College of Agricultural Sciences
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 the College of Agricultural Sciences. 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 their academic college 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

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

My department or office...	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
Supports a healthy work/life balance	3.8%	7.6%	15.1%	39.5%	34.0%	238	3.92
Understands the value of diversity	5.0%	8.4%	9.7%	38.7%	38.2%	238	3.97
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	5.9%	11.4%	13.9%	38.8%	30.0%	237	3.76
Treats all employees equitably	8.1%	11.4%	18.2%	37.3%	25.0%	236	3.60
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	5.5%	7.6%	18.1%	35.9%	32.9%	237	3.83
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	2.9%	7.5%	18.0%	39.3%	32.2%	239	3.90
Promotes respect for cultural differences	3.4%	6.0%	16.4%	41.4%	32.8%	232	3.94
Is open and transparent in communication	5.8%	12.5%	20.8%	36.3%	24.6%	240	3.61
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	5.5%	14.0%	16.6%	34.0%	29.8%	235	3.69

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	5.6%	15.9%	28.8%	31.3%	18.5%	233	3.41
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.0%	8.2%	16.8%	40.5%	31.5%	232	3.89
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	1.4%	6.5%	6.1%	38.8%	47.2%	214	4.24
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	5.7%	7.2%	12.0%	35.4%	39.7%	209	3.96
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	21.9%	38.6%	20.2%	12.0%	7.3%	233	2.44
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	10.5%	23.2%	30.7%	27.2%	8.3%	228	3.00
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	2.9%	11.3%	24.3%	38.1%	23.4%	239	3.68
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	5.9%	11.8%	25.3%	35.0%	21.9%	237	3.55
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	5.0%	12.2%	15.1%	34.5%	33.2%	238	3.79

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	2.4%	9.4%	21.7%	53.3%	13.2%	212	3.66
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	0.9%	12.6%	19.1%	53.0%	14.4%	215	3.67
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	0.0%	8.8%	12.1%	47.3%	31.8%	239	4.02
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	2.4%	6.3%	21.3%	42.0%	28.0%	207	3.87
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	3.6%	6.4%	22.3%	43.2%	24.5%	220	3.79
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.3%	11.2%	27.1%	39.3%	19.2%	214	3.60
I feel valued as an employee	5.5%	10.5%	16.5%	40.1%	27.4%	237	3.73

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	11.6%	30.4%	27.5%	17.9%	12.6%	207	2.89
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	11.5%	30.1%	30.1%	19.6%	8.6%	209	2.84
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	13.9%	40.1%	30.7%	9.4%	5.9%	202	2.53
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	14.2%	36.8%	23.5%	17.2%	8.3%	204	2.69
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	13.7%	35.6%	25.4%	14.6%	10.7%	205	2.73

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	9.8%	14.7%	20.2%	38.0%	17.2%	163	3.38
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	6.8%	15.9%	16.5%	40.9%	19.9%	176	3.51
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	9.2%	12.4%	28.1%	34.6%	15.7%	153	3.35

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	8.0%	12.3%	28.2%	30.7%	20.9%	163	3.44
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	8.3%	18.5%	30.4%	31.0%	11.9%	168	3.20
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	6.8%	17.9%	25.3%	33.7%	16.3%	190	3.35
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	5.0%	6.9%	15.3%	44.6%	28.2%	202	3.84
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.3%	6.6%	10.9%	39.8%	39.3%	211	4.05
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	8.4%	13.2%	28.1%	32.3%	18.0%	167	3.38
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	7.0%	11.4%	24.3%	33.5%	23.8%	185	3.56
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	8.0%	17.6%	21.8%	35.6%	17.0%	188	3.36
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	8.3%	18.1%	19.1%	34.3%	20.1%	204	3.40

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	8.7%	4.8%	13.0%	33.0%	0.4%	8.3%	63.0%	230
___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	7.0%	3.5%	12.2%	30.0%	0.0%	7.0%	64.8%	230
___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	4.8%	2.2%	12.2%	27.0%	0.4%	7.4%	66.1%	230
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	3.9%	1.7%	16.5%	26.5%	0.4%	11.7%	66.1%	230

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	1.9%	5.1%	16.7%	47.7%	28.7%	216	3.96
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	2.8%	12.4%	27.0%	36.5%	21.3%	178	3.61
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	7.2%	17.7%	45.9%	20.4%	8.8%	181	3.06
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	6.2%	20.2%	42.6%	22.5%	8.5%	129	3.07
CSU handles incidents of bias well	5.5%	10.9%	31.5%	38.8%	13.3%	165	3.44

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	82.2%	189
No	17.8%	41
Total	100.0%	230

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	2.5%	8.9%	30.4%	44.3%	13.9%	158	3.58
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	1.2%	3.6%	22.0%	39.9%	33.3%	168	4.01

