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INTRODUCTION: ANALYSIS OF CLIMATE FOR SOUTHERN POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

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/kennescwcca/

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 Southern Polytechnic College of Engineering and Engineering Technology (herein referred to as SPCEET). 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 SPCEET faculty and staff are compared to those of all other KSU Marietta Campus faculty and staff; and responses from SPCEET 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 SPCEET when compared against the KSU Marietta Campus as a whole.

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

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

Section IV presents an analysis of items with numeric scale ratings on various dimensions of the campus climate. This analysis includes multiple comparisons of groups within SPCEET to the corresponding groups for the KSU Marietta Campus.

Section V 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.

2 It should be noted that percentage point differences may appear extreme when small numbers are expressed as percentages, which is the case with many SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups.
SECTION I: COMPARISON OF RESPONSES FROM SPCEET TO ALL OTHER RESPONDENTS AND TO BENCHMARKS

Chi square tests determined statistically significant differences between responses from SPCEET 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 V for student analyses. Data tables in these appendices provide information on additional items that may be considered potential strengths and challenges for SPCEET.

Comparisons were also conducted of responses from SPCEET 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 the Appendix IV for faculty/staff analyses and Appendix VI for student analyses.

---

3 Responses for faculty and staff were combined, as numbers were too small to analyze these groups separately.  
4 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details of this analysis.  
5 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.  
6 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 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 SPCEET Faculty/Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET 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>There were no areas of strength with a difference of 10 percentage points or greater for this comparison.</td>
<td>Higher agreement that • their service contributions are important to tenure/promotion • their colleagues include them as much as others in opportunities that will help their careers • Lower agreement that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>• Higher agreement that they perform more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues Lower agreement that • the tenure/promotion process is clear • they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that the way salaries are determined is clear • Higher agreement that they perform more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues • Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of taking leave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 1.1: SPCEET Faculty/Staff to KSU Marietta Campus Faculty/Staff Comparisons

Significant Strengths
No items met the criteria for significant strengths.

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

Chart 1: Top Three Challenges, SPCEET Faculty Compared to All Other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Faculty

Significant Challenges
No items met the criteria for significant challenges.

Meaningful Challenges
A higher percentage of SPCEET faculty or faculty/staff
- agreed or strongly agreed that they perform more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues (68%, n=15) compared to all other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty (46%, n=22), and
- have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (34%, n=11) compared to all other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty/staff (24%, n=36).

A lower percentage of SPCEET faculty or faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that
- the tenure/promotion process is clear (46%, n=11) compared to all other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty (67%, n=32),
- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (57%, n=16) compared to all other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty/staff (74%, n=101),

7 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
• SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave (70%, n=14) compared to all other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty (84%, n=103), and
• the tenure/promotion standards are reasonable (65%, n=15) compared to all other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty (77%, n=37).

See Table 1 of Appendix III for further information.

Section 1.2: SPCEET Faculty/Staff to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET 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:

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 35% or less responding with “yes.”

---

8 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
9 See Table 1 in Appendix IV for details.
The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff have observed unjust hiring practices at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (29%, n=8).

The analysis also disclosed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (47%, n=15).

Chart 2: SPCEET Faculty/Staff “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed three areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides them with resources to pursue professional development (81%, n=25),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of flexible work schedules (79%, n=23), and
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (78%, n=25).

The analysis also disclosed four areas of challenge. The top three are presented here. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff agreed that

- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (57%, n=16),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of taking leave (41%, n=7), and
- the way salaries are determined is clear (31%, n=10).

Chart 2.1: SPCEET Faculty/Staff Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greatest Strength</th>
<th>Greatest Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“SPSU (e.g., CTE, OISD, etc.) provides me with resources to pursue professional development opportunities.” (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>“I believe that the way salaries are determined is clear.” (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I find that SPSU is supportive of flexible work schedules.” (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>“I find that SPSU is supportive of taking leave.” (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My supervisor provides me with resources to pursue professional development opportunities.” (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td>“I have supervisors who give me job/career advice or guidance when I need it.” (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.”

---

10 See Table 1 of Appendix IV for further information.
The benchmark comparison for faculty specific agree-disagree item types revealed two areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET faculty agreed that

- their service contributions are important to tenure/promotion (91%, n=21), and
- their colleagues include them as much as others in opportunities that will help their careers (82%, n=18).

The analysis also disclosed four areas of challenge. The top three are presented here. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET faculty agreed that

- their diversity-related contributions have been or will be valued for promotion (50%, n=8),
- the tenure/promotion standards are applied equally to all faculty (48%, n=11), and
- the tenure/promotion process is clear (46%, n=11).

Chart 2.2: SPCEET Faculty Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark, Faculty-Specific Items

---

11 See Table 1 of Appendix IV for further information.
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 strength. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff agreed that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children (25%, n=7).

The analysis also disclosed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff agreed that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition (44%, n=14).

Chart 2.3: SPCEET 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 one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET faculty agreed that they are burdened by service responsibilities beyond those of their colleagues (29%, n=7).

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

- they feel pressured by departmental work requirements outside of normal hours (42%, n=10),
- they feel burdened by service responsibilities (55%, n=12), and
- they perform more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues (68%, n=15).

Chart 2.4: SPCEET Faculty Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark, Faculty-Specific Items
Findings for Undergraduate/Graduate 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 SPCEET Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET UNDERGRADUATE/GRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>Comparison to All Other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Students</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></td>
<td>Higher levels of comfort with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>Higher agreement that they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower percentage who selected “climate was unwelcoming” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>Lower percentage who have observed exclusionary conduct at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher agreement that they have performed academically as well as anticipated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Higher percentage who selected “transfer/I never intended to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)” as a reason for considering leaving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower agreement that they have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher percentage who have performed academically as well as anticipated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 1.3: SPCEET Undergraduate/Graduate Students to KSU Marietta Campus

Undergraduate/Graduate Student Comparisons

Significant Strengths

- A significantly higher percentage of SPCEET students were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (83%, n=275) compared to all other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) students (73%, n=276).¹
- A significantly lower percentage of SPCEET students selected “climate was unwelcoming” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (16%, n=19) compared to all other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) students (26%, n=37).²

See Table 1 of Appendix V for further information.

Meaningful Strengths

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

Significant Challenges

- A significantly higher percentage of SPCEET students selected “transfer/I never intended to graduate from KSU” as a reason for considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (38%, n=46) compared to all other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) students (23%, n=32).³

Meaningful Challenges

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

¹²See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Section 1.4: SPCEET Undergraduate/Graduate Students to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET undergraduate/graduate 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:**

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 two areas of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET students have

- observed exclusionary conduct at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (15%, n=49), and
- personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (16%, n=52).

Chart 4: SPCEET Undergraduate/Graduate Students “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

---

13 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
14 See Table 1 in Appendix VI 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 two areas of strength. SPCEET students had levels of comfort above the benchmark with the climate:

- at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (83%, n=275), and
- in their courses (81%, n=268).

**Chart 4.1: SPCEET Undergraduate/Graduate Students Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark**

![Chart showing 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.”
The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed five areas of strength. The top three are presented here. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET students agreed that

- they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates (95%, n=310),
- their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth (82%, n=272), and
- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (82%, n=270).

The analysis also disclosed one area of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET students agreed that they have performed academically as well as anticipated (60%, n=199).

Chart 4.2: SPCEET Undergraduate/Graduate Students Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (negative statements):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No items met the criteria for this item type.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

15 See Table 1 of Appendix V for further information.
i A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of student respondents from SPCEET with all other student respondents who were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus): X²(2, n=709)=8.651, p<.05.

ii A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of student respondents from SPCEET with all other student respondents who selected “climate was unwelcoming” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus): X²(1, n=261)=4.167, p<.05.

iii A chi square test was conducted to compare percentages of student respondents from SPCEET with all other student respondents who selected “transfer/I never intended to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus): X²(1, n=261)=7.566, p<.01.
SECTION II: ANALYSIS OF FACULTY/STAFF IDENTITY GROUP RESPONSES WITHIN SPCEET

This section includes subsections of analyses of faculty and/or staff responses for each of the following demographic variables: gender, race/ethnicity, disability status, citizenship status, military service status, and sexual identity status. Responses of faculty and staff were combined because numbers for the smaller demographic categories were insufficient for separate analysis.

For the first comparison, responses of SPCEET faculty/staff for each identity group were compared to those of all SPCEET faculty/staff 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. Only items with differences of ten percentage points or more were included. All items, including those with differences of less than ten percentage points, can be found in the dashboard tables in Appendix III.

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 SPCEET faculty/staff for each reference group were compared to their demographic counterparts. For example, responses of faculty/staff with disabilities were compared to those of faculty/staff 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 III.

For the third comparison, responses of SPCEET faculty/staff for each reference group were compared to established benchmarks. 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 IV.

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

---

16 A more limited analysis by religious affiliation is presented in Section 2.19.
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.
SPCEET Faculty/Staff, Gender/Gender Identity

Both female and male faculty/staff are the reference groups for this subsection. Both groups gave responses that are indicative of institutional challenges for SPCEET that could be the focus of planning efforts. Within SPCEET, there were 13 female faculty/staff and 19 male faculty/staff respondents. There were no respondents who identified as transgender, genderqueer, or multiple gender identities.

Findings for Female Faculty/Staff

OVERVIEW

Table 3 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Underlined items appear as top strengths or challenges in two of three comparisons. Bold items appear as top strengths or challenges in all three comparisons. Items that appear in more than one comparison should be considered as having been emphasized in terms of their importance.

Table 3: Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET FEMALE FACULTY/STAFF</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Male Faculty/Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Strengths</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that the tenure/promotion standards are reasonable</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that their service contributions are important to tenure/promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher levels of comfort with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>• Higher levels of comfort with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>• Higher levels of comfort with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                             | • Higher agreement that they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers | • Higher agreement that the tenure/promotion standards are reasonable | Higher agreement that they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers
|                             |                                                                                   |                                | • SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides them with resources to pursue professional development |

20 These two items are the same distance from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Challenges</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Female Faculty/Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides available resources for work-life balance</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides available resources for work-life balance</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides available resources for work-life balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher agreement that they perform more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that they perform more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that they perform more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower agreement that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving KSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2.1: SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 1: Top Three Strengths, SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff Compared to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups

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

**Significant Strengths**

The percentage of SPCEET female faculty or faculty/staff who

- agreed or strongly agreed that the tenure/promotion standards are reasonable (83%, n=5) was one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (62%, n=15),
- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (92%, n=12) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (77%, n=24),
- agreed or strongly agreed that they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers (92%, n=11) was one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (77%, n=23), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides them with resources to pursue professional development opportunities (92%, n=11) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (80%, n=25).

See Table 2 of Appendix III for further information.

**Meaningful Strengths**

A higher percentage of SPCEET female faculty or faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave (80%, n=8) compared to all other SPCEET faculty identity groups (64%, n=14), and
- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (77%, n=10) compared to all other SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (63%, n=18).

