



Administrative Professionals Employee Climate Survey Results 2018

The 2018 CSU Employee Climate Assessment is a biennial assessment conducted in the fall to assess employee perceptions related to their department/unit, division/college, and CSU. The full assessment comprises three main components: the survey, focus groups, open forums, and open ended results.

This sub report focuses on the results of the survey component of the assessment for administrative professional respondents. Please visit the [2018 Employee Climate Survey website](#) for the complete university report, specialized reports, the focus group report, the open end analysis, links to past results, and presentations.

The 2018 instrument focuses on the following employment themes: culture, sense of belonging, respect, favoritism, accountability, misconduct, bias incidents, feedback on employee councils, Principles of Community usage and awareness, freedom of speech, and CSU and department perceptions. All of these items were asked on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree). Only select findings are covered in this report.

For the purposes of this report “agreement” is defined as a respondent selecting either “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” on the Likert scale. Agreement is generally reported as the proportion or percent of respondents providing the combination of these responses. When a mean (average) score is reported, it is based on this 1 to 5 scale. Generally, with exceptions such as Favoritism, the higher the mean score, the more favorable the rating.

On many of the survey items, respondents could chose a non-evaluative response such as “Don’t know/NA” or “Prefer not to disclose.” These responses, along with missing data, have been excluded from all analyses.

Data are reported only when there is a large enough response pool (number of respondents to a survey item) to ensure respondent anonymity. Any potentially identifying data has been kept confidential and will not be reported.

Contents

Appendix A: Item Percentages.....	2
Appendix B: Employee Characteristics Mean Comparisons	17
Appendix C: Employee Type Comparison to CSU Overall	30

Appendix A: Item Percentages

The following tables display the frequencies for each item asked on the survey for the employee type's respondents only. For items asked on the 1 to 5 point Likert scale, the mean (average) rating is also displayed.

Table A1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
Supports a healthy work/life balance	2.4%	10.0%	9.4%	42.3%	35.9%	1,782	3.99
Understands the value of diversity	1.4%	6.9%	10.5%	40.1%	41.1%	1,758	4.13
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	5.6%	14.0%	12.7%	40.6%	27.1%	1,775	3.70
Treats all employees equitably	7.0%	17.7%	13.9%	37.0%	24.3%	1,750	3.54
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	2.6%	8.5%	16.6%	36.1%	36.2%	1,758	3.95
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	2.4%	7.7%	8.6%	37.7%	43.6%	1,780	4.12
Promotes respect for cultural differences	0.9%	4.0%	15.9%	39.7%	39.6%	1,744	4.13
Is open and transparent in communication	8.1%	16.5%	16.8%	36.4%	22.3%	1,776	3.48
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	8.7%	16.6%	18.6%	32.8%	23.3%	1,757	3.45

Table A2 Culture

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	5.9%	15.5%	22.1%	41.1%	15.4%	1,752	3.44
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	0.9%	4.5%	15.5%	46.7%	32.4%	1,723	4.05
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	2.7%	4.4%	3.2%	40.5%	49.2%	1,648	4.29
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	5.6%	9.2%	12.8%	34.9%	37.6%	1,638	3.90
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	22.1%	36.6%	16.5%	14.0%	10.9%	1,756	2.55
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	7.3%	23.9%	32.9%	25.6%	10.2%	1,750	3.07
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.2%	11.6%	19.7%	38.0%	27.4%	1,789	3.75
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	4.7%	15.3%	21.8%	36.2%	22.0%	1,783	3.56
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	4.1%	8.8%	13.1%	32.8%	41.1%	1,788	3.98

Table A3 Respect

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
My department/office is treated with respect by other departments/offices within my division/college	2.1%	11.6%	18.2%	47.5%	20.6%	1,636	3.73
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	2.1%	6.5%	17.4%	51.7%	22.2%	1,629	3.85
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	1.5%	7.7%	9.8%	50.6%	30.4%	1,792	4.01
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	1.5%	4.1%	21.5%	44.2%	28.6%	1,567	3.94
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	1.2%	2.6%	14.9%	46.8%	34.5%	1,681	4.11
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	6.4%	13.7%	24.9%	38.8%	16.3%	1,622	3.45
I feel valued as an employee	5.1%	10.4%	13.3%	41.9%	29.2%	1,792	3.80

Table A4 Favoritism

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office	12.5%	31.9%	20.2%	21.1%	14.3%	1,666	2.93
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	14.2%	35.3%	22.1%	16.9%	11.5%	1,653	2.76
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	17.2%	40.1%	21.4%	12.8%	8.5%	1,665	2.55
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	14.9%	31.0%	23.5%	16.2%	14.4%	1,608	2.84
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	16.3%	35.4%	25.6%	13.1%	9.7%	1,600	2.64

Table A5 Leadership and Accountability

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	6.7%	14.8%	24.2%	39.3%	15.0%	1,370	3.41
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	6.4%	15.8%	17.5%	42.5%	17.7%	1,540	3.49
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	6.7%	15.7%	27.0%	36.7%	13.9%	1,315	3.36

