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INTRODUCTION: ANALYSIS OF CLIMATE FOR COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

This report expands upon the work of the Campus Climate and Culture Task Force on the Assessment of Climate for Learning, Kennesaw State University (KSU) Marietta Campus. 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/

In order to guide the diversity action planning process, faculty, staff and student responses have been analyzed within each college. This report provides findings for respondents affiliated with the College of Architecture and Construction Management (herein referred to as COACM). There are five sections in this report; they are described in detail below. General response items are included while detailed demographic variables are excluded. Items with very small response numbers were excluded from all comparisons to protect confidentiality.

In Section I, responses from COACM faculty and staff are compared to those of all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty and staff; and responses from COACM undergraduate and graduate students are compared to those of all other KSU Marietta Campus undergraduate and graduate students. 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 COACM when compared against the KSU Marietta Campus as a whole.

Section II compares responses between single identity groups of students within COACM and all COACM student 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. The comparisons in Section II provide a more detailed insight into COACM’s climate based on traits such as gender, race/ethnicity, and disability.

Section II also includes a separate analysis based on benchmarks. Benchmarks were established by averaging responses by group (faculty/staff, faculty only, staff only, and students), revealing a response rate ideal which varied by the type of question asked. For example, if on average, 90% of student respondents across KSU report comfort with the climate in their courses, then it is established that at least 90% of COACM student respondents should report the same. If that benchmark is exceeded, it is considered a strength within COACM. If the benchmark is not met, then it is considered a challenge. Benchmarks do not represent the desired end points for COACM’s climate; rather, they are next steps or goals in the improvement process.

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 COACM to the corresponding groups for the KSU Marietta Campus.

Section IV presents findings for items that are either specific to identity groups such as persons with disabilities or students of color, or are general to the campus, such as awareness of sustainability efforts.

1 Although the report refers to the Marietta Campus, at the time of the climate assessment it was Southern PolyTechnic State University (SPSU). Assessment items reference “SPSU.” This report uses the reference “SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus).”
2 There were insufficient numbers of faculty/staff responses when broken down by identity group to analyze separately without compromising confidentiality.
3 It should be noted that percentage point differences may appear extreme when small numbers are expressed as percentages, which is the case with many COACM student identity groups.
SECTION I: COMPARISON OF RESPONSES FROM COACM TO ALL OTHER RESPONDENTS AND TO BENCHMARKS

Chi square tests determined statistically significant differences between responses from COACM faculty, staff, and students and all other KSU faculty, staff, and students. 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. All items, including those with differences of less than ten percentage points, can be found in Appendix III for faculty/staff analyses and Appendix IV for student analyses. Data tables in these appendices provide information on additional items that may be considered potential strengths and challenges for COACM.

Comparisons were also conducted of responses from COACM faculty, staff, and students 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 can be found in Appendix III for faculty/staff analyses and Appendix V for student analyses.

4 Responses for faculty and staff were combined, as numbers were too small to analyze these groups separately.
5 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details of this analysis.
6 Items where the difference between the college group response average and the average for all other KSU 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.
7 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Findings for Faculty/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. Underlined items appear as strengths and 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 1: Top Strengths and Challenges for COACM Faculty/Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COACM FACULTY/STAFF</th>
<th>Comparison to All Other KSU Marietta Campus Faculty/Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher agreement that their colleagues include them as much as others in opportunities that will help their careers (faculty only)</td>
<td>Lower agreement that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower agreement that they feel pressured to change their research agendas to achieve tenure/promotion (faculty only)</td>
<td>higher agreement that they feel pressured to change their research agendas to achieve tenure/promotion (faculty only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher agreement that they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed</td>
<td>in their departments, faculty who use accommodation policies (FMLA) are disadvantaged in promotion (faculty only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Higher agreement that they are burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues (faculty only)</td>
<td>Higher agreement that they are burdened by service responsibilities (faculty only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are burdened by service responsibilities (faculty only)</td>
<td>are burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues (faculty only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feel pressured by departmental work requirements outside of normal classroom/office hours (faculty only)</td>
<td>feel pressured by departmental work requirements outside of normal classroom/office hours (faculty only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 1.1: COACM Faculty/Staff to KSU Marietta Campus Faculty/Staff Comparisons

Chart 1: Top Three Strengths, COACM Faculty/Staff Compared to All Other KSU Faculty/Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Strengths</th>
<th>COACM Faculty/Staff</th>
<th>All Other KSU Marietta Campus Faculty/Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I believe that my colleagues include me in opportunities that will help my career as much as they do others in my position.&quot; (faculty only - % agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I feel pressured to change my research agenda to achieve tenure/promotion.&quot; (faculty only - % agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I have supervisors who give me job/career advice or guidance when I need it.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No items met the criteria for significant strengths.

Meaningful Strengths

A lower percentage of COACM faculty agreed or strongly agreed that

- they feel pressured to change their research agendas to achieve tenure/promotion (0%, n=0) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty (75%, n=46), and
- in their departments, faculty members who use family accommodation policies (FMLA) are disadvantaged in promotion (0%, n=0) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty (24%, n=12).

A higher percentage of COACM faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- their colleagues include them as much as others in opportunities that will help their careers (100%, n=5) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty/staff (75%, n=46),
- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (91%, n=10) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty/staff (69%, n=107),
- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (83%, n=10) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty/staff (66%, n=108), and
- the way salaries are determined is clear (50%, n=5) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty/staff (34%, n=55).

See Table 1 of Appendix III for further information.

---

8 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Chart 1.1: Top Three Challenges, COACM Faculty Compared to All Other KSU Faculty

**Significant Challenges**

No items met the criteria for significant challenges.

**Meaningful Challenges**

A higher percentage of COACM faculty agreed or strongly agreed that

- they feel burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues (71%, n=5) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty (31%, n=19),
- they feel burdened by service responsibilities (86%, n=6) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty (58%, n=37),
- they feel pressured by departmental work requirements outside of normal classroom/office hours (71%, n=5) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty (43%, n=27), and
- they perform more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues (71%, n=5) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty (51%, n=32).

A lower percentage of COACM faculty or faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- **SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)** is supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave (60%, n=6) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty (84%, n=111),
- **SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)** provides them with resources to pursue professional development (64%, n=7) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty/staff (86%, n=139), and
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (70%, n=7) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty (82%, n=131),

See Table 1 of Appendix III for further information.
The results of benchmark comparisons for COACM faculty/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:**
No items met the criteria for this item type.

**Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:**
No items met the criteria for this item type.

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (faculty and 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 70% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

---

9 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
10 See Table 2 in Appendix III for details.
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed two areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, COACM faculty/staff agreed that

- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (91%, n=10) and
- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (83%, n=10).

The analysis also disclosed two areas of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, COACM faculty/staff agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides them with resources to pursue professional development (64%, n=7), and
- the way salaries are determined is clear (50%, n=5).

Chart 2: COACM Faculty/Staff Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark
Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (faculty only, positive statements):

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about faculty-specific aspects of work-life, so the desired responses are “agree” and “strongly agree.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these item types is 70% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

The benchmark comparison for faculty specific agree-disagree item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, COACM faculty agreed that their colleagues include them as much as others in opportunities that will help their careers (100%, n=5).

The analysis also disclosed one area of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, COACM faculty agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave (60%, n=6).

Chart 2.1: COACM Faculty Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark, Faculty-Specific Items
Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (faculty and 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 one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, COACM faculty/staff agreed that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition (45%, n=5).

Chart 2.2: COACM Faculty/Staff Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark
Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (faculty only, negative statements):

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of negatively worded statements about faculty-specific aspects of work-life, 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, COACM faculty agreed that

- they feel pressured to change their research agendas to achieve tenure/promotion (0%, n=0), and
- faculty in their department who use family accommodation (FMLA) policies are disadvantaged in promotion (0%, n=0).

The analysis also disclosed four areas of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, COACM faculty agreed that

- they feel burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues (71%, n=5),
- they feel pressured by departmental work requirements outside of normal classroom/office hours (71%, n=5),
- they perform more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues (71%, n=5), and
- they feel burdened by service responsibilities (86%, n=6).

Chart 2.3: COACM Faculty Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark, Faculty-Specific Items
Findings for Students

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.

Table 2: Top Strengths and Challenges for COACM Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COACM STUDENTS</th>
<th>Comparison to All Other KSU Marietta Campus Students</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Top Strengths** | • Lower agreement that they don't see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify  
• Higher agreement that  
• they have performed academically as well as anticipated  
• they are performing up to their full academic potential | Higher agreement that  
• they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)  
• they feel valued by other students in the classroom  
• their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth |
| **Top Challenges** | • There were no areas of challenge with a difference of 10 percentage points or greater for this comparison. | Higher agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background |
Section 1.3: COACM Students to KSU Marietta Campus Student Comparisons

Chart 3: Top Three Strengths, COACM Students Compared to All Other KSU Marietta Campus Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A significantly lower percentage of COACM students agreed or strongly agreed that they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify (29%, n=19) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus students (46%, n=291).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significantly higher percentage of COACM students agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have performed academically as well as anticipated (77%, n=51) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus students (61%, n=394),
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (83%, n=55) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus students (70%, n=447),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaningful Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A higher percentage of COACM students agreed or strongly agreed that
  - they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (92%, n=58) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus students (81%, n=502), and
  - their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (83%, n=55) compared to all other KSU Marietta Campus students (73%, n=470). |

See Table 1 of Appendix IV for further information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No items met the criteria for significant challenges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaningful Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No items met the criteria for meaningful challenges. See Table 1 of Appendix IV for further information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
The results of benchmark comparisons for COACM student 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:**

No items met the criteria for this item type.

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

No items met the criteria for this item type.

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

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 70% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

---

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

14 See Table 1 in Appendix V for details.
The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed nine areas of strength. The top six are presented here. At percentages above the benchmark, COACM students agreed that

- they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (92%, n=58),
- they feel valued by other students in the classroom (91%, n=60),
- their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth (86%, n=56),
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (83%, n=55),
- their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (83%, n=55), and
- they have faculty who they perceive as role models (83%, n=54).

Chart 4: COACM Student Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

---

15 See Table 1 of Appendix V for further information. Three of the top six are the same distance from the benchmark, and therefore have the same rank.
Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (negative statements):

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of negatively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 40% 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, COACM students agreed that they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify (29%, n=19).

The analysis also disclosed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, COACM students agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background.

Chart 4.1: COACM Student Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Academic Experiences/Perceptions Compared to Benchmark

---

1 A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of student respondents from COACM with all other student respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify: X2(1, n=697)=7.266, p<.01.
A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of student respondents from COACM with all other student respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they have performed academically as well as anticipated: $X^2(2, n=707)=6.414$, $p<.05$.

A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of student respondents from COACM with all other student respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they are performing up to their full academic potential: $X^2(2, n=707)=6.666$, $p<.05$. 
SECTION II: ANALYSIS OF STUDENT IDENTITY GROUP RESPONSES WITHIN COACM

This section includes subsections of analyses of student responses for each of the following demographic variables: gender, race/ethnicity, disability status, citizenship status, sexual identity, and religious affiliation.\(^\text{16}\) Responses of undergraduate and graduate students were combined because numbers for the smaller demographic categories were insufficient for separate analysis.

For the first comparison, responses of COACM students for each identity group were compared to those of all COACM student identity groups. Favorable differences of more than one standard deviation from the average for all identity groups were labeled significant strengths, and unfavorable differences were labeled significant challenges. Favorable differences of less than one standard deviation were labeled meaningful strengths and unfavorable differences were labeled meaningful challenges.\(^\text{17}\) 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 IV.\(^\text{18}\)

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 COACM students for each reference group were compared to their demographic counterparts. For example, responses of students with disabilities were compared to those of students without disabilities. 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 IV.

For the third comparison, responses of COACM students for each reference group were compared to established benchmarks.\(^\text{19}\) 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. Those that did not meet or fell below benchmarks were labeled challenges. Only items with differences of six percentage points or more were included. Dashboard tables of these comparisons can be found in Appendix V.

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

---

\(^{16}\) This same analysis could not be performed for faculty and staff because of small response numbers.

\(^{17}\) See Appendix I: Methodology for more details of this analysis.

\(^{18}\) 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.

\(^{19}\) See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
**COACM Students, Gender/Gender Identity**

Female students are the reference group for this subsection. Within COACM, there were 24 female student and 41 male student respondents. The number of respondents who identified as transgender, genderqueer, or multiple gender identities was too small for analysis.