---

21 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
A lower percentage of SPCEET female faculty/staff have

- personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (54%, n=7) compared to all other SPCEET faculty identity groups (64%, n=14), and
- seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (46%, n=6) compared to all other SPCEET faculty identity groups (59%, n=15).

See Table 2 of Appendix III for further information.

Chart 1: Top Challenges, SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff Compared to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups

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

**Significant Challenges**

The percentage of SPCEET female faculty or faculty/staff who agreed or strongly agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides available resources for work-life balance (0%, n=0) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all SPCEET faculty identity groups (65%, n=41),
- they perform more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues (83%, n=5) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (64%, n=15),
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (69%, n=9) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (82%, n=25), and
• their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (69%, n=9) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (82%, n=25).
Meaningful Challenges

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

Section 2.2: SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff to SPCEET Male Faculty/Staff Comparisons

Chart 2: Top Three Strengths, SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff Compared to SPCEET Male Faculty/Staff

Strengths

A higher percentage of SPCEET female faculty or faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (77%, n=10) compared to SPCEET male faculty/staff (47%, n=8),
- the tenure/promotion standards are reasonable (83%, n=5) compared to SPCEET male faculty/staff (59%, n=10),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave (80%, n=8) compared to SPCEET male faculty (60%, n=6),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides them with resources to pursue professional development (92%, n=11) compared to SPCEET male faculty/staff (74%, n=14),
- they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers (92%, n=11) compared to SPCEET male faculty/staff (75%, n=12),
- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (67%, n=8) compared to SPCEET male faculty/staff (50%, n=8), and
- their service contributions are important to tenure/promotion (100%, n=6) compared to SPCEET male faculty (88%, n=15).

A higher percentage of SPCEET female faculty/staff

- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (92%, n=12) compared to SPCEET male faculty/staff (63%, n=12), and
- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their courses (100%, n=6) compared to SPCEET male faculty/staff (89%, n=12).
In addition,

- a lower percentage of SPCEET female faculty/staff have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (54%, n=7) compared to SPCEET male faculty/staff (74%, n=14).

See Table 2 of Appendix III for further information.

Chart 2.1: Top Three Challenges, SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff Compared to SPCEET Male Faculty/Staff

Challenges

A lower percentage of SPCEET female faculty or faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides available resources for work-life balance (0%, n=0) compared to SPCEET male faculty/staff (40%, n=6),
- they perform more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues (83%, n=5) compared to SPCEET male faculty (63%, n=10),
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (69%, n=9) compared to SPCEET male faculty/staff (89%, n=16), and
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (69%, n=9) compared to SPCEET male faculty/staff (84%, n=16).

In addition,

- a higher percentage of SPCEET female faculty or faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that they perform more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues (83%, n=5) compared to SPCEET male faculty (63%, n=10). See Table 2 of Appendix III for further information.
Section 2.3: SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET female 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:

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 to reduce the percentage of “yes” responses. The benchmark for these items is 35% or less responding with “yes.”

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

- personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (54%, n=7), and
- seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (46%, n=6).

Chart 3: SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

---

22 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
23 See Table 2 in Appendix IV for details.
**Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:**

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. This item type includes items corresponding to comfort with the climate at KSU and with the climate in departments. The benchmark for these items is 70%. This revealed one area of strength. At levels above the benchmark, SPCEET female faculty/staff were comfortable with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (92%, n=12).

This item type also includes one item that corresponded to faculty comfort with the climate in their courses. The benchmark for this item is 90%. This revealed one area of strength. At levels above the benchmark, SPCEET female faculty/staff were comfortable with the climate in their courses (100%, n=6).

**Chart 3.1: SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark**

**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.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed three areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET female faculty/staff agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides them with resources to pursue professional development (92%, n=11),
- they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers (92%, n=11), and
- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (77%, n=10).

The analysis also disclosed one of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET female faculty/staff agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides available resources for work-life balance (0%, n=0)

**Chart 3.2: SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark**

![Chart showing greatest strengths and challenge]

**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 three areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET female faculty agreed that

- their service contributions are important to tenure/promotion (100%, n=6),
- the tenure/promotion standards are reasonable (83%, n=5)
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave (80%, n=8).

Chart 3.3: SPCEET Female Faculty Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark, Faculty-Specific Items

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

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

**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 one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET female faculty agreed that they perform more work to help students beyond that of their colleagues (83%, n=5).

Chart 3.4: SPCEET Female Faculty Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark, Faculty-Specific Items

See Section V for additional findings for SPCEET female faculty/staff based on gender-specific items.
Findings for Male Faculty/Staff

OVERVIEW

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

Table 4: Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET Male Faculty/Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET MALE FACULTY/STAFF</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Female Faculty/Staff</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></td>
<td>Higher agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides available resources for work-life balance</td>
<td>Higher agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides available resources for work-life balance</td>
<td>Higher agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides available resources for work-life balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower agreement that their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance</td>
<td>Lower agreement that their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance</td>
<td>Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower levels of comfort with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>Lower levels of comfort with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>Lower agreement that they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower agreement that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed</td>
<td>Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year</td>
<td>Lower agreement that they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 These two items are the same distance from the comparison and therefore have the same rank.
Section 2.4: SPCEET Male Faculty/Staff to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 4: Top Strength, SPCEET Male Faculty/Staff Compared to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups

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

Significant Strengths
No items met the criteria for significant strengths.

Meaningful Strengths

- A higher percentage of SPCEET male faculty or faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides available resources for work-life balance (40%, n=6) compared to all other SPCEET faculty identity groups (29%, n=6).

See Table 3 of Appendix III for further information.

---

25 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
**Chart 4.1: Top Three Challenges, SPCEET Male Faculty/Staff Compared to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups**

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

**Significant Challenges**

- The percentage of SPCEET male faculty/staff who were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (63%, n=12) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all other SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (77%, n=24).

See Table 3 of Appendix III for further information.

**Meaningful Challenges**

A lower percentage of SPCEET male faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (47%, n=8) compared to all other SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (63%, n=18), and
- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (50%, n=8) compared to all other SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (63%, n=16).

See Table 3 of Appendix III for further information.
Section 2.5: SPCEET Male Faculty/Staff to SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff Comparisons

Chart 5: Top Three Strengths, SPCEET Male Faculty/Staff Compared to SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff

Strengths

A higher percentage of SPCEET male faculty or faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides available resources for work-life balance (40%, n=6) compared to SPCEET female faculty/staff (0%, n=0), and
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (89%, n=16) compared to SPCEET female faculty/staff (69%, n=9).

See Table 3 of Appendix III for further information.
Chart 5.1: Top Challenges, SPCEET Male Faculty/Staff Compared to SPCEET Female Faculty/Staff

Challenges

A lower percentage of SPCEET male faculty or faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (47%, n=8) compared to SPCEET female faculty/staff (100%, n=10),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave (60%, n=6) compared to SPCEET female faculty (80%, n=8),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides them with resources to pursue professional development (74%, n=14) compared to SPCEET female faculty/staff (92%, n=11), and
- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (50%, n=8) compared to SPCEET female faculty/staff (67%, n=8).

A lower percentage of SPCEET male faculty or faculty/staff were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate

- at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (63%, n=12) compared to SPCEET female/staff (92%, n=12), and
- in their courses (KSU Marietta Campus) (89%, n=16) compared to SPCEET female faculty (100%, n=6).

In addition,

- a higher percentage of SPCEET male faculty/staff have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (74%, n=14) compared to female SPCEET faculty/staff (54%, n=7).

See Table 3 of Appendix III for further information.
Section 2.6: SPCEET Male Faculty/Staff to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET male 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:

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 to reduce the percentage of “yes” responses. The benchmark for these items is 35% or less responding with “yes.”

The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET male faculty/staff have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (74%, n=14)

Chart 6: SPCEET Male Faculty/Staff “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

---

26 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
27 See Table 3 in Appendix IV for details.
Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 70%.

The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed one area of challenge. SPCEET male faculty/staff had levels of comfort with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) that were below the benchmark (63%, n=12).

Chart 6.1: SPCEET Male Faculty/Staff Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark

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.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET male faculty/staff agreed that they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (89%, n=16).

The analysis also disclosed three areas of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET male faculty/staff agreed that

- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (50%, n=8),
- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (47%, n=8), and
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides available resources for work-life balance (40%, n=6).

Chart 6.2: SPCEET Male 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 challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET male faculty agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave (60%, n=6).

Chart 6.3: SPCEET Male Faculty Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark, Faculty-Specific Items

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

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

See Section V for additional findings for SPCEET male faculty/staff based on gender-specific items.
SPCEET Faculty/Staff, Race/Ethnicity

SPCEET faculty/staff of color are the reference groups for this section. Within SPCEET, there were 13 faculty/staff of color respondents and 17 white faculty/staff respondents. There were two respondents who did not specify race or ethnicity.

OVERVIEW

Table 5 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Underlined items appear as top strengths or challenges in two of three comparisons. Bold-faced 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 SPCEET Faculty/Staff of Color

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET FACULTY/STAFF OF COLOR</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to White Faculty/Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Strengths</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave</td>
<td>Higher agreement that they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• their service contributions are important to tenure/promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher levels of comfort with the climate in their courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Top Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to White Faculty/Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Higher agreement that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition&lt;br&gt;Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides them with resources to pursue professional development&lt;br&gt;they have adequate access to administrative support</td>
<td>- Higher agreement that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition&lt;br&gt;Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides them with resources to pursue professional development&lt;br&gt;their service contributions are important to tenure/promotion(^{28})&lt;br&gt;Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year(^{28})</td>
<td>- Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year&lt;br&gt;Higher agreement that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition&lt;br&gt;Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving KSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{28}\) These two items are the same distance from the comparison and therefore have the same rank.
Section 2.7: SPCEET Faculty/Staff of Color to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 4: Strength, SPCEET Faculty/Staff of Color Compared to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups

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

**Significant Strengths**

No items met the criteria for significant strengths.

**Meaningful Strengths**

- A higher percentage of SPCEET faculty/staff of color were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (78%, n=7) compared to all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (64%, n=14).

See Table 4 of Appendix III for further information.

---

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

**Significant Challenges**

The percentage of SPCEET faculty/staff of color who agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition (62%, n=8) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (43%, n=14), and
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides them with resources to pursue professional development (69%, n=9) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (80%, n=25).

See Table 4 of Appendix III for further information.

**Meaningful Challenges**

- A lower percentage of SPCEET faculty/staff of color agreed or strongly agreed that they have adequate access to administrative support (69%, n=9) compared to all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (79%, n=23).

