CAMPUS DIVERSITY INITIATIVE – HOW ARE YOU DOING? SURVEY RESULTS

This report highlights the results of an online survey of newly enrolled first year and transfer traditional undergraduate students at Cal Lutheran. It provides a good indication of how these students are adjusting to their lives on campus both academically and socially after nine full weeks on campus.
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HOW ARE YOU DOING? SURVEY

Purpose:

This 51 question survey of newly enrolled traditional undergraduate students from diverse backgrounds near the end of their first semester seeks to provide a picture of how students are experiencing the campus on multiple measures as well as how they view their prospects for successfully progressing towards their degree.

DEMOGRAPHICS

A total of 499 first year students were sent the survey via Cal Lutheran email from the ninth through the twelfth week of classes. A total of 225 students responded for a response rate of 45%, however, only 180 students (35%) completed the survey in its entirety.

The demographic makeup of the respondents is heavily female (152; 68%) and they are mostly between the ages of 17-19 (176; 78%) with only 15% (7 students) of the 46 transfer student respondents being over age 25. The majority (175; 78%) were first year freshmen. The respondents were ethnically diverse with 130 Hispanic/Latinx respondents (40%) who were also primarily female (74%), followed by white students (64; 20%) of which 63% are white females. Asians made up 14% (46) of respondents with 72% females, followed by mixed race students (29; 9%) and black students (22; 7%) nearly evenly female and male. Different from race or ethnicity, 9 students (3%) are international students of which 5 are male and 4 are female. However, 17 students said their family’s home is outside the U.S. Another 13 students (4%) self-identified as “other” for race/ethnicity and only two are male.

Thirty-three respondents are NCAA III athletes, evenly distributed with 17 males and 16 females. Black students are overrepresented among NCAA III athletes with 39% of black respondents reporting participation or anticipated participation.

About 11% of respondents described themselves as Gay, Lesbian or Bi-sexual (24 students) and another 11 students (5%) responded that they were either “questioning” or “other” writing in pansexual or asexual. One international student self-identified as “questioning”.

A little over a third of the respondents (35%; 78 students) said they were the first in their immediate family to attend college. Of these, 65% (51 students) self-identified as Hispanic/Latinx. It is important to note and perhaps not surprising that 40% of the female respondents are first generation students compared to only 24% of male respondents.

Religious diversity was also a hallmark of this incoming class with 41% (90 students) identifying themselves as Catholic, followed by 21% (45 students) identifying with one of the major protestant Christian denominations. Among the respondents, 15% percent (32 students) responded that they were Agnostic/Atheist. There were also 26 students (12%)
who self-identify as religious “other”, 10 students (5%) who identify as spiritual, 7 (3%) as Muslims, 5 (2%) as Buddhist, two students as Hindu, one Sikh, one Mormon, and one Jewish student.

As expected, only 3% (7 students) said they had a physical disability and another 16 students (7%) claimed a learning disability. Another 12 students (5%) responded that they possibly have an undiagnosed learning disability.

Anecdotal evidence has suggested that a greater number of students today are enrolling in college with emotional or mental health issues. This is the first time that the survey asked students if they have an emotional or mental health disability. Of the 225 students who responded to this question, 40 students (18%) responded “yes” while another 33 (15%) responded “possibly undiagnosed”. The remaining 152 students (68%) responded that they did not. The percentage of students reporting actual or possible emotional or mental health disability is not only surprising, but concerning. The survey examined the self-reporting of various groups to determine possible identity groups where added attention might be needed to aid with adjustment. What the survey revealed was that 50% of the 24 students who identified as LGBTQ also self-reported a diagnosed (6 students, 25%) or possibly undiagnosed (6 students, 25%) emotional or mental health disability. Of the six students who were questioning their sexual orientation, three reported a diagnosed mental health condition and one reported a possibly undiagnosed condition. Females were far more likely than males to disclose a diagnosis of mental illness. A total of 32 female respondents (out of 152 females or 20%) report a diagnosed mental illness compared to only 11% of the males (8 out of 72). Another 17% of female respondents report a possibly undiagnosed mental health issue compared to only 8% of males.

Given the University’s residential policy, as expected 60% (130 students out of 216) reside on campus. Another third (34%; 73 students) reside off campus with family. A very small percentage of respondents live off campus with roommates (11 students; 5%) and only two of them are in the 17-19 year old age range. With the close proximity of the campus to the largely Hispanic city of Oxnard, it is not surprising that Hispanic/Latinx students are a little less likely to reside on campus than their peers with a low of 56%. More than 65% of students from all other ethnic groups and international students (89%) reside on campus. The overwhelming majority of NCAA III athletes also reside on campus (94%). The family home of Hispanic/Latinx students is much more likely than students from other ethnic groups to be within 100 miles of campus at 78% (96 of 123 Hispanic/Latinx students who responded to the question).

