opinion: Has a lot of racial tension	LGBTQI+	75	2.93	1.044
	Not LGBTQI+	636	2.67	1.059

This factor measures staff perceptions of the campus climate across a range of issues. ABGLPQ+ staff reported overall higher scores for having heard racially insensitive remarks than non-ABGLPQ+ staff. These results are not surprising due to the heteronormative society we live in that has historically discriminated against the LGBTQIA+ community. Because of this, LGBTQIA+ identified staff are more responsive to insensitive remarks that may not be as obvious to people who have benefited from a heteronormative, white supremacist, patriarchal society.

ABGLPQ+ staff reported overall higher scores than non-ABGLPQ+ staff when asked about racial tension on campus. This likely reflects the fact that LGBTQIA+ experience exclusion and discrimination in a heteronormative society and may therefore be more attuned to instances of racial tension. LGBTQIA+ people also hold other, intersecting identities and may be exposed to racial tension on the basis of their own racial and ethnic identities.

There was no significant difference between ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ staff perceptions of the overall climate for engagement and diversity factor. There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ staff scores for Satisfaction with Campus Climate for the Overall Climate for Engagement and Diversity Factor. Given that there are no significant differences regarding the staff's opinion of Overall Climate for Engagement & Diversity, these results show that the institution has a lack of LGBTQIA+ representation and does not provide enough of a safe space for LGBTQIA+ identified staff to voice their opinions and concerns regarding Engagement & Diversity within the institution. There was no significant difference between ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ staff scores for perceptions of whether the campus Effectively communicates information about employee compensation and benefits.

Summary of Build Community

In the area of build community, there were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ staff and non- ABGLPQ+ with regards to timeliness or outcomes of administrative response to sexual assault, discrimination/bias, and campus emergencies. Similarly, there was no significant difference between scores for satisfaction with campus climate for diversity and inclusion factor nor were there significant differences with the campus climate for diversity and hiring actor. Lastly there were no significant differences for the experienced harassment/discrimination social status factor nor were there significant differences in staff perceptions of the overall climate for engagement and diversity. The significant differences were observed in the Harassment assistance and experience factor, where ABGLPQ+ Staff reported higher overall scores than non ABGLPQ+ staff. Following this pattern, ABGLPQ+ staff reported higher overall scores on the factor of Acted/Served as a harassment resource as well as higher scores for having heard racially insensitive remarks when compared to their non- ABGLPQ+ counterparts.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Based on the findings, it is clear that LGBTQIA+ are more likely to be trusted than non LGBTQIA+ staff when discussing sensitive matters such as discrimination and harassment. Moreover, LGBTQIA+ staff are also more keenly aware of instances of microaggressions that can be easily dismissed by a cisgender, white, heteronormative society. For example, the misgendering of LGBTQIA+ individuals is more likely to be noticed by other LGBTQIA+ individuals than non-LGBT individuals. We recommend that the university build training on how to identify, report, and support communities when these acts are committed so that this job of reporting harassment and discrimination does not only fall on the shoulders of LGBTQIA+ staff as well as other marginalized people. Furthermore, we recommend that LGBTQIA+ staff who are more likely to recognize harassment and discrimination, as well as more likely to be trusted as a resource to disclose this, are supported via additional staff assistance programs that include professionals trained in LGBTQIA+ mental health.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

Although we know that LGBTQIA+ staff were more likely to be confidants for individuals who experience harassment and discrimination, we do not know if these reports are coming from

students, other staff, or faculty. Furthermore, there are clear procedures for LGBTQIA+ staff members to report concerning incidents for students such as CARES and CAPS, there are no clear procedures for reporting these incidents when they occur to faculty and staff. As noted above, ABGLPQ+ staff have a lower score for job security, therefore it is possible that instances of harassment and discrimination remain underreported for fear of retaliation from the university or from supervisors.

Cultivate Resilience

Cultivating resilience refers to implementation of innovative, entrepreneurial, and forward-looking actions to strengthen the institution and support the aspirations of community members. This category measures staff perceptions of the campus across a range of related factors.

Institutional priority

This factor measures staff perceptions of the priorities of the institution. There was no significant difference between ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ staff scores for the Institutional Priorities Factor. Except for perceptions of the Institutional investment in creating and sustaining partnerships with surrounding communities, none of the institutional priorities addressed in this factor are likely to reflect or impact staff based on their sexual and gender identities. For example, perceptions of the Institutional investment in the physical appearance of campus, modernizing facilities, increasing prestige, and investing in the professional development of staff are all areas that staff across campus are likely to be more or less equally invested in and which deal with the campus infrastructure but not necessarily with equity and change that provide for the specific concerns of LGBTQIA+ staff.

Recommend employer factor

This factor measures staff perceptions of CSULB as an employer. There was no significant difference between ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ staff scores for the Recommend Work at CSULB Factor. This suggests that LGBTQIA+ staff and faculty are no more or less likely than non-LGBTQIA+ staff to recommend that a friend apply for a job at CSULB, including within their current department. They are also not more or less likely to apply or reapply for a position on campus. Given the lack of significant differences between LGBTQIA+ and non-LGBTQIA+ staff in other areas directly related to job description, expectations, professional development, and overall climate, it is not surprising that there were no significant differences in terms of whether or not they would recommend CSULB as an employer.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

There were no significant differences in the areas of institutional priority or in the area of recommending work at CSULB. This suggests that the CSULB campus still has a lot of work ahead to achieve “inclusive excellence,” which is the campus’ commitment to diversity and equity for all members of the community. For example, investment in the professional development of its LGBTQIA+ staff can potentially increase the score of ABGLPQ+ staff perception of CSULB as an employer. The fact that ABGLPQ+ staff is not more or less likely to apply to reapply for a position on campus suggests that retention of ABGLPQ+ staff is not a priority.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

We recommend that CSULB commit to hiring and retaining LGBTQIA+ staff. Furthermore, we recommend that CSULB commit to establishing and funding an LGBTQ+ Resource Center on

campus with full-time professional staff where resources and support for Staff, Faculty, and Students can be centralized.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

The scores above do not take into account the experiences of trans, nonbinary, and intersex staff therefore we may be missing important information about the experiences of staff who identify within these categories. Furthermore, staff data is not disaggregated between student-facing roles, and non-student facing roles which can potentially tell us more about LGBTQIA+ staff experiences on campus. It is unclear whether ABGLPQ+ staff who work directly with student are retained at higher rates than staff who do not work directly with students.

Age

Below data are provided for a number of factors where statistically significant differences were found based on the self-reported age of staff members who responded to the survey.

Expand Access

Stress: Childcare Factor

(I) Age (Cohort)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)
Stress: Childcare	35 and younger (born 1985 or later)	36 - 43 (born 1977 - 1984)	-.684*
		44 - 53 (born 1967 - 1976)	-.533*
	36 - 43 (born 1977 - 1984)	35 and younger (born 1985 or later)	.684*
		54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	.726*
	44 - 53 (born 1967 - 1976)	35 and younger (born 1985 or later)	.533*
		54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	.575*
	54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	36 - 43 (born 1977 - 1984)	-.726*
		44 - 53 (born 1967 - 1976)	-.575*

Job Satisfaction Benefits Factor

(I) Age (Cohort)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)
Job Satisfaction Compensation & Benefits Overall Factor	35 and younger (born 1985 or later)	54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	-.26649*
	54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	35 and younger (born 1985 or later)	.26649*

Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor

(I) Age (Cohort)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)
Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor	35 and younger (born 1985 or later)	44 - 53 (born 1967 - 1976)	-.39852*
		54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	-.47298*
	36 - 43 (born 1977 - 1984)	54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	-.25864*
	44 - 53 (born 1967 - 1976)	35 and younger (born 1985 or later)	.39852*
	54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	35 and younger (born 1985 or later)	.47298*
		36 - 43 (born 1977 - 1984)	.25864*

Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor

(I) Age (Cohort)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)
Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor	35 and younger (born 1985 or later)	54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	-.24273 [*]
	44 - 53 (born 1967 - 1976)	54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	-.25541 [*]
	54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	35 and younger (born 1985 or later)	.24273 [*]
		44 - 53 (born 1967 - 1976)	.25541 [*]

Institutional Priorities Factor

(I) Age (Cohort)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)
Institutional Priorities Factor	44 - 53 (born 1967 - 1976)	54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	-.29327 [*]
	54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	44 - 53 (born 1967 - 1976)	.29327 [*]

Cultivate Resilience

Personal Stress Factor

(I) Age (Cohort)	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)
Personal Stress Factor	35 and younger (born 1985 or later)	44 - 53 (born 1967 - 1976)	.20013 [*]
		54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	.29848 [*]
	36 - 43 (born 1977 - 1984)	54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	.23636 [*]
	44 - 53 (born 1967 - 1976)	35 and younger (born 1985 or later)	-.20013 [*]
	54 or older (born earlier than 1967)	35 and younger (born 1985 or later)	-.29848 [*]
		36 - 43 (born 1977 - 1984)	-.23636 [*]

Dependent care responsibilities

Engage All Students

Action factor

This factor measures how often staff have participated in activities that focus on diverse issues, differences, and issues of discrimination. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18.

Goal factors

This factor measures the extent to which staff agreed that it was their role to help students develop personal values, provide for students' emotional development, enhance students' knowledge and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, develop students' moral character, encourage students to become agents of social change, prepare students for employment after college, prepare students for graduate or advanced education, and encourage respect for different beliefs. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18.

Supervisor

This factor measures the extent to which staff agreed that their supervisor cares about their well-being, supports their professional development, sets unrealistic expectations for their job, demonstrates a commitment to diversity and inclusion, provides feedback that assists in performing job responsibilities, and advocates for them. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18.

Summary of Engaging All Students

Overall, there were no significant differences between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18 with respect to how often they have participated in activities with a "diversity" focus, how much they agree that their roles as staff are to help students develop personally and professionally, and how much they agree that their supervisor generally cares about and assists with their professional well-being.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

It is recommended to promote the campus resources for those with dependents and also to encourage departments and offices to offer hybrid programming to engage staff, students and faculty with dependent care.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

None.

Expand Access

Stress factor

This includes measures for degree to which staff have experienced stress due to personal, work-related, or other forms of stress. The Social & Environmental Work Stress Factor specifically measures other work-related facets that may cause stress, such as the physical work environment, workplace safety, and the review/promotion process. Child Care Stress is not

a factor, but an individual item that measures the extent to which staff are stressed specifically because of childcare.

This includes measures for the degree to which staff have experienced stress due to personal, work-related, or other forms of stress. The results for our campus show that staff who have one or more dependents under 18 have a lower average Social & Environmental Work Stress Factor score and a higher average Child Care Stress item score in comparison to staff with no dependents under 18.

Stress: Childcare Factor

Dependent Care Responsibilities		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Stress: Childcare	1 or More Dependents under 18	227	2.96	0.856
	No Dependents under 18	373	1.27	0.506

The Social & Environmental Work Stress Factor specifically measures other work-related facets that may cause stress, such as the physical work environment, workplace safety, and the review/promotion process. Child Care Stress is not a factor, but an individual item that measures the extent to which staff are stressed specifically because of childcare.

Stress Work Items Misc. Items General work stress Factor

Dependent Care Responsibilities		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Stress Work Items Misc. Items General work stress Factor	1 or More Dependents under 18	220	2.3617	0.42702
	No Dependents under 18	365	2.4387	0.43585

The results for our campus show that staff who have one or more dependents under 18 have a lower average Social & Environmental Work Stress Factor score and a higher average Child Care Stress item score in comparison to staff with no dependents under 18.

Opinion institutional factors

These factors measure the degree to which staff agree that the institution makes them feel respected, valued, part of the campus community, in alignment between their skills/role and their respective department, and balanced & belonged.

Dependent Care Responsibilities		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Institutional Opinion - My Skills & Role are Clearly Defined & Aligned with dept mission Factor	1 or More Dependents under 18	225	3.2252	0.49966
	No Dependents under 18	370	3.0703	0.56750

Dependent Care Responsibilities		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Institutional Opinion I Feel Valued Factor	1 or More Dependents under 18	226	3.0354	0.56654
	No Dependents under 18	358	2.9337	0.59406

Dependent Care Responsibilities		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Inst Opinion: I feel a sense of belonging to this campus	1 or More Dependents under 18	226	3.21	0.677
	No Dependents under 18	367	3.01	0.766

The results for our campus show that staff who have one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average Institutional Opinion on Skills & Role Clearly Defined & Aligned Factor score, a higher average Institutional Opinion on Feeling Valued Factor score, and a higher average Institutional Opinion on Sense of Belonging Factor score in comparison to staff with no dependents under 18.

Summary of Expand Access

While staff with one or more dependents under the age of 18 report higher average levels of stress related to childcare, they report lower average levels of stress related to their work environment. In addition, staff with one or more dependents under the age of 18 report higher scores related to whether they feel valued at work, and whether they feel a part of the campus community.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

It makes sense that childcare stress would be higher for staff who have one or more dependents under the age of 18 in comparison with staff who have no dependents under the age of 18. The lower levels of work-related stress, along with scores reflecting higher sense of being valued and being part of a community among staff with one or more dependents under the age of 18 suggests that the culture on campus may be favorable to those who have children. Considering these findings, we recommend that the campus continue to develop and implement supportive resources for staff with dependents under the age of 18, while also considering whether staff without children experience work-related pressures and/or alienation related to expectations of specific family structures. For example, it is possible that staff without children feel added pressure to invest more time and energy in work related activities and find it difficult to advocate for work life balance for themselves.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

It would be helpful to know what contributes to the higher sense of belonging and being valued among staff who have one or more dependents under the age of 18 so that the campus could continue to invest in those areas where staff with dependents thrive.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Job satisfaction overall factor

This factor measures staffs' satisfaction across several aspects of their job, including their relationships with co-workers and supervisors, balancing across work and life responsibilities, and the quality of their position overall.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18.

Job Satisfaction

This factor measures staffs' satisfaction across several aspects of compensation, including sick leave, vacation time, extended leave, and salary.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18.

Job Satisfaction II

This factor measures staffs' satisfaction across several aspects of health and retirement benefits, including cost of health benefits, quality of health benefits, and retirement benefits.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18.

Professional Development factor

These factors measure the extent to which staff have participated in professional development opportunities, including diversity-related trainings or workshops, optional technical skill development, leadership development, enhancement of interpersonal skills, job benefits training, public safety/security training, health and wellness programs, mentorship, networking events, and policy and procedure training.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

Overall, the findings show that there were no significant differences between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18 on any factors regarding Intellectual Achievement. This includes overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with compensation, satisfaction with health and retirement benefits, and engaging in professional development opportunities.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

It is recommended to promote staff research presentations at PCSW's Annual Women's Research Colloquium, the Leadership Fellows Program, the Data Fellows Program, along with continued sponsorship opportunities for Professional Conferences as offered by PCSW.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

None.

Build Community

Respect Factor

This factor measures the extent to which staff agreed that they feel respected by faculty, other staff members, students, senior administrators, and whether they feel their concerns are considered when making policy.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18.

Satisfaction factors

These factors measure staffs' satisfaction across several aspects of institutional practices and policies. The Satisfaction with Timeliness of Admin. Response Factor measures the extent to which staff are satisfied with how quickly administration responds to issues of sexual assault, discrimination/bias, and campus emergencies. The Satisfaction with Outcome of Response Factor measures the extent to which staff are satisfied with administration's outcome regarding the same issues.

Dependent Care Responsibilities		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfaction Timeliness & Outcome Admin Responses Factor	1 or More Dependents under 18	222	4.1652	1.31635
	No Dependents under 18	361	3.8153	1.35300

The results for our campus show that staff who have one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average Satisfaction with Timeliness of Admin. Response Factor score and a higher average Satisfaction with Outcome of Response Factor score in comparison to staff with no dependents under 18.

Dependent Care Responsibilities		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfaction Timeliness of Administrative Response Factor	1 or More Dependents under 18	228	4.2149	1.30555
	No Dependents under 18	371	3.8715	1.36888

Dependent Care Responsibilities		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfaction with Outcome of Response Factor	1 or More Dependents under 18	223	4.0972	1.38273
	No Dependents under 18	366	3.7623	1.43821

These factors measure staffs' satisfaction across several aspects of institutional practices and policies. The results for our campus show that staff who have one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average Satisfaction with Timeliness of Admin. Response Factor score and a higher average Satisfaction with Outcome of Response Factor score in comparison to staff with no dependents under 18.

The first factor measures the extent to which staff are satisfied with how quickly administration responds to issues of sexual assault, discrimination/bias, and campus emergencies. The second factor measures the extent to which staff are satisfied with the administration’s outcome regarding the same issues.

Discrimination

These factors measure the extent to which staff have been discriminated against or excluded from activities on the basis of their social identity (e.g., race/ethnicity, sexual orientation) or social status (e.g., dis/ability status, parent/guardian status). The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18.

Harassment engagements/witness

These factors are a measure of how often staff have witness, have been a target of, or have assisted others in response to their experiences with harassment on campus. The results for our campus show that staff who have one or more dependents under 18 have a lower average Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor score in comparison to staff with no dependents under 18.

Dependent Care Responsibilities		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor	1 or More Dependents under 18	221	2.2624	0.87488
	No Dependents under 18	360	2.3394	0.79744

Climate opinion: Has a lot of racial tension

This factor measures the extent to which staff perceive the campus as promoting opportunities for engagement and diversity. The results for our campus show that there were no significant differences in the Climate Opinion factor between staff with dependents under 18 and staff without. However, staff who have one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average score on the Climate Opinion of Racial Tension individual item in comparison to staff with no dependents under 18.

Dependent Care Responsibilities		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Climate Opinion: Has a lot of racial tension	1 or More Dependents under 18	228	2.71	1.043
	No Dependents under 18	374	2.68	1.045

The results for our campus show that there were no significant differences in the Climate Opinion factor between staff with dependents under 18 and staff without. However, staff who have one or more dependents under 18 have a higher average score on the Climate Opinion of Racial Tension individual item in comparison to staff with no dependents under 18.

Summary of Build Community

The higher average score for Harassment Assistance and Experience Factor among staff who do not have any dependents under the age of 18 may reflect increased availability to provide supportive services for those experiencing harassment in comparison with staff who have minor dependents. Staff without dependents under the age of 18 also report lower satisfaction with administrative responses to harassment. Both scores could be related to their higher levels of work-related stress factor scores (discussed above). However, staff with one or more dependents under the age of 18 report higher scores on perception of racial tensions on campus than those without any dependents under the age of 18.

Recommendations related to Build Community

It is recommended to continue to promote the Staff Professional Development opportunities and Campus-Wide programs for engagement to cultivate resilience as well as recognitions, benefits offered through Staff/HR. These also include the Employee Affinity Groups for Staff and Faculty. It is recommended to continue the opportunities and funding for campus-wide programs and services such as the existing Ally Trainings (Dreamers -AB540/LGBTQIA+Trans/Veterans/ as well as Gender Language Training from PCSW/WGEC and Intergroup Dialogue Series.

It is recommended to continue town halls for staff, with collaborated efforts in the future between the three President's Commissions (PCSW, Equity and Change and Sustainability) Because staff with one or more dependents under the age of 18 report higher perceptions of racial tension on campus but report higher satisfaction with administrative responses to harassment and lower scores related to having provided harassment assistance, we recommend a follow-up to assess the specific ways that racial tensions manifest in the lives of staff with one or more dependents under the age of 18. We make this recommendation because this seems to be the primary factor impacting staff with dependents under the age of 18 within this area of inquiry.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

None.

Cultivate Resilience

Institutional priority

These factors measure the extent to which staff believe their institution is committed to creating and sustaining partnership with surrounding communities, to increasing prestige, to professional development, to the physical appearance of the campus, and to building or modernizing campus facilities. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18.

Recommend employer factor

This factor measures the likelihood that staff would recommend that a friend apply for a job in their current department that a friend apply for a job at the institution, or that staff would apply or reapply for a position on campus themselves. The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

There were no differences in perceptions of Institutional Priority or Whether they would Recommend Employer factors for staff in relation to dependent care status. The results across the two factors measuring Cultivate Resilience consistently show that there are no significant differences in beliefs about the various ways the institution prioritizes its commitments or in the likelihood of recommending a friend or themselves apply to a campus position between staff with dependents under 18 and staff who have no dependents under 18.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

- Given the lack of significant findings, engage in continued program assessment.
- It is recommended promoting the Child and Family Development Center by CHHS Department of Family and Consumer Sciences as well as the Isabel Patterson Child & Development Center by Associated Students for childcare
- Ask additional questions that seek to elucidate potential issues of funding and access that may keep differently positioned staff members from participating in existing programs.

We recommend that our campus continue to provide supportive services to staff with dependent care responsibilities to maintain their satisfaction with CSULB as an employer.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

None.

Political

Engage All Students

Action factor

Political Views (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Action Staff Efforts to Engage Diversity Factor	Far Right, Conservative, Middle	335	2.3769	0.87716
	Liberal, Far Left	302	2.6457	0.87478

With regards to the factor of “action highlighting staff efforts to engage diversity”, there was a statistically significant difference between the Far-right, conservative and middle group and the Liberal and far-left group: the Liberal and far-left group had a higher level of satisfaction in this area. One of the questions about this factor was if you attended diversity-focused events. Perhaps those that are Liberal and far-left were more likely to attend such events, therefore answering why they might show higher satisfaction in this area.

Goal factors

Political Views (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Career Advancement, Stability Professional Development Satisfaction Factor	Far Right, Conservative, Middle	338	4.1612	1.10093
	Liberal, Far Left	307	3.9568	1.02778

The Career Advancement, Stability, and Professional Development factors showed statistically significant differences between the two groups. The Far-right, conservative and middle staff group showed a higher level of satisfaction than the Liberal and far-left staff group. This may be because generally older people are more conservative than younger ones and in terms of careers older people tend to be more successful than younger ones because they have been in the labor force for a longer period of time.

Supervisor

Political Views (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Supervisor Factor	Far Right, Conservative, Middle	334	3.2114	0.70280
	Liberal, Far Left	295	3.0881	0.73482

With regards to the Supervisor factor, there was a statistically significant difference between the Far-right, conservative and middle group and the Liberal and far-left groups: the Liberal and far-left group had a higher level of satisfaction in this area. The questions for this factor included whether your supervisor cared and advocated for you as well as if they supported your professional development. Also asked were if you received feedback to assist in your job performance and if your supervisor demonstrated a commitment to equity and inclusion. Those

staff members in the far-right and conservative group may not have appreciated the fact that their supervisor was interested in diversity and inclusion, and this may have contributed to the lower level of satisfaction for those staff members.

Summary of Engaging All Students

In the area of Engaging all Students it appears that staff members with a Liberal and far-left leaning show higher satisfaction in this area in all areas other than Career Goals. This may be due to the fact that liberals tend to be more racially sensitive and thus would be more amenable to the idea of engaging in diversity.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Having staff members participate in some sort of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion training might be helpful for the University to achieve one of their Beach 2030 Action Plans of Building an Equitable and Empowering Culture.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

Going forward it would be helpful to know why members of the Liberal and far-left groups had generally higher levels of satisfaction in this area. An additional survey of staff would be helpful and informative.

Expand Access

Stress Factors

Political Views (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Personal Stress Factor	Far Right, Conservative, Middle	337	2.7255	0.59789
	Liberal, Far Left	307	2.9088	0.51273

Political Views (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Stress: Childcare	Far Right, Conservative, Middle	341	1.99	0.991
	Liberal, Far Left	309	1.76	1.052

In terms of their political views, liberal and far left members of the CSULB staff reported greater personal stress and work stress than their far right, conservative, and middle counterparts. The difference between politically affiliated staff was most marked when it came to personal stress (as opposed to work stress), though stress related to childcare was greater among far right, conservative, and middle staff members when these staff members were compared with liberal and far left staff.

Opinion institutional factors

There were many areas for comparison when it came to staff opinions about CSULB as an institution. There was not a statistically significant difference between liberal and far left staff versus conservative, far right, and middle of the road staff when staff members rated the degree to which they feel valued, feel respected, and feel a part of the CSULB campus community. Similarly, there was not a statistically significant difference between the political groupings when it came to staff members' sense that they achieve a healthy personal and professional life

balance. In addition, the two political groupings did not exhibit a statistically significant difference when they gauged the extent to which their workload is manageable given the hours they are scheduled to work.

Political Views (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Institutional Opinion Sense of Belonging & Balance Factor	Far Right, Conservative, Middle	335	3.0478	0.56013
	Liberal, Far Left	303	2.9318	0.64345

Political Views (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Institutional Opinion My Skills & Role are Clearly Defined & Aligned with dept mission Factor	Far Right, Conservative, Middle	338	3.1716	0.56331
	Liberal, Far Left	309	3.0820	0.55156

Yet, despite this data, liberal and far left staff answered institutional opinion questions around belonging with lower scores than the conservative, far right, and middle of the road staff. There was a statistically significant difference between left leaning staff and moderate and right leaning staff such that further left staff members showed less agreement with the statement that they felt a sense of belonging to the campus. When far left and liberal staff rated the extent to which their skills and their role are clearly defined and aligned with their department mission, they also scored lower on average than far right, conservative, and middle of the road staff members.

Summary of Expand Access

Stress is certainly an area where differences emerge between staff members of different political persuasions. The political climate of the country at least since 2016, with President Trump’s racial antagonism and challenges to the rule of law, increased right-wing disinformation and radicalism, and an overall lack of action on the increasingly urgent climate crisis, could be seen as a cause of increased stress among liberal and far left staff. Given that CSULB is a Hispanic-Serving Institution, that President Trump’s policies directly supported the deportation and criminalization of undocumented members of the Hispanic community, and that Trump’s political campaigns drew heavily on anti-immigrant rhetoric and the militarization of the United States’ southern border, it is not surprising that many of CSULB’s liberal and far left staff members reported a greater sense of personal stress when taking this survey.

When it came to their opinions of CSULB as an institution, far left and liberal staff also felt less of a sense of belonging than staff of other political orientations; they also felt less of a sense that their skills and role were aligned with their department’s mission, though other, sometimes similar areas in this category saw a lack of statistically significant differences between the two political categories of staff.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

CSULB should plan more events for far left and liberal staff members that allow them to feel a greater sense of belonging to the campus and that, simultaneously, help them deal with the greater levels of stress that they face (in comparison with conservative, far left, and middle of the road staff). Guest speakers, service days, social events, and annual gatherings that allow faculty and staff members to bring their families and friends to campus to support some aspect

of our educational mission would all be promising ideas. Staff might also be asked to participate in campus lobby days to meet with legislators in Sacramento—an event that would allow them to express their political identity, support higher education without getting mired in politics, and get to know one another outside of the workplace. The CSULB Staff Union should also consider ways that it can assist and support its liberal and far left members who are struggling with their sense of belonging and stress levels.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

It would be useful in future surveys to gather data on the extent to which the political situation of the state, country, and world serves as a source of stress for staff members, especially during periods when the United States has a president from the opposite party of the staff member. Given that one's sense of politics is shaped by the news media, one's social circle, and one's personal history, it would also be useful to learn how staff members gain information about present-day politics.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Job satisfaction overall factor

There was not a statistically significant difference between the far right, conservative and middle and the Liberal, far left groups in terms of average ratings of their overall job satisfaction. This section of the survey included twelve questions with respect to overall satisfaction, it was interesting that with that many questions, there was still no significant difference between the two groups of staff.

Job Satisfaction

No statistically significant difference between the two groups was found in this factor.

Job Satisfaction II

No statistically significant difference between the two groups was found in this factor.

