1

CEMML 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 CEMML. 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, a respondent's division refers to CEMML and "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	16
Appendix C: Division Comparisons to CSU Overall	29

Appendix A: Item Percentages

The following tables display the frequencies for each item asked on the survey for the division'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

	Channel Discourse	D!	Neither Agree nor	•	Channel Assess	Total	
My department or office	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N)	Avg)
Supports a healthy work/life balance	2.5%	4.9%	8.9%	48.3%	35.5%	203	4.09
Understands the value of diversity	2.1%	5.7%	15.6%	47.9%	28.6%	192	3.95
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	7.9%	14.8%	13.8%	38.4%	25.1%	203	3.58
Treats all employees equitably	6.6%	14.7%	12.7%	43.1%	22.8%	197	3.61
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.0%	9.6%	26.8%	36.9%	23.7%	198	3.69
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.4%	11.6%	7.7%	44.9%	32.4%	207	3.91
Promotes respect for cultural differences	2.6%	3.1%	19.4%	42.9%	32.1%	196	3.99
Is open and transparent in communication	11.5%	17.7%	15.8%	33.0%	22.0%	209	3.36
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	11.9%	18.3%	17.3%	33.7%	18.8%	202	3.29

Table A2 Culture

		Neither Agree nor		Tota			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N A	Avg)
My division/college is open and	6.7%	16.3%	19.2%	39.4%	18.3%	208	3.46
transparent in communication							
My division/college promotes	2.1%	3.1%	18.3%	51.3%	25.1%	191	3.94
respect for cultural differences							
I had a performance review of my							
progress as an employee in the last	3.2%	2.7%	4.9%	45.4%	43.8%	185	4.24
year							
I was satisfied with the effort my							
supervisor puts into my	6.0%	4.9%	12.0%	36.6%	40.4%	183	4.01
performance reviews							
I fear negative job consequences if							
I were to raise an issue of unfair	24.5%	35.8%	23.5%	10.3%	5.9%	204	2.37
treatment							
I would be able to do my job more							
effectively if I received more	9.8%	19.0%	31.2%	23.9%	16.1%	205	3.18
information from my	3.670	15.070	31.270	23.370	10.170	203	3.10
department/office							
I feel a strong sense of belonging	7.2%	15.9%	27.9%	39.9%	9.1%	208	3.28
to CSU	7.270	13.570	27.570	33.570	5.170	200	3.20
I feel a strong sense of belonging	5.8%	11.6%	25.6%	38.6%	18.4%	207	3.52
to my division/college	3.6%	11.0%	23.0%	30.0%	10.4%	207	3.32
I feel a strong sense of belonging	5.8%	7.2%	17.3%	41.3%	28.4%	208	3.79
to my department/office	5.076	1.2/0	17.3/0	41.5/0	20.470	208	3.73

Table A3 Respect

Table A3 Respect			Noither Agree nor			To	tal
	a	5 .	Neither Agree nor				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N)	Avg)
My department/office is treated							
with respect by other	1.7%	3.4%	29.1%	47.4%	18.3%	175	3.77
departments/offices within my	1.770	3.470	23.170	77.770	10.370	173	3.77
division/college							
My division/college is treated with	2.00/	0.00/	3F C0/	44.40/	17.50/	160	2.62
respect by CSU	3.8%	8.8%	25.6%	44.4%	17.5%	100	3.63
The people I interact with treat	1.00/	7.20/	0.20/	F1 00/	24.70/	200	4.02
each other with respect.	1.9%	7.2%	8.2%	51.0%	31.7%	208	4.03
There is respect for religious							
differences in my	0.0%	5.2%	19.8%	49.4%	25.6%	172	3.95
department/office							
There is respect for liberal							
perspectives in my	1.1%	3.8%	18.9%	49.2%	27.0%	185	3.97
department/office							
There is respect for conservative							
perspectives in my	3.4%	7.9%	22.6%	47.5%	18.6%	177	3.70
department/office							
I feel valued as an employee	4.4%	8.8%	14.1%	44.4%	28.3%	205	3.83

Table A4 Favoritism

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree		tal Avg)
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office	16.4%	27.9%	29.5%	15.3%	10.9%	183	2.77
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	18.5%	32.6%	29.3%	11.4%	8.2%	184	2.58
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	17.3%	36.8%	28.1%	12.4%	5.4%	185	2.52
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	19.6%	27.9%	27.9%	17.9%	6.7%	179	2.64
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	19.4%	30.6%	32.8%	11.7%	5.6%	180	2.53

Table A5 Leadership and Accountability

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	To:	
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.9%	11.7%	29.2%	39.6%	15.6%	154	3.51
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	6.1%	12.9%	23.3%	41.1%	16.6%	163	3.49
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	5.8%	8.4%	31.8%	37.7%	16.2%	154	3.50

