



American International College



Assessment of Campus Climate for Learning, Living, and Working Executive Summary

May, 2023

Executive Summary

History of the Project

This report provides the findings from the survey entitled *American International College (AIC) Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working*, conducted at American International College. In the 2022 fall semester, AIC contracted with Rankin Climate (RC) to conduct a college-wide study. Eighteen AIC faculty, staff, students, and administrators formed the Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion Steering Committee (DEISC), which worked with R&A to develop the survey instrument and promote the survey's administration in fall 2022.

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

Responses to the multiple-choice format survey items were analyzed for statistical differences based on various demographic categories decided upon by the DEISC.¹ Where sample sizes were small, certain responses were combined into categories to make comparisons between groups and to ensure respondents' confidentiality. For example, the survey offered 11 response choices for the question asking respondents about their racial/ethnic identity.² To run analyses and maintain respondents' confidentiality, the DEISC collapsed some response choices into broader

¹ For Student respondents, the DEISC selected position status, gender identity, racial identity, first-generation status, sexual identity, disability status, and income status. For Faculty and Staff respondents, the DEISC chose position status, gender identity, racial identity, years of employment, and sexual identity. Additionally, AIC will receive the dataset in spring 2023, allowing the college to further explore the data to better understand community members' experiences and, ultimately, improve the campus climate.

² Response choices were Alaska Native, American Indian/Native, Asian/Of Asian Descent, Black/Of African Descent, Hispanic/Latinx/Chicanx, Indigenous Latin American, Middle Eastern/North African/Of Arab Descent, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, White/Of European Descent, and a racial/ethnic identity not listed in the survey.

categories. For instance, racial identity was collapsed into five categories: Black/Of African Descent, Hispanic/Latinx/Chicanx, Additional³ People of Color, Multiracial, and White.

Seven hundred eighty-one (781) surveys were returned for a 30% overall response rate. Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic characteristics of survey respondents. Of the respondents, 70% ($n = 547$) of the sample were students, 18% ($n = 144$) were staff, and 12% ($n = 90$) were faculty.

Table 1. AIC Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Category ⁴	<i>n</i>	% of sample
Position status	Student	547	70.0
	Faculty	90	11.5
	Staff	144	18.4
Gender identity	Women	487	62.4
	Men	271	34.7
	Trans-spectrum	15	1.9
	Missing/Not Listed	8	1.0
Racial/ethnic identity	White	412	52.8
	Black/of African descent	126	16.1
	Hispanic/Latinx/Chicanx	89	11.4
	Additional Respondents of Color	37	4.7
	Multiracial	88	11.3
	Missing/Not Listed	29	3.7
Sexual identity	Queer-spectrum	158	20.2
	Heterosexual	587	75.2
	Missing/Not Listed	36	4.6
Citizenship status	U.S. Citizen	728	93.2
	Non-U.S. Citizen	53	6.8
	Missing	0	0.0

³ The report uses the term “Additional” to avoid “othering” respondents who do not self-identify with the responses listed in the survey.

⁴ R&A and the DEISC recognize and honor the vastly different identities and experiences of the individual respondents who were categorized in the various groups in this table and report; the terms were used for analysis, recognizing that not every respondent in each group would self-identify as such.

Table 1. AIC Sample Demographics

Characteristic	Category ⁴	<i>n</i>	% of sample
Disability status	Single Disability	76	9.7
	No Disability	659	84.4
	Multiple Disabilities	43	5.5
	Missing	< 5	---
Religious affiliation	Christian Affiliation	416	53.3
	Additional Affiliation	57	7.3
	Multiple Affiliations	18	2.3
	No Affiliation	264	33.8
	Missing	26	3.3

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

This summary provides highlighted findings from the full report, where more information is available for each finding. In some ways, the findings are similar to the results of other climate studies—in other ways they differ—and mirror the experiences offered in the literature about historically excluded constituent groups.⁵

Comfort With Campus, Workplace, and Classroom Climate at AIC

Research on campus climate⁶ generally has focused on the experiences of faculty, staff, and students associated with historically underserved social/community/affinity groups (e.g., women, People of Color, people with disabilities, first-generation and/or low-income students, queer-spectrum and/or trans-spectrum individuals, and veterans).⁷ Several groups at AIC indicated on the survey that they were less comfortable than their counterparts with the climates of the campus, classes, and workplace.