Professional development factor

There was also not a statistically significant difference between the far right, conservative and middle and the Liberal, far left groups with respect to Professional Development. The questions asked in this section were regarding support and prospects for career advancement and ongoing professional development.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

With respect to the factor of Promote Intellectual Achievement there was no statistically significant difference between the far right, conservative and middle and the Liberal, far left groups. The tables showed a slight difference between the two groups with the far right, conservative, and middle having a slightly higher level of satisfaction in this regard. This difference may be attributed to the fact that at the time of this poll a far-right leader oversaw our country and its politics. Perhaps this was a factor in the liberal and far left groups having a lower level of satisfaction. The only category which showed a statistically significant difference was that of Job Satisfaction- Compensation factor. This category showed that far right, conservative, and middle leaning groups had a higher level of satisfaction with compensation than the Liberal and far-left groups.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

The mean figures for the factor in Job Satisfaction were among the highest means in the staff tables. This may suggest that the University is doing an admirable job in this regard.

Recommendations would include continuing current practices and expanding professional development and work life balance for staff members.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

To understand the reason that Conservative, far right, and middle staff members had a higher level of satisfaction. Additional surveys of staff with specific questions would be useful.

Build Community

Respect

There was not a statistically significant difference between the far right, conservative, and middle political views on the one hand the liberal and far left political views on the other when it came to questions of staff members feeling respected.

Satisfaction factors

Political Views (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor	Far Right, Conservative, Middle	339	4.5140	0.93383
	Liberal, Far Left	305	4.3492	0.87465

Far right, conservative, and middle of the road staff members reported on average greater satisfaction with their compensation than staff members who identified as liberal or far left.

Discrimination

For the questions that concerned staff experiences of discrimination related to social status and staff experiences of discrimination based on social identity, there was not a statistically significant difference between, on the one hand, far right, conservative, and middle of the road staff and, on the other, liberal and far left staff.

Harassment engagements/witness

Political Views (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor	Far Right, Conservative, Middle	330	2.2025	0.81886
	Liberal, Far Left	301	2.4324	0.82947

For the questions related to harassment, there was not a statistically significant difference between far right, conservative, and middle of the road staff and, alternatively, liberal and far left staff in the average frequency of being sought out as a resource for someone facing harassment. Liberal and far left staff, however, did show a statistically significant difference from their far right, conservative, and middle of the road counterparts when it came to experiencing harassment and assisting someone who had been harassed.

Climate opinion factor

Political Views (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Heard Racially Insensitive Remarks Factor	Far Right, Conservative, Middle	335	2.1724	0.89761
	Liberal, Far Left	307	2.4511	0.87544

Political Views (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Climate Opinion: Has a lot of racial tension	Far Right, Conservative, Middle	343	2.62	1.104
	Liberal, Far Left	309	2.81	1.008

When staff members answered questions around the climate of CSULB as an institution, there were no statistically significant differences around some aspects of the climate on campus when conservative, far right, and middle of the road staff were compared with liberal and far left staff. These aspects were the degree to which CSULB effectively communicates information about employee compensation and benefits as well as how CSULB fosters a climate of diversity and engagement. Yet regarding the statement that CSULB as an institution has a lot of racial tension, liberal and far left staff showed greater average agreement with the statement when they were compared with staff identifying as conservative, far right, and middle of the road in terms of political orientation.

Summary of Build Community

When it comes to the topic of building community on campus for staff of different political orientations or identities, the survey indicated that liberal and far left staff (when compared with conservative, far right, and middle of the road staff) were less likely to be satisfied with their compensation, more likely to experience or assist those who experienced harassment, and more likely to view the climate on campus as having a lot of racial tension.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Given the three factors discussed in the summary of building community, it does seem likely that liberal and far left staff have a less positive experience of CSULB as a community and would benefit from additional institutional efforts to build community. It would be especially valuable for the university to work on reducing racial tension at the institution, as this work would clearly improve the sense of community among liberal and far left staff on a campus in a majority liberal state. Racial tension among staff and in the staff workplace would be an excellent topic for research and programming should the university's AACU Truth, Racial Healing, & Transformation (TRHT) Campus Center application be successful.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

Regarding the statistically significant difference between liberal and far left staff experiencing harassment and assisting those who experienced harassment and their staff counterparts who identify as conservative, far right, or middle of the road, it would be useful to know how staff of different political orientations identify and understand harassment. Similarly, it would be useful to find out if there were differences between the assorted political groups of staff about their understanding of racial tension. Could it be that far right, conservative, and middle of the road staff are unaware of harassment and racial tension, or that they are more likely to turn a blind

eye to harassment and racial tension than their liberal or far left counterparts? To what extent is a lack of awareness unconscious and to what extent is it consciously intertwined with one's political beliefs?

Cultivate Resilience

Institutional priority

There was not a statistically significant difference between the far right, conservative, and middle political views and the liberal and far left political views when it came to the question of Institutional Priority. The questions asked in this section referred to the Institution improving and maintaining the physical appearance of the campus as well as modernization of buildings. Additionally, the survey asked about sustaining partnerships with the surrounding community and maintaining institutional prestige. Finally, the survey asked about the institution's commitment to professional development.

Recommend employer factor

There was also not a statistically significant difference between the far right, conservative, and middle political views and the liberal and far left political views when it came to the factor or recommending employment at CSULB. The questions asked were whether you would recommend that a friend apply for a job at this institution, in your department, or that you would apply or reapply for a job on campus.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

To summarize the results of this portion of the survey for staff, I would say that no matter what your political affiliation most staff are quite satisfied with working at the University, would recommend to friends and would in fact apply again if the situation presented itself. This survey also shows high numbers for the Section on Institutional Priorities, and it appears that staff members are satisfied with this factor.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

To Cultivate Resilience among staff members the University needs to continue to offer Professional Development opportunities for staff so that they feel valued and appreciated as important members of the campus community. The numbers for this section of the survey were fairly high, which suggests to me that staff employees of all political affiliations feel satisfied working on campus. Continuing with the trend of keeping the physical appearance pleasing, modernizing buildings, sustaining partnerships with the community, and maintaining institutional prestige is recommended.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

The questions around cultivating resilience for staff members were answered thoroughly by staff members.

Role on Campus

A number of statistically different were found when comparing the type of role a staff person holds on campus. Below data are provided for those factors.

Engage All Students

Perceptions of Supervisor Factor

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Supervisor: Lacks the skills or knowledge to support me in my job	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	129	1.77	0.834
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	524	1.98	0.936

Staff Role in Student Development

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Role in Student Development Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	116	3.1767	0.56963
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	505	2.8322	0.69730

Expand Access

Institutional Opinion My Skills & Role are Clearly Defined & Aligned with dept mission

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Institutional Opinion My Skills & Role are Clearly Defined & Aligned with dept mission Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	133	3.3083	0.54064
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	540	3.0735	0.56064

Work Stress

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Work Stress Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	122	2.8492	0.53832
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	518	2.6239	0.58957

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Career Advancement & Professional Development Satisfaction

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Professional Development General Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	120	3.4683	0.44192
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	508	3.3134	0.59404

Job Satisfaction Compensation

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	126	4.9206	0.81649
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	531	4.2990	0.86994

Job Satisfaction Benefits

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Satisfaction Benefits Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	128	5.2708	0.84364
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	529	5.0195	0.81433

Job Satisfaction Compensation & Benefits Overall

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Satisfaction Compensation & Benefits Overall Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	126	5.0737	0.76382
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	522	4.6092	0.74306

Professional Development Career Advancement

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Professional Development Career Advancement Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	122	3.2705	0.62717
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	510	2.9369	0.73167

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Career Advancement, Stability Professional Development Satisfaction Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	128	4.6504	0.94605
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	527	3.9260	1.05616

Specific Job Satisfaction Overall

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Specific Job Satisfaction Overall Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	124	4.9644	0.66770
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	516	4.7723	0.72569

Build Community

Acted/served as a Harassment Resource

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Harassment Served as a Resource Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	122	2.3255	0.94854
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	519	2.0707	0.90036

Harassment Assistance & Experience

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	124	2.5430	0.88291
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	520	2.2413	0.80103

Institutional Opinion I feel a part of the campus community (professional community support, valued by those around me, valued by the campus community)

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Institutional Opinion I feel a part of the campus community Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	126	3.2937	0.44092
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	528	3.1809	0.45901

Institutional Opinion I Feel Respected

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Institutional Opinion I Feel Respected Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	130	3.7708	0.68477
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	545	3.5288	0.70768

Institutional Opinion I Feel Valued

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Institutional Opinion I Feel Valued Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	126	3.1111	0.58271
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	530	2.9264	0.59337

Climate Opinion Overall Climate for Engagement & Diversity

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
REV Climate Opinion Overall Climate for Engagement & Diversity Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	129	3.6157	0.73449
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	532	3.3247	0.89103

Satisfaction Timeliness of Administrative Response

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfaction Timeliness of Administrative Response Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	136	4.1838	1.33569
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	561	3.9103	1.35842

Satisfaction with Outcome of Response

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Satisfaction with Outcome of Response Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	131	4.0560	1.39912
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	552	3.7723	1.44814

Cultivate Resilience

Institutional Priorities

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Institutional Priorities Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	126	4.3651	0.73062
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	527	4.1901	1.05444

Recommend to Work at CSULB

Role (2 Group Comparison)		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Recommend Work at CSULB Factor	Senior and Mid-Level Administrator	129	3.3075	0.63685
	Admin Assistants, Analysts, Skilled Craft Worker	532	3.1021	0.66148

Years on campus

Group comparisons based on staff years on campus were made. Below data for those factors where there were statistical differences are provided.

Engage All Students

Supervisor Factor

(I) Years on Campus	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)
Supervisor Factor	Less than 5 years	11-15 years	.27590*
		More than 15 years	.24104*
	11-15 years	Less than 5 years	-.27590*
	More than 15 years	Less than 5 years	-.24104*

Expand Access

Personal Stress

(I) Years on Campus	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)
Personal Stress Factor	Less than 5 years	More than 15 years	.17086*
	More than 15 years	Less than 5 years	-.17086*

Stress: Child Care

(I) Years on Campus	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)
Stress: Childcare	Less than 5 years	11-15 years	-.337*
	11-15 years	Less than 5 years	.337*

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Career Advancement & Professional Development Satisfaction

(I) Years on Campus	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)
Career Advancement, Stability Professional Development Satisfaction Factor	Less than 5 years	5-10 years	.32395*
		11-15 years	.37171*
	5-10 years	Less than 5 years	-.32395*
	11-15 years	Less than 5 years	-.37171*

Job Satisfaction Compensation

(I) Years on Campus	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)
Job Satisfaction Compensation Factor	Less than 5 years	More than 15 years	-.32815*
	5-10 years	More than 15 years	-.33884*
	More than 15 years	Less than 5 years	.32815*
		5-10 years	.33884*

Build Community

Experience Discrimination Social Identity

(I) Years on Campus	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)
Experience Harassment/ Discrimination Social Identity Factor	Less than 5 years	More than 15 years	-.11593*
	More than 15 years	Less than 5 years	.11593*

Cultivate Resilience

Satisfaction with Compositional Diversity & Hiring Factor

(I) Years on Campus	Group I	Group J	Mean Difference (I-J)
Satisfaction Compositional Diversity & Hiring Factor	Less than 5 years	More than 15 years	.25347*
	More than 15 years	Less than 5 years	-.25347*

Level of Education

Group comparisons based on staff self-reported level of education. Below data for those factors where there were statistical differences are provided.

Engage All Students

Staff Role in Student Development

Level of Education		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Role in Student Development Factor	Associate Degree or Lower	104	2.7296	0.68975
	Bachelor Degree or Higher	528	2.9190	0.68045

Expand Access

Personal Stress

Level of Education		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Personal Stress Factor	Associate Degree or Lower	110	2.6023	0.59845
	Bachelor Degree or Higher	563	2.8437	0.55180

Work Stress

Level of Education		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Work Stress Factor	Associate Degree or Lower	106	2.4113	0.58932
	Bachelor Degree or Higher	561	2.7023	0.57893

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Professional Development Career Advancement

Level of Education		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Professional Development Career Advancement Factor	Associate Degree or Lower	106	2.8453	0.79966
	Bachelor Degree or Higher	551	3.0218	0.71795

Build Community

Harassment Assistance & Experience

Level of Education		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Harassment Assistance & Experience Factor	Associate Degree or Lower	110	2.0955	0.68606
	Bachelor Degree or Higher	549	2.3482	0.84991

Institutional Opinion My workload is manageable given the hours I'm scheduled to work

Level of Education		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Inst Opinion: My workload is manageable given the hours I'm scheduled to work	Associate Degree or Lower	114	3.06	0.790
	Bachelor Degree or Higher	568	2.88	0.805

Racial Insensitivity; heard racially insensitive remarks

Level of Education		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Heard Racially Insensitive Remarks Factor	Associate Degree or Lower	109	2.1307	0.79247
	Bachelor Degree or Higher	561	2.3324	0.91588

Cultivate Resilience

Institutional Priorities

Level of Education		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Institutional Priorities Factor	Associate Degree or Lower	110	4.4764	1.08872
	Bachelor Degree or Higher	564	4.1784	0.97100

Faculty

Entire Sample Descriptive statistics

HERI Factor Score	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Student-Centered Pedagogy	559	28.72	71.64	53.90	8.21
Civic-Minded Values	573	9.31	65.65	53.30	9.90
Civic-Minded Values	573	1.00	3.00	2.33	0.73
Civic-Minded Practices	533	37.46	73.49	49.39	8.52
Civic-Minded Practices	533	1.00	3.00	1.96	0.80
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus	532	25.31	65.19	49.31	9.65
Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement	541	31.17	70.24	50.49	9.90
Institutional Priority: Diversity	532	29.33	71.23	54.91	9.03
Institutional Priority: Prestige	531	29.22	66.12	44.54	8.04
Mentor Self-Efficacy	496	9.21	67.30	50.01	8.60
Scholarly Productivity	601	36.47	67.74	49.23	9.16
Scholarly Productivity Group	601	1.00	3.00	1.99	0.82
Respectful Climate	534	24.09	62.28	48.81	9.23
Satisfaction with Compensation	493	27.99	71.84	50.09	7.77
Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment	496	23.80	67.18	49.21	8.59
Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Group	496	1.00	3.00	1.95	0.72
Science Identity	54	35.55	60.56	50.36	7.50
Science Identity Group	54	1.00	3.00	1.85	0.81
Science Self-Efficacy	52	23.26	66.45	50.71	8.65
Career-Related Stress	515	13.21	74.17	50.12	9.97
Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development	578	10.96	64.40	52.12	9.62
Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Group	578	1.00	3.00	2.20	0.77

Engage All Students

Student-Centered Pedagogy & Civic-Minded Practices

On average, faculty reported actively engaging in student-centered pedagogy (n = 559; mean = 53.90; standard deviation = 8.21; min = 28.72; max = 71.64), but less in civic-minded practices (n = 533; mean = 49.39; standard deviation = 8.52; min = 37.46; max = 73.49).

Summary of Engaging All Students

While faculty report that they center students in the classroom, they do not report as much participation in civic-engagement activities.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Engagement in student-centered pedagogy requires a certain degree of cultural and political awareness on the part of faculty. As a result, it will be useful to identify which faculty are more likely to engage in both practices, and to encourage student-centered pedagogy that reflects student needs.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

None.

Expand Access

Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development & Mentor Self-Efficacy

On average, faculty reported high agreement with focus on undergraduate personal development (n = 578; mean = 52.12; standard deviation = 9.62; min = 10.96; max = 64.40).

On average, faculty reported high levels of mentor self-efficacy (n = 496; mean = 50.01; standard deviation = 8.60; min = 9.21; max = 67.30).

Summary of Expand Access

These findings suggest that faculty perceive themselves as effective mentors, and that they also perceive themselves as highly invested in undergraduate personal development.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Because faculty report high focus on undergraduate personal development, we recommend making resources available to faculty that support them in this process. For example, increasing awareness of and access to supportive services for students in relation to their long-term goals, access to internship programs, and other personal development programming.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

None.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment; Scholarly Productivity; Science Identity; Science Self-Efficacy

On average, faculty reported mid-level satisfaction with the professional work environment (n = 496; mean = 49.21; standard deviation = 8.59; min = 23.80; max = 67.18). On average, faculty reported low levels of scholarly productivity (n = 601; mean = 49.23; standard deviation = 9.16; min = 36.47; max = 67.74).

On average, faculty reported high levels of science identity (n = 54; mean = 50.36; standard deviation = 7.50; min = 35.55; max = 60.56).

On average, faculty reported high levels of science self-efficacy as well (n = 52; mean = 50.71; standard deviation = 8.65; min = 23.26; max = 66.45).

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

While faculty report high levels of science self-efficacy and science identity, suggesting that they view themselves as effective researchers and scholars, they also report low levels of scholarly productivity and only mid-level satisfaction with their professional work environment.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

These findings indicate that faculty do not have adequate time or resources to dedicate to their scholarly productivity. Because this is a pattern reflected in scores for all faculty, we recommend addressing the issue through increased opportunities for assigned time for Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA) for faculty at all levels, both tenure-track and non-tenure track.

We also recommend a general course reduction for faculty to provide a balance in teaching and research that reflects the high standards expected of faculty in both areas on our campus. For example, we recommend a campus wide maximum of a 3/3 teaching load for tenure-track and tenured faculty and offering of RSCA for adjunct faculty who currently have limited to no access to these course release opportunities.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

None.

Build Community

Respectful Climate; Civic-Minded Values; Civic-Minded Practices

On average, faculty reported mid-level agreement that the campus was a respectful climate (n = 534; mean = 48.80; standard deviation = 9.22; min = 24.09; max = 62.28).

On average, faculty reported holding high levels of civic-minded values (n = 573; mean = 53.30; standard deviation = 9.90; min = 9.31; max = 65.65).

On average, faculty reported engaging less in civic-minded practices (n = 533; mean = 49.39; standard deviation = 8.52; min = 37.46; max = 73.49).

Summary of Build Community

Low levels of reported engagement in civic-minded practices, paired with high levels of reported civic-minded values suggests that while faculty are invested in political and social issues, they are not directly involved in activities associated with those values. This may be due to their mid-level perception that the campus is a respectful climate, resulting in a reduced sense of need for civic engagement. Alternatively, this may reflect faculty investment in civic-minded values but limited time and resources to engage in related activities.

Recommendations related to Build Community

While faculty report mid-level agreement that the campus is a respectful climate, efforts should still be taken to improve the campus climate to reach high levels of agreement. To this end we recommend assessment of the types of civic-minded values faculty hold and which areas of civic engagement they perceive as being important. This can contribute to campus efforts to improve the climate for faculty across various investments and interests, while also creating additional areas for participation among faculty interested in civic engagement.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

None.

Cultivate Resilience

Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus; Institutional Priority: Diversity; Institutional Priority: Prestige; Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement; Civic-Minded Values; Satisfaction with Compensation; Career-Related Stress

On average, faculty reported mid-level perceptions of the climate for diversity on campus (n = 532; mean = 49.31; standard deviation = 9.65; min = 25.31; max = 65.19).

On average, faculty reported mid-level agreement that diversity is an institutional priority (n = 532; mean = 54.91; standard deviation = 9.03; min = 29.33; max = 71.23).

On average, faculty reported mid-level agreement that prestige is an institutional priority (n = 531; mean = 44.54; standard deviation = 8.04; min = 29.22; max = 66.12).

On average, faculty reported mid-level agreement that civic engagement is an institutional priority (n = 541; mean = 50.49; standard deviation = 9.90; min = 31.17; max = 70.24).

On average, faculty reported holding high levels of civic-minded values (n = 573; mean = 53.30; standard deviation = 9.90; min = 9.31; max = 65.65).

On average, faculty reported mid-level satisfaction with compensation (n = 493; mean = 50.09; standard deviation = 7.77; min = 27.99; max = 71.84).

On average, faculty reported high levels of career-related stress (n = 515; mean = 50.12; standard deviation = 9.97; min = 13.21; max = 74.17).

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

Overall, faculty report mid-level satisfaction with and perception of the climate for and prioritization of diversity on campus, as well as institutional investments in civic engagement and prestige. They also report high levels of career-related stress, and mid-level satisfaction with compensation.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

Because faculty report high levels of career-related stress paired with mid-level satisfaction with compensation, we recommend review and revision of the RTP process to account for campus expectations and support. The mid-level ranking of institutional investment in prestige suggests that faculty do not perceive the institution as prioritizing or supporting scholarly innovation to a high enough degree, particularly given high publication and teaching expectations for tenure-track faculty. This also reflects the lack of support for adjunct faculty to pursue their research, so we recommend an increase in opportunities for adjunct faculty to receive assigned time or compensation for research. These patterns in perceptions of institutional priority, when paired with mid-level perceptions of the climate for and prioritization of diversity on campus may also reflect perceptions that the university does not support innovative scholarship, or the hiring of innovative or star scholars in areas that are less representative of marginalized voices. As a result, we recommend increased investment in cutting edge research among faculty at all ranks that investigate issues of equity and diversity.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

There are likely to be differences in reported scores for faculty across colleges and departments. It would be beneficial to identify how scores vary in relation to area of study and specialization.

Race/ethnicity

Engage All Students

Student-Centered Pedagogy & Civic-Minded Practices

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Civic-Minded Practices	Not POC	304	48.3860
	POC	199	50.3364

People of Color reported significantly higher scores on Civic-Minded Practices than those not of color. There were no differences based on race/ethnicity for student-centered pedagogy.

Summary of Engaging All Students

Compared to faculty not of color, faculty of color had a higher level of involvement in civic activities such as advising student groups involved in service/volunteer work, collaborating with local community in research/service, or just spending more hours engaged in public service either directly or embedding community services as part of coursework. There were no differences based on race/ethnicity in how faculty use student-centered teaching and evaluation methods in their course instruction.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Develop at least one service-learning opportunity for students. Additionally, all colleges can be encouraged to provide opportunities for students. Encourage reflective service learning for all graduates from the Beach. For example, the following website provides suggestions https://www.gtc.edu/sites/default/files/files/documents/Service_Learning_Reflection_Toolkit.pdf. Finally, direct students to the center of community engagement.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

None.

Expand Access

People of Color reported significantly higher scores on Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development than those not of color. There were no differences based on race/ethnicity for Mentor self-efficacy.

Summary of Expand Access

Faculty of color expressed a higher belief that personal development is a central goal for undergraduate education compared to faculty not of color. There was no difference based on race/ethnicity in faculty members' confidence in their ability to effectively mentor students.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Redefine mentorship to include personal development
Train faculty on how to effectively mentor our diverse students

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

None

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment; Scholarly Productivity; Science Identity; Science Self-Efficacy

There were no differences based on race/ethnicity for Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment, Scholarly Productivity, Science Identity, Science Self-efficacy.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

There was no difference based on race/ethnicity in how satisfied faculty were with their working environment or scholarly activity. Additionally, the extent to which faculty conceive of themselves as scientists and faculty members' efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy was similar for both faculty of color and those not of color.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Because this data does not speak to specific racial/ethnic groups, we recommend more in-depth studies and analysis of the experiences of BIPOC faculty. We also recommend that efforts to promote intellectual achievement be undertaken in collaboration with racial and ethnic faculty groups on campus.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

It would be helpful to know the specific racial/ethnic identities of faculty who participated in the survey and whether there are differences when broken down into more distinct categories.

Build Community

Respectful Climate; Civic-Minded Values; Civic-Minded Practices Factors

People of Color (POC)		N	Mean
Civic-Minded Values	Not POC	306	52.2160
	POC	203	54.9992
Civic-Minded Practices	Not POC	304	48.3860
	POC	199	50.3364

People of Color reported significantly higher scores on Civic-Minded Values and Civic-Minded Practices than those not of color. There were no differences based on race/ethnicity for Respectful Climate.

Summary of Build Community

Compared to faculty not of color, faculty of color had a higher level of involvement in civic activities such as advising student groups involved in service/volunteer work, collaborating with local community in research/service, or just spending more hours engaged in public service either directly or embedding community services as part of coursework. Additionally, faculty of color had a stronger belief that civic engagement is a central part of the college mission compared to faculty not of color. There was no difference based on race/ethnicity in the extent to which faculty feel their contributions are respected or appreciated by their colleagues.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Recognize diverse types of civic-minded practices (note: move beyond formal volunteering in recognized organizations to more diverse and informal engagements with community).

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

What are current “civic-minded” practices? Which are more impactful in building community?

Cultivate Resilience

Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus; Institutional Priority: Diversity; Institutional Priority: Prestige; Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement; Civic-Minded Values; Satisfaction with Compensation; Career-Related Stress

People of Color (POC)		N	Mean
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus	Not POC	306	50.2471
	POC	192	48.0498
Institutional Priority: Prestige	Not POC	311	43.3661
	POC	196	46.5566

People of Color reported significantly lower scores on Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus than those not of color. People of color reported higher scores on Institutional Priority: Prestige and Civic Minded Values than those not of color. There were no differences based on race/ethnicity for Institutional Priority for Diversity, Civic Engagement, Satisfaction with Compensation, or Career-Related Stress.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

Faculty of color had a lower level of agreement that the campus climate is equitable for faculty members of diverse backgrounds. This includes a lower belief that diverse faculty like those of color, women, LGBTQ are treated fairly. However, faculty of color had a higher believe that their institution is committed to increasing its prestige and civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. There was no difference based on race/ethnicity in faculty members’ belief that CSULB is committed to creating a diverse multicultural campus environment, is committed to facilitating civic engagement among students and faculty, satisfaction with compensation packages, and the amount of stress faculty experience related to their career.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

Address the underlying causes of low perception of climate for diversity. Improve climate for diversity on campus by increasing representation of faculty of color and support their success.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

What are the factors that lead to significantly lower scores on perception of the climate for diversity on campus among people of color?

Women of Color

Engage All Students

Student-Centered Pedagogy; Civic-Minded Practices Factors

BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Student-Centered Pedagogy	Not WOC	391	53.2065
	WOC	121	55.3431
Civic-Minded Values	Not WOC	405	51.8468
	WOC	124	57.0904

Student-Centered Pedagogy Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty use student-centered teaching and evaluation methods in their course instruction, including with student presentations, student evaluations of each others' work, class discussions, cooperative small-group learning, experiential learning & field studies, group projects, reflective writing or journaling, and using student inquiry to drive learning.

The results for our campus show that Women of Color faculty have a higher average Student-Centered Pedagogy Factor score in comparison to faculty who are not Women of Color.

Civic-Minded Practices Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty have advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work, collaborated with local communities in research/teaching to address their needs, made community service a part of their coursework, dedicated weekly hours to community or public service, and engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay.

The results for our campus show that Women of Color faculty have a higher average Civic-Minded Practices score in comparison to faculty who are not Women of Color.

Summary of Engaging All Students

BIPOC women faculty reported using more student-centered teaching and evaluation methods in their course instruction compared to white women faculty. BIPOC women faculty also had a higher level of involvement in civic activities such as advising student groups involved in service/volunteer work, collaborating with local community in research/service, or just spending more hours engaged in public service either directly or embedding community services as part of coursework.

Across the two factors for this section, the findings consistently show that Women of Color faculty were more likely to report using student-centered pedagogy in their courses and encouraging students to engage in various civically-minded activities compared to faculty who are not Women of Color.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Align with Beach 2030 goal to “reimagine faculty” to elevate student-centered pedagogy and civic-minded practices in tenure and review process. Embed building community into RTP policy at each College.

Women of color faculty at CSULB are to be commended for engaging in student-centered pedagogy and civic-minded practices at higher rates than other faculty. We believe that this finding helps support our recommendation for greater investment in hiring and retaining more faculty of color. This also suggests the need for compensating women of color faculty for such work, which tends to be more time intensive and contributes to cultural taxation.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

How are these civic-minded activities viewed by white faculty?