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	6.7%	15.3%	20.7%	40.5%	16.8%	1,500	3.45
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	8.0%	19.0%	28.3%	34.5%	10.1%	1,317	3.20
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	8.6%	19.8%	18.9%	39.4%	13.3%	1,535	3.29
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.9%	6.3%	16.7%	45.7%	27.4%	1,545	3.86
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.7%	6.4%	11.5%	46.7%	31.7%	1,683	3.96
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	6.0%	13.7%	26.0%	37.1%	17.2%	1,379	3.46
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	5.8%	12.8%	22.7%	39.8%	18.9%	1,522	3.53
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	9.4%	19.2%	23.0%	32.3%	16.1%	1,419	3.27
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	10.6%	19.1%	15.8%	35.7%	18.9%	1,623	3.33

Table A6 Misconduct

Check whether or not the following statements are true based on the type of misconduct. (Select all that apply)	Sexual Harassment	Sexual Misconduct	Bullying	Bias	Physical Assault	Verbal Assault	None	Total (N)
___ is problematic among employees at CSU	6.8%	2.9%	13.1%	28.5%	0.3%	7.2%	66.2%	1,789
___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	2.5%	1.0%	10.8%	23.5%	0.1%	4.9%	71.5%	1,789
___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	1.1%	0.8%	11.5%	21.5%	0.1%	5.9%	72.7%	1,789
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	2.7%	1.1%	16.0%	18.2%	0.6%	10.5%	70.8%	1,789

Table A7 Bias Incidents

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	1.2%	4.3%	13.9%	49.0%	31.5%	1,725	4.05
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	1.3%	9.5%	20.0%	47.0%	22.2%	1,488	3.79
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	4.8%	24.4%	38.1%	24.3%	8.4%	1,491	3.07
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.6%	17.3%	44.7%	24.3%	10.2%	1,117	3.20
CSU handles incidents of bias well	2.6%	8.6%	32.2%	44.4%	12.3%	1,377	3.55

Table A8 Employee Councils

Are you aware there is an employee group/organization that represents the interests of my employee group?(multiple response item)	%	N
Yes	88.4%	1,587
No	11.6%	208
Total	100.0%	1,795

Table A9 Employee Councils

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
I feel my employee council addresses issues and topics that are important and relevant to me	2.8%	11.9%	40.2%	38.2%	6.9%	1,115	3.35
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	1.3%	4.9%	22.6%	48.0%	23.2%	1,262	3.87

Table A10 Principles of Community

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
I am familiar with the Principles of Community.	2.9%	9.9%	4.9%	40.9%	41.3%	1,711	4.08
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	5.9%	20.1%	10.7%	30.2%	33.0%	1,604	3.64
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.8%	15.0%	40.8%	26.4%	14.1%	1,525	3.32
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.1%	12.3%	40.8%	28.4%	15.3%	1,467	3.41

Table A11 Freedom of Speech

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
My division/college supports people speaking freely	4.0%	11.1%	15.4%	50.4%	19.1%	1,684	3.70
Free speech is an important issue on campus	0.5%	1.1%	6.0%	50.3%	42.2%	1,691	4.33
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	1.5%	11.8%	23.9%	48.3%	14.6%	1,614	3.63
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.6%	24.8%	16.2%	39.1%	16.3%	1,623	3.40
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	8.9%	30.5%	27.8%	23.1%	9.8%	1,686	2.94

Table A12 CSU Perceptions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	1.5%	6.8%	14.8%	56.1%	20.7%	1,558	3.88
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	1.6%	5.7%	17.3%	58.3%	17.3%	1,600	3.84
CSU retains diverse employees	2.5%	12.6%	23.5%	46.0%	15.4%	1,392	3.59
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	1.3%	6.2%	18.8%	55.0%	18.6%	1,497	3.83
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	0.7%	3.3%	10.9%	52.7%	32.4%	1,631	4.13
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	1.4%	4.4%	13.0%	57.7%	23.5%	1,680	3.97
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	1.4%	5.5%	23.0%	47.6%	22.5%	1,523	3.84
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	1.0%	2.5%	10.1%	46.6%	39.7%	1,756	4.22

Table A13 Department/Unit Perceptions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
Department/office recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	2.6%	13.1%	17.4%	47.4%	19.5%	1,697	3.68
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.3%	9.5%	20.3%	48.4%	18.4%	1,660	3.69
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.5%	14.0%	26.8%	40.6%	15.1%	1,614	3.50
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	2.6%	8.1%	21.5%	48.1%	19.7%	1,625	3.74
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	2.7%	12.3%	19.2%	39.7%	26.2%	1,679	3.74
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	4.0%	8.9%	13.8%	46.7%	26.5%	1,767	3.83
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.6%	10.3%	25.0%	40.5%	20.5%	1,621	3.64
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	4.3%	7.6%	14.2%	37.0%	36.9%	1,772	3.95