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	9.8%	8.5%	22.6%	42.7%	16.5%	164	3.48
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	5.8%	15.5%	28.4%	35.5%	14.8%	155	3.38
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	10.9%	15.8%	19.4%	38.2%	15.8%	165	3.32
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	4.9%	1.6%	17.6%	50.0%	25.8%	182	3.90
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	4.8%	4.2%	15.9%	49.2%	25.9%	189	3.87
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	4.1%	8.2%	29.3%	40.1%	18.4%	147	3.61
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	6.5%	9.2%	26.8%	37.3%	20.3%	153	3.56
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	8.1%	9.2%	20.8%	40.5%	21.4%	173	3.58
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	11.4%	15.1%	17.3%	34.1%	22.2%	185	3.41

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	0.5%	1.0%	2.0%	8.0%	0.5%	2.0%	90.0%	200
is problematic among employees in my division/college	0.5%	0.5%	3.5%	9.5%	0.0%	2.5%	87.5%	200
is problematic among employees in my department/office	0.5%	0.5%	6.5%	16.5%	0.0%	3.0%	81.5%	200
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear	0.0%	0.5%	7.0%	8.0%	0.0%	1.5%	86.5%	200

Table A7 Bias Incidents

			Neither Agree nor			Total	
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	1.7%	10.3%	25.7%	41.1%	21.1%	175	3.70
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	0.8%	6.4%	36.8%	38.4%	17.6%	125	3.66
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	8.4%	28.2%	53.4%	8.4%	1.5%	131	2.66
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.3%	14.3%	68.1%	11.0%	3.3%	91	2.97
CSU handles incidents of bias well	1.9%	5.6%	49.5%	36.4%	6.5%	107	3.40

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
	70	11
Yes	68.8%	139
·		

Table A9 Employee Councils

			Neither Agree nor			То	tal
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
I feel my employee council addresses issues and topics that are important and relevant to me	1.0%	21.4%	37.8%	35.7%	4.1%	98	3.20
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	0.0%	7.3%	28.2%	50.0%	14.5%	110	3.72

Table A10 Principles of Community

			Neither Agree nor			То	tal
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
I am familiar with the Principles of	7.8%	22.2%	11.7%	42.8%	15.6%	180	3.36
Community.							
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	17.4%	29.8%	19.3%	27.3%	6.2%	161	2.75
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	7.0%	19.6%	52.4%	18.9%	2.1%	143	2.90
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	5.3%	14.3%	55.6%	20.3%	4.5%	133	3.05

Table A11 Freedom of Speech

			Neither Agree nor			То	tal
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
My division/college supports people speaking freely	3.3%	5.5%	18.8%	53.6%	18.8%	181	3.79
Free speech is an important issue on campus	0.0%	2.2%	17.4%	42.8%	37.7%	138	4.16
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	0.8%	7.8%	31.8%	41.9%	17.8%	129	3.68
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	4.7%	28.9%	25.5%	28.2%	12.8%	149	3.15
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	12.0%	50.9%	24.0%	8.0%	5.1%	175	2.43

Table A12 CSU Perceptions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree		tal Avg)
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	0.7%	2.1%	16.6%	58.6%	22.1%	145	3.99
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	0.0%	1.6%	21.3%	57.4%	19.7%	122	3.95
CSU retains diverse employees	0.0%	6.6%	21.3%	54.1%	18.0%	122	3.84
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	0.0%	0.7%	16.9%	60.3%	22.1%	136	4.04
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	0.0%	4.3%	24.1%	49.6%	22.0%	141	3.89
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	0.6%	2.4%	14.1%	55.3%	27.6%	170	4.07
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	0.0%	3.7%	27.2%	44.9%	24.3%	136	3.90
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	1.1%	0.6%	8.4%	49.7%	40.2%	179	4.27

Table A13 Department/Unit Perceptions

			Neither Agree nor			То	tal
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
Department/office recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	2.3%	8.6%	18.3%	52.6%	18.3%	175	3.76
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	2.9%	10.1%	34.1%	39.1%	13.8%	138	3.51
Department/office retains diverse employees	2.3%	9.9%	26.7%	45.9%	15.1%	172	3.62
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	1.7%	4.6%	26.0%	48.6%	19.1%	173	3.79
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	4.2%	15.0%	37.7%	30.5%	12.6%	167	3.32
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	6.1%	9.1%	14.7%	45.7%	24.4%	197	3.73
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	4.7%	12.4%	34.9%	30.8%	17.2%	169	3.43
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	5.7%	7.2%	15.5%	41.2%	30.4%	194	3.84

Table A14 Discriminatory Attitudes

Discriminatory attitudes are		
present in your department/office		
based on:	%	N
No intolerant attitudes are present	45.6%	73
Job title	25.0%	40
Employment classification	19.4%	31
Political affiliation	18.1%	29
Age	15.0%	24
Gender	13.1%	21
Appearance	6.3%	10
Veteran status	5.0%	8
Gender identity and expression	5.0%	8
Ethnic origin	4.4%	7
Sexual orientation	4.4%	7
Socioeconomic status	3.8%	6
Parental status	2.5%	4
Religion	2.5%	4
Race or color	2.5%	4
Other (Nationality/Country of		
origin, Disability (e.g. physical,		
mental), Marital status,	10.1%	16
Education/professional		
background)		

Note: multiple response item.