Most survey respondents were “very comfortable” or “comfortable” with the overall environment at AIC (70%, *n* = 544, p. 54), with the environment in their departments/program or work units (69%, *n* = 163, p. 54), and with the environment in their classes (74%, *n* = 471, p. 54). Student respondents were significantly more comfortable with the overall climate than were

⁵ Guiffrida et al. (2008); Harper & Hurtado (2007); Harper & Quaye (2004); Hurtado & Ponjuan (2005); Rankin & Reason (2005); Sears (2002); Settles et al. (2006); Silverschanz et al. (2008); Yosso et al. (2009)

⁶ Climate is defined as “the current attitudes, behaviors, and standards, and practices of employees and students in an institution” (Rankin & Reason, 2008, p. 264).

⁷ Garvey et al. (2015); Goldberg et al. (2019); Harper & Hurtado (2007); Jayakumar et al. (2009); Johnson (2012); Means & Pyne (2017); Soria & Stebleton (2013); Rankin (2003); Rankin & Reason (2005); Walpole et al. (2014)

Faculty and Staff respondents (p. 55). Faculty respondents were significantly more comfortable with the climate in their classes than Student respondents (p. 56). Women respondents were significantly more comfortable with the overall climate than Men respondents (p. 57). Respondents With No Disability were significantly more comfortable with the overall climate than Respondents With At Least One Disability (p. 61).

Faculty Respondents – Positive Views About Faculty Work

Tenured and Tenure-Track

Most Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents indicated that AIC valued teaching (68%, $n = 23$, p. 107). Only 38% ($n = 13$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents indicated that tenure standards/promotion standards were not applied equally to faculty in their schools/division (p. 106).

Non-Tenure-Track

The vast majority (93%, $n = 13$) of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents indicated that AIC valued teaching (p. 109), and 64% ($n = 9$) felt that they were not asked to perform more work to help students than their colleagues (p. 110).

Adjunct

Most Adjunct Faculty respondents indicated that the expectations of their responsibilities were clear (86%, $n = 36$, p. 111), their teaching was valued by AIC (71%, $n = 29$, p. 111), and there were support mechanisms in place for adjunct faculty (60%, $n = 25$, p. 111).

All Faculty

Slightly more than half of Faculty respondents (51%, $n = 41$) indicated that they would recommend AIC as a good place to work (p. 114).

Staff Respondents – Positive Views About Staff Work

Staff respondents generally held positive views about working at AIC. Staff respondents felt their supervisors (66%, $n = 95$, p. 120) and coworkers/colleagues (80%, $n = 115$, p. 120) gave them job/career advice or guidance when they needed it. Most Staff respondents felt that their supervisors provided adequate support for them to manage work-life balance (78%, $n = 112$, p. 121). Almost three-quarters of Staff respondents indicated that they were given a reasonable time frame to complete assigned responsibilities (73%, $n = 105$, p. 122).

Graduate Student Respondents – Positive Attitudes About Academic Experiences

In general, Graduate Student respondents also viewed their AIC experiences favorably. Most Graduate Student respondents (62%, $n = 60$, p. 154) were satisfied with the quality of advising they have received from their departments/programs. Seventy-five percent ($n = 73$, p. 154) felt that they had adequate access to their advisors, and 73% ($n = 71$, p. 154) of Graduate Student respondents indicated that their advisors responded to their emails, calls, or voicemails in a prompt manner.

Experiences of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

Several empirical studies reinforce the importance of the perception of non-discriminatory environments for positive learning and developmental outcomes.⁸ Research also underscores the relationship between hostile workplace climates and subsequent productivity.⁹ Further, scholars have explored the experiences Black and Latinx student populations have with microaggressions.¹⁰ Similarly, when taking only gender into consideration, campus climate research specific to women faculty revealed experiences of gender discrimination, professional isolation, lack of work-life balance, and disproportionate service expectations within campus environments.¹¹

Seventeen percent ($n = 129$) of respondents indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (p. 66). Of these respondents, 24% ($n = 31$) felt the conduct was based on position status, 17% ($n = 21$) on their racial identity, and 16% ($n = 20$) on their gender identity (p. 66) The following significant differences existed in respondents' experiences of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct.