See Table 4 of Appendix III for further information.
Section 2.8: SPCEET Faculty/Staff of Color to SPCEET White Faculty/Staff Comparisons

Chart 8: Strength, SPCEET Faculty/Staff of Color Compared to SPCEET White Faculty/Staff

Strengths

- A higher percentage of SPCEET faculty of color agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave.

See Table 4 of Appendix III for further information.
Chart 8.1: Top Challenges, SPCEET Faculty/Staff of Color Compared to SPCEET White Faculty/Staff

Challenges

A lower percentage of SPCEET faculty or faculty/staff of color agreed or strongly agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) provides them with resources to pursue professional development (69%, n=9) compared to SPCEET white faculty/staff (88%, n=14),
- their service contributions are important to tenure/promotion (82%, n=9) compared to SPCEET white faculty (100%, n=10),
- they have adequate access to administrative support (82%, n=9) compared to SPCEET white faculty (100%, n=10), and
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (77%, n=10) compared to SPCEET white faculty (88%, n=14).

In addition, a higher percentage of SPCEET faculty/staff of color

- agreed or strongly agreed that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition (62%, n=8) compared to SPCEET white faculty/staff (29%, n=5), and
- a higher percentage of SPCEET faculty/staff of color have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU within the past year (77%, n=10) compared to SPCEET white faculty (59%, n=10).

See Table 4 of Appendix III for further information.
Section 2.9: SPCEET Faculty/Staff of Color to Benchmark Comparisons\[30\]

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET faculty/staff of color responses are presented here, arranged by item type.\[31\] Items that were less than six percentage points from the benchmark were not included in the analysis. As a result, there will be no findings to report for some item types.

Yes-No Item Types:

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

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

- personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU within the past year (77%, n=10), and
- seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (54%, n=7).

Chart 9: SPCEET Faculty/Staff of Color “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

---

\[30\] See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.

\[31\] See Table 4 in Appendix IV for details.
Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. There was one item that corresponded to faculty comfort with the climate in their courses. The benchmark for this item is 90%. This revealed one area of strength for SPCEET. Faculty of color had levels of comfort above the benchmark with the climate in their courses (100%, n=11).

Chart 9.1: SPCEET Faculty of Color Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark

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.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed four areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff of color agreed that

- they are comfortable taking earned leave without fear that it may affect their careers (82%, n=9),
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (77%, n=10), and
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (77%, n=10).

The analysis also revealed two areas of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff of color agreed that

- they have supervisors who give career guidance when needed (58%, n=7), and
- their supervisors provide ongoing feedback to help improve performance (58%, n=7).

Chart 9.2: SPCEET Faculty/Staff of Color 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 below the benchmark, SPCEET faculty of color agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave (78%, n=7).

Chart 9.3: SPCEET Faculty of Color 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 following is an analysis of faculty responses to these items.
The benchmark comparison for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff of color agreed that they have to work harder than their colleagues to achieve the same recognition (62%, n=8).

Chart 9.4: SPCEET Faculty/Staff of Color Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark

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

No items met the criteria for this item type.

See Section V for additional findings for SPCEET faculty/staff of color based on race/ethnicity-specific items.
SPCEET Faculty/Staff, Demographic Groups with N = 5

This section presents findings for demographic groups whose response numbers equal five. This has been determined to be the lowest number of responses that can be reported without jeopardizing confidentiality. The reference groups in this section are faculty/staff with disabilities, non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff, and LGBQ faculty/staff. Because the threshold for inclusion is \( n \geq 5 \), only those items where 100% of the reference groups’ responses fell into a particular category (i.e., agree or strongly agree) are included. Therefore, these findings will tend to have a positive skew that should not be considered to be a complete representation of the groups’ observations, experiences, and perceptions of the climate.

**Findings for Faculty/Staff with Disabilities**

SPCEET faculty and staff who identified as having disabilities are the reference group for this section. There were 5 faculty/staff respondents from SPCEET who identified as having disabilities, and 25 who did not. There were two respondents who did not identify a disabilities status.

**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 in two of three comparisons. Bold-faced items appear as top strengths or challenges in all three comparisons. Items that appear in more than one comparison should be considered as having been emphasized in terms of their importance.
Table 6: Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET Faculty/Staff with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET FACULTY/STAFF WITH DISABILITIES</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Faculty/Staff without Disabilities</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></td>
<td>• Lower agreement that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher levels of comfort with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher agreement that they have adequate access to administrative support access to administrative support</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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

32 These items are the same distance from the comparison and therefore have the same rank.

33 These items are all the same distance from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
Section 2.10: SPCEET Faculty/Staff with Disabilities to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups

Comparisons

Chart 10: Top Three Strengths, SPCEET Faculty/Staff with Disabilities Compared to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups

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

Significant Strengths

The percentage of SPCEET faculty or faculty/staff with disabilities who agreed or strongly agreed that

- people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children (0%, n=0) was more than two standard deviations below the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (25%, n=7),
- they have adequate access to administrative support (100%, n=5) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (79%, n=23),
- their colleagues include them as much as others in opportunities that will help their careers (100%, n=5) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty identity groups (81%, n=18), and
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (100%, n=5) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (82%, n=25).

In addition,

- the percentage of SPCEET faculty/staff with disabilities who were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (100%, n=5) was more than two standard deviations above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (77%, n=24).

Meaningful Strengths

No items met the criteria for meaningful strengths. See Table 5 of Appendix III for further information.

---

See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
**Chart 10.1: Challenge, SPCEET Faculty/Staff with Disabilities Compared to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups**

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

**Significant Challenges**

- The percentage of SPCEET faculty/staff with disabilities who have seriously considered leaving KSU (100%, n=5) was more than two standard deviations above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (59%, n=15).

**Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for meaningful challenges.
Section 2.11: SPCEET Faculty/Staff with Disabilities to SPCEET Faculty/Staff Without Disabilities

Comparisons

Chart 11: Strengths, SPCEET Faculty with Disabilities Compared to SPCEET Faculty Without Disabilities

**Strengths**

A higher percentage of SPCEET faculty or faculty/staff with disabilities were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate

- at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET faculty/staff without disabilities (68%, n=17), and
- in their courses (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET faculty without disabilities (88%, n=15).

A higher percentage of SPCEET faculty or faculty/staff with disabilities agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have adequate access to administrative support (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET faculty/staff without disabilities (67%, n=16),
- their colleagues include them as much as others in opportunities that will help their careers (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET faculty without disabilities (73%, n=11), and
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET faculty/staff without disabilities (75%, n=18).

In addition,

- a lower percentage of SPCEET faculty/staff with disabilities agreed or strongly agreed that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children (0%, n=0) compared to SPCEET faculty/staff without disabilities (27%, n=6).
Chart 11.1: Challenge, SPCEET Faculty/Staff with Disabilities Compared to SPCEET Faculty/Staff Without Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever seriously considered leaving SPSU? (% of “yes” responses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEET Faculty/Staff with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Challenge**

- A higher percentage of SPCEET faculty/staff with disabilities have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET faculty/staff without disabilities (44%, n=11).

**Section 2.12: SPCEET Faculty/Staff with Disabilities to Benchmark Comparisons**

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

**Yes-No Item Types:**

These questions refer to observations or experiences that are undesirable, so a “yes” response to any of these questions is also undesirable. The goal is for the percentage of “yes” responses to be below the benchmark. The benchmark for these items is 35% or less responding with “yes.”

---

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

36 See Table 5 in Appendix IV for details.
The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff with disabilities have seriously considered leaving KSU (100%, n=5).

Chart 12: SPCEET Faculty/Staff 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. This item type includes items corresponding to comfort with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) and with the climate in departments. The benchmark for these items is 70%. This revealed one area of strength. At levels above the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff with disabilities were comfortable with the climate at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (100%, n=5).
This item type also includes one item that corresponded to faculty comfort with the climate in their courses. The benchmark for this item is 90%. This revealed one area of strength. At levels above the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff with disabilities were comfortable with the climate in their courses (100%, n=5).

Chart 12.1: SPCEET Faculty/Staff with Disabilities Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark

**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.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed two areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff with disabilities agreed that

- they have adequate access to administrative support (100%, n=5), and
- they have colleagues who give career guidance when needed (100%, n=5).

Chart 12.2: SPCEET Faculty/Staff with Disabilities 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, SPCEET faculty with disabilities agreed that KSU is supportive of faculty taking sabbatical leave (100%, n=5).

Chart 12.3: SPCEET Faculty with Disabilities Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark, Faculty-Specific Items

![Chart](image)

**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 following is an analysis of faculty responses to these items.
The benchmark comparison for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET faculty/staff with disabilities agreed or strongly agree that people who do not have children are burdened with work responsibilities beyond those who do have children (0%, n=0).

Chart 12.4: SPCEET Faculty/Staff with Disabilities Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Work-Life Compared to Benchmark

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

No items met the criteria for this item type.

See Section V for additional findings for SPCEET faculty/staff with disabilities based on disability-specific items.
Findings for Non-U.S. Citizen Faculty/Staff

SPCEET non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff are the reference group for this section. There were 5 faculty/staff respondents from SPCEET who identified as non-U.S. citizens and 27 faculty/staff who did not.

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. Bold items appear as top strengths or challenges in all three comparisons. Items that appear in more than one comparison should be considered as having been emphasized in terms of their importance.

Table 7: Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Faculty/Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET NON-U.S. CITIZEN FACULTY/STAFF</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to U.S. Citizen Faculty/Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower percentage who have observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower percentage who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• exclusionary conduct at SPSU (KSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>have observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marietta Campus) within the past year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• exclusionary conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• unjust promotion/tenure/reclassification practices at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at SPSU (KSU Marietta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Higher percentage who agreed that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campus) within the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their supervisors provide them with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources to pursue professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• unjust promotion/tenure/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reclassification practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at SPSU (KSU Marietta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• exclusionary conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at SPSU (KSU Marietta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campus) within the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher percentage who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agreed that their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supervisors provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>them with resources to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pursue professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher agreement that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>their service contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>are important to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tenure/promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 These items are the same difference from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET NON-U.S. CITIZEN FACULTY/STAFF</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to U.S. Citizen Faculty/Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of taking leave</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of taking leave</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of taking leave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chart 13: Top Three Strengths, SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Faculty/Staff Compared to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups

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

**Significant Strength**

The percentage of SPCEET non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff who

- have observed exclusionary conduct at SPSU within the past year (0%, n=0) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (31%, n=9),
- have observed unjust promotion/tenure/reclassification practices at SPSU (0%, n=0) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (29%, n=8), and
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development opportunities (100%, n=5) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (82%, n=25).

See Table 6 of Appendix III for further details.

**Meaningful Strengths**

No items met the criteria for meaningful strengths. See Table 6 of Appendix III for further details.