Table A14 Discriminatory Attitudes

Discriminatory attitudes are present in your department/office based on:	%	N
No intolerant attitudes are present	36.4%	550
Job title	30.4%	459
Employment classification	26.6%	402
Political affiliation	22.4%	339
Age	20.2%	305
Gender	17.8%	269
Appearance	9.5%	143
Parental status	8.9%	134
Race or color	6.9%	105
Religion	6.9%	104
Gender identity and expression	6.2%	94
Ethnic origin	5.7%	86
Socioeconomic status	5.3%	80
Disability (e.g. physical, mental)	5.1%	77
Marital status	4.1%	62
Sexual orientation	3.8%	57
Nationality/Country of origin	3.0%	45
Education/professional background	1.5%	23
Veteran status	1.1%	16
Other	0.9%	13
Employment duration	0.5%	7
Nepotism/favoritism	0.5%	7
Differing opinions/work styles/personalities	0.4%	6
General bias	0.3%	5
Reverse discrimination	0.1%	2
Bullying	0.1%	1

Table A15 Work-related Stressors

Please select your top THREE work-related stressors	%	N
Lower salary	42.9%	739
Workload	34.6%	597
Lack of growth/promotion	30.5%	526
Work/life balance	28.8%	496
Office/department climate	21.5%	370
Email overload	18.7%	323
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	15.3%	263
Affordable housing near work	13.3%	229
Job security	13.2%	227
Interpersonal conflict	11.9%	205
Duties outside my job responsibilities/Taking on additional work	11.1%	191
Ill-defined job	7.6%	131
Lack of work flexibility	5.6%	96
Physical environment	4.8%	83
Health issues	4.3%	74
Misconduct occurring at work/Inequities/Bias	4.1%	70
Lack of work autonomy	3.4%	59
Lack of training/skills to do my work	3.4%	58
Other	2.0%	35
Administration/Leadership	1.2%	20
Physical safety	1.0%	18

Parking and Transportation	1.0%	17
Bureaucracy	0.6%	11
Communication	0.5%	8
Health Insurance/Benefits	0.5%	8
General Climate	0.3%	6
Feeling Undervalued	0.2%	4
Dependent Care	0.2%	3

Table A16 Use of Child and/or Adult Care Services

Have you utilized child or adult care services this past year?	%	N
Yes	15.5%	278
No	84.5%	1,517
Total	100.0%	1,795

Table A17 Child and/or Adult Care-related Challenges

Please indicate what child care and/or adult care-related challenges, if any, you have encountered this past year	%	N
Cost of care services	79.5%	221
Scheduling care to match work schedule	42.4%	118
Finding child care services	32.7%	91
Transportation to/from care services	28.4%	79
Finding summer care services	28.1%	78
Finding care for a sick child/adult	26.3%	73
Quality of care services	16.5%	46
Location of care services	16.5%	46
Dependability of care services	13.3%	37
Finding temporary care services	12.6%	35
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	6.1%	17
Finding adult care services	4.0%	11
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	3.6%	10
Other	1.1%	3

Note: only asked of those who used child and/or adult care services.

Table A18 Gender

	%	N
Women	63.3%	1,090
Men	35.2%	606
T/NB/GNC	1.5%	26

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose. T/NB/GNC = Transgender, non-binary, gender non-conforming.

Table A19 Minoritized Race/Ethnicity

	%	N
Non-minoritized	85.9%	1,437
Minoritized	14.1%	236

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose.

Appendix B: Employee Characteristics Mean Comparisons

The following tables show the mean comparison scores by employee characteristics. Mean scores for CSU overall and the employee type are also provided.

Table B1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Supports a healthy work/life balance	3.86 ¹	4008	3.99 ¹	1782	4.09 _a	601	3.94 _b	1079	4.00 _a	1424	4.03 _a	234
Understands the value of diversity	4.06 ¹	3956	4.13 ¹	1758	4.21 _a	589	4.09 _b	1070	4.15 _a	1404	4.06 _a	232
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.62 ¹	3994	3.70 ¹	1775	3.86 _a	596	3.63 _b	1077	3.70 _a	1414	3.79 _a	234
Treats all employees equitably	3.46 ¹	3946	3.54 ¹	1750	3.75 _a	592	3.45 _b	1059	3.55 _a	1396	3.62 _a	229
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.87 ¹	3950	3.95 ¹	1758	4.05 _a	588	3.92 _b	1071	3.96 _a	1402	3.94 _a	232
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.99 ¹	3999	4.12 ¹	1780	4.21 _a	599	4.10 _b	1079	4.14 _a	1420	4.19 _a	235
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.04 ¹	3934	4.13 ¹	1744	4.20 _a	585	4.11 _b	1060	4.16 _a	1391	4.06 _a	231
Is open and transparent in communication	3.44 ¹	4009	3.48 ¹	1776	3.61 _a	599	3.45 _b	1075	3.48 _a	1419	3.66 _b	232
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	3.46 ¹	3952	3.45 ¹	1757	3.57 _a	589	3.43 _b	1065	3.46 _a	1396	3.63 _b	234