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.	1.4%	8.8%	6.5%	45.2%	38.2%	217	4.10
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.4%	10.2%	14.6%	36.9%	35.0%	206	3.90
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	4.2%	11.0%	37.2%	34.0%	13.6%	191	3.42
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	4.2%	11.1%	38.9%	31.1%	14.7%	190	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	2.4%	11.0%	16.3%	52.6%	17.7%	209	3.72
Free speech is an important issue on campus	0.5%	1.4%	10.0%	44.3%	43.9%	221	4.30
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	1.4%	13.3%	27.6%	44.3%	13.3%	210	3.55
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.4%	27.1%	17.7%	41.4%	10.3%	203	3.28
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	10.7%	28.4%	31.6%	21.4%	7.9%	215	2.87

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%	4.6%	13.2%	58.9%	21.8%	197	3.95
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	2.0%	5.9%	19.3%	53.0%	19.8%	202	3.83
CSU retains diverse employees	1.7%	5.6%	24.0%	47.5%	21.2%	179	3.81
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	1.6%	5.8%	18.0%	55.6%	19.0%	189	3.85
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	0.5%	3.3%	13.9%	53.6%	28.7%	209	4.07
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	1.0%	6.2%	16.7%	54.3%	21.9%	210	3.90
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	0.5%	6.7%	23.3%	48.2%	21.2%	193	3.83
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	2.3%	3.7%	12.8%	42.5%	38.8%	219	4.12

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	3.3%	9.4%	12.2%	53.1%	22.1%	213	3.81
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.8%	5.7%	19.6%	48.8%	22.0%	209	3.79
Department/office retains diverse employees	5.5%	7.5%	24.6%	40.7%	21.6%	199	3.65
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.9%	6.3%	21.0%	45.4%	23.4%	205	3.78
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	4.2%	14.6%	20.7%	36.2%	24.4%	213	3.62
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	2.7%	8.1%	15.7%	44.8%	28.7%	223	3.89
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	4.0%	6.0%	23.4%	41.8%	24.9%	201	3.78
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.6%	6.3%	16.3%	32.6%	41.2%	221	4.01

Table A14 Discriminatory Attitudes

Discriminatory attitudes are present in your department/office based on:	%	N
No intolerant attitudes are present	37.3%	76
Employment classification	29.9%	61
Job title	27.9%	57
Gender	24.0%	49
Political affiliation	21.1%	43
Age	14.7%	30
Race or color	12.3%	25
Ethnic origin	10.8%	22
Religion	10.8%	22
Nationality/Country of origin	10.3%	21
Appearance	9.8%	20
Parental status	9.3%	19
Gender identity and expression	8.3%	17
Sexual orientation	6.9%	14
Socioeconomic status	5.9%	12
Marital status	5.4%	11
Disability (e.g. physical, mental)	3.9%	8
Other (veteran status, research/grant money brought in, education/professional background)	3.9%	8

Note: multiple response item.

Table A15 Work-Related Stressors

Please select your top THREE work-related stressors	%	N
Lower salary	40.2%	86
Work/life balance	37.4%	80
Workload	32.2%	69
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	26.6%	57
Email overload	21.5%	46
Lack of growth/promotion	19.2%	41
Office/department climate	17.3%	37
Interpersonal conflict	10.3%	22
Job security	10.3%	22
Affordable housing near work	9.8%	21
Duties outside my job responsibilities/Taking on additional work	9.3%	20
Ill-defined job	6.5%	14
Physical environment	6.1%	13
Lack of training/skills to do my work	4.7%	10
Misconduct occurring at work/Inequities/Bias	4.2%	9
Lack of work flexibility	2.3%	5
Lack of work autonomy	2.3%	5
Physical safety	1.9%	4
Health issues	1.9%	4
Other	0.5%	1
General Climate	0.5%	1
Feeling Undervalued	0.5%	1
Parking and Transportation	0.5%	1
Dependent Care	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	18.3%	41
No	81.7%	183
Total	100.0%	224

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	61.9%	26
Scheduling care to match work schedule	38.1%	16
Finding summer care services	31.0%	13
Transportation to/from care services	28.6%	12
Finding child care services	26.2%	11
Finding care for a sick child/adult	23.8%	10
Quality of care services	21.4%	9
Location of care services	14.3%	6
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	14.3%	6
Dependability of care services	11.9%	5
Finding adult care services	4.8%	2
Finding temporary care services	4.8%	2
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	2.4%	1

Note: This question was only asked to those who answered they used care services; multiple response item

Table A18 Gender

	%	N
Women	48.8%	100
Men	48.8%	100
T/NB/GNC	2.4%	5

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	86.3%	170
Minoritized	13.7%	27

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose.