Expand Access

Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Group; Mentor Self-Efficacy Factors

This factor measures the extent to which faculty agree that it is their role to develop students’ moral character, provide for students’ emotional development, help students develop personal values, and encourage respect for different beliefs.

The results for our campus show that Women of Color faculty have a higher average Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development score in comparison to faculty who are not Women of Color.

Mentor Self-Efficacy Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty are confident in their ability to effectively mentor students. This includes providing constructive feedback to mentees, taking into account the biases and prejudices they bring into the mentor/mentee relationship, working effectively with mentees whose personal background is different from their own, being an advocate for mentees, helping mentees network effectively, and helping mentees acquire financial resources.

The results for our campus show that Women of Color faculty have a higher average Mentor Self-Efficacy Factor score in comparison to faculty who are not Women of Color.

Summary of Expand Access

BIPOC women faculty expressed a higher belief that personal development is a central goal for undergraduate education and had greater confidence in their ability to effectively mentor students compared to white women faculty.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Based on these findings we recommend that each college embed mentorship and student development into the RTP process, and that these qualities be considered as central in the review process. We also recommend that lecturer faculty be compensated for their participation in student development and mentorship, particularly for lecturer BIPOC women faculty, since they are likely to provide supportive services for marginalized students but are not compensated for service as part of their job description. We also recommend that efforts to Expand Access be undertaken in collaboration with BIPOC women faculty groups on campus.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

Are there differences in reported engagement among BIPOC women faculty in relation to lecturer or tenure-track status.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Factor

This factor is a unified measure of the extent to which faculty are satisfied with their working environment. Aspects of the work environment included autonomy and independence, departmental leadership, relative equity of salary and job benefits, flexibility in relation to family matters or emergencies, and leave policies.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color faculty and faculty who are not Women of Color.

Scholarly Productivity Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty engaged in scholarly activity such as publishing academic and professional journal articles, publishing chapters in edited volumes, and having professional writings published or accepted for publication in the past three years.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color faculty and faculty who are not Women of Color.

Science Self-Efficacy Factor

This factor is a measure of faculty members' efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy based on the STEM courses they taught in the previous year. Faculty were asked how often they encouraged students to use technical science skills (use of tools, instruments, and/or techniques), generate a research question, determine how to collect appropriate data, explain the results of a study, use scientific literature to guide research, integrate results from multiple studies, ask relevant questions, identify what is known and not known about a problem, understand scientific concepts, and see connections between different areas of science and mathematics.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color faculty and faculty who are not Women of Color.

Science Identity Factor

This factor is a measure describing the extent to which faculty conceive of themselves as scientists. Faculty were asked to what extent they found it true that they have a strong sense of belonging to a community of scientists, derive great personal satisfaction from working on a team that is doing important research, think of themselves as a scientist, and feel like they belong in the field of science.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color faculty and faculty who are not Women of Color.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

The results for this section of Intellectual Achievement indicate that there were no significant differences between Women of Color faculty and all other faculty in terms of satisfaction with the professional work environment, their scholarly productivity, their ability to increase students' science self-efficacy, or their own perceptions of themselves as scientists.

There was no difference between BIPOC and white women faculty in how satisfied faculty were with their working environment or scholarly activity. Additionally, the extent to which faculty conceive of themselves as scientists and faculty members' efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy was similar for both BIPOC and white women faculty.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Because both groups report similar satisfaction with their work environment, scholarly productivity, science identity, and self-efficacy, we recommend further inquiries into the experiences and perceptions of women faculty on campus, and whether there are differences in the ways that BIPOC and non-BIPOC women faculty think about these areas of their work life and experience.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

While it is recognized that the differences between who are and who are not Women of Color, we also acknowledge the trend of results showing slightly higher (re: insignificant) values for faculty who are not Women of Color in each factor with the exception of "Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Factor + Group."

Given this information, and that the results provide an aggregate account of climate experience, the following questions remain:

- Would significant differences occur if/when results are disaggregated by college and by department?
 - If so, what are the structural, interpersonal, and personal experiences by faculty that contribute to those differences?
 - And, how can the university establish (or remove) policies and practices that exacerbate those differences?

Did these scores reflect high, middle, or low satisfaction across each of these factors?

Build Community

Respectful Climate; Civic-Minded Values; Civic-Minded Practices Factors

BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Civic-Minded Values	Not WOC	405	51.8468
	WOC	124	57.0904
Civic-Minded Practices	Not WOC	389	48.8697
	WOC	121	50.4136

BIPOC women faculty reported significantly higher scores on Civic-Minded Values and Civic-Minded Practices than white women faculty. There were no differences between the two groups for Respectful Climate.

Respectful Climate Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe that personal development is a central goal for undergraduate education. Faculty were asked to rate to what extent they agree that their role includes helping to develop students' moral character, provide for students' emotional development, help students develop personal values, and encourage respect for different beliefs.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color faculty and faculty who are not Women of Color.

Civic-Minded Values Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. This includes enhancing students' knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, encouraging students to become agents of social change, and believing that colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues.

The results for our campus show that Women of Color faculty have a higher average Civic-Minded Values score in comparison to faculty who are not Women of Color.

Civic-Minded Practices Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty have advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work, collaborated with local communities in research/teaching to address their needs, made community service a part of their coursework, dedicated weekly hours to community or public service, and engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay.

The results for our campus show that Women of Color faculty have a higher average Civic-Minded Practices score in comparison to faculty who are not Women of Color.

Summary of Build Community

We conclude from these results that, with the exception of the Respectful Climate Factor, Women of Color faculty reported significantly higher averages for beliefs about civic engagement being a central goal of undergraduate education and have integrated those beliefs into their curriculum and practice as instructors and advisors to students and student groups.

Compared to white women faculty, BIPOC women faculty had a higher level of involvement in civic activities such as advising student groups involved in service/volunteer work, collaborating with local community in research/service, or just spending more hours engaged in public service either directly or embedding community services as part of coursework. Additionally, BIPOC women faculty had a stronger belief that civic engagement is a central part of the college mission compared to white women faculty. There was no difference between the two groups in the extent to which faculty feel their contributions are respected or appreciated by their colleagues.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Because both groups feel that their contributions are respected or appreciated by their colleagues, we recommend further consideration of the ways that contributions to community and civic mindedness are rewarded in the RTP process, specifically for BIPOC women faculty who report higher levels of involvement in these areas. We also recommend that these efforts be undertaken in collaboration with BIPOC women faculty groups on campus.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

In light of the significant differences in this section, the following questions remain, all of which are relevant to what we perceive may be additional demands on Women of Color's time as it relates to instruction and student mentorship, compared to faculty who are not Women of Color.

- Is it the case that Women of Color faculty are building community amongst themselves on campus? This may account for the difference between them and non-Women of Color faculty.
- Alternatively, could it be the case that Women of Color faculty build community at increased rates in response to (and to cope with) their relatively lower numbers of representation on campus and in academia broadly?

How do white women faculty view collaborations with local communities in research/service and civic engagement? How do BIPOC women faculty become involved in higher levels of civic engagement and public service? Answering these questions will provide a basis for recommendations that attend to specific labor expectations projected onto and needs associated with BIPOC women faculty and their roles on campus.

Cultivate Resilience

Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus and Institutional Priority: Prestige Factors

BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus	Not WOC	392	50.1479
	WOC	114	46.8997
Institutional Priority: Prestige	Not WOC	392	44.0105
	WOC	118	46.4651

BIPOC women faculty reported significantly lower scores on Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus than white women faculty. BIPOC women faculty reported higher scores on Institutional Priority: Prestige and Civic Minded Values than white women faculty. There were no differences based between the groups for Institutional Priority for Diversity, Civic Engagement, Satisfaction with Compensation, or Career-Related Stress.

Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus Factor

This factor represents faculty's perspectives about the climate for faculty members from diverse backgrounds. This includes ratings of the effectiveness of hiring practices and policies that increase faculty diversity, of taking responsibility for educating underprepared students, and how fairly faculty of color, women faculty, and LGBTQ faculty are treated.

The results for our campus show that Women of Color faculty have a lower average Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus Factor score in comparison to faculty who are not Women of Color.

Institutional Priority: Diversity Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to creating a diverse multicultural campus environment. Faculty rated how important they believe the university prioritized recruiting more traditionally underrepresented students, promoting gender diversity in the faculty and administration, promoting racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty and administration, developing an appreciation for multiculturalism, and increasing or maintaining institutional affordability.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color faculty and faculty who are not Women of Color.

Institutional Priority: Prestige Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to increasing its prestige. This includes perceptions on the institution's ability to increase or maintain prestige, hire faculty "stars", and maintain a competitive student admissions process.

The results for our campus show that Women of Color faculty have a higher average Institutional Priority: Prestige Factor score in comparison to faculty who are not Women of Color.

Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to facilitating civic engagement among students and faculty. Faculty rated how important they believe the university prioritized facilitating student involvement in community service, providing resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research, and creating and sustaining partnerships with surrounding communities.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color faculty and faculty who are not Women of Color.

Civic-Minded Values Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. This includes enhancing students' knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, encouraging students to become agents of social change, and believing that colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues.

The results for our campus show that Women of Color faculty have a higher average Civic-Minded Values score in comparison to faculty who are not Women of Color.

Satisfaction with Compensation Factor

This factor is a unified measure of the extent to which faculty are satisfied with their compensation packages, including salary, health benefits, retirement benefits, opportunities for scholarly pursuits, teaching load, and prospects for career advancement.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color faculty and faculty who are not Women of Color.

Career-Related Stress Factor

This factor measures the amount of stress faculty experience related to their career in the past year. Faculty were asked to report the extent to which they were stressed by the following:

committee work, students, research or publishing demands, institutional procedures/red tape, teaching load, lack of personal time, and self-imposed high expectations.

The results for our campus show that there was no significant difference between Women of Color faculty and faculty who are not Women of Color.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

The findings in this section present mixed results. Although there were no significant differences between Women of Color faculty and non-Women of Color faculty for most factors, Women of Color faculty reported significantly lower perceptions of the institution's climate as being diverse and significantly higher scores for perceptions of the institution being committed to increasing prestige and in their belief that civic-engagement is a central part of the college's mission.

BIPOC women faculty had a lower level of agreement that the campus climate is equitable for faculty members of diverse backgrounds. This includes a lower belief that diverse faculty like those of color, women, LGBTQ are treated fairly. However, BIPOC women faculty had a higher believe that their institution is committed to increasing its prestige and civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. There was no difference between the groups in faculty members' belief that CSULB is committed to creating a diverse multicultural campus environment, is committed to facilitating civic engagement among students and faculty, satisfaction with compensation packages, and the amount of stress faculty experience related to their career.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

Despite their critical contributions to the campus community and student success, there are concerns about the campus climate women of color experience when it comes to support for faculty of color, women faculty and LGBTQ+ faculty. Given that women of color faculty report higher levels of mentorship and civic engagement in their engagement with students than other faculty, we recommend that the university provide compensation (for example assigned time or stipends) for such work.

Higher reported beliefs by BIPOC women faculty that the institution is committed to increasing prestige and civic engagement, paired with lower reported levels of agreement that the campus climate is equitable for faculty members of diverse backgrounds, indicates that there is a mismatch between campus priorities and actions. Because of their unique insights at the intersections of racism and sexism, it is important to take the perceptions of BIPOC women faculty who are reporting these experiences. As a result, we recommend assessment of the practices and outcomes that administrators pursue in attempts to increase the diversity, prestige, and civic engagement for the university, and that steps be taken to increase equitable outcomes for faculty across identities and backgrounds. These approaches should be informed by diverse faculty across the colleges and should reflect the needs and interests of those who these practices will impact, including revised policies and procedures for ensuring equity and inclusion across campus. As such, we recommend that these efforts be undertaken in collaboration with BIPOC women faculty groups on campus.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

None.

Sex (Status of Women)

The following points should be considered when interpreting the results for this section (drafted in partnership between PCSW and LGBTQIA+CC):

- Sex is generally used to refer to the category people are assigned at birth, primarily based on genitalia (male, female, intersex), whereas gender refers to a person's gender identity (man, woman, genderqueer, nonbinary, etc.). The categories in this section refer to people's gender identities, but the language in the survey used to reference gender was "sex". To match with the survey data, we use sex when referencing data but also use gender to discuss possible explanations for findings.
- Options on the survey collapsed "man/trans man" and "woman/trans woman" as categories. Further disaggregation of the data revealed significantly fewer data points from trans identified men and women, specifically. Although these data were included in the analysis, it should be noted that the findings are overwhelmingly representative of cis identified women's and men's climate perceptions. There were genderqueer (et....name the options), which means we are able to speak to some extent on the potential impacts for people whose gender is considered to fall outside of social expectations.
- For more analysis on potential impacts and explanation for genderqueer and nonbinary people, there is further discussion in the LGBTQIA+ section of the report.

An Important Note Regarding Language: Though we acknowledge the effort to be inclusive, this survey grouped trans and cisgender people together: "men/trans men" and "women/trans women." By collapsing cisgender and transgender people together the survey dismisses the specific types of gender marginalization that transgender people face. The combining of trans and cisgender men and women results in a lack of data speaking to differences in experiences of transgender and cisgender students, both on and off campus, in the context of a cisnormative society.

Engage All Students

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' centering of students and service in their pedagogical approach.

Student-Centered Pedagogy Factor

BOLD Indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Student-Centered Pedagogy	Man/Trans Man	202	51.4911
	Woman/Trans Woman	325	55.1350

This factor measures the extent to which faculty use student-centered teaching and evaluation methods in their course instruction, including with student presentations, student evaluations of each other's work, class discussions, cooperative small-group learning, experiential learning & field studies, group projects, reflective writing or journaling, and using student inquiry to drive learning.

The results for our campus show that women faculty have a higher average Student-Center Pedagogy Factor score in comparison to men faculty.

Civic-Minded Practices Factor

BOLD Indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Civic-Minded Practices	Man/Trans Man	199	48.5540
	Woman/Trans Woman	305	49.6972

This factor measures the extent to which faculty have advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work, collaborated with local communities in research/teaching to address their needs, made community service a part of their coursework, dedicated weekly hours to community or public service, and engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay.

The results for our campus show that women faculty have a higher average Civic-Minded Practices score in comparison to men faculty.

Summary of Engaging All Students

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' centering of students and service in their pedagogical approach. Women faculty have a higher average Civic-Minded Practices score and a higher average Student-Center Pedagogy Factor score in comparison to men faculty. These results indicate that women faculty are more likely than men faculty to center students and service in their approach to teaching.

Women faculty report higher use of student-centered teaching and evaluation methods, as well as higher levels of engagement with student and community groups in civic-minded ways. Due to their marginal gender status, women are likely to be more attuned to issues of equity than men of similar race, class, and sexual identities as them. This may result in increased investment in these areas of work.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Because student-centered teaching and evaluation methods align with our campus investment in student success, we recommend that student centered teaching and community engagement be favorably included in RTP evaluations. Considering these contributions as key to our students and campus community can go a long way to address gender inequities in labor that sustains and builds the community.

- Ask additional questions to better understand why men faculty at this university are less likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching, and why women faculty members are more likely to do so. See below.
- Develop targeted outreach, programming, messaging, and resources to motivate and increase the likelihood that men faculty will center students and service in their approach to teaching.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

Determining the reasons why faculty members are more and less likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching, and how/why this relates to "sex" distinctions (see "sex" section introduction above), will be beneficial for creating a more strategic approach to outreach, programming, messaging, and resources, to better support reaching this goal.

Also, learning more about the specifics of how faculty members are centering (or not) students and service in their approach to teaching may reveal trends that can help to shape programs and interventions. Knowing that there may be variability in the identification and development of student and service centered approaches, it may be advantageous to follow up with specific narrative or focus group studies on how differently positioned faculty members may understand and operationalize these practices.

We do not know if there are differences for transgender and cisgender faculty.

- Why are men faculty members less likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching?
- Why are women faculty members more likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching?
- Are other approaches to student empowerment and success being pursued among faculty members who are less likely to center students and service?

Expand Access

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' perception of their role in relationship to students' moral and emotional development as well as their confidence in their ability to be an effective mentor.

Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Factor

BOLD Indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development	Man/Trans Man	208	49.9864
	Woman/Trans Woman	337	53.3461

This factor measures the extent to which faculty agree that it is their role to develop students' moral character, provide for students' emotional development, help students develop personal values, and encourage respect for different beliefs. The results for our campus show that women faculty have a higher average Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development score in comparison to men faculty.

Mentor Self-Efficacy Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty are confident in their ability to effectively mentor students. This includes providing constructive feedback to mentees, taking into account the biases and prejudices they bring into the mentor/mentee relationship, working effectively with mentees whose personal background is different from their own, being an advocate for mentees, helping mentees network effectively, and helping mentees acquire financial resources. There were no gender differences in faculty perceptions of their efficacy as mentors.

Summary of Expand Access

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' perception of their role in relationship to students' moral and emotional development as well as their confidence in their ability to be an effective mentor. Results show that women faculty, in comparison with men faculty, are more likely to see their role as a faculty member as contributing to students' moral and emotional development, including encouraging respect for different beliefs.

The only significant gender difference in scores for Expand Access was focus on undergraduate personal development. This suggests that women faculty see student personal development and mentorship as more central to their roles as faculty members than do men faculty.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Higher levels of investment in and belief that it is their job to promote student personal development also results in increased workload expectations for women faculty. As a result, we recommend that support of student personal development be ranked positively in the RTP process across all colleges. We also recommend that both tenure-track and adjunct faculty be provided with compensation through assigned time or course credits when they engage in exceptional amounts of student personal development and support since women faculty in both groups are likely to do a large amount of this labor.

- Ask additional questions to better understand why men faculty are less likely, and women faculty are more likely, to conceptualize their role as one that should contribute to students' moral and emotional development, including encouraging respect for different beliefs. See below.
- Develop targeted outreach, programming, and resources to increase the likelihood that men faculty will critically reflect on their role as faculty members relative to the goal of contributing to students' moral and emotional development, with an emphasis on encouraging respect for different beliefs.
- Continue to monitor faculty members' confidence in their ability to act as effective mentors through routine program assessments, including a consideration of how and why resources are distributed to support mentorship.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

We do not know if there are differences for transgender and cisgender faculty.

Determining the reasons why faculty members are more and less likely to conceptualize their role as one that should contribute to students' moral and emotional development, including encouraging respect for different beliefs, and how/why this relates to "sex" distinctions (see "sex" section introduction above—which has here also been addressed as gender-based ideologies), will be beneficial for creating a more strategic approach to outreach, programming, messaging, and resources, to better support reaching this goal. In order to support wider diversity and inclusion goals, it is particularly important to understand how and why women and men faculty members are (and are not) taking up the opportunity to encourage respect for different beliefs among their students.

- Why are men faculty are less likely to conceptualize their role as one that should contribute to students' moral and emotional development, including encouraging respect for different beliefs?
- Why are women faculty are more likely to conceptualize their role as one that should contribute to students' moral and emotional development, including encouraging respect for different beliefs?
- How might persistent gender-based ideologies contribute to these divergent conceptualizations?

Promote Intellectual Achievement

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' job satisfaction, scholarly activities, and perception of themselves as scientists.

Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Factor

This factor is a unified measure of the extent to which faculty are satisfied with their working environment. Aspects of the work environment included autonomy and independence, departmental leadership, relative equity of salary and job benefits, flexibility in relation to family matters or emergencies, and leave policies. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing women faculty and men faculty.

Scholarly Productivity Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty engaged in scholarly activity such as publishing academic and professional journal articles, publishing chapters in edited volumes, and having professional writings published or accepted for publication in the past three years. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing women faculty and men faculty.

Science Self-Efficacy Factor

This factor is a measure of faculty members' efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy based on the STEM courses they taught in the previous year. Faculty were asked how often they encouraged students to use technical science skills (use of tools, instruments, and/or techniques), generate a research question, determine how to collect appropriate data, explain the results of a study, use scientific literature to guide research, integrate results from multiple studies, ask relevant questions, identify what is known and not known about a problem, understand scientific concepts, and see connections between different areas of science and mathematics. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing women faculty and men faculty.

Science Identity Factor

This factor is a measure describing the extent to which faculty conceive of themselves as scientists. Faculty were asked to what extent they found it true that they have a strong sense of belonging to a community of scientists, derive great personal satisfaction from working on a team that is doing important research, think of themselves as a scientist, and feel like they belong in the field of science. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing women faculty and men faculty.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' job satisfaction, scholarly activities, and perception of themselves as scientists. There were no significant findings noting distinctions between women and men faculty members related to promoting intellectual achievement.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Institute routine program assessments to continue to monitor faculty members' job satisfaction, scholarly activities, and perception of themselves as scientists, focusing on potential distinctions between women and men faculty members.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

We do not know if there are differences for transgender and cisgender faculty. Therefore, we recommend distributing a survey that includes more inclusive and informative categories of gender.

- Do faculty members feel supported in scholarly productivity?
- How does this factor into workplace satisfaction?
- Are there distinctions between women and men faculty members in feeling supported to produce?

The survey questions regarding scholarly productivity focused on number of publications. While it is promising that there appears to be no sex/gender gap (see definition of “sex” in section introduction) in publication among faculty members, it should be noted that workplace satisfaction questions did not address publication support as part of workplace assessment. Given recent trends in publication submissions and acceptance rates relative to sex/gender, this seems like an area that would be worthy of additional inquiry, particularly as it relates to potential distinctions between women and men faculty members.

Build Community

This section reports results focusing on the degree to which faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues as well as the degree to which faculty members believe in and promote community service work among students as part of the college mission.

Respectful Climate Factor

This measure represents the extent to which faculty feel their contributions are respected or appreciated by their colleagues. This includes feeling that their research, teaching, and service are valued by their department and that faculty generally respect each other. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing women faculty and men faculty.

Civic-Minded Practices Factor

BOLD Indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Civic-Minded Practices	Man/Trans Man	199	48.5540
	Woman/Trans Woman	305	49.6972

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe civic engagement is a central part of the college mission, including the extent to which faculty have advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work, collaborated with local communities in research/teaching to address their needs, made community service a part of their coursework, dedicated weekly hours to community or public service, and engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay. This includes enhancing students’ knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, encouraging students to become agents of social change, and believing that colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues. The results for our campus show that women faculty have a higher average Civic-Minded Practices score in comparison to men faculty.

Summary of Build Community

Women faculty report higher average civic-minded practices scores than men faculty. This section reports results focusing on the degree to which faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues as well as the degree to which faculty members believe in and promote community service work among students as part of the college mission.

There were no significant findings among women faculty and men faculty relative to feeling appreciated and respected by colleagues. While there were no significant findings among women faculty and men faculty in positioning community service work and engagement as part of the college mission, women faculty members were more likely to concretely engage in unpaid service work as compared with men faculty members.

Recommendations related to Build Community

While it is promising that there were no significant findings among women faculty and men faculty relative to feeling appreciated and respected by colleagues, we recommend the following:

- Institute routine program assessments to continue to monitor feelings of appreciation and respect, focusing on potential distinctions between women and men faculty members.
- Consider further exploration of this finding through a consideration of potential distinctions between lecturers, junior faculty members, and senior faculty members.
 - Pay particular attention to the ways in which sex/gender may be a factor in not only who inhabits specific faculty positions but also in how holding specific faculty positions may impact the degree to which faculty members feel appreciated and respected.

While there were no significant findings among women faculty and men faculty in positioning community service work and engagement as part of the college mission, it seems potentially problematic that women faculty members were more likely to concretely engage in unpaid service work as compared with men faculty members. Therefore, we recommend the following:

- Ask additional questions to better understand why men faculty are less likely, and women faculty are more likely, to engage in the unpaid service work that they position as part of the college mission, as well as how sex/gender may be a factor in this divergence. See below.
- Develop targeted outreach, programming, and resources to increase the likelihood that men and women faculty can and will more equitably engage in service work, alongside promoting this work as part of the college mission.

Recommendations related to Build Community

As reflected in the section on Promote Intellectual Achievement, higher average Civic-Minde Practices are also likely to increase the workload for women faculty across tiers. As a result, we recommend that support of student personal development be ranked positively in the RTP process across all colleges. We also recommend that both tenure-track and adjunct faculty be provided with compensation through assigned time or course credits when they engage in exceptional amounts of student personal development and support.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

We do not know if there are differences for transgender and cisgender faculty.

- Why are men faculty less likely to engage in the unpaid service work that they position as part of the college mission?
- Why are women faculty more likely to engage in the unpaid service work that they position as part of the college mission?
- How might persistent sex/gender-based ideologies contribute to these divergences?

Determining the reasons why faculty members are more and less likely to engage in the kinds of service work that they believe to be part of the college mission, and understanding how/why this relates to sex/gender ideologies/distinctions, will be beneficial for creating a more strategic approach to outreach, programming, messaging, and resources that can support a more equitable distribution of service-labor. This will support wider diversity and inclusion goals.

Cultivate Resilience

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' perception of the mission, goals, commitments, and actions of the institution relative to faculty and campus diversity, increasing prestige, facilitating civic engagement, providing adequate compensation, and mitigating workplace stress.

Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus Factor

BOLD Indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus	Man/Trans Man	203	51.8521
	Woman/Trans Woman	303	47.7725

This factor represents faculty's perspectives about the climate for faculty members from diverse backgrounds. This includes ratings of the effectiveness of hiring practices and policies that increase faculty diversity, of taking responsibility for educating underprepared students, and how fairly faculty of color, women faculty, and LGBTQ faculty are treated. The results for our campus show that women faculty have a lower average Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus score in comparison to men faculty.

Institutional Priority: Diversity Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to creating a diverse multicultural campus environment. Faculty rated how important they believe the university prioritized recruiting more traditionally underrepresented students, promoting gender diversity in the faculty and administration, promoting racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty and administration, developing an appreciation for multiculturalism, and increasing or maintaining institutional affordability. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing women faculty and men faculty.

Institutional Priority: Prestige Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to increasing its prestige. This includes perceptions on the institution's ability to increase or maintain prestige, hire faculty "stars", and maintain a competitive student admissions process. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing women faculty and men faculty.

Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to facilitating civic engagement among students and faculty. Faculty rated how important they believe the university prioritized facilitating student involvement in community service, providing resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research, and creating and sustaining partnerships with surrounding communities. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing women faculty and men faculty.

Civic-Minded Values Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. This includes enhancing students' knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, encouraging students to become agents of social change, and believing that colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues.

There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing women faculty and men faculty.

Satisfaction with Compensation Factor

This factor is a unified measure of the extent to which faculty are satisfied with their compensation packages, including salary, health benefits, retirement benefits, opportunities for scholarly pursuits, teaching load, and prospects for career advancement.

There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing women faculty and men faculty.

Career-Related Stress Factor

This factor measures the amount of stress faculty experience related to their career. Aspects include committee work, students, research and publishing demands, instructional procedures/red tape, teaching loads, lack of personal time, and self-imposed high expectations.

There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing women faculty and men faculty.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' perception of the mission, goals, commitments, and actions of the institution relative to faculty and campus diversity, increasing prestige, facilitating civic engagement, providing adequate compensation, and mitigating career stress.

In comparing women faculty and men faculty, there were no significant findings related to increasing prestige, facilitating civic engagement, providing adequate compensation, and mitigating career stress.

However, while findings indicate that there were no significant distinctions among women faculty and men faculty in assessing the institution's commitment to campus diversity, women faculty were less likely than men faculty to perceive the current campus climate as equitable to all faculty members and underprepared students and/or conducive to increasing faculty diversity.

