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INTRODUCTION: ANALYSIS OF CLIMATE FOR OFFICE OF THE CHIEF BUSINESS OFFICER

This report expands upon the work of the Campus Climate and Culture Task Force on the Assessment of Climate for Learning, Kennesaw Campus.\(^1\) Background information, a campus-wide executive summary, and details about the consulting firm that assisted with the study can be viewed on the Campus Culture and Climate Assessment home page at [http://diversity.kennesaw.edu/kennesawccca/](http://diversity.kennesaw.edu/kennesawccca/).

In order to guide the diversity action planning process, responses have been analyzed within each college and division/department/office. This report provides findings for respondents affiliated with the Office of the Chief Business Officer (herein referred to as OCBO). There are four sections in this report; they are described in detail below. General response items are included while follow-up questions are excluded. Items with very small response numbers were excluded from all comparisons to protect confidentiality.\(^2\)

In Section I, responses from OCBO staff are compared to those of all other Kennesaw Campus staff. Chi square tests were used for these comparisons to identify statistically significant differences. This comparison provides important information to measure the strengths and challenges evident within OCBO when compared against the Kennesaw Campus as a whole. Also in section one are comparisons of responses from staff by department, compared to the rest of the office.

Section II compares responses between single identity groups of staff within OCBO and all OCBO staff identity groups combined, with a focus on historically underrepresented/marginalized identity groups. Standard deviation was used to establish a statistical basis for determining whether differences between comparison groups were large enough to be labeled significant strengths or challenges. When differences were not statistically significant but still informative, the designation of meaningful strengths or challenges was used. These comparisons provide a more detailed insight into OCBO’s climate based on traits such as gender, race/ethnicity, and disability status.

Section II also includes a separate analysis based on benchmarks. Benchmarks were established by averaging responses by group (instructors/faculty/staff and students), revealing a response rate ideal that varied by the type of question asked. For example if, on average, 80% of staff respondents across KSU report comfort with the climate in their departments, then it is established that at least 80% of OCBO staff respondents should report the same. If that benchmark is exceeded, it is considered a strength within OCBO. If the benchmark is not met, then it is considered a challenge. Benchmarks do not represent the desired end points for OCBO’s climate; rather, they are next steps or goals in the improvement process.

---

1 The Kennesaw Campus is also referred to as KSU in this report, because the climate assessment was conducted prior to consolidation.

2 It should be noted that percentage point differences may appear extreme when small numbers are expressed as percentages, which is the case with many OCBO staff identity groups and departments.
Section III presents an analysis of items with numeric scale ratings on various dimensions of the campus climate. This analysis includes multiple comparisons of groups within OCBO to the corresponding groups for the Kennesaw Campus.

Section IV presents findings for items that are specific to identity groups such as persons with disabilities or with military service.
SECTION I: COMPARISON OF RESPONSES FROM OCBO STAFF TO ALL OTHER RESPONDENTS AND TO BENCHMARKS

Chi square tests determined statistically significant differences between responses from OCBO staff and all other KSU staff, as well as departmental staff to the rest of the office. Statistically significant and favorable results were labeled significant strengths while those that were statistically significant and unfavorable were labeled significant challenges. Results that were informative but not statistically significant were labeled meaningful strengths and meaningful challenges. Only items with differences of ten percentage points or more were included in the report narrative. All items with differences of less than ten percentage points can be found in Appendix III. Data tables in this appendix provide information on additional items that may be considered potential strengths and challenges for OCBO.

Comparisons were also conducted of responses from OCBO staff to established benchmarks. Established benchmarks enabled comparisons of a group to a predetermined goal as opposed to a group to a group. Items that did meet or went beyond benchmarks (either above or below depending on whether an item is stated positively or negatively) were labeled strengths. Those that did not meet or fell below benchmarks were labeled challenges. Only items with differences of six percentage points or more were included. All items with differences of less than six percentage points can be found in Appendix IV. Data tables in this appendix provide information on additional items that may be considered potential strengths and challenges for OCBO.

---

3 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details of this analysis.
4 Items where the difference between the comparison group response average and the average for all other groups was less than four percentage points were excluded from analysis. The result is that some group comparisons will have more items in the analysis than others. Groups with more items in the analysis may warrant priority attention because of more overall group differences in experiences and perceptions of climate.
5 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
**Findings for OCBO Staff Compared to Other KSU Staff**

**OVERVIEW**

Table 1 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison.

**Table 1: Top Strengths and Challenges for OCBO Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCBO STAFF</th>
<th>Comparison to All Other KSU Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Top Strengths** | There were no areas of strength with a difference of 10 percentage points or greater for this comparison. | Lower agreement that  
• people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children  
• their colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view” of their identities  
• Lower percentage who have observed unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU |
| **Top Challenges** | • Lower levels of comfort with the climate in their departments | Lower agreement that  
• KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs  
• the way salaries are determined is clear  
• Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving KSU |
Section 1.1: OCBO Staff to KSU Staff Comparisons

Significant/meaningful strengths

No items met the criteria for significant or meaningful strengths. See Table 1 of Appendix III for further information.

Chart 1: Top Challenge, OCBO Staff Compared to All Other KSU Staff

Significant Challenges

- A significantly lower percentage of OCBO staff were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their departments (69%, n=76) compared to all other KSU staff (82%, n=498). See Table 1 of Appendix III for further information.

Meaningful Challenges

No items met the criteria for meaningful challenges. See Table 1 of Appendix III for further information.

Section 1.2: OCBO Staff to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for OCBO staff responses are presented here, arranged by item type. Items that were less than six percentage points from the benchmark were not included in the analysis. As a result, there will be no findings to report for some item types.

Yes-No Item Types:

These questions refer to observations or experiences that are undesirable, so a “yes” response to any of these questions is also undesirable. The goal is for the percentage of “yes” responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 25% or less responding with “yes.”

---

6 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
7 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
8 See Table 1 in Appendix IV for details.
The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, OCBO staff have observed unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU (17%, n=16).

The analysis also disclosed four areas of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, OCBO staff have observed exclusionary conduct at KSU within the past year (31%, n=34), personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year (32%, n=35), observed unjust promotion/reclassification practices at KSU (40%, n=36), and seriously considered leaving KSU (53%, n=58).

Chart 2: OCBO Staff “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark
Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 80%.

The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed one area of challenge. OCBO staff had comfort levels with the climate in their departments that were below the benchmark (69%, n=76).

Chart 2.1: OCBO Staff Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark

Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, positive statements):

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about work-life for staff, so the desired responses are “agree” or “strongly agree.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these item types is 80% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, OCBO staff agreed that they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers (87%, n=94).

The analysis also disclosed three areas of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, OCBO staff agreed that:

- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (74%, n=76),
- the way salaries are determined is clear (41%, n=41), and
- KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (39%, n=31).

![Chart 2.2: OCBO Staff Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark](chart.png)
Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, negative statements):

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of negatively worded statements about work-life for staff, so responses of “agree” or “strongly agree” are not desirable. The goal is for such responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 35% or less responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

The benchmark comparison for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed two areas of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, OCBO staff agreed that

- people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children (18%, n=18), and
- their colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view” of their identities (26%, n=21).

Chart 2.3: OCBO Staff Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark
Findings for Department of Public Safety Staff and University Police Compared to Other OCBO Staff

OVERVIEW

Table 2 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Underlined items appear as a top strength or challenge in both comparisons. Items that appear in more than one comparison should be considered as having been emphasized in terms of their importance.

Table 2: Top Strengths for Department of Public Safety Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Strengths</th>
<th>Comparison to All Other OCBO Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher agreement that KSU is supportive of taking leave</td>
<td>Higher agreement that KSU is supportive of taking leave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Challenges</th>
<th>Comparison to All Other OCBO Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher percentage who have observed unjust hiring practices at KSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower levels of comfort with the climate in their departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher percentage who have observed unjust promotion/reclassification practices at KSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower agreement that KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher percentage who have observed unjust promotion/reclassification practices at KSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower agreement that the way salaries are determined is clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 1.3: Department of Public Safety Staff to All Other OCBO Staff Comparisons

Chart 3: Top Strength, Department of Public Safety Staff Compared to All Other OCBO Staff

Significant Strengths

No items met the criteria for significant strengths.