⁸ Dugan et al. (2012); Garvey et al. (2018); Hurtado & Ponjuan (2005); Kim & Hargrove (2013); Mayhew et al. (2016); Oseguera et al. (2017); Pascarella & Terenzini (2005); Strayhorn (2012)

⁹ Bilimoria & Stewart (2009); Costello (2012); Dade et al. (2015); Eagan & Garvey (2015); Garcia (2016); Hirshfield & Joseph (2012); Jones & Taylor (2012); Levin et al. (2015); Rankin et al. (2010); Silverschanz et al. (2008)

¹⁰ Mills (2020); Yosso et al. (2009)

¹¹ Grant & Ghee (2015)

Differences Based on Position Status, Racial Identity, and Gender Identity

- In terms of position status, 19% ($n = 17$) of Faculty respondents, 19% ($n = 27$) of Staff respondents, and 16% ($n = 85$) of Student respondents indicated that they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct within the past year (p. 67).
 - A higher percentage of Staff respondents (54%, $n = 14$) than Student respondents (14%, $n = 12$) who had experienced this conduct indicated that they thought that the conduct was based on their position status (Faculty respondents [31%, $n = 5$] did not significantly differ from the other groups, p. 67).
- By racial identity, a higher percentage of White respondents (19%, $n = 80$) than Respondents of Color (12%, $n = 33$) indicated that they had experienced this conduct (Multiracial respondents [18%, $n = 16$] did not significantly differ from the other groups, p. 68).
 - Higher percentages of Multiracial respondents (31%, $n = 5$) and Respondents of Color (30%, $n = 10$) than White respondents (8%, $n = 6$) who had experienced this conduct indicated that the conduct was based on their racial identity (p. 68).
- By gender identity, a higher percentage of Trans-spectrum respondents (47%, $n = 7$) than Women respondents (19%, $n = 90$) and Men respondents (11%, $n = 30$) indicated that they had experienced this conduct. Additionally, significantly more Women respondents than Men respondents indicated that they had experienced this conduct (p. 69).

Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving AIC

Campus climate research has demonstrated the effects of campus climate on faculty and student retention.¹² Research specific to student experiences has found that sense of belonging is integral to student persistence and retention.¹³ Noteworthy percentages of respondents indicated that they seriously considered leaving AIC.

Faculty Respondents

Fifty-one percent ($n = 46$) of Faculty respondents had seriously considered leaving AIC in the past year (p. 133). Seventy-eight percent ($n = 36$) of Faculty respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of low salary/pay rate (p. 133).

An analysis of Faculty respondents' comments indicated that they seriously considered leaving because of salary concerns, workload, a lack of support, and issues with students.

Staff Respondents

Fifty-five percent ($n = 79$) of Staff respondents seriously considered leaving AIC in the past year. Seventy-seven percent ($n = 61$) of Staff respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because of low salary/pay rate (p. 133).

Qualitative analysis of Staff respondent comments revealed that they seriously considered leaving because of salary concerns, workload, and difficulties with colleagues.

Student Respondents

Forty-eight percent ($n = 265$) of Student respondents had seriously considered leaving AIC in the past year (p. 157). A significantly higher proportion of Undergraduate Student respondents who started at AIC (54%, $n = 211$) than Undergraduate Student respondents who transferred to AIC (28%, $n = 16$) seriously considered leaving AIC (p. 157).

Additionally, a significantly higher proportion of Undergraduate Student Respondents With Multiple Disabilities (74%, $n = 25$) than Undergraduate Student Respondents With No Disability (45%, $n = 202$) seriously considered leaving AIC (Undergraduate Student

¹² Blumenfeld et al. (2016); Gardner (2013); Garvey & Rankin (2018); Johnson et al. (2014); Kutscher & Tuckwiller (2019); Lawrence et al. (2014); Pascale (2018); Ruud et al. (2018); Strayhorn (2013); Walpole et al. (2014)

¹³ Booker (2016); García & Garza (2016); Hausmann et al. (2007)

Respondents with a Single Disability [59%, $n = 38$] were not significantly different than other groups, p. 157).