Table A20 Employee Type

	%	N
Administrative Professional	42.1%	93
Faculty	43.0%	95
State Classified	7.7%	17
Other	0.5%	1
Prefer not to disclose	6.8%	15
Total	100.0%	221

Table A21 Department/Unit

	%	N
Agricultural and Resource Economics	11.25%	27
Agricultural Experiment Stations (including ARDEC, Arkansas Valley, Eastern Co., Plainsman, San Luis Valley, Southwestern Co., Plant Growth Facility, Western Co.)	8.33%	20
Animal Sciences	11.25%	27
Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management	11.25%	27
Dean's Office/College of Agricultural Sciences	9.58%	23
Horticulture and Landscape Architecture	12.50%	30
Soil and Crop Sciences	18.75%	45
Prefer not to disclose	17.08%	41
Total	100.0%	242

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

Table B1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Supports a healthy work/life balance	3.86[1]	4008	3.92[1]	238	3.96$_a$	98	3.94$_a$	98	3.93$_a$	167	4.04$_a$	27	4.01$_a$	90	3.86$_a$	94	4.12$_a$	17
Understands the value of diversity	4.06[1]	3956	3.97[1]	238	4.10$_a$	99	3.82$_a$	97	4.04$_a$	167	3.69$_a$	26	4.00$_a$	89	3.89$_a$	95	4.18$_a$	17
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.62[1]	3994	3.76[1]	237	3.97$_a$	98	3.67$_a$	97	3.86$_a$	165	3.67$_a$	27	3.69$_a$	90	3.90$_a$	93	4.12$_a$	17
Treats all employees equitably	3.46[1]	3946	3.60[1]	236	3.71$_a$	100	3.59$_a$	94	3.65$_a$	164	3.70$_a$	27	3.66$_a$	90	3.56$_a$	93	4.00$_a$	16
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.87[1]	3950	3.83[1]	237	3.97$_a$	97	3.74$_a$	98	3.90$_a$	165	3.59$_a$	27	3.81$_a$	90	3.88$_a$	93	4.00$_a$	17
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.99[1]	3999	3.90[1]	239	3.85$_a$	97	3.98$_a$	100	3.96$_a$	168	3.81$_a$	26	3.97$_a$	93	3.91$_a$	93	3.76$_a$	17
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.04[1]	3934	3.94[1]	232	4.14$_a$	96	3.82$_b$	94	4.03$_a$	162	3.85$_a$	26	4.05$_a$	86	3.94$_a$	94	4.00$_a$	16
Is open and transparent in communication	3.44[1]	4009	3.61[1]	240	3.69$_a$	100	3.59$_a$	98	3.63$_a$	169	3.67$_a$	27	3.48$_a$	91	3.78$_a$	95	3.71$_a$	17
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	3.46[1]	3952	3.69[1]	235	3.82$_a$	97	3.67$_a$	96	3.77$_a$	164	3.81$_a$	26	3.48$_a$	88	4.04$_b$	94	3.71$_{a,b}$	17

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		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	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	3.41^1	233	3.41_a	98	3.44_a	94	3.40_a	161	3.63_a	27	3.53_a	90	3.22_a	92	3.64_a	14
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.97^1	3872	3.89^1	232	3.97_a	96	3.78_a	94	3.93_a	161	3.77_a	26	4.03_a	87	3.75_a	93	4.13_a	15
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	4.32^1	3691	4.24^1	214	4.34_a	88	4.16_a	89	4.22_a	152	4.45_a	22	4.07_a	82	4.41_b	87	$4.41_{a,b}$	17
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.90^1	3687	3.96^1	209	3.88_a	89	4.08_a	84	4.05_a	148	3.91_a	22	3.96_a	77	3.92_a	87	4.18_a	17
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	2.66^1	3925	2.44^1	233	2.38_a	97	2.44_a	96	2.33_a	163	2.63_a	27	2.33_a	88	2.42_a	93	2.35_a	17
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	3.10^1	3910	3.00^1	228	2.97_a	95	3.00_a	93	2.89_a	159	3.31_a	26	3.12_a	89	2.79_b	90	$3.07_{a,b}$	15
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.65^1	4012	3.68^1	239	3.68_a	100	3.74_a	98	3.65_a	168	3.89_a	27	3.61_a	92	$3.67_{a,b}$	94	4.18_b	17
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.49^1	4003	3.55^1	237	3.59_a	99	3.51_a	97	3.53_a	167	3.62_a	26	3.60_a	92	3.43_a	93	3.94_a	16
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.88^1	4007	3.79^1	238	3.80_a	100	3.81_a	97	3.82_a	168	3.58_a	26	3.71_a	91	3.82_a	95	4.12_a	17