Meaningful Strengths

- A higher percentage of Department of Public Safety staff agreed or strongly agreed that KSU is supportive of taking leave (97%, n=31) compared to all other OCBO staff (86%, n=63).

See Table 2 of Appendix III for further information.

---

9 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Significant Challenges

A significantly higher percentage of Department of Public Safety staff have

- observed unjust hiring practices at KSU (45%, n=14) compared to all other OCBO staff (11%, n=7),
- observed unjust promotion/reclassification practices at KSU (61%, n=19) compared to all other OCBO staff (29%, n=17), and
- observed unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU (35%, n=11) compared to all other OCBO staff (8%, n=5).

In addition,

- a significantly lower percentage of Department of Public Safety staff were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their departments (47%, n=16) compared to all other OCBO staff (79%, n=60).

Meaningful Challenges

A lower percentage of Department of Public Safety staff

- agreed or strongly agreed that KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (26%, n=6) compared to all other OCBO staff (45%, n=25),
- agreed or strongly agreed that KSU provides them with resources to pursue professional development (72%, n=21) compared to all other OCBO staff (90%, n=64),
- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at KSU (71%, n=24) compared to all other OCBO staff (82%, n=62).

A higher percentage of Department of Public Safety staff

- have observed exclusionary conduct at KSU within the past year (41%, n=14) compared to all other OCBO staff (26%, n=20), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition (44%, n=14) compared to all other OCBO staff (31%, n=22).

See Table 2 of Appendix III for further information.

Section 1.4: Department of Public Safety Staff to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for Department of Public Safety staff responses are presented here, arranged by item type. Items that were less than six percentage points from the benchmark were not included in the analysis. As a result, there will be no findings to report for some item types.

**Yes-No Item Types:**

These questions refer to observations or experiences that are undesirable, so a “yes” response to any of these questions is also undesirable. The goal is for the percentage of “yes” responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 25% or less responding with “yes.”

---

10 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
11 See Table 2 in Appendix IV for details.
The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed six areas of challenge. The top five are presented here. At percentages above the benchmark, Department of Public Safety staff have

- observed unjust promotion/reclassification practices at KSU (61%, n=19),
- seriously considered leaving KSU (59%, n=20),
- observed unjust hiring practices at KSU (45%, n=14),
- observed exclusionary conduct at KSU within the past year (41%, n=14), and
- personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year (38%, n=13).

Chart 4: OCBO Staff “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 80%.
The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed two areas of challenge. Department of Public Safety staff had comfort levels below the benchmark with the climate

- In their departments (47%, n=16), and
- at KSU (71%, n=24).

Chart 4.1: Department of Public Safety Staff Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, positive statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about work-life for instructors and staff, so the desired responses are “agree” or “strongly agree.” The goal is for such responses to be **above** the benchmark. The benchmark for these item types is 80% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, Department of Public Safety staff agreed that KSU is supportive of taking leave (97%, n=31).

The analysis also disclosed five areas of challenge. The top four are presented here. At percentages below the benchmark, Department of Public Safety staff agreed that

- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (70%, n=23),
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (70%, n=23),
- the way salaries are determined is clear (45%, n=13), and
- KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (26%, n=6).

Chart 4.2: Department of Public Safety Staff Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, negative statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of negatively worded statements about work-life for faculty and staff, so responses of “agree” or “strongly agree” are not desirable. The goal is for such responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 35% or less responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

---

12 See Table 2 of Appendix III for further information. Two of these items are the same distance from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
The benchmark comparison for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, Department of Public Safety staff agreed that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition (44%, n=14).

Chart 4.3: Department of Public Safety Staff Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark
Findings for Facilities Services Staff

OVERVIEW

Table 3 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison.

Table 3: Top Strengths and Challenges for Facilities Services Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITIES SERVICES STAFF</th>
<th>Comparison to All Other OCBO Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></td>
<td>• Lower percentage who have observed unjust promotion/reclassification practices at KSU</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Lower agreement that • they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed • their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development • Higher agreement that they are reluctant to bring up issues of concern for fear it will affect performance evaluations or tenure/promotion decisions</td>
<td>Lower agreement that • the way salaries are determined is clear • KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs • Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving KSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 1.5: Facilities Services Staff to All Other OCBO Staff Comparisons

Chart 5: Strength, Facilities Services Staff Compared to All Other OCBO Staff

Significant Strengths
No items met the criteria for significant strengths.

Meaningful Strengths

- A lower percentage of Facilities Services staff have observed unjust promotion/reclassification practices at KSU (28%, n=5) compared to all other OCBO staff (43%, n=31).

See Table 3 of Appendix III for further information.

---

13 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Significant Challenges

A significantly lower percentage of Facilities Services staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (54%, n=13) compared to all other OCBO staff (85%, n=71),
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (52%, n=11) compared to all other OCBO staff (79%, n=65), and
- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (58%, n=14) compared to all other OCBO staff (79%, n=67).

In addition,

- a higher percentage of Facilities Services staff agreed or strongly agreed that they are reluctant to bring up issues of concern for fear it will affect performance evaluations or tenure/promotion decisions (48%, n=11) compared to all other OCBO staff (26%, n=21).

Meaningful Challenges

A lower percentage of Facilities Services staff were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate

- at KSU (54%, n=13) compared to all other OCBO staff (85%, n=73), and
- in their departments (58%, n=14) compared to all other OCBO staff (72%, n=62).

A lower percentage of Facilities Services staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- the way salaries are determined is clear (26%, n=5) compared to all other OCBO staff (45%, n=35),
- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (63%, n=15) compared to all other OCBO staff (79%, n=66),
- they have adequate access to administrative support (64%, n=14) compared to all other OCBO staff (80%, n=66),
they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers (78%, n=18) compared to all other OCBO staff (89%, n=76),
- KSU is supportive of taking leave (82%, n=18) compared to all other OCBO staff (92%, n=76), and
- KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (31%, n=5) compared to all other OCBO staff (41%, n=26).

A higher percentage of Facilities Services staff
- have seriously considered leaving KSU (63%, n=15) compared to all other OCBO staff (50%, n=43), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children (28%, n=5) compared to all other OCBO staff (16%, n=13).

See Table 3 of Appendix III for further information.

Section 1.6: Facilities Services Staff to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for Facilities Services staff responses are presented here, arranged by item type. Items that were less than six percentage points from the benchmark were not included in the analysis. As a result, there will be no findings to report for some item types.

Yes-No Item Types:

These questions refer to observations or experiences that are undesirable, so a “yes” response to any of these questions is also undesirable. The goal is for the percentage of “yes” responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 25% or less responding with “yes.”

---

14 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
15 See Table 3 in Appendix IV for details.
The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed two areas of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, Facilities Services staff have

- seriously considered leaving KSU (63%, n=15), and
- observed exclusionary conduct at KSU within the past year (38%, n=9).

Chart 6: Facilities Services Staff “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark
**Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:**

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 80%.

The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed two areas of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, Facilities Services staff were comfortable with the climate:

- at KSU (54%, n=13), and
- in their departments (58%, n=14).

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, positive statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about work-life for instructors and staff, so the desired responses are “agree” or “strongly agree.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these item types is 80% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed seven areas of challenge. The top five are presented here. At percentages below the benchmark, Facilities Services staff agreed that

- the way salaries are determined is clear (26%, n=6),
- KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (31%, n=5),
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (52%, n=11),
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (54%, n=13), and
- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (58%, n=14).

Chart 6.2: Facilities Services Staff Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, negative statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of negatively worded statements about work-life for faculty and staff, so responses of “agree” or “strongly agree” are not desirable. The goal is for such responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 35% or less responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

---

16 See Table 3 of Appendix IV for further information.
The benchmark comparison for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, Facilities Services staff agreed that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children (28%, n=5).

The analysis also disclosed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, Facilities Services staff agreed that they are reluctant to bring up issues of concern for fear it will affect performance evaluations or tenure/promotion decisions (48%, n=11).

Chart 6.3: Facilities Services Staff Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark
Findings for Human Resources

OVERVIEW

Table 4 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Underlined items appear as top strengths or challenges in both comparisons. Items that appear in more than one comparison should be considered as having been emphasized in terms of their importance.