Thirty-four percent ($n = 89$) of Student respondents who seriously considered leaving did so because they wanted to transfer to another institution, and 30% each either wanted to transfer owing to financial reasons ($n = 80$) or a lack of sense of belonging ($n = 79$, p. 157).

An analysis of Student respondent comments indicated that they seriously considered leaving because of financial stress and/or academic concerns.

Respondents' *Sense of Belonging* at AIC

Campus climate influences individuals' sense of belonging within social and academic institutional environments.¹⁴ Sense of belonging can be defined as one's perceived social support on campus, feeling or sensation of connectedness, the experience of mattering or importance to the campus community or others on campus.¹⁵ A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the *Sense of Belonging* scale derived from Questions 94, 97, and 98 on the survey. Higher scores on the *Sense of Belonging* factors suggested an individual or constituent group felt a stronger sense of belonging at AIC. Using this scale, analyses revealed the following significant difference: Student Respondents With No Disability had higher *Student Sense of Belonging* scores than those of Student Respondents With Multiple Disabilities (p. 150).

Challenges and Opportunities Related to Campus Climate

Staff Respondents

Staff responses indicated that they felt less positive about several aspects of their work life at AIC. Thirty-nine percent ($n = 56$) of Staff respondents felt that the performance evaluation process was clear, and 30% ($n = 43$) felt it was productive (p. 121). More than half of Staff respondents (54%, $n = 77$) indicated that a hierarchy existed within staff positions that allowed some voices to be valued more than others (p. 122). Sixty percent

¹⁴ Museus et al. (2017); Rankin & Reason (2005); Strayhorn (2012, 2013)

¹⁵ Strayhorn (2012)

($n = 86$) of Staff respondents felt that their workload increased without additional compensation as a result of other staff departures (p. 122).

Faculty Respondents

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents held negative beliefs about some aspects of faculty work at AIC. For example, many Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents indicated that research (56%, $n = 19$, p. 107) was not valued at AIC and that the criteria for tenure were unclear (47%, $n = 16$, p. 106). Sixty-two percent ($n = 21$) of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty respondents felt that they were not supported and mentored during the tenure-track years (p. 106), and 36% ($n = 28$) of Faculty respondents indicated they felt positive about their career opportunities at AIC (p. 114).

Looking across all Faculty respondents, 72% ($n = 43$) of full-time Faculty respondents noted that salaries for tenure-track faculty positions were not competitive (p. 112). Eighty percent ($n = 67$) of Faculty respondents indicated that salaries for adjunct professors were not competitive (p. 112). Forty-four percent ($n = 23$) of full-time Faculty respondents indicated that the performance evaluation process was unclear (p. 113). Forty-seven percent ($n = 24$) of full-time Faculty respondents disagreed that AIC provided them with resources to pursue professional development (p. 113).

Student Respondents

Analyses of the Students' survey responses revealed statistically significant differences based on income status and racial identity, where students from backgrounds historically underrepresented at colleges held less positive views of their experiences than did their peers from "majority" backgrounds. Specifically:

- 26% ($n = 19$) of Multiracial Student respondents, 24% ($n = 57$) of White Student respondents, and 15% ($n = 35$) of Student Respondents of Color disagreed that faculty prejudged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background (p. 151).
- 19% ($n = 36$) of Low-Income Student respondents strongly agreed that faculty prejudged their abilities based on their perception of their identity/background compared to 12% ($n = 40$) of Not-Low-Income Student respondents (p. 151).

- 19% ($n = 37$) of Low-Income Student respondents strongly agreed that staff prejudged their abilities based on their perception of students' identity/background compared to 13% ($n = 42$) of Not-Low-Income Student respondents (p. 151).