Women faculty report lower average perceptions of the climate for diversity on campus than men faculty report, despite reporting similar perceptions about campus priorities relating to diversity and civic engagement.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

Because women faculty are likely than men faculty to experience gender marginalization, this may make them more attuned to issues of inequity on campus. However, this does not account for racial, economic, and sexuality-based marginalization, which men faculty may also experience. Still, it is important to consider the insights of women faculty into contradictions between campus priorities and outcomes. As a result, we recommend assessment of the practices and outcomes that administrators pursue in attempts to increase the diversity, prestige, and civic engagement for the university, and that steps be taken to increase equitable

outcomes for faculty across identities and backgrounds. These approaches should be informed by diverse faculty across the colleges and should reflect the needs and interests of those who these practices will impact, including revised policies and procedures for ensuring equity and inclusion across campus.

While it is promising that there were no significant findings among women faculty and men faculty related to increasing prestige, facilitating civic engagement, providing adequate compensation, and mitigating career stress we recommend the following:

- Institute routine program assessments to continue to monitor these factors, focusing on potential distinctions between women and men faculty members.
- Consider further exploration of these findings, particularly relative to compensation and career stress, through a consideration of potential distinctions between lecturers, junior faculty members, and senior faculty members.
 - Pay particular attention to the ways in which sex/gender may be a factor in not only who inhabits specific faculty positions but also in how holding specific faculty positions may impact the degree to which faculty members experience career related stress and/or feel satisfied with compensation.

While findings indicate that there were no significant distinctions among women faculty and men faculty in assessing the institution's commitment to campus diversity, it is noteworthy that women faculty were less likely than men faculty to perceive the current campus climate as equitable to all faculty members and underprepared students and/or conducive to increasing faculty diversity. Therefore, we recommend the following:

- Ask additional questions to better understand why men faculty are less likely, and women faculty are more likely, perceive the current campus climate as equitable to all faculty members and underprepared students and/or conducive to increasing faculty diversity. Ask additional questions to better understand how sex/gender may be a factor in this divergence. See below.
- Develop targeted outreach, programming, messaging, and resources to increase the likelihood that men faculty will better understand potential experiences of inequity on campus in the present, as raising awareness and understanding of such inequities is a critical component of successful diversity and inclusion strategy.
 - Consider an allyship focus.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

We do not know if there are differences for transgender and cisgender faculty.

- Why are men faculty more likely to perceive the current campus climate as equitable to all faculty members and underprepared students and/or conducive to increasing faculty diversity when women faculty less likely?
- How might sex/gender be a factor in this divergence?

Determining the reasons why faculty members are more and less likely to perceive the current campus climate as equitable, and understanding how/why this relates to sex/gender distinctions, will be beneficial for creating a more strategic approach to outreach, programming, messaging, and resources. Raising awareness and understanding of current inequities is a critical component of successful diversity and inclusion strategy.

Dependent care responsibilities

The following points should be considered when interpreting the results for this section:

- Dependent care responsibilities are not inherently gendered. However, these responsibilities, historically, have been disproportionately assumed to be the purview of women.
- Gender-based expectations for labor related to dependent care, both historically and in the present, more and less significantly impacts women, and specific categories of women, based on other aspects of socio-political status, context, and identity.

Engage All Students

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' centering of students and service in their pedagogical approach.

Student-Centered Pedagogy Factor

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Student-Centered Pedagogy	Doesn't have adult care responsibilities	450	53.5951
	Yes, has adult care responsibilities	96	55.4006

This factor measures the extent to which faculty use student-centered teaching and evaluation methods in their course instruction, including with student presentations, student evaluations of each other's work, class discussions, cooperative small-group learning, experiential learning & field studies, group projects, reflective writing or journaling, and using student inquiry to drive learning. The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Student-Centered Pedagogy Factor score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Civic-Minded Practices Factor

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Civic-Minded Practices	Doesn't have adult care responsibilities	419	48.8990
	Yes, has adult care responsibilities	94	50.9645

This factor measures the extent to which faculty have advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work, collaborated with local communities in research/teaching to address their needs, made community service a part of their coursework, dedicated weekly hours to community or public service, and engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay. The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Civic-Minded Practices score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Summary of Engaging All Students

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' centering of students and service in their pedagogical approach. Faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Civic-Minded Practices score and a higher average Student-Center Pedagogy Factor score in

comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities. These results indicate that faculty with adult care responsibilities are more likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching than faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Faculty with adult care responsibilities report higher levels of student-centered teaching and evaluation methods in their courses, as well as higher average civic-minded practices in comparison with faculty who have no adult care responsibilities.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Because these factors are aligned with university interests in student success, we recommend that they be considered during the RTP process. We also suggest that since faculty with adult care responsibilities have higher scores in these areas, efforts be made to provide supportive services for these faculty.

Because results indicate that faculty with adult care responsibilities are more likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching than faculty with no adult care responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Ask additional questions to better understand why faculty with no adult care responsibilities are less likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching, and why faculty with adult care responsibilities are more likely to do so. See below.
- Ask additional questions to better understand what faculty members with adult care responsibilities are doing to center students and service in their approach to teaching, comparatively. See below.
- From this additional data, develop targeted outreach, programming, messaging, and resources to increase the likelihood that more faculty members center students and service in their approach to teaching.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

- Why are faculty members with no adult care responsibilities less likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching?
- Why are faculty members with adult care responsibilities more likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching?
- How might sex/gender, or other categories of being that influence expectations for labor related to dependent care, be a factor in this divergence?
- How and why are different kinds of dependent care responsibilities a factor (or not) in these considerations?

Determining the reasons why faculty members are more and less likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching, and understanding how/why this might relate to sex/gender, or other categories of being that influence expectations for labor related to dependent care, will be beneficial for creating a more strategic approach to outreach, programming, messaging, and resources. Finding these answers will create conditions for more successful outreach as well as more successful resource distribution and program development to achieve desired outcomes.

- What, specifically, are faculty members with adult care responsibilities doing to center students and service in their approach to teaching, comparatively?

- Are other approaches to student empowerment and success being pursued among faculty members who are less likely to center students and service?

Learning more about the specifics of how faculty members are centering (or not) students and service in their approach to teaching may reveal trends that can help to shape programs and interventions. Knowing that there may be variability in the identification and development of student and service centered approaches, it may be advantageous to follow up with specific narrative or focus group studies on how differently positioned faculty members may understand and operationalize these practices.

Expand Access

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' perception of their role in relationship to students' moral and emotional development as well as their confidence in their ability to be an effective mentor.

Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty agree that it is their role to develop students' moral character, provide for students' emotional development, help students develop personal values, and encourage respect for different beliefs.

There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/childcare responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities.

Mentor Self-Efficacy Factor

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Mentor Self-Efficacy	Doesn't have adult care responsibilities	383	49.6394
	Yes, has adult care responsibilities	84	52.0529

This factor measures the extent to which faculty are confident in their ability to effectively mentor students. This includes providing constructive feedback to mentees, taking into account the biases and prejudices they bring into the mentor/mentee relationship, working effectively with mentees whose personal background is different from their own, being an advocate for mentees, helping mentees network effectively, and helping mentees acquire financial resources. The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Mentor Self-Efficacy Factor score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Summary of Expand Access

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' perception of their role in relationship to students' moral and emotional development as well as their confidence in their ability to be an effective mentor.

In comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, there are no significant findings related to the perception of their role in relationship to students' moral and emotional development. However, faculty with adult care responsibilities are more

confident in their ability to be an effective mentor when compared with faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Faculty with adult care responsibilities have higher confidence, on average, in their mentorship abilities than those faculty without adult care responsibilities.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Because these factors are aligned with university interests in student success, we recommend that they be considered during the RTP process. We also suggest that since faculty with adult care responsibilities have higher scores in these areas, efforts be made to provide supportive services for these faculty.

Because results indicate that faculty with adult care responsibilities are more confident in their ability to be an effective mentor when compared with faculty with no adult care responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Ask additional questions to better understand what faculty members with adult care responsibilities are doing to mentor students and why this makes them feel more confident in their ability to be an effective mentor, as compared with faculty with no adult care responsibilities. See below.
- From this additional data, develop targeted outreach, programming, messaging, and resources to increase the likelihood that more faculty members can confidently mentor students.

Because there are no significant findings related to the perception of role in relationship to students' moral and emotional development when comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Continue to monitor faculty members' perception of their role in relationship to students' moral and emotional development through routine assessments.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

- What are faculty members with adult care responsibilities doing to mentor students?
- Why does this make them feel more confident in their ability to be an effective mentor, as compared with faculty with no adult care responsibilities?
- How might sex/gender, or other categories of being that influence expectations for labor related to dependent care, be a factor in this divergence?
- How and why are different kinds of dependent care responsibilities a factor (or not) in these considerations?

Learning more about the specifics of how faculty members are mentoring students, as well as why they feel confident in their ability to do so may reveal trends that can help to shape programs and interventions. Knowing that there may be variability in approaches to mentorship, and in how/why faculty members may feel confident in their approach, it may be advantageous to follow up with specific narrative or focus group studies on how differently positioned faculty members may understand and operationalize these practices.

Furthermore, determining the reasons why faculty members are more and less likely to feel confident in their mentorship and understanding how/why this might relate to sex/gender, or other categories of being that influence expectations for labor related to dependent care, will be

beneficial for creating a more strategic approach to outreach, programming, messaging, and resources.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' job satisfaction, scholarly activities, and perception of themselves as scientists.

Scholarly Productivity Factor

HERI Factor		Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	
Scholarly Productivity	None	9-16	-3.88680*	0.016
	9-16	17+	2.83827*	0.038

This factor measures the extent to which faculty engaged in scholarly activity such as publishing academic and professional journal articles, publishing chapters in edited volumes, and having professional writings published or accepted for publication in the past three years.

This factor is a unified measure of the extent to which faculty are satisfied with their working environment. Aspects of the work environment included autonomy and independence, departmental leadership, relative equity of salary and job benefits, flexibility in relation to family matters or emergencies, and leave policies.

This factor measures the extent to which faculty engaged in scholarly activity such as publishing academic and professional journal articles, publishing chapters in edited volumes, and having professional writings published or accepted for publication in the past three years.

The results for our campus show that faculty with 9-16 hours of house/childcare responsibilities have a higher average Scholarly Productivity score in comparison to faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities and faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

Science Self-Efficacy Factor

This factor is a measure of faculty members' efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy based on the STEM courses they taught in the previous year. Faculty were asked how often they encouraged students to use technical science skills (use of tools, instruments, and/or techniques), generate a research question, determine how to collect appropriate data, explain the results of a study, use scientific literature to guide research, integrate results from multiple studies, ask relevant questions, identify what is known and not known about a problem, understand scientific concepts, and see connections between different areas of science and mathematics.

There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/childcare responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities.

Science Identity Factor

This factor is a measure describing the extent to which faculty conceive of themselves as scientists. Faculty were asked to what extent they found it true that they have a strong sense of belonging to a community of scientists, derive great personal satisfaction from working on a team that is doing important research, think of themselves as a scientist, and feel like they belong in the field of science.

There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/child care responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' job satisfaction, scholarly activities, perception of themselves as scientists, and efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy.

Results of this section were mixed. In comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, and in comparing faculty with house/childcare responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities, there were no significant findings related to job satisfaction, perception of themselves as scientists, and efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy. However, faculty with 9-16 hours of house/childcare responsibilities were more productive in scholarly activities than faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities and faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

There were no differences between faculty with different degrees of dependent care responsibilities for any areas of Intellectual Development, other than in relation to the factor for Scholarly Productivity. Faculty with 9-16 hours of house/childcare responsibilities have a higher average Scholarly Productivity score in comparison to faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities and faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Higher average scholarly productivity scores for faculty with 9-16 hours of house/childcare responsibilities, compared with those who have no hours or 17+ hours, indicate that scholarly productivity can be challenging for faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities. The lower scholarly productivity scores among those with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities may reflect higher self-expectations of scholarly productivity among these faculty. Otherwise, it is possible that other expectations—either work or personal—are interfering with scholarly productivity for faculty with no house/childcare responsibilities. To address differences in scholarly productivity for faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities, we recommend that equitable opportunities for assigned

Based on the finding that faculty with 9-16 hours of house/childcare responsibilities were more productive in scholarly activities than faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities and faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Ask additional questions to better understand why faculty members with a certain degree of care responsibilities are able to engage and be productive in scholarly activities while those with more/less care responsibilities are not. See below.

- From this additional data, develop targeted outreach, programming, messaging, and resources to increase the likelihood that all faculty members can engage in scholarly activities.
- Specifically, it is recognized that in U.S. society women are disproportionately responsible for care work. As the survey suggests, those who must invest more time in care work and other household responsibilities have a lower productivity score. Based on these discrepancies we encourage the university to support faculty who have care work responsibilities by providing reasonable accommodations in work schedules, creating more on-campus childcare options, and by providing resources for the research activities and conference travel of faculty who are care givers.

Given that there were no significant findings related to job satisfaction, perception of themselves as scientists, and efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy when comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, and in comparing faculty with house/childcare responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Institute routine program assessments to continue to monitor faculty members' job satisfaction, perception of themselves as scientists, and efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy, focusing on potential distinctions between faculty with care responsibilities to faculty with no care responsibilities.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

- Why are faculty members with a certain degree of dependent care responsibility able to engage and be productive in scholarly activities while those with more/less care responsibilities are not?
- How might sex/gender, or other categories of being that influence expectations for labor related to dependent care, be a factor in this divergence?
- How are different kinds of dependent care responsibilities a factor in these considerations?

As stated above, it is recognized that in U.S. society women are disproportionately responsible for care work and that differently positioned women are impacted differently by this expectation. Learning more about the specifics of this finding concerning scholarly activities relative to time spent engaging in dependent care can help to shape useful programs and interventions. It may be advantageous to follow up with specific narrative or focus group studies on how dependent care responsibilities are impacting differently positioned faculty members.

Furthermore, determining the reasons why faculty members are more and less likely to feel confident in their mentorship and understanding how/why this might relate to sex/gender, or other categories of being that influence expectations for labor related to dependent care, will be beneficial for creating a more strategic approach to outreach, programming, messaging, and resources.

Build Community

This section reports results focusing on the degree to which faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues as well as the degree to which faculty members believe in and promote community service work among students as part of the college mission.

Respectful Climate Factor

HERI Factor			Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Respectful Climate	1-8	17+	2.74290*	0.040

This measure represents the extent to which faculty feel their contributions are respected or appreciated by their colleagues. This includes feeling that their research, teaching, and service are valued by their department and that faculty generally respect each other. The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a lower average Respectful Climate Factor score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities. Additionally, faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities have a lower average Respectful Climate Factor score in comparison to faculty with 1-8 hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

Civic-Minded Values Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. This includes enhancing students' knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, encouraging students to become agents of social change, and believing that colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues.

The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Civic-Minded Values score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Civic-Minded Practices Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty have advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work, collaborated with local communities in research/teaching to address their needs, made community service a part of their coursework, dedicated weekly hours to community or public service, and engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay.

The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Civic-Minded Practices score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Summary of Build Community

This section reports results focusing on the degree to which faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues as well as the degree to which faculty members believe in and promote community service work among students as part of the college mission.

The findings in this section show that the presence and degree of dependent care responsibilities has an impact on whether faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues. Specifically, when compared with faculty members with no adult care responsibilities, faculty members with adult care responsibilities feel less appreciated and respected by their colleagues. Similarly, faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities feel less appreciated and respected by their colleagues in comparison to faculty with 1-8 hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

At the same time, when compared with faculty members with no adult care responsibilities, faculty members with adult care responsibilities are more likely to believe in and promote community service work among students as part of the college mission.

Faculty with adult care responsibilities report lower Respectful Climate Factor scores than other faculty, and faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities report lower Respectful Climate Factor scores than those with 1-8 hours of house/childcare responsibilities. This suggests that there are specific issues of interpersonal and institutional respect for the work and contributions of faculty who provide adult care or who are responsible for 17+ hours of house/childcare per week. Faculty with adult care responsibilities also report the higher perceptions that civic engagement is part of the college mission, and higher levels of participation in advising student groups involved in service/volunteer work or other community related activities than other faculty. Their perceptions of and investments in the value of civic-minded activities may reflect the importance of interdependence and community that caregiving requires, but is also likely to result in additional labor for faculty invested in these activities.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Because faculty with adult caregiving responsibilities and faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities report lower perceptions that their research, teaching, and service contributions are valued and respected by colleagues and in their departments, we recommend that conversations and consultation with caregiving faculty be an integral part of campus equity work. We recommend that Campus Parenting and Caregiver Groups, including those organized through the President's Equity and Change Commission, and those involved in groups like Parents and Caregivers United, be consulted on how to best support faculty caregivers, and to ensure that their contributions to our campus are valued and respected.

Because results show that the presence, kind, and degree of dependent care responsibly has an impact on whether faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues, we recommend the following:

- Ask additional questions to better understand how different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibilities impact whether and how faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues. See below.
- From this additional data, develop targeted outreach, programming, messaging, and resources to increase the likelihood that all faculty members feel appreciated, respected, and supported.
- Consider further exploration of these finding through a consideration of potential distinctions between lecturers, junior faculty members, and senior faculty members.

It is also recommended to continue identifying resources and support networks for faculty with dependents and to encourage campus programming to offer hybrid options for increased engagement.

Furthermore, because faculty members with adult care responsibilities are more likely to believe in, engage in, and promote service work among students as part of the college mission, when compared with faculty members with no adult care responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Ask additional questions to better understand why faculty members with adult care responsibilities are more likely to believe in, engage in, and promote service work among students as part of the college mission, comparatively. Also ask what kinds of service work is being engaged in and promoted.

- Ask additional questions to better understand how different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibilities impact this belief and engagement in service work.
- Develop targeted outreach, programming, and resources to increase the likelihood that all faculty can engage in service work, alongside promoting this work as part of the college mission.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

How do faculty in each of these groups conceive of things like civic engagement and belonging? What opportunities or activities contribute to higher scores in some groups when compared with others? For example, are time constraints a large contributor? Conceptions of parenting and work responsibilities? Access to networks of support from other caregivers?

- How do different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibility impact whether and how faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues?

Determining the reasons why faculty members who have different dependent care responsibilities are more and less likely to feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues will be critical for developing targeted outreach, programming, messaging, and resources needed to support these faculty members in the different ways that they may need to be supported, while also meeting wider diversity and inclusion goals.

- Why are faculty members with adult care responsibilities more likely to believe in, engage in, and promote service work among students as part of the college mission, comparatively?
- What kinds of service work is being engaged in and promoted, comparatively?
- How do different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibility impact the kinds and degrees of belief, engagement in, and promotion of service work?

Determining the reasons why faculty members are more and less likely to engage in the kinds of service work that they believe to be part of the college mission, and understanding how/why this relates to different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibility, will be beneficial for creating a more strategic approach to outreach, programming, messaging, and resources that can support a more equitable distribution of service-labor. Determining how such distinctions may overlap with sex/gender ideology will also be useful. This will support wider diversity and inclusion goals.

It may be advantageous to follow up with focus group studies to determine these distinctions, including how dependent care responsibilities are impacting differently positioned faculty members.

Cultivate Resilience

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' perception of the mission, goals, commitments, and actions of the institution relative to faculty and campus diversity, increasing prestige, facilitating civic engagement, providing adequate compensation, and mitigating career stress.

Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus Factor

This factor represents faculty's perspectives about the climate for faculty members from diverse backgrounds. This includes ratings of the effectiveness of hiring practices and policies that increase faculty diversity, of taking responsibility for educating underprepared students, and

how fairly faculty of color, women faculty, and LGBTQ faculty are treated. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/child care responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities.

Institutional Priority: Diversity Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to creating a diverse multicultural campus environment. Faculty rated how important they believe the university prioritized recruiting more traditionally underrepresented students, promoting gender diversity in the faculty and administration, promoting racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty and administration, developing an appreciation for multiculturalism, and increasing or maintaining institutional affordability. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/childcare responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities.

Institutional Priority: Prestige Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to increasing its prestige. This includes perceptions on the institution's ability to increase or maintain prestige, hire faculty "stars", and maintain a competitive student admissions process. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/child care responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities.

Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to facilitating civic engagement among students and faculty. Faculty rated how important they believe the university prioritized facilitating student involvement in community service, providing resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research, and creating and sustaining partnerships with surrounding communities. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/child care responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities.

Civic-Minded Values Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. This includes enhancing students' knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, encouraging students to become agents of social change, and believing that colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues. The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Civic-Minded Values score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Satisfaction with Compensation Factor

No differences.

Career-Related Stress Factor

HERI Factor			Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Career-Related Stress	None	9-16	-4.14819*	0.036
		17+	-5.35559*	0.003

This factor measures the amount of stress faculty experience related to their career. Aspects include committee work, students, research and publishing demands, instructional procedures/red tape, teaching loads, lack of personal time, and self-imposed high expectations. The results for our campus show that faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities have a higher average Career-Related Stress Factor score in comparison to faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' perception of the mission, goals, commitments, and actions of the institution relative to faculty and campus diversity, increasing prestige, facilitating civic engagement, providing adequate compensation, and mitigating career stress.

The results from this section were mixed.

In comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, and faculty with house/child care responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities there were no significant findings related to assessing the institution's commitment to campus climate and diversity, increasing prestige, and providing adequate compensation.

However, distinctions did exist in results around civic engagement. When comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, and faculty with house/child care responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities, there were no significant distinctions related to the perception of the institution as committed to facilitating civic engagement among students and faculty; however, faculty members with adult care responsibilities were more likely to believe that civic engagement is a central part of the college mission when compared with faculty members with no adult care responsibilities.

Distinctions also existed in mitigating career stress as results show that faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities experience more stress related to their career in comparison to faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

There are no significant dependent-care differences in perceptions of climate for diversity on campus, or perceptions of how the institution prioritizes diversity, prestige, or civic engagement. There are also no significant dependent-care differences in satisfaction with compensation. However, faculty with house/childcare responsibilities reported greater belief in the importance of civic-engagement than those without house/childcare responsibilities. Moreover, faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities experienced higher career-related stress than those with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

Because faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities experience higher career-related stress than those with no house/childcare responsibilities, we recommend greater attention to equity in the RTP process. To this end, we recommend consultation with parenting and caregiving groups on campus, including the CLA Equity Task Force, to identify the needs of caregiving faculty.

While it is promising that there were no significant findings among faculty members with and without dependent care responsibilities relative to assessing the institution's commitment to campus climate and diversity, increasing prestige, and providing adequate compensation, we recommend the following:

- Institute routine program assessments to continue to monitor these factors, focusing on potential distinctions between differently positioned faculty members with and without dependent care responsibilities.
- In these assessments, consider how and why different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibility can differently impact faculty members.

As results show that faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities experience more stress related to their career in comparison to faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Additional study to understand how and why different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibility can differently impact faculty members relative to career stress.
- Additional study to understand the specific nature of the responsibilities that faculty members are undertaking, which will allow for more targeted suggestions and support.
- Additional study to understand and identify the campus resources and support networks that currently work to mitigate career stress among faculty members who have dependent responsibilities to see how these may apply (or not) to faculty members who have 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities.
- Continued support and expansion of existing resources and support for faculty members with house/childcare responsibilities that currently work to mitigate career stress, including hybrid options.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

It would be helpful to know whether there are differences for caregiving faculty in relation to lecturer and tenure-track status, as well as whether there are differences in various disciplines/departments on campus.

LGBTQI

Important Note Regarding Language

People who participated in this survey had the option to identify as Asexual, Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Pansexual, Queer, or “Other” (ABGLPQ+). As a result, we cannot speak to identities commonly included within LGBTQIA+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, Asexual+) groups, including people who identify as Transgender, Nonbinary, Intersex, or Two Spirit. This mirrors the frequent conflation of gender and sexual identities, which leads to inaccurate assessments of community experiences and needs. To this end, we articulate varying possibilities throughout the report as they pertain to score interpretations across both gender and sexual identities. We wish to note that this language has the potential to impact participation in and responses to survey questions, and that lack of recognition and inclusion may skew the results and participation of faculty. In addition, smaller numbers of faculty and the ability to cross reference data across discipline and other intersecting identities may have led to hesitancy to participate for fear of answers to questions being identifiable. To reflect the language of the survey, we use the acronym ABGLPQ+ when discussing specific findings. However, when talking about broader patterns of inequity, community, or resistance in society and across campus, we use the acronym LGBTQIA+.

LGBTQIA+ Faculty Overview

CSULB has a history of LGBTQIA+ faculty engagement and activism on campus. From 2008 to 2013, LGBTQIA+ and allied faculty and staff who called themselves the LGBTQ Task Force were able to gain official recognition as The Committee for LGBTQIA+ Campus Climate as a subgroup of the broader Campus Climate Committee in 2013. This group also participated in formation of the Safe Zone Committee trainings, which continue to be held on campus. In 2013, Faculty in the Women’s, Gender, and Sexualities Studies (WGSS) Department established the Queer Studies Minor, providing opportunities for critical intellectual engagement with LGBTQIA+ content.

Rainbow Café, a drop-in support group for LGBTQIA+ students, has been active for 7 consecutive academic years since 2014 due to the commitment of a faculty member who continues to provide this space. Having a consistent and reliable safe space for LGBTQIA+ students on campus has provided a link for CSULB alumni, returning, and reentering students to reconnect with LGBTQIA_ community on campus. Without a full-time staff person at the LGBTQIA+ Student Cultural Resource Center, this space is reliant upon voluntary labor by faculty, including those faculty who are adjuncts, or who have short-term contracts to provide these spaces.

In Fall 2020, Faculty also established the Transgender Advocacy Coalition with the Support of the President’s Office, providing trans specific expertise and resources with partners across campus. The establishment of LGBTQIA+ resources and advocacy by faculty groups demonstrates their dedication to the Campus Climate for LGBTQIA+ people across a range of spaces and contexts.

Engage All Students

This category measures faculty involvement in student-centered pedagogy and civic-minded practices.

Student-Centered Pedagogy

BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Student-Centered Pedagogy	Not LGBQPAO	416	53.41
	LGBQPAO	73	55.79

ABGLPQ+ identified faculty reported higher overall scores for Student-Centered Pedagogy than non-LGBTQIA+ identified faculty. This might reflect the increased likelihood of LGBTQIA+ identified faculty teaching courses with content that encourages discussion and other forms of reflective learning. Sexually marginalized faculty, even when they are not teaching content that promotes experiential reflexivity, may be more attuned to student needs based on their own experiences of institutional and extra-institutional exclusion.

Civic-Minded Practices

BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Civic-Minded Values	Not LGBQPAO	435	52.92
	LGBQPAO	78	56.34

ABGLPQ+ identified faculty reported higher overall scores for Civic-Minded Practices than non-ABGLPQ+ identified faculty. This pattern aligns with the likelihood that, even outside of courses, LGBTQIA+ faculty are more likely to consider students' needs. Based on structural marginalization within a heteronormative and ciscentric society, LGBTQIA+ faculty are more likely to be involved in extracurricular community or public service. Due to underrepresentation of LGBTQIA+ faculty, they are more likely to be identified by students as potential mentors and/or advisors, or to participate in or contribute to campus and community organizations. Because the LGBTQIA+ community is also diverse across race, gender, socioeconomic status, (dis)ability, ethnicity, citizenship and other identities and statuses, they may also more likely than non-LGBTQIA+ faculty to serve students and communities across multiple groups.