**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. Underlined items appear as top strengths or challenges in two of three comparisons. Bold 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 3: Top Strengths and Challenges for COACM Female Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COACM FEMALE STUDENTS</th>
<th>Comparison to All COACM Student Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Male Students</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>• many of their courses this year have been</td>
<td>• they are satisfied with</td>
<td>• they are satisfied with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intellectually stimulating</td>
<td>their academic experience</td>
<td>their academic experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they are performing up to their full</td>
<td>at SPSU (KSU Marietta</td>
<td>at SPSU (KSU Marietta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>academic potential</td>
<td>Campus)</td>
<td>Campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they are satisfied with their academic</td>
<td></td>
<td>• many of their courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>this year have been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>intellectually stimulating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>• Lower agreement that</td>
<td>Lower agreement that</td>
<td>There were no areas of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their interest in ideas and intellectual</td>
<td>• their interest in ideas</td>
<td>challenge for this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>matters has increased since coming to SPSU</td>
<td>and intellectual matters</td>
<td>comparison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>has increased since</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• they have opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for academic success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>similar to their classmates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2.1: COACM Female Students to All COACM Student Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 1: Top Three Strengths, COACM Female Students Compared to All COACM Student 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 COACM female students who agreed or strongly agreed that they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (92%, n=22) was more than one standard deviation higher than the mean for all COACM student identity groups (82%, n=53).

Meaningful Strengths

A higher percentage of COACM female students agreed or strongly agreed that

- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (92%, n=22) compared to the mean for all COACM student identity groups (76%, n=53), and
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (88%, n=21) compared to the mean for all COACM student identity groups (76%, n=55).

---

20 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
**Chart 1.1: Challenge, COACM Female Students Compared to All COACM Student Identity Groups**

*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 COACM female faculty or faculty/staff who agreed or strongly agreed that their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (67%, n=16) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (83%, n=55).

See Table 2 of Appendix IV for further information.

**Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for meaningful challenges. See Table 2 of Appendix IV for further information.

**Section 2.2: COACM Female Students to COACM Male Students Comparisons**

**Chart 2: Top Strengths, COACM Female Students Compared to COACM Male Students**

**Strengths**

A higher percentage of COACM female students agreed or strongly agreed that

- they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (92%, n=22) compared to COACM male students (73%, n=30), and
- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (92%, n=22) compared to COACM male students (76%, n=31).
Chart 2: Top Three Challenges, COACM Female Students Compared to COACM Male Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lower percentage of COACM female students agreed or strongly agreed that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (67%, n=16) compared to COACM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male students (93%, n=38), and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(83%, n=19) compared to COACM male students (98%, n=40),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Table 2 of Appendix IV for further information.

Section 2.3: COACM Female Students to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for COACM female student 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:

No items met the criteria for this item type.

Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:

No items met the criteria for this item type.

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

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 70% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

---

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

22 See Table 2 in Appendix V for details.
The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed five areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, COACM female students agreed that

- they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (92%, n=22),
- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (92%, n=22),
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (88%, n=21),
- they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates (83%, n=19), and
- they have faculty who they perceive as role models (78%, n=18).

Chart 3: COACM Female Students Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

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

No items met the criteria for this item type.

See Section IV for additional findings for COACM female students based on gender-specific items.
**COACM Students, Race/Ethnicity**

COACM students of color are the reference group for this section. Within COACM, there were 25 student of color respondents and 39 white student respondents.

**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 strengths in two of three comparisons. Bold 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 4: Top Strengths and Challenges for COACM Students of Color

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COACM STUDENTS OF COLOR</th>
<th>Comparison to All COACM Student Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to White Students</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Strengths</td>
<td>Higher agreement that • <em>many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating</em>  • they have staff who they perceive as role models</td>
<td>Higher agreement that • <em>many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating</em>  • they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)  • they have performed academically as well as anticipated</td>
<td>Higher agreement that • they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)  • <em>many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating</em>  • they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Challenges</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 opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates  • Lower levels of comfort with the climate in their courses  • Lower agreement that they feel valued by faculty in the classroom 23  • Lower agreement that they have faculty who they perceive as role models 23</td>
<td>There were no areas of challenge with a difference of 6 percentage points or greater for this comparison.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 These two items are the same distance from the comparison and therefore have the same rank.
Section 2.4: COACM Students of Color to All COACM Student Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 4: Top Strengths, COACM Students of Color Compared to All COACM 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 COACM students of color agreed or strongly agreed that

- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (88%, n=22) compared to all COACM student identity groups (76%, n=53), and
- they have staff who they perceive as role models (71%, n=17) compared to all COACM student identity groups (60%, n=42).

See Table 3 of Appendix IV for further information.

**Significant/Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for significant challenges. See Table 3 of Appendix IV for further information.

---

24 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Section 2.5: COACM Students of Color to COACM White Students Comparisons

Chart 5: Top Three Strengths, COACM Students of Color Compared to COACM White Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Percentage COACM Students of Color (%)</th>
<th>Percentage COACM White Students (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many of my courses this year have been intellectually stimulating</td>
<td>88% (n=22)</td>
<td>74% (n=29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>88% (n=22)</td>
<td>74% (n=29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have performed academically as well as I anticipated I would</td>
<td>84% (n=21)</td>
<td>72% (n=28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Table 3 of Appendix IV for further information.

Strengths

A higher percentage of COACM students of color agreed or strongly agreed that

- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (88%, n=22) compared to COACM white students (74%, n=29),
- they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (88%, n=22) compared to COACM white students (74%, n=29), and
- they have performed academically as well as anticipated (84%, n=21) compared to COACM white students (72%, n=28).

See Table 3 of Appendix IV for further information.
Chart 5.1: Top Challenges, COACM Students of Color Compared to COACM White Students

**Challenges**

A lower percentage of COACM students of color agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates (84%, n=21) compared to COACM white students (100%, n=38),
- they feel valued by faculty in the classroom (79%, n=19) compared to COACM white students (90%, n=35), and
- they have faculty who they perceive as role models (79%, n=19) compared to COACM white students (90%, n=35).

In addition,

- a lower percentage of COACM students of color were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their courses (72%, n=18) compared to COACM white students (84%, n=32).
Section 2.6: COACM Students of Color to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for COACM students 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:**

No items met the criteria for this item type.

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

No items met the criteria for this item type.

