



College of Liberal Arts

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 Liberal Arts. 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.....	2
Appendix B: Employee Characteristics Mean Comparisons	17
Appendix C: Division Comparisons to CSU Overall	32

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	3.0%	17.5%	14.4%	40.3%	24.7%	263	3.66
Understands the value of diversity	2.7%	5.3%	11.0%	43.9%	37.1%	264	4.08
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	6.8%	18.3%	12.9%	40.7%	21.3%	263	3.51
Treats all employees equitably	9.2%	23.1%	15.0%	32.3%	20.4%	260	3.32
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	2.6%	5.3%	13.2%	43.4%	35.5%	265	4.04
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	1.9%	9.1%	9.1%	41.3%	38.6%	264	4.06
Promotes respect for cultural differences	2.3%	2.3%	13.3%	37.3%	44.9%	263	4.20
Is open and transparent in communication	7.2%	16.6%	18.5%	35.8%	21.9%	265	3.49
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	7.3%	10.4%	15.8%	36.9%	29.6%	260	3.71

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	3.9%	9.7%	27.0%	50.6%	8.9%	259	3.51
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	1.9%	1.5%	13.5%	57.1%	25.9%	259	4.03
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	2.0%	1.2%	3.6%	42.5%	50.6%	247	4.38
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.2%	10.5%	10.1%	41.3%	34.8%	247	3.94
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	18.1%	36.7%	18.1%	19.3%	7.7%	259	2.62
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	6.3%	34.8%	31.3%	19.9%	7.8%	256	2.88
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.0%	14.8%	17.4%	44.3%	20.5%	264	3.64
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	2.7%	15.5%	26.5%	39.0%	16.3%	264	3.51
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.8%	11.0%	10.2%	38.3%	36.7%	264	3.93

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	3.4%	16.4%	27.3%	41.6%	11.3%	238	3.41
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	14.2%	30.5%	21.1%	30.1%	4.1%	246	2.79
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	2.7%	6.1%	11.4%	51.7%	28.1%	263	3.97
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	0.9%	3.9%	19.7%	43.8%	31.8%	233	4.02
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	1.2%	0.0%	6.3%	50.4%	42.1%	254	4.32
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	5.4%	14.2%	28.7%	37.9%	13.8%	240	3.40
I feel valued as an employee	5.7%	12.2%	15.6%	43.7%	22.8%	263	3.66

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	8.7%	32.1%	19.8%	26.6%	12.7%	252	3.02
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	9.8%	37.3%	22.5%	20.1%	10.2%	244	2.84
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	15.0%	40.5%	23.1%	14.2%	7.3%	247	2.58
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	16.7%	36.6%	21.5%	15.9%	9.3%	246	2.65
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	15.9%	39.0%	22.0%	13.0%	10.2%	246	2.63

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	4.6%	8.0%	29.7%	46.3%	11.4%	175	3.52
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	5.6%	12.7%	22.1%	42.7%	16.9%	213	3.53
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	5.8%	9.6%	30.8%	42.9%	10.9%	156	3.44

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	5.6%	15.8%	23.0%	39.8%	15.8%	196	3.44
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	6.5%	14.1%	33.5%	40.6%	5.3%	170	3.24
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	5.1%	25.3%	23.0%	38.7%	7.8%	217	3.19
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	1.9%	2.9%	17.2%	52.6%	25.4%	209	3.97
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	1.2%	4.9%	13.1%	48.4%	32.4%	244	4.06
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	7.6%	15.2%	24.8%	37.6%	14.8%	210	3.37
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.5%	17.8%	20.4%	40.0%	18.3%	230	3.52
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	5.7%	17.1%	28.0%	37.8%	11.4%	193	3.32
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	9.5%	24.5%	18.7%	34.0%	13.3%	241	3.17

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	7.3%	4.2%	12.0%	28.2%	0.4%	6.2%	67.6%	259
___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	3.1%	2.7%	8.1%	20.1%	0.4%	2.3%	75.7%	259
___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	2.7%	2.7%	13.5%	22.8%	0.0%	6.9%	71.0%	259
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	3.1%	1.2%	15.4%	20.5%	0.8%	10.8%	71.4%	259

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	0.0%	1.2%	8.8%	45.2%	44.8%	250	4.34
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	1.8%	12.8%	24.2%	39.6%	21.6%	227	3.67
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	4.8%	20.2%	31.1%	26.8%	17.1%	228	3.31
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	1.8%	18.1%	40.9%	24.6%	14.6%	171	3.32
CSU handles incidents of bias well	1.9%	10.3%	29.6%	46.0%	12.2%	213	3.56

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	91.5%	236
No	8.5%	22
Total	100.0%	258

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	5.7%	13.5%	30.2%	40.1%	10.4%	192	3.36
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	1.9%	1.9%	12.0%	46.3%	38.0%	216	4.17