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B2 Division/College Culture

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	3.39 ¹	3931	3.44 ¹	1752	3.61 _a	586	3.37 _b	1064	3.46 _a	1396	3.51 _a	230
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.97 ¹	3872	4.05 ¹	1723	4.16 _a	577	4.01 _b	1045	4.08 _a	1367	3.98 _a	231
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	4.32 ¹	3691	4.29 ¹	1648	4.30 _a	563	4.28 _a	984	4.28 _a	1323	4.40 _a	204
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.90 ¹	3687	3.90 ¹	1638	3.97 _a	562	3.88 _a	975	3.90 _a	1312	4.02 _a	204
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	2.66 ¹	3925	2.55 ¹	1756	2.42 _a	591	2.57 _b	1061	2.52 _a	1400	2.50 _a	230
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	3.10 ¹	3910	3.07 ¹	1750	3.01 _a	591	3.07 _a	1057	3.05 _a	1397	3.11 _a	228
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.65 ¹	4012	3.75 ¹	1789	3.69 _a	599	3.81 _b	1086	3.77 _a	1428	3.76 _a	234
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.49 ¹	4003	3.56 ¹	1783	3.64 _a	596	3.54 _a	1083	3.57 _a	1422	3.64 _a	234
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.88 ¹	4007	3.98 ¹	1788	4.09 _a	600	3.95 _b	1085	4.00 _a	1425	4.00 _a	236

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B3 Respect

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My department/office is treated with respect by other departments/offices within my division/college	3.64 ¹	3673	3.73 ¹	1636	3.81 _a	542	3.70 _b	999	3.75 _a	1307	3.77 _a	213
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.69 ¹	3656	3.85 ¹	1629	3.85 _a	544	3.87 _a	995	3.88 _a	1299	3.86 _a	218
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	3.95 ¹	3999	4.01 ¹	1792	4.14 _a	603	3.95 _b	1085	4.02 _a	1430	4.06 _a	235
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.91 ¹	3459	3.94 ¹	1567	3.97 _a	528	3.95 _a	951	3.96 _a	1242	3.95 _a	215
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	4.06 ¹	3723	4.11 ¹	1681	4.12 _a	565	4.09 _a	1025	4.11 _a	1339	4.08 _a	226
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.47 ¹	3600	3.45 ¹	1622	3.45 _a	548	3.48 _a	986	3.48 _a	1283	3.44 _a	224
I feel valued as an employee	3.68 ¹	3991	3.80 ¹	1792	3.90 _a	603	3.78 _b	1085	3.83 _a	1430	3.82 _a	235

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B4 Favoritism

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office	3.00 ¹	3711	2.93 ¹	1666	2.75 _a	560	2.99 _b	1009	2.91 _a	1323	2.82 _a	221
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	2.85 ¹	3670	2.76 ¹	1653	2.62 _a	555	2.81 _b	1001	2.74 _a	1309	2.67 _a	225
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	2.64 ¹	3665	2.55 ¹	1665	2.44 _a	560	2.58 _b	1007	2.52 _a	1318	2.53 _a	227
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	2.88 ¹	3606	2.84 ¹	1608	2.67 _a	541	2.89 _b	975	2.82 _a	1278	2.74 _a	215
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	2.73 ¹	3568	2.64 ¹	1600	2.52 _a	543	2.67 _b	967	2.62 _a	1274	2.57 _a	215

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B5 Leadership and Accountability

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.35 ¹	2953	3.41 ¹	1370	3.62 _a	478	3.30 _b	810	3.43 _a	1076	3.34 _a	192
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.45 ¹	3343	3.49 ¹	1540	3.73 _a	522	3.40 _b	933	3.51 _a	1227	3.57 _a	203
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.30 ¹	2849	3.36 ¹	1315	3.56 _a	459	3.25 _b	776	3.39 _a	1033	3.27 _a	183
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.41 ¹	3241	3.45 ¹	1500	3.68 _a	510	3.36 _b	903	3.48 _a	1190	3.46 _a	201
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.13 ¹	2894	3.20 ¹	1317	3.34 _a	456	3.13 _b	775	3.21 _a	1036	3.17 _a	180
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.25 ¹	3365	3.29 ¹	1535	3.41 _a	523	3.26 _b	920	3.31 _a	1213	3.31 _a	206
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.78 ¹	3369	3.86 ¹	1545	4.01 _a	517	3.81 _b	934	3.88 _a	1225	3.87 _a	207
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.89 ¹	3705	3.96 ¹	1683	4.04 _a	568	3.95 _a	1020	3.99 _a	1345	3.98 _a	217
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.37 ¹	3033	3.46 ¹	1379	3.66 _a	476	3.37 _b	817	3.50 _a	1095	3.37 _a	182
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.47 ¹	3351	3.53 ¹	1522	3.68 _a	514	3.49 _b	919	3.55 _a	1206	3.59 _a	203
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.20 ¹	3130	3.27 ¹	1419	3.45 _a	489	3.19 _b	843	3.28 _a	1116	3.33 _a	199
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.25 ¹	3599	3.33 ¹	1623	3.50 _a	551	3.27 _b	978	3.35 _a	1283	3.46 _a	221