Table 4: Top Strengths and Challenges for Human Resources Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUMAN RESOURCES STAFF</th>
<th>Comparison to All Other OCBO Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Strengths</td>
<td>• Higher levels of comfort with the climate in their departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower agreement that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower percentage who have observed unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower agreement that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower percentage who have observed unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher levels of comfort with the climate in their departments\textsuperscript{17}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher agreement that KSU provides them with resources to pursue professional development\textsuperscript{17}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Challenges</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that they have adequate access to administrative support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower agreement that they have adequate access to administrative support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{17} These two items are the same distance from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
Section 1.7: Human Resources Staff to All Other OCBO Staff Comparisons

Chart 7: Top Three Strengths, Human Resources Staff Compared to All Other OCBO Staff

**Significant Strength**
- No items met the criteria for significant strengths.

**Meaningful Strengths**

A lower percentage of Human Resources staff
- agreed or strongly agreed that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children (0%, n=0) compared to all other OCBO staff (20%, n=18), and
- have observed unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU (0%, n=0) compared to all other OCBO staff (18%, n=16).

A higher percentage of Human Resources staff
- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their departments (100%, n=9) compared to all other OCBO staff (66%, n=67),
- agreed or strongly agreed that KSU is supportive of flexible work schedules (89%, n=8) compared to all other OCBO staff (72%, n=69),
- agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (89%, n=8) compared to all other OCBO staff (72%, n=68),
- agreed or strongly agreed that they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (89%, n=8) compared to all other OCBO staff (73%, n=73),
- agreed or strongly agreed that KSU provides them with resources to pursue professional development (100%, n=9) compared to all other OCBO staff (84%, n=76),
- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at KSU (89%, n=8) compared to all other OCBO staff (77%, n=78), and
• agreed or strongly agreed that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (89%, n=8) compared to all other OCBO staff (77%, n=76).

See Table 4 of Appendix III for further information.

Chart 7.1: Challenge, Human Resources Staff Compared to All Other OCBO Staff

Significant Challenges

No items met the criteria for significant challenges.

Meaningful Challenge

• A lower percentage of Human Resources staff agreed or strongly agreed that they have adequate access to administrative support (67%, n=6) compared to all other OCBO staff (77%, n=74).

Section 1.8: Human Resources Staff to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for Human Resources staff responses are presented here, arranged by item type. Items that were less than six percentage points from the benchmark were not included in the analysis. As a result, there will be no findings to report for some item types.

Yes-No Item Types:

These questions refer to observations or experiences that are undesirable, so a “yes” response to any of these questions is also undesirable. The goal is for the percentage of “yes” responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 25% or less responding with “yes.”

---

18 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.

19 See Table 4 in Appendix IV for details.
The benchmark comparison for yes-no items revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, Human Resources staff have observed unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU (0%, n=0).

Chart 8: Human Resources Staff “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 80%.
The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed two areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, Human Resources staff were comfortable with the climate

- in their departments (100%, n=9) and
- at KSU (89%, n=8).

Chart 8.1: Human Resources Staff Responses Compared to Benchmark

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, positive statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about work-life for instructors and staff, so the desired responses are “agree” or “strongly agree.” The goal is for such responses to be **above** the benchmark. The benchmark for these item types is 80% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed five areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, Human Resources staff agreed that

- KSU provides them with resources to pursue professional development (100%, n=9),
- KSU is supportive of flexible work schedules (89%, n=8),
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (89%, n=8),
- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (89%, n=8), and
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (89%, n=8).

The comparison also disclosed one area of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, Human Resources staff agreed that they have adequate access to administrative support (67%, n=6).

Chart 8.2: Human Resources Staff Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, negative statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of negatively worded statements about work-life for instructors and staff, so responses of “agree” or “strongly agree” are not desirable. The goal is for such responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 35% or less responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, Human Resources staff agreed that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children (0%, n=0).

Chart 8.3: Human Resources Staff Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark
Findings for Auxiliary Services

OVERVIEW

Table 5 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Underlined items appear as strengths or challenges in more than one comparison. Items that appear in more than one comparison should be considered as having been emphasized in terms of their importance.

Table 5: Top Strengths and Challenges for Auxiliary Services Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUXILIARY SERVICES STAFF</th>
<th>Comparison to All Other OCBO Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Top Strengths**        | • Higher levels of comfort with the climate in their departments  
                            • Higher agreement that they have adequate access to administrative support  
                            • They have colleagues who give career guidance when needed | • Lower agreement that they have observed unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU  
                                                                 • Higher levels of comfort with the climate in their departments  
                                                                 • Higher agreement that they have adequate access to administrative support  
                                                                 • They have colleagues who give career guidance when needed |
| **Top Challenges**       | • Higher agreement that their colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view” of their identities  
                            • Lower agreement that KSU is supportive of taking leave | • Lower agreement that  
                                                                 • KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs  
                                                                 • KSU is supportive of flexible work schedules  
                                                                 • Higher agreement that their colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view” of their identities |

20 These two items are the same distance from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
Section 1.9: Auxiliary Services Staff to OCBO Staff Comparisons

Chart 9: Top Three Strengths, Auxiliary Services Staff Compared to All Other OCBO Staff

**Significant Strengths**

No items met the criteria for significant strengths.

** Meaningful Strengths**

A higher percentage of Auxiliary Services staff were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate

- in their departments (100%, n=13) compared to all other OCBO staff (64%, n=59), and
- at KSU (92%, n=12) compared to all other OCBO staff (75%, n=69).

A higher percentage of Auxiliary Services staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have adequate access to administrative support (100%, n=13) compared to all other OCBO staff (73%, n=64),
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (100%, n=12) compared to all other OCBO staff (75%, n=68), and
- KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (50%, n=6) compared to all other OCBO staff (38%, n=24).

A lower percentage of Auxiliary Services staff have

- observed unjust employment-related disciplinary action at KSU (0%, n=0) compared to all other OCBO staff (21%, n=16), and
- seriously considered leaving KSU (38%, n=5) compared to all other OCBO staff (54%, n=50).

See Table 5 of Appendix III for further information.

---

21 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
**Significant Challenge**

No items met the criteria for significant challenges.

**Meaningful Challenges**

- A higher percentage of Auxiliary Services staff agreed or strongly agreed that their colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view” of their identities (46%, n=6) compared to all other OCBO staff (20%, n=13).

- A lower percentage of Auxiliary Services staff agreed or strongly agreed that KSU is supportive of taking leave (77%, n=10) compared to all other OCBO staff (91%, n=79).

See Table 5 of Appendix III for further information.

**Section 1.10: Auxiliary Services Staff to Benchmark Comparisons**

The results of benchmark comparisons for Student Success Services staff responses are presented here, arranged by item type. Items that were less than six percentage points from the benchmark were not included in the analysis. As a result, there will be no findings to report for some item types.

**Yes-No Item Types:**

These questions refer to observations or experiences that are undesirable, so a “yes” response to any of these questions is also undesirable. The goal is for the percentage of “yes” responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 20% or less responding with “yes.”

---

22 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.

23 See Table 5 in Appendix IV for details.
The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, Auxiliary Services staff have observed unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU (0%, n=0).

The analysis also disclosed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, Auxiliary Services staff have seriously considered leaving KSU (38%, n=5).

Chart 10: Auxiliary Services Staff “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 80%.
The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed two areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, Auxiliary Services staff were comfortable with the climate

- in their departments (100%, n=13), and
- at KSU (92%, n=12).

**Chart 10.1: Auxiliary Services Staff Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark**

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, positive statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about work-life for faculty and staff, so the desired responses are “agree” or “strongly agree.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these item types is 80% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed two areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, Auxiliary Services staff agreed that

- they have adequate access to administrative support (100%, n=12), and
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (100%, n=12).

The analysis also revealed two areas of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, Auxiliary Services staff agreed that

- KSU is supportive of flexible work schedules (69%, n=9), and
- KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (50%, n=6).

Chart 10.2: Auxiliary Services Staff Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark
**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (negative statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of negatively worded statements about work-life for faculty and staff, so responses of “agree” or “strongly agree” are not desirable. The goal is for such responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 35% or less responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

The benchmark comparisons for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, Auxiliary Services staff agreed that their colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view” of their identities (46%, n=6).