Student Respondents' *Perceived Academic Success*

How students perceive their academic success often contributes to their decision to persist in higher education. Research indicates that when students experience an unwelcoming college climate, they also experience a decline in persistence and academic performance.¹⁶ A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the *Perceived Academic Success* scale derived from Question 11 on the survey. Using this scale, significant differences existed in the overall test for means for Student respondents by racial identity and disability status on *Perceived Academic Success*. Analyses revealed:

- White Undergraduate Student respondents, Hispanic/Latinx/Chicanx Undergraduate Student respondents, and Additional Undergraduate Respondents of Color had higher *Perceived Academic Success* scores than those of Multiracial Undergraduate Student respondents (p. 143).
- Undergraduate Student Respondents With No Disability had higher *Perceived Academic Success* scores than those of Undergraduate Student Respondents With a Single Disability and Undergraduate Student Respondents With Multiple Disabilities (p. 145).

A Meaningful Percentage of Respondents Experienced Unwanted Sexual Conduct

In 2014, *Not Alone: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault* indicated that sexual assault is a substantial issue for colleges and universities nationwide, affecting the physical health, mental health, and academic success of students. The report highlights that one in five women is sexually assaulted while in college. One section of the AIC survey requested information regarding respondents' experiences with sexual assault.

- 6% ($n = 50$) of respondents indicated that they had experienced one or more types of unwanted sexual contact/conduct while at AIC (p. 91).

¹⁶ Allen & Alleman (2019); Booker (2016); Johnson (2012); Kim & Hargrove (2013); Kutscher & Tuckwiller (2019); Reynolds et al. (2010)

- 1% ($n = 5$) experienced relationship violence (e.g., ridiculed, controlling, hitting, p. 92).
 - 2% ($n = 12$) experienced stalking (e.g., following me, on social media, texting, phone calls, p. 92).
 - 4% ($n = 33$) experienced unwanted sexual interaction (e.g., catcalling, repeated sexual advances, sexual harassment, p. 94).
 - 3% ($n = 20$) experienced unwanted sexual contact (e.g., fondling, rape, sexual assault, penetration without consent, p. 97).
- Respondents identified AIC students, current or former dating/intimate partners, acquaintances/friends, and strangers as sources of unwanted sexual contact/conduct (pp. 92–98).
 - Most respondents did not report the unwanted sexual contact/conduct (pp. 92–99).

Student Financial Hardship

Fifty-five percent ($n = 303$) of Student respondents indicated they experienced financial hardship while attending AIC (p. 50). Students indicated they experienced financial hardship in the following areas:

- 71% ($n = 216$) had difficulty affording tuition.
- 62% ($n = 189$) had difficulty affording books/course materials.
- 46% ($n = 138$) had difficulty affording food.
- 40% ($n = 122$) had difficulty affording housing.

AIC's Initiatives

The survey asked respondents to indicate if they believed certain initiatives currently were available at AIC and the degree to which they thought that those initiatives would influence college climate. Examples of overall findings are presented below. For each result, the majority of respondents felt that the initiative would positively influence the campus climate. A complete overview of findings related to institutional actions is provided on pages 161 – 180 of the full report.

Examples of Findings for Student Respondents

- 85% ($n = 434$) of Student respondents thought that effective academic advising was available and 15% ($n = 76$) of Student respondents thought that it was not available (p. 173).
- 84% ($n = 431$) of Student respondents thought a process to address student complaints of bias by faculty/staff in learning environments was available and 16% ($n = 84$) of Student respondents thought that it was not available (p. 172).
- 86% ($n = 436$) of Student respondents thought that effective faculty mentorship of students was available and 15% ($n = 74$) of Student respondents thought that it was not available (p. 173).

Examples of Findings for Faculty Respondents

- 45% ($n = 29$) of Faculty respondents thought that toolkits for faculty to create an inclusive classroom environment were available and 55% ($n = 36$) of Faculty respondents thought they were not available (p. 162).
- 39% ($n = 25$) of Faculty respondents thought that mentorship for new faculty was available and 62% ($n = 40$) of Faculty respondents thought that such mentorship was not available (p. 163).
- 48% ($n = 30$) of Faculty respondents thought that a clear process to resolve conflicts was available and 52% ($n = 33$) of Faculty respondents thought that it was not available (p. 163).