---

38 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Chart 13.1: Challenges, SPCEET Non- U.S. Citizen Faculty/Staff Compared to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups

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

**Significant Challenges**

The percentage of SPCEET non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff who

- agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of taking leave (0%, n=0) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (42%, n=7), and
- personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (100%, n=5) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (69%, n=11).
Section 2.14: SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Faculty/Staff to SPCEET U.S. Citizen Faculty/Staff

Chart 14: Top Three Strengths, SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Faculty/Staff Compared to SPCEET U.S. Citizen Faculty/Staff

Strengths

A lower percentage of non-U.S. citizen SPCEET faculty/staff have observed

- unjust promotion/tenure/reclassification practices at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (0%, n=0) compared to SPCEET U.S. citizen faculty/staff (38%, n=8), and
- exclusionary conduct at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (0%, n=0) compared to SPCEET U.S. citizen faculty/staff (33%, n=9).

A higher percentage of non-U.S. citizen SPCEET faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET U.S. citizen faculty/staff (74%, n=20), and
- their service contributions are important to tenure/promotion (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET U.S. citizen faculty/staff (89%, n=16).
Challenges

- A lower percentage of SPCEET non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of taking leave (0%, n=0) compared to SPCEET U.S. citizen faculty/staff (50%, n=7).
- A higher percentage of SPCEET non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET U.S. citizen faculty/staff (59%, n=16).

Section 2.15: SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Faculty/Staff to Benchmark Comparisons

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

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 35% or less responding with “yes.”

---

39 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
40 See Table 6 in Appendix IV for details.
The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed two areas of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff

- observed exclusionary conduct at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (0%, n=0), and
- observed unjust promotion/tenure/reclassification practices at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (0%, n=0).

The analysis also disclosed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff had personally experienced exclusionary behavior at KSU within the past year (100%, n=5).

Chart 15: SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Faculty/Staff “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark
Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. There was one item that corresponded to faculty comfort with the climate in their courses. The benchmark for this item is 90%. This revealed one area of strength for SPCEET. Non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff were comfortable with the climate in their courses at levels above the benchmark (100%, n=5).

Chart 15.1: SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Faculty/Staff Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark

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.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff respondents agreed that their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (100%, n=5).

The analysis also disclosed one area of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET non-U.S. citizen faculty agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) is supportive of taking leave (0%, n=0).

Chart 15.2: SPCEET Non U.S. Citizen 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, SPCEET non-U.S. citizen faculty agreed that their service contributions are important to tenure/promotion (100%, n=5).

**Chart 15.3: SPCEET Faculty with Disabilities Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark, Faculty-Specific Items**

![Chart 15.3](image)

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

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

See Section V for additional findings for SPCEET non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff based on items specific to citizenship status.
Findings for LGBQ Faculty/Staff

SPCEET LGBQ faculty/staff are the reference group for this section. There were 5 faculty/staff respondents from SPCEET who identified as LGBQ and 26 faculty/staff who identified as heterosexual. There was one respondent who did not identify a sexual identity.

OVERVIEW

Table 8 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Bold items appear as top strengths and 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 8: Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET LGBQ Faculty/Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET LGBQ FACULTY/STAFF</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Heterosexual Faculty/Staff</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></td>
<td>Higher agreement that</td>
<td>Higher agreement that</td>
<td>Higher agreement that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they have adequate access to</td>
<td>• they have adequate access to</td>
<td>• they have adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>administrative support</td>
<td>administrative support</td>
<td>access to administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• their colleagues include them as much</td>
<td>• their supervisors provide them with</td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as others in opportunities that will</td>
<td>resources to pursue professional</td>
<td>• their supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>help their careers</td>
<td>development</td>
<td>provide them with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• their supervisors provide them with</td>
<td>• their colleagues include them as much</td>
<td>resources to pursue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resources to pursue professional</td>
<td>as others in opportunities that will</td>
<td>professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td>help their careers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have personally</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have personally</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have personally experienced</td>
<td>have personally experienced</td>
<td>have personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU</td>
<td>exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU</td>
<td>experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marietta Campus) within the past year</td>
<td>Marietta Campus) within the past year</td>
<td>exclusionary behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at SPSU (KSU Marietta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campus) within the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section 2.16 SPCEET LGBQ Faculty/Staff to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups Comparisons**

Chart 16: Top Three Strengths, SPCEET LGBQ Faculty/Staff Compared to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups

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

**Significant Strengths**

The percentage of SPCEET LGBQ faculty/staff who agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have adequate access to administrative support (100%, n=5) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (79%, n=23),
- their colleagues include them as much as others in opportunities that will help their career as much as they do others in my position.” (faculty only - % agree or strongly agree) (100%, n=5) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (81%, n=18), and
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (100%, n=5) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (82%, n=25).

See Table 7 of Appendix III for further details.

**Meaningful Strengths**

No items met the criteria for meaningful strengths. See Table 7 of Appendix III for further details.
**Chart 1.6.1: Challenge, SPCEET LGBQ Faculty/Staff Compared to All SPCEET Faculty/Staff Identity Groups**

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

**Significant Challenge**

- The percentage of SPCEET LGBQ faculty/staff who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU within the past year (100%, n=5) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups (69%, n=11).

**Section 2.17: SPCEET LGBQ Faculty/Staff to SPCEET Heterosexual Faculty/Staff**

**Chart 17: Top Three Strengths, SPCEET LGBQ Faculty/Staff Compared to SPCEET Heterosexual Faculty/Staff**

**Strengths**

A higher percentage of SPCEET LGBQ faculty or faculty/staff agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have adequate access to administrative support (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET heterosexual faculty/staff (72%, n=18),
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET heterosexual faculty/staff (73%, n=19), and
- their colleagues include them as much as others in opportunities that will help their careers (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET heterosexual faculty/staff (72%, n=18), and
- their service contributions are important to tenure/promotion (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET heterosexual faculty/staff (88%, n=15).
In addition,

- a higher percentage of SPCEET LGBQ faculty or faculty/staff were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their courses (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET heterosexual faculty/staff (89%, n=16).

Chart 17.1: Challenge, SPCEET LGBQ Faculty/Staff Compared to SPCEET Heterosexual Faculty/Staff

Challenge

- A higher percentage of SPCEET LGBQ faculty/staff have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (100%, n=5) compared to SPCEET heterosexual faculty/staff (58%, n=15).

Section 2.18: SPCEET LGBQ Faculty/Staff to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET LGBQ 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:

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 35% or less responding with “yes.”

---

42 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
43 See Table 7 in Appendix IV for details.
The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET LGBQ faculty/staff personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (100%, n=5).

Chart 18: SPCEET LGBQ Faculty/Staff “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark
**Very Comfortable – Very Uncomfortable Item Types:**

These questions refer to levels of comfort in different environments, so the desired responses are “comfortable” or “very comfortable.” The goal is for such responses to be above the benchmark. There was one item that corresponded to faculty comfort with the climate in their courses. The benchmark for this item is 90%. This revealed one area of strength for SPCEET. LGBQ faculty/staff were comfortable with the climate in their courses at levels above the benchmark (100%, n=5).

**Chart 18.1: SPCEET LGBQ Faculty/Staff Comfort Responses Compared to Benchmark**

**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.”
The benchmark comparison for agree-disagree item types revealed two areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET LGBQ faculty/staff respondents agreed that

- they have adequate access to administrative support (100%, n=5), and
- their supervisors provide them with resources to pursue professional development (100%, n=5).

Chart 18.2: SPCEET LGBQ 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 two areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET LGBQ faculty agreed that

- their colleagues include them as much as others in opportunities that will help their careers (100%, n=5).
- their service contributions are important to tenure/promotion (100%, n=5).

Chart 18.3: SPCEET LGBQ Faculty Work-Life Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark, Faculty-Specific Items

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

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

See Section V for additional findings for SPCEET LGBQ faculty/staff based on items specific to sexual identity.
SPCEET Faculty/Staff, Religious Affiliation

For this analysis, only those items on the climate assessment that referred to religious affiliation are addressed. For items referencing religious affiliation, the three responses categories were other or multiple faith-based affiliation, no faith-based affiliation, and Christian affiliation. Because of small numbers, the categories of other faith-based and no faith-based affiliation were combined. Comparisons to the KSU population as a whole by affiliation are also included. This analysis does not categorize findings in terms of strengths or challenges, but rather presents descriptive results.

Section 2.19: SPCEET Religious Affiliation Comparisons

As illustrated in the chart below, respondents were asked to rate the climate on a 5-point scale where 1 was “positive for people of Christian faith” and 5 was “negative for people of Christian faith.” The ratings of SPCEET Christian faculty/staff (2.25, n=17) were slightly further from “positive for people of Christian faith” than those of all other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Christian faculty/staff (2.13, n=77). There was little difference between the ratings of SPCEET Christian faculty/staff and those of SPCEET faculty/staff of other or no faith-based affiliation (2.31, n=13).

Chart 19: Scale Ratings of Climate for Christians, by Religious Affiliation
For the next item, respondents were asked to rate the climate on a 5-point scale where 1 was “positive for people of other faith backgrounds” and 5 was “negative for people of other faith backgrounds.” All other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty/staff of other or no faith-based affiliation had ratings that were furthest from “positive for people of other faith backgrounds” (2.62, n=65). The ratings of SPCEET faculty/staff of other or no faith-based affiliation (2.58, n=13) were very close to those of their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts. The ratings closest to “positive for people of other faith backgrounds” were from SPCEET Christian faculty/staff (2.38, n=17).

Chart 19.1: Scale Ratings of Climate for Other Religious Affiliations, by Religious Affiliation

A final item related to religious affiliation asked respondents’ agreement to the statement, “My workplace climate at KSU is welcoming regardless of a person’s religious/spiritual views.” The highest percentage of agreement was from SPCEET Christian faculty/staff (91%, n=10). All other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Christian faculty/staff (73%, n=46) and all other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty/staff of no or other faith-based affiliations (73%, n=36) shared the next highest ratings. SPCEET faculty staff of other or no faith-based affiliation (60%, n=6) has notably lower ratings than all other comparison groups.

Chart 19.2: Ratings of How Welcoming Climate is Regardless of Spiritual Views, by Religious Affiliation
SECTION III: ANALYSIS OF STUDENT IDENTITY GROUP RESPONSES WITHIN SPCEET

This section includes subsections of analyses of student responses for each of the following demographic variables: gender, race/ethnicity, disability status, citizenship status, military service, sexual identity, and religious affiliation. Responses of undergraduate and graduate students were combined because numbers for the smaller demographic categories were insufficient for separate analysis. All references to students will refer to both undergraduate and graduate students.

For the first comparison, responses of SPCEET students for each identity group were compared to those of all SPCEET 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. 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 V.44

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 SPCEET 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 V.

For the third comparison, responses of SPCEET students for each reference group were compared to established benchmarks.46 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 VI.

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

44 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details of this analysis.
45 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.
46 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
SPCEET Students, Gender/Gender Identity

Female students were the reference group for this subsection. Within SPCEET, there were 72 female respondents and 253 male respondents. The number of respondents who identified as other gender identities was too small for analysis.