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B6 Misconduct Among Employees at CSU

___ is problematic among employees at CSU	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	247	6.8%	121	5.8%	35	7.3%	79	6.2%	89	11.1%	26
Sexual Misconduct	3.0%	117	2.9%	52	*	*	4.0%	43	2.9%	41	4.3%	10
Bullying	13.3%	519	13.1%	235	8.2%	49	15.7%	170	11.9%	170	18.7%	44
Bias	28.3%	1104	28.5%	509	21.2%	127	31.9%	346	26.2%	375	40.4%	95
Physical Assault	0.6%	23	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.2%	282	7.2%	129	4.5%	27	8.6%	93	6.7%	96	8.9%	21
None	65.7%	2566	66.2%	1185	75.0%	450	61.8%	671	68.5%	979	54.5%	128

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with n ≥ 10.

Table B7 Misconduct Among Division/College

___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.8%	109	2.5%	44	2.0%	12	2.8%	30	2.4%	35	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.3%	52	1.0%	17	*	*	1.4%	15	1.0%	15	*	*
Bullying	10.3%	404	10.8%	194	6.7%	40	12.5%	136	10.1%	144	14.0%	33
Bias	24.1%	940	23.5%	421	17.8%	107	26.0%	282	22.3%	318	28.1%	66
Physical Assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	5.1%	199	4.9%	87	3.5%	21	5.6%	61	4.6%	66	5.1%	12
None	70.8%	2765	71.5%	1280	78.7%	472	68.2%	741	73.0%	1043	66.8%	157

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with n ≥ 10.

Table B8 Misconduct Among Department/Office

___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	1.9%	73	1.1%	20	*	*	0.9%	10	1.3%	18	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.1%	42	0.8%	15	*	*	0.9%	10	0.8%	12	*	*
Bullying	12.4%	486	11.5%	206	7.0%	42	13.7%	149	10.9%	156	14.5%	34
Bias	23.3%	911	21.5%	384	15.2%	91	24.2%	263	20.6%	295	23.4%	55
Physical Assault	0.3%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.0%	272	5.9%	106	3.5%	21	6.7%	73	5.5%	79	7.7%	18
None	69.9%	2731	72.7%	1301	81.0%	486	68.8%	747	73.3%	1048	70.6%	166

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with n ≥ 10.

Table B9 Avoidance due to Misconduct

There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.5%	99	2.7%	49	*	*	3.7%	40	2.0%	29	6.8%	16
Sexual Misconduct	1.0%	41	1.1%	19	*	*	1.7%	18	0.9%	13	*	*
Bullying	16.7%	651	16.0%	286	8.8%	53	19.1%	207	15.0%	214	19.1%	45
Bias	20.0%	781	18.2%	325	14.5%	87	19.3%	210	16.2%	232	26.0%	61
Physical Assault	0.9%	37	0.6%	11	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	11.0%	428	10.5%	187	7.2%	43	11.6%	126	10.3%	147	11.1%	26
None	68.7%	2682	70.8%	1267	79.2%	475	67.5%	733	72.4%	1034	65.5%	154

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with n ≥ 10.

Table B10 Bias Incidents

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	4.00 ¹	3726	4.05 ¹	1725	3.95 _a	579	4.13 _b	1051	4.03 _a	1380	4.28 _b	225
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.64 ¹	3199	3.79 ¹	1488	3.80 _a	477	3.81 _a	923	3.81 _a	1187	3.71 _a	199
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.10 ¹	3174	3.07 ¹	1491	2.85 _a	488	3.20 _b	915	3.07 _a	1195	3.13 _a	191
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.21 ¹	2397	3.20 ¹	1117	3.02 _a	363	3.29 _b	684	3.18 _a	885	3.39 _b	154
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.44 ¹	2962	3.55 ¹	1377	3.57 _a	446	3.57 _a	847	3.59 _a	1091	3.33 _b	186

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B11 Employee Councils

Are you aware there is an employee group/organization that represents my employee group's interests (i.e., Administrative Professional Council, Classified Personnel Council, Faculty Council).	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	83.9% ¹	3260	88.4% ¹	1587	89.2% _a	538	88.1% _a	959	90.1% _a	1290	77.5% _b	183
No	16.1% ¹	627	11.6% ¹	208	10.8% _a	65	11.9% _a	129	9.9% _a	142	22.5% _b	53

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B12 Employee Councils

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I feel my employee council addresses issues and topics that are important and relevant to me	3.35 ¹	2437	3.35 ¹	1115	3.31 _a	388	3.40 _a	660	3.38 _a	907	3.23 _a	127
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.87 ¹	2700	3.87 ¹	1262	3.83 _a	429	3.92 _a	763	3.90 _a	1034	3.75 _a	138