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		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	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	3.66[1]	212	3.59$_a$	88	3.73$_a$	85	3.62$_a$	150	3.81$_a$	21	3.77$_a$	74	3.45$_b$	88	4.00$_a$	16
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.69[1]	3656	3.67[1]	215	3.73$_a$	93	3.69$_a$	83	3.68$_a$	153	4.00$_a$	20	3.94$_a$	78	3.51$_b$	89	4.00$_{a,b}$	13
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	3.95[1]	3999	4.02[1]	239	4.09$_a$	100	3.95$_a$	98	4.02$_a$	168	4.00$_a$	27	3.98$_a$	92	4.03$_a$	95	4.31$_a$	16
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.91[1]	3459	3.87[1]	207	3.92$_a$	84	3.79$_a$	87	3.92$_a$	143	3.59$_a$	22	3.94$_a$	77	3.88$_a$	83	3.93$_a$	14
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	4.06[1]	3723	3.79[1]	220	3.85$_a$	92	3.69$_a$	90	3.83$_a$	154	3.52$_a$	23	3.78$_a$	81	3.86$_a$	90	3.86$_a$	14
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.47[1]	3600	3.60[1]	214	3.60$_a$	88	3.76$_a$	88	3.61$_a$	148	4.00$_a$	23	3.61$_a$	79	3.59$_a$	85	3.93$_a$	15
I feel valued as an employee	3.68[1]	3991	3.73[1]	237	3.76$_a$	98	3.85$_a$	99	3.79$_a$	167	3.78$_a$	27	3.83$_a$	92	3.64$_a$	94	4.00$_a$	17

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		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	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	2.89^1	207	2.90_a	88	2.83_a	86	2.81_a	145	2.96_a	25	2.96_a	75	2.84_a	89	2.56_a	16
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	2.85^1	3670	2.84^1	209	2.90_a	90	2.72_a	86	2.74_a	148	3.08_a	24	2.88_a	77	2.82_a	88	2.44_a	16
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	2.64^1	3665	2.53^1	202	2.51_a	88	2.55_a	82	2.44_a	143	2.92_b	24	2.61_a	72	2.47_a	87	2.31_a	16
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	2.88^1	3606	2.69^1	204	2.60_a	89	2.65_a	81	2.54_a	141	2.96_a	25	2.81_a	72	2.56_a	87	2.56_a	16
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	2.73^1	3568	2.73^1	205	2.65_a	89	2.75_a	83	2.60_a	144	2.96_a	24	2.85_a	73	2.60_a	88	2.62_a	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 B5 Leadership and Accountability

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.35^1	2953	3.38^1	163	3.59_a	73	3.29_a	65	3.39_a	119	3.74_a	19	$3.38_{a,b}$	65	3.26_a	66	4.00_b	12
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.45^1	3343	3.51^1	176	3.71_a	77	3.47_a	72	3.57_a	127	3.68_a	22	3.48_a	67	3.52_a	73	4.07_a	14
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.30^1	2849	3.35^1	153	3.46_a	68	3.34_a	61	3.38_a	111	3.53_a	17	$3.40_{a,b}$	60	3.18_a	62	4.00_b	12

Table B5 Leadership and Accountability

Item	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.41^1	3241	3.44^1	163	3.55_a	71	3.46_a	65	3.49_a	116	3.53_a	19	3.45_a	65	3.41_a	64	4.08_a	13
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.13^1	2894	3.20^1	168	3.18_a	78	3.30_a	67	3.22_a	124	3.29_a	17	3.23_a	66	3.11_a	72	3.64_a	11
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.25^1	3365	3.35^1	190	3.43_a	87	3.43_a	75	3.42_a	136	3.30_a	23	3.27_a	74	3.38_a	79	3.69_a	16
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.78^1	3369	3.84^1	202	3.90_a	91	3.84_a	81	3.95_a	148	3.67_a	21	4.04_a	77	3.69_b	89	4.33_a	12
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.89^1	3705	4.05^1	211	4.02_a	96	4.19_a	85	4.20_a	153	3.80_b	25	4.09_a	80	4.10_a	93	4.38_a	13
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.37^1	3033	3.38^1	167	3.43_a	75	3.47_a	68	3.51_a	122	3.28_a	18	$3.53_{a,b}$	64	3.22_a	73	$*_b$	*
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.47^1	3351	3.56^1	185	3.58_a	81	3.66_a	76	3.70_a	130	3.42_a	24	3.59_a	70	3.57_a	82	4.20_a	10
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.20^1	3130	3.36^1	188	3.44_a	82	3.45_a	78	3.47_a	137	3.35_a	20	3.49_a	68	3.27_a	84	3.54_a	13
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.25^1	3599	3.40^1	204	3.54_a	91	3.42_a	83	3.50_a	146	3.54_a	24	3.47_a	73	3.51_a	91	3.47_a	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 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 ≥ 10.