OVERVIEW

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

Table 9: Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET Female Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET FEMALE STUDENTS</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to SPCEET 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>• they are performing up to their full academic</td>
<td>• they are performing up to their full academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>faculty are genuinely concerned for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they have performed academically as well as</td>
<td>• they have performed academically as well as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anticipated</td>
<td>anticipated</td>
<td>their welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta</td>
<td>• they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus)(^{47})</td>
<td>Campus)(^{48})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they have staff who they perceive as role</td>
<td>• they have staff who they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>models(^{47})</td>
<td>perceive as role models(^{48})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{47}\) These two items are the same distance from the comparison and therefore have the same rank.

\(^{48}\) These two items are the same distance from the comparison and therefore have the same rank.

\(^{49}\) These two items are the same distance from the benchmark and therefore have the same rank.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Challenges</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to SPCEET Male Students</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have personally</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have</td>
<td>Higher agreement that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experienced exclusionary behavior at</td>
<td>personally experienced</td>
<td>SPSU (KSU Marietta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past</td>
<td>exclusionary behavior at</td>
<td>Campus) faculty pre-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>year</td>
<td>SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within</td>
<td>judge their abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta</td>
<td>the past year</td>
<td>based on perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based on perceived background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have observed</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who</td>
<td>• they don’t see enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exclusionary conduct at SPSU (KSU Marietta</td>
<td>observed exclusionary conduct at</td>
<td>faculty/staff with whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus) within the past year</td>
<td>SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within</td>
<td>they identify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta</td>
<td>the past year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based on perceived background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3.1: SPCEET Female Students to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 1: Top Strengths, SPCEET Female Students Compared to All SPCEET 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 SPCEET female students who agreed or strongly agreed that

- they are performing up to their full academic potential (86%, n=62) was more than two standard deviations above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (69%, n=230),
- have performed academically as well as anticipated (69%, n=50) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (58%, n=199),
- intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (90%, n=65) was two standard deviations above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (80%, n=267), and
- have staff who they perceive as role models (66%, n=46) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (56%, n=187).

See Table 2 of Appendix V for further information.

**Meaningful Strengths**

- A higher percentage of SPCEET female students agreed or strongly agreed that they are satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling in SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (85%, n=61) compared to the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (75%, n=256).

See Table 2 of Appendix V for further information.

---

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

**Significant Challenges**

The percentage of SPCEET female students who

- have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU within the past year (31%, n=22) was more than two standard deviations above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (16%, n=52), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (56%, n=40) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (43%, n=242).

See Table 2 of Appendix V for further information.

**Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for meaningful challenges. See Table 2 of Appendix V for further information.
Section 3.2: SPCEET Female Students to SPCEET Male Students Comparisons

Chart 2: Top Strengths, SPCEET Female Students Compared to SPCEET Male Students

Strengths

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

- they are performing up to their full academic potential (86%, n=62) compared to SPCEET male students (65%, n=162),
- they have performed academically as well as anticipated (69%, n=50) compared to SPCEET male students (58%, n=145),
- they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (90%, n=65) compared to SPCEET male students (79%, n=196),
- they have staff who they perceive as role models (66%, n=46) compared to SPCEET male students (55%, n=137),
- they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (85%, n=61) compared to SPCEET male students (74%, n=186), and
- their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (85%, n=61) compared to SPCEET male students (74%, n=188).

See Table 2 of Appendix V for further information.
Chart 2.1: Top Three Challenges, SPCEET Female Students Compared to SPCEET Male Students

**Challenges**

A higher percentage of SPCEET female students

- have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (31%, n=22) compared to SPCEET male students (11%, n=29),
- have observed exclusionary conduct at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (25%, n=18) compared to SPCEET male students (11%, n=29), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (56%, n=40) compared to SPCEET male students (44%, n=112).

See Table 2 of Appendix V for further information.

---

**Section 3.3: SPCEET Female Students to Benchmark Comparisons**

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET 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:**

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%.

---

51 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
52 See Table 2 in Appendix VI for details.
The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed one area of strength. SPCEET female students had levels of comfort with the climate in their courses that were above the benchmark (87%, n=62).

Chart 3: SPCEET Female Students 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 11 areas of strength. The top five are presented here. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET female students agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare (92%, n=65),
- they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (90%, n=65),
- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (88%, n=63),
- they feel valued by other students in the classroom (88%, n=63), and
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (86%, n=62).

Chart 3.1: SPCEET Female 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 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.”

---

53 See Table 2 of Appendix VI for further information.
The benchmark comparisons for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed two areas of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET female students agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (56%, n=40), and
- they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify (48%, n=34).

Chart 3.2: SPCEET Female Student Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Academic Experiences/Perceptions Compared to Benchmark, 4-Point Scale

See Section V for additional findings for SPCEET female students based on gender-specific items.
SPCEET Students, Race/Ethnicity

SPCEET students of color are the reference group for this section. Within SPCEET, there were 129 student of color respondents and 196 white student respondents. There were eight student respondents who did not specify a race or ethnicity.

OVERVIEW

Table 10 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. 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 10: Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET Students of Color

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET STUDENTS OF COLOR</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to White Students</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Top Strengths            | There were no areas of strength with a difference of 10 percentage points or greater for this comparison. | • Lower percentage selecting “consolidation” as a reason for considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)  
  • Higher agreement that they have staff who they perceive as role models  
  • Lower percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year  | |
| Top Challenges           | • Higher agreement that they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify  
  • Higher agreement that they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify  
  • Lower levels of comfort with the climate in their courses  
  • Higher percentage who have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year  | • Higher agreement that they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify  
  • Higher agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background  
  • Lower agreement that they have staff who they perceive as role models  | |

54 This item is a strength when compared to white students and a challenge when compared to the benchmark. The greatest difference was with the comparison to white students.
55 This item is a strength when compared to the benchmark and a challenge when compared to white students. The greatest difference was with the comparison to white students.
Section 3.4: SPCEET Students of Color to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups Comparisons

**Significant Strengths**

No items met the criteria for significant strengths.

** Meaningful Strengths**

No items met the criteria for meaningful strengths. See Table 3 of Appendix V for further information.

*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 SPCEET students of color who agreed or strongly agreed that they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify (52%, n=67) was one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (41%, n=145).

**Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for meaningful challenges. See Table 3 of Appendix V for further information.

---

56 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Section 3.5: SPCEET Students of Color to SPCEET White Students Comparisons

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

Strengths

- A lower percentage of SPCEET students of color selected “consolidation” as a reason for seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (35%, n=16) compared to SPCEET white students (47%, n=34).
- A higher percentage of SPCEET students of color agreed or strongly agreed that they have staff who they perceive as role models (63%, n=80) compared to SPCEET white students (53%, n=103).
Chart 5.1: Top Three Challenges, SPCEET Students of Color Compared to SPCEET White Students

Challenges

A higher percentage of SPCEET students of color agreed or strongly agreed that they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify (52%, n=67) compared to SPCEET white students (38%, n=74), had personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU within the past year (22%, n=29) compared to SPCEET white students (11%, n=22), and agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (52%, n=66) compared to SPCEET white students (42%, n=82).

In addition,

- a lower percentage of SPCEET students of color were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their courses (75%, n=96) compared to SPCEET white students (87%, n=167).

See Table 3 of Appendix V for further information.

Section 3.6: SPCEET Students of Color to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET 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:

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.”

---

57 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
58 See Table 3 in Appendix VI for details.
The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET students of color have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (KSU Marietta Campus) (22%, n=29).

Chart 6: SPCEET Students of Color “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

**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 one area of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET students of color agreed that they have staff who they perceive as role models (63%, n=80).

Chart 6.1: SPCEET Students of Color 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 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 two areas of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET students of color agreed that

- they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify (53%, n=67), and
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (52%, n=66).

Chart 6.2: SPCEET Students of Color Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Academic Experiences/Perceptions Compared to Benchmark, 4-Point Scale

See Section V for additional findings for SPCEET students of color based on items specific to race/ethnicity.
**SPCEET Students, Disability Status**

SPCEET students with disabilities are the reference groups for this section. Within SPCEET, there were 69 student respondents who identified as having disabilities and 241 student respondents without disabilities. There were 23 students who did not identify a disability status.

**OVERVIEW**

Table 11 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 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 11: Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET Students with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Students without Disabilities</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were no areas of strength with a difference of 10 percentage points or greater for this comparison.</td>
<td>Higher agreement that they have faculty who they perceive as role models</td>
<td>Higher agreement that they have faculty who they perceive as role models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher percentage selecting</td>
<td>Higher percentage selecting</td>
<td>Higher agreement that they are performing up to their full academic potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “climate was unwelcoming” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>• “climate was unwelcoming” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that they are performing up to their full academic potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “didn’t offer my major” as a reason for considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>• “didn’t offer my major” as a reason for considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lower agreement that they are performing up to their full academic potential</td>
<td>• Lower agreement that they are performing up to their full academic potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

59 There were insufficient numbers to analyze these categories separately.
**Section 3.7: SPCEET Students with Disabilities to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups Comparisons**

**Significant/meaningful Strengths**

No items met the criteria for significant or meaningful strengths. See Table 4 of Appendix V for further information.

**Chart 7: Top Three Challenges, SPCEET Students with Disabilities Compared to All SPCEET 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 SPCEET students with disabilities who

- chose “climate was unwelcoming” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (30%, n=8) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (15%, n=19),
- chose “didn’t offer my major” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (22%, n=6) was more than two standard deviations above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (9%, n=12), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that they are performing up to their full academic potential (59%, n=41) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (69%, n=230).

See Table 4 of Appendix V for further information.

**Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for meaningful challenges. See Table 4 of Appendix V for further information.

---

60 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Section 3.8: SPCEET Students with Disabilities to SPCEET Students Without Disabilities Comparisons

Chart 8: Strength, SPCEET Students with Disabilities Compared to SPCEET Students Without Disabilities

Strengths

- A higher percentage of SPCEET students with disabilities agreed or strongly agreed that they have faculty who they perceive as role models (86%, n=59) compared with SPCEET students without disabilities (76%, n=181).

See Table 4 of Appendix V for further information.

Chart 8.1: Top Three Challenges, SPCEET Students with Disabilities Compared to SPCEET Students Without Disabilities

Challenges

A higher percentage of SPCEET students with disabilities chose

- “climate was unwelcoming” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (30%, n=8) compared to SPCEET student without disabilities (13%, n=11), and
- “didn’t offer my major” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (22%, n=6) compared to SPCEET student without disabilities (7%, n=6).

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

- they are performing up to their full academic potential (59%, n=41) compared to SPCEET students without disabilities (71%, n=170), and
- they are satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling in SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (70%, n=48) compared to SPCEET students without disabilities (80%, n=189).
See Table 4 of Appendix V for further information.