Chart 10.3: Auxiliary Services Staff Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark
Findings for Office of Finance and Accounting

OVERVIEW

Table 6 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Underlined items appear as strengths in more than one comparison. Items that appear in more than one comparison should be considered as having been emphasized in terms of their importance.

Table 6: Top Strengths and Challenges for Office of Finance and Accounting Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE OF FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING STAFF</th>
<th>Comparison to All Other OCBO Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Top Strengths**                      | • Higher levels of comfort with the climate at KSU  
• Higher agreement that the way salaries are determined is clear  
• Their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development | • Higher agreement that they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers  
• Higher levels of comfort with the climate at KSU  
• Higher agreement that KSU provides them with resources to pursue professional development |
| **Top Challenges**                     | There were no areas of challenge with a difference of 10 percentage points or greater for this comparison. | • Lower agreement that KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs  
• Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving KSU  
• Lower agreement that the way salaries are determined is clear |
Section 1.11: Office of Finance and Accounting Staff to OCBO Staff Comparisons

Chart 11: Top Three Strengths, Office of Finance and Accounting Staff Compared to All Other OCBO Staff

### Significant Strengths

A significantly higher percentage of Office of Finance and Accounting staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- the way salaries are determined is clear (61%, n=14) compared to all other OCBO staff (37%, n=27),
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (92%, n=22) compared to all other OCBO staff (69%, n=51), and
- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (92%, n=23) compared to all other OCBO staff (70%, n=55).

### Meaningful Strengths

A higher percentage of Office of Finance and Accounting staff were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate

- at KSU (96%, n=24) compared to all other OCBO staff (71%, n=57), and
- in their departments (80%, n=20) compared to all other OCBO staff (65%, n=52).

A higher percentage of Office of Finance and Accounting staff were agreed or strongly agreed that

- they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers (100%, n=24) compared to all other OCBO staff (82%, n=65),
- KSU provides them with resources to pursue professional development (96%, n=24) compared to all other OCBO staff (80%, n=57),
- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (88%, n=22) compared to all other OCBO staff (72%, n=56), and
- KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (50%, n=9) compared to all other OCBO staff (36%, n=21).

A lower percentage of Office of Finance and Accounting staff

---

24 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
• agreed or strongly agreed that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition (21%, n=5) compared to all other OCBO staff (38%, n=28),
• have observed exclusionary conduct at KSU within the past year (20%, n=5) compared to all other OCBO staff (35%, n=28), and
• have seriously considered leaving KSU (44%, n=11) compared to all other OCBO staff (55%, n=44).

**Significant Challenge**

No items met the criteria for significant challenges.

**Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for meaningful challenges. See Table 6 of Appendix III for further information.

---

**Section 1.12: Office of Finance and Accounting Staff to Benchmark Comparisons**

The results of benchmark comparisons for Office of Finance and Accounting staff responses are presented here, arranged by item type. Items that were less than six percentage points from the benchmark were not included in the analysis. As a result, there will be no findings to report for some item types.

**Yes-No Item Types:**

These questions refer to observations or experiences that are undesirable, so a “yes” response to any of these questions is also undesirable. The goal is for the percentage of “yes” responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 25% or less responding with “yes.”

---

25 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
26 See Table 6 in Appendix IV for details.
The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, Office of Finance and Accounting staff have seriously considered leaving KSU (44%, n=11).

Chart 12: Office of Finance and Accounting Staff “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

**Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:**

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 80%.
The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed one area of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, Office of Finance and Accounting staff were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at KSU (96%, n=24).

Chart 12.1: Office of Finance and Accounting Staff Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark

Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, positive statements):

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about work-life for faculty and staff, so the desired responses are “agree” or “strongly agree.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these item types is 80% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed six areas of strength. The top three are presented here. The top three are presented here.\(^2\) At percentages above the benchmark, Office of Finance and Accounting staff agreed that

- they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers (100%, n=24),
- KSU provides them with resources to pursue professional development (96%, n=24), and
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (92%, n=22).

The analysis also revealed the areas of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, Student Office of Finance and Accounting staff agreed that

- KSU is supportive of flexible work schedules (68%, n=17),
- the way salaries are determined is clear (61%, n=14) and
- KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (50%, n=9).

Chart 12.2: Office of Finance and Accounting Staff Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

See Table 6 of Appendix IV for further information.

---

\(^2\) See Table 6 of Appendix IV for further information.
These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of negatively worded statements about work-life for faculty and staff, so responses of “agree” or “strongly agree” are not desirable. The goal is for such responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 35% or less responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

The benchmark comparison for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, Office of Finance and Accounting agreed that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition (21%, n=5).

Chart 12.3: Office of Finance and Accounting Staff Agreement with Negatively worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark

---

i A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of staff respondents from OCBO with all other staff respondents who were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their departments: \( X_2(2, n=719)=11.260, p<.01 \).

ii A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of staff respondents from the Department of Public Safety with all other OCBO staff respondents who have observed unjust hiring practices at KSU: \( X_2(1, n=93)=13.563, p<.01 \).

iii A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of staff respondents from the Department of Public Safety with all other OCBO staff respondents who have observed unjust promotion/reclassification practices at KSU: \( X_2(1, n=90)=8.931, p<.01 \).
A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of staff respondents from the Department of Public Safety with all other OCBO staff respondents who have observed unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU: X²(1, n=95)=11.418, p<.01.

A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of staff respondents from the Department of Public Safety with all other staff OCBO staff respondents who were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their departments: X²(2, n=88)=12.822, p<.01.

A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of staff respondents from Facilities Services with all other staff OCBO staff respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed: X²(1, n=108)=9.953, p<.01.

A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of staff respondents from Facilities Services with all other staff OCBO staff respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development: X²(1, n=103)=6.249, p<.05.

A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of staff respondents from Facilities Services with all other staff OCBO staff respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed: X²(1, n=109)=4.116, p<.05.

A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of staff respondents from Facilities Services with all other staff OCBO staff respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they are reluctant to bring up issues of concern for fear it will affect performance evaluations or tenure/promotion decisions: X²(1, n=32)=4.033, p<.05.

A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of staff respondents from the Office of Finance and Accounting with all other staff OCBO staff respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that the way salaries are determined is clear: X²(1, n=96)=4.077, p<.05.

A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of staff respondents from the Office of Finance and Accounting with all other staff OCBO staff respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development: X²(1, n=98)=4.935, p<.05.

A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of staff respondents from the Office of Finance and Accounting with all other staff OCBO staff respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they have supervisors who give them career guidance when needed: X²(1, n=104)=5.073, p<.05.
SECTION II: ANALYSIS OF STAFF IDENTITY GROUP RESPONSES WITHIN OCBO

This section includes subsections of analyses of staff responses by gender, race/ethnicity, disability status, and military service status. 28 For other demographic variables such as citizenship or sexual identity status, numbers were insufficient to analyze without compromising confidentiality.

For the first comparison, responses of OCBO staff for each identity group were compared to those of all OCBO staff identity groups. Favorable differences of more than one standard deviation from the average for all identity groups were labeled significant strengths. Favorable differences of less than one standard deviation were labeled meaningful strengths. 29 Only items with differences of ten percentage points or more were included. All items, including those with differences of less than ten percentage points, can be found in the dashboard tables in Appendix III. 30

The remaining two comparisons do not use the distinctions of significant or meaningful, because they do not use standard deviation – the basis of these distinctions. For the second comparison, responses of OCBO staff for each identity group were compared to their demographic counterparts. For example, responses of female staff were compared to those of male staff. Responses of the reference group that compared favorably to their counterparts were labeled strengths, and those that compared unfavorably were labeled challenges. Only items with differences of ten percentage points or more were included. All items, including those with differences of less than ten percentage points, can be found in the dashboard tables in Appendix III.

For the third comparison, responses of OCBO staff for each reference group were compared to established benchmarks. 31 Established benchmarks enabled comparisons of a group to a predetermined goal as opposed to another group. Items that did meet or went beyond benchmarks (either above or below depending on whether an item is stated positively or negatively) were labeled strengths. Only items with differences of six percentage points or more were included. Dashboard tables of these comparisons can be found in Appendix IV.