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B13 Principles of Community

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I am familiar with the Principles of Community.	3.91 ¹	3644	4.08 ¹	1711	3.98 _a	574	4.14 _b	1038	4.07 _a	1359	4.10 _a	229
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.52 ¹	3366	3.64 ¹	1604	3.60 _a	543	3.68 _a	970	3.61 _a	1275	3.81 _b	212
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.20 ¹	3209	3.32 ¹	1525	3.39 _a	504	3.31 _a	937	3.31 _a	1207	3.45 _a	206
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.26 ¹	3082	3.41 ¹	1467	3.46 _a	486	3.41 _a	898	3.40 _a	1158	3.51 _a	199

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B14 Freedom of Speech

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My division/college supports people speaking freely	3.64 ¹	3629	3.70 ¹	1684	3.83 _a	570	3.65 _b	1015	3.74 _a	1338	3.64 _a	225
Free speech is an important issue on campus	4.28 ¹	3697	4.33 ¹	1691	4.35 _a	562	4.31 _a	1032	4.33 _a	1353	4.28 _a	218
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	3.59 ¹	3525	3.63 ¹	1614	3.79 _a	548	3.53 _b	971	3.63 _a	1284	3.54 _a	211
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.30 ¹	3473	3.40 ¹	1623	3.41 _a	551	3.40 _a	979	3.40 _a	1297	3.40 _a	210
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.97 ¹	3648	2.94 ¹	1686	2.89 _a	571	2.96 _a	1021	2.88 _a	1350	3.20 _b	218

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B15 CSU Perceptions

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	3.84 ¹	3315	3.88 ¹	1558	3.94 _a	524	3.85 _a	941	3.95 _a	1237	3.52 _b	211
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.72 ¹	3408	3.84 ¹	1600	3.91 _a	529	3.81 _b	983	3.86 _a	1279	3.77 _a	209
CSU retains diverse employees	3.60 ¹	2992	3.59 ¹	1392	3.77 _a	480	3.50 _b	825	3.67 _a	1100	3.22 _b	194
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.77 ¹	3194	3.83 ¹	1497	3.95 _a	511	3.78 _b	892	3.89 _a	1173	3.60 _b	211
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.02 ¹	3472	4.13 ¹	1631	4.09 _a	547	4.16 _a	989	4.16 _a	1301	4.00 _b	213
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	3.84 ¹	3541	3.97 ¹	1680	4.07 _a	566	3.95 _b	1018	4.00 _a	1347	3.95 _a	218
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.76 ¹	3183	3.84 ¹	1523	3.89 _a	509	3.84 _a	918	3.88 _a	1207	3.75 _a	205
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.08 ¹	3708	4.22 ¹	1756	4.27 _a	586	4.21 _a	1069	4.26 _a	1406	4.05 _b	227

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B16 Department/Unit Perceptions

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Department/office recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	3.67 ¹	3603	3.68 ¹	1697	3.80 _a	574	3.62 _b	1024	3.69 _a	1350	3.62 _a	227
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.61 ¹	3548	3.69 ¹	1660	3.80 _a	557	3.66 _b	1015	3.71 _a	1323	3.74 _a	220
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.50 ¹	3414	3.50 ¹	1614	3.67 _a	557	3.41 _b	964	3.51 _a	1278	3.46 _a	223
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.68 ¹	3458	3.74 ¹	1625	3.89 _a	563	3.68 _b	966	3.76 _a	1283	3.70 _a	223
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.66 ¹	3561	3.74 ¹	1679	3.83 _a	569	3.72 _a	1016	3.76 _a	1339	3.77 _a	221
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.71 ¹	3739	3.83 ¹	1767	3.97 _a	597	3.80 _b	1069	3.86 _a	1414	3.85 _a	231
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.59 ¹	3380	3.64 ¹	1621	3.76 _a	549	3.61 _b	974	3.67 _a	1285	3.66 _a	218
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.86 ¹	3735	3.95 ¹	1772	4.09 _a	599	3.92 _b	1072	3.99 _a	1416	3.89 _a	231

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B17 Use of Child and/or Adult Care Services

Have you utilized child or adult care services this past year?	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	14.1% ¹	533	15.5% ¹	278	12.9% _a	78	17.5% _b	190	16.3% _a	233	12.3% _a	29
No	85.9% ¹	3247	84.5% ¹	1517	87.1% _a	525	82.5% _b	898	83.7% _a	1200	87.7% _a	207

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B18 Child and/or Adult Care-related Challenges