**Section 3.9: SPCEET Students with Disabilities to Benchmark Comparisons**

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET 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 two areas of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET students with disabilities have

- observed exclusionary conduct at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (22%, \( n=15 \)), and
- personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (23%, \( n=16 \)).

**Chart 9: SPCEET Students with Disabilities “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark**

---

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

62 See Table 4 in Appendix VI 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. SPCEET students with disabilities had levels of comfort with the climate in their courses that were above the benchmark (86%, n=59).

Chart 9.1: SPCEET 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 one area of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET students with disabilities agreed that they have faculty who they perceive as role models (86%, n=59).

The analysis also disclosed one area of challenge. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET students with disabilities agreed that they are performing up to their full academic potential (59%, n=41).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (negative statements – 5-point scale):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The benchmark comparisons for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET students with disabilities agreed that they are considering transferring due to academic reasons (10%, n=6).

Chart 9.3: SPCEET Students with Disabilities Agreement with Negatively Worded Statement about Transfer Compared to Benchmark, 5-Point Scale

See Section V for additional findings for SPCEET students with disabilities based on disability-specific items.
SPCEET Students, Citizenship Status

SPCEET non-U.S. citizen students are the reference group for this section. Within SPCEET, there were 31 non-U.S. citizen respondents and 301 U.S. citizen student respondents. There was one respondent who did not specify a citizenship status.

OVERVIEW

Table 12 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Underlined items appear as strengths or challenges in two of three comparisons. Bold 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 12: Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET NON-U.S. CITIZEN STUDENTS</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to U.S. Citizen Students</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Top Strengths**                | • Lower percentage selecting “climate was unwelcoming” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)  
Higher agreement that  
• they feel valued by other students in the classroom  
• they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)^63  
• SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare^63 | • Lower percentage selecting “climate was unwelcoming” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)  
Higher agreement that  
• they feel valued by other students in the classroom  
• they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) | Higher agreement that  
• they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates  
• they feel valued by other students in the classroom  
• SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare  
• they feel valued by faculty in the classroom |
| **Top Challenges**               | • Higher percentage selecting “transfer/I never intended to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)” as a reason for seriously considered leaving  
• Lower agreement that they have performed academically as well as anticipated | • Higher percentage selecting “transfer/I never intended to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)” as a reason for seriously considered leaving  
• Lower agreement that they have performed academically as well as anticipated | • Lower agreement that they have performed academically as well as anticipated |

^63 These two items are the same distance from the comparison and therefore have the same rank.
**Section 3.10: SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Students to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups Comparisons**

**Chart 10: Top Strengths, SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Students Compared to All SPCEET 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 SPCEET non-U.S. citizen students who

- selected “climate was unwelcoming” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (0%, n=0) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (15%, n=19),
- agreed or strongly agreed that they feel valued by other students in the classroom (97%, n=30) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (82%, n=283),
- agreed or strongly agreed that they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (87%, n=27) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (77%, n=254), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare (93%, n=28) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (83%, n=281).

See Table 5 of Appendix V for further information.

**Meaningful Strengths**

No items met the criteria for meaningful strengths. See Table 5 of Appendix V for further information.

---

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

the percentage of SPCEET non-U.S. citizen students who

- selected “transfer/I never intended to graduate from KSU” as a reason for considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (70%, n=7) was more than two standard deviations above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (36%, n=46), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that they have performed academically as well as anticipated (48%, n=15) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (58%, n=199).

see table 5 of appendix v for further information.

meaningful challenges

no items met the criteria for meaningful challenges. see table 5 of appendix v for further information.
Section 3.11: SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Students to SPCEET U.S. Citizen Students Comparisons

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

**Strengths**

A higher percentage of SPCEET non-U.S. citizen students agreed or strongly agreed that

- they feel valued by other students in the classroom (97%, n=30) compared to SPCEET U.S. citizen students (84%, n=253), and
- they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (87%, n=27) compared to SPCEET U.S. citizen students (76%, n=227).

In addition,

- a lower percentage of SPCEET non-U.S. citizen students selected “climate was unwelcoming” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (0%, n=0) compared to SPCEET U.S. citizen students (17%, n=18).

See Table 5 of Appendix V for further information.
Chart 11.1: Top Challenges, SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Students Compared to SPCEET U.S. Citizen Students

Challenges

- A higher percentage of SPCEET non-U.S. citizen students selected “transfer/I never intended to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)” as a reason for considering leaving (70%, n=7) compared to SPCEET U.S. citizen students (36%, n=39).
- A lower percentage of SPCEET non-U.S. citizen students agreed or strongly agreed that they have performed academically as well as anticipated (48%, n=15) compared to SPCEET U.S. citizen students (61%, n=184).

See Table 5 of Appendix V for further information.

Section 3.12: SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Students to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET 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.

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%.

---

65 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
66 See Table 5 in Appendix VI for details.
The benchmark comparison for comfortable-uncomfortable items revealed one area of strength. SPCEET non-U.S. citizen students had levels of comfort with the climate in their courses that were above the benchmark (90%, n=28).

Chart 12: SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Students 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 eight areas of strength. The top three are presented here. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET non-U.S. citizen students agreed that

- they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates (100%, n=30),
- they feel valued by other students in the classroom (97%, n=30), and
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare (93%, n=28).

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

- they have staff who they perceive as role models (61%, n=19), and
- they have performed academically as well as anticipated (48%, n=15).

Chart 12.1: SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Students Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greatest Strength</th>
<th>Greatest Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I have opportunities for academic success that are similar to those of my classmates.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I feel valued by other students in the classroom/learning environment.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I think SPSU faculty/instructors are genuinely concerned about my welfare.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I have staff who I perceive as role models.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I have performed academically as well as I anticipated I would.&quot; (% agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

These questions refer to levels of agreement with two 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.”

---

67 See Table 5 of Appendix VI for further information.
The benchmark comparisons for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET non-U.S. citizen students agreed that they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify (47%, n=14).

Chart 12.2: SPCEET Non-U.S. Citizen Students Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Academic Experiences/Perceptions Compared to Benchmark, 4-Point Scale

See Section V for additional findings for SPCEET non-U.S. citizen students based on items specific to citizenship status.
**SPCEET Students, Military Service Status**

SPCEET students with military service are the reference group for this section.\(^{68}\) Within SPCEET, there were 28 student respondents who identified as having military service and 302 student respondents who identified as not having military service. There were three student respondents who did not identify a military service status.

**OVERVIEW**

Table 13 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. Items that appear in more than one comparison should be considered as having been emphasized in terms of their importance.

Table 13: Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET Students with Military Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPCEET STUDENTS WITH MILITARY SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher agreement that they are satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling in SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Higher percentage who selected “consolidation” as the reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{68}\) There were insufficient numbers of graduate students with military service to analyze separately, so undergraduate and graduate students have been combined for this analysis.
Section 3.13: SPCEET Students with Military Service to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 13: Top Strengths, SPCEET Students with Military Service Compared to All SPCEET 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 Strength**

No items met the criteria for significant strengths. See Table 6 of Appendix V for further information.

**Meaningful Strengths**

- A lower percentage of SPCEET students with military service agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (32%, n=9) compared to all SPCEET student identity groups (43%, n=242).
- A higher percentage of SPCEET students with military service agreed or strongly agreed that they are satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling in SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (85%, n=23) compared to all SPCEET student identity groups (75%, n=256).

See Table 6 of Appendix V for further information.

---

69 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
**Chart 13.1: Top Challenge, SPCEET Students with Military Service Compared to All SPCEET 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 SPCEET students with military service who selected “consolidation” as a reason for seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (54%, n=7) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (42%, n=51).

**Meaningful Challenges**

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

**Section 3.14: SPCEET Students with Military Service to SPCEET Students Without Military Service Comparisons**

**Chart 14: Top Strengths, SPCEET Students with Military Service Compared to SPCEET Students Without Military Service**

**Strengths**

- A lower percentage of SPCEET students with military service agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (32%, n=9) compared to SPCEET students without military service (47%, n=142).
- A higher percentage of SPCEET students with military service agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare (82%, n=23) compared to SPCEET students without military service (73%, n=217).

See Table 6 of Appendix V for further information.
Chart 14.1: Top Challenges, SPCEET Students with Military Service Compared to SPCEET Students Without Military Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>SPCEET Students with Military Service</th>
<th>SPCEET Students Without Military Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td>54%, n=7</td>
<td>41%, n=43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever seriously considered leaving SPSU? (%) of &quot;yes&quot; responses</td>
<td>46%, n=13</td>
<td>35%, n=106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenges

A higher percentage of SPCEET students with military service

- selected “consolidation” as a reason for seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (54%, n=7) compared to SPCEET students without military service (41%, n=43), and
- have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (46%, n=13) compared to SPCEET students without military service (35%, n=106).

See Table 6 of Appendix V for further information.

Section 3.15: SPCEET Students with Military Service to Benchmark Comparisons

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

Yes-No Item Types:

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.”

---

70 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
71 See Table 6 in Appendix VI for details.
The benchmark comparison for yes-no item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET students with military service have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (46%, n=13).

Chart 15: SPCEET Students with Military Service “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

![Chart 15: SPCEET Students with Military Service “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark](chart.png)

**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 eight areas of strength. The top six are presented here. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET students with military service agreed that

- they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates (100%, n=26),
- they feel valued by faculty in the classroom (93%, n=26),
- they are satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling in SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (85%, n=23),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) administrators are genuinely concerned for their welfare (82%, n=23),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare (81%, n=22), and
- they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (81%, n=21).

Chart 15.1: SPCEET Students with Military Service 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 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.”

---
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The benchmark comparisons for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET students with military service agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (32%, n=9).

Chart 15.2: SPCEET Students with Military Service Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Academic Experiences/Perceptions Compared to Benchmark, 4-Point Scale
**SPCEET Students, Sexual Identity**

SPCEET LGBQ and graduate students are the reference groups for this section. Within SPCEET, there were 40 student respondents who identified as LGBQ or other sexual identity and 288 student respondents who identified as heterosexual. There were five students who did not identify a sexual identity.

**OVERVIEW**

Table 14 shows the items that were identified as top strengths and challenges. Items in each cell are ranked by greatest differences from the comparison. Underlined items appear as top challenges in two of three comparisons. Bold 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 14: Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET LGBQ Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET LGBQ STUDENTS</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Heterosexual Students</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Strengths</td>
<td>There were no areas of strength with a difference of 10 percentage points or greater for this comparison.</td>
<td>• Lower percentage selecting “transfer/I never intended to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)” as a reason for seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>Higher agreement that • they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates • they feel valued by faculty in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Challenges</td>
<td>• Lower levels of comfort with the climate in their courses • Lower agreement that their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth • Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>• Lower levels of comfort with the climate in their courses • Lower agreement that their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth • Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>• Higher percentage who have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Lower agreement that • they have performed academically as well as anticipated • they have staff who they perceive as role models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant/ Meaningful Strengths

No items met the criteria for significant or meaningful strengths. See Table 7 of Appendix V for further information.