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		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	247	8.7%	20	*	*	14.1%	14	7.7%	13	*	*	*	*	11.7%	11	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	3.0%	117	4.8%	11	*	*	*	*	6.0%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	13.3%	519	13.0%	30	*	*	20.2%	20	10.7%	18	*	*	12.9%	12	14.9%	14	*	*
Bias	28.3%	1104	33.0%	76	24.2%	24	39.4%	39	29.8%	50	40.7%	11	34.4%	32	36.2%	34	*	*
Physical Assault	0.6%	23	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.2%	282	8.3%	19	*	*	10.1%	10	6.0%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	65.7%	2566	63.0%	145	71.7%	71	56.6%	56	66.1%	111	55.6%	15	61.3%	57	61.7%	58	81.3%	13

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		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.8%	109	7.0%	16	*	*	12.1%	12	7.1%	12	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.3%	52	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	10.3%	404	12.2%	28	*	*	19.2%	19	11.3%	19	*	*	17.2%	16	*	*	*	*
Bias	24.1%	940	30.0%	69	23.2%	23	35.4%	35	26.8%	45	40.7%	11	28.0%	26	33.0%	31	*	*
Physical Assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	5.1%	199	7.0%	16	*	*	10.1%	10	6.0%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	70.8%	2765	64.8%	149	73.7%	73	57.6%	57	67.9%	114	55.6%	15	63.4%	59	63.8%	60	81.3%	13

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		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	1.9%	73	4.8%	11	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.1%	42	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	12.4%	486	12.2%	28	*	*	16.2%	16	10.1%	17	*	*	14.0%	13	*	*	*	*
Bias	23.3%	911	27.0%	62	22.2%	22	28.3%	28	22.6%	38	40.7%	11	26.9%	25	27.7%	26	*	*
Physical Assault	0.3%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.0%	272	7.4%	17	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	69.9%	2731	66.1%	152	73.7%	73	63.6%	63	70.8%	119	55.6%	15	65.6%	61	67.0%	63	81.3%	13

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		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.5%	99	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.0%	41	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	16.7%	651	16.5%	38	*	*	24.2%	24	16.1%	27	*	*	19.4%	18	16.0%	15	*	*
Bias	20.0%	781	26.5%	61	23.2%	23	28.3%	28	20.8%	35	51.9%	14	25.8%	24	27.7%	26	*	*
Physical Assault	0.9%	37	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	11.0%	428	11.7%	27	*	*	13.1%	13	9.5%	16	*	*	11.8%	11	11.7%	11	*	*
None	68.7%	2682	66.1%	152	71.7%	71	63.6%	63	71.4%	120	48.1%	13	65.6%	61	67.0%	63	75.0%	12

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

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

Table B10 Bias Incidents

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	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	3.96[1]	216	3.88$_a$	95	4.15$_b$	94	3.97$_a$	161	4.23$_a$	26	3.99$_a$	91	3.90$_a$	90	4.25$_a$	12
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.64[1]	3199	3.61[1]	178	3.49$_a$	75	3.79$_a$	78	3.59$_a$	131	3.95$_a$	20	3.65$_a$	80	3.56$_a$	68	*$_a$	*
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.10[1]	3174	3.06[1]	181	2.79$_a$	77	3.31$_b$	78	2.99$_a$	134	3.45$_a$	20	3.15$_a$	80	2.91$_a$	69	3.33$_a$	12
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.21[1]	2397	3.07[1]	129	2.92$_a$	52	3.22$_a$	59	3.11$_a$	98	3.15$_a$	13	3.14$_a$	56	3.02$_a$	47	3.40$_a$	10
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.44[1]	2962	3.44[1]	165	3.47$_a$	68	3.51$_a$	73	3.42$_a$	120	3.80$_a$	20	3.45$_a$	69	3.33$_a$	66	3.90$_a$	10

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 ≥ 10.

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		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	83.9%[1]	3260	82.2%[1]	189	81.0%[a]	81	88.0%[a]	88	86.5%[a]	147	63.0%[b]	17	82.8%[a]	77	84.2%[a]	80	88.2%[a]	15
No	16.1%[1]	627	17.8%[1]	41	19.0%[a]	19	12.0%[a]	12	13.5%[a]	23	37.0%[b]	10	17.2%[a]	16	15.8%[a]	15	*[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 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 ≥ 10.

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

Table B12 Employee Councils

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	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	3.58[1]	158	3.49[a]	69	3.73[a]	74	3.65[a]	122	3.60[a]	15	3.72[a]	64	3.49[a]	68	3.50[a]	12
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.87[1]	2700	4.01[1]	168	3.92[a]	74	4.13[a]	77	4.03[a]	130	4.07[a]	15	4.07[a]	67	4.01[a]	76	4.18[a]	11

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		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I am familiar with the Principles of Community.	3.91^1	3644	4.10^1	217	3.98_a	99	4.40_b	93	4.20_a	162	3.96_a	27	4.10_a	87	4.15_a	92	4.06_a	17
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.52^1	3366	3.90^1	206	3.75_a	92	4.25_b	89	4.09_a	150	3.62_b	26	3.91_a	81	3.93_a	89	4.27_a	15
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.20^1	3209	3.42^1	191	3.47_a	86	3.54_a	82	3.54_a	140	3.39_a	23	3.57_a	75	3.38_a	84	3.46_a	13
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	190	3.43_a	84	3.54_a	84	3.53_a	141	3.36_a	22	3.65_a	75	3.27_b	81	$3.62_{a,b}$	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