Examples of Findings for Staff Respondents

- 38% ($n = 48$) of Staff respondents thought that mentorship for new staff was available and 63% ($n = 80$) of Staff respondents thought that it was not available (p. 168).
- 31% ($n = 39$) of Staff respondents thought that support for staff who have increased workload due to staff departures and unfilled positions was available and 69% ($n = 88$) of Staff respondents thought that they were not available (p. 169).

- 42% ($n = 55$) of Staff respondents thought that career development opportunities for staff were available and 58% ($n = 75$) of Staff respondents thought that such opportunities were not available (p. 169).

Conclusion

AIC climate findings¹⁷ were consistent with those found in R&A's work with higher education institutions across the country.¹⁸ For example, 70% to 80% of respondents in similar reports found the campus climate to be "very comfortable" or "comfortable." Seventy percent of AIC respondents indicated that they were "very comfortable" or "comfortable" with the overall climate at AIC (p. 54). Twenty percent to 25% of respondents in similar reports indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct. At AIC, a lower percentage of respondents (17%) indicated that they personally had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct (p. 66). The results also paralleled the findings of other climate studies of specific constituent groups offered in the literature.¹⁹

Prior research reveals that:

Student body diversity in institutions of higher education is important not only for improving the economic and educational opportunities for underrepresented students, but also for the social, academic, and societal benefits that diversity presents for all students and communities. Diverse learning environments help students sharpen their critical thinking and analytical skills; prepare students to succeed in an increasingly diverse and interconnected world; break down stereotypes and reduce bias; and enable schools to fulfill their role in opening doors for students of all backgrounds.²⁰

Everyone benefits from a more inclusive college. To create a more inclusive college environment, AIC must acknowledge areas of opportunity and take responsibility for restoring,

¹⁷ Additional findings disaggregated by position status and other selected demographic characteristics are provided in the full report.

¹⁸ Rankin & Associates Consulting (2021)

¹⁹ Guiffrida et al. (2008); Harper & Hurtado (2007); S. R. Harper & Quaye (2004); Hurtado & Ponjuan (2005); Rankin & Reason (2005); Sears (2002); Settles et al. (2006); Silverschanz et al. (2008); Yosso et al. (2009)

²⁰ United States Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development and Office of the Under Secretary (2016, p. 5)

rebuilding, and implementing action that prioritizes those most negatively affected in the current structure.

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

References

- Allen, C. C., & Alleman, N. F. (2019). A private struggle at a private institution: Effects of student hunger on social and academic experiences. *Journal of College Student Development, 60*(1), 52–69. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2019.0003>
- Bilimoria, D., & Stewart, A. J. (2009). “Don’t ask, don’t tell”: The academic climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty in science and engineering. *National Women’s Studies Association Journal, 21*(2), 85–103.
- Blumenfeld, W. J., Weber, G. N., & Rankin, S. (2016). In our own voice: Campus climate as a mediating factor in the persistence of LGBT students, faculty, and staff in higher education. In E. A. Mikulec & P. C. Miller (Eds.), *Queering classrooms: Personal narratives and educational practices to support LGBTQ youth in schools* (pp. 187–212). Information Age.
- Booker, K. (2016). Connection and commitment: How sense of belonging and classroom community influence degree persistence for African American undergraduate women. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education, 28*(2), 218–229.
- Costello, C. A. (2012). Women in the academy: The impact of culture, climate and policies on female classified staff. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education, 5*(2), 99–114. <https://doi.org/10.1515/njawhe-2012-1118>
- Dade, K., Tartakov, C., Hargrave, C., & Leigh, P. (2015). Assessing the impact of racism on Black faculty in White academe: A collective case study of African American female faculty. *The Western Journal of Black Studies, 39*(2), 134–146.
- Dugan, J. P., Kusel, M. L., & Simounet, D. M. (2012). Transgender college students: An exploratory study of perceptions, engagement, and educational outcomes. *Journal of College Student Development, 53*(5), 719–736. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2012.0067>
- Eagan, M. K., Jr., & Garvey, J. C. (2015). Stressing out: Connecting race, gender, and stress with faculty productivity. *Journal of Higher Education, 86*(6), 923–954. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2015.0034>