Summary of Engaging All Students

ABGLPQ+ faculty have higher overall scores across all areas of engaging students when compared with non-ABGLPQ+ faculty.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Because of their higher overall scores across areas of engaging students, we recommend that LGBTQIA+ faculty—especially adjunct faculty—be compensated for their contribution to the campus community through mentorship grants, assigned time, and offices where they can meet consistently with their students. These resources would allow these conversations to continue—especially those more private conversations needed by LGBTQIA+ students who are likely to be seeking support around vulnerable identities.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

These data do not differentiate between adjunct and tenure-track faculty, whose experiences with and perspectives on student mentorship are likely to differ. Adjunct positions are likely to be solely teaching-focused positions and continued employment is likely to be contingent upon performance in the classroom and relationships with students. These data also do not include information about trans and nonbinary faculty, as well as information about intersecting identities that may inform the experiences and investments of LGBTQIA+ faculty.

Expand Access

This category measures faculty perceptions pertaining to their involvement in student development and mentorship. With regards to expanding access, ABGLPQ+ identified faculty did not report significant differences than non- ABGLPQ+ identified faculty. These results are somewhat surprising given the previous findings where ABGLPQ+ faculty reported higher scores for student-centered pedagogy.

Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Group

There were no significant differences in scores between ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ faculty with regards to their focus on undergraduate personal development, including developing students' moral character, providing for students' emotional development, helping students develop personal values, and encouraging respect for different beliefs.

Mentor Self-Efficacy

There were no significant differences in recorded scores between ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ faculty members' confidence in their ability to effectively mentor students.

Summary of Expand Access

There were no significant differences between faculty member's reported scores of their focus on undergraduate development and their confidence to effectively mentor students.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Given that previously it was recorded that ABGLPQ+ faculty had higher overall scores of engaging all students, it is surprising that ABGLPQ+ faculty did not report higher scores than their non- ABGLPQ+ peers in both their focus on undergraduate development and their confidence to effectively mentor students. This could indicate that LGBTQIA+ faculty may not be considering the time they put into engaging all students as mentoring, rather may see this as a duty to give back instead a formalized mentor/mentee relationship. This pattern may indicate that LGBTQIA+ faculty are not receiving proper mentoring themselves, leading to lower confidence levels. Findings could also suggest that LGBTQIA+ faculty are overworked in the engagement areas of these populations, are doing a great deal of DEI work to benefit the University's profile and less among students or assume that there are other adequate resources on campus for student development and are not trained to provide these kinds of services. In any case, we recommend that informal relationships continue to be encouraged and formalized in departments and colleges so that adequate training and compensation can be provided.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

These data do not differentiate between tenure-track and adjunct faculty. Student mentoring requires time and resources and given the different types of teaching loads between tenure-track and adjunct faculty, this could also impact the mentoring relationships between students and faculty. We also know that LGBTQIA+ faculty dedicate time outside of teaching and formal mentoring to projects, but do not have specific information on the extent and impact of those projects on both students and faculty. Finally, information on the gender and racial identities of faculty could allow us to better understand which LGBTQIA+ faculty are engaging in these types of activities.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

This category addresses Faculty Satisfaction with their intellectual lives across professional contexts, including their use of scientific method in the classroom, and their sense of selves in relation to a "science identity." There are no significant differences reported between ABGLPQ+

and non- ABGLPQ+ faculty across each of the following factors, however we provide potential explanations for these findings and recommendations for promoting intellectual equity among LGBTQIA+ and non-LGBTQIA+ faculty.

Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Group

This factor measures faculty satisfaction with autonomy and independence, departmental leadership, relative equity of salary and job benefits, flexibility in relation to family matters or emergencies, and leave policies. There were no significant differences in reported scores between ABGLPQ+ and non- ABGLPQ+ faculty across these areas. Except for satisfaction with departmental leadership, these scores appear to be in response to general campus policies that are unlikely to be enforced in relation to sexual and gender identity—though there may be patterns having to do with family structure that relate to LGBTQIA+ family networks and support systems that are unaccounted for in this data. As a result, it is not surprising that there were not significant reported differences between the two groups.

Scholarly Productivity/Scholarly Productivity Group

This factor reflects faculty scholarly activity, including whether they have published in the past three years, and whether they have published chapters in edited volumes, or in academic or professional journals. There were no significant differences in reported scores between ABGLPQ+ faculty with regards to scholarly productivity. Among Tenure-Track faculty this may reflect the retention requirements for publication, which requires that these faculty continue to publish regularly during the retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) process. Even if sexual identity were correlated with discrimination or difficulties publishing, it is unlikely that tenure-track faculty members who were unable to publish would be retained and therefore be present to participate in this survey. For Adjunct faculty members, research is not part of their employment contract, but this section does not address differences between adjunct and tenure-track faculty.

Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Science Identity

There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non- ABGLPQ+ faculty. These areas are discussed in a separate section and are repeated here.

Science Self-Efficacy

This factor measures faculty members' efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy. These scores relate to faculty efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy through measures such as: using technical science skills, determining how to collect appropriate data, using scientific literature to guide research, asking relevant questions, and understanding scientific concepts. There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ faculty and non-ABGLPQ+ faculty with regards to Science Self-Efficacy. These are areas of teaching that are likely dependent on the field of study and teaching style of the faculty, specifically how faculty relate information and skills to students. While gender nonconformity, or perceived failure to live up to the gender expectations of students may impact how faculty are perceived, sexual identity on its own is therefore unlikely to be an explicit factor across these areas.

Science Identity Group

This factor measures the extent to which faculty conceive of themselves as scientists. There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ faculty and non- ABGLPQ+ faculty scores in terms of their sense of scientific community, satisfaction from working with a team doing important research, or self-concept as a scientist. This could reflect general equity in treatment

and recognition of scientific work among ABGLPQ+ and non- ABGLPQ+ faculty. However, LGBTQIA+ faculty may also be self-selecting into departments and communities where they feel more affirmed in relation to the research that they do and may even be invested in scientific and research communities off campus based on sexual and gender identity, rather than based on on-campus networks.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

This category has to do with the well-being and satisfaction of faculty as members of an intellectual community across multiple contexts. These include how they perceive their relationships with other faculty, with students in the classroom, their own research productivity, and the institutional support that they are provided as part of their employee benefits. Across all factors related to Promoting Intellectual Achievement, there were no significant differences in reported scores between ABGLPQ+ and non- ABGLPQ+ faculty. This suggests that ABGLPQ+ faculty view themselves similarly to non-ABGLPQ+ faculty across each of these factors.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

In order to Promote the Intellectual Achievement of LGBTQIA+ Faculty, we recommend investment in LGBTQIA+ specific research, and other scholarly and creative activities. As part of this, we recommend that the Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) process be revised at the University level to allow for more community based and non-traditional research, which marginalized faculty are more likely to engage in than other faculty. This is especially likely given the higher scores among ABGLPQ+ faculty in relation to the Engage All Students factor, which included community involvement and advocacy. Finally, we recommend the creation of research opportunities for LGBTQIA+ Adjunct Faculty, particularly those with research degrees who are pursuing tenure track positions. This could include a course release for LGBTQIA+ Adjunct Faculty who are working on research projects, or specific research grants for LGBTQIA+ Adjunct Faculty to conduct research, write up findings, and/or attend conferences. Given the general barriers faced by LGBTQIA+ people in academia, and ongoing heterosexism and cissexism, these resources would go a long way to reward the work that LGBTQIA+ Faculty are already doing, while providing opportunities for them to continue intellectual work that benefits both them and the University.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Despite the lack of significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non- ABGLPQ+ faculty scores across factors in this section, we do not have access to information about intersecting identities that may impact faculty experiences of support and engagement across campus. As a result, we do not know about the experiences of transgender, nonbinary, or intersex faculty. Nor do we have access to information about LGBTQIA+ faculty of color, disabled LGBTQIA+ faculty, or other groups of faculty who are underrepresented in these data. A limitation that is also present in this section is that there is no separation of answers given by Adjunct vs. Tenure-Track Faculty. Since Adjunct Faculty tend to be hired for teaching-specific positions, they are less likely to receive resources and support for research related activities. Moreover, if Tenure-Track LGBTQIA+ faculty are facing difficulties publishing, they are less likely to have been retained and so are less likely to be accounted for in this survey. There are other factors that may contribute to similar scores, such as self-selection into disciplines that are more supportive of LGBTQIA+ faculty, such as those in the humanities and social sciences. In addition, we do not know which intellectual communities LGBTQIA+ faculty are working with and if these extend beyond the campus.

Build Community

This category measures faculty perceptions of community across various contexts, including their relationships with colleagues and their beliefs about Civic-Minded values on campus. There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non- ABGLPQ+ identified faculty across the following factors. In the following sections we offer some explanations for why this might be, the contradictions evident in these findings, and how to address these through ongoing support community building among LGBTQIA+ Faculty.

Respectful Climate

This factor measures the extent to which faculty feel their contributions are respected or appreciated by their colleagues. For example, they were asked whether their research, teaching and service are valued by faculty in their department, and whether faculty on campus respect one another. There are no significant differences in the reported scores between ABGLPQ+ identified faculty and non- ABGLPQ+ faculty. This is not surprising given that there were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non- ABGLPQ+ Faculty in their Promote Intellectual Achievement Scores. However, LGBTQIA+ faculty may also be evaluating whether their work is respected and appreciated in relation to what they know and expect based on in-group comparisons among their LGBTQIA+ peers. For example, if they are hearing that other LGBTQIA+ faculty are doing a great deal of service work (as reflected in the Engage All Students Factors) they may not see themselves as going above and beyond to fulfill peer expectations.

It is also possible that there are no significant differences between the two groups because sexual identities would not typically be disclosed when discussing the faculty members' contributions to their respective departments. However, whether their sexual and gender identities are linked with their research and service will vary. For example, for LGBTQIA+ faculty whose research, service, and teaching are focused on trans and sexuality studies, their identities may be central to these evaluations. In addition, trans and nonbinary faculty may experience misgendering (use of the incorrect pronouns by others to refer to them), which may impact their campus climate experiences and have negative impacts on them.

Civic-Minded Values/Civic-Minded Values Group

This factor measures whether faculty believe civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. There are no significant differences in the reported scores between ABGLPQ+ identified faculty non-ABGLPQ+ faculty regarding Civic-Minded Values. It is surprising that ABGLPQ+ identified faculty did not score higher because of their higher scores in the Civic Mindedness category relating to Engage All Students. However, this factor is a reflection of LGBTQIA+ faculty perceptions of the college mission, not of their own investment in these areas. This suggests that LGBTQIA+ Faculty are doing the work of enhancing student knowledge and appreciation of other racial/ethnic groups, encouraging students to become agents of social change, and working with local communities independently of their belief that it is expected by the college.

Civic-Minded Practices/Civic-Minded Practices Group

This factor is repeated below and explained in further detail (in the section on Cultivate Resilience). There are no significant differences in the reported scores between ABGLPQ+ identified faculty and non- ABGLPQ+ identified faculty in the Civic-Minded Factor relating to Engage All Students. This may indicate that they do not perceive it as an expectation of their Role within the College despite their ongoing investment in Civic-Minded Practice.

Summary of Build Community

Regarding the Build Community factors, there were no reported significant differences in the reported scores between ABGLPQ+ identified faculty and those not ABGLPQ+ identified. Given that ABGLPQ+ identified faculty scored higher than non-ABGLPQ+ identified faculty in Civic-Minded Practices within the Engage All Students factor, it is surprising that ABGLPQ+ identified faculty reported no significant differences from faculty not ABGLPQ+ identified. The contradictions between scores in each of these sections suggests that despite their perception that the College does not require or expect them to pursue these activities, LGBTQIA+ faculty still extend themselves through additional labor to engage all students in both campus and community activities.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Given the history of activism and advocacy among LGBTQIA+ identified faculty on our campus, we recommend that resources be allocated to support their work. Unaccounted for in this section is the fact that the LGBTIQ+ Climate Committee and the Trans Advocacy Coalition (TAC) were both faculty-initiated projects that have helped to build community for LGBTQIA+ faculty, students, and staff over the years. Moreover, the development of the Safe Zone Committee on our campus was a project of Faculty and Staff in their own time as a part of their service to the community. Because only Tenure-Track Faculty are compensated or recognized for service as part of the RTP process, this means that Adjunct Faculty are engaged in efforts to build community without support or resources. We therefore recommend that grants and assigned time for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA) be expanded to include community engagement and advocacy both on and off campus, and that some of these resources be allocated to Adjunct Faculty. We also recommend the development and resourcing of an LGBTQIA+ Resource Center on Campus that provides ongoing support for faculty, students, and staff. This Center should be staffed by someone who is competent in DEI, advocacy, and crisis management, and be actively engage in LGBTQIA+ justice. We also recommend that the people developing curriculum and trainings regarding LGBTQIA+ communities be fully involved in and informed about the nuances of LGBTQIA+ content, language, and needs.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

We do not have access to intersecting identities that may also impact these scores, and have no information on trans, nonbinary, and intersex faculty. We also do not know whether faculty were Adjunct or Tenure-Track, which would likely impact responses—particularly since Tenure-Track Faculty are expected to participate in Service as part of the RTP evaluation process. Given the low response rate of faculty, it is also possible that scores do not include those faculty who are less trusting of the academy, or who have experienced alienation or challenges within their professional communities. As a result, we recommend collection of qualitative data to supplement these findings.

Cultivate Resilience

This section provides information about faculty perceptions of the Campus Climate and what types of Investments they perceive as central to the mission of the campus. There are some differences between ABGLPQ+ and non- ABGLPQ+ identified faculty across the following factors, but some of the inconsistencies in these scores raise new questions. We offer potential explanations, and discuss these findings for each factor, then summarize and offer recommendations for cultivating resilience among LGBTQIA+ faculty.

Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus Factor

BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus	Not LGBQPAO	423	50.14
	LGBQPAO	76	45.91

This factor measures faculty perspectives about the Climate on campus for Faculty members from diverse backgrounds. This factor includes perceptions of effective diversity related hiring practices, whether the institution takes responsibility for educating underprepared students, and whether faculty of color, women faculty, and LGBTQIA+ faculty are treated fairly. ABGLPQ+ identified faculty reported lower overall scores for Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus than non- ABGLPQ+ identified faculty. This may reflect overall underrepresentation of LGBTQIA+ faculty on campus, as well as an attunement to the ways that heteronormativity infuses everyday interactions and institutional treatment of LGBTQIA+ people. Because LGBTQIA+ faculty are also diverse across intersecting identities like race, gender, class, ethnicity, disability, citizenship status, and religion, their insights likely reflect a range of experiences within the university community and underrepresented groups, leading them to have greater insights into and awareness of inequities across groups.

Institutional Priority: Diversity

This Factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to creating a diverse multicultural campus environment. There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non- ABGLPQ+ when it came to Institutional Commitment to Diversity scores. This is surprising, given that ABGLPQ+ faculty scored lower in their Perceptions of Campus Climate for Diversity, but may reflect a perception that the University is invested in making diversity-related efforts but that the outcomes are not perceived as being effective at achieving stated goals. For example, there may be DEI programming, but the day-to-day experiences that ABGLPQ+ faculty members have may not reflect changes resulting from that programming.

Institutional Priority: Prestige

BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Institutional Priority: Prestige	Not LGBQPAO	432	44.96
	LGBQPAO	76	42.65

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to increasing its prestige. ABGLPQ+ identified faculty reported lower overall scores for Institutional Priority: Prestige than non- ABGLPQ+ identified faculty. This may suggest that for ABGLPQ+ faculty prestige is not at the forefront of institutional investments. With regards to LGBTQIA+ scholars who are openly queer, lower scores for hiring faculty “stars” may reflect the marginalization of cutting-edge queer studies on our campus. But the perception that the institution does not prioritize increasing selectivity of the student body through more competitive admissions criteria may reflect the campus-wide culture of making higher education accessible to underserved students. As underrepresented members of the campus community, LGBTQIA+

faculty are likely to be more invested in supporting admissions of underrepresented and underserved students.

Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement

This Factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to facilitating Civic Engagement among students and faculty—both on and off-campus. There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non- ABGLPQ+ perceptions of institutional commitment to facilitating civic engagement among students and faculty. This likely reflects the overall community-based orientation of the campus across various groups and constituencies. Given that ABGLPQ+ faculty report higher overall Student-Centered Pedagogy and Civic-Minded Practices, it is surprising that they did not report any differences in their perceptions of the institutional commitment to these practices. This mirrors the data for Expanding Access and Building Community, which showed no significant differences between the two groups, despite higher reported levels of participation in related activities among ABGLPQ+ faculty. These data suggest that while ABGLPQ+ faculty are reporting higher levels of activity in these areas, these activities are not matched with higher levels of university support and resources and may be carried out by these faculty members independently of institutional investment.

Civic-Minded Values

BOLD indicates lower mean		N	Mean
Civic-Minded Values	Not LGBQPAO	435	52.92
	LGBQPAO	78	56.34

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. There were no significant differences between ABGLPQ+ and non- ABGLPQ+ faculty members beliefs that civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. This mirrors the data for Expanding Access and Building Community, which showed no significant differences between the two groups, despite higher reported levels of participation in related activities among ABGLPQ+ faculty. These data suggest that while ABGLPQ+ faculty are reporting higher levels of activity in these areas, their participation may be taking place independent of their perception of the mission of the college. Underrepresentation of LGBTQIA+ faculty, the diversity of LGBTQIA+ faculty across intersecting identities, widespread heteronormativity, and anti-LGBTQIA+ discrimination are all likely to make them more attuned to the importance of civic-engagement and knowledge and appreciation across differences—and to pass these values onto their students.

Satisfaction with Compensation

This factor measures the extent to which faculty members are satisfied with their compensation packages. There were no significant differences between scores for ABGLPQ+ and non- ABGLPQ+ faculty members' Satisfaction with Compensation. Salary is not necessarily reflective of workloads, so even if faculty compare salaries, they are unlikely to get an accurate sense of equity in salary. Prospects for career advancement also become available through a range of different networks, intra and extra-institutionally. Given what we know about informal networks among privileged groups, it is surprising that there is no reported difference but may indicate that faculty who do not have access to career advancement opportunities are unlikely to know they are being excluded if this is the case. It is also hard to compare salaries, teaching load, and prospects for career advancement between adjunct and full-time faculty.

Career-Related Stress

This factor measures the amount of stress faculty experience related to their career. There are no significant differences in scores for Career-Related Stress between ABGLPQ+ and non-ABGLPQ+ faculty. It is surprising that there is no reported difference given that they reported higher scores with regards to Student-Centered Pedagogy and Civic-Minded Practices, as well as lower scores with regards to perception of the Campus Climate for Diversity. While the first two reflect higher overall engagement, which we would expect to correlate with higher levels of stress associated with those activities, this may reflect how ABGLPQ+ faculty think about student engagement—they may not see it as a formal part of their job, but as part of their duty to campus. They may also assume that other faculty members are doing this type of service, since comparisons between employees are likely to be in-group. In addition, they may be engaged in committee work and student mentorship based on their own experiences as students.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

ABGLPQ+ identified faculty reported lower scores than non- ABGLPQ+ faculty for the “Institutional Priority: Prestige” and “Perception of the Climate for Diversity on Campus” Factors. However, there were no significant differences for ABGLPQ+ Faculty across other factors in the Cultivate Resilience Section. The differences in perceptions of the campus investment in prestige may reflect LGBTQIA+ faculty investments in working with underrepresented students and developing new and innovative research programs that may not fit with the measures of Institutional Prestige used for this Survey. Given that CSULB prides itself as being an institution that is accessible to underserved populations, it is not surprising that prestige is not viewed as a priority under those measures. At the same time, lower scores among ABGLPQ+ faculty with regards to perceptions of the campus climate for diversity likely reflects their insights into the operations of power across communities on campus. It is likely that, because LGBTQIA+ identities also intersect a range of racial, gender, class, disability, and other communities, they are likely to be attuned to inequities in hiring and treatment of employees.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

Based on the findings from this section, we recommend further investment in identifying the ways that LGBTQIA+ faculty are marginalized within academia across a range of intersecting identities and experiences. To this end, we suggest further research through a qualitative component, and ongoing assessment of LGBTQIA+ faculty experiences on campus. This research should be informed and led by LGBTQIA+ faculty and be designed to fulfill the unique needs of both Adjunct and Tenure Track Faculty Members. We also recommend development of specific resources to support LGBTQIA+ faculty—either through initiatives within existing commissions and coalitions (ex: the LGBTQIA+ Climate Committee and TAC), or through creation of specific groups to support LGBTQIA+ faculty. We also recommend that faculty leaders involved in these initiatives be compensated for their work. This is particularly important in light of unpaid labor for LGBTQIA+ Adjunct Faculty who are not compensated for service, and in recognition of the increase in service labor for LGBTQIA+ tenure track faculty whose investment in the well-being of LGBTQIA+ community members may take away from other areas of work RTP. Finally, we recommend revision or, more preferably, doing away with student evaluations that inform the retention of both tenure-track and adjunct faculty. Since we know that these evaluations often reflect sexist, transphobic, heterosexist, ableist, and racist biases, they do serve to adequately reflect the work of marginalized faculty.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

As mentioned in previous sections, we have no information on trans, nonbinary, and intersex faculty from this survey. Given the low response rate from faculty, it is likely that we are missing important information about LGBTQIA+ faculty experiences on and perceptions of campus. Due to heteronormative and cisnormative expectations both on and off campus, LGBTQIA+ faculty are likely to experience greater overall challenges to their pathways on campus – at least as it pertains to intersecting sexual and gender identities-- than non-LGBTQIA+ faculty. But the specific ways in which heteronormativity is also deeply racist, ableist, classist, sexist, nationalist, and sizeist, must also be recognized. Therefore, we feel that information about intersecting identities would allow for a more nuanced and complete analysis of LGBTQIA+ faculty responses.

Age

We did not see any significant differences in the survey categories based on age. For example, in the category of Student-Centered Pedagogy, the results demonstrated no significant variance based on age. This was true for all categories measured for the report pertaining to Age.

Dependent care responsibilities

Engage All Students

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' centering of students and service in their pedagogical approach.

Student-Centered Pedagogy Factor

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Student-Centered Pedagogy	Doesn't have adult care responsibilities	450	53.5951
	Yes, has adult care responsibilities	96	55.4006

This factor measures the extent to which faculty use student-centered teaching and evaluation methods in their course instruction, including with student presentations, student evaluations of each other's work, class discussions, cooperative small-group learning, experiential learning & field studies, group projects, reflective writing or journaling, and using student inquiry to drive learning. The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Student-Centered Pedagogy Factor score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Civic-Minded Practices Factor

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Civic-Minded Practices	Doesn't have adult care responsibilities	419	48.8990
	Yes, has adult care responsibilities	94	50.9645

This factor measures the extent to which faculty have advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work, collaborated with local communities in research/teaching to address their needs, made community service a part of their coursework, dedicated weekly hours to community or public service, and engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay. The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Civic-Minded Practices score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Summary of Engaging All Students

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' centering of students and service in their pedagogical approach. Faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Civic-Minded Practices score and a higher average Student-Center Pedagogy Factor score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities. These results indicate that faculty with adult care responsibilities are more likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching than faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Faculty with adult care responsibilities report higher levels of student-centered teaching and evaluation methods in their courses, as well as higher average civic-minded practices in comparison with faculty who have no adult care responsibilities.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Because these factors are aligned with university interests in student success, we recommend that they be considered during the RTP process. We also suggest that since faculty with adult care responsibilities have higher scores in these areas, efforts be made to provide supportive services for these faculty. Because results indicate that faculty with adult care responsibilities are more likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching than faculty with no adult care responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Ask additional questions to better understand why faculty with no adult care responsibilities are less likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching, and why faculty with adult care responsibilities are more likely to do so. See below.
- Ask additional questions to better understand what faculty members with adult care responsibilities are doing to center students and service in their approach to teaching, comparatively. See below.
- From this additional data, develop targeted outreach, programming, messaging, and resources to increase the likelihood that more faculty members center students and service in their approach to teaching.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

- Why are faculty members with no adult care responsibilities less likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching?
- Why are faculty members with adult care responsibilities more likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching?
- How might sex/gender, or other categories of being that influence expectations for labor related to dependent care, be a factor in this divergence?
- How and why are different kinds of dependent care responsibilities a factor (or not) in these considerations?

Determining the reasons why faculty members are more and less likely to center students and service in their approach to teaching, and understanding how/why this might relate to sex/gender, or other categories of being that influence expectations for labor related to dependent care, will be beneficial for creating a more strategic approach to outreach, programming, messaging, and resources. Finding these answers will create conditions for more successful outreach as well as more successful resource distribution and program development to achieve desired outcomes.

- What, specifically, are faculty members with adult care responsibilities doing to center students and service in their approach to teaching, comparatively?
- Are other approaches to student empowerment and success being pursued among faculty members who are less likely to center students and service?

Learning more about the specifics of how faculty members are centering (or not) students and service in their approach to teaching may reveal trends that can help to shape programs and interventions. Knowing that there may be variability in the identification and development of student and service centered approaches, it may be advantageous to follow up with specific narrative or focus group studies on how differently positioned faculty members may understand and operationalize these practices.

Expand Access

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' perception of their role in relationship to students' moral and emotional development as well as their confidence in their ability to be an effective mentor.

Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty agree that it is their role to develop students' moral character, provide for students' emotional development, help students develop personal values, and encourage respect for different beliefs. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/childcare responsibilities to faculty with no house/childcare responsibilities.

Mentor Self-Efficacy Factor

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Mentor Self-Efficacy	Doesn't have adult care responsibilities	383	49.6394
	Yes, has adult care responsibilities	84	52.0529

This factor measures the extent to which faculty are confident in their ability to effectively mentor students. This includes providing constructive feedback to mentees, taking into account the biases and prejudices they bring into the mentor/mentee relationship, working effectively with mentees whose personal background is different from their own, being an advocate for mentees, helping mentees network effectively, and helping mentees acquire financial resources. The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Mentor Self-Efficacy Factor score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Summary of Expand Access

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' perception of their role in relationship to students' moral and emotional development as well as their confidence in their ability to be an effective mentor.

In comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, there are no significant findings related to the perception of their role in relationship to students' moral and emotional development. However, faculty with adult care responsibilities are more confident in their ability to be an effective mentor when compared with faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Faculty with adult care responsibilities have higher confidence, on average, in their mentorship abilities than those faculty without adult care responsibilities.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Because these factors are aligned with university interests in student success, we recommend that they be considered during the RTP process. We also suggest that since faculty with adult care responsibilities have higher scores in these areas, efforts be made to provide supportive services for these faculty.

Because results indicate that faculty with adult care responsibilities are more confident in their ability to be an effective mentor when compared with faculty with no adult care responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Ask additional questions to better understand what faculty members with adult care responsibilities are doing to mentor students and why this makes them feel more confident in their ability to be an effective mentor, as compared with faculty with no adult care responsibilities. See below.
- From this additional data, develop targeted outreach, programming, messaging, and resources to increase the likelihood that more faculty members can confidently mentor students.

Because there are no significant findings related to the perception of role in relationship to students' moral and emotional development when comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Continue to monitor faculty members' perception of their role in relationship to students' moral and emotional development through routine assessments.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

- What are faculty members with adult care responsibilities doing to mentor students?
- Why does this make them feel more confident in their ability to be an effective mentor, as compared with faculty with no adult care responsibilities?
- How might sex/gender, or other categories of being that influence expectations for labor related to dependent care, be a factor in this divergence?
- How and why are different kinds of dependent care responsibilities a factor (or not) in these considerations?