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My division/college supports people speaking freely	3.64[1]	3629	3.72[1]	209	3.70$_a$	93	3.76$_a$	89	3.80$_a$	154	3.58$_a$	24	3.72$_a$	82	3.72$_a$	90	3.93$_a$	15
Free speech is an important issue on campus	4.28[1]	3697	4.30[1]	221	4.29$_a$	95	4.33$_a$	97	4.35$_a$	163	4.00$_b$	26	4.40$_a$	90	4.24$_a$	92	4.19$_a$	16
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	3.59[1]	3525	3.55[1]	210	3.57$_a$	89	3.55$_a$	93	3.57$_a$	156	3.46$_a$	24	3.67$_a$	87	3.42$_a$	84	3.37$_a$	16
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.30[1]	3473	3.28[1]	203	3.23$_a$	88	3.40$_a$	88	3.33$_a$	150	3.09$_a$	23	3.28$_a$	83	3.25$_a$	84	3.14$_a$	14
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.97[1]	3648	2.87[1]	215	2.86$_a$	94	2.89$_a$	91	2.90$_a$	160	2.78$_a$	23	2.91$_a$	88	2.83$_a$	89	2.60$_a$	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 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		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	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	3.95^1	197	4.08_a	87	3.87_a	87	3.99_a	150	3.81_a	21	3.99_a	81	3.85_a	84	4.50_b	14
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.72^1	3408	3.83^1	202	3.95_a	91	3.80_a	87	3.84_a	154	4.00_a	21	3.91_a	82	3.78_a	87	3.86_a	14
CSU retains diverse employees	3.60^1	2992	3.81^1	179	3.99_a	80	3.66_b	77	3.80_a	138	3.88_a	16	3.83_a	75	3.70_a	76	4.08_a	12
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.77^1	3194	3.85^1	189	3.99_a	83	3.76_a	82	3.87_a	142	3.90_a	20	$3.89_{a,b}$	75	3.74_a	80	4.25_b	16
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.02^1	3472	4.07^1	209	4.04_a	93	4.11_a	92	4.07_a	157	4.08_a	25	4.13_a	83	4.00_a	92	4.14_a	14
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	3.84^1	3541	3.90^1	210	3.96_a	96	3.90_a	89	3.89_a	160	4.00_a	23	4.01_a	85	3.87_a	92	3.86_a	14
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.76^1	3183	3.83^1	193	3.87_a	86	3.84_a	82	3.85_a	144	3.81_a	21	3.79_a	77	3.80_a	84	4.13_a	15
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.08^1	3708	4.12^1	219	4.14_a	98	4.16_a	95	4.08_a	165	4.35_a	26	4.20_a	91	4.06_a	93	4.40_a	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 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		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	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	3.81^1	213	3.96_a	96	3.67_b	91	3.87_a	159	3.68_a	25	$3.83_{a,b}$	89	3.80_a	91	4.36_b	14
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.61^1	3548	3.79^1	209	3.94_a	96	3.72_a	88	3.84_a	156	3.84_a	25	3.88_a	84	3.80_a	92	3.93_a	15
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.50^1	3414	3.65^1	199	3.79_a	90	3.54_a	85	3.70_a	148	3.46_a	24	3.79_a	81	3.53_a	87	4.08_a	13
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.68^1	3458	3.78^1	205	3.91_a	91	3.69_a	89	3.87_a	150	3.63_a	27	3.83_a	81	3.75_a	88	4.13_a	16
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.66^1	3561	3.62^1	213	3.68_a	97	3.58_a	91	3.68_a	159	3.50_a	26	3.72_a	85	3.60_a	93	3.50_a	14
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.71^1	3739	3.89^1	223	3.96_a	100	3.89_a	98	3.94_a	168	3.81_a	27	3.95_a	93	3.87_a	94	4.13_a	15
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.59^1	3380	3.78^1	201	3.92_a	90	3.69_a	86	3.85_a	151	3.68_a	22	3.71_a	79	3.80_a	87	4.19_a	16
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.86^1	3735	4.01^1	221	4.10_a	99	3.97_a	96	4.05_a	166	3.89_a	27	4.04_a	91	4.02_a	94	4.33_a	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 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		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	14.1%[1]	533	18.3%[1]	41	17.2%[a]	17	23.0%[a]	23	20.1%[a]	34	*[a]	*	16.1%[a]	15	27.7%[a]	26	*[2]	*
No	85.9%[1]	3247	81.7%[1]	183	82.8%[a]	82	77.0%[a]	77	79.9%[a]	135	81.5%[a]	22	83.9%[a]	78	72.3%[a]	68	100.0%[2]	17

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 ≥ 10.

