

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **Assessment Plan Overview**

The A&F CDSJ Assessment Plan consisted of five major components: A&F Internal Survey; CDSJ Attitudes and Experiences Survey; Focus Groups; A&F Demographics and other A&F documents. Data from these sources were gathered and analyzed in order to obtain a better understanding of how the issues of community, diversity and social justice are evidenced in Administration and Finance.

### **Assessment Methodology**

This section outlines the data gathering methodology for each component of the assessment plan except for the A&F Internal Survey. It also describes, where relevant, pertinent information related to the data analysis.

#### **1. A&F Internal Survey**

This instrument was developed by Administration and Finance and has been administered to all A&F employees approximately every three years. It was last administered in March of 2000. The A&F survey gave us some limited information about the acceptance of diversity and the occurrence of acts of discrimination. This information was beneficial, however, in helping to direct the gathering of additional information.

#### **2. CDSJ Attitudes and Experiences Survey:**

This instrument was developed collaboratively by representatives from each of the CDSJ Executive Area Teams and a representative from SAREO (Student Assessment Research and Evaluation Office). The survey was designed to provide quantitative information about the climate for various groups in our executive area as well as give us baseline data for future evaluation. A copy of the survey can be found at the end of this section.

The survey was administered over a six month period of time (March to October 2002) by members of the A&F CDSJ team. In order to achieve maximum participation from A&F employees, the survey was administered during face to face meetings with employees. At these meetings, the CDSJ initiative was explained and employees were given the opportunity to complete the survey and sign up to participate in focus groups.

#### **Survey Response:**

**Response Rate:** The survey yielded 785 responses, for an overall response rate of 56.8%. The overall response rate for A&F employees was 56.8%, which is adequate to allow extrapolation from the survey responses to the A&F employee population as a whole. The breakdown of the response rate by division, however, reveals that the majority of divisions have response rates of 60% or better. Auxiliary Services, a division with a significant population, had a noticeably lower response rate, which lowered the response rate for the entire executive area. In this case, the wrong copies of forms were used to administer the survey. They could not be scanned using the optical mark scanner system, and this problem was not discovered until it was too late to correct the problem. Please see the chart on the following page for a breakdown of the response rate within Administration and Finance.

**Respondent Characteristics:** Looking at the characteristics of the survey respondents provides a perspective on the population within Administration and Finance. The chart on the following pages summarizes the personal and employment characteristics of the respondent population.

An important issue to consider when viewing the survey results however, is that there were questions about the number of employees who identified themselves as Native American. The numbers gathered in the survey do not correspond to the demographic information on file and it is believed that some individuals may have marked this category incorrectly, either inadvertently or intentionally. The decision was made to include the responses of these individuals in any aggregate, in the People of Color/White analysis, but to exclude them from the detailed cross race analysis.

**Demographics of the survey respondents – personal characteristics**

**Sex**

Women	307	39.1%
Men	451	57.5%
Transgender	5	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>463</b>	

**Sexual orientation**

Lesbian, gay or bisexual	20	2.9%
Heterosexual	668	97.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>688</b>	

**Age**

24 or under	32	4.2%
25 to 34	72	9.6%
35 to 44	195	25.9%
45 to 54	300	39.8%
55 to 64	148	19.7%
65 or older	6	0.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>753</b>	

**Do you identify as a person with a disability?**

Yes	89	11.7%
No	674	88.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>763</b>	

**Religious affiliation**

Buddhist	12	1.6%
Christian Catholic	363	49.8%
Christian Protestant	169	23.2%
Hindu	4	0.5%
Islamic	6	0.8%
Jewish	5	0.7%
None	105	14.4%
Other	65	8.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>729</b>	

**Race**

African-American or Black	20	2.7%
Asian or Pacific Islander	47	6.3%
Cape Verdean	2	0.3%
Latino/a or Chicano/a or Hispanic	12	1.6%
Middle Eastern or Arab American	3	0.4%
White or Caucasian	624	83.1%
Native American, or North or South American or Alaskan Native	13	1.7%
Other	14	1.9%
Native American and White	11	1.5%
Native American and African-American	4	0.5%
Native American and African-American and White	1	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>751</b>	

**Professional/ employment characteristics****Work area**

Auxiliary Services	178	23.8%
Budget Office, Financial Cost & Analysis	7	0.9%
Bursar's Office	13	1.7%
Campus Planning & Space Management	6	0.8%
Campus Services	58	7.8%
Controller's Office	33	4.4%
Environmental Health & Safety	22	2.9%
Facilities Planning	25	3.3%
Human Resources	42	5.6%
Physical Plant	343	45.9%
Procurement	9	1.1%
Vice Chancellor's Office, Ucard, Administrative Systems	11	1.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>747</b>	

**Employee type**

Graduate employee	22	2.9%
Undergraduate employee	24	3.2%
Classified staff	506	67.4%
Professional staff	175	23.3%
Faculty/ instructor/ librarian	18	2.4%
Executive administrator	6	0.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>751</b>	

**Job classification**

Administrative, managerial	59	8.6%
Professional non-faculty	98	14.3%
Secretarial/ clerical	119	17.4%
Technical	42	6.1%
Skilled crafts	81	11.9%
Service/ maintenance	284	41.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>683</b>	

<b>Full-time or part-time</b>		
Full-time	732	94.9%
Part-time	39	5.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>771</b>	

<b>Length of employment at UMass</b>		
Less than six months	16	2.1%
Six months to one year	30	3.9%
1 to 2 years	53	6.9%
3 to 5 years	119	15.6%
6 to 10 years	113	14.8%
11 to 15 years	108	14.1%
16 to 20 years	136	17.8%
More than 20 years	190	24.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>765</b>	

**Survey Data Analysis:** The surveys were analyzed in a number of ways in order to provide as complete a picture as possible of the climate in A&F. See Appendix 1 for an Item by Item Analysis of the survey and Appendix 2 for an Item by Item Analysis of the survey for your division.