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

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 70% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

---

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

26 See Table 3 in Appendix V for details.
The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed ten areas of strength. The top seven are presented here.27 At percentages above the benchmark, COACM students of color agreed that

- they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (96%, n=22),
- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (88%, n=22),
- they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (88%, n=22),
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (84%, n=21),
- they have performed academically as well as anticipated (84%, n=21),
- they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates (84%, n=21), and
- their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth (84%, n=21).

Chart 6: COACM Students of Color Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Type</th>
<th>Agreement Percentage</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I intend to graduate from SPSU.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Many of my courses this year have been intellectually stimulating.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I am satisfied with my academic experience at SPSU.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I am performing up to my full academic potential.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I have performed academically as well as I anticipated I would.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I have opportunities for academic success that are similar to those of my classmates.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;My academic experience has had a positive influence on my intellectual growth and interest in ideas.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

No items met the criteria for this item type.

See Section IV for additional findings for COACM students of color based on items specific to race/ethnicity.

---

27 Four of the top seven are the same distance from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
COACM Students, Disability Status

COACM students with disabilities are the reference groups for this section. Within COACM, there were 16 student respondents who identified as having disabilities and 48 student respondents with no disability.

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. Bold items appear as top 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 5: Top Strengths and Challenges for COACM Students with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COACM STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES</th>
<th>Comparison to All COACM Student Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Students without Disabilities</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></td>
<td>• Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background</td>
<td>There were no areas of strength with a difference of 10 percentage points or greater for this comparison.</td>
<td>Higher agreement that • their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) • they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates • they are satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling in SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year Lower agreement that • they have performed academically as well as anticipated • SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year Lower agreement that • SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare • they have performed academically as well as anticipated</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year Lower agreement that • SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare • they have performed academically as well as anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year Lower agreement that • they have performed academically as well as anticipated • SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year Lower agreement that • SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare • they have performed academically as well as anticipated</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year Lower agreement that • SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare • they have performed academically as well as anticipated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2.7: COACM Students with Disabilities to All COACM Student Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 7: Top Strength, COACM Students with Disabilities Compared to All COACM Student 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. See Table 4 of Appendix IV for further information.

**Meaningful Strengths**

- A lower percentage of COACM students with disabilities agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (44%, n=7) compared to all COACM student identity groups (54%, n=45).

See Table 4 of Appendix IV for further information.

---

28 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Chart 7.1: Top Three Challenges, COACM Students with Disabilities Compared to All COACM Student Identity Groups

*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 COACM students with disabilities who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year (50%, n=8) was more than two standard deviations above the mean for all COACM student identity groups (18%, n=13).

In addition, the percentage of COACM students with disabilities who agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have performed academically as well as anticipated (56%, n=9) was more than two standard deviations below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (78%, n=51),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare (50%, n=8) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (72%, n=49),
- they feel valued by other students in the classroom (75%, n=12) was more than two standard deviations below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (91%, n=60),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare (67%, n=10) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (81%, n=52),
- they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify (38%, n=6) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all COACM student identity groups (26%, n=19), and
- they have faculty who they perceive as role models (75%, n=12) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (85%, n=54).

See Table 4 of Appendix IV for further information.

**Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for meaningful challenges. See Table 4 of Appendix IV for further information.
Section 2.8: COACM Students with Disabilities to COACM Students Without Disabilities Comparisons

**Strengths**

No items met the criteria for strengths. See Table 4 of Appendix IV for further information.

**Chart 8: Top Three Challenges, COACM Students with Disabilities Compared to COACM Students Without Disabilities**

**Challenges**

A higher percentage of COACM students with disabilities

- have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (50%, n=8) compared to COACM students without disabilities (10%, n=5), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify (38%, n=6) compared to COACM students without disabilities (27%, n=13).

A lower percentage of COACM students with disabilities agreed or strongly agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare (50%, n=8) compared to COACM students without disabilities (83%, n=40),
- have performed academically as well as anticipated (56%, n=9) compared to COACM students without disabilities (83%, n=4),
- feel valued by other students in the classroom (75%, n=12) compared to COACM students without disabilities (96%, n=46),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare (67%, n=10) compared to COACM students without disabilities (85%, n=40),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare (60%, n=9) compared to COACM students without disabilities (74%, n=35),
- they have staff who they perceive as role models (56%, n=9) compared to COACM students without disabilities (68%, n=32), and
- they have faculty who they perceive as role models (75%, n=12) compared to COACM students without disabilities (85%, n=40).
The results of benchmark comparisons for COACM students 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 30% or less responding with “yes.”

The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, COACM students with disabilities have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (50%, n=8).

**Chart 9: COACM Students with Disabilities “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 75%.

---

29 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
30 See Table 4 in Appendix V for details.
The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed one area of challenge. COACM students with disabilities had levels of comfort with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) that were below the benchmark (69%, n=11).

Chart 9.1: COACM Students with Disabilities Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark

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

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 70% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed four areas of strength. The top three are presented here. At percentages above the benchmark, COACM students with disabilities agreed that

- their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to KSU (88%, n=14),
- they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates (88%, n=14), and
- they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (87%, n=13).

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

- they have performed academically as well as anticipated (56%, n=9),
- they have staff who they perceive as role models (56%, n=9), and
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare (50%, n=8).

Chart 9.2: COACM Students with Disabilities Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (negative statements): No items met the criteria for this item type.

See Section IV for additional findings for COACM students with disabilities based on disability-specific items.

COACM Students, Citizenship Status

---

31 See Table 4 of Appendix V for further information.
COACM non-U.S. citizen students are the reference groups for this section. Within COACM, there were 10 student respondents who identified as being non-U.S. citizens and 56 student respondents who identified as being U.S. citizens.

**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 top strengths or challenges in two of three comparisons. Bold 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 6: Top Strengths and Challenges for COACM Non-U.S. Citizen Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COACM NON-U.S. CITIZEN UNDERGRADUATE/GRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>Comparison to All COACM Student Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to U.S. Citizen Students</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Higher agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Higher agreement that they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Higher agreement that they have faculty who they perceive as role models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Higher agreement that they are performing up to their full academic potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Lower agreement that their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>Lower agreement that their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare</td>
<td>Lower levels of comfort with the climate in their courses</td>
<td>Lower levels of comfort with the climate in their courses</td>
<td>• their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lower levels of comfort with the climate in their courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>32</sup> This item is a strength when compared to all COACM student identity groups and COACM students without disabilities. It is a challenge when compared to the benchmark. The greatest differences are for the comparisons where it is a strength.