Table A15 Work-Related Stressors

Please select your top THREE work-		
related stressors	%	N
Job security	43.3%	81
Lower salary	31.0%	58
Lack of growth/promotion	30.5%	57
Office/department climate	25.7%	48
Workload	23.0%	43
Work/life balance	15.5%	29
Duties outside my job responsibilities	13.4%	25
Interpersonal conflict	13.4%	25
Affordable housing near work	12.8%	24
III-defined job	10.2%	19
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	10.2%	19
Physical environment	8.6%	16
Email overload	7.0%	13
Health issues	7.0%	13
Lack of work autonomy	4.8%	9
Physical safety	4.3%	8
Misconduct occurring at work/Inequities/Bias	3.7%	7
Lack of training/skills to do my work	3.7%	7
Administration/Leadership	3.7%	7
Lack of work flexibility	2.1%	4
Other	2.1%	4
Parking and Transportation	1.6%	3
Health Insurance/Benefits	1.1%	2
Communication	0.5%	1

Note: multiple response item.

Table A16 Use of Child and/or Adult Care Services

Have you utilized child or adult care		
services this past year?	%	N
Yes	10.6%	21
No	89.4%	178
Total	100.0%	199

Table A17 Child and/or Adult Care-Related Challenges

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	78.3%	18							
Finding child care services	26.1%	6							
Dependability of care services	21.7%	5							
Quality of care services	21.7%	5							
Scheduling care to match work schedule	21.7%	5							
Transportation to/from care services	17.4%	4							
Finding care for a sick child/adult	13.0%	3							
Finding summer care services	13.0%	3							
Location of care services	13.0%	3							
Finding temporary care services	8.7%	2							
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	8.7%	2							
Finding adult care services	0.0%	0							
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	0.0%	0							
Other	0.0%	0							

Note: This question was only asked to those who answered they used care

services; multiple response item

Table A18 Gender

	%	N
Men	53.8%	98
Women	42.9%	78
T/NB/GNC	3.3%	6

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	86.1%	155
Minoritized	13.9%	25

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose.

Table A20 Employee Type

	%	N
Administrative Professional	86.3%	170
Faculty	1.5%	3
State Classified	2.5%	5
Other	3.0%	6
Prefer not to disclose	6.6%	13
Total	100.0%	197

Appendix B: Employee Characteristics Mean Comparisons

The following tables show the mean comparison scores by employee characteristics. Mean scores for CSU overall and the Division are also provided. CEMML had fewer than 10 faculty or state classified respondents; therefore, results are not reported by employee type.

Table B1 Department/Unit Culture

	Overall Division			Gender				Minoritized Rae/Ethnicity				
	CSU		CEMML		Men		Women		n Non-mino		Minoritized	
My department or office	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Supports a healthy work/life balance	3.86 ¹	4008	4.09 ¹	203	4.16 _a	98	4.03_{a}	75	4.15 _a	152	3.79 _a	24
Understands the value of diversity	4.06 ¹	3956	3.95 ¹	192	4.01 _a	90	3.86 _a	72	4.02 _a	144	3.52 _b	23
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.62 ¹	3994	3.58 ¹	203	3.68a	97	3.38 _a	76	3.61 _a	151	3.29 _a	24
Treats all employees equitably	3.46 ¹	3946	3.61 ¹	197	3.76 _a	95	3.40 _b	73	3.69 _a	147	3.04 _b	24
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.87 ¹	3950	3.69 ¹	198	3.71 _a	94	3.59 _a	74	3.74 _a	148	3.30 _a	23
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.99 ¹	3999	3.91 ¹	207	3.94 _a	97	3.92 _a	77	4.04 _a	153	3.29 _b	24
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.04 ¹	3934	3.99 ¹	196	4.08 _a	95	3.79 _b	72	4.06 _a	147	3.48 _b	23
Is open and transparent in communication	3.44 ¹	4009	3.36 ¹	209	3.41a	98	3.23 _a	77	3.35 _a	154	3.36 _a	25
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	3.46 ¹	3952	3.29 ¹	202	3.38 _a	97	3.08 _a	73	3.30 _a	148	3.04 _a	25

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

	Ove	Overall Division (Ger	nder		Minoritized Rae/Ethnicity			ty	
	CSU		CEMML		Men		Women		n 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	3.46 ¹	208	3.57 _a	97	3.26 _a	77	3.47 _a	153	3.32 _a	25
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.97 ¹	3872	3.94 ¹	191	4.02 _a	89	3.86 _a	71	4.02 _a	142	3.59 _b	22
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	4.32 ¹	3691	4.24 ¹	185	4.18 _a	89	4.30a	67	4.26a	139	4.16a	19
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.90 ¹	3687	4.01 ¹	183	4.14 _a	87	3.91 _a	67	4.07 _a	137	3.80 _a	20
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	2.66 ¹	3925	2.37 ¹	204	2.29 _a	95	2.42 _a	76	2.31 _a	150	2.71 _a	24
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	3.10 ¹	3910	3.18 ¹	205	3.18 _a	95	3.05 _a	77	3.14 _a	153	3.35 _a	23
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.65 ¹	4012	3.28 ¹	208	3.32a	96	3.21 _a	78	3.33 _a	154	3.12 _a	24
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.49 ¹	4003	3.52 ¹	207	3.61 _a	95	3.42 _a	78	3.59 _a	153	3.33 _a	24
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.88 ¹	4007	3.79 ¹	208	3.93 _a	97	3.72 _a	78	3.86 _a	153	3.52 _a	25