- Garcia, G. A. (2016). Exploring student affairs professionals' experiences with the campus racial climate at a Hispanic-serving institution (HSI). *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 9(1), 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039199>
- García, H. A., & Garza, T. (2016). Retaining Latino males in community colleges: A structural model explaining sense of belonging through socio-academic integration. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*, 23(2), 41–58.
- Gardner, S. K. (2013). Women and faculty departures from a striving institution: Between a rock and a hard place. *Review of Higher Education*, 36(3), 349–370. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2013.0025>
- Garvey, J. C., & Rankin, S. (2018). The influence of campus climate and urbanization on queer-spectrum and trans-spectrum faculty intent to leave. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 11(1), 67–81. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000035>
- Garvey, J. C., Squire, D. D., Stachler, B., & Rankin, S. (2018). The impact of campus climate on queer-spectrum student academic success. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 15(2), 89–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2018.1429978>
- Garvey, J. C., Taylor, J. L., & Rankin, S. (2015). An examination of campus climate for LGBTQ community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 39(6), 527–541. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2013.861374>
- Goldberg, A. E., Kuvalanka, K., & Dickey, L. (2019). Transgender graduate students' experiences in higher education: A mixed-methods exploratory study. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 12(1), 38–51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000074>
- Grant, C. M., & Ghee, S. (2015). Mentoring 101: Advancing African-American women faculty and doctoral student success in predominantly White institutions. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 28(7), 759–785. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2015.1036951>
- Guiffrida, D., Gouveia, A., Wall, A., & Seward, D. (2008). Development and validation of the need for Relatedness at College Questionnaire (nRC-Q). *Journal of Diversity in Higher*

Education, 1(4), 251–261. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014051>

Harper, S. R., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2007(120), 7–24.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.254>

Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (2004). Taking seriously the evidence regarding the effects of diversity on student learning in the college classroom: A call for faculty accountability.

UrbanEd, 2(2), 43–47.

Hausmann, L. R., Schofield, J. W., & Woods, R. L. (2007). Sense of belonging as a predictor of intentions to persist among African American and White first-year college students.

Research in Higher Education, 48(7), 803–839. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-007-9052-9>

Hirshfield, L. E., & Joseph, T. D. (2012). “We need a woman, we need a Black woman”:

Gender, race, and identity taxation in the academy. *Gender and Education*, 24(2), 213–227.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2011.606208>

Hurtado, S., & Ponjuan, L. (2005). Latino educational outcomes and the campus climate. *Journal*

of Hispanic Higher Education, 4(3), 235–251. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192705276548>

Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., & Han, J. C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *Journal of*

Higher Education, 80(5), 538–563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2009.11779031>

Johnson, D. R. (2012). Campus racial climate perceptions and overall sense of belonging among racially diverse women in STEM majors. *Journal of College Student Development*, 53(2),

336–346. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2012.0028>

Johnson, D. R., Wasserman, T. H., Yildirim, N., & Yonai, B. A. (2014). Examining the effects of stress and campus climate on the persistence of students of color and White students: An

application of Bean and Eaton’s psychological model of retention. *Research in Higher*

Education, 55(1), 75–100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-013-9304-9>

Jones, S. J., & Taylor, C. M. (2012). Effects of institutional climate and culture on the