<sup>33</sup> See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
**Chart 10: Strength, COACM Non-U.S. Citizen Students Compared to All COACM Student 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 COACM non-U.S. citizen students who agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (50%, n=5) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (69%, n=33).

See Table 5 of Appendix IV for further information.

**Meaningful Strengths**

No items met the criteria for meaningful strengths. See Table 5 of Appendix IV for further information.
**Significant Challenges**

The percentage of COACM Non-U.S. citizen students who

- agreed or strongly agreed that their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (60%, n=6) was more than two standard deviations below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (83%, n=55),
- agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare (50%, n=5) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (69%, n=33), and
- were comfortable or very comfortable with the comfort in their courses (70%, n=7) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (80%, n=52).

**Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for meaningful challenges. See Table 5 of Appendix IV for further information.
Section 2.11: COACM Non-U.S. Citizen Students Compared to COACM U.S. Citizen Students

Chart 11: Top Strengths, COACM Non-U.S. Citizen Students Compared to COACM U.S. Citizen Students

Strengths

- A lower percentage of COACM non-U.S. citizen students agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (50%, n=5) compared to COACM U.S. citizen students (74%, n=40).
- A higher percentage of COACM non-U.S. citizen students agreed or strongly agreed that they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (90%, n=9) compared to COACM U.S. citizen students (79%, n=44).

See Table 5 of Appendix IV for further information.

Challenges

A lower percentage of COACM non-U.S. citizen students

- agreed or strongly agreed that their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (60%, n=6) compared to COACM U.S. citizen students (88%, n=49),
- agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare (50%, n=5) compared to COACM U.S. citizen students (74%, n=40), and
- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their courses (70%, n=7) compared to COACM U.S. citizen students (82%, n=45).

See Table 5 of Appendix IV for further information.

Section 2.12: COACM Non-U.S. Citizen Students to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for COACM non-U.S. citizen student 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:

No items met the criteria for this item type.

---

34 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
35 See Table 5 in Appendix V for details.
Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:
No items met the criteria for this item type.

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

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 70% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed five areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, COACM non-U.S. citizen students agreed that

- they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (90%, n=9),
- they have faculty who they perceive as role models (89%, n=8),
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (80%, n=8),
- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (80%, n=8), and
- they feel valued by faculty in the classroom (80%, n=8).

The analysis also disclosed two areas of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, COACM non-U.S. citizen students agreed that

- their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (60%, n=6), and
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare (50%, n=5).

Chart 12: COACM Non-U.S. Citizen Students Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

36 Three of these five items were the same distance from the benchmark and therefore had the same rank.
**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (negative statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of negatively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 item types is 40% 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, COACM non-U.S. citizen students agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (50%, n=5).

**Chart 12.1: COACM Non-U.S. Citizen Students Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Academic Experiences/Perceptions Compared to Benchmark**

See Section IV for additional findings for COACM non-U.S. citizen students based on items specific to citizenship or immigrant status.
COACM Students, Sexual Identity

COACM LGBQ students are the reference groups for this section. Within COACM, there were 14 student respondents who identified as LGBQ and 51 student respondents who identified as heterosexual.

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 top strengths or challenges in two of three comparisons. Bold 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 7: Top Strengths and Challenges for COACM LGBQ Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COACM LGBQ STUDENTS</th>
<th>Comparison to All COACM Student Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Heterosexual Students</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></td>
<td>• Lower agreement that they are considering transferring due to academic reasons Higher agreement that • they have staff who they perceive as role models • they are performing up to their full academic potential$^{37}$ • many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating$^{37}$</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that they are considering transferring due to academic reasons • Higher agreement that they feel valued by other students in the classroom</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that they feel valued by other students in the classroom • Higher agreement that they feel valued by faculty in the classroom • <strong>Lower agreement that they are considering transferring due to academic reasons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower agreement that • they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) • they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates • their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>Lower agreement that • they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) • they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates • their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>Higher agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background Lower agreement that • SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare • SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{37}$ These two items are the same distance from the comparison and therefore have the same rank.
Section 2.13: COACM LGBQ Students to All COACM Student Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 13: Top Strengths, COACM LGBQ Students Compared to All COACM Student Identity Groups

- The percentage of COACM LGBQ students who agreed or strongly agreed that they are considering transferring due to academic reasons (0%, n=0) was one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (22%, n=10).

See Table 6 of Appendix IV for further information.

Significant Strength

- The percentage of COACM LGBQ students who agreed or strongly agreed that they have staff who they perceive as role models (71%, n=10) compared to all COACM student identity groups (60%, n=42),
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (86%, n=12) compared to all COACM student identity groups (76%, n=55), and
- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (86%, n=12) compared to all COACM student identity groups (76%, n=53).

See Table 6 of Appendix IV for further information.

Meaningful Strengths

A higher percentage of COACM LGBQ students agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have staff who they perceive as role models (71%, n=10) compared to all COACM student identity groups (60%, n=42),
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (86%, n=12) compared to all COACM student identity groups (76%, n=55), and
- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (86%, n=12) compared to all COACM student identity groups (76%, n=53).

See Table 6 of Appendix IV for further information.

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

---

38 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Chart 13.1: Top Three Challenges, COACM LGBQ Students Compared to All COACM Student Identity Groups

*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 COACM LGBQ students who agreed or strongly agreed that

- they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (79%, n=11) was more than two standard deviations below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (92%, n=58),
- they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates (79%, n=11) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (92%, n=60),
- their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (71%, n=10) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (83%, n=55), and
- they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (71%, n=10) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (82%, n=53).

See Table 6 of Appendix IV for further information.

**Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for meaningful challenges. See Table 6 of Appendix IV for further information.
Section 2.14: COACM LGBQ Students to COACM Heterosexual Students Comparisons

Chart 14: Strength, COACM LGBQ Students Compared to COACM Heterosexual Students

Strength

- A lower percentage of COACM LGBQ students agreed or strongly agreed that they are considering transferring due to academic reasons (0%, n=0) compared to COACM heterosexual students (23%, n=10).
- A higher percentage of COACM LGBQ students agreed or strongly agreed that they feel valued by other students in the classroom (100%, n=14) compared to COACM heterosexual students (88%, n=45).

See Table 6 of Appendix IV for further information.