Table A10 Principles of Community

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
I am familiar with the Principles of Community.	2.5%	8.3%	6.3%	45.4%	37.5%	240	4.07
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	6.1%	18.3%	12.7%	35.2%	27.7%	213	3.60
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	4.9%	13.1%	45.6%	24.3%	12.1%	206	3.26
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.1%	10.3%	45.4%	28.4%	12.9%	194	3.38

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	1.6%	5.6%	12.9%	51.8%	28.1%	249	3.99
Free speech is an important issue on campus	0.0%	2.0%	2.4%	40.3%	55.3%	253	4.49
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	0.0%	8.9%	20.7%	48.4%	22.0%	246	3.83
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	1.7%	22.3%	16.5%	37.6%	21.9%	242	3.56
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	3.3%	15.1%	20.4%	38.8%	22.4%	245	3.62

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	3.4%	14.8%	20.7%	47.8%	13.3%	203	3.53
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.6%	12.0%	23.6%	51.1%	9.8%	225	3.52
CSU retains diverse employees	5.7%	19.1%	29.4%	37.1%	8.8%	194	3.24
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	4.0%	12.1%	27.8%	46.5%	9.6%	198	3.45
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	0.8%	3.8%	12.2%	55.9%	27.3%	238	4.05
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	2.6%	5.1%	24.4%	54.3%	13.7%	234	3.71
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	2.0%	8.6%	21.7%	53.5%	14.1%	198	3.69
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	1.6%	7.3%	11.4%	49.2%	30.5%	246	4.00

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	4.3%	16.8%	18.1%	44.4%	16.4%	232	3.52
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.8%	7.1%	21.3%	53.3%	14.6%	240	3.68
Department/office retains diverse employees	5.8%	14.7%	27.2%	40.6%	11.6%	224	3.37
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	5.4%	5.8%	24.2%	50.7%	13.9%	223	3.62
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	2.9%	6.6%	15.2%	44.0%	31.3%	243	3.94
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	4.9%	8.1%	15.0%	47.4%	24.7%	247	3.79
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	4.2%	7.4%	24.5%	45.8%	18.1%	216	3.66
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	4.5%	6.5%	14.2%	39.4%	35.4%	246	3.95

Table A14 Discriminatory Attitudes

Discriminatory attitudes are present in your department/office based on:	%	N
Employment classification	39.8%	88
Job title	35.7%	79
No intolerant attitudes are present	32.1%	71
Gender	19.0%	42
Age	16.3%	36
Political affiliation	12.2%	27
Parental status	10.0%	22
Appearance	7.2%	16
Gender identity and expression	6.8%	15
Marital status	5.4%	12
Ethnic origin	5.0%	11
Religion	5.0%	11
Race or color	4.5%	10
Socioeconomic status	3.6%	8
Sexual orientation	3.2%	7
Disability (e.g. physical, mental)	3.2%	7
Nationality/Country of origin	2.7%	6
Other (Education/professional background, Research area/Grant money brought in, Discipline, Veteran status, Employment duration, Differing opinions/work styles/personalities)	6.6%	14

Note: multiple response item.

Table A15 Work-Related Stressors

Please select your top THREE work-related stressors	%	N
Lower salary	70.0%	175
Workload	35.6%	89
Work/life balance	30.0%	75
Lack of growth/promotion	27.6%	69
Email overload	21.2%	53
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	18.4%	46
Office/department climate	14.4%	36
Affordable housing near work	12.4%	31
Job security	11.6%	29
Interpersonal conflict	10.0%	25
Duties outside my job responsibilities/Taking on additional work	7.2%	18
Physical environment	4.4%	11
Health issues	4.4%	11
Lack of training/skills to do my work	3.2%	8
Ill-defined job	2.4%	6
Misconduct occurring at work/Inequities/Bias	2.4%	6
Lack of work autonomy	2.0%	5
Lack of work flexibility	1.6%	4
Other	1.6%	4
Dependent Care	1.2%	3
Administration/Leadership	1.2%	3
Health Insurance/Benefits	1.2%	3
Physical safety	0.8%	2

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	19.2%	48
No	80.8%	202
Total	100.0%	250

Table A17 Child and/or Adult Care-related Challenges

Please indicate what child care and/or adult care-related challenges, if any, you have encountered this past year	%	N
Cost of care services	79.2%	38
Scheduling care to match work schedule	47.9%	23
Finding child care services	41.7%	20
Finding care for a sick child/adult	37.5%	18
Transportation to/from care services	37.5%	18
Finding summer care services	29.2%	14
Dependability of care services	16.7%	8
Quality of care services	16.7%	8
Finding temporary care services	12.5%	6
Finding adult care services	10.4%	5
Location of care services	10.4%	5
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	4.2%	2
Other	4.2%	2
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	2.1%	1

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

Table A18 Gender

	%	N
Women	67.8%	160
Men	30.1%	71
T/NB/GNC	2.1%	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	89.5%	204
Minoritized	10.5%	24

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose.