For all of these comparisons, items with very small response numbers were excluded. The data tables in Appendices III and IV provide the full detail of these comparisons in dashboard format.

---

28 A more limited analysis by religious affiliation and political affiliation is presented in Sections 2.13 and 2.14.
29 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details of this analysis.
30 Items where the difference between the specific identity group response averages and the mean for all identity groups was less than four percentage points were excluded from analysis. The result is that some group comparisons will have more items in the analysis than others. Groups with more items in the analysis may warrant priority attention because of more overall group differences in experiences and perceptions of climate.
31 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
OCBO Staff, Gender/Gender Identity

OCBO female staff are the focus of this section. Within OCBO, there were 55 female staff and 53 male staff respondents.32

OVERVIEW

Table 7 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Underlined items appear as strengths or challenges in two of three comparisons. Bold-faced items appear as strengths in all three comparisons. Items that appear in more than one comparison should be considered as having been emphasized in terms of their importance.

Table 7: Top Strengths and Challenges for OCBO Female Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCBO FEMALE STAFF</th>
<th>Comparison to All OCBO Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to OCBO Male Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></td>
<td>• Lower agreement that their colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view” of their identities</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that their colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view” of their identities</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that their colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view” of their identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher levels of comfort with the climate at KSU</td>
<td>• Higher levels of comfort with the climate at KSU</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that KSU is supportive of taking leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher agreement that KSU is supportive of taking leave</td>
<td>• Lower percentage of observations of unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU</td>
<td>• Lower percentage of observations of unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>There were no areas of challenge with a difference of 10 percentage points or greater for this comparison.</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that they have adequate access to administrative support</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower agreement that they have adequate access to administrative support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have observed exclusionary conduct at KSU within the past year33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower agreement that KSU is supportive of flexible work schedules33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 There were no staff respondents who identified as transgender or genderqueer. Numbers of respondents identifying as multiple gender identities or not providing an identity were too small for analysis.
33 These two items were the same distance from the benchmark and therefore had the same rank.
Chart 1: Top Three Strengths, OCBO Female Staff Compared to All OCBO Staff Identity Groups

*The mean is derived from the average responses of each identity group in the analysis to provide the basis for comparison.

**Significant Strengths**

No items met the criteria for significant strengths.

**Meaningful Strengths**

A higher percentage of OCBO female staff

- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at KSU (87%, n=48) compared to all OCBO staff identity groups (72%, n=86),
- agreed or strongly agreed that KSU is supportive of taking leave (96%, n=49) compared to all OCBO staff identity groups (81%, n=94),
- agreed or strongly agreed that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (83%, n=45) compared to all OCBO staff identity groups (71%, n=84), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (76%, n=42) compared to all OCBO staff identity groups (66%, n=81).

In addition,

- a lower percentage of OCBO female staff agreed or strongly agreed that their colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view” of their identities (15%, n=6) compared to all OCBO staff identity groups (31%, n=21).

**Significant Challenges**

No items met the criteria for significant challenges.

**Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for meaningful challenges. See Table 7 in Appendix III for further information.

---

See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Section 2.2: OCBO Female Staff to OCBO Male Staff Comparisons

Chart 2: Top Three Strengths, OCBO Female Staff Compared to OCBO Male Staff

**Strengths**

A lower percentage of OCBO female staff

- agreed or strongly agreed that their colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view” of their identities (15%, n=6) compared to OCBO male staff (34%, n=14), and
- have observed unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU (11%, n=5) compared to OCBO male staff (23%, n=11).

A higher percentage of OCBO female staff

- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at KSU (87%, n=48) compared to OCBO male staff (70%, n=37),
- agreed or strongly agreed that KSU is supportive of taking leave (96%, n=49) compared to OCBO male staff (85%, n=44), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (83%, n=45) compared to OCBO male staff (73%, n=38).

**Challenges**

No items met the criteria for challenges. See Table 7 in Appendix III for further information.
Section 2.3: OCBO Female Staff to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for OCBO female staff responses are presented here, arranged by item type. Items that were less than six percentage points from the benchmark were not included in the analysis. As a result, there will be no findings to report for some item types.

**Yes-No Item Types:**

These questions refer to observations or experiences that are undesirable, so a “yes” response to any of these questions is also undesirable. The goal is for the percentage of “yes” responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 25% or less responding with “yes.”

The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, OCBO female staff have observed unjust employment-related disciplinary actions at KSU (11%, n=5).

The analysis also disclosed two areas of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, OCBO female staff have

- observed exclusionary conduct at KSU within the past year (31%, n=17), and
- personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year (36%, n=20).

**Chart 3: OCBO Female Staff “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark**

**Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:**

35 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.

36 See Table 7 in Appendix IV for details.
These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 80%.

The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed one area of strength. OCBO female staff had comfort levels with the climate at KSU above the benchmark (87%, n=48).

**Chart 3.1: OCBO Female Staff Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark**

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, positive statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about work-life for staff, so the desired responses are “agree” or “strongly agree.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these item types is 80% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed three areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, OCBO female staff agreed that

- KSU is supportive of taking leave (96%, n=49),
- they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers (91%, n=48), and
- KSU provides them with resources to pursue professional development (89%, n=48).

The analysis also disclosed two areas of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, OCBO female staff agreed that

- KSU is supportive of flexible work schedules (74%, n=39), and
- they have adequate access to administrative support (72%, n=38).

**Chart 3.2: OCBO Female Staff Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Type</th>
<th>Greatest Strength</th>
<th>Greatest Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I find that KSU is supportive of taking leave.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I am comfortable taking leave that I am entitled to without fear that it may affect my job/career.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;KSU (e.g., CETL, CUL, etc.) provides me with resources to pursue professional development opportunities.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I find that KSU is supportive of flexible work schedules.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I have adequate access to administrative support.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, negative statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of negatively worded statements about work-life for faculty and staff, so responses of “agree” or “strongly agree” are not desirable. The goal is for such responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 35% or less responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed two areas of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, OCBO female staff agreed that

- their colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view” of their identities (15%, n=6), and
- they are reluctant to bring up issues of concern for fear it will affect performance evaluations or tenure/promotion decisions (27%, n=14).

Chart 3.3: OCBO Female Staff Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark

See Section IV for additional findings for OCBO female staff based on gender-specific items.
OCBO Staff, Race/Ethnicity

OCBO staff of color are the reference group for this section. Within OCBO, there were 19 staff of color respondents and 89 white staff respondents.

OVERVIEW

Table 8 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Underlined items appear as top strengths in two of three comparisons. Bold-faced items appear as top strengths in all three comparisons. Items that appear in more than one comparison should be considered as having been emphasized in terms of their importance.

Table 8: Top Strengths and Challenges for OCBO Staff of Color

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCBO STAFF OF COLOR</th>
<th>Comparison to All OCBO Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to OCBO White Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Strengths</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs(^{37})</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs(^{37})</td>
<td>• Higher levels of comfort with the climate at KSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher levels of comfort with the climate at KSU</td>
<td>• Higher levels of comfort with the climate at KSU</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher agreement that their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that they are reluctant to bring up issues of concern for fear it will affect performance evaluations or tenure/promotion decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Challenges</td>
<td>There were no areas of challenge for this comparison.</td>
<td>There were no areas of challenge for this comparison.</td>
<td>Lower agreement that the way salaries are determined is clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs(^{37})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have observed unjust promotion/reclassification practices at KSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{37}\)This item was a strength when compared to all other staff identity groups and white staff, but a challenge when compared to the benchmark. The greatest difference was for the comparison with white staff.
Section 2.4: OCBO Staff of Color to All OCBO Staff Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 4: Top Three Strengths, OCBO Staff of Color Compared to All OCBO Staff Identity Groups

*The mean is derived from the average responses of each identity group in the analysis to provide the basis for comparison.

**Significant Strengths**

The percentage of OCBO staff of color who

- agreed or strongly agreed that KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (64%, n=9) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (36%, n=31),
- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at KSU (95%, n=18) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (72%, n=86), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (89%, n=17) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (66%, n=81).

**Meaningful Strengths**

No items met the criteria for meaningful strengths. See Table 8 of Appendix III for further information.