Chart 14.1: Top Three Challenges, COACM LGBQ Students Compared to COACM Heterosexual Students

Challenges

A lower percentage of COACM LGBQ students agreed or strongly agreed that

- they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (79%, n=11) compared to COACM heterosexual students (96%, n=46),
- they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates (79%, n=11) compared to COACM heterosexual students (96%, n=48),
- their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (71%, n=10) compared to COACM heterosexual students (88%, n=45),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare (64%, n=9) compared to COACM heterosexual students (78%, n=40), and
- they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (71%, n=10) compared to COACM heterosexual students (82%, n=42).

See Table 6 of Appendix IV for further information.
Section 2.15: COACM LGBQ Students to Benchmark Comparisons\textsuperscript{39}

The results of benchmark comparisons for COACM LGBQ student responses are presented here, arranged by item type.\textsuperscript{40} 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:**

No items met the criteria for this item type.

**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 75%.

The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed one area of strength. COACM LGBQ students had levels of comfort above the benchmark with the climate in their courses (86%, n=12).

**Chart 15: COACM LGBQ Students Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark**

![Chart 15: COACM LGBQ Students Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark](image)

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

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 70% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

\textsuperscript{39} See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.

\textsuperscript{40} See Table 6 in Appendix V for details.
The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed nine areas of strength. The top four are presented here.\textsuperscript{41} At percentages above the benchmark, COACM LGBQ students agreed that

- they feel valued by other students in the classroom (100%, n=14),
- they feel valued by faculty in the classroom (93%, n=13),
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (86%, n=12), and
- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (86%, n=12).

There were also two areas of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, COACM LGBQ students agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare (64%, n=9), and
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare (64%, n=9).

\textbf{Chart 15.1: COACM LGBQ Students Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark}

\textsuperscript{41} See Table 6 of Appendix V for further information. Two of the top four are the same distance from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (negative statement- 5-point scale):**

This question refers to levels of agreement with a negatively worded statement about considerations of transferring, so responses of “agree” or “strongly agree” are not desirable. The goal is for such responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for this item is 20% 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, COACM LGBQ students agreed that they are considering transferring due to academic reasons (0%, n=0).

**Chart 15.2: COACM LGBQ Students Agreement with Negatively Worded Statement about Transfer Compared to Benchmark, 5-Point Scale**

See Section IV for additional findings for COACM LGBQ students based on items specific to sexual identity.
COACM Students, Religious Affiliation

Religious affiliations were compared to the standard deviation of all identity groups. There were 33 student respondents from COACM who identified as Christian, 14 who identified as being of other or multiple affiliations, and 18 who identified as having no faith-based affiliation.

Findings for Students of Multiple or Other Faith-Based Affiliations

OVERVIEW

Table 8 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. This section does not include inter-group comparisons which were included in previous sections (e.g., female to male or disability to no disability) because of the complexity of making such comparisons across three groups. 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 8: Top Strengths and Challenges for COACM Students of Other Faiths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COACM STUDENTS OF MULTIPLE OR OTHER FAITH-BASED AFFILIATIONS</th>
<th>Comparison to All COACM Student Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></td>
<td>Lower agreement that they are considering transferring due to academic reasons</td>
<td>Higher agreement that they intend to graduate from KSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher agreement that they are performing up to their full academic potential</td>
<td>SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating</td>
<td>many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Lower agreement that they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates</td>
<td>Lower agreement that they have staff who they perceive as role models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to KSU</td>
<td>SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they have staff who they perceive as role models</td>
<td>SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42 These items are all the same distance from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
43 These items are all the same distance from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
Section 2.16: COACM Students of Multiple or Other Faith-Based Affiliations to All COACM Student Identity Groups
Comparisons

Chart 16: Top Three Strengths, COACM Students of Other Faith-Based Affiliations Compared to All COACM Student 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 COACM students of other faiths who agreed or strongly agreed that

- they are considering transferring due to academic reasons (0%, n=0) was one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (22%, n=1),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare (93%, n=13) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all COACM student identity groups (81%, n=52), and
- they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (93%, n=13) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all COACM student identity groups (82%, n=53).

See Table 7 of Appendix IV for further information.

**Meaningful Strengths**

A higher percentage of COACM students of other faiths agreed or strongly agreed that

- they are performing up to their full academic potential (93%, n=13) compared to the mean for all COACM student identity groups (76%, n=55), and
- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (93%, n=13) compared to the mean for all COACM student identity groups (76%, n=53).

---

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

The percentage of COACM students of other faith-based affiliations who agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates (79%, n=11) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (92%, n=60), and
- their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (71%, n=10) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (83%, n=55).

**Meaningful Challenges**

- A lower percentage of COACM students of other faith-based affiliations agreed or strongly agreed that they have staff who they perceive as role models (50%, n=7) compared to all COACM student identity groups (60%, n=42).

See Table 7 of Appendix IV for further information.

---

**Section 2.17: COACM Students of Multiple or Other Faith-Based Affiliation to Benchmark Comparisons**

The results of benchmark comparisons for COACM students of other faiths 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:**

No items met the criteria for this item type.

---

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

46 See Table 7 in Appendix V 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 75%.

The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed one area of strength. COACM students of other faith-based affiliations had levels of comfort above the benchmark with the climate in their courses (85%, n=11).

Chart 17: COACM Students of Other Faith-Based Affiliations Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark

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

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 70% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed nine areas of strength. The top six are presented here.\textsuperscript{47} At percentages above the benchmark, COACM students of other faith-based affiliations agreed that

- they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (100%, n=14),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare,
- they are satisfied with their academic experience at KSU (93%, n=13),
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (93%, n=13),
- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (93%, n=13), and
- they feel valued by faculty in the classroom (93%, n=13).

Chart 17.1: COACM Students of Other Faith-Based Affiliations Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark, Strengths

\textsuperscript{47} See Table 7 of Appendix V for further information. Five of the top six are the same distance from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank. Strengths and challenges for this item type are presented in separate charts for the sake of readability.
The analysis also disclosed three areas of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, COACM students of other faith-based affiliations agreed that

- they have staff who they perceive as role models (50%, n=7),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare (64%, n=9), and
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare (64%, n=9).

Chart 17.2: COACM Students of Other Faith-Based Affiliations Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark, Challenge

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (negative statement- 5-point scale):**

This question refers to levels of agreement with a negatively worded statement about considerations of transferring, so responses of “agree” or “strongly agree” are not desirable. The goal is for such responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for this item is 20% 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, COACM students of other faiths agreed that they were considering transferring to another university for academic reasons (0%, n=0).