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

	Ove	rall	Divis	ion		Gen	der		Minori	tized Ra	e/Ethnicit	ty
	CS	U	CEM	ML	Mer	1	Wom	en	Non-mino	ritized	Minoriti	ized
	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	3.77 ¹	175	3.85 _a	80	3.69 _a	67	3.79 _a	131	3.57 _a	21
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.69 ¹	3656	3.63 ¹	160	3.65 _a	74	3.60 _a	60	3.66a	120	3.71 _a	17
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	3.95 ¹	3999	4.03 ¹	208	4.08 _a	98	3.96 _a	78	4.03 _a	155	4.04 _a	25
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.91 ¹	3459	3.95 ¹	172	3.92 _a	86	3.85 _a	61	3.94a	132	3.89 _a	19
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	4.06 ¹	3723	3.97 ¹	185	3.98 _a	88	3.96 _a	69	3.99 _a	140	3.68 _a	22
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.47 ¹	3600	3.70 ¹	177	3.56 _a	86	3.70 _a	64	3.71 _a	133	3.38 _a	21
I feel valued as an employee	3.68 ¹	3991	3.83 ¹	205	3.88 _a	95	3.78 _a	78	3.88a	152	3.48a	25

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

	Ove	rall	Divisi	on		Gen	der		Minor	itized Rae	e/Ethnicity	
	CS	U	CEMI	ИL	Men)	Wome	en	Non-mino	ritized	Minoriti	ized
	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	2.77 ¹	183	2.71 _a	90	2.79a	68	2.76 _a	138	2.91 _a	22
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	2.85 ¹	3670	2.58 ¹	184	2.60 _a	89	2.59 _a	69	2.54 _a	138	2.96 _a	24
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	2.64 ¹	3665	2.52 ¹	185	2.54 _a	89	2.46 _a	69	2.44 _a	138	3.00 _b	24
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	2.88 ¹	3606	2.64 ¹	179	2.63a	89	2.62a	65	2.60 _a	136	2.95 _a	22
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	2.73 ¹	3568	2.53 ¹	180	2.60 _a	88	2.43 _a	67	2.47 _a	136	2.91 _a	23

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

	Ove	rall	Divis	ion		Gen	der		Minori	tized Ra	e/Ethnicit	ty
	CS	U	CEM	ML	Men)	Wom	en	Non-mino	ritized	Minorit	ized
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.35^{1}	2953	3.51 ¹	154	3.64 _a	72	3.33 _a	60	3.53 _a	113	3.25 _a	20
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.45 ¹	3343	3.49^{1}	163	3.66 _a	79	3.27 _b	62	3.49 _a	121	3.35 _a	20
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.30^{1}	2849	3.50^{1}	154	3.53 _a	73	3.34_{a}	59	3.49 _a	114	3.25 _a	20
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.41 ¹	3241	3.48^{1}	164	3.63 _a	81	3.27 _a	60	3.48 _a	122	3.35 _a	20
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.13 ¹	2894	3.38 ¹	155	3.52 _a	75	3.05 _b	58	3.36 _a	114	3.15 _a	20
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.25 ¹	3365	3.32 ¹	165	3.39 _a	82	3.11 _a	61	3.27 _a	122	3.24 _a	21
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.78 ¹	3369	3.90 ¹	182	3.90 _a	84	3.86a	71	3.90 _a	136	3.83 _a	23
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.89 ¹	3705	3.87 ¹	189	3.89 _a	91	3.84 _a	73	3.89 _a	145	3.71 _a	21
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.37 ¹	3033	3.61 ¹	147	3.66 _a	68	3.45 _a	58	3.67 _a	110	3.11 _b	19
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.47 ¹	3351	3.56 ¹	153	3.53 _a	75	3.48a	56	3.61 _a	115	3.11 _a	18
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.20 ¹	3130	3.58 ¹	173	3.59 _a	79	3.46 _a	69	3.63 _a	130	3.22 _a	23
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.25 ¹	3599	3.41 ¹	185	3.40 _a	89	3.35 _a	71	3.41 _a	140	3.22 _a	23

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

	Over	all	Divisio	on		Ger	nder		Mino	itized Rae	/Ethnicity	
	CSI	J	CEMN	1L	Men		Wome	n	Non-mino	ritized	Minoriti	zed
is problematic among employees at CSU	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	247	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	3.0%	117	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	13.3%	519	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bias	28.3%	1104	8.0%	16	*	*	*	*	7.9%	12	*	*
Physical Assault	0.6%	23	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.2%	282	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	65.7%	2566	90.0%	180	90.5%	86	89.6%	69	89.4%	135	88.0%	22

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with $n \ge 10$.