Conclusion

The entering student body is diverse on pretty much every measure that we measure diversity. Close attention must be paid to the mental and emotional well-being of the incoming students as increased numbers believe themselves to have emotional or mental health issues. Students should also be made aware of available testing to correctly diagnose a suspected learning disability. With a diverse student body, attention needs to be paid to ensuring that students see themselves reflected in the faculty and staff who serve them and that policies and practices reflect their diverse and unique needs for support and access, especially since so many are first generation college students.
ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Confidence in the ability to pay for the balance of their education at Cal Lutheran is highest among international and Asian respondents and lowest among first generation students with only 18% (13 of 72 students) responding with the highest level of confidence. In the aggregate, 64% of students were pretty confident that they would be able to pay for their education at Cal Lutheran. This left the remaining 36% expressing doubt at or below the “might or might not” level (on a five point Likert scale) with regards to being able to successfully pay for their education at Cal Lutheran. This doubt was concentrated among Hispanic/Latinx, black, white, Native and multiracial respondents ranging from 37% (Hispanic/Latinx) to 39% (blacks and whites) to 44% (multiracial). As previously mentioned, first generation respondents are far more uncertain regarding their ability to fund their Cal Lutheran education than non-first generation respondents, with 42% reporting “might or might not”, “probably not” or “definitely not” to the question compared to only 30% of non-first generation students. It is concerning that 17% of first generation respondents are in the “probably not” and “definitely not” category. Not one non-first generation student that responded “definitely not” and only nine (8%) of the 114 non-first generation students responded “probably not”. Although 70% of the NCAA III athletes reported that they do not have a job, they are just as confident as their peers that they will be able to afford to complete their education at Cal Lutheran.

It is common knowledge that many students today fund their college education through a combination of scholarships, family funds, grants, loans, and work. However, 53% of the respondents (114 of 216) did not have a job at the time of the survey. The highest unemployment rate is among first year students with 60% (101 of 168) reporting no employment. Of the 67 first year students who did work, 38 (57%) worked off campus and 22 students (33%) have jobs on campus. Another seven first year students held jobs both on and off campus. The largest percentage of transfer students 57% (25 of 44 students) work off campus with only 9% holding on campus jobs (4 students of 44) and another 4 transfers have both an on campus and off campus job. Only 25% of transfer respondents are unemployed.

New F-1 visa international students, although few in number (9 respondents) are only permitted employment on campus. For new international students, on campus employment is their only legal option and two of them report having a job on campus. This might explain their higher rate of unemployment at 78%.

With a greater percentage of respondents reporting unemployment than employment (including internships), it would be interesting to know whether unemployed respondents were not working by choice. However, that question was not asked. It is also notable that significantly more respondents report working off campus than on campus (76 students versus 37 students). Of these, 11 held jobs both on and off campus simultaneously.

Few respondents consistently work more than 20 hours per week (12%; 26 of 216 students). However, 20 of these 26 respondents (77%) who work more than 20 hours per week on a consistent basis are Hispanic/Latinx representing 16% of the Hispanic/Latinx respondents.
Also noteworthy is that 54% of the respondents working more than 20 hours per week (14 students) are also first generation students and are far more likely to be transfer students. Students living off campus with family were much more likely to be working more than 20 hours per week than their peers. In fact, 65% (17 out of the 26) students reportedly working more than 20 hours per week live at home with their families while school is in session.

A big topic on college campuses today is food insecurity and so respondents were asked if they had “access to adequate food on a daily basis”. It is disturbing to report that only 56% (106 students) responded, “yes, always”. Another 29% (56 students) responded, “yes, on most days”, 21 students (11%) responded, “yes, sometimes” and 7 students (4%) responded, “no, not on most days.” The prevalence of food insecurity seemed to be spread across all ethnic categories and there is no real difference among first generation students and their peers. It is also important to note that there is no significant difference between students who live on campus and those who live off campus when it comes to food insecurity.

Conclusion

We know that financial worries can have a negative effect on students’ full engagement and persistence with their education. The high levels of unemployment is surprising and perhaps concerning when considering the rising levels of student debt. The evidence reveals that work must be done to provide first generation students with adequate financial aid information and perhaps greater financial support to ensure an improved level of confidence in their ability to pay for school. The higher than expected level of food insecurity reported by respondents is also concerning. The pantry and other food initiatives under consideration are steps in the right direction.

ADJUSTMENT TO CAMPUS LIFE

When it comes to social adjustment, the survey sought to measure how smooth students perceived their transition to campus life, how connected they feel to the campus, how well they feel they are getting along with their classmates, and how easy it is to make friends on campus.

In the aggregate the news is very good with 90% of the students responding that the smoothness of their transition to Cal Lutheran ranged from “somewhat smooth”, “mostly smooth” to “very smooth”. However, only 22% of these respondents actually characterized their transition to Cal Lutheran as “very smooth”. But what of the few students who did not find their transition so smooth? A closer examination of student populations revealed that a lower percentage of international students (11%), Asian students (16%); LGBTQ students (17%), and Multiracial students (17%) described their transition as “very smooth”. Males (25%) and Hispanic students (24%) were the two groups who reported the highest level of a “very” smooth transition. Only five students reported that their transition was “not at all smooth”. When combining “not very smooth” and “not at all smooth”, the aggregate percentage of students with this perception was a low 9.7%. Groups whose perceptions were more often found on the negative side were African Americans (14%; 3 out of 22); multiracial
(21%; 6 out of 29); and LGBTQ students (29%; 7 out of 24) and all of these were in the "not very smooth" category. This last LGBTQ statistic stands out when you compare it to the extremely low 4% of heterosexual students who describe their transition this way. Another 23% of students with an emotional or mental health disability also report a less than smooth transition to campus. Those respondents who work both on campus and off-campus are the least likely to describe their transition on the smooth side. And finally, first year students report their transition to Cal Lutheran as a bit smoother than transfer students with 69% of first years describing the transition as "very or mostly" smooth compared to 61% of transfers.