Chart 16: Top Three Challenges, SPCEET LGBQ Students Compared to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups

- Overall, how comfortable are you with the climate in your courses? (% comfortable or very comfortable)
- "My academic experience has had a positive influence on my intellectual growth and interest in ideas." (% agree or strongly agree)
- Have you ever seriously considered leaving SPSU? (% of "yes" responses)

*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 SPCEET LGBQ students who

- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their courses (63%, n=25) was three standard deviations below the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (80%, n=268),
- have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (53%, n=21) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (39%, n=120),
- have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (28%, n=11) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (16%, n=52).

The percentage of SPCEET LGBQ students who agreed or strongly agreed that

- their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth (67%, n=26) was more than two standard deviations below the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (83%, n=272),
- they are considering transferring due to academic reasons (27%, n=9) was more than two standard deviations above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (14%, n=45),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare (70%, n=28) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (83%, n=281),
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (58%, n=23) was two standard deviations below the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (83%, n=230),
- are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (65%, n=26) was two standard deviations below the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (77%, n=254), and

---
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• their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (65%, n=26) was more than one standard deviation below the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (77%, n=256).

See Table 7 of Appendix V for further information.

**Meaningful Challenges**

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

• they feel valued by other students in the classroom (70%, n=28) compared to all SPCEET student identity groups (82%, n=283), and
• they are satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling in SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (64%, n=25) compared to all SPCEET student identity groups (75%, n=256).

See Table 7 of Appendix V for further information.

**Section 3.17: SPCEET LGBQ Students to SPCEET Heterosexual Students Comparisons**

**Chart 17: Strength, SPCEET LGBQ Students Compared to SPCEET Heterosexual Students**

**Strengths**

• A lower percentage of SPCEET LGBQ students selected “transfer/I never intended to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)” as a reason for considering leaving (29%, n=) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (40%, n=40).
Chart 17.1: Top Three Challenges, SPCEET LGBQ Students Compared to SPCEET Heterosexual Students

Challenges

A higher percentage of SPCEET LGBQ students

- were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their courses (63%, n=25) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (84%, n=239),
- have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (53%, n=21) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (34%, n=99),
- agreed or strongly agreed that they are considering transferring due to academic reasons (27%, n=9) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (13%, n=34),
- have personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (28%, n=11) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (14%, n=40),
- have observed exclusionary conduct at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (25%, n=10) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (13%, n=38), and
- agreed or strongly agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (55%, n=22) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (45%, n=130).

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

- they were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their courses (63%, n=25) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (84%, n=239),
- their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth (67%, n=26) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (84%, n=241),
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare (70%, n=28) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (87%, n=248),
- they feel valued by other students in the classroom (70%, n=28) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (87%, n=250),
- they are satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling in SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (64%, n=25) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (80%, n=227),
- they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (65%, n=26) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (79%, n=225),
- they are performing up to their full academic potential (58%, n=23) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (71%, n=202), and
- their interest in ideas and intellectual matters has increased since coming to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (65%, n=26) compared to SPCEET heterosexual students (78%, n=226),

See Table 7 of Appendix V for further information.

Section 3.18: SPCEET LGBQ Students to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET LGBQ 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:

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, SPCEET LGBQ students have seriously considered leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (53%, n=21).

Chart 18: SPCEET LGBQ Students “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

---
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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. SPCEET LGBQ students had levels of comfort below the benchmark with the climate in their courses (63%, n=25).

Chart 18.1: SPCEET LGBQ Students 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 two areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET LGBQ students agreed that

- they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates (90%, n=35), and
- they feel valued by faculty in the classroom (80%, n=32).

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

- they are performing up to their full academic potential (58%, n=23),
- they have performed academically as well as anticipated (53%, n=21), and
- they have staff who they perceive as role models (53%, n=21).

Chart 18.2: SPCEET LGBQ Students Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark

**Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree Item Types (negative statement- 4-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.”

---
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The benchmark comparisons for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed two areas of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET LGBQ students agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (55%, n=2), and
- they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify (48%, n=19).

Chart 18.3: SPCEET LGBQ Students Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Academic Experiences/Perceptions Compared to Benchmark, 4-Point Scale

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 challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET LGBQ students agreed that they are considering transferring due to academic reasons (27%, n=9).

Chart 18.4: SPCEET LGBQ Student Agreement with Negatively Worded Statement about Transfer Compared to Benchmark, 5-Point Scale

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

Responses by religious affiliations of students were compared to the standard deviation of all identity groups. There were 185 student respondents from SPCEET who identified as Christian, 45 who identified as being of other or multiple affiliations, and 99 who identified as having no faith-based affiliation.

Findings for Students of Multiple or Other Faith-Based Affiliations

OVERVIEW

Table 15 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 15: Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET Students of Other Faiths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET STUDENTS OF MULTIPLE OR OTHER FAITH-BASED AFFILIATIONS</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Student 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</td>
<td>• they feel valued by faculty in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as role models</td>
<td>• they have opportunities for academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they have performed</td>
<td>success similar to their classmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>academically as well as</td>
<td>• they feel valued by other students in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anticipated</td>
<td>the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Higher percentage selecting</td>
<td>Higher agreement that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“personal reasons (medical,</td>
<td>SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family emergencies, etc.)” as a</td>
<td>based on perceived background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reason for seriously considering leaving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3.19: SPCEET Students of Multiple or Other Faith-Based Affiliations to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups Comparisons

Chart 19: Top Strengths, SPCEET Students of Other Faith-Based Affiliations Compared to All SPCEET 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 SPCEET students of other faiths who agreed or strongly agreed that

- they have staff who they perceive as role models (73%, n=33) was more than two standard deviations above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (56%, n=187), and
- they have performed academically as well as anticipated (69%, n=31) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (58%, n=199).

See Table 8 of Appendix V for further information.

**Meaningful Strengths**

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

---
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**Chart 19.1: Challenge, SPCEET Students of Other Faith-Based Affiliations Compared to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups**

![Chart showing personal reasons as a challenge]

**Significant Challenges**

The percentage of SPCEET students of other faith-based affiliations who

- selected “personal reasons (medical, family emergencies, etc.)” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (29%, n=5) was more than three standard deviations above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (9%, n=11).

See Table 8 of Appendix V for further information.

**Meaningful Challenges**

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

---

**Section 3.20: SPCEET Students of Multiple or Other Faith-Based Affiliation to Benchmark Comparisons**

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET 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.

**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.”

---

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

79 See Table 8 in Appendix VI for details.
The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed eight areas of strength. The top six are presented here. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET students of other faith-based affiliations agreed that

- they feel valued by faculty in the classroom (93%, n=41),
- they have opportunities for academic success similar to their classmates (91%, n=40),
- they feel valued by other students in the classroom (89%, n=40),
- they have faculty who they perceive as role models (87%, n=39),
- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (87%, n=39), and
- their academic experience has had a positive influence on their intellectual growth (87%, n=39).

Chart 20: SPCEET Students of Other Faith-Based Affiliations Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark, Strengths

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

This question refers to levels of agreement with 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.”

---
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The benchmark comparisons for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET students of other faith-based affiliations agreed that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty pre-judge their abilities based on perceived background (52%, n=23).

Chart 20.1: SPCEET Students of Other Faith-Based Affiliations Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Academic Experiences/Perceptions Compared to Benchmark, 4-Point Scale

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

**OVERVIEW**

Table 16 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 16 Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET Students of No Faith-Based Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET STUDENTS OF NO FAITH-BASED AFFILIATION</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></td>
<td>There were no areas of strength with a difference of 10 percentage points or greater for this comparison.</td>
<td>Lower percentage who have • observed exclusionary conduct at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year • personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year • Higher agreement that SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Higher percentage who selected • “transfer/I never intended to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)” as a reason for considering leaving • “coursework was not challenging enough” as a reason for seriously considering leaving SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)</td>
<td>Lower agreement that • they have staff who they perceive as role models • they are performing up to their full academic potential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3.21: SPCEET Students of No Faith-Based Affiliation to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups Comparisons

Significant/meaningful strengths

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

Chart 21: Top Challenges, SPCEET Students of No Faith-Based Affiliation—Compared to All SPCEET 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 SPCEET students of no faith-based affiliation who selected

- “transfer/I never intended to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus)” as the reason for seriously considered leaving (59%, n=20) was more than one standard deviation above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (36%, n=46), and
- “coursework was not challenging enough” as the reason for seriously considered leaving (21%, n=7) was more than two standard deviations above the mean for all SPCEET student identity groups (10%, n=12).

See Table 9 of Appendix V for further information.

Section 3.22: SPCEET Students of No Faith-Based Affiliation to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET 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.

---
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83 See Table 9 in Appendix VI for details.
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 two areas of strength. At percentages below the benchmark, SPCEET students of no faith-based affiliation have

- observed exclusionary conduct at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (11%, n=11), and
- personally experienced exclusionary behavior at SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) within the past year (12%, n=12).

Chart 22: SPCEET Students of No Faith-Based Affiliations “Yes-No” Responses Compared to Benchmark

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 two areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET students of no faith-based affiliation agreed that

- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty are genuinely concerned for their welfare (87%, n=86), and
- SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) staff are genuinely concerned for their welfare (83%, n=82).

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

- they are performing up to their full academic potential (62%, n=61), and
- they have staff who they perceive as role models (46%, n=32).

**Chart 22.1: SPCEET Students of No Faith-Based Affiliation Academic Experiences/Perceptions Agreement Responses Compared to Benchmark**

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

No items met the criteria for this item type.

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

OVERVIEW

Table 17 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 17: Top Strengths and Challenges for SPCEET Students of Christian Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPCEET STUDENTS OF CHRISTIAN AFFILIATION</th>
<th>Comparison to All SPCEET Identity Groups</th>
<th>Comparison to Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Strengths</strong></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 • many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating • they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) • they are satisfied with their academic experience at SPSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Challenges</strong></td>
<td>There were no areas of challenge with a difference of 10 percentage points or greater for this comparison.</td>
<td>• Higher agreement that they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3.23: SPCEET Students of Christian Affiliation to All SPCEET Student Identity Groups Comparisons

**Significant Strengths**

No items met the criteria for significant strengths.

**Meaningful Strengths**

No items met the criteria for meaningful strengths. See Table 10 of Appendix V for further information.

**Significant Challenges**

No items met the criteria for significant strengths.

**Meaningful Challenges**

No items met the criteria for meaningful strengths. See Table 10 of Appendix V for further information.

---

84 See Appendix I: Methodology for more details and rationale for this method of comparison.
Section 3.24: SPCEET Students of Christian Affiliation to Benchmark Comparisons

The results of benchmark comparisons for SPCEET 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:
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.”

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

See Table 10 in Appendix VI for details.
The benchmark comparison of agree-disagree item types revealed three areas of strength. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET Christian students agreed that

- many of their courses this year have been intellectually stimulating (84%, n=154),
- they intend to graduate from SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (84%, n=153), and
- they are satisfied with the extent of their intellectual development since enrolling in SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) (79%, n=143).