Learning more about the specifics of how faculty members are mentoring students, as well as why they feel confident in their ability to do so may reveal trends that can help to shape programs and interventions. Knowing that there may be variability in approaches to mentorship, and in how/why faculty members may feel confident in their approach, it may be advantageous to follow up with specific narrative or focus group studies on how differently positioned faculty members may understand and operationalize these practices.

Furthermore, determining the reasons why faculty members are more and less likely to feel confident in their mentorship and understanding how/why this might relate to sex/gender, or other categories of being that influence expectations for labor related to dependent care, will be beneficial for creating a more strategic approach to outreach, programming, messaging, and resources.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' job satisfaction, scholarly activities, and perception of themselves as scientists.

Scholarly Productivity Factor + Group

HERI Factor			Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Scholarly Productivity	None	9-16	-3.88680*	0.016
	9-16	17+	2.83827*	0.038

This factor measures the extent to which faculty engaged in scholarly activity such as publishing academic and professional journal articles, publishing chapters in edited volumes, and having professional writings published or accepted for publication in the past three years. The results for our campus show that faculty with 9-16 hours of house/childcare responsibilities have a higher average Scholarly Productivity score in comparison to faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities and faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

Science Self-Efficacy Factor

This factor is a measure of faculty members' efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy based on the STEM courses they taught in the previous year. Faculty were asked how often they encouraged students to use technical science skills (use of tools, instruments, and/or techniques), generate a research question, determine how to collect appropriate data, explain the results of a study, use scientific literature to guide research, integrate results from multiple studies, ask relevant questions, identify what is known and not known about a problem, understand scientific concepts, and see connections between different areas of science and mathematics.

There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/childcare responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities.

Science Identity Factor + Group

This factor is a measure describing the extent to which faculty conceive of themselves as scientists. Faculty were asked to what extent they found it true that they have a strong sense of belonging to a community of scientists, derive great personal satisfaction from working on a team that is doing important research, think of themselves as a scientist, and feel like they belong in the field of science.

There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/child care responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' job satisfaction, scholarly activities, perception of themselves as scientists, and efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy.

Results of this section were mixed. In comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, and in comparing faculty with house/childcare responsibilities

to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities, there were no significant findings related to job satisfaction, perception of themselves as scientists, and efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy. However, faculty with 9-16 hours of house/childcare responsibilities were more productive in scholarly activities than faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities and faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

There were no differences between faculty with different degrees of dependent care responsibilities for any areas of Intellectual Development, other than in relation to the factor for Scholarly Productivity. Faculty with 9-16 hours of house/childcare responsibilities have a higher average Scholarly Productivity score in comparison to faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities and faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

Higher average scholarly productivity scores for faculty with 9-16 hours of house/childcare responsibilities, compared with those who have no hours or 17+ hours, indicate that scholarly productivity can be challenging for faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities. The lower scholarly productivity scores among those with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities may reflect higher self-expectations of scholarly productivity among these faculty. Otherwise, it is possible that other expectations—either work or personal—are interfering with scholarly productivity for faculty with no house/childcare responsibilities. To address differences in scholarly productivity for faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities, we recommend that equitable opportunities for assigned

Based on the finding that faculty with 9-16 hours of house/childcare responsibilities were more productive in scholarly activities than faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities and faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Ask additional questions to better understand why faculty members with a certain degree of care responsibilities are able to engage and be productive in scholarly activities while those with more/less care responsibilities are not. See below.
- From this additional data, develop targeted outreach, programming, messaging, and resources to increase the likelihood that all faculty members can engage in scholarly activities.
- Specifically, it is recognized that in U.S. society women are disproportionately responsible for care work. As the survey suggests, those who must invest more time in care work and other household responsibilities have a lower productivity score. Based on these discrepancies we encourage the university to support faculty who have care work responsibilities by providing reasonable accommodations in work schedules, creating more on-campus childcare options, and by providing resources for the research activities and conference travel of faculty who are care givers.

Given that there were no significant findings related to job satisfaction, perception of themselves as scientists, and efforts to increase students' science self-efficacy when comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, and in comparing faculty with house/childcare responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Institute routine program assessments to continue to monitor faculty members' job satisfaction, perception of themselves as scientists, and efforts to increase students'

science self-efficacy, focusing on potential distinctions between faculty with care responsibilities to faculty with no care responsibilities.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

- Why are faculty members with a certain degree of dependent care responsibility able to engage and be productive in scholarly activities while those with more/less care responsibilities are not?
- How might sex/gender, or other categories of being that influence expectations for labor related to dependent care, be a factor in this divergence?
- How are different kinds of dependent care responsibilities a factor in these considerations?

As stated above, it is recognized that in U.S. society women are disproportionately responsible for care work and that differently positioned women are impacted differently by this expectation. Learning more about the specifics of this finding concerning scholarly activities relative to time spent engaging in dependent care can help to shape useful programs and interventions. It may be advantageous to follow up with specific narrative or focus group studies on how dependent care responsibilities are impacting differently positioned faculty members.

Furthermore, determining the reasons why faculty members are more and less likely to feel confident in their mentorship and understanding how/why this might relate to sex/gender, or other categories of being that influence expectations for labor related to dependent care, will be beneficial for creating a more strategic approach to outreach, programming, messaging, and resources.

Build Community

This section reports results focusing on the degree to which faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues as well as the degree to which faculty members believe in and promote community service work among students as part of the college mission.

Respectful Climate Factor

HERI Factor			Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Respectful Climate	1-8	17+	2.74290*	0.040

This measure represents the extent to which faculty feel their contributions are respected or appreciated by their colleagues. This includes feeling that their research, teaching, and service are valued by their department and that faculty generally respect each other. The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a lower average Respectful Climate Factor score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities. Additionally, faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities have a lower average Respectful Climate Factor score in comparison to faculty with 1-8 hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

Civic-Minded Values Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. This includes enhancing students' knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, encouraging students to become agents of social change, and believing

that colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues. The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Civic-Minded Values score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Civic-Minded Practices Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty have advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work, collaborated with local communities in research/teaching to address their needs, made community service a part of their coursework, dedicated weekly hours to community or public service, and engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay.

The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Civic-Minded Practices score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Summary of Build Community

This section reports results focusing on the degree to which faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues as well as the degree to which faculty members believe in and promote community service work among students as part of the college mission.

The findings in this section show that the presence and degree of dependent care responsibilities has an impact on whether faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues. Specifically, when compared with faculty members with no adult care responsibilities, faculty members with adult care responsibilities feel less appreciated and respected by their colleagues. Similarly, faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities feel less appreciated and respected by their colleagues in comparison to faculty with 1-8 hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

At the same time, when compared with faculty members with no adult care responsibilities, faculty members with adult care responsibilities are more likely to believe in and promote community service work among students as part of the college mission.

Faculty with adult care responsibilities report lower Respectful Climate Factor scores than other faculty, and faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities report lower Respectful Climate Factor scores than those with 1-8 hours of house/childcare responsibilities. This suggests that there are specific issues of interpersonal and institutional respect for the work and contributions of faculty who provide adult care or who are responsible for 17+ hours of house/childcare per week. Faculty with adult care responsibilities also report the higher perceptions that civic engagement is part of the college mission, and higher levels of participation in advising student groups involved in service/volunteer work or other community related activities than other faculty. Their perceptions of and investments in the value of civic-minded activities may reflect the importance of interdependence and community that caregiving requires, yet is also likely to result in additional labor for faculty invested in these activities.

Recommendations related to Build Community

Because faculty with adult caregiving responsibilities and faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities report lower perceptions that their research, teaching, and service contributions are valued and respected by colleagues and in their departments, we recommend that conversations and consultation with caregiving faculty be an integral part of campus equity work. We recommend that Campus Parenting and Caregiver Groups, including

those organized through the President's Equity and Change Commission, and those involved in groups like Parents and Caregivers United, be consulted on how to best support faculty caregivers, and to ensure that their contributions to our campus are valued and respected.

Because results show that the presence, kind, and degree of dependent care responsibly has an impact on whether faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues, we recommend the following:

- Ask additional questions to better understand how different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibilities impact whether and how faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues. See below.
- From this additional data, develop targeted outreach, programming, messaging, and resources to increase the likelihood that all faculty members feel appreciated, respected, and supported.
- Consider further exploration of these finding through a consideration of potential distinctions between lecturers, junior faculty members, and senior faculty members.

It is also recommended to continue identifying resources and support networks for faculty with dependents and to encourage campus programming to offer hybrid options for increased engagement.

Furthermore, because faculty members with adult care responsibilities are more likely to believe in, engage in, and promote service work among students as part of the college mission, when compared with faculty members with no adult care responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Ask additional questions to better understand why faculty members with adult care responsibilities are more likely to believe in, engage in, and promote service work among students as part of the college mission, comparatively. Also ask what kinds of service work is being engaged in and promoted.
- Ask additional questions to better understand how different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibilities impact this belief and engagement in service work.
- Develop targeted outreach, programming, and resources to increase the likelihood that all faculty can engage in service work, alongside promoting this work as part of the college mission.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

How do faculty in each of these groups conceive of things like civic engagement and belonging? What opportunities or activities contribute to higher scores in some groups when compared with others? For example, are time constraints a large contributor? Conceptions of parenting and work responsibilities? Access to networks of support from other caregivers?

- How do different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibility impact whether and how faculty members feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues?

Determining the reasons why faculty members who have different dependent care responsibilities are more and less likely to feel appreciated and respected by their colleagues will be critical for developing targeted outreach, programming, messaging, and resources needed to support these faculty members in the different ways that they may need to be supported, while also meeting wider diversity and inclusion goals.

- Why are faculty members with adult care responsibilities more likely to believe in, engage in, and promote service work among students as part of the college mission, comparatively?
- What kinds of service work is being engaged in and promoted, comparatively?
- How do different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibility impact the kinds and degrees of belief, engagement in, and promotion of service work?

Determining the reasons why faculty members are more and less likely to engage in the kinds of service work that they believe to be part of the college mission, and understanding how/why this relates to different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibility, will be beneficial for creating a more strategic approach to outreach, programming, messaging, and resources that can support a more equitable distribution of service-labor. Determining how such distinctions may overlap with sex/gender ideology will also be useful. This will support wider diversity and inclusion goals.

It may be advantageous to follow up with focus group studies to determine these distinctions, including how dependent care responsibilities are impacting differently positioned faculty members.

Cultivate Resilience

This section reports results focusing on faculty members' perception of the mission, goals, commitments, and actions of the institution relative to faculty and campus diversity, increasing prestige, facilitating civic engagement, providing adequate compensation, and mitigating career stress.

Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus Factor

This factor represents faculty's perspectives about the climate for faculty members from diverse backgrounds. This includes ratings of the effectiveness of hiring practices and policies that increase faculty diversity, of taking responsibility for educating underprepared students, and how fairly faculty of color, women faculty, and LGBTQ faculty are treated. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/childcare responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities.

Institutional Priority: Diversity Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to creating a diverse multicultural campus environment. Faculty rated how important they believe the university prioritized recruiting more traditionally underrepresented students, promoting gender diversity in the faculty and administration, promoting racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty and administration, developing an appreciation for multiculturalism, and increasing or maintaining institutional affordability. There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/childcare responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities.

Institutional Priority: Prestige Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to increasing its prestige. This includes perceptions on the institution's ability to increase or maintain prestige, hire faculty "stars", and maintain a competitive student admissions process.

There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/child care responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities.

Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe their institution is committed to facilitating civic engagement among students and faculty. Faculty rated how important they believe the university prioritized facilitating student involvement in community service, providing resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research, and creating and sustaining partnerships with surrounding communities.

There were no significant findings for this factor in comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, nor were there significant findings in comparing faculty with house/childcare responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities.

Civic-Minded Values Factor

This factor measures the extent to which faculty believe civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. This includes enhancing students’ knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, encouraging students to become agents of social change, and believing that colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues.

The results for our campus show that faculty with adult care responsibilities have a higher average Civic-Minded Values score in comparison to faculty with no adult care responsibilities.

Satisfaction with Compensation Factor

No differences.

Career-Related Stress Factor

HERI Factor			Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Career-Related Stress	None	9-16	-4.14819*	0.036
		17+	-5.35559*	0.003

This factor measures the amount of stress faculty experience related to their career. Aspects include committee work, students, research and publishing demands, instructional procedures/red tape, teaching loads, lack of personal time, and striving to meet high expectations. The results for our campus show that faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities have a higher average Career-Related Stress Factor score in comparison to faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

This section reports results focusing on faculty members’ perception of the mission, goals, commitments, and actions of the institution relative to faculty and campus diversity, increasing prestige, facilitating civic engagement, providing adequate compensation, and mitigating career stress.

The results from this section were mixed.

In comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, and faculty with house/childcare responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities there were no significant findings related to assessing the institution's commitment to campus climate and diversity, increasing prestige, and providing adequate compensation.

However, distinctions did exist in results around civic engagement. When comparing faculty with adult care responsibilities to faculty with no adult care responsibilities, and faculty with house/child care responsibilities to faculty with no house/child care responsibilities, there were no significant distinctions related to the perception of the institution as committed to facilitating civic engagement among students and faculty; however, faculty members with adult care responsibilities were more likely to believe that civic engagement is a central part of the college mission when compared with faculty members with no adult care responsibilities.

Distinctions also existed in mitigating career stress as results show that faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities experience more stress related to their career in comparison to faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

There are no significant dependent-care differences in perceptions of climate for diversity on campus, or perceptions of how the institution prioritizes diversity, prestige, or civic engagement. There are also no significant dependent-care differences in satisfaction with compensation. However, faculty with house/childcare responsibilities reported greater belief in the importance of civic-engagement than those without house/childcare responsibilities. Moreover, faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities experienced higher career-related stress than those with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

Because faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities experience higher career-related stress than those with no house/childcare responsibilities, we recommend greater attention to equity in the RTP process. To this end, we recommend consultation with parenting and caregiving groups on campus, including the CLA Equity Task Force, to identify the needs of caregiving faculty.

While it is promising that there were no significant findings among faculty members with and without dependent care responsibilities relative to assessing the institution's commitment to campus climate and diversity, increasing prestige, and providing adequate compensation, we recommend the following:

- Institute routine program assessments to continue to monitor these factors, focusing on potential distinctions between differently positioned faculty members with and without dependent care responsibilities.
- In these assessments, consider how and why different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibility can differently impact faculty members.

As results show that faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities experience more stress related to their career in comparison to faculty with no hours of house/childcare responsibilities, we recommend the following:

- Additional study to understand how and why different degrees and kinds of dependent care responsibility can differently impact faculty members relative to career stress.
- Additional study to understand the specific nature of the responsibilities that faculty members are undertaking, which will allow for more targeted suggestions and support.
- Additional study to understand and identify the campus resources and support networks that currently work to mitigate career stress among faculty members who have dependent responsibilities to see how these may apply (or not) to faculty members who have 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities.
- Continued support and expansion of existing resources and support for faculty members with house/childcare responsibilities that currently work to mitigate career stress, including hybrid options.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

It would be helpful to know whether there are differences for caregiving faculty in relation to lecturer and tenure-track status, as well as whether there are differences in various disciplines/departments on campus.

Part time and full time

Engage All Students

Student-Centered Pedagogy

With respect to student-centered pedagogy there was no statistically significant difference between part time and full-time faculty.

Civic-Minded Practices

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Civic-Minded Practices	Part time	141	47.0498
	Full time	387	50.2306

The statistical difference between part time and full-time faculty with regards to Civic-Minded Practices showed that full-time faculty were more likely to be involved in civic activities.

Summary of Engaging All Students

In considering full-time and part-time faculty responses to questions about engaging all students, it appears likely that the full-time faculty have a higher level of student engagement than part-time faculty. This may be because part-time faculty are not encouraged to engage students in anything other than teaching. They are not compensated for extra engagement with students that may involve civic involvement, and they may not be able to find the time or resources to engage in some of the more labor-intensive practices that are associated with student-centered teaching and evaluation methods.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students.

To improve engagement with all students, part-time faculty must be given additional compensation for their mentoring, for trying new ways of teaching and evaluating students, for their extra engagement with students, and for their work advising student groups or engaging in community service with students. The campus's Center for Community Engagement might find a way to incentivize part-time faculty in the creation of service-learning courses, perhaps through some form of assigned time. Currently any outside mentoring and engagement of students by part-time faculty is done on their own time without compensation of any kind. This creates an unfair burden on part-time faculty and should be addressed by the University. Also, the necessity for some part-time faculty of working on multiple campuses may also limit their ability to engage all students at CSULB, so it would be to our campus's advantage to hire more full-time faculty when possible.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

It would be helpful to know what sorts of obstacles and limitation part-time faculty and full-time faculty encounter in their attempts to both engage in civic-minded practices and center their pedagogy on their students. While differences in time and compensation, as we indicated in our recommendations, are likely one factor, there may be other barriers of which we are not aware.

Expand Access

Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Group

With respect to Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development, or the belief that student personal development is a central goal of undergraduate education, there was no statistically significant difference between the full-time and part-time faculty members.

Mentor Self-Efficacy

Additionally, for Mentor Self-Efficacy there was also no statistically significant difference between full-time and part-time faculty members. Both groups appear equally confident in their ability to mentor our students effectively.

Summary of Expand Access

In light of the responses of full-time and part-time faculty regarding their beliefs around undergraduate education as a way of expanding access for students, the fact that there was no statistically significant difference between full-time and part-time faculty indicates that both sets of faculty members may be united in their beliefs about this aspect of our educational mission.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

The university should continue to emphasize this important part of our educational mission among full-time and part-time faculty, since it is a crucial part of our attempts to close equity gaps among our diverse student population. Since this is an area that unites full-time and part-time faculty, additional opportunities for mentoring students and for encouraging moral and emotional development in the classroom should involve both full-time and part-time faculty working in tandem.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

While there is general agreement about the importance of expanding access among the full-time and part-time faculty, it would be useful to know if both full-time and part-time faculty are able to devote the amount of time they would like to mentoring and focusing on students' personal development. It may be that both faculty groups are happy with the amount of time they can offer students in the areas of mentoring and personal development, but since this section focuses on faculty beliefs and confidence around expanding access, more data is needed.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Group

With respect to the Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment, the part-time and full-time faculty showed no statistically significant difference in their levels of satisfaction.

Scholarly Productivity/Scholarly Productivity Group

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Scholarly Productivity	Part time	157	41.7466
	Full time	428	51.7608

In considering full-time and part-time faculty responses to questions about Scholarly Productivity, we noted a statistically significant difference indicating that full-time faculty reported more scholarly activity than their part-time counterparts.

Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment Science Identity

There was not a statistically significant difference between full-time and part-time faculty when it came to their satisfaction with their working environment.

Science Self-Efficacy

In the comparison between full-time and part-time faculty regarding their efforts to increase their students' science self-efficacy, there was not statistically significant difference between the two groups.

Science Identity Group

There was not a statistically significant difference between full- and part-time faculty in the survey's measurement of the extent to which faculty conceive of themselves as scientists.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

In the area of promoting intellectual achievement, full-time faculty have reported higher scholarly productivity than part-time faculty, but there was no difference in the other areas measured related to intellectual achievement. Part-time faculty are not compensated for their scholarly work, which may be the reason for their reports of lower levels of scholarly productivity in comparison with their full-time counterparts. The alignment between full-time faculty and part-time faculty satisfaction with their work environment is surprising given the differences between these groups elsewhere. This alignment does not mean that both groups are very satisfied, but that their levels of workplace satisfaction are not different. The lack of a statistically significant difference may be due to the increased workload of full-time faculty in the face of falling tenure density alongside the potentially precarious position of part-time faculty at the university.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

To achieve greater scholarly productivity for part-time faculty, the University needs to explore the idea of additional compensation for part-time faculty to engage in scholarly research and intellectual activity. Many part-time teachers participate in research and provide valuable insights into their field of study as it is, but they do this without compensation from CSULB. It is highly likely that the lack of compensation takes a toll on their productivity, and, we suspect, on their ability to share with their students the most recent research and creative activities in their field. Scholarly productivity is important in its own right—most of our faculty are teachers and scholars dedicated to the creation of new knowledge and art—but scholarly productivity is also a crucial part of what gives CSULB students an interesting, valuable, and up-to-date education. We recognize the constraints of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and encourage the creation of new forms of part-time faculty work that include compensation for research and intellectual achievement. These new forms should not, however, come at the expense of the number of tenured and tenure-track positions at the CSULB. In addition, any new kinds of faculty positions must consider concerns about workload and equity.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

It would be useful to have more data about the specific levels of satisfaction of full-time and part-time faculty with their workplace environment as well as specific data about what specific aspects of the workplace that are more or less important for determining full-time and part-time faculty workplace satisfaction.

Build Community

Respectful Climate

The data indicate that part-time faculty registered less respect from and appreciation by their colleagues in comparison with full-time faculty. This was a statistically significant difference.

Civic-Minded Values/Civic-Minded Values Group

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Civic-Minded Values	Part time	158	51.6384
	Full time	415	53.9367

There was also a statistically significant difference between full-time and part-time faculty around the belief that civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. Part-time faculty were less likely than full-time faculty to emphasize the role of the faculty and of the university in promoting civic engagement.

Civic-Minded Practices/Civic-Minded Practices Group

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Civic-Minded Practices	Part time	141	47.0498
	Full time	387	50.2306

A statistically significant difference between the two groups also indicates that full-time faculty reported greater involvement in civic activities than part-time faculty.

Summary of Build Community

In considering full-time and part-time faculty responses to questions about how respected faculty feel on campus, we noted a statistically significant difference indicating that full-time faculty felt more respected. In addition, full-time faculty placed greater emphasis on civic-minded values and practices as part of their teaching at CSULB. It seems possible and even likely that part-time faculty, not being regularly compensated for their research and service, would conclude that their work in these areas is less valued by other, presumably full-time, faculty. The limitation of part-time faculty work to teaching without service and research may also limit part-time faculty members' ability to consider civic-minded values and practices in relation to their job. Though CSULB is like the rest of the United States in terms of its over-reliance on part-time faculty, many of whom may work at multiple universities to make ends meet, the division between full-time and part-time faculty does currently harm the overall sense of community on campus.

Recommendations related to Build Community

To improve community on campus, it is essential that we offer more service and research opportunities for part-time faculty. These opportunities must be, of course, properly compensated. These opportunities would help part-time faculty feel more valued and respected by their peers; such opportunities would, because they would make part-time faculty more fulfilled, also likely improve part-time faculty teaching as well as student learning. We recognize

the constraints of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and therefore it might not be possible to create new forms of part-time faculty work that include compensation for research and service, but it should not be forgotten that student success and student learning depend on the kind of community that we create via the institution's treatment of faculty.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

In terms of measuring full-time and part-time faculty involvement in civic activities, it would be useful to have data about which colleges and departments of the university rely on greater numbers of part-time faculty, as we suspect that levels of civic engagement may be impacted by discipline. Some areas of study lend themselves more readily to volunteer work and community work than other areas.

Cultivate Resilience

Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus	Part time	131	52.2331
	Full time	383	48.2955

With respect to full-time and part-time faculty responses to questions about their perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus, we noted a statistically significant difference indicating that part-time faculty had a greater sense that faculty of color, women, and LGBTQ faculty were treated fairly and that CSULB was being effective in hiring diverse faculty.

Institutional Priority: Diversity

With respect to Institutional Priority: Diversity, the survey showed no statistically significant difference between the two groups of faculty members.

Institutional Priority: Prestige

With respect to Institutional Priority: Prestige the survey showed no statistically significant difference between the two groups of faculty members.

Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement

With respect to Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement, the survey showed there were no significant differences between the two groups of faculty members.

Civic-Minded Values

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Civic-Minded Values	Part time	158	51.6384
	Full time	415	53.9367

In the area of Civic-Minded Values, the survey noted a statistically significant difference between the part-time and full-time faculty with the full-time faculty showing a greater belief in civic engagement as part of CSULB's mission. The University seeks to encourage innovative, and forward-looking scholarship focused on social change; however, this the importance of this goal may not be reaching part-time faculty members.

Satisfaction with Compensation

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Satisfaction with Compensation	Part time	123	47.9080
	Full time	370	50.8118

In the area of Satisfaction with Compensation, we noted a statistically significant difference between full and part-time faculty indicating that full-time faculty had a higher level of satisfaction than part-time faculty.

Career-Related Stress

HERI Factor		N	Mean
Career-Related Stress	Part time	137	42.6762
	Full time	378	52.8128

Career related stress was an area of the survey where there was a high degree of difference between full and part-time faculty with respect to their answers. Full-time faculty had a much higher level of career related stress than part-time faculty. This may be because full-time faculty must perform positively in teaching, scholarship, and service. Part-time faculty likely have fewer classes at CSULB and must only perform teaching to achieve a positive performance appraisal, though they may sometimes be asked to participate in additional service on campus or they may participate in part-time instructional work at multiple campuses in the CSULB area.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

Four significant differences emerged in this area. Full-time faculty, when contrasted with their part-time counterparts, show both a greater belief in civic engagement as part of CSULB's mission and a higher level of satisfaction with compensation. Part-time faculty, however, when they were contrasted with full-time faculty, experienced lower levels of stress related to their careers and seemed more inclined to see CSULB as having a positive climate for diverse faculty. It may be that full-time faculty have greater sensitivity to the problems or challenges on campus, especially those related to diversity, since they may have a stronger sense of the ways in which their professional life depends on CSULB. Full-time faculty may also be more aware of trends over time related to diversity and be more likely to serve on search committees where they see the institution's successes and failures to make university and faculty administrations more diverse. Also, given how CSULB is a large campus with many levels of bureaucracy and how its fortunes intertwined are with the unpredictable state government and budgetary outlook, full-time faculty likely develop a more nuanced sense of the campus and the CSU as institutions that need to be improved. Full-time faculty are likely to have more interactions with university bureaucracy and funding crises than part-time counterparts. Also, as tenure density has declined, full-time faculty have been required to do additional work to keep the institution running, which doubtlessly serves as a source of additional stress for many full-time faculty.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

To address full-time faculty dissatisfaction with the campus climate for diversity, the University must continue to increase diversity in their tenure-track hiring practices. The University must

pledge to hire more tenure-track faculty of color and diverse backgrounds within the next few years. As a Hispanic-serving institution we should have a diverse faculty to serve our diverse students. The University should use mechanisms such as legislative advocacy, philanthropy and community and industry partnerships to withstand economic volatility to remain a vital part of the Long Beach financial landscape.

The university also must improve its tenure density and consider ways to adjust the course load of its full-time faculty in the face of the changing nature of higher education. As we face the COVID-19 pandemic and its aftermath, the amount of work required to teach one class continues to increase—especially as we hope to close equity gaps among our students—while retirements have reduced the number of available faculty without a reduction in enrolled students or a reduction in the necessary work on committees, in student mentorship, and advising. Fewer people are doing more work. There are certainly many well-educated and willing PhDs who would find CSULB’s mission attractive and be willing to join us on the tenure track, so in many ways the CSU could be a national trailblazer in making the hiring of many new, diverse tenure-track faculty members a top priority. We need new faculty in all areas, whether traditional disciplines like math and languages, or newer areas like biomedical engineering. The hiring of new faculty cannot be only about STEM, about job-training, or about up-and-coming fields. The faculty needs to grow across the board: the more tenure-track faculty we have teaching our classes and helping in the shared governance of our institution, the more our students will be able to thrive in a stable, consistent, and innovative learning environment. Faculty can only be so resilient, and a “tenure-track hiring campaign” would be a great way for the university to show its commitment to student success moving forward after the multiple intersecting struggles of 2020 and 2021.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

Since so many different factors are part of this category of the survey, it is difficult to formulate questions for further research. It would, though, benefit the campus to have a more fine-grained sense of the sources of faculty job satisfaction and the reasons why full-time faculty are more skeptical about the university’s commitment to creating a diverse multicultural campus environment.