Eight to twelve weeks into the semester, students responded to how connected they feel to the campus community. In the aggregate only about 13% report feeling "very connected" while another 42% feel "moderately connected". At the bottom of the Likert scale, 10 students report feeling "very disconnected", representing only 5% of respondents. Once again, a closer examination reveals a difference among certain student groups. First year respondents report feeling considerably greater connection than transfers with 59% of them feeling "very" or "moderately" connected compared to only 42.5% of transfers. In addition, transfers are overrepresented on the disconnected side of the scale with 27% of them reporting some level of disconnection. Not surprisingly, students who report active involvement in at least one club or organization report significantly greater feelings of connection to the campus than their uninvolved peers. In fact, the more campus organizations students report being actively involved in, the more connected they report being to the campus community. Only 43.5% of the respondents who are not actively involved in any on campus club or organization report feeling "very or moderately" connected to the campus community compared to 86% of respondents who are involved in four or more campus clubs or organizations. Even respondents who are actively involved in only one campus club report much greater connection to the campus community with 61.5% of them reporting "very" or "moderately" connected.

The survey confirms the intuitive thought that students who find it easier to make friendships on campus also report a greater connection to the campus. Also confirmed is the thinking that athletes report greater connection to the campus community than non-athletes, particularly students involved in intramurals (86%), NCAA III (78%) and Club sports (64%) reporting "very" or "moderate" connection to the campus community. Compare this to the less than half of non-athletic participants (48%) who report this level of campus connection. Additionally, and not surprisingly, the survey results also confirm that respondents who participate in on campus athletic competition also report significantly greater ease in forming friendships than their non-participating peers.

A total of six students out of 39 students (15%) with a self-reported mental health disability said they feel "very disconnected" while another five (13%) report feeling "moderately disconnected". While no black student respondents report feeling "very disconnected", four of the 19 who responded to this question (21%) responded that they feel "moderately disconnected". Multiracial students are also overrepresented in this less than desirable level of connection to the University with five of the 27 feeling "moderately disconnected" (19%) and another 7% (two students) feeling "very disconnected". Respondents who report having a possibly undiagnosed mental health disability also report high levels of disconnection with eight of the 31 students (26%) reporting their feeling as "moderately disconnected". Also of
note is that self-reported heterosexual and LGBTQ students report similar levels of connection to the University while students who are questioning their sexual orientation report a significantly lower feeling of connection to campus.

A finding outside conventional wisdom is that respondents who are working on campus or not working at all report a similar level of connectedness to the campus. However, not surprisingly, both groups report a greater campus connection than students working off campus and especially greater than students holding both on and off campus jobs. While few respondents feel completely disconnected from campus, 56% of the students working off campus and 60% of those working both on and off campus jobs report some level of disconnection. The results of the survey make it apparent that more time spent on campus is correlated to greater feelings of campus connection. It is therefore not surprising that respondents who live off campus with family report feeling significantly less connected to the campus than residential students. The comparison is stark with 64% of residential students reporting “very” or “moderate” levels of connection compared to a meager 37% of students who are living off campus with their family. In addition, another crosstab reveals a positive correlation between the frequency of participation in campus events and feelings of connection to the campus community, although it is not clear whether students feel more connected so they participate or they participate and then feel more connected.

Another measure had to do with how well students get along with their classmates. It is definitely good to learn that most respondents report getting along either “very well” or “moderately well” with their classmates whether they are residential or commuter students. In the aggregate, 79% report this good news, with 44% of the students reporting “very well”. Very few students report not getting along at all with their classmates. It is important to note that among LGBTQ respondents, the outlook is different. A troubling finding is that only 54% of LGBTQ respondents report getting along “very well” or “moderately well” with their classmates as compared with 84% of their heterosexual peers.

With the exception of students working both on and off campus, more than 60% of new students find it “very easy” or “moderately easy” to form friendships on campus. This is especially true for students who work on campus as 72% report their ease of making friends. However, one group that reported some difficulty is international students. None found it “very easy” and a third (3 of the 9 students) found the task to be moderately difficult. It is common knowledge among international educators that international students have different ideas as to the meaning of friendship, so this statistic may be less cause for concern than it appears to be. However, of concern is that respondents who identify as LGBTQ also report more difficulty in forming friendships. Only 45% found it “very easy” or “moderately easy” compared to 65% of their heterosexual peers.

Conclusion

Taken together, it is evident that the majority of traditional undergraduates make a pretty smooth transition to Cal Lutheran, forming friendships with ease, feeling reasonably connected and getting along with classmates. It cannot go unnoticed that connections to the campus community are strongest among students who are actively involved in athletics and clubs or organizations. Special attention however, must be paid to international students who beyond having different ideas about friendship, might also experience both language
and cultural differences that impede friendship formation. Additionally, students reporting emotional and mental health issues and our LGBTQ students and those questioning their sexual orientation experience greater challenges than their peers when it comes to adjusting to campus life. Special attention should also be paid to students who work both on and off campus and those who reside off campus with family members as their time away from campus appears to hamper their ability to form friendships and also limit their sense of connection to the campus community.