Table B7 Misconduct Among Division/College

	Ove	rall	Divisi	on		Ger	nder		Minor	itized Rae	e/Ethnicity	
	CS	U	CEMI	ЛL	Men		Wome	n	Non-mino	ritized	Minoriti	zed
is problematic among employees in my division/college	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.8%	109	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.3%	52	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	10.3%	404	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bias	24.1%	940	9.5%	19	*	*	*	*	8.6%	13	*	*
Physical Assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	5.1%	199	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	70.8%	2765	87.5%	175	90.5%	86	83.1%	64	88.1%	133	76.0%	19

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with $n \ge 10$.

Table B8 Misconduct Among Department/Office

	Over	all	Divisi	on		Gen	der		Minori	tized Rae	/Ethnicity	
	CSI	J	CEMI	ЛL	Men		Wome	n	Non-mino	ritized	Minoriti	zed
is problematic among employees in my department/office	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	1.9%	73	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.1%	42	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	12.4%	486	6.5%	13	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bias	23.3%	911	16.5%	33	14.7%	14	19.5%	15	15.9%	24	*	*
Physical Assault	0.3%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.0%	272	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	69.9%	2731	81.5%	163	85.3%	81	76.6%	59	82.1%	124	72.0%	18

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with $n \ge 10$.

Table B9 Avoidance due to Misconduct

	Over	all	Divisio	on		Gen	der		Minor	itized Rae	/Ethnicity	
	CSI	J	CEMN	1L	Men		Wome	n	Non-mino	ritized	Minoritiz	zed
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear	%	N	·		%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.5%	99	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.0%	41	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	16.7%	651	7.0%	14	*	*	*	*	7.3%	11	*	*
Bias	20.0%	781	8.0%	16	*	*	*	*	7.9%	12	*	*
Physical Assault	0.9%	37	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	11.0%	428	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	68.7%	2682	86.5%	173	89.5%	85	84.4%	65	86.1%	130	80.0%	20

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with $n \ge 10$.

Table B10 Bias Incidents

	Ove	rall	Divisi	on		Gen	der		Mino	itized Rae	/Ethnicity	
	cs	U	CEMI	ИL	Men		Wome	en	Non-mino	ritized	Minoriti	ized
	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	3.70^{1}	175	3.56_a	84	3.86 _b	71	3.73 _a	135	3.74 _a	23
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.64 ¹	3199	3.66^{1}	125	3.53 _a	57	3.82 _a	51	3.71 _a	97	3.50 _a	14
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.10^{1}	3174	2.66 ¹	131	2.55 _a	60	2.76 _a	54	2.65 _a	104	2.71 _a	14
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.21 ¹	2397	2.97 ¹	91	2.83 _a	42	3.03 _a	37	2.96 _a	68	2.92 _a	13
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.44 ¹	2962	3.40 ¹	107	3.45a	51	3.33 _a	39	3.41 _a	82	3.42a	12

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

	Ovei	rall	Divisio	on		Ger	nder		Minorit	ized R	ae/Ethnici	ty
Are you aware there is an employee group/organization that represents my		CCII							Non			
employee group's interests (i.e., Administrative Professional Council, Classified	CSI	CSU		/L	Men		Wome	n	minorit	zed	Minoriti	zed
Personnel Council, Faculty Council).	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	83.9% ¹	3260	68.8% ¹	139	70.4%a	69	72.7% _a	56	75.3%a	116	40.0%b	10
No	16.1% ¹	627	31.2% ¹	63	29.6% _a	29	27.3% _a	21	24.7% _a	38	60.0% _b	15

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

	Ove	rall	Divis	ion		Gen	der		Minoriti	zed Ra	e/Ethnici	ity
									Non-			
	CSU Avg N	CEM	ML	Mer	1	Wom	en	minoriti	zed	Minorit	tized	
	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	3.35 ¹	2437	3.20 ¹	98	3.25 _a	51	3.06 _a	36	3.19 _a	81	* a	*
me												-
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.87 ¹	2700	3.72 ¹	110	3.67 _a	58	3.71 _a	41	3.67 _a	93	* a	*

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.

Means and percentages are reported only for items with $n \ge 10$.

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

Table B13 Principles of Community

,	Ove	erall	Divis	ion		Gen	der		Minorit	ized Ra	e/Ethnic	ity
									Nor			
	CS	SU	CEM		Mei		Wom		minori		Minorit	ized
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I am familiar with the Principles of Community.	3.91 ¹	3644	3.36 ¹	180	3.43 _a	84	3.25 _a	73	3.36a	137	3.26 _a	23
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.52 ¹	3366	2.75 ¹	161	2.74 _a	78	2.69 _a	64	2.70 _a	127	2.76 _a	17
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.20 ¹	3209	2.90 ¹	143	2.97 _a	71	2.87 _a	54	2.88 _a	112	2.93 _a	14
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.26 ¹	3082	3.05 ¹	133	3.11 _a	66	3.12 _a	49	3.05 _a	104	3.08 _a	13