Chart 17.3: COACM Students of Other Faith-Based Affiliations Agreement with Negatively Worded Statement about Transfer Compared to Benchmark, 5-Point Scale

Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (negative statements – 4-point scale):

These questions refer to levels of agreement with two of negatively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 40% 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, COACM students of other faith-based affiliations agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (46%, n=6).

Chart 17.4: COACM Students of Other Faith-Based Affiliations Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Academic Experiences/Perceptions Compared to Benchmark, 4-Point Scale

See Section IV for additional findings for COACM students of multiple or other faith-based affiliation for items specific to religious affiliation.
Findings for Students of No Faith-Based Affiliations

OVERVIEW

Table 10 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. This section does not include inter-group comparisons which were included in previous sections (e.g., female to male or disability to no disability) because of the complexity of making such comparisons across three groups. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Underlined items appear as top 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 10 Top Strengths and Challenges for COACM Students of No Faith-Based Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Strengths</th>
<th>Comparison to All COACM Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background</td>
<td>Higher agreement that • they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates • they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) • they feel valued by other students in the classroom • their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Challenges</td>
<td>• Lower levels of comfort with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) • they feel valued by faculty in the classroom • SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that they have staff who they perceive as role models • Lower levels of comfort with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) • Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48 These items are the same distance from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
Section 2.18: COACM Students of No Faith-Based Affiliation to All COACM Student Identity Groups

Comparisons

Chart 18: Top Strength, COACM Students of No Faith-Based Affiliation—Compared to All COACM Student 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. See Table 8 of Appendix IV for further information.

Meaningful Strengths

A lower percentage of COACM students of no faith-based affiliation agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (44%, n=8) compared to all COACM student identity groups (54%, n=45).

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

The percentage of COACM students of no faith-based affiliation who

- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (56%, n=10) was more than two standard deviations below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (78%, n=50),
- agreed or strongly agreed that they feel valued by faculty in the classroom (67%, n=12) was more than two standard deviations below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (87%, n=56),
- agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare (53%, n=9) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (69%, n=33),
- have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year 33%, n=6) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all COACM identity groups (18%, n=13), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (72%, n=13) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all COACM student identity groups (82%, n=53).

See Table 8 of Appendix IV for further information.
The results of benchmark comparisons for COACM students of no faith-based affiliation 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:**

No items met the criteria for this item type

**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 75%.

The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed one area of challenge. COACM students of no faith-based affiliations had levels of comfort below the benchmark with the climate at SPSU (56%, n=10).

- **Chart 19: COACM Students of No Faith-Based Affiliation Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark**

---

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

51 See Table 8 in Appendix V for details.
Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (positive statements):

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 70% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed five areas of strength. The top four are presented here. At percentages below the benchmark, COACM students of no faith-based affiliation agreed that

- they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates (100%, n=17),
- they intend to graduate from KSU (83%, n=15),
- they feel valued by other students in the classroom (83%, n=15), and
- their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth (83%, n =15).

The analysis also disclosed two areas of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, COACM students of no faith-based affiliation agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare (53%, n=9), and
- they have staff who they perceive as role models (44%, n=8).

Chart 19.1: COACM Students of No Faith-Based Affiliation Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

---

See Table 8 of Appendix V for further information. Two of the top four items are the same distance from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (negative statements):**

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of negatively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 40% 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, COACM students of no faith-based affiliation agreed that they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify (33%, n=6).

**Chart 19.2: COACM Students of No Faith-Based Affiliation Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Academic Experiences/Perceptions Compared to Benchmark**

See Section IV for additional findings for COACM students of no faith-based affiliation for items specific to religious affiliation.
Findings for Students of Christian Affiliation

OVERVIEW

Table 11 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. This section does not include inter-group comparisons which were included in previous sections (e.g., female to male or disability to no disability) because of the complexity of making such comparisons across three groups. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison.

Table 11: Top Strengths and Challenges for COACM Students of Christian Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COACM UNDERGRADUATE/GRADUATE STUDENTS OF CHRISTIAN AFFILIATION</th>
<th>Comparison to All COACM Identity Groups</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they have staff who they perceive as</td>
<td>• they feel valued by faculty in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>role models</td>
<td>classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>• their interest in ideas and intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>administrators are genuinely</td>
<td>matters has increased since coming to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concerned for their welfare</td>
<td>SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are</td>
<td>• they have staff who they perceive as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genuinely concerned for their welfare</td>
<td>role models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>There were no areas of challenge with</td>
<td>Higher agreement that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a difference of 10 percentage points or</td>
<td>SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>greater for this comparison.</td>
<td>their abilities based on perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2.20: COACM Students of Christian Affiliation to All COACM Student Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 20: Top Three Strengths, COACM Students of No Faith-Based Affiliation-Compared to All COACM Student 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 COACM students of Christian faith who agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have staff who they perceive as role models (84%, n=27) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all COACM student identity groups (60%, n=42), and
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare (81%, n=26) was one standard deviation above the mean for all COACM student identity groups (69%, n=33).

**Meaningful Strengths**

- A higher percentage of COACM students of Christian faith agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare (82%, n=27) compared to the mean for all COACM student identity groups (72%, n=49).

See Table 9 of Appendix IV for further information.

**Significant/Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for significant or meaningful challenges. See Table 9 of Appendix IV for further information.

---

53 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Section 2.21: COACM Students of Christian Affiliation to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for COACM students of Christian affiliation 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.”

The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, COACM Christian students have observed exclusionary conduct at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (21%, n=7).

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 75%

---

54 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
55 See Table 9 in Appendix V for details.
The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed one area of strength. COACM students Christian affiliation had levels of comfort above the benchmark with the climate at SPSU (85%, n=28).

Chart 21.1: COACM Students of Christian Affiliation Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark

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

These questions refer to levels of agreement with a series of positively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 70% or more responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”
The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed seven areas of strength. The top six are presented here. The top six are presented here.\(^5\) At percentages above the benchmark, COACM Christian students agreed that

- they feel valued by faculty in the classroom (94%, \(n=30\)),
- their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to KSU (88%, \(n=29\)),
- they have staff who they perceive as role models (84%, \(n=27\)),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare (82%, \(n=27\)),
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (82%, \(n=27\)), and
- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (82%, \(n=27\)).