ACADEMIC OUTLOOK

The ultimate goal for college students is to succeed academically and to graduate with knowledge that will help them reach their life goals. The survey sought to find out what new students think about their coursework and how confident they are in their ability to maintain at least a 3.0 GPA.

Students were asked to rate the level of “usefulness” on a scale of 1-10 of freshman seminar, general education courses and major courses (if any) since they are mostly first year students. The wording of the question and the responses were not in sync and so it is not advisable to strictly rely on the responses. The wording of the prompt indicates that 10 is the most or best while the responses indicate the reverse. While the responses are very descriptive, for example, “Extremely Useful” at a “1” and “Extremely Useless” at a “10”, any responses are suspect. The mean for the usefulness of freshman seminar was 5.27 (162 respondents, Std 2.71), 4.35 (165 respondents; Std 2.33) for general education courses and 3.12 (154 respondents; Std 2.58) for major courses. Remember, in this case, the lower number is a more positive response as “1 “is the highest level of “usefulness”.

When it comes to the academic rigor of these categories of courses the survey asked students to compare the rigor of their current courses to what they experienced in high school. Again the scale was 1-10 with the same flaw as the previous question, where the responses did not match the prompt. For freshman seminar the mean was 6.09 (171 respondents; Std 2.63). For general education the mean was 4.83 (172 respondents; Std 2.40). And finally for major courses the mean was 4.15 (162 respondents; Std 2.54). Again, lower numbers indicate greater rigor.

The majority of students (60%) are confident in their ability to maintain at least a 3.0 GPA. Students in all categories of work report greater confidence in their ability to earn at least a 3.0 GPA than their non-working peers. The highest confidence is among students working on campus with 76% of them responding, “definitely yes” to the GPA question compared to only 50% of non-workers. Even the students working both on and off campus report greater academic confidence than unemployed students with 63% of those working two jobs reporting that they definitely have the ability to maintain at least a 3.0 GPA. It would be interesting to see if having a job actually corresponds to earning a higher grade point average. First year students and transfers have almost identical levels of confidence in their ability to maintain at least a 3.0 GPA as do residential and commuter students. Non-athletic students are significantly more confident than NCAA III athletes where only 54.5% report definite confidence compared to 65% of non-athletic students. Females are slightly more confident than males and first generation students are slightly less confident than their peers.
Students from all ethnic backgrounds appear to be similarly confident in their academic ability.

**Conclusion**

If the reader believes that respondents paid more attention to the descriptive responses and ignored the number attached to the response, then it the reader may conclude that the students find the academic rigor of their general education and major courses to be slightly to moderately more rigorous than they experienced in high school and for now at least, there is a perception that their courses will be slightly to moderately useful. Freshman Seminar ranks slightly lower in both usefulness and rigor than their general education courses and their major courses. In general, there is a high level of confidence among the students that they will be able to maintain at least a 3.0 GPA. Of course, this is only 9-12 weeks into the first semester and perceptions might change.

**PERCEPTION OF CAMPUS CLIMATE**

Campus climate has to do with how welcomed, accepted, safe, appreciated, and included campus members feel while on campus. Campus climate is affected by everyday interactions involving silent and often unintentional messages sent to campus members via artifacts, visual diversity, policies, access to resources, as well as the explicit everyday behaviors viewed and experienced by campus members. Several questions on the survey addressed contributors to the campus climate. Students were asked how comfortable they are with the levels of various kinds of diversity on campus, about the approachability of faculty and staff, if they ever felt disrespected because of their perceived membership in a particular group, and how easy it was for them to make friends with students who were culturally different from them.

When it comes to comfort with the level of ethnic diversity on campus, the news is very good with 52\% of all respondents reporting that they are “very comfortable”. Notably, 63\% of transfers reported being “very comfortable” compared to 49\% of first year freshmen. Another 24\% of all students said they are “moderately comfortable”. Only 14 students (7\%) report being “somewhat” or “very uncomfortable”. Similarly, 51\% are “very comfortable” with the level of religious diversity and another 28\% are “moderately comfortable”. Only five students expressed any level of discomfort with religious diversity on campus.

Interactions with faculty and staff have a strong impact on students’ sense that they are valued members of the campus community. So, students were asked how open/approachable they find faculty and staff to be in answering their questions and concerns. Concerning faculty, the news is good with 64\% of students responding, “very open” and another 24\% responding “moderately open”. Only four students (2\%) responded that they find faculty “not very open”.


Similarly, but only slightly less positive, staff are widely viewed as open/approachable with 59% responding that they are “very open” and another 26% responding, “moderately open”. Seven students (4%) reported that they find staff “not very open”.

The question of whether campus members feel accepted and respected with regard to their actual or perceived membership in a particular group adds greatly to the perception of a positive or warm campus climate. Students were asked if they had ever felt disrespected by anyone because of their perceived or actual religion, ethnic group membership, sexual orientation, or immigration status. In general, the news is great on three of the four measures because between 92% and 96% reported that they have not felt disrespected because of their religion, sexual orientation or immigration status. However, each category had 3-7 respondents who had felt disrespected and several more 4-10 who thought “maybe” they had been disrespected. Amazingly, being in California, only one Hispanic/Latinx respondent reported ever feeling disrespected because of his or her perceived immigration status. Four Hispanic/Latinx students said “maybe” representing only 4% of students from their ethnic group. In fact, more Asian students (two students; 5%) reported having felt disrespected because of their perceived immigration status while no international students reported feeling that way.