- perceptions of the working environments of public community colleges. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*, 5(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1515/njawhe-2012-1106>
- Kim, E., & Hargrove, D. T. (2013). Deficient or resilient: A critical review of Black male academic success and persistence in higher education. *Journal of Negro Education*, 82(3), 300–311. <https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.82.3.0300>
- Kutscher, E. L., & Tuckwiller, E. D. (2019). Persistence in higher education for students with disabilities: A mixed systematic review. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 12(2), 136–155. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000088>
- Lawrence, J. H., Celis, S., Kim, H. S., Lipson, S. K., & Tong, X. (2014). To stay or not to stay: Retention of Asian international faculty in STEM fields. *Higher Education*, 67(5), 511–531. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9658-0>
- Levin, J. S., Jackson-Boothby, A., Haberler, Z., & Walker, L. (2015). “Dangerous work”: Improving conditions for faculty of color in the community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 39(9), 852–864. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2014.917596>
- Mayhew, M. J., Rockenbach, A. N., Bowman, N. A., Seifert, T. A., & Wolniak, G. C. (2016). *How college affects students: 21st century evidence that higher education works* (Vol. 3). Jossey-Bass.
- Means, D. R., & Pyne, K. B. (2017). Finding my way: Perceptions of institutional support and belonging in low-income, first-generation, first-year college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 58(6), 907–924. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2017.0071>
- Mills, K. J. (2020). “It’s systemic”: Environmental racial microaggressions experienced by Black undergraduates at a predominantly White institution. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 13(1), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000121>
- Museus, S. D., Yi, V., & Saelua, N. (2017). How culturally engaging campus environments influence sense of belonging in college: An examination of differences between White students and students of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 11(4), 467–483.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000069>

Oseguera, L., Merson, D., Harrison, C. K., & Rankin, S. (2017). Beyond the Black/White binary: A multi-institutional study of campus climate and the academic success of college athletes of different racial backgrounds. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, *35*(2), 1–43.

<https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.2016-0175>

Pascale, A. B. (2018). Supports and pushes: Insight into the problem of retention of STEM women faculty. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*, *11*(3), 247–264.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/19407882.2018.1423999>

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). Jossey-Bass.

Rankin & Associates Consulting. (2021). *Clients*. <https://rankin-consulting.com/clients>

Rankin, S. (2003). *Campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered people: A national perspective*. National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute.

Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and White students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of Student College Development*, *46*(1), 43–61. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0008>

Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2008). Transformational tapestry model: A comprehensive approach to transforming campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *1*(4), 262–274. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014018>

Rankin, S., Weber, G., Blumenfeld, W., & Frazer, S. (2010). *2010 state of higher education for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people*. Campus Pride.

Reynolds, A. L., Sneva, J. N., & Beehler, G. P. (2010). The influence of racism-related stress on the academic motivation of Black and Latino/a students. *Journal of College Student Development*, *51*(2), 135–149. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0120>

Ruud, C. M., Saclarides, E. S., George-Jackson, C. E., & Lubienski, S. T. (2018). Tipping points:

- Doctoral students and consideration of departure. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 20(3), 286–307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025116666082>
- Sears, J. T. (2002). The institutional climate for lesbian, gay and bisexual education faculty. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43(1), 11–37. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v43n01_02
- Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Malley, J., & Stewart, A. J. (2006). The climate for women in academic science: The good, the bad, and the changeable. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30(1), 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00261.x>
- Silverschanz, P., Cortina, L. M., Konik, J., & Magley, V. (2008). Slurs, snubs, and queer jokes: Incidence and impact of heterosexist harassment in academia. *Sex Roles*, 58(3–4), 179–191. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9329-7>
- Soria, K. M., & Stebleton, M. J. (2013). Social capital, academic engagement, and sense of belonging among working-class college students. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 31(2), 139–153.
- Strayhorn, T. L. (2012). *College students' sense of belonging: A key to educational success for all students*. Routledge.
- Strayhorn, T. L. (2013). Measuring race and gender difference in undergraduate perceptions of campus climate and intentions to leave college: An analysis in Black and White. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 50(2), 115–132. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jsarp-2013-0010>
- United States Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development and Office of the Under Secretary. (2016). *Advancing diversity and inclusion in higher education: Key data highlights focusing on race and ethnicity and promising practices*. <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/advancing-diversity-inclusion.pdf>
- Walpole, M., Chambers, C. R., & Goss, K. (2014). Race, class, gender and community college persistence among African American women. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*, 7(2), 153–176. <https://doi.org/10.1515/njawhe-2014-0012>

Yosso, T. J., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. G. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(4), 659–691. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.79.4.m6867014157m7071>