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Cost of care services	72.3%	391	79.5%	221	74.7%	59	81.5%	154	78.5%	183	86.2%	25
Finding child care services	31.8%	172	32.7%	91	30.4%	24	33.3%	63	31.3%	73	34.5%	10
Finding adult care services	5.5%	30	4.0%	11	*	*	*	*	4.3%	10	*	*
Finding temporary care services	12.0%	65	12.6%	35	15.2%	12	11.1%	21	12.0%	28	*	*
Finding care for a sick child/adult	28.7%	155	26.3%	73	17.7%	14	30.2%	57	26.2%	61	*	*
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	3.5%	19	3.6%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Other	2.2%	12	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Transportation to/from care services	29.2%	158	28.4%	79	26.6%	21	29.6%	56	27.5%	64	*	*
Dependability of care services	15.0%	81	13.3%	37	*	*	15.3%	29	12.0%	28	*	*
Quality of care services	17.2%	93	16.5%	46	16.5%	13	17.5%	33	18.0%	42	*	*
Scheduling care to match work schedule	40.1%	217	42.4%	118	35.4%	28	43.4%	82	42.1%	98	34.5%	10
Finding summer care services	27.9%	151	28.1%	78	16.5%	13	32.3%	61	28.8%	67	*	*
Location of care services	15.5%	84	16.5%	46	*	*	19.6%	37	17.2%	40	*	*
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	10.2%	55	6.1%	17	*	*	*	*	6.9%	16	*	*

Note: only asked of those who used child and/or adult care services; multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with n ≥ 10.

Table B19 Factors

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		Admin Pro		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
CSU Perceptions	3.82 ¹	2524	3.91 ¹	1191	4.00 _a	421	3.88 _b	694	3.96 _a	928	3.74 _b	171
Department/Unit Perceptions	3.66 ¹	2869	3.73 ¹	1363	3.85 _a	480	3.68 _b	805	3.76 _a	1066	3.69 _a	192
Department/Unit Leadership	3.42 ¹	2859	3.49 ¹	1327	3.66 _a	463	3.43 _b	789	3.52 _a	1052	3.53 _a	178
College/Division Leadership	3.31 ¹	2472	3.39 ¹	1140	3.61 _a	404	3.28 _b	667	3.41 _a	901	3.37 _a	155
Favoritism	2.80 ¹	3417	2.72 ¹	1541	2.56 _a	523	2.76 _b	933	2.69 _a	1226	2.66 _a	207
Sense of Belonging	3.67 ¹	3978	3.76 ¹	1774	3.81 _a	593	3.76 _a	1078	3.78 _a	1413	3.80 _a	234
Department/Unit Culture	3.52 ¹	3807	3.58 ¹	1711	3.74 _a	581	3.54 _b	1032	3.59 _a	1365	3.71 _a	223
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	4.00 ¹	3753	4.07 ¹	1677	4.16 _a	559	4.04 _b	1022	4.10 _a	1331	4.01 _a	228

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p < .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Appendix C: Employee Type Comparisons to CSU Overall

The following tables display the employee type's (Administrative Professional respondents) mean score compared to CSU overall. Results for administrative professional respondents are noted as being "higher," "similar," or "lower" than the CSU average, meaning that the Employee Type's score for the item is either statistically similar to or different than (higher or lower)¹ the university's score.

Table C1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Supports a healthy work/life balance	Higher	3.99	3.87	.12	78.2%	73.0%	5.1
Understands the value of diversity	Higher	4.13	4.07	.06	81.2%	79.3%	1.9
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Higher	3.70	3.63	.07	67.7%	65.4%	2.3
Treats all employees equitably	Higher	3.54	3.47	.07	61.3%	58.9%	2.5
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Higher	3.95	3.88	.07	72.3%	70.4%	1.9
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Higher	4.12	4.00	.12	81.3%	77.6%	3.7
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Higher	4.13	4.05	.08	79.3%	76.7%	2.6
Is open and transparent in communication	Similar	3.48	3.45	.04	58.7%	57.6%	1.1
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Similar	3.45	3.47	-.01	56.1%	57.8%	-1.7

¹ Based a 95% confidence interval where the margin of error for any given item is calculated as $1.96 \times (\sigma \div \sqrt{n})$.

Table C2 Culture

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	Higher	3.44	3.38	.06	56.4%	54.2%	2.3
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	Higher	4.05	3.98	.07	79.0%	76.4%	2.6
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	Lower	4.29	4.35	-.06	89.7%	92.6%	-2.9
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	Similar	3.90	3.91	-.01	72.5%	73.5%	-1.1
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Lower	2.55	2.63	-.08	24.8%	27.3%	-2.5
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Similar	3.07	3.08	-.01	35.8%	36.2%	-.4
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	Higher	3.75	3.66	.08	65.4%	63.0%	2.4
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	Higher	3.56	3.50	.05	58.2%	56.3%	1.9
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	Higher	3.98	3.90	.08	73.9%	72.2%	1.8

Table C3 Respect

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My department/office is treated with respect by other departments/offices within my division/college	Higher	3.73	3.63	.10	68.1%	64.2%	3.9
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	Higher	3.85	3.70	.16	73.9%	67.4%	6.5
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	Higher	4.01	3.96	.04	81.0%	79.3%	1.7
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	Similar	3.94	3.91	.03	72.8%	71.2%	1.6
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	Higher	4.11	4.06	.04	81.3%	79.1%	2.2
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	Similar	3.45	3.47	-.02	55.1%	55.2%	-.1
I feel valued as an employee	Higher	3.80	3.69	.10	71.1%	67.5%	3.6