By disaggregating the data, it became apparent that 19% (4 of the 21) LGBTQ students had felt disrespected because of their actual or perceived sexual orientation. They represented four of the seven students who reported being disrespected based on perceived sexual orientation. The other three actually identified as heterosexual. On the basis of religion, two Catholics and one agnostic/atheist reported feeling like they had been disrespected. It is notable that all six of the Muslim students who participated in the survey responded, “no” to this question of feeling disrespected based on their religion.

The least positive news was on the issue of race and ethnicity wherein only 80% reported that they had not felt disrespected because of their perceived or actual race or ethnicity. Seventeen students (9.5%) said they had felt disrespected. The perception was equally likely among first year students and transfers. Another 19 students (11%) thought “maybe” they had been disrespected because of their perceived race or ethnicity. Again, there was no difference in the experience between first years and transfers. The students who reported having felt disrespected because of their race or ethnicity were international students with 29% of them responding “yes” (two of the seven who responded to this question). Another 43% of international students (three students) reported “maybe”. One third of black students responded “yes” or “maybe” to having felt disrespected (5 of the 15 students who responded to the question).

A final measure of climate is the ease with which students feel they can form friendships with students who are culturally different. In the aggregate about 37% reported that it is “definitely easy” while another 34% said that “most of the time” it is easy. Only a very small percentage described making friends with students who are culturally different to be “not easy” (7%) or “very difficult” (2.5%). It is good news when only 19 students out of 199 who responded to the question expressed some level of difficulty in this area and these students do not belong to any particular identity group.

Conclusion
In general, new students find the campus climate for diversity to be pretty good. The pockets of slight concern are around race and ethnicity (particularly international and black students) and sexual orientation. While these areas of concern appear to be better than what the greater society is currently experiencing, attention needs to be paid to improve the way international students and black students experience the campus. Of surprise is the overwhelming sense of acceptance students report when it comes to perceived religion, immigration status, and for the most part, sexual orientation.

**SEEKING ASSISTANCE**

Knowing where to go and whom to see when issues arise is an important aspect of campus life. The survey sought to learn where students think to go for assistance with healthcare, academic support, personal problems and certain issues they might encounter. For some of the questions, respondents could select as many options that would reflect where they would go.

It is a mystery as to why 61% of male respondents know where to go on campus if they are sick compared to only 46% of females. The good news is that there is no difference with regard to that knowledge for first generation students and their peers. However, respondents who work more than 20 hours per week have considerably less knowledge about where to go on campus for healthcare (only 33% know) compared to over 50% of their peers who work fewer hours or not at all. Not surprisingly, even fewer students who live off campus with family know where to go on campus if they are sick. This is to be expected and the majority of respondents working more than 20 hours per week are the same students living off campus with family. It should be noted that these students may not need to access healthcare on campus like their peers, so their lack of knowledge is understandable.

As an academic institution, knowing how and where to seek academic assistance can impact academic persistence and ultimately academic success. The survey asked students to select all the places they would go if they need academic support. Consistently, across gender, residential status, working status, and first generation status, a faculty member was the most selected choice. Although first generation students most frequently selected faculty, only 19 of the 72 (26%) first generation respondents did so compared to 42% of non-first generation students (48 out of 114). It is important to note that Student Support Services was a very close second behind a faculty member as the selected destination for first generation students with 18 of them (25%) selecting that office, with female first generation respondents far more likely to go there than their male counterparts. On the other hand, male students in general were far more likely than female students to seek academic support from the Center for Academic Support, with males placing that office as an equal preference as classmates (15%). With the exception of first generation students, among other students, classmates were the second most frequent designation for academic support, far above departmental assistants for both males and females with only 3% of students thinking of departmental assistants as a source of academic support. The Center for Academic Support was selected by fewer than 10% of the students across categories, except males with 9 of the 62 (15%) saying they would go there compared to only 2% (3 females out of 128). Not
surprisingly, male respondents also reported with significantly greater frequency that they would not seek any academic support help on campus (6.5% versus 2%).

Part of being human is encountering personal problems. The survey asked respondents where they will go if they need support with personal problems. It is not surprising that 81% (104 of 128) of females selected friends as the most popular option. It was also the most frequent selection among males but to a lesser degree with only 68% of them choosing friends as their destination. On the flip side, 24% of males (far greater than the 14% of females) said they wouldn’t seek support on campus. Not surprisingly, respondents who work more than 20 hours per week had friends as their first choice but only 55% (12 of the 22) chose this option as compared to the 82% (59 of 72) of their peers who work fewer hours. Again, a lot of the students working over 20 hours per week also live with their family and so it is not surprising that only 66% (44 of 67) of the students living off campus with their family selected friends as a destination for support with personal problems compared to 84% of students who live on campus. Of surprise, however, is that students living with family are less likely to turn to family members for support with personal problems than they are to go to the Student Counseling Center (33%), a faculty or staff member (28%) or Student Support Services (27%). Only a slightly greater percentage of these non-residential students than their residential peers would not seek support on campus (19% versus 17%).

Students were asked if they knew where to go on campus if they were having emotional or mental health issues. Only 23% of students working over 20 hours per week and a little over a third of students living off campus with their families knew for sure where they could go on campus for help. Males knew slightly better than females, Non-first generation students knew slightly better than first generation students. However, in general, most students had an idea where they could go with the exception of students working over 20 hours per week and those residing off campus with family. In general, with mental health issues on the rise, too many respondents did not know where to go on campus if they were experiencing mental or emotional health issues. The percentages ranged from 11% to 28% of the respondents.