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

	Ove	rall	Divisi	on		Gen	der		Minor	itized Rae	/Ethnicity	
	cs	U	CEMI	VIL	Men		Wome	en	Non-mino	ritized	Minoriti	ized
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My division/college supports people speaking freely	3.64 ¹	3629	3.79^{1}	181	3.85 _a	89	3.63 _a	68	3.85 _a	138	3.27 _b	22
Free speech is an important issue on campus	4.28 ¹	3697	4.16^{1}	138	4.14a	70	4.14a	49	4.15 _a	108	4.15 _a	13
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	3.59 ¹	3525	3.68 ¹	129	3.72 _a	71	3.41 _a	39	3.59 _a	100	3.83 _a	12
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.30 ¹	3473	3.15^{1}	149	3.15 _a	75	3.02 _a	54	3.13 _a	118	2.92 _a	13
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.97 ¹	3648	2.43 ¹	175	2.42a	89	2.29 _a	66	2.34 _a	139	2.63a	16

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

	Ove	rall	Divisi	on		Gen	der		Minoritized Rae/Ethnicity			,
	CS	U	CEMML		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	3.99^{1}	145	3.91 _a	70	4.00_{a}	55	4.02 _a	114	3.56 _b	16
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.72 ¹	3408	3.95^{1}	122	3.82 _a	66	4.00_{a}	43	3.95 _a	99	3.83 _a	12
CSU retains diverse employees	3.60 ¹	2992	3.84 ¹	122	3.79 _a	62	3.76 _a	45	3.82 _a	96	3.60 _a	15
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.77 ¹	3194	4.04 ¹	136	3.94 _a	69	4.02 _a	50	4.02 _a	106	4.00 _a	16
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.02 ¹	3472	3.89 ¹	141	3.78 _a	74	3.90 _a	51	3.92 _a	111	3.67 _a	15
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	3.84 ¹	3541	4.07 ¹	170	4.06a	85	4.00a	63	4.12 _a	133	3.61 _b	18
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.76 ¹	3183	3.90 ¹	136	3.76 _a	67	3.94 _a	52	3.93 _a	106	3.62 _a	16
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.08 ¹	3708	4.27 ¹	179	4.24 _a	88	4.29 _a	69	4.36 _a	139	3.67 _b	21

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

	Ove	rall	Divis	ion		Gen	ıder		Minoritized Rae/Ethnicity			
	CS	SU	CEM	ML	Men		Women		Non-mine	oritized	ritized Minoritize	
	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	3.76 ¹	175	3.86 _a	87	3.58 _a	67	3.76 _a	135	3.52 _a	23
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.61 ¹	3548	3.51 ¹	138	3.52 _a	73	3.46 _a	50	3.54 _a	109	3.27 _a	15
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.50 ¹	3414	3.62 ¹	172	3.68a	85	3.46a	67	3.61 _a	133	3.42a	24
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.68 ¹	3458	3.79 ¹	173	3.86 _a	87	3.64 _a	66	3.80 _a	133	3.57 _a	23
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.66 ¹	3561	3.32 ¹	167	3.38 _a	82	3.21 _a	68	3.36 _a	131	3.00 _a	20
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.71 ¹	3739	3.73 ¹	197	3.91 _a	95	3.62 _a	77	3.83 _a	151	3.16 _b	25
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.59 ¹	3380	3.43 ¹	169	3.40a	83	3.48a	66	3.49 _a	130	3.09 _a	22
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.86 ¹	3735	3.84 ¹	194	3.91 _a	94	3.79 _a	77	3.95 _a	149	3.16 _b	25

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

	Over	Overall		Overall Division				Gen	der		Minoritized Rae/Ethnicity			
	CSU	ı	СЕММ	L	Men		Women	1	Non-minor	itized	Minoritiz	ed		
Have you utilized child or adult care services this past year?	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N		
Yes	$14.1\%^{1}$	533	10.6% ¹	21	14.4% _a	14	* a	*	11.1% _a	17	* a	*		
No	85.9% ¹	3247	89.4% ¹	178	85.6%a	83	93.5%a	72	88.9%a	136	92.0% _a	23		

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.

Means and percentages are reported only for items with $n \ge 10$.

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

	Overa	ıll	Divisio	n		Gende	r		Minoritized Rae/Ethnicity			у
	CSU		СЕММ	L	Men		Women		Non-minori	tized	Minor	itized
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Cost of care services	72.3%	391	78.3%	18	93.3%	14	*	*	78.9%	15	*	*
Finding child care services	31.8%	172	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding adult care services	5.5%	30	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding temporary care services	12.0%	65	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding care for a sick child/adult	28.7%	155	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	3.5%	19	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Other	2.2%	12	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Transportation to/from care services	29.2%	158	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Dependability of care services	15.0%	81	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Quality of care services	17.2%	93	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Scheduling care to match work schedule	40.1%	217	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding summer care services	27.9%	151	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Location of care services	15.5%	84	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	10.2%	55	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

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

Means and percentages are reported only for items with $n \ge 10$.