**Significant/Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for significant or meaningful challenges.

**Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for meaningful challenges. See Table 8 of Appendix III for further information.

---

38 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Section 2.5: OCBO Staff of Color to OCBO White Staff Comparisons

Chart 5: Top Three Strengths, OCBO Staff of Color Compared to OCBO White Staff

Strengths

A higher percentage of OCBO staff of color agreed or strongly agreed that

- KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (64%, n=9) compared to OCBO white staff (34%, n=22),
- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (89%, n=17) compared to OCBO white staff (72%, n=63), and
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (82%, n=14) compared to OCBO white staff (71%, n=60).

A higher percentage of OCBO staff of color were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate

- at KSU (95%, n=18) compared to OCBO white staff (75%, n=67), and
- in their departments (79%, n=15) compared to OCBO white staff (66%, n=59).

In addition,

- a lower percentage of OCBO staff of color have observed unjust promotion/reclassification practices at KSU (31%, n=5) compared to OCBO white staff (43%, n=31).

See Table 8 of Appendix III for further information.

Challenges

No items met the criteria for challenges.
Section 2.6: OCBO Staff of Color to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for OCBO staff of color responses are presented here, arranged by item type. Items that were less than six percentage points from the benchmark were not included in the analysis. As a result, there will be no findings to report for some item types.

**Yes-No Item Types:**

These questions refer to observations or experiences that are undesirable, so a “yes” response to any of these questions is also undesirable. The goal is for the percentage of “yes” responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 25% or less responding with “yes.”

The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, OCBO staff have observed unjust promotion/reclassification practices at KSU (31%, n=5).

**Chart 6: OCBO Staff of Color “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark**

![](chart.png)

**Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:**

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 80%.

---

See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.

See Table 8 in Appendix IV for details.
The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed one area of strength. OCBO staff of color had levels of comfort with the climate at KSU above the benchmark (95%, n=18).

Chart 6.1: OCBO Staff of Color Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark

**Chart 6.1: OCBO Staff of Color Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark**

![Chart 6.1](chart61.png)

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, positive statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about work-life for instructors and staff, so the desired responses are “agree” or “strongly agree.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these item types is 80% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, OCBO staff of color agreed that their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (89%, n=17).

The analysis also disclosed two areas of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, OCBO staff of color agreed that

- KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (64%, n=9), and
- the way salaries are determined is clear (44%, n=7).

**Chart 6.2: OCBO Staff of Color Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark**

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, negative statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of negatively worded statements about work-life for faculty and staff, so responses of “agree” or “strongly agree” are not desirable. The goal is for such responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 35% or less responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparisons for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, OCBO staff of color agreed that they are reluctant to bring up issues of concern for fear it will affect performance evaluations or tenure/promotion decisions (28%, n=5).

Chart 6.3: OCBO Staff of Color Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark

See Section IV for additional findings for OCBO staff of color based on race/ethnicity-specific items.
OCBO Staff, Disability Status

OCBO staff with disabilities are the reference group for this section. Within OCBO, there were 13 staff respondents with disabilities and 94 staff respondents without disabilities.

OVERVIEW

Table 9 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Underlined items appear as strengths or challenges in two of three comparisons. Bold-faced items appear as strengths or challenges in all three comparisons. Items that appear in more than one comparison should be considered as having been emphasized in terms of their importance.

Table 9: Top Strengths and Challenges for OCBO Staff of Color

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCBO STAFF WITH DISABILITIES</th>
<th>Comparison to All OCBO Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to OCBO Staff Without Disabilities</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></td>
<td>Higher agreement that • they have adequate access to administrative support • the way salaries are determined is clear(^{41})</td>
<td>Higher agreement that • they have adequate access to administrative support • the way salaries are determined is clear(^{41})</td>
<td>Higher agreement that • they have adequate access to administrative support • they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Lower levels of comfort with the climate in • their departments • at KSU • Lower agreement that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed</td>
<td>Lower levels of comfort with the climate in • their departments • at KSU • Lower agreement that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving KSU • <strong>Lower levels of comfort with the climate in their departments</strong> • Lower agreement that the way salaries are determined is clear(^{41})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{41}\) This item was a strength when compared to all other staff identity groups and staff without disabilities, but a challenge when compared to the benchmark. The greatest difference was for the comparison with the benchmark.
Section 2.7: OCBO Staff with Disabilities to All OCBO Staff Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 7: Top Strengths, OCBO Staff with Disabilities to All OCBO Staff Identity Groups Comparisons

*The mean is derived from the average responses of each identity group in the analysis to provide the basis for comparison.

**Significant Strengths**

- The percentage of OCBO staff with disabilities who agreed or strongly agreed that the way salaries are determined is clear (50%, n=6) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (39%, n=41).

**Meaningful Strengths**

- A higher percentage of OCBO staff with disabilities agreed or strongly agreed that they have adequate access to administrative support (92%, n=11) compared to all other OCBO staff identity groups (79%, n=80).

See Table 9 of Appendix III for further information.

---

42 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
**Significant Challenges**

The percentage of OCBO staff with disabilities who

- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their departments (46%, n=6) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (71%, n=75),
- agreed or strongly agreed that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition (50%, n=6) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (34%, n=36),
- agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (58%, n=7) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (74%, n=76), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (62%, n=8) was one standard deviation below the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (74%, n=81).

See Table 9 of Appendix III for further information.

**Meaningful Challenges**

A lower percentage of OCBO staff with disabilities

- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at KSU (54%, n=7) compared to all OCBO staff identity groups (72%, n=86), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (54%, n=7) compared to all OCBO staff identity groups (71%, n=84).

In addition,

- a higher percentage of OCBO staff with disabilities have observed exclusionary conduct at KSU within the past year (38%, n=5) compared to all OCBO staff identity groups (27%, n=34).

See Table 9 of Appendix III for further information.
Section 2.8: OCBO Staff with Disabilities to OCBO Staff Without Disabilities Comparisons

Chart 8: Top Strengths, OCBO Staff with Disabilities Compared to OCBO Staff Without Disabilities

Strengths

A higher percentage of OCBO staff with disabilities agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have adequate access to administrative support (92%, n=11) compared to OCBO staff without disabilities (75%, n=68), and
- the way salaries are determined is clear (50%, n=6) compared to OCBO staff without disabilities (38%, n=33).

See Table 9 of Appendix III for further information.

Chart 8: Top Three Challenges, OCBO Staff with Disabilities Compared to OCBO Staff Without Disabilities

Challenges

A lower percentage of OCBO staff with disabilities

- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their departments (46%, n=6), compared to OCBO staff without disabilities (100%, n=68),
- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at KSU (54%, n=7) compared to OCBO staff without disabilities (82%, n=77),
- agreed or strongly agreed that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (54%, n=7) compared to OCBO staff without disabilities (80%, n=74),
agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (58%, n=7) compared to OCBO staff without disabilities (75%, n=67),
- agreed or strongly agreed that they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (62%, n=8) compared to OCBO staff without disabilities (76%, n=71), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that KSU provides them with resources to pursue professional development (75%, n=9) compared to OCBO staff without disabilities (86%, n=75).

See Table 9 of Appendix III for further information.

Section 2.9: OCBO Staff with Disabilities to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for OCBO staff with disabilities responses are presented here, arranged by item type. Items that were less than six percentage points from the benchmark were not included in the analysis. As a result, there will be no findings to report for some item types.

Yes-No Item Types:

These questions refer to observations or experiences that are undesirable, so a “yes” response to any of these questions is also undesirable. The goal is for the percentage of “yes” responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 25% or less responding with “yes.”

The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed two areas of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, OCBO staff have

- seriously considered leaving KSU (62%, n=8), and
- observed exclusionary conduct at KSU within the past year (38%, n=5).

Chart 9: OCBO Staff with Disabilities “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

---

43 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
44 See Table 9 in Appendix IV for details.
**Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:**

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 80%.

The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed two areas of challenge. OCBO staff with disabilities had levels of comfort below the benchmark with the climate

- in their departments (46%, n=6), and
- at KSU (54%, n=7).

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, positive statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about work-life for instructors and staff, so the desired responses are “agree” or “strongly agree.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these item types is 80% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed two areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, OCBO staff with disabilities agreed that

- they have adequate access to administrative support (92%, n=11), and
- they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers (92%, n=12).