Table C4 Favoritism

	Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office Similar	2.93	2.98	-.06	35.4%	37.8%	-2.4
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office Lower	2.76	2.83	-.07	28.4%	30.8%	-2.4
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities Lower	2.55	2.62	-.07	21.3%	23.2%	-2.0
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office Similar	2.84	2.86	-.02	30.6%	31.9%	-1.3
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office Lower	2.64	2.71	-.06	22.8%	25.2%	-2.5

Table C5 Leadership and Accountability

	Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior Similar	3.41	3.35	.06	54.3%	52.0%	2.3
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior Similar	3.49	3.45	.04	60.2%	58.8%	1.4
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior Similar	3.36	3.30	.06	50.6%	48.3%	2.4

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.45	3.42	.04	57.3%	55.9%	1.3
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Higher	3.20	3.13	.07	44.6%	41.6%	3.1
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.29	3.25	.04	52.7%	50.8%	1.9
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Higher	3.86	3.79	.07	73.1%	70.2%	2.9
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Higher	3.96	3.91	.05	78.4%	76.0%	2.4
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Higher	3.46	3.38	.08	54.3%	50.8%	3.5
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Similar	3.53	3.48	.05	58.7%	56.5%	2.2
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Higher	3.27	3.20	.06	48.4%	45.9%	2.5
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Higher	3.33	3.26	.07	54.5%	51.8%	2.7

Table C6 Bias Incidents

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	Higher	4.05	4.01	.04	80.5%	78.1%	2.4
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Higher	3.79	3.66	.13	69.2%	62.6%	6.5
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Similar	3.07	3.10	-.03	32.7%	32.6%	.2
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Similar	3.20	3.20	.00	34.5%	33.9%	.6
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Higher	3.55	3.45	.10	56.6%	51.8%	4.8

Table C7 Employee Councils

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I feel my employee council addresses issues and topics that are important and relevant to me	Similar	3.35	3.34	.00	45.1%	46.8%	-1.7
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	Similar	3.87	3.88	-.01	71.2%	71.4%	-.2

Note: This question was only asked to those who answered they were aware of employee councils.

Table C8 Principles of Community

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I am familiar with the Principles of Community	Higher	4.08	3.95	.13	82.2%	78.4%	3.8
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment	Higher	3.64	3.54	.10	63.2%	59.1%	4.1
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	Higher	3.32	3.21	.11	40.5%	36.6%	3.8
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	Higher	3.41	3.28	.12	43.8%	39.3%	4.5

Table C9 Freedom of Speech

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college supports people speaking freely	Similar	3.70	3.65	.05	69.5%	67.3%	2.1
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Higher	4.33	4.29	.03	92.5%	90.1%	2.4
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Similar	3.63	3.59	.03	62.8%	60.2%	2.6
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Higher	3.40	3.30	.09	55.4%	50.7%	4.7
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Similar	2.94	2.96	-.02	32.9%	33.1%	-.2

Table C10 CSU Perceptions

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	Similar	3.88	3.85	.02	76.8%	75.2%	1.6
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Higher	3.84	3.73	.11	75.5%	70.0%	5.5
CSU retains diverse employees	Similar	3.59	3.59	.00	61.4%	61.0%	.4
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Higher	3.83	3.77	.06	73.6%	70.0%	3.6
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Higher	4.13	4.03	.10	85.0%	80.1%	4.9
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Higher	3.97	3.85	.13	81.2%	74.6%	6.6
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Higher	3.84	3.77	.07	70.1%	67.0%	3.0
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Higher	4.22	4.10	.12	86.3%	81.7%	4.6

Table C11 Department/Unit Perceptions

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Department/office recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	Similar	3.68	3.68	.00	66.9%	66.7%	.3
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	Higher	3.69	3.63	.06	66.9%	64.3%	2.5
Department/office retains diverse employees	Similar	3.50	3.51	-.01	55.7%	57.0%	-1.3
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Higher	3.74	3.68	.06	67.8%	65.6%	2.2
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	Higher	3.74	3.66	.09	65.9%	62.0%	3.9
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	Higher	3.83	3.73	.10	73.3%	69.5%	3.8
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.64	3.61	.03	61.1%	59.9%	1.2
Would recommend department/office as a place of employment	Higher	3.95	3.87	.07	73.9%	72.1%	1.8

Table C12 Factors

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Higher	3.91	3.83	.09
Department/Unit Perceptions	Higher	3.73	3.67	.06
Department/Unit Leadership	Higher	3.49	3.44	.06
College/Division Leadership	Higher	3.39	3.32	.07
Favoritism	Lower	2.72	2.78	-.06
Sense of Belonging	Higher	3.76	3.69	.07
Department/Unit Culture	Higher	3.58	3.53	.05
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Higher	4.07	4.01	.07