Table B19 Factors

	Ove	rall	Divisi	on		Gen	der		Minoritized Rae/Ethnicity			
	CS	U	CEMI	ИL	Men		Wome	n	Non-mino	ritized	Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
CSU Perceptions	3.82 ¹	2524	3.97 ¹	90	3.84 _a	50	3.97 _a	30	3.99 _a	71	3.64 _a	10
Department/Unit Perceptions	3.66 ¹	2869	3.62 ¹	111	3.61 _a	60	3.58 _a	39	3.64 _a	86	3.31 _a	14
Department/Unit Leadership	3.42 ¹	2859	3.52 ¹	139	3.59 _a	67	3.38a	53	3.52 _a	103	3.28 _a	17
College/Division Leadership	3.31 ¹	2472	3.58^{1}	130	3.69 _a	59	3.35 _a	53	3.59 _a	94	3.23 _a	18
Favoritism	2.80 ¹	3417	2.61 ¹	173	2.62 _a	86	2.55 _a	64	2.56 _a	131	2.95 _a	21
Sense of Belonging	3.67 ¹	3978	3.53^{1}	206	3.62a	95	3.45 _a	78	3.59 _a	152	3.33a	24
Department/Unit Culture	3.52 ¹	3807	3.56 ¹	190	3.64 _a	93	3.38 _a	72	3.56 _a	143	3.24 _a	23
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	4.00 ¹	3753	3.89 ¹	183	3.95 _a	84	3.78 _a	70	3.95 _a	137	3.47 _b	22

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: Division Comparisons to CSU Overall

The following tables display the Division's mean score compared to CSU overall. Division results are noted as being "higher," "similar," or "lower" than the CSU average, meaning that the Division'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		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Supports a healthy work/life balance	Higher	4.09	3.86	.24	83.7%	72.5%	11.3
Understands the value of diversity	Similar	3.95	4.06	10	76.6%	78.6%	-2.1
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Similar	3.58	3.62	04	63.5%	64.7%	-1.1
Treats all employees equitably	Similar	3.61	3.46	.15	66.0%	58.5%	7.5
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Lower	3.69	3.87	19	60.6%	69.8%	-9.2
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Similar	3.91	3.99	07	77.3%	77.0%	.3
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Similar	3.99	4.04	05	75.0%	76.1%	-1.1
Is open and transparent in communication	Similar	3.36	3.44	08	55.0%	57.3%	-2.2
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Similar	3.29	3.46	17	52.5%	57.3%	-4.9

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

Table C2 Culture

					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college is open and S transparent in communication	Similar	3.46	3.39	.08	57.7%	54.2%	3.5
My division/college promotes S respect for cultural differences	Similar	3.94	3.97	03	76.4%	76.1%	.3
I had a performance review of my S progress as an employee in the last year	Similar	4.24	4.32	08	89.2%	91.6%	-2.4
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	Similar	4.01	3.90	.11	77.0%	72.9%	4.1
I fear negative job consequences if L I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Lower	2.37	2.66	29	16.2%	28.0%	-11.8
I would be able to do my job more S effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Similar	3.18	3.10	.07	40.0%	37.0%	3.0
I feel a strong sense of belonging to L	Lower	3.28	3.65	37	49.0%	62.4%	-13.4
I feel a strong sense of belonging to S my division/college	Similar	3.52	3.49	.03	57.0%	55.4%	1.6
I feel a strong sense of belonging to S my department/office	Similar	3.79	3.88	08	69.7%	71.3%	-1.6

Table C3 Respect

Table C5 Nespect					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My department/office is treated	Higher						
with respect by other		3.77	3.64	.13	65.7%	64.3%	1.5
departments/offices within my		5.77	5.04	.13	03.7%	04.5%	1.5
division/college							
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	Similar	3.63	3.69	06	61.9%	67.0%	-5.2
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	Similar	4.03	3.95	.08	82.7%	78.9%	3.8
There is respect for religious	Similar						
differences in my		3.95	3.91	.04	75.0%	71.7%	3.3
department/office							
There is respect for liberal	Similar						
perspectives in my		3.97	4.06	09	76.2%	79.0%	-2.8
department/office							
There is respect for conservative	Higher						
perspectives in my		3.70	3.47	.23	66.1%	55.1%	11.0
department/office							
I feel valued as an employee	Higher	3.83	3.68	.16	72.7%	66.7%	6.0

Table C4 Favoritism

	Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Favoritism plays a role in who gets Lower recognized within my department/office	2.77	3.00	23	26.2%	37.9%	-11.7
Favoritism plays a role in who gets Lower resources in my department/office	2.58	2.85	27	19.6%	31.3%	-11.8
Favoritism plays a role in who gets Similar professional development opportunities	2.52	2.64	12	17.8%	23.7%	-5.8
Favoritism plays a role in who gets Lower promoted in my department/office	2.64	2.88	23	24.6%	32.3%	-7.8
Favoritism plays a role in who gets Lower hired in my department/office	2.53	2.73	20	17.2%	25.6%	-8.3

Table C5 Leadership and Accountability

					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Division/college leadership	Higher						
adequately addresses		3.51	3.35	.17	55.2%	51.7%	3.5
inappropriate behavior							
Department/office leadership	Similar						
adequately addresses		3.49	3.45	.04	57.7%	58.2%	5
inappropriate behavior							
Division/college leadership holds	Higher						
employees accountable for		3.50	3.30	.20	53.9%	48.1%	5.8
inappropriate behavior							