The analysis also disclosed four areas of challenge. The top three are presented here. At percentages below the benchmark, OCBO staff with disabilities agreed that

- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (58%, n=7),
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (54%, n=7), and
- the way salaries are determined is clear (50%, n=6).

Chart 9.2: OCBO Staff with Disabilities Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, negative statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of negatively worded statements about work-life for faculty and staff, so responses of “agree” or “strongly agree” are not desirable. The goal is for such responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 35% or less responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

---

45 See Table 9 of Appendix IV for further information.
The benchmark comparison for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, OCBO staff with disabilities agreed that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition (50%, n=6).

Chart 9.3: OCBO Staff with Disabilities Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark

See Section IV for additional findings for OCBO staff with disabilities based on disability-specific items.
OCBO Staff, Military Service Status

OCBO staff with military service are the reference group for this section. Within OCBO, there were 11 staff with military service respondents and 99 staff without military service respondents.

OVERVIEW

Table 10 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Underlined items appear as top challenges in two of three comparisons. Bold-faced items appear as top strengths or challenges in all three comparisons. Items that appear in more than one comparison should be considered as having been emphasized in terms of their importance.

Table 10: Top Strengths and Challenges for OCBO Staff with Military Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCBO STAFF WITH MILITARY SERVICE</th>
<th>Comparison to All OCBO Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to OCBO Staff Without Military Service</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></td>
<td>Higher agreement that</td>
<td>Higher agreement that</td>
<td>Higher agreement that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they have adequate access to</td>
<td>• they have adequate access to</td>
<td>• they have adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>administrative support</td>
<td>administrative support</td>
<td>access to administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they are comfortable taking</td>
<td>• they are comfortable taking</td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>earned leave without fear that it</td>
<td>earned leave without fear that it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>may affect their careers</td>
<td>may affect their careers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• KSU is supportive of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>flexible work schedules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Lower agreement that</td>
<td>Lower agreement that</td>
<td>Lower agreement that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• KSU provides available resources to</td>
<td>• KSU provides available resources to</td>
<td>• KSU provides available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>help balance work-life needs</td>
<td>help balance work-life needs</td>
<td>resources to help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they have supervisors who give</td>
<td></td>
<td>balance work-life needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>career guidance when needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• KSU provides them with resources to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pursue professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower agreement that</td>
<td>Lower agreement that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• KSU provides available resources to</td>
<td>• their supervisors provide ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>help balance work-life needs</td>
<td>feedback to help improve performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• their supervisors provide ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feedback to help improve performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they have supervisors who give</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>career guidance when needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2.10: OCBO Staff with Military Service to All OCBO Staff Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 10: Top Three Strengths, OCBO Staff with Military Service to All OCBO Staff Identity Groups Comparisons

*The mean is derived from the average responses of each identity group in the analysis to provide the basis for comparison.

**Significant Strengths**

The percentage of OCBO staff with military service who agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have adequate access to administrative support (100%, n=10) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (79%, n=80), and
- they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers (100%, n=11) was one standard deviation above the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (86%, n=94).

**Meaningful Strengths**

- A higher percentage of OCBO staff with military service who agreed or strongly agreed that KSU is supportive of flexible work schedules (69%, n=77).

See Table 10 of Appendix III for further information.

---

46 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
*The mean is derived from the average responses of each identity group in the analysis to provide the basis for comparison.

**Significant Challenges**

The percentage of OCBO staff with military service who agreed or strongly agreed that

- KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (0%, n=0) was more than two standard deviations below the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (36%, n=31),
- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (55%, n=6) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (74%, n=81),
- KSU provides them with resources to pursue professional development (67%, n=6) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (84%, n=85), and
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (60%, n=6) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all OCBO staff identity groups (74%, n=76).

**Meaningful Challenges**

- A lower percentage of OCBO staff with military service agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (50%, n=5) compared to all OCB staff identity groups (66%, n=81).

See Table 10 of Appendix III for further information.
Section 2.11: OCBO Staff with Military Service to OCBO Staff Without Military Service Comparisons

Chart 11: Top Strengths, OCBO Staff with Military Service Compared to OCBO Staff Without Military Service

Strengths

A higher percentage of OCBO staff with military service agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have adequate access to administrative support (100%, n=10) compared to OCBO staff without military service (74%, n=70), and
- they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers (100%, n=11) compared to OCBO staff without military service (86%, n=83).

See Table 10 of Appendix III for further information.
Chart 11.1: Top Three Challenges, OCBO Staff with Military Service Compared to OCBO Staff Without Military Service

Challenges

A lower percentage of OCBO staff with military service agreed or strongly agreed that

- KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (0%, n=0) compared to OCBO staff without military service (42%, n=31),
- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (50%, n=5) compared to OCBO staff without military service (78%, n=76),
- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (55%, n=6) compared to OCBO staff without military service (77%, n=75),
- KSU provides them with resources to pursue professional development (67%, n=6) compared to OCBO staff without military service (87%, n=79),
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (64%, n=7) compared to OCBO staff without military service (79%, n=77), and
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (60%, n=6) compared to OCBO staff without military service (75%, n=70).

See Table 10 of Appendix III for further information.

Section 2.12: OCBO Staff with Military Service to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for OCBO staff with military service responses are presented here, arranged by item type. Items that were less than six percentage points from the benchmark were not included in the analysis. As a result, there will be no findings to report for some item types.

Yes-No Item Types:

There were no items that met the criteria for this item type.

---

47 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
48 See Table 10 in Appendix IV for details.
**Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:**

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be **above** the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 80%.

The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed one area of challenge. OCBO staff with military service had levels of comfort with the climate in their departments below the benchmark (64%, n=7).

*Chart 12: OCBO Staff with Military Service Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark*

---

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, positive statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about work-life for instructors and staff, so the desired responses are “agree” or “strongly agree.” The goal is for such responses to be **above** the benchmark. The benchmark for these item types is 80% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed three areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, OCBO staff with military service agreed that

- they have adequate access to administrative support (100%, n=10),
- they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers (100%, n=11), and
- KSU is supportive of taking leave (90%, n=9).

The analysis also disclosed six areas of challenge. The top three are presented here. At percentages below the benchmark, OCBO staff with military service agreed that

- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (55%, n=6),
- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (50%, n=5), and
- KSU provides available resources to help balance work-life needs (0%, n=0).

Chart 12.1: OCBO Staff with Military Service Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (staff, negative statements):

There were no items that met the criteria for this item type.

See Section IV for additional findings for OCBO staff with military service based on items specific to veterans.

---

49 See Table 10 in Appendix IV for further information.
OCBO Staff, Religious and Political Affiliation

For this analysis, only those items on the climate assessment that referred to religious or political affiliation are addressed. For items referencing religious affiliation, responses from two categories were analyzed – staff of other or no faith-based affiliation and staff of Christian affiliation. For items referencing political affiliation, the three response categories were liberal, conservative, and moderate. Comparisons to the KSU population as a whole by affiliation are also included. This analysis does not categorize findings in terms of strengths or challenges, but rather presents descriptive results.

Section 2.13: OCBO Staff Religious Affiliation Comparisons

As illustrated in the chart below, there was very little difference between the ratings of OCBO staff of Christian affiliation (93%, n=70), OCBO non-Christian staff (95%, n=18) and all other KSU staff of Christian affiliation (93%, n=352).

Chart 13: Percentage Ratings of Climate for Christians, by Religious Affiliation
A related item asked respondents to rate the climate on a 5-point scale where 1 was “positive for people of Christian faith” and 5 was “negative for people of Christian faith.” The ratings of OCBO staff of other or no faith-based affiliation were much closer to “positive for people of Christian faith” (1.60, n=20) compared to OCBO staff of Christian affiliation (2.10, n=85) and all other KSU Christian faith (2.12, n=426).

Chart 13.1: Scale Ratings of Climate for Christians, by Religious Affiliation

The next set of items pertains to the climate for those other than Christians. All other KSU staff from other or no religious/spiritual affiliation had the lowest percentage of “respectful or very respectful” responses (82%, n=100). OCBO staff of other or no religious/spiritual affiliation (94%, n=17) and Christian affiliation (97%, n=67) responded with similar ratings.