Students were asked where they would go if they felt they were being mistreated because of their cultural background. Again, they were asked to check as many options as they thought appropriate. The most common choice (66 students; 14%) responded that they would go to a faculty member, followed closely by their parents (63 students). An equal number (55 students, 12%) would go to Campus Safety or their peer advisor. Around 20% of first years and transfers would not report the incident at all. The same is true for both 20% of males and females. Black and international students, who also reported higher levels of feeling disrespected, are also much more likely than their peers to report the incident to Campus Safety with the exception of students who identify as "other". Seventy percent of self-identified "other" students, 57% of international students, and 43% of black student would go to Campus Safety. However, another 29% of international students wouldn’t report it compared to only 7% of black students and none of the self-identified "other" students. Males are more likely to report to Campus Safety than females (40% versus only 27.5%). Similarly, 42% of transfer student respondents would report to Campus Safety compared to only 29% of first year students.

First year students are more likely to report the incident to their parents (38.5% of them) than to Campus Safety, especially if they are female. Among black students, parents are the
most preferred place to go to report an incident of mistreatment based on their cultural background. Students identifying ethnically as “other” are also most likely to go to parents (70%). The results of the survey indicated that first generation students would respond differently than their peers if they felt mistreated based on their cultural background. The difference is that non-first generation students would seek out multiple options including parents, faculty, peer advisors and campus safety (each with 35% - 43% of respondents) while their first generation students would more frequently seek out a faculty member (38%) with the others option sought out far less frequently. Even parents were chosen by only 26% of first generation students compared to 43% of their peers. Among all options, in the aggregate, Safe Zone Allies were selected only 7% of the time, although among ethnic groups, religious groups, and LGBTQ students, the Safe Zone Allies rank higher as an option. This is particularly true for multiracial students, Muslim students, and students who are questioning their sexual orientation.

With Title IX and sexual harassment being an important consideration on college campuses, it made sense to ask students where they would to go on campus if they were being sexually harassed. The most chosen designation to report was Campus Safety with 104 students (59%) of respondents selecting that option. The Title IX Coordinator was the second choice (85 respondents), followed by parents (68 respondents) and then a faculty member (52 respondents). A small percentage of respondents, fewer than 10% or 16 students, said that they would not report. It is important to note that there is no significant difference between males and females in their reporting choices. The findings also indicate that there are also no real differences between first generation respondents and their peers in their reporting choices.

Conclusion

The findings indicate that new students view faculty as more than just teachers in the classroom. They are more, too, than simply an academic support resource as students from all backgrounds will likely seek them out as a primary resource for personal issues. It is therefore imperative that faculty are prepared to point students towards the many and varied resources available to students on campus and that they are prepared to properly handle Title IX sexual harassment complaints. An under-utilized resource appears to be departmental assistants for academic support and Safe Zone Allies. Campus Safety is another resource that may not be entirely appropriate if an actual crime has not been committed. With students reporting frequently to parents, the administration might never become aware of some of the important personal issues students are dealing with. Efforts need to be made to ensure that faculty and all students are fully aware of the low cost healthcare and mental health care services available on campus. In addition it is evident that international students, black students, and students who select “other” might take more seriously any mistreatment they experience based on their cultural background as evidenced by their greater propensity to seek out campus safety to report mistreatment based on their cultural background.

ENGAGEMENT
Overall, self-reported participation in campus activities/events is very low among students no matter how the students are disaggregated into separate identity groups with the notable exception of the two Hindu students (both international students) who report that they “very often” participate. They are among the nine respondents of the 215 who claimed to participate “very often” in on campus activities. Across groups, a larger number and percentage of students report that they participate in campus activities/events “not very often” or “not at all” than report even a moderate level of participation (56% versus 39.5%). With the exception of international students, students whose families reside outside the U.S. and black and native students, a very small percentage of students report that they “very often” participated in campus activities. It is notable that these aforementioned student groups also have a lower percentage reporting that they don’t participate at all. This is not true of the other ethnic groups where the percent of not participating at all is even higher than participating “very often”. It is also notable, and perhaps not surprising, that the groups with the smallest representation on campus also report the highest level of participation with the exception of students questioning their sexual orientation wherein 83% report little to no participation and none report “very often” participation. Similarly, transfer students also report exceedingly low levels of participation with only 1 of the 43 respondents (2%) reporting “very often” participation and 77% reporting “not very often or not at all”. Among identify groups with zero to less than 5% reporting very often participation are transfer students, students who work more than 20 hours per week, males, the remaining ethnic groups, students who reside off campus, students with mental illness, and students who are questioning their sexual orientation. It is important to note that four of the six students who report questioning their sexual orientation also report mental health issues, indicating an evident overlap.

While students who do not have a job report significantly greater participation in campus activities than their working counterparts and students who work on campus report significantly greater participation than students who work off campus or who work both on and off campus, there is no cause for celebration. With 19% of transfers and 12% of the non-working students reporting that they don’t participate in campus activities at all, it leaves open the question as to why the levels of participation are so low.