Political

Engage All Students

Student-Centered Pedagogy

HERI Factor			Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Student-Centered Pedagogy	Far Left	Far Right & Conservative	6.09404*	0.002

Faculty with a far-left political orientation report statistically significant higher average use of student-centered teaching and evaluation methods than faculty with a far right and conservative political orientation.

Civic-Minded Practices

In terms of their involvement in civic activities, there was not a statistically significant difference among faculty when they were grouped by political orientation.

Summary of Engaging All Students

With respect to student-centered pedagogy and civic-minded Practices, faculty with a far-left political orientation report on average making greater use of student-centered teaching and evaluation methods than their far right and conservative counterparts, while there is not a significant difference in the amount of civic engagement when political orientation is considered.

Recommendations related to Engaging All Students

Beyond suggesting that the Faculty Center and CSULB faculty do more to promote student-centered pedagogy among all faculty, regardless of political orientation, it is difficult to recommend a course of action. Perhaps the broad, universal learning benefits of student-centered pedagogy should be emphasized to a greater extent, as should the specific background of our students and how our students benefit from these practices. Regardless of a faculty member's political orientation, it is beneficial for faculty members to know more about their students and more about the learning that suits them best.

Unanswered Questions related to Engaging All Students

It would be useful to obtain additional data about the reasons why far right and conservative faculty report lower average usage of student-centered teaching and evaluation practices. Are some aspects of these practices unappealing to certain faculty depending on their political orientation? Do far right and conservative faculty perceive a political position behind the conception of a student-centered classroom? In what way? On the topic of civic involvement, it would be interesting to find out if there are different reasons why faculty of different political orientations find civic involvement to be important.

Expand Access

Focus on Undergraduate Personal Development Group

When comparing faculty from a far right, conservative, and middle of the road political orientation with those who identify as liberal or far left, the liberal and far left faculty were, on average, more likely to believe that personal development is a central part of undergraduate education.

Mentor Self-Efficacy

In the area of mentor self-efficacy, or faculty members' confidence in their ability to effectively mentor students, there were no statistically significant differences among the different political orientations.

Summary of Expand Access

The data in this section suggest that political orientation does not affect faculty members' confidence in their ability to mentor students, while political orientation does impact (or at least correlate with) faculty members' belief in the centrality of student personal development as part of a CSULB education. To borrow from the wording of the survey questions, faculty members who identify as far left, liberal, or moderate seem to place greater stress on student respect for different beliefs, moral character, emotional development, and personal belief than do more right-leaning faculty. Since respecting beliefs different from one's own is classically liberal value, this result is not entirely surprising.

Recommendations related to Expand Access

Given the connection that emerges in this area between political orientation on the one hand and faculty belief in the centrality of the formation of personal values as part of undergraduate education, it seems that more conservative faculty are less likely to support the so-called liberal values that come with an undergraduate education. If CSULB as an institution continues to believe that personal development is part of what students accomplish during their time at our institution, then more work needs to be done to emphasize to all faculty, including conservative faculty members, the importance of a liberal education and an area central to weighing and evaluating one's beliefs and ethical positions, the liberal arts. Recent cuts to general education due to systemwide mandates have reduced the number of requirements in liberal arts, and it is not uncommon to find some faculty themselves, like students, questioning the need for education in areas linked to values, beliefs, and character. We need to do more to emphasize that, while college may be about achieving a higher salary, joining the middle class, and getting a job, it is not exclusively about these utilitarian and economic goals, but about the development of the whole person. When we confine teaching topics around personal development to professional programs, what results is a narrower professional education that leaves out personal development. Expanding access to CSULB should involve expanding access throughout the university in all areas of study, such that more students regardless of field are able to pursue an education, whether that education assists workforce needs or enriches the community and individual's life in a less measurable way.

Unanswered Questions related to Expand Access

If conservative and far right faculty members are less inclined to see the importance of personal development as part of a CSULB student's education, it would be useful to learn what other benefits of education right-leaning faculty members do recognize as crucial to a student's education.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

Satisfaction with Professional Work Environment

There was no statistically significant difference among faculty of different political orientations regarding the extent to which they are satisfied with their professional work environment.

Scholarly Productivity/Scholarly Productivity Group

Again, there was not statistically significant difference among faculty of different political orientations when it comes to scholarly productivity.

Science Identity Group

When comparing far right, conservative, and middle of the road faculty with their liberal and far left counterparts, there was not a statistically significant difference in the extent to which these two groups of faculty members perceive themselves as scientists.

Science Self-Efficacy

When comparing far right, conservative, and middle of the road faculty with their liberal and far left counterparts, there was not a statistically significant difference between the two groups' relative efforts to increase their students' science self-efficacy.

Summary of Promote Intellectual Achievement

No statistically significant differences emerged between groups of faculty organized by political orientation when we analyzed the questions around satisfaction with work environment, scholarly productivity, science identity, and science self-efficacy. This appears to suggest that political orientation does not correlate with the ways that different faculty members think about their intellectual achievement.

Recommendations related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

The survey results do not seem to suggest any need for change in this area with respect to faculty members' political orientation.

Unanswered Questions related to Promote Intellectual Achievement

A question on the survey that asked about the extent to which faculty members view their intellectual achievements as political would be interesting, and might assist CSULB in understanding the dearth of statistically significant differences in this category. Does one's discipline or even one's college shape the degree to which faculty members view their scholarly achievements as political?

Given that the COVID-19 pandemic and the ongoing climate crisis have resulted in the politicization of science, it would be useful to know whether the data in this area may have changed since the survey was administered. Perhaps, though, such politicized debates around science do not impact faculty members' commitment to increasing their students' science self-efficacy.

Build Community

Respectful Climate

There was not a statistically significant difference among faculty of different political orientations when it came to their feelings that their contributions are respected or appreciated by their colleagues.

Civic-Minded Values/Civic-Minded Values Group

HERI Factor			Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Civic-Minded Values	Middle of the Road	Far Right & Conservative	7.61248*	0.000
	Liberal	Middle of the Road	4.06322*	0.000

In the area of civic-minded values, there was a statistically significant difference between, on the one hand, middle of the road faculty, and, on the other, those who identified as far right and/or conservative; faculty who report being middle of the road politically report higher average belief in civic-minded values as central to the college mission than do faculty who are far right or conservative. In addition, faculty who identify themselves as liberal in political orientation are more likely to believe in the importance of civic-minded values in higher education than those who identify as middle of the road.

Civic-Minded Practices/Civic-Minded Practices Group

In the area of civic-minded practices, there was not a statistically significant difference between faculty of different political orientations. Thus, the survey does not find a connection between, on the one hand, the political position of a faculty member and, on the other, the degree to which the faculty member is involved in civic activities.

Summary of Build Community

There were not statistically significant differences between the far right, conservative, and middle faculty and the liberal and far left faculty when it came to the question of feeling respected by their colleagues or to the question of the faculty member's involvement in civic activities, though left and far left faculty placed far greater emphasis on civic-minded values when differentiated from the far right, conservative, and middle faculty. This would suggest that, on average, faculty members who identify as conservative or as part of the far right are hesitant to encourage students to become agents of social change or to gain knowledge and appreciation of other racial and ethnic groups.

Recommendations related to Build Community

The data indicate that CSULB needs to do a better job assisting all faculty in understanding the centrality of civic-minded values to the education that they provide at CSULB. It might be useful to communicate directly with far right, conservative, and middle of the road faculty to emphasize, for example, the importance of our students gaining knowledge and appreciation of other racial and ethnic groups. All faculty need to become more aware of the racial and ethnic diversity of our student population and of the ways in which political forces—whether debates about systemic racism and anti-blackness in the United States, histories of racism and oppression, and discussions of the long history of anti-immigrant sentiment—shape the lives of our students and require us to be even more deliberate in describing the importance of civic-minded values in the education our students receive.

Unanswered Questions related to Build Community

It would be useful to know more about why faculty members who identify as far right, conservative, or middle are less supportive of the idea of civic engagement as part of the

college mission. Since the public good is part of CSULB’s mission and values, this item indicates that there may be potential skepticism about central parts of CSULB’s purpose and values among conservative, far right, and middle faculty members, so more data in this area would be crucial as CSULB moves forward to accomplish its mission. If conservative, far right, and middle faculty member are less focused on the importance of civic-minded values for our students, then how does this group of faculty members understand the value and significance of higher education as an endeavor?

Cultivate Resilience

Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus

HERI Factor			Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Perceptions of the Climate for Diversity on Campus	Liberal	Far Right & Conservative	-6.00870*	0.002
		Middle of the Road	-3.49518*	0.002
		Far Left	4.49323*	0.002

Faculty who identify as far right and conservative reported much higher scores with regards to their perceptions of the climate for diversity on campus when compared with liberal faculty, while faculty who identified as liberal were far more positive in their average assessment of the campus’s climate for diversity than faculty who identified as far left. Given this information, the further left one appears on the political spectrum, the less satisfied one seems to be with the campus’s climate for diversity.

Institutional Priority: Diversity

In comparing faculty of different political orientations in the extent to which they believe that CSULB is committed to creating a multicultural campus environment, there was no statistically significant difference between groups.

Institutional Priority: Prestige

HERI Factor			Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Institutional Priority: Prestige	Far Left	Middle of the Road	-3.27874*	0.028

Faculty members who identify themselves as having a far-left political orientation reported, on average, lower scores than middle of the road faculty in their assessment of CSULB’s commitment to increasing its prestige. Thus, individuals on the far left are less likely than moderates to believe that CSULB is committed to being more competitive in admissions, hiring faculty stars, and increasing institutional prestige.

Institutional Priority: Civic Engagement

There was no statistically significant difference among faculty of different political orientations when it came to average scores regarding faculty belief that CSULB's institution is committed to facilitating civic engagement among students and faculty.

Civic-Minded Values

HERI Factor			Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Civic-Minded Values	Middle of the Road	Far Right & Conservative	7.61248*	0.000
	Liberal	Middle of the Road	4.06322*	0.000

In the area of civic-minded values, there was a statistically significant difference between, on the one hand, middle of the road faculty, and, on the other, those who identified as far right and/or conservative; faculty who identify as being middle of the road politically report higher average belief in civic-minded values as central to the college mission than do faculty who are far right or conservative. In addition, faculty who identify themselves as liberal in political orientation are more likely to believe in the importance of civic-minded values in higher education than those who identify as middle of the road.

Satisfaction with Compensation

There was no statistically significant difference among faculty of different political orientations in their average estimates of their satisfaction with their compensation packages.

Career-Related Stress

HERI Factor			Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Career-Related Stress	Liberal	Middle of the Road	2.69009*	0.043
	Far Left	Far Right & Conservative	7.53509*	0.001
		Middle of the Road	6.14625*	0.000
	Liberal	3.45616*	0.049	

In the area of career-related stress, liberal faculty reported greater average stress than faculty members who identify as middle of the road politically. In addition, faculty members who identify as far left politically experienced more career related stress than faculty members of every other political orientation, with the greatest mean difference occurring between far-left faculty and far right or conservative faculty.

Summary of Cultivate Resilience

Career-related stress and belief in the importance of civic-minded values as part of CSULB's mission both increase as faculty move leftward on the political spectrum, while far left and liberal faculty appear far more likely to be critical of the campus's climate for faculty members from diverse backgrounds than their middle of the road, conservative, and far right counterparts. Far left faculty were also less likely to see CSULB as committed to institutional prestige than middle of the road faculty.

Recommendations related to Cultivate Resilience

If far left and liberal faculty are more likely to experience career-related stress and feel a lack of satisfaction with the climate for faculty of diverse backgrounds on campus, it is crucial that administrators and faculty leaders remain aware of the fact that the political climate of the city, state, nation, and world are intertwined with attitudes that far left faculty possess towards their job and towards the climate for diversity on campus. More dialogue about the intersection between political affiliation and life on campus would be beneficial, perhaps through guest speakers, community service events that involved faculty, staff, students, and administrators, or even lobby days that combined these groups.

Unanswered Questions related to Cultivate Resilience

For liberal and far left faculty, to what extent might there be a correlation between, on the one hand, a lack of satisfaction about the climate on campus for faculty of diverse backgrounds, and, on the other, faculty stress? Is there any correlation between faculty diversity and far left political orientation? Also, to what extent does a sense of the campus's prestige relate to an understanding (or misunderstanding) of the campus's mission? What other values are associated with the idea of prestige when we consider a faculty member's political orientation? A more detailed analysis would be useful around the concept of institutional

Where we Excel

The survey data shows that at CSULB, the students overall perceive the institution's staff and faculty have taken an interest in the students' educational development. The data suggest that a student-centered approach in the classroom is correlated with higher engagement and self confidence in the classroom. The students also perceive the institution to have a commitment to diversity. The school has many students from varying backgrounds and intersecting identities, and this helps create conversations across differences within the campus' students, staff, and faculty. Students reported high scores across all factors under Promote Intellectual Achievement: Academic Self-Concept, Academic Validation in the Classroom, and Habits of Mind. Within Build Community, students reported high scores in under the Sense of Belonging, Pluralistic Orientation, Conversations Across Differences, and Critical Consciousness and Action factors.

The staff reported high levels of engagement with student development. The staff also reported high levels of belonging and a sense of being appreciated on campus as well as a strong sense of work/life balance. There is a high overall satisfaction of compensation and benefits as well as opportunities for professional development. There is a general belief that the campus and administrators are transparent and regularly communicate about employee compensation and benefits. The staff also reported an overall general satisfaction with the campus as reflected in a high likelihood of recommending California State University, Long Beach as an employer.

Overall faculty at California State University, Long Beach reported that there is more of a student-centered approach to teaching and are highly invested in undergraduates' personal development at the school. Faculty also reported high levels of self-efficacy and science identity, suggesting that they view themselves as effective researchers and scholars.

Where Campus Community Members Thrive

Based on data from this survey, we were able to identify a variety of areas where campus community members thrive. In the area of Engage All Students, faculty and staff have done well at facilitating value and/or participation in sociopolitical activities among marginalized students (for example, gender queer and gender nonconforming students, BIPOC women students, Black students, and disabled students, all reported higher scores for valuing and/or participating in socio-political activities). This labor appears to fall primarily on marginalized faculty, with women faculty, faculty of color, BIPOC women faculty, ABGLPQ+ faculty, and faculty with adult care responsibilities reporting the high levels of investment in student-centered pedagogy, and value in and/or participation in sociopolitical activities. These strengths are very important on a campus such as ours and reflect the ways that faculty and staff with marginalized identities and from marginalized communities contribute to our campus climate. Gender marginalized students (gender queer, gender non-conforming, and women) also express generally high scores across all areas of Engage All Students.

Similar patterns are reflected in students' exposure to and engagement in diversity and equity, as well as in Faculty perceptions that student development was an important role for them on campus. Gender queer and gender non-conforming students, students with one or more dependents, students with disabilities, and ABGLPQ+ students all reported having been exposed to materials and pedagogy that focus on diversity. Women faculty are focused on contributing to students' moral development, as well as exposing students to new ideas. Women faculty are also invested in personal development and mentorship of undergraduates, with BIPOC women faculty expressing even higher levels of investment than white women faculty. Overall, faculty of color expressed a higher belief that their role included student personal development than white faculty did. BIPOC women also expressed higher levels of efficacy as mentors than all other faculty. This suggests that faculty of color, and especially BIPOC women, are contributing significantly to the areas in which our students thrive and should be recognized and compensated as such. Moreover, staff with one or more dependents under the age of 18 expressed feeling valued at work, and faculty with one or more adult dependents expressed higher degrees of efficacy as mentors than those with no adult care responsibilities.

In the area of Promoting Intellectual Achievement, gender marginalized students (genderqueer, gender non-conforming, and women) express higher confidence in academic achievement and self-confidence than men, which suggests that we are providing a context for gender marginalized students to thrive intellectually. Racial data on academic confidence is complicated in that Black students do report higher confidence than Hispanic students, but these data need to be considered in relation to other data on race and academic support on campus. We also see patterns of high self-awareness and support/resource-seeking among older students, higher academic self-concepts and sense of validation among LGBTQIA+ students than among non-LGBTQIA+ students, and higher levels of academic validation and behaviors associated with academic success for students with disabilities than for students without disabilities. These data suggest that among some of our marginalized student groups, members are thriving academically, but this does not seem to extend meaningfully to Hispanic and other racially marginalized student groups.

As far as Building community, the data suggests that conversations across differences are occurring among students with disabilities, and those who are liberal or far left. Faculty of color

report higher levels of engagement than white faculty when it comes to advising student groups, community involvement, and other important community-building activities that contribute to belonging. BIPOC women expressed particularly high levels of investment in civic activities and viewed civic engagement as central to the college mission more frequently than white women. ABGLPQ+ faculty expressed higher levels of civic minded practices than non-LGBTQIA+ identified faculty, and faculty with adult care responsibilities reported stronger beliefs that civic engagement is central to the college mission than those without adult care responsibilities. Significantly, Affinity Groups on campus for faculty and staff are a beginning stage in providing important support and resources for marginalized employees who are enduring the bulk of this necessary work. In addition, institutionalized support for civic activities and student development are currently underway through recent hiring of an LGBTQIA+ Resource Center Assistant Director, and a staffed Dream Success Center. It is also important to note that staff generally reported feeling adequately compensated and described campus communications about compensation, benefits, and diversity as being generally strong.

Where we Have Room to Grow

After assessing the data from the surveys, we were able to distinguish where this institution has room to grow. Regarding Engage All Students, overall, students reported a low enrolment in courses that include materials and pedagogy addressing diversity in the curriculum. AANAPI students scored the lowest in all the factors under Engage All Students. Men students were also less likely to notice or be exposed to materials and pedagogy that address diversity. The data suggests that students that are part of marginalized communities are more likely to seek out curriculum that discusses Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) but there is not as much focus on DEI in curriculum outside of the Ethnic Studies classes under the College of Liberal Arts. There needs to be These ideologies are important and need to be exposed to all groups of students within their educational careers (See Recommendations: Engage All Students). There are similar patterns within the staff and faculty data regarding people that are part of marginalized communities. Staff and faculty that are part of these communities', for example, BIPOC women and faculty with adult care responsibilities, report that they have participated in or used more pedagogy that addresses DEI than staff and faculty that are not in these groups. These practices should be a part of every staff and faculty member's mission regarding working with students and the curriculum that is being taught.

Within the Expand Access section, we have room to grow in terms of support for and recognition of students of color on our campus, as well as in reported gender differences among faculty in terms of their views of their own role in student personal development that needs to start at the very beginning of their educational career at CSULB – the SOAR orientation. (See Recommendations: Expand Access). BIPOC women students reported taken fewer courses with a focus on “addressing diversity” and less likely to believe that faculty and staff are interested in their professional development compared to white women students. AANAPI students also had lower experiences with curriculum that focused on diversity and a lower belief that faculty and staff take an interest in their development compared to other student groups. Similarly, to Engage All Students, it is seen by marginalized communities that the institution lacks a focus of pedagogy that emphasizes Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion within the curriculum. This means faculty were not as likely to see their role as a faculty member as contributing to students' moral and emotional development, including encouraging respect for different beliefs. Faculty not of color and white women faculty reported lower scores regarding a belief that personal development is a central goal for undergraduate education.

Under Promote Intellectual Achievement, the data shows there is low intellectual satisfaction and self-concepts among students, staff and faculty on campus. The data states that BIPOC women students report that they were less likely to perceive faculty members' as taking their success into consideration. AANAPI and Hispanic students have a lower belief that they receive academic validation in the classroom and thus engage in fewer behaviors that are related to academic success compared to other student groups. The data suggests that staff and faculty that report investment in strategies that support students' intellectual achievement (See Recommendations: Promote Intellectual Achievement) are part of the women, BIPOC, disabled, and LGBTQIA+ communities. This shows that there is a not as much commitment to these strategies to these communities' counterparts. The younger student population are not as open, self-aware, or eager to learn and grow and seek the needed resources to reach their goals as older students. Regarding staff and faculty, People of Color staff reported lower levels in Job Satisfaction Overall, Job Satisfaction Compensations, and Job Satisfaction Health and

Retirement Benefits. There is a lower perception of satisfaction in terms of job compensation regarding racial and gender equity. The faculty reported low levels of scholarly productivity and only mid-level satisfaction with their professional work environment.

Regarding Build Community, perceptions of campus climate at this institution were not favorable when asked of the marginalized students, staff and faculty. BIPOC women students reported fewer instances of having in depth conversation with “diverse” peers and fewer instances of critically examining and challenging theirs and other’s biases. Women of Color staff reported significantly higher scores for how often they have either witnessed or assisted others with experiences with harassment on campus in comparison to staff who are not Women of Color. These women also reported significantly lower scores for how satisfied they were regarding the institution’s commitment to diverse hiring practices regarding race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, political, and disability status. The staff also reported that the campus has mid-level racial tensions, suggesting that existing efforts to communicate about racial diversity might not be as effective as they could be addressing racial inequities and tensions. The findings suggest that women staff are generally less satisfied than men staff with the institution’s atmosphere for differences in social status and identity, as well as with the efficacy of administrative responses to issues of sexual assault, discrimination bias, and campus emergencies. Regarding faculty, men did not have as high of a belief in civic engagement being a central part of the college mission than their women and BIPOC women faculty counterparts.

In Cultivate Resilience, there was limited data and needs further assessment to fully grasp where the institution needs to grow in this regard. However, with what data we do have, the results show that BIPOC women students as well as genderqueer, gender non-conforming, other-identity students, do not perceive the campus as having a commitment to diversity. Showing that this institution has a lot of room to grow in establishing a safe space for the marginalized students to further their education. Faculty of Color reported a lower level of agreement that the campus climate is equitable for faculty members of diverse backgrounds and a lower belief that diverse faculty like those of color, women, and LGBTQIA+ are treated fairly. There is a lack of resources available to students, staff, and faculty who are LGBTQIA+, BIPOC, undocumented, disabled, and caregivers (see Recommendations: Cultivate Resilience). For example, the resources for the trans and disabled community members - BMAC has the infrastructure for student requests but is not readily available for faculty and staff. ABGLPQ+ identified faculty reported lower scores than non-ABGLPQ+ identified faculty for the “Institutional Priority: Prestige” and “Perception of the Climate for Diversity on Campus” factors. Women of Color faculty reported significantly lower perceptions of the institution’s climate as being diverse. The faculty overall reported high levels of career-related stress and mid-level satisfaction with compensation.

Recommendations for Campus Action

Across all areas of assessment, there were multiple recommendations that would contribute to a more equitable campus. Across many of the groups surveyed for this project, a need for additional assessments was expressed. These included research into the factors that contribute to student, faculty, and staff engagement across DEI areas—with particular attention to the how cultural taxation informs and impacts the work of marginalized community members such as those who are BIPOC, gender marginalized, disabled, and caregivers. Taking these dynamics into account, report-writers also recommended research into the investments and views of students, faculty, and staff who express lower engagement in these areas. Based on findings from these assessments, report-writers recommend programming and outreach to increase the investment of privileged community members in areas such as civic engagement, conversations across difference, and DEI work. For many of the communities represented in this report, additional data is needed to paint a fuller picture of our campus climate and needs. Therefore, our overall recommendation is to undertake further research with marginalized groups on campus, and to accompany this with clear communication about the purpose and intent of this research, as well as clarity on the ways that data will be used. Due to issues with some of the identity categories and language used in this survey, we also recommend consultation with community constituencies in the development of a new survey tool, and a qualitative component to supplement missing information.

Engage All Students

To increase our ability as a campus community to engage all students across a range of areas, further assessment of findings from this data is recommended. Assessments should be focused on how faculty and staff perceive their role in relation to students. Of particular interest is analysis of why women faculty—especially BIPOC women—and faculty with adult care responsibilities are more likely to be focused on student-centered pedagogy. Because the data show that gender marginalized faculty and staff are more likely to experience cultural taxation related to student engagement, it is further recommended that steps be taken to improve compensation, hiring, and retention practices for employees who are gender non-conforming, women, people of color, disabled, parents/caregivers, and LGBTQIA+. This is particularly important because their presence on and contributions to our campus are integral to our ability to reflect students' needs. To support their ongoing labor in support of students, we recommend continued promotion of campus-wide events and professional development opportunities such as those offered through Employee Affinity Groups, Human Resources, and Staff Council.

Teaching, service, and research that is civic-minded and invested in DEI should therefore be evaluated favorably during the RTP process. This includes revisiting which types of research and service “count” towards RTP, provision of mentorship grants, and assigned time for teaching innovations and research projects that engage students. To align with our Beach 2030 vision to “reimagine faculty, we should be elevating student-centered pedagogy and civic-minded practices in the RTP process so that gendered and racialized labor that sustains and builds the community can be properly addressed. Staff members and adjunct faculty should be compensated for their mentorship of students as well, and for exploration of innovative pedagogy and programming. This should be addressed through distribution of assigned time or through the creation of special projects with additional pay. All faculty – both tenure track and adjunct— must also have access to offices where they can regularly meet with students.

To engage all students, it is also necessary to reconsider our curriculum. This group recommends development of service-learning opportunities for students as part of the degree, which could include a first-year seminar for face-to-face students that engages them in co-curricular activities and build networks within the community. We also recommend that social equity be a central focus in curricular requirements. It is not enough to offer courses that address inequities, however. Our campus must also ensure that experts in these areas are teaching these topics. To this end, we recommend that diversity requirements remain central to general education and that courses in these areas—including and especially Ethnic Studies—be offered by those departments in the Social Sciences and Humanities which specialize in theories and practices related to social inequities.

Student engagement can also be improved through utilization of town halls where students can share their interests and needs with the President and other high-level administrators on campus. We also recommend that students' voices be included in campus committees, like the President's Equity and Change Commission, and information about these groups be made easily available to students. This can be accomplished through clear and consistent publication of information about campus resources, student groups, and commissions. A primary recommendation to this end is website development for groups on campus who are engaging with students and are contributing to our campus community.

Targeted outreach, programming, and messaging are also recommended to increase students in socio-political institutions and activities, including those that deal with diversity and equity. This is particularly important for allyship development among students, since the data from this survey reflects higher levels of civic-engagement and DEI related activities among marginalized students. We should also develop strategies for increasing faculty and staff engagement in programming focused on allyship, student-centered pedagogy, and DEI work. These programs should be considered integral to our ability as community members to successfully engage and support students and should be revisited and revised on a continual basis by experts in these areas.

Expand Access

To make our campus more equitable and accessible to people of various identities and experiences, we have identified several useful recommendations. These are focused on mechanisms for ensuring that campus community members are equitably supported by our institution through targeted additional assessments, outreach, programming, resources, and curriculum development.