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

2. This category is not used in comparisons because its column proportion is equal to zero or one.

Table B18 Child and/or Adult Care-Related Challenges

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Cost of care services	72.3%	391	61.9%	26	76.5%	13	52.2%	12	55.9%	19	*	*	80.0%	12	53.8%	14	*	*
Finding child care services	31.8%	172	26.2%	11	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding adult care services	5.5%	30	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding temporary care services	12.0%	65	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding care for a sick child/adult	28.7%	155	23.8%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
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	28.6%	12	*	*	*	*	29.4%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Dependability of care services	15.0%	81	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Quality of care services	17.2%	93	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Scheduling care to match work schedule	40.1%	217	38.1%	16	*	*	47.8%	11	41.2%	14	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding summer care services	27.9%	151	31.0%	13	*	*	*	*	32.4%	11	*	*	*	*	38.5%	10	*	*

Table B18 Child and/or Adult Care-Related Challenges

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 ≥ 10.

Table B19 Factors

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CAS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
CSU Perceptions	3.82^1	2524	3.92^1	152	4.00_a	68	3.94_a	66	3.95_a	120	3.94_a	12	3.99_a	63	3.83_a	65	4.23_a	10
Department/Unit Perceptions	3.66^1	2869	3.79^1	170	3.94_a	79	3.70_a	70	3.87_a	128	3.70_a	19	3.81_a	70	3.77_a	74	4.13_a	11
Department/Unit Leadership	3.42^1	2859	3.49^1	138	3.55_a	61	3.60_a	55	3.58_a	97	3.63_a	18	3.53_a	53	3.50_a	55	4.13_a	10
College/Division Leadership	3.31^1	2472	3.39^1	131	3.42_a	60	3.50_a	52	3.46_a	95	3.54_a	15	$3.53_{a,b}$	52	3.17_a	52	$*_b$	*
Favoritism	2.80^1	3417	2.72^1	191	2.71_a	83	2.67_a	77	2.61_a	133	2.99_a	24	2.79_a	67	2.67_a	83	2.48_a	15
Sense of Belonging	3.67^1	3978	3.67^1	235	3.70_a	99	3.67_a	95	3.65_a	166	3.75_a	25	3.63_a	91	3.65_a	93	4.04_a	16
Department/Unit Culture	3.52^1	3807	3.68^1	223	3.84_a	95	3.63_a	88	3.75_a	155	3.69_a	26	3.60_a	85	3.81_a	89	3.90_a	16
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	4.00^1	3753	3.92^1	224	4.05_a	93	3.81_a	89	3.99_a	154	3.72_a	26	4.00_a	83	3.87_a	91	4.09_a	14

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 ≥ 10.

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	Similar	3.92	3.86	.07	73.5%	72.5%	1.1
Understands the value of diversity	Similar	3.97	4.06	-.09	76.9%	78.6%	-1.7
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Similar	3.76	3.62	.13	68.8%	64.7%	4.1
Treats all employees equitably	Similar	3.60	3.46	.13	62.3%	58.5%	3.8
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Similar	3.83	3.87	-.04	68.8%	69.8%	-1.1
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Similar	3.90	3.99	-.08	71.5%	77.0%	-5.5
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Similar	3.94	4.04	-.10	74.1%	76.1%	-2.0
Is open and transparent in communication	Higher	3.61	3.44	.17	60.8%	57.3%	3.6
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Higher	3.69	3.46	.22	63.8%	57.3%	6.5

---

[1] Based a 95% confidence interval where the margin of error for any given item is calculated as 1.96 × (σ ÷ √n).

Table C2 Culture

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	Similar	3.41	3.39	.03	49.8%	54.2%	-4.4
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	Similar	3.89	3.97	-.08	72.0%	76.1%	-4.1
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	Similar	4.24	4.32	-.08	86.0%	91.6%	-5.6
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	Similar	3.96	3.90	.07	75.1%	72.9%	2.2
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Lower	2.44	2.66	-.22	19.3%	28.0%	-8.7
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Similar	3.00	3.10	-.11	35.5%	37.0%	-1.5
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	Similar	3.68	3.65	.03	61.5%	62.4%	-.9
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	Similar	3.55	3.49	.06	57.0%	55.4%	1.6
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	Similar	3.79	3.88	-.09	67.6%	71.3%	-3.7

Table C3 Respect

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My department/office is treated with respect by other departments/offices within my division/college	Similar	3.66	3.64	.02	66.5%	64.3%	2.3
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	Similar	3.67	3.69	-.02	67.4%	67.0%	.4
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	Similar	4.02	3.95	.07	79.1%	78.9%	.2
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	Similar	3.87	3.91	-.04	70.0%	71.7%	-1.6
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	Lower	3.79	4.06	-.27	67.7%	79.0%	-11.2
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	Similar	3.60	3.47	.13	58.4%	55.1%	3.3
I feel valued as an employee	Similar	3.73	3.68	.06	67.5%	66.7%	.8