In looking for a reason behind the low participation rates, the data reveals that knowledge of the events is not likely the problem with 67% (145 of 215 students) of respondents reporting that they are either “very” or at least “moderately aware” of the events happening on campus with international students, black, and native students being the most aware and students questioning their sexual orientation being the least aware. Again, it could be that the small numbers of black, native, and international students drive them to seek opportunities to be involved. Being more than 100 miles from the family home, particularly for 100% of international students, 56% of native students, and 40% of black students might also contribute to their higher level of awareness and participation. Females and males report similar awareness levels, as do first generation students, first years and transfers. Students who reside off campus with family report being less aware than their on campus peers as well as their peers who reside off campus with roommates. Family responsibilities and activities might serve as an understandable distraction to what is happening on-campus. For students questioning their sexual orientation, the emotional energy expended in coming to terms with their sexual identity might be a strong distraction. It is interesting that students
who work 20 hours or less each week actually report slightly higher levels of awareness of on-campus activities than students who do not work at all. With participation rates so low, but awareness not being the major issue, the question becomes that of appeal.

Students were asked how satisfied they are with the kinds of involvement opportunities available to them on campus. Nearly a third, 32%, responded that they are “very satisfied” and another 44% responded that they are “moderately satisfied”. Transfers report slightly higher levels of satisfaction than first years. Only 13 students (6%) responded that they are either “moderately dissatisfied” or “extremely dissatisfied”. Nineteen percent (40 students out of 216) are “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied”. Students who report questioning their sexual orientation report less satisfaction than their peers. Among religious groups, the most satisfied are Protestants being over represented than their peers with 43% reporting “very satisfied” followed by 40% of spiritual and 38% of Catholics.

When it comes to ethnicity, 35% of Hispanic/Latinx and white students report being “very satisfied” with the kinds of involvement opportunities on campus while the highest representation of most satisfied are the four of nine Native/Alaskan/Hawaiian students (44%) with the other five of them reporting less satisfaction almost evenly along the Likert scale. Less than 28% of the remaining ethnic groups, including international students are “very satisfied” however, the largest percentage of them report being “moderately satisfied”. This is how five of the nine international students described their satisfaction with the involvement opportunities with none expressing any level of dissatisfaction.

Although they are not among the most satisfied with the involvement opportunities on campus, black and international students report being the most aware of what is happening. Engagement among black and international students can be described as “very aware” of the involvement opportunities, moderately satisfied with the opportunities, and only seldom likely to participate whereas Hispanic/Latinx and white students are moderately aware of what is happening, more satisfied with the involvement opportunities, but even less likely to participate in them than black and international students. However, ethnically speaking, the least aware of involvement opportunities, least satisfied with what is offered and the least likely to report participation are Asian and multiracial students.

As a campus whose mission is to educate leaders for a global society, the survey asked students how satisfied they are with the amount of opportunities to learn about other cultures represented on campus. In the aggregate, a good percentage overall, 37% report being “very satisfied” with 47.5% of transfer students being “very satisfied”. In the aggregate another 31% report being “moderately satisfied”. Males and females report similar levels of satisfaction with cultural learning opportunities. Across ethnic groups, with the exception of students who self-identify as “other” between a third and 50% report being “very satisfied” with these opportunities. Fifty-two percent of Protestants and 40% of Catholics were also “very satisfied” while religious minorities were less satisfied with the exception of the one Jewish student who was also “very satisfied” and five of the seven Muslim respondents (71%) who were “moderately satisfied”. It is easy to speculate that the lack of programming specifically for Buddhist and Hindu respondents might be behind their less than satisfied response.
On a campus like Cal Lutheran, many students find their involvement in activities on campus through clubs and organizations. So, students were asked how many clubs or organizations they are actively involved in. It is notable that 85 students or 43% (out of 200 respondents) report “none”. The lack of club involvement is more pronounced among transfers with 53% (21 out of 40 transfers) reporting no participation in clubs on campus compared to only 41% of first years. Not surprisingly, 61% of students who consistently worked more than 20 hours per week as well as 60% of those who only occasionally worked more than 20 hours per week are not actively involved in any clubs. Additionally, 57% of students who live off campus with family members also report no involvement with on campus clubs or organizations. First generation students are also slightly less likely than their peers to be involved in a club or organization on campus.

**Conclusion**

Although students are generally aware and satisfied with the opportunities for involvement on campus, the vast majority of students report little to no participation with on campus activities/events. A large percentage of new students are not active in campus organizations either. This is particularly true among students who work more than 20 hours per week, students who reside off campus with their families, as well as Asian and multiracial students. Black students and international students seem to be the students who are most aware and most likely to participate, although their participation rates can and perhaps should be higher if they actually had higher levels of satisfaction with the kinds of involvement opportunities available. The kinds of activities/events available to students at this early point in their enrollment are clearly not enticing enough to motivate them to participate. How students are spending their time and ways to entice greater on campus engagement should be the topic of focus groups.

**ASPIRATIONAL ENGAGEMENT**

A little more than half way into their first semester, students were asked about their aspirations for participating in high impact activities such as taking on a student leadership role, studying abroad and participation in organized forms of athletics, including NCAA III, intramurals, club sports, off campus teams, and informally with friends.

Not surprisingly, students are largely on the fence about taking on a leadership role with only 16% (31 respondents) having made up their minds to do it. When it came to studying abroad, however, 58% report being interested in studying abroad (111 respondents out of 191) while 66% have no plans to participate in any level of organized sports on campus (126 of 191 respondents). A disaggregation of the data provided greater insight into the aspirations of these new students.