With regards to the curriculum, we recommend introducing students to a range of academic disciplines starting with Student Orientation, Advising, and Registration (SOAR). Departments should also be supported at the institutional level to engage in outreach to local high schools to discuss majors that students may be unfamiliar with. This is likely to enrich student engagement and to provide them with a more multifaceted educational experience. To improve access to diversity and inclusion curriculum for BIPOC women students, LGBTQIA+ students, and other marginalized students who benefit from these spaces, we recommend that these curricula be featured prominently across the university, colleges, academic advising centers (following, for example, CLA's practice of featuring courses related to antiracist pedagogy). We also recommend consideration of how these courses are classified and named, so that they are easily identifiable to students seeking courses that center their experiences and identities. To reflect our student needs and to prepare students for full participation as global citizens,

diversity curriculum should be a principal component of our General Education requirements. Therefore, faculty who prioritize these efforts should be recognized for their efforts (see *Where We Have Room to Grow: Expand Access*). We recommend an increase in the number of courses focused on race, ethnicity, privilege, gender, identity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic class differences, and disability so that students have many opportunities to understand structural inequities. These courses should also be cross listed where possible to increase accessibility and contribution to students' degree attainment. Ethnic Studies and other Diversity requirements should be taught by faculty in the Social Sciences and Humanities who have specialized training that prepares them to teach relevant theories and topics. Moreover, we recommend that students be included in conversations about General Education, since their careers are shaped by their experiences in the classroom.

We recommend that changes in curriculum be coupled with increased promotion of, access to, and opportunities for students to participate in extracurricular activities and non-certification programs through divisions such as Student Life and Development, Housing and Residential Life, and the Office of Multicultural Affairs. These connections have the potential to provide a powerful sense of belonging among students as well as offering them access to professional development that is supported at the institutional level. We also recommend developing and promoting programs for students with dependents, such as the Pregnant and Parenting Student Organizations, which include access to resources, services, and support networks. Overall, we recommend development of internship programs and other professional development opportunities to support students' post-graduate goals, and to support these programs at the institutional level.

Expanding access means attending to student mental health in addition to their academic well-being, which is why we argue that it is necessary to expand access to qualified mental health professionals who are skilled in working with LGBTQIA+, BIPOC, and disabled individuals. These mental health professionals should have access to permanent employment on our campus, and a bulk of them should be tenure-track to ensure ongoing training, research, and community engagement that benefits our campus community. Resources should also be offered to support faculty and staff who are gender marginalized, BIPOC, from working class-backgrounds, disabled, and who have caretaking responsibilities—particularly since these groups report having prominent levels of engagement in student development and other community-oriented activities. This makes their continued presence and labor on our campus a necessary component of expanding student access and requires adequate resources—in terms of professional development opportunities, mental health care, assigned time, and other means of support-- to maintain their work. For faculty, this means granting consideration of these contributions during the RTP process for tenure-track faculty and creating assigned time opportunities for adjunct faculty who engage in campus service and/or student development.

To ensure continued focus on student-centered pedagogy, we recommend targeted outreach, programming, and resources that encourage faculty to critically reflect on their roles as faculty members relative to student moral and emotional development, with an emphasis on encouraging respect for different beliefs. This should be accompanied with programming and resources that support faculty professional development as mentors so that they can more confidently mentor students. This is especially important as an HSI (Hispanic Serving Institution) and an AANAPISI (Asian American, Native American, Pacific Islander Serving Institution), and given that AANAPI, Hispanic, and BIPOC women students reported lower scores related to

faculty support, academic validation in the classroom, and experiences with diversity related curriculum.

Importantly, and given the student population that we serve, greater investment should be placed on hiring and retention of faculty and staff of color so that they more accurately reflect our student body's racial and ethnic composition. Programming focused on challenging bias in evaluation processes, classrooms, and offices across campus should be developed and implemented to improve the climate for students, faculty, and staff. Faculty should also have access to programming focused on developing pedagogical skills that empower students of color, gender marginalized students, students with disabilities, and LGBTQIA+ students. Because faculty overall report high levels of focus on undergraduate personal development, we also recommend that a formal process be implemented for informing faculty of available resources on an ongoing basis—not only for student well-being on campus, but in support of their long-term goals.

To improve staff well-being and to assuage work-related stressors, it is recommended that staff and administrators be included in budget planning and revisions, and that they be provided with professional development resources to help them manage competing work deadlines. It is also necessary to clarify the chain of command in divisions with multiple supervisors, and to establish resources for staff and administrators with parenting and adult care responsibilities. Supervisors and managers should be provided trainings on bias, as well as on the important skills and cultural competency that LGBTQIA+ staff, gender marginalized staff, and BIPOC staff bring to the workplace, particularly since these staff experience cultural taxation through labor that contributes greatly to our campus community.

Finally, we recommend that continual evaluation be conducted and reassessed on a biennial basis to ensure that we are pursuing appropriate strategies as needed by our campus. Given the lack of significant findings with regards to staff members' experiences of stress and feelings of respect and value, we recommend additional inquiries into what mitigates stress and promotes value so that specific programs can be developed and implemented to support staff success. It is also important to identify campus co-curricular activities that promote positive student-development outcomes and promote these more widely. To improve student access in the classroom and beyond, we recommend research and ongoing assessments of students' perceptions of faculty and staff as supportive figures in their development, and of pedagogy and materials pertaining to DEI so that we can better understand their impacts. We also recommend assessment of why specific groups of faculty and staff view student development and student-centered pedagogy to be more important than others. To ensure expanded access, it is also necessary to address the lower scores for student-centered pedagogy and civic-minded activities among men faculty, students, and staff—as well as among white women when compared with BIPOC women—targeted assessment and outreach should be directed at communities identified as less invested in these areas so that they can be effectively encouraged to participate in student development both in and outside of the classroom. Given their high commitment to our student population, efforts to expand access should be undertaken in collaboration with faculty and staff who are BIPOC women faculty groups on campus.

Promote Intellectual Achievement

To increase intellectual satisfaction and self-concepts among students, faculty and staff on campus, we recommend a number of different approaches. First, given the diversity of our student population, it is necessary to develop pedagogical resources and set basic standards

for inclusive syllabi and course materials. Because it supports students professional, intellectual, and personal development, as well as the students' sense of self-efficacy, we recommend that faculty consider incorporating real-world tasks and active learning strategies into course work. Additional recommendations include opportunities for students to access mentorship opportunities and offering additional resources such as funding and grants for students doing research projects and who are involved in leadership roles on campus. It is also necessary to acknowledge that students' academic self-efficacy is developed alongside a range of life experiences that impact their learning. Therefore, we recommend that faculty and staff engage more unconventional strategies to support student learning, such as: modelling vulnerability in the classroom, making connections with students' lived experiences, utilizing academic praise, providing reassurance of their potential pathway to graduation, and allowing second chances with assessments and deadlines. To ensure strategies for supporting students' intellectual achievement are successful, we also recommend that ongoing assessment of student intellectual needs be undertaken to solicit feedback and ideas about curriculum, campus resources, and other projects.

Faculty and staff who already report investment in many of these strategies are women, BIPOC, disabled, and LGBTQIA+. Therefore, we recommend that greater investment be placed on recruitment, hiring, and retention of staff and faculty from these groups. Particularly given our student body's racial and ethnic composition, a high emphasis should be placed on recruitment, hiring, and retention of BIPOC faculty and staff, since this has been shown to improve sense of belonging and help students of color to develop and academic identity. A full-time staff member trained in crisis-management and institutional approaches to diversity, equity and inclusion should also be hired to oversee all of the cultural student centers and should be available to serve as a liaison for faculty, students, and staff so that the ongoing needs of our student body are acknowledged and provided for. Opportunities for BIPOC women should be heavily publicized, and the work of BIPOC students should be acknowledged in newsletters, advertisements, and other public facing media. To reduce barriers to access for students, the LGBTQIA+ Resource center should be revitalized and relocated to a more central and accessible space on campus, and this should be expected for all student cultural centers.

To retain faculty and staff in these areas, their work must be adequately valued and compensated. Therefore, we recommend regular salary increases be institutionalized across divisions, and that policies be communicated using clear and inclusive language. We recommend a general course reduction for faculty to provide a balance in teaching and research that reflects the high standards expected of faculty in both areas on our campus. This would mean a campus wide maximum of a 3/3 teaching load for tenure-track and tenured faculty and offering RSCA or some other form of additional compensation to adjunct faculty who currently have limited-to-no access to these course release opportunities. We recommend investment in LGBTQIA+ specific research, and other scholarly and creative activities. As part of this, we recommend that the Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) process be revised at the University level to allow for more community based and non-traditional research, which marginalized faculty are more likely to engage in than other faculty. To address differences in scholarly productivity for faculty with 17+ hours of house/childcare responsibilities, we recommend that equitable opportunities for assigned time be considered.

It is necessary to ensure that intellectual achievement is supported through infrastructural support and networks. To this end, we recommend programs that offer mentorship and support

for women of color students, and that those leading these programs be compensated for their labor. It is also necessary to provide formalized mentorship programs for staff during onboarding to increase staff knowledge of professional development opportunities. To address challenges that may be faced by students with disabilities, we recommend that faculty and staff go through BMAC training on resources and services so that they can appropriately assist students. We also recommend that support systems for students, faculty, and staff with dependents be expanded, providing reasonable accommodations in work schedules, more on-campus childcare options, and resources for research activities and conference travel. All staff should be provided with opportunities to expand their workplace autonomy and independence, take on special projects that support professional development, and have access to strategies for successfully managing their work/life balance.

Existing research opportunities need to be more consistently promoted to engage students across campus. These include the Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program's Research Symposium, the Leadership Fellows Program, Graduate Research Center's Research Program and the PCSW Annual Women's Research Colloquium and the President's Sustainability Commission's Annual Student Competition. This requires more consistent campus communication and consistency across campus calendars and websites. Further, staff should be supported and encouraged to participate in opportunities for professional development, including staff research presentations at PCSW's Annual Women's Research Colloquium, the Leadership Fellows Program, the Data Fellows Program, and continued sponsorship opportunities for Professional Conferences as offered by PCSW. Opportunities for engagement in scholarly activities should be equitably promoted across campus so that all faculty have opportunities to apply and participate. This means considering the messaging, outreach, programming, and resources associated with these calls.

Intellectual engagement requires that we celebrate the differences and achievements of all students involved in cultural organizations. To support student activities, we recommend creating an annual event/symposium that brings these organizations together and to participate in intergroup dialogues. Students must be included in campus-wide discussions with faculty around equity including anti-racist, anti-sexist, anti-ableist, anti-classist, and anti-heterosexist practices in the classroom. Any attempts to promote intellectual achievement among gender marginalized, BIPOC, disabled, and LGBTQIA+ students must deploy an intersectional, community-based approach rather than assessing the individual performance of students and faculty. Further, efforts to promote intellectual achievement must be undertaken in collaboration with racial and ethnic faculty groups on campus.

Additional Assessment: To ensure that these recommendations are successful, we recommend that the campus engage in routine program review and assessments of students' intellectual self-concepts, including consideration of why men express lower levels of academic confidence. Given that women staff have lower average levels of satisfaction with compensation, we recommend additional inquiry into the specific nature of this dissatisfaction as part of a closer assessment of the ways in which women and men staff members are currently compensated. We also advocate for potential increases in compensation based on this additional inquiry. Because data in this area do not speak to specific racial/ethnic groups among BIPOC faculty, we recommend further assessment of the experiences of BIPOC faculty as they relate to intellectual activities. We also suggest that routine assessments be undertaken to analyze faculty members' job satisfaction, intellectual self-concepts, and efforts to increase students'

self-efficacy. It is particularly important to understand differences in reported levels for faculty as it relates to gender, race, sexuality, and dependent care responsibilities. Greater analysis of the reasons for these differences will lead to more targeted recommendations to support intellectual achievement on our campus.

Build Community

There are several ways that we can build community on our campus and improve perceptions of our campus climate. One of the most common recommendations was to develop and implement trainings to directly address and counter bias and discrimination. Trainings should also include information on how to identify and report issues, and how to support communities experiencing bias, discrimination, and harassment so that this labor does not continue to disproportionately fall on marginalized faculty and staff. Staff, faculty and students involved in developing programming and spaces should be trained to effectively engage in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion work. The development and implementation of these trainings should be funded at the institutional level and should undergo regular internal assessment every two years to ensure they are up to date. No trainings should be developed without direct consultation and engagement with the communities that they are focused on. For example, antiracist trainings should be developed by and in collaboration with BIPOC faculty, students, and staff. Dialogue between community members should be implemented to identify issues and concerns that are distinct to students, faculty, and staff. We further recommend that these topics be included in mandatory trainings already provided to students, faculty, and staff each year.

The report writers identified a number of programs that are recommended for building community on campus. We encourage campus members across all divisions, departments, and job positions continue to promote and offer the Student Life & Development, Associated Students, Inc, and Division of Student Affairs Programs and Leadership Academy as well as the Office of Multicultural Affairs Cultural Resource Centers programming. We recommend that students be encouraged to participate in the CSULB Intergroup Dialogue workshop series to encourage dialogue across differences. We also recommend more programming focused on disability and suggest that greater efforts be made to highlight student projects and artwork across campus.

Opportunities for campus dialogues were also highly recommended. To ensure that students are reflected in the community at CSULB, we recommend that students be included as collaborators in decisions made at the faculty, staff, and administrative levels. Demonstrating care and compassion for students' feelings, experiences, and circumstances is essential to cultivating a sense of belonging among them. It is also necessary to consult with Campus Affinity Groups and other groups on campus that address specific faculty and staff needs. For example, we recommend that the Campus Parenting and Caregiver group be consulted on how to best support faculty, staff, and student caregivers, and that their insights and contributions to our campus are valued and respected. Given the importance of civic-minded values to student education, it is also important to engage in targeted outreach to faculty who are less invested in dialogues about diversity and equity, and to encourage them to include student-centered pedagogy in their classrooms.

We have many community spaces and groups on our campus, but students, faculty, and staff may struggle to identify them on their own. Therefore, we recommend direct outreach to students, faculty, and staff to inform them of specific centers, coalitions, committees, and organizations on campus. Employee Affinity Groups, for example, should be widely publicized,

as well as programs and events provided by the Women's and Gender Equity Center to support BIPOC women. Affinity groups supported through the President's Equity and Change Commission, the President's Commission on the Status of Women, and the Trans Advocacy Coalition should all continue to receive support from the President's Office, given their importance to the campus community and their service to students. Increased funding should be provided to DEI resources and programming, including development of learning communities and other collective spaces for incoming students. To address differences in service work between women and men faculty, we recommend further assessment of the reasons for this, followed by targeted outreach, programming, and resources to increase gender equity in labor.

Given the findings of this report, we recommend several avenues for further assessment and resources. First, we recommend a self-study to assess how our campus responds to reports of sexual assault, discrimination, and harassment. We also recommend an increase in counselors and confidential advocates who can provide services for students, faculty, and staff who have experienced sexual assault, harassment, and discrimination. We recommend that the University develop an expedited and transparent process for addressing these instances on campus.

Based on the data from this survey, research and programming focused on racial tension among staff, and in the staff workplace, should be developed and supported at the institutional level, and should inform strategies for countering these instances. Since they reported higher levels of racial tension, we recommend a follow-up to assess the specific ways that racial tensions manifest in the lives of staff with one or more dependents under the age of 18. It is important that communications about diversity be paired with action steps to improve equity on campus—particularly racial equity as reflected in staff perceptions of racial tension.

Considering the importance of building community for our campus, we recommend that grants and assigned time for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA) be expanded to include community engagement and advocacy both on and off campus, and that some of these resources be allocated to Adjunct Faculty. Because higher Civic-Minded Practices are also likely to increase the workload for women faculty across tiers. As a result, we recommend that support of student personal development be ranked positively in the RTP process across all colleges. We recommend further consideration of the ways that contributions to community and civic mindedness are rewarded in the RTP process, specifically for BIPOC women faculty who report higher levels of involvement in these areas. We also recommend that both tenure-track and adjunct faculty be provided with compensation through assigned time or course credits when they engage in exceptional amounts of student personal development and support, and that efforts to better understand the relationship between contributions to community and the RTP process be undertaken in collaboration with BIPOC women faculty groups on campus.

More broadly, we recommend assessment of which specific institutions, programs, initiatives, and messaging are working to make students feel integrated on campus and are lowering the frequency of students' experiences with harassment and more subtle forms of discrimination. We also recommend further research on factors that inform student, faculty and staff perceptions of the campus climate, experiences of harassment and discrimination, and feelings of being respected and valued on our campus. Finally, it is important to understand how differences in these areas are manifest across various groups on campus, and how their experiences are shaped by structural inequities.

Cultivate Resilience

Given the ambiguity and limited reach of some of the data from this survey, we recommend that further assessment be carried out in the following areas. Overall, it is important to carry out a qualitative assessment of the experiences of groups underrepresented in this data. This research should be informed and led by members of these groups, and be designed to fulfill the unique needs of faculty (both adjunct and TT), staff, and student populations. We also recommend assessment of existing practices by administrators to increase the diversity, prestige, and civic engagement of the university, with particular attention to outcomes for students, faculty, and staff across diverse identities and backgrounds.

To explain discrepancies in perceptions of the campus climate for diversity across groups (see *Where We Have Room to Grow: Cultivate Resilience*) it is necessary to gather additional data on these areas, with specific attention to factors that contribute to marginalized group members' experiences of diversity and equity work on campus (see for example, data on genderqueer and gender non-conforming students, faculty of color, and BIPOC women faculty). Further research is needed on factors (such as funding or outreach) that contribute to or hinder staff participation in professional development programs, to identify which existing programs are successful, and to better understand staff perceptions of the institution's commitment to community partnerships. It is also important to carry out assessments on how dependent care responsibilities impact faculty across a range of factors, including career stress, and to identify the networks and resources needed to support these faculty.

Additional work is needed to identify and enhance the resources available to students, faculty, and staff who are LGBTQIA+, BIPOC, undocumented, disabled, and caregivers. The resilience of our diverse community is dependent upon adequate resources and community, including updating and full-time staffing for cultural resource centers. It is also necessary to amplify discussions about disability and other marginalizing statuses, and to develop targeted mechanisms through which these discussions can inform strategies in support of our communities. Students should also be provided credit options and scholarships participation in civic engagement since economic barriers are likely to prevent low-income students from access to these opportunities. These should be paired with increased dialogue across campus about politics, activism, and identity to provide a sense of belonging and resilience to campus members who are experiencing higher levels of stress (see for example data on left identified faculty). We also recommend development of targeted outreach and programming to cultivate participation in equity-centered activities among men and other students who reported lower levels of civic-engagement.

Hiring and retention are major areas where we, as a campus, can cultivate resilience for our students, faculty, and staff. Particularly given that the data show marginalized faculty and staff provide disproportionate levels of support for our students, it is necessary to recruit, hire, and retain faculty within these groups. And given the racial composition of our student body, it is particularly important that we direct resources towards the hiring and retention of faculty and staff of color. To address full-time faculty dissatisfaction with the campus climate for diversity, the University must continue to increase diversity in their tenure-track hiring practices. The University must pledge to hire more tenure-track faculty of color and diverse backgrounds within the next few years and must be transparent in communicating all institutional priorities and implementations. To retain faculty, we recommend increased investment at the institutional level to support innovative research in the areas of gender, sexuality, race, and disability. We also

recommend that student evaluations be revised or done away with given their propensity to include sexist, transphobic, heterosexist, ableist, and racist biases that inadequately reflect the work of marginalized faculty. For marginalized faculty involved in high levels of mentorship and service (see high levels among women of color faculty) we recommend compensation such as assigned time or stipends to account for the cultural taxation they experience.

Moving forward, efforts to increase the prestige, diversity, and civic engagement of the university should be informed by diverse students, faculty and staff across the colleges and should reflect the needs and interests of those who these practices will impact-- including revised policies and procedures for ensuring equity and inclusion across campus. Policy changes should include changes to the RTP process at the University level to reflect the changing landscape and expectations of academia, including reduction of faculty course-load to a maximum of 3/3. It should also account for the impacts of caretaking responsibilities for faculty, the importance of community-centered research and creative activities for our campus that go beyond traditional scholarship, and the impacts that bias and discrimination play in the trajectories of marginalized faculty. The university must also increase tenure density and develop strategies for providing adjunct faculty opportunities to work towards tenure and more permanent employment on our campus. This is particularly important since increased tenure density means increased shared governance and support for our institution, and a stable and innovative environment where our students can flourish. Moreover, this should be considered in supportive services across campus, including CAPS (Counseling and Psychological Services), so that students have consistent and qualified care throughout their time on campus.

Data Collection Summary

Response rates

Faculty: The total response rate among faculty members (BUILD and non-BUILD) of 23%. NIH BUILD sample is at 38.2% and the non-NIH BUILD is at 20.8%.

Student DLE: 9.3% completed the survey, 2.9% partially completed the survey, with a total of response rate of 12.2%.

Staff: For stateside SCS, there is a 47.2%. For auxiliary SCS, the response rate is remained at 53.0%.

Higher Education Research Institute

The Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California Los Angeles was selected to administer their survey products in Fall 2019. The campus decided to use population surveys for the Spring 2020 administration meaning that each enrolled or active students, staff and faculty received an invitation to complete a survey. Each survey was distinct and you may mind more information about the Diverse Learning Environment survey sent to students [here](#). For addition information about the Staff Climate Survey, click [here](#). And finally, for the Faculty Survey, click [here](#) for additional details. Below we provide more details about the surveys and how they were administered at CSULB.

CSULB

Students

All students who were enrolled at CSULB during spring 2020 received the survey. This included full time and part time students, as well as undergraduate, postbaccalaureate, and graduate students. All students will had FERPA clearance, and were at least 18 years old.

CSULB provided a data file drawn from Institutional Research (IR), using specifications provided by HERI and included first and last name, email, and student ID, for students who were enrolled at CSULB as students for the Spring 2020 term. CSULB administered the survey directly to the students who met the above specifications, by emailing the unique survey link to each student. Each student received a specific survey link.

Recruitment methods included passive programming to share about the three climate surveys being administered. Students were informed that they could complete the survey for campus climate by clicking the link from the emailed survey invitation. Additionally, posts about the general survey announcement were made to DSA Social Media pages to inform students that the survey is being administered and to check their email for the survey invitation. Overall, the flyer for marketing, social media posts, tabling and electronic notifications were used to alert students to this survey administration.

When students clicked on the link, they were shown the welcome screen which included the online notice of consent form. They indicated their consent by completing the survey. They were informed they could stop out at any time. Students could also choose not to provide a response

to the questions if they didn't feel comfortable. Students were also informed that participation or nonparticipation would not affect their standing at CSULB. Students also had the option to request that no further messages be sent, using the contact information provided in the informed consent statement. Students will completed the survey electronically. Students who completed the survey were removed from further contact attempts once their responses were logged. All CSULB-customized recruitment messages were reviewed for IRB standards to safeguard voluntary participation.

Some students were selected at random for their participation to receive an incentive. Not all students received an incentive. The first 1,000 students who completed the survey received a \$10 Beach Bucks or Amazon Gift Card. Additionally, all students who completed the survey could enter into an opportunity drawing for a variety of incentives including: a pair of AirPods valued at \$160, an Ipad valued at \$329, a Nintendo Switch valued at \$300, a Bookstore or Amazon gift card for \$25, or a Coffee Bean Gift Card for \$25. The total amount per participant was \$10 or from \$25-\$400 per incentive. This small incentive for 1,000 students at \$10 and for less than 10 students with the other incentives, encouraged participation in the survey. Additionally, providing incentives to the first 1,000 students encouraged them to participate early in the survey administration. The overall incentives provided an opportunity to any student who completed the survey to also be eligible for an incentive.

Staff

The Staff Climate Survey instrument contains items pertaining to staff's perceptions regarding the campus climate for diversity, the practices they experience with faculty, staff, peers, and professional development. The instrument is derived from studies of diverse staff and the complexity of staff intergroup relations (<https://heri.ucla.edu/staff-climate-survey/>).

CSULB provided a data file drawn from Institutional Research (IR), using uniform population file specifications provided by HERI. The general specifications are: first and last name, email, and staff id, for staff who are employed at CSULB as staff for the Spring 2020 term. UCLA HERI administered the survey directly to the staff who met the above specifications, by emailing the unique survey link to each staff member. When staff members clicked on the link, they were then able to review the welcome screen which included the online notice of consent form. Since the survey poses no more than minimal risk to subjects, the documented informed consent was waived and respondents indicated their consent by completing the survey. They were informed they could stop out at any time. Staff could also choose not to provide a response to the questions if they didn't feel comfortable. Staff could also request that no further messages be sent, using the contact information provided in the informed consent statement. Staff completed the survey electronically. Staff who completed the survey were removed from further contact attempts once their responses were logged. Once any staff completed the survey they were informed that they could enter in an opportunity drawing for incentives. All staff who responded and completed the survey were able to request the incentive. Those who provided complete and accurate information received an incentive of \$25 Beach Bucks.

Faculty

The HERI Faculty Survey was be administered to two samples: CWEP, includes faculty members that have been part of BUILD in some form (i.e., surveys, funding, participation) or faculty members in the following four BUILD participating Colleges (Liberal Arts, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Health and Human Services, or Engineering); and the Non-CWEP, which includes CSULB faculty that are not included in the CWEP sample.

The 2020 HERI Faculty Survey was administered to all faculty on campus active during the Spring 2020, including part-time and full-time faculty. The survey included three optional modules: The core survey instrument was used in addition to (a) Part-Time Module; (b) STEM Module (CWEP sample only); (c) Mentor Module and (d) Campus-Climate Module. Only the CWEP sample will receive an additional STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) module, which has 18 items that covers the expectations and practices in STEM disciplines (See Appendix G). In addition to the core survey and modules for the CWEP sample, additional questions were generated by the CSULB BUILD program (11 questions) and the Coordination and Evaluation Center (CEC) (9 questions) that will allow for on-going assessment regarding faculty participation in CSULB BUILD program and across the ten BUILD campuses. See Appendix H for the CWEP additional questions.

The CWEP sample includes tenure/tenure-track faculty members that have either a) previously completed one of the Enhance Diversity Study surveys, b) may have participated in the 2016 HERI Faculty Survey, c) participated in a program sponsored by CSULB Building Infrastructure Leading to Diversity (BUILD), or d) are a faculty member in one of the following Colleges (Liberal Arts, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Health and Human Services, or Engineering). Please note that lecturers from these BUILD participating departments will not be included in the CWEP sample. It is from the CWEP sample where the CEC will drive BUILD's comparison sample for program evaluation.

The non-CWEP sample included tenure/tenure-track and adjunct lecturers (signed a contract for Spring 2020) that did not meet the criteria for the CWEP sample from the Colleges (CLA, CNSM, CHHS, and COE). The non-CWEP sample also included tenure/tenure-track and adjunct lecturers from the Colleges of Business Administration, Education, and Art.

Recruitment procedures for the CWEP and non-CWEP samples were similar; however, the CWEP sample received different pre-notification, email reminders, and a Welcome Page which details the informed consent process specific to their sample and reminded the faculty member that the survey is strictly voluntary. CSULB informed of the value of the survey and encourage faculty to complete it. The promotional information was sent via email by the CSULB administration. In order to maximize the response rates, an email from President Jane Close Conoley was sent to all the faculty members about a week prior to administering the survey to inform faculty what the HERI Faculty Survey was and when to expect the survey link. The faculty member received a survey invitation email from the Data Manager (see Appendix L for CWEP Survey Invitation Email and Appendix M for the non-CWEP Survey Invitation Email) that contained a unique survey link directing them to the web-based Faculty Survey hosted by HERI at UCLA. When the participant clicked on the unique survey link, they were directed to a Welcome Page that details the online notice of consent form. The information sheet provided faculty with information and indicated that the faculty member is providing informed consent by completing the survey. Further, the participant was reminded that this was a voluntary survey, and there was no obligation to complete the survey. For their time, all participants that completed and submitted the survey received a \$25 Amazon eGift Card after the period for taking the survey ended.