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Kennesaw State University’s Strategic Plan, 2012-17, Goal 4, commits to “enhance the collegiate experience, and foster a welcoming, diverse, and inclusive environment.” Accordingly, this report provides an in depth analysis of University Information Technology Services (UITS) data from the 2014 campus climate assessment.

In collaboration with the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, UITS will create a Diversity Action Committee charged to act on the findings from the climate assessment. This analysis will assist the Committee in the development of action items that improve upon UITS’s strengths and address UITS’s challenges. The results of these actions will be assessed in the next climate assessment, which will provide longitudinal data on the impact of these efforts.

A total of 46 staff respondents from UITS participated in the 2014 Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living and Working at Kennesaw State University (KSU). The table below shows the breakdown of respondents by gender, race, and disability status. These were the only categories with sufficient numbers for more detailed analysis. The respondents reflect 23% of UITS staff.¹

Table 1. UITS Respondents by Demographic Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Categories</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Staff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Staff</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff of Color</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Staff</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff with Disabilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Without Disabilities</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next table shows the demographic breakdown of all UITS staff for most currently available data. Data was only available for gender and race/ethnicity.

Table 2. All UITS Staff Comparisons, Term of Assessment and Most Current Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Categories</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person of Color</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Excluded from these counts were Enterprise Information Management, Sports and Recreation Parks, and Museums and Archives. This was done in an effort to be consistent with respondent counts. The respondent departments that were included under UITS were the Department of Public Safety, Facilities Services, Human Resources, Auxiliary Services, and Office of Finance and Accounting. These departments roughly correspond to the current organizational structure. Because department labels in HR data files may not perfectly match those used for the climate assessment, response rates should be considered approximations.
Five different analyses are included in this report.

- Responses from UITS staff were compared to all other KSU staff.
- Within UITS, responses of UITS historically marginalized groups were compared to those of all UITS identity groups.
- Within UITS, responses of historically marginalized groups were compared to their demographic counterparts (i.e. female to male).
- Within UITS, responses of historically marginalized groups were compared to established benchmarks.
- Mean responses from UITS staff identity groups to numerical scale items about the general climate were compared to those of all other KSU staff identity groups.

More information about the statistical measures used to analyze the data can be found in the introduction to the full report.

**UITS Staff Compared to KSU Staff — Reported Strengths and Challenges**

**Top Strengths**
- Lower percentage who have observed exclusionary conduct at KSU within the past year
- Higher levels of comfort with climate in their departments
- Lower agreement that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children

**Top Challenges**
- Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving KSU

**UITS Female Staff — Reported Strengths and Challenges**

**Top Strengths**
- Higher agreement that they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed
- Higher agreement that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed

**Top Challenges**
- Higher agreement that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition
- Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving KSU
- Lower agreement that they have adequate access to administrative support

**UITS Staff of Color — Reported Strengths and Challenges**

**Top Strengths**
- Higher agreement that KSU is supportive of taking leave
- Higher agreement that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed
- Higher agreement that they have adequate access to administrative support
Top Challenges
- Higher agreement that they are reluctant to bring up issues of concern for fear it will affect performance evaluations or tenure/promotion decisions
- Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving KSU
- Lower levels of comfort with climate in their departments and at KSU

**UITS Staff with Disabilities — Reported Strengths and Challenges**

Top Strengths
- Higher agreement that they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed
- Higher agreement that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed
- Higher levels of comfort with the climate in their departments and at KSU

Top Challenges
- Lower levels of agreement that they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers
- Higher agreement that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition
- Lower agreement that they have adequate access to administrative support

Other findings of note:
- For general climate scales (friendly – hostile, cooperative – uncooperative, improving – regressing, welcoming – not welcoming, respectful – disrespectful) most demographic groups within UITS have more positive ratings than their KSU counterparts.
- **UITS staff of color** rated the climate as more racist than UITS white staff.
- **UITS staff with disabilities** rated the climate as more negative for people with disabilities and less disability-friendly than UITS staff without disabilities.
- A lower percentage of **UITS staff with disabilities** rated the climate as respectful or very respectful for people with a learning disability or mental/psychological health issues compared to UITS staff without disabilities.

In addition to the identity groups listed above, the report contains findings for staff based on faith-based affiliation. See full report for details.
WE ARE stronger together.