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.48	3.41	.07	59.1%	55.4%	3.8
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Higher	3.38	3.13	.25	50.3%	41.5%	8.8
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.32	3.25	.07	53.9%	50.5%	3.4
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.90	3.78	.12	75.8%	69.4%	6.4
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.87	3.89	02	75.1%	75.1%	.0
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Higher	3.61	3.37	.24	58.5%	50.3%	8.2
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Similar	3.56	3.47	.08	57.5%	55.8%	1.7
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Higher	3.58	3.20	.38	61.8%	45.8%	16.0
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.41	3.25	.15	56.2%	51.1%	5.1

Table C6 Bias Incidents

					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	Lower	3.70	4.00	31	62.3%	77.7%	-15.4
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Similar	3.66	3.64	.02	56.0%	61.8%	-5.8
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Lower	2.66	3.10	44	9.9%	32.4%	-22.4
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Lower	2.97	3.21	24	14.3%	34.0%	-19.8
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Similar	3.40	3.44	04	43.0%	51.2%	-8.2

Table C7 Employee Councils

Table C7 Employee Councils							
					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I feel my employee council	Similar						
addresses issues and topics that		3.20	3.35	14	39.8%	46.7%	-6.9
are important and relevant to me							
I feel that the councils' collective	Lower						
participation in shared governance		3.72	3.87	16	64.5%	70.8%	-6.2
is pertinent to the success of our		3.72	5.67	10	04.570	70.070	-0.2
institution							

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

Table C8 Principles of Community

	Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I am familiar with the Principles of Lower Community	3.36	3.91	55	58.3%	77.2%	-18.9
Within my department/office, the Lower Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment	2.75	3.52	77	33.5%	58.4%	-24.8
I feel the Principles of Community Lower have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	2.90	3.20	30	21.0%	36.0%	-15.0
I feel the Principles of Community Lower have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.05	3.26	22	24.8%	38.4%	-13.6

Table C9 Freedom of Speech

					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college supports people speaking freely	Higher	3.79	3.64	.15	72.4%	66.7%	5.7
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Similar	4.16	4.28	12	80.4%	89.5%	-9.0
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Similar	3.68	3.59	.09	59.7%	59.8%	1
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Similar	3.15	3.30	15	40.9%	50.3%	-9.4
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Lower	2.43	2.97	54	13.1%	33.5%	-20.4

Table C10 CSU Perceptions

Table C10 C30 Perceptions					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	Higher	3.99	3.84	.15	80.7%	75.0%	5.7
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Higher	3.95	3.72	.23	77.0%	69.5%	7.5
CSU retains diverse employees	Higher	3.84	3.60	.24	72.1%	61.2%	10.9
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Higher	4.04	3.77	.27	82.4%	69.9%	12.5
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	3.89	4.02	13	71.6%	79.9%	-8.3
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Higher	4.07	3.84	.23	82.9%	74.0%	9.0
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Higher	3.90	3.76	.14	69.1%	66.6%	2.5
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Higher	4.27	4.08	.20	89.9%	80.9%	9.0

Table C11 Department/Unit Perceptions

Table CII Department/Onit Fercep					Division percent		
		Division sugges	CCII average	Ava Can		CCII mayaant agyaa	PP Gap
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	РР Сар
Department/office recruits	Similar						
employees from a diverse set of		3.76	3.67	.09	70.9%	66.6%	4.2
backgrounds							
Department/office improves the	Similar	3.51	3.61	10	52.9%	63.7%	-10.8
campus climate for all employees		3.51	3.01	10	52.9%	03.7%	-10.8
Department/office retains diverse	Similar	2.62	2.50	4.4	64.00/	F.C. 00/	4.2
employees		3.62	3.50	.11	61.0%	56.8%	4.2
Department/office creates a	Similar						
supportive environment for		3.79	3.68	.11	67.6%	65.3%	2.4
employees from diverse		5.79	5.06	.11	07.0%	05.5%	2.4
backgrounds							
Department/office encourages	Lower	3.32	3.66	33	43.1%	61.8%	-18.6
discussions related to diversity		3.32	5.00	33	45.1%	01.0%	-10.0
Department/office provides	Similar						
employees with a positive work		3.73	3.71	.02	70.1%	68.7%	1.4
experience							
Department/office climate has	Lower						
become consistently more inclusive		3.43	3.59	16	47.9%	59.3%	-11.4
of all employees							
Would recommend	Similar						
department/office as a place of		3.84	3.86	02	71.6%	71.3%	.4
employment							

Table C12 Factors

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Higher	3.97	3.82	.15
Department/Unit Perceptions	Similar	3.62	3.66	04
Department/Unit Leadership	Similar	3.52	3.42	.10
College/Division Leadership	Higher	3.58	3.31	.27
Favoritism	Lower	2.61	2.80	19
Sense of Belonging	Lower	3.53	3.67	14
Department/Unit Culture	Similar	3.56	3.52	.03
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Similar	3.89	4.00	11