Table C4 Favoritism

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office	Similar	2.89	3.00	-.10	30.4%	37.9%	-7.5
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	Similar	2.84	2.85	-.01	28.2%	31.3%	-3.1
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	Similar	2.53	2.64	-.11	15.3%	23.7%	-8.3
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	Lower	2.69	2.88	-.19	25.5%	32.3%	-6.8
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	Similar	2.73	2.73	.00	25.4%	25.6%	-.2

Table C5 Leadership and Accountability

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.38	3.35	.03	55.2%	51.7%	3.5
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.51	3.45	.07	60.8%	58.2%	2.6
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.35	3.30	.06	50.3%	48.1%	2.2

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.44	3.41	.03	51.5%	55.4%	-3.9
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.20	3.13	.07	42.9%	41.5%	1.3
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.35	3.25	.10	50.0%	50.5%	-.5
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.84	3.78	.06	72.8%	69.4%	3.4
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Higher	4.05	3.89	.16	79.1%	75.1%	4.0
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Similar	3.38	3.37	.02	50.3%	50.3%	.0
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Similar	3.56	3.47	.08	57.3%	55.8%	1.5
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.36	3.20	.17	52.7%	45.8%	6.8
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.40	3.25	.14	54.4%	51.1%	3.3

Table C6 Bias Incidents

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	Similar	3.96	4.00	-.04	76.4%	77.7%	-1.3
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Similar	3.61	3.64	-.03	57.9%	61.8%	-3.9
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Similar	3.06	3.10	-.04	29.3%	32.4%	-3.1
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Similar	3.07	3.21	-.14	31.0%	34.0%	-3.0
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Similar	3.44	3.44	.00	52.1%	51.2%	.9

Table C7 Employee Councils

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I feel my employee council addresses issues and topics that are important and relevant to me	Higher	3.58	3.35	.23	58.2%	46.7%	11.6
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	Similar	4.01	3.87	.13	73.2%	70.8%	2.4

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 Community	Higher	4.10	3.91	.19	83.4%	77.2%	6.2
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment	Higher	3.90	3.52	.38	71.8%	58.4%	13.5
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	Higher	3.42	3.20	.22	47.6%	36.0%	11.7
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	Higher	3.41	3.26	.15	45.8%	38.4%	7.3

Table C9 Freedom of Speech

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college supports people speaking freely	Similar	3.72	3.64	.09	70.3%	66.7%	3.6
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Similar	4.30	4.28	.02	88.2%	89.5%	-1.2
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Similar	3.55	3.59	-.04	57.6%	59.8%	-2.2
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Similar	3.28	3.30	-.02	51.7%	50.3%	1.4
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Similar	2.87	2.97	-.10	29.3%	33.5%	-4.2

Table C10 CSU Perceptions

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	Similar	3.95	3.84	.11	80.7%	75.0%	5.7
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Similar	3.83	3.72	.10	72.8%	69.5%	3.3
CSU retains diverse employees	Higher	3.81	3.60	.21	68.7%	61.2%	7.5
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Similar	3.85	3.77	.08	74.6%	69.9%	4.7
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	4.07	4.02	.04	82.3%	79.9%	2.4
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.90	3.84	.06	76.2%	74.0%	2.2
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.83	3.76	.07	69.4%	66.6%	2.8
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Similar	4.12	4.08	.04	81.3%	80.9%	.4

Table C11 Department/Unit Perceptions

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Department/office recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	Higher	3.81	3.67	.14	75.1%	66.6%	8.5
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	Higher	3.79	3.61	.18	70.8%	63.7%	7.1
Department/office retains diverse employees	Higher	3.65	3.50	.15	62.3%	56.8%	5.5
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Similar	3.78	3.68	.10	68.8%	65.3%	3.5
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	3.62	3.66	-.04	60.6%	61.8%	-1.2
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	Higher	3.89	3.71	.17	73.5%	68.7%	4.9
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Higher	3.78	3.59	.18	66.7%	59.3%	7.3
Would recommend department/office as a place of employment	Higher	4.01	3.86	.15	73.8%	71.3%	2.5

Table C12 Factors

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Similar	3.92	3.82	.10
Department/Unit Perceptions	Similar	3.79	3.66	.13
Department/Unit Leadership	Similar	3.49	3.42	.07
College/Division Leadership	Similar	3.39	3.31	.08
Favoritism	Similar	2.72	2.80	-.08
Sense of Belonging	Similar	3.67	3.67	.00
Department/Unit Culture	Higher	3.68	3.52	.15
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Similar	3.92	4.00	-.08