First, items in the survey were grouped together to create scales (composite measures) for A&F. Each scale has a number of questions included within it. An alpha reliability test was applied to the scale to test for “soundness”. The alpha reliability coefficient can range from 0 to 1. The closer the number is to 1, the better the scale hangs together. Scales with several items tend to have higher alphas than scales with just a few items.

Scales were run for all of A&F and also scale scores were created by job classification, work area, race/ethnicity, gender, disability, sexual orientation and years of service. A summary table was created for each scale that lists the mean score for each group, and whether there are significant differences among them. Both the Scale Overview (See Appendix 3) and the Group Comparison of Scale Scores (See Appendix 4) are used to provide an overview of the different experiences that employees have with respect to the issues under examination in the survey.

In addition to the overview information that the scales provided, cross tabulations were done on different demographic groups and the results were compared to see if there were significant differences between or among different groups of employees on the specific questions in the survey. A Chi Square test was administered to assess whether the differences that were indicated are significant or “real” differences or could be explained by chance. Only items with statistically significant differences at at least the .05 level were examined. Therefore, items that are referred to as “statistically significant” are those where we are confident that the differences that were described are meaningful; a confidence level of at least 95%. The only exception is in the analysis of race, where several racial groups were too small to allow analysis using the chi square test. Since some of the racial differences are too important to ignore, they are illustrated despite their statistical status.

The body of the report contains numerous figures which illustrate an analysis of both the overall responses of Administration and Finance employees and responses by specific groups and or

areas. A list of these figures is located on pages 9-12. Once we analyzed the data, we coded the items to determine if the phenomena were contributing to or detracting from the development of a socially just workplace within A&F.

### **3. Focus Groups**

Focus groups were used to help gather qualitative information regarding people's experience within the A&F environment. Issues of diversity; the welcoming and inclusive nature of people's workplace; access to opportunities; how offensive behavior is dealt with and participant's suggestions for improvement formed the basis for the focus group questions. The team conducted 13 focus groups between January and April 2003. Of those focus groups, six were "mixed groups" of employees; and the remainder were from the following identity groups: People of color, Women, People with disabilities, Classified employees (2 groups), Supervisors, and the CDSJ team. Overall, participation in the groups ranged from 2-6 employees.

**Focus Group Data Analysis:** After the focus groups were administered, the audio tapes of those meetings were transcribed. The text from the tapes was then analyzed by the CDSJ team for ideas, phrases or comments that would help us further understand the particular way some of the issues play out in A&F. The focus groups also gave us information about themes and patterns that seem to occur repeatedly, thereby reinforcing, or in some cases contradicting, the survey responses.

### **4. Demographic Profiles**

Data was gathered from the Affirmative Action reports to create a Demographic Profile for each department within A&F. Each demographic profile contains five years worth of information regarding the make up of the employee population within the department. Information is displayed numerically, by percentages and in graph form. This information will enable departments to obtain a more specific picture of the distribution of employees within their department by race, gender and classification. See Appendix 5 for your Departmental Diversity Demographic Report.

### **Use of Multicultural Organizational Development (MCOD) Models for Analysis and Organization.**

Because the goal of this organizational assessment was to measure and to understand how effectively we were or were not meeting the standards of a multicultural organization, the secondary level of the research was to analyze the data gathered in relation to an MCOD model. Two models were used for this analysis. Jackson (2003) was the primary model utilized and the Chesler and Crowfoot (1991) model was utilized to integrate additional important details. Each of these models expands on previous work by the authors and relates specifically to MCOD in a higher education setting.

These models identify specific components of a successful multicultural organization as well as describing behaviors, practices and organizational details which will help to categorize an organization as Monocultural, Transitional, or Multicultural. In the process of our analysis the key question that we posed was "Do the behaviors described by these data contribute to or detract from the development of a multicultural organization?"

The model itself is divided into five simple components, four of which we have utilized to analyze our data and to organize our report: Goals and Values; Work Environment; Personnel Profile; and Management Practices. This is the same model being utilized by each of the executive area teams and in the campus-wide analysis. Given the nature of the work in A&F we chose not to include the fifth section of the model on Curriculum and Technology. Included below are brief descriptions of the four components of the model and the types of data, which can be found in each section of the report.

**Section 1. Goals and Values:** This section explores data that measures the visibility, practice, consistency and integration of CDSJ values into the organization and its' mission and vision. It also includes analysis of demographics of the organization.

**Section 2. Work Environment (In the Jackson model this section is named Psycho-social dynamics):** This section outlines data about the overall climate for CDSJ in A&F and looks closely at differences between majority and minority group responses within the executive area. Analysis is done of both interpersonal and inter-group relationships and dynamics.

**Section 3. Personnel Profile:** This section includes an analysis of human resource policies and practices such as hiring, promotion practices, and rewards to examine both how consistent these practices are with CDSJ efforts and how supportive the implementation of these practices are to CDSJ success.

**Section 4. Management Practices:** This section explores data that relates to leadership and management in the organization and in the executive area and whether or not management and supervision support efforts of CDSJ. This section also includes consideration of environmental challenges that may have an impact on CDSJ efforts.