Chart 21.2: COACM Christian Students Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (negative statements – 4-point scale):

These questions refer to levels of agreement with two of negatively worded statements about academic experiences and perceptions of climate, 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 40% or less responding with “agree” or “strongly agree.”

---

\(^5\) Three of the top six are the same difference from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
The benchmark comparisons for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, COACM students of Christian affiliation agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (58%, n=19).

Chart 21.3: COACM Students Christian Affiliation Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Academic Experiences/Perceptions Compared to Benchmark, 4-Point Scale

See Section IV for additional findings for COACM students of Christian affiliation for items specific to religious affiliation.
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 each scale for COACM students compared to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) students.\textsuperscript{57} Keep in mind that a lower numerical rating is more positive than a higher numerical rating.

Findings for Students

Section 3.1: Friendly – Hostile Dimension

Chart 1: Comparison of Climate Ratings for “Friendly – Hostile” Dimension by Identity Groups – COACM Students vs. All Other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Students

- COACM students of other faiths, female students and LGBQ students had ratings that were slightly closer to “friendly” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- COACM non-U.S. citizen students had ratings that were furthest from “friendly” in comparison to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.

\textsuperscript{57} Numbers of faculty/staff respondents in minoritized demographic categories were not sufficient for analysis.
Section 3.2: Cooperative – Uncooperative Dimension

Chart 2: Comparison of Climate Ratings for “Cooperative – Uncooperative” Dimension by Identity Groups – COACM Students vs. All Other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Students

- COACM students of other faiths, LGBQ students, and female students had ratings that were notably closer to “cooperative” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- COACM students of no faith-based affiliation had ratings that were furthest from “cooperative” in comparison to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts, followed by COACM non-U.S. citizen students.
Section 3.3: Improving – Regressing Dimension

Chart 3: Comparison of Climate Ratings for “Improving – Regressing” Dimension by Identity Groups – COACM Students vs. All Other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Students

- COACM students with disabilities, students of other faiths, and white students had ratings that were slightly closer to “improving” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- COACM non-U.S. citizen students had ratings that were furthest from “improving” in comparison to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts, followed by COACM students of no faith-based affiliation.
Section 3.4: Welcoming – Not Welcoming Dimension

Chart 4: Comparison of Climate Ratings for “Welcoming – Not Welcoming” Dimension by Identity Groups – COACM Students vs. All Other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Students

- COACM overall rated the climate as closer to “welcoming” when compared to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) students overall.
- COACM LGBQ students and Christian students rated the climate as closest to “welcoming” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- There were no COACM student groups who rated the climate as further from “welcoming” than their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
Section 3.5: Respectful – Not Respectful Dimension

Chart 5: Comparison of Climate Ratings for “Respectful – Disrespectful” Dimension by Identity Groups – COACM Students vs. All Other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Students

- COACM students overall had ratings of the respectfulness of the climate that were roughly the same as SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) students overall.
- COACM LGBQ students had ratings that were slightly closer to “respectful” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- COACM students with military service had ratings that were furthest from “respectful” in comparison to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts, followed by COACM non-U.S. citizen students.

NOTE: There were a number of other scale items from this section of the climate assessment that were specific to identity groups, such as “positive for persons with disabilities – negative for persons with disabilities.” These items were analyzed differently by drawing comparisons only for the groups to whom the items related. The results of such analyses are summarized in Section IV – Additional Findings of Interest.
SECTION IV: ADDITIONAL FINDINGS OF INTEREST

Comparisons of Climate Ratings for Students – Identity Group-Specific Items

This section provides highlights of responses to identity-group specific items from student members of those groups, compared to their counterparts. Details of these findings are included in the data tables in Appendix IV.

Section 4.1: Gender/Gender Identity

A comparison of the responses of COACM female students to those of COACM male students on items relating to gender provided the following findings.

- On a scale of “not sexist – sexist,” COACM female student’s ratings were 34% further from “not sexist” than were those of COACM male student’s ratings.
- On a scale of “positive for women – negative for women,” COACM female student’s ratings were 24% further from “not sexist” than were those of COACM male student’s ratings.

Section 4.2: Race/Ethnicity

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

- On a scale of “positive for people of color – negative for people of color,” COACM’s students of color ratings were 21% further from “positive for people of color” compared to those of COACM’s white students.
- On a scale of “not racist – racist,” COACM’s students of color ratings were 17% further from “not racist” compared to those of COACM’s white students.

Section 4.3: Disability Status

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

- On a scale of “disability friendly – not disability friendly,” COACM’s students with disabilities ratings were 19% further from “disability friendly” than were those of COACM students without disabilities.

Section 4.4: Citizenship Status

A comparison of the responses of COACM non-U.S. citizen students to those of COACM U.S. citizen students on items relating to citizenship or nationality provided findings that were unremarkable. All differences between comparison groups were less than 10%.
Section 4.5: Sexual Identity

A comparison of the responses of COACM LGBQ students to those of COACM heterosexual students on items relating to sexual orientation provided the following findings:

- On a scale of “positive for people who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual – negative for people who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual,” COACM’s LGBQ student ratings were 15% further from “positive for people who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual” compared to COACM’s heterosexual students.

Section 4.6: Religious Affiliation

A comparison of the responses of COACM students of other or no faith-based affiliations to those of COACM Christian students (the majority group) on items relating to religious affiliation provided findings that were unremarkable. All differences between comparison groups were less than 10%.
Other Additional Findings for Students

Section 4.7: Student Awareness of Environmental/Sustainability Efforts

An item on the climate assessment directed only to students asks for level of agreement with the statement, “I am aware of KSU’s environmental/sustainability efforts, initiatives, and course offerings.” Responses to this item were analyzed according to demographic variables and student levels, and comparisons were drawn between responses of COACM students and those of the entire Kennesaw campus. This analysis provided the following highlights:

- The level of awareness of COACM students (64%, n=42) was slightly higher than that of all other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) students (60%, n=354).
- For COACM students, levels of awareness were highest among students in their second and third years of school and lowest among students in their fourth year.
- COACM female students had a higher level of awareness than male students, by a difference of 16 percentage points.
- COACM students with disabilities had a higher level of awareness than those without disabilities, by a difference of 21 percentage points.
- Students of multiple or other faith-based affiliations-based affiliations had a higher level of awareness than those of Christian or no faith-based affiliation.

Full details of these comparisons can be found in Appendix VII.
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