To start, males are participating or are planning to participate in organized sports at higher levels (27% of males versus 12% of females report participation in NCAA III sports) while females are far more interested in studying abroad (64% of females compared to only 45% of males). Females are also slightly more interested in seeking leadership roles (18% of females and only 12% of males).
When it comes to comparing the responses of first years and transfers regarding aspirational engagement, first year students express greater interest on all three measures. Nearly 18% of first year students express interest in pursuing a student leadership role compared to only 13% of transfers. An additional 46% of first years responded “maybe” to the question compared to only 36% of transfers. When asked about their interest in studying abroad, 63% of first years responded in the affirmative versus only 41% of transfers and a high percentage (28%) of transfers disclosed their disinterest in studying abroad versus only 17% of first years. Finally, 87% of transfers are not planning to nor currently participate in any organized athletics compared to only 60% of first years. Of course, only 25% of transfers are unemployed.

When looked at through the lens of ethnicity, Native/Alaskan/Hawaiian and Asian students show the highest levels of aspiration for student leadership with three out of eight Native/Alaskan/Hawaiian students (38%) and eight out of 41 (20%) of Asian students reporting their intention to seek a student leadership role. Hispanic/Latinx students follow with 16% (17 out of 108 students). There were a lot of respondents in the “maybe” category, primarily white, Hispanic/Latinx, and international students. Multiracial and black students show considerably lower aspirations when it comes to seeking student leadership roles on campus with 68% of multiracial students and 56% of black students responding “no” to the question of whether they were interested in pursuing a student leadership role on campus. These responses are significantly more negative than any other ethnic group represented in the survey. However, black and multiracial students lead the other ethnic groups in their interest in study abroad with 67% of black students (12 of the 18 students) and 64% of multiracial students (16 of the 25 students) expressing the highest level of interest. With the exception of the self-reported “other” in the ethnic category, all ethnic groups express a high level of interest in studying abroad with a low of 49% among white students. Only 27% of self-reported “other” students said they were interested in studying abroad. Participation in organized sports at all levels appears to be the purview of black students as 39% of them are participating or planning to participate in NCAA III sports, higher than any other ethnic group. Additionally, where 100% of Native/Alaskan/Hawaiian and 76% of Asian students report no athletic participation, current or planned, only 39% of black students report the same, the lowest level among all ethnic groups. The other ethnic groups range from 60% to 100% with no level of athletic participation.

A comparison of first generation students to their peers reveals that they are only slightly more interested in pursuing student leadership roles, they are slightly less interested in studying abroad, and they are less likely to participate in organized sports on campus.

Respondents who work more than 20 hours per week are just as interested in pursuing a leadership role as other working peers, but surprisingly they are actually more likely than students who are unemployed. They are also just slightly more interested in studying abroad than all their peers, working or not. However, they have little participation in organized sports while 25% of non-working students are participating in NCAA III sports. Anecdotal evidence suggests that NCAA III athletes are less likely to be interested in studying abroad and this survey indicates that this might be the case with less than half (49%) of these NCAA III respondents saying they are interested in studying abroad. Another
27% of NCAA III athletes place themselves in the “maybe” category and another 24% said they were not interested.

Surprisingly, respondents who reside on campus versus those who live off campus with family or roommates are slightly less likely to pursue student leadership, slightly less interested in studying abroad (58%) than students who live off campus with their families (66%), but they are a lot more interested than students who live off campus with roommates (only 11%). Residential respondents are also participating or planning to participate in sports at a much higher level than their non-residential peers, with 27% of them participating in NCAA III. Only 54% of residential respondents don’t participate in sports at all compared to 82% of those living with family and 89% of those living with roommates.

Comparing disaggregated responses along the lines of self-reported sexual orientation reveals that students who self-identify as LGBTQ report similar interest in pursuing leadership roles, but significantly greater interest in studying abroad with 18 of the 22 students responding “yes” as opposed to “maybe” or “no”. Not surprisingly, students who are questioning their sexual orientation are a bit more cautious with only half (three students) responding “yes” and the remaining three students responding “maybe” to the interest in study abroad question. Although none of the questioning students responded “yes” to pursuing a leadership role, all six responded, “maybe”, leaving the door open for the possibility.

Conclusion

Less than a forth of new students report being interested in pursuing a leadership role on campus, but far more are open to the idea, leaving the door open for active recruitment and encouragement. Female students have a greater interest in pursuing leadership roles and studying abroad than their male counterparts, but both should be encouraged as gender diversity will benefit everyone. Although interest in studying abroad is high, few students actually do it. There is a great opportunity to recruit students of color and LGBTQ students to study abroad as their interest level is already high. The challenge is to get transfer students and NCAA III athletics to see study abroad as an option. Race, gender, first generation status, and questioning of LGBTQ status do appear to deter certain students from being interested in engaging in one or more of these high impact activities. It will take a little more effort and some creativity to encourage transfers, NCAA III athletes, and males to participate.

What follows in the appendix are charts and graphs that provide the aggregate results from the survey, divided along topics presented in this report. There are additional charts that detail responses that might also be of interest but are not addressed in this report. At the end is a printed version of the complete survey that was sent via email to 499 newly enrolled students.