Chart 13.2: Percentage Ratings of Climate for Other or No Religious Affiliation, by Religious Affiliation
A related item asked respondents to rate the climate on a 5-point scale where 1 was “positive for people of other faith backgrounds” and 5 was “negative for people of other faith backgrounds.” The ratings of all other KSU staff of other or no faith-based affiliation (2.51, n=151) were furthest from “positive for people of other faith-based affiliations.” Those of OCBO staff of other or no faith-based affiliation were slightly further from positive (2.05, n=20) compared to OCBO Christian staff (1.92, n=85).

Chart 13.3: Scale Ratings of Climate for Other or No Religious Affiliations, by Religious Affiliation

A final item related to religious affiliation asked respondents’ agreement to the statement, “My workplace climate at KSU is welcoming regardless of a person’s religious/spiritual views.” Levels of agreement were nearly the same for all groups compared: OCBO Christian staff (91%, n=67), OCBO staff of other or no faith-based affiliation (90%, n=18), all other KSU Christian staff of Christian (91%, n=347), and all other KSU staff of other or no faith-based affiliation-based affiliations (87%, n=120).

Chart 13.4: Ratings of How Welcoming Climate is Regardless of Spiritual Views, by Religious Affiliation
Section 2.14: OCBO Staff Political Affiliation Comparisons

There was only one item on the climate assessment related to political affiliation. The categories were liberal, conservative, and moderate. Respondents were asked their agreement to the statement, “My workplace climate at KSU is welcoming regardless of a person’s political views.” The responses of each OCBO staff political affiliation were compared to those of all KSU staff.

The highest percentage of agreement was among OCBO Conservative staff (90%, n=36), followed by OCBO liberal staff (86%, n=6). All other KSU staff followed closely (85%, n=431). OCBO moderate staff (82%, n=27) had the lowest percentage of agreement.

Chart 14: Ratings of How Welcoming Climate is Regardless of Political Views, by Political Affiliation

![Chart showing percentage agreement by political affiliation](chart14.png)
SECTION III: ANALYSIS OF GENERAL CLIMATE SCALES BY IDENTITY GROUP

The Campus Culture and Climate Assessment included a section where respondents were asked to rate the climate at KSU on a scale of 1 to 5 along a number of different dimensions. Many of these dimensions were specific to identity groups, such as “positive for persons with disabilities – negative for persons with disabilities.” This section presents the results of the five scales that are general in nature as follows: “friendly – hostile,” “cooperative – uncooperative,” “improving – regressing,” “welcoming – not welcoming”, and “respectful – disrespectful,” where 1 is the most positive rating and 5 is the most negative rating. Results are presented for staff for each scale. Keep in mind that a lower numerical rating is more positive than a higher numerical rating.

Section 3.1: Friendly – Hostile Dimension

Chart 1: Comparison of Climate Ratings for “Friendly – Hostile” Dimension by Identity Groups
OCBO Staff vs. All Other KSU Staff

- OCBO staff overall rated the climate as slightly further from “friendly” compared to all other KSU staff. There were more OCBO staff groups whose ratings were further from “friendly” than their counterparts than the reverse.
- In comparison to their KSU counterparts, OCBO staff of other or no faith-based affiliation, staff with disabilities, and female staff rated the climate as closer to “friendly.”
- OBCD male, liberal, and LGBQ staff rated the climate as further from “friendly” compared to their KSU counterparts.
Section 3.2: Cooperative – Uncooperative Dimension

Chart 2: Comparison of Climate Ratings for “Cooperative – Uncooperative” Dimension by Identity Groups
OCBO Staff vs. All Other KSU Staff

- OCBO staff overall rated the climate as slightly further from “cooperative” compared to all other KSU staff. There were more OCBO staff groups whose ratings were further from “cooperative” than their counterparts than the reverse.
- In comparison to their KSU counterparts, OCBO staff of other or no faith-based affiliation, moderate staff, and female staff rated the climate as closer to “cooperative.”
- OBCD staff with military service, male staff, and LGBQ staff rated the climate as further from “cooperative” compared to their KSU counterparts.
Section 3.3: Improving – Regressing Dimension

Chart 3: Comparison of Climate Ratings for “Improving – Regressing” Dimension by Identity Groups
OCBO Staff vs. All Other KSU Staff

- OCBO staff overall rated the climate as slightly further from “improving” compared to all other KSU staff. There were only three OCBO staff groups whose ratings were closer to “improving.”
- In comparison to their KSU counterparts, OCBO staff with military service, LGBQ staff, and staff of other or no faith-based affiliation rated the climate as closer to “improving.”
- OBCD staff with disabilities, liberal staff, and staff of color rated the climate as further from “improving” compared to their KSU counterparts. These are the groups with the greatest differences in ratings compared to their counterparts.
Section 3.4: Welcoming – Not Welcoming Dimension

Chart 4: Comparison of Climate Ratings for “Welcoming – Not Welcoming” Dimension by Identity Groups
OCBO Staff vs. All Other KSU Faculty/Staff

- OCBO staff overall rated the climate as slightly further from “welcoming” compared to all other KSU staff.
- There were no OCBO staff groups whose ratings compared to their KSU counterparts were notably closer to “welcoming.”
- OBOD LGBQ, liberal, and male staff rated the climate as further from “welcoming” compared to their KSU counterparts. These are the groups with the greatest differences in ratings compared to their counterparts.
Section 3.5: Respectful – Disrespectful Dimension

Chart 5: Comparison of Climate Ratings for “Respectful – Disrespectful” Dimension by Identity Groups
OCBO Staff vs. All Other KSU Faculty/Staff

- OCBO staff overall rated the climate as slightly further from “respectful” compared to all other KSU staff. There were only three OCBO staff groups whose ratings were closer to “improving.”
- Differences between OCBO groups and their KSU counterparts were minimal.
SECTION IV: ADDITIONAL FINDINGS OF INTEREST

Comparisons of Climate Ratings for Staff for Identity Group-Specific Items

The climate assessment included several items that addressed perceptions of how the climate is experienced by specific identity groups. Comparing responses from OCBO staff of one identity group to another identity group for these items yielded some interesting findings. Highlights are presented here for staff by identity group. Details of these findings are included in the data tables in Appendix III.

Section 4.1: Gender

A comparison of the responses of OCBO female staff to those of OCBO male staff on items relating to gender/gender identity provided findings that were unremarkable. All differences between comparison groups were less than 10%.

Section 4.2: Race/Ethnicity

A comparison of the responses of OCBO staff of color to those of OCBO white staff on items relating to race/ethnicity provided the following finding:

- On a scale of “positive for people of color – negative for people of color,” ratings for OCBO staff of color were 15% further from “positive for people of color” compared to ratings of OCBO white staff.
- On a scale of “not racist – racist,” ratings for OCBO staff of color were 15% further from “not racist” compared to ratings of OCBO white staff.

Section 4.3: Disability Status

A comparison of the responses of OCBO staff with disabilities to those of OCBO staff without disabilities on items relating to conditions impacting learning/living activities provided the following findings:

- There was lower agreement among OCBO staff with disabilities compared to OCBO staff without disabilities that the workplace climate at KSU is welcoming regardless of a person’s physical disability, by a difference of 24%.
- On a scale of “positive for persons with disabilities – negative for persons with disabilities,” ratings of OCBO staff with disabilities were 20% further from “positive for persons with disabilities” than were those of OCBO staff without disabilities.
- On a scale of “disability-friendly – not disability-friendly,” ratings of OCBO staff with disabilities were 13% further from “disability-friendly” than were those of OCBO staff without disabilities.

Section 4.4: Military Service Status

A comparison of the responses of OCBO staff with military service to those of OCBO staff without military service provided findings that were unremarkable. All differences between comparison groups were less than 10%.

---

50 Highlights are listed in descending order of the amount of difference between the comparison groups. Differences of less than 10% were not included.
Other Additional Findings

Section 4.5: Staff Experiences of Unwanted Sexual Contact

The number of OCBO staff respondents who reported having experienced unwanted sexual contact was 4.5% of total OCBO respondents. This exceeds the Kennesaw Campus incidence of 2% of total respondents.
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