Chart 24: SPCEET 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.”
The benchmark comparisons for negatively worded agree-disagree item types revealed one area of challenge. At percentages above the benchmark, SPCEET students of Christian affiliation agreed that they don’t see enough faculty/staff with whom they identify (48%, n=88).

Chart 24.1: SPCEET Students Christian Affiliation Agreement with Negatively Worded Statements about Academic Experiences/Perceptions Compared to Benchmark, 4-Point Scale

See Section V for additional findings for SPCEET students of Christian affiliation for items specific to religious affiliation.
SECTION IV: 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 SPCEET faculty/staff compared to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) faculty/staff, and SPCEET students compared to SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) students. Keep in mind that a lower numerical rating is more positive than a higher numerical rating.

Findings for Faculty/Staff

Section 4.1: Friendly – Hostile Dimension

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

- All but three SPCEET faculty/staff identity groups have ratings closer to friendly in comparison to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- SPCEET LGBQ faculty/staff, those with disabilities, and those with military service had ratings that were closest to “friendly” in comparison to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
Section 4.2: Cooperative – Uncooperative Dimension

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

- SPCEET LGBQ faculty/staff had ratings that were more than 50% closer to “cooperative” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- There were more SPCEET faculty/staff groups that were further from “cooperative” compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts, than were closer to “cooperative.”
- SPCEET non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff were the furthest from “cooperative” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
Section 4.3: Improving – Regressing Dimension

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

- SPCEET faculty/staff with military service had ratings that were more than 50% closer to “improving” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- SPCEET faculty/staff of no faith-based affiliation and those with disabilities also had ratings much closer to “improving” compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- SPCEET Christian faculty/staff were the furthest from “improving” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
Section 4.4: Welcoming – Not Welcoming Dimension

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

- SPCEET faculty/staff with disabilities had ratings that were more than 30% closer to “welcoming” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- SPCEET faculty/staff of no faith-based affiliation also had ratings much closer to “welcoming” compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- SPCEET faculty/staff groups whose ratings were further from “welcoming” than their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts were those who have not historically been marginalized.
Section 4.5: Respectful – Not Respectful Dimension

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

- SPCEET faculty/staff with disabilities had ratings that were notably closer to “respectful” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- SPCEET male faculty/staff, those without disabilities, and non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff had ratings further from “respectful” compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- For many SPCEET faculty/staff groups, differences between their ratings and those of their counterparts were minor.

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 V – Additional Findings of Interest.
Findings for Students

Section 4.6: Friendly – Hostile Dimension

Chart 6: Comparison of Climate Ratings for “Friendly – Hostile” Dimension by Identity Groups – SPCEET Students vs. All Other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Students

- For most SPCEET student groups, differences between their ratings and those of their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts were minimal.
- SPCEET students of other faith-based affiliations had ratings that were closer “friendly” in comparison to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- SPCEET LGBQ students had ratings that were further from “friendly” in comparison to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
The majority of SPCEET student identity groups had ratings that were slightly further from “cooperative” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.

SPCEET students of other faith-based affiliations had ratings slightly closer to “cooperative” compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.

SPCEET LGBQ students had ratings furthest from “cooperative” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
Section 4.8: Improving – Regressing Dimension

Chart 8: Comparison of Climate Ratings for "Improving – Regressing" Dimension by Identity Groups – SPCEET Students vs. All Other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Students

- The majority of SPCEET student identity groups had ratings that were slightly further from “improving” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- SPCEET students with military service had ratings slightly closer to “improving” compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- SPCEET LGBQ students had ratings furthest from “improving” when compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
Section 4.9: Welcoming – Not Welcoming Dimension

Chart 9: Comparison of Climate Ratings for “Welcoming – Not Welcoming” Dimension by Identity Groups – SPCEET Students vs. All Other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Students

- Most SPCEET student identity groups had minimal differences compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- SPCEET LGBQ students had ratings that were furthest from “welcoming” in comparison to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts, followed by SPCEET liberal students.
Section 4.10: Respectful – Not Respectful Dimension

Chart 10: Comparison of Climate Ratings for “Respectful – Disrespectful” Dimension by Identity Groups – SPCEET Students vs. All Other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) Students

- Most SPCEET student identity groups had minimal differences compared to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.
- SPCEET LGBQ students and those of other faith-based affiliations had ratings that were notably further from “respectful” in comparison to their SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) counterparts.

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 V – Additional Findings of Interest.
SECTION V: ADDITIONAL FINDINGS OF INTEREST

Comparisons of Climate Ratings for Faculty/Staff – Identity Group-Specific Items

This section provides highlights of responses to identity-group specific items from faculty/staff members of those groups, compared to their counterparts.\(^87\) Details of these findings are included in the data tables in Appendix III.

Section 5.1: Gender/Gender Identity

A comparison of the responses of SPCEET female faculty/staff to those of SPCEET male faculty/staff on items relating to gender provided the following findings.

- On a scale of “not sexist – sexist,” SPCEET female faculty/staff ratings were 12% further from “not sexist” than were those of SPCEET male faculty/staff ratings.
- On a scale of “positive for women – negative for women,” SPCEET female faculty/staff ratings were 11% further from “positive for women” than were those of SPCEET male faculty/staff ratings.
- There was higher agreement among female faculty/staff compared to male faculty/staff that the workplace climate at KSU is welcoming regardless of a person’s gender expression,\(^88\) by a difference of 10%.

A comparison of the responses of SPCEET male faculty/staff to those of SPCEET female faculty/staff on items relating to gender provided the following findings.

- On a scale of “positive for men – negative for men,” SPCEET male faculty/staff ratings were 25% closer to “positive for men” than were those of SPCEET female faculty/staff ratings.
- On a scale of “not sexist – sexist,” SPCEET male faculty/staff ratings were 12% closer to “not sexist” than those of SPCEET female faculty/staff ratings.
- There was lower agreement among male faculty/staff compared to female faculty/staff that the workplace climate at KSU is welcoming regardless of a person’s gender expression, by a difference of 10%.

Section 5.2: Race/Ethnicity

A comparison of the responses of SPCEET faculty/staff of color to those of SPCEET white faculty/staff on items relating to race/ethnicity provided the following findings.

- There was higher agreement among faculty/staff of color compared to white faculty/staff that the workplace climate at KSU is welcoming regardless of a person’s ethnicity, by a difference of 31%.
- There was higher agreement among faculty/staff of color compared to white faculty/staff that the workplace climate at KSU is welcoming regardless of a person’s race, by a difference of 26%.
- On a scale of “positive for people of color – negative for people of color,” SPCEET’s faculty/staff of color ratings were 24% further from “positive for people of color” compared to those of SPCEET’s white faculty/staff.

\(^87\) There were no items specific to military service status.
\(^88\) Gender expression was defined as “the manner in which a person outwardly represents gender, regardless of the physical characteristics that might typically define the individual as male or female.”
Section 5.3: Disability Status

A comparison of the responses of SPCEET faculty/staff with disabilities to those of SPCEET faculty/staff without disabilities on items relating to conditions impacting learning/living activities provided findings that were unremarkable. All differences between comparison groups were less than 10%.

Section 5.4: Citizenship Status

A comparison of the responses of SPCEET non-U.S. citizen faculty/staff to those of SPCEET U.S. citizen faculty/staff on items relating to citizenship or nationality provided findings that were unremarkable. All differences between comparison groups were less than 10%.

Section 5.5: Sexual Identity

A comparison of the responses of SPCEET LGBQ faculty/staff to those of SPCEET heterosexual faculty/staff on items relating to sexual identity provided the following finding.

- On a scale of “positive for people who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual – negative for people who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual,” SPCEET’s LGBQ faculty/staff ratings were 18% further from “positive for people who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual” compared to SPCEET’s heterosexual faculty/staff.
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 V.

Section 5.6: Gender/Gender Identity

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

- On a scale of “not sexist – sexist,” SPCEET female student’s ratings were 35% further from “not sexist” than were those of SPCEET male student’s ratings.
- On a scale of “positive for women – negative for women,” SPCEET female student’s ratings were 18% further from “positive for women” than were those of SPCEET male student’s ratings.

Section 5.7: Race/Ethnicity

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

- On a scale of “not racist – racist,” SPCEET’s students of color ratings were 13% further from “not racist” compared to those of SPCEET’s white students.

Section 5.8: Disability Status

A comparison of the responses of SPCEET students with disabilities to those of SPCEET students without disabilities on items relating to conditions impacting learning/living activities provided the following finding.

- On a scale of “disability friendly – not disability friendly,” SPCEET’s students with disabilities’ ratings were 13% further from “disability friendly” than were those of SPCEET students without disabilities.

Section 5.9: Citizenship Status

A comparison of the responses of SPCEET non-U.S. citizen students to those of SPCEET 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 5.10: Sexual Identity

A comparison of the responses of SPCEET LGBQ students to those of SPCEET heterosexual students on items relating to sexual orientation provided the following finding.

- On a scale of “not homophobic - homophobic,” SPCEET’s LGBQ student ratings were 41% further from “not homophobic” compared to SPCEET’s heterosexual students.

There were no items specific to military service status.
On a scale of “positive for people who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual – negative for people who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual,” SPCEET’s LGBQ student ratings were 19% further from “positive for people who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual” compared to SPCEET’s heterosexual students.

Section 5.11: Religious Affiliation

A comparison of the responses of SPCEET students of other or no faith-based affiliations to those of SPCEET Christian students (the majority group) on items relating to religious affiliation provided the following finding.

On a scale of “positive for people of Christian faith – negative for people of Christian faith,” SPCEET Christian student’s ratings were 11% further from “positive for people from Christian faiths” than were those of SPCEET students of no or other faith-based affiliations.
Other Additional Findings for Students

Section 5.12: 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 comparisons were drawn between responses of SPCEET students and those of the entire SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus). This analysis provided the following highlights:

- For SPCEET students, levels of awareness were highest among students in their fourth year (68%, n=19) and lowest among students in their second year (50%, n=32). Levels of awareness of all SPCEET students compared to all other SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) students were virtually the same.
- SPCEET female students had a higher level of awareness than male students, by a difference of 6 percentage points.
- SPCEET students of color had a higher level of awareness than white students, by a difference of 14 percentage points.
- SPCEET non-U.S. citizen students had a higher level of awareness than U.S. citizen students, by a difference of 19 percentage points.
- SPCEET students with military service had a lower level of awareness than students without military service, by a difference of 8 percentage points.

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

Section 5.13: Student Experiences of Unwanted Sexual Contact

The percentage of SPCEET students who reported having experienced unwanted sexual contact (<1%, n<5) was below the percentage for all SPSU (KSU Marietta Campus) student respondents (2%, n=16). These students reported that the contact was initiated by acquaintances, none of whom were faculty or staff. No further identifying information can be provided for these students in order to protect confidentiality.
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