Table A20 Employee Type

	%	N
Administrative Professional	17.3%	43
Faculty	71.9%	179
State Classified	7.6%	19
Other	0.4%	1
Prefer not to disclose	2.8%	7
Total	100.0%	249

Table A21 Department/Unit

	%	N
Anthropology	6.5%	16
Art and Art History or LEAP Institute for the Arts	7.3%	18
Communication Studies	6.5%	16
Dean's Office/College of Liberal Arts/Academic Support Center	10.2%	25
Economics	4.5%	11
English	19.9%	49
History	3.7%	9
Journalism and Media Communication	5.7%	14
Languages, Literatures and Cultures	2.4%	6
Philosophy	1.6%	4
Political Science	3.3%	8
School of Music, Theatre and Dance	11.8%	29
Sociology or Ethnic Studies	4.9%	12
Prefer not to disclose	11.8%	29
Total	100.0%	246

Note: Smaller departments were combined to ensure confidentiality.

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.

Table B1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CLA		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	3.66 ¹	263	3.84 _a	70	3.67 _a	157	3.70 _a	201	3.52 _a	23	4.49 _a	43	3.43 _b	175	4.11 _a	19
Understands the value of diversity	4.06 ¹	3956	4.08 ¹	264	4.21 _a	71	4.04 _a	158	4.10 _a	202	3.79 _a	24	4.26 _a	43	4.02 _a	178	4.17 _a	18
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.62 ¹	3994	3.51 ¹	263	3.64 _a	70	3.54 _a	157	3.57 _a	200	3.29 _a	24	3.65 _a	43	3.52 _a	175	3.37 _a	19
Treats all employees equitably	3.46 ¹	3946	3.32 ¹	260	3.46 _a	68	3.29 _a	156	3.32 _a	197	3.17 _a	24	3.71 _a	42	3.24 _b	174	3.11 _{a,b}	19
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.87 ¹	3950	4.04 ¹	265	4.13 _a	71	4.01 _a	158	4.06 _a	202	3.75 _a	24	4.21 _a	43	4.00 _a	178	3.89 _a	18
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.99 ¹	3999	4.06 ¹	264	4.27 _a	71	3.97 _b	157	4.05 _a	201	3.96 _a	24	4.07 _a	43	4.07 _a	176	3.95 _a	19
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.04 ¹	3934	4.20 ¹	263	4.33 _a	70	4.17 _a	157	4.24 _a	200	3.83 _b	24	4.19 _a	43	4.18 _a	175	4.26 _a	19
Is open and transparent in communication	3.44 ¹	4009	3.49 ¹	265	3.58 _a	71	3.52 _a	158	3.54 _a	202	3.08 _a	24	3.51 _a	43	3.50 _a	178	3.56 _a	18
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	3.46 ¹	3952	3.71 ¹	260	3.77 _a	70	3.73 _a	155	3.71 _a	199	3.65 _a	23	3.57 _a	42	3.76 _a	174	3.53 _a	19

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		CLA		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	3.51 ¹	259	3.54 _a	69	3.48 _a	156	3.52 _a	198	3.04 _b	24	3.71 _a	41	3.47 _{a,b}	175	3.16 _b	19
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.97 ¹	3872	4.03 ¹	259	4.07 _a	70	4.01 _a	157	4.08 _a	200	3.54 _b	24	4.23 _a	43	3.97 _b	175	3.95 _{a,b}	19
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	4.32 ¹	3691	4.38 ¹	247	4.28 _a	67	4.43 _a	146	4.37 _a	188	4.50 _a	22	4.43 _a	40	4.38 _a	165	4.42 _a	19
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.90 ¹	3687	3.94 ¹	247	4.01 _a	68	3.91 _a	145	3.93 _a	188	3.95 _a	22	4.03 _a	40	3.99 _a	166	3.72 _a	18
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	2.66 ¹	3925	2.62 ¹	259	2.38 _a	68	2.60 _a	156	2.54 _a	198	2.74 _a	23	2.36 _a	42	2.61 _a	173	2.95 _a	19
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	3.10 ¹	3910	2.88 ¹	256	2.78 _a	69	2.92 _a	153	2.86 _a	196	3.05 _a	22	3.02 _{a,b}	43	2.79 _a	170	3.33 _b	18
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.65 ¹	4012	3.64 ¹	264	3.65 _a	71	3.63 _a	159	3.68 _a	203	3.29 _a	24	4.23 _a	43	3.44 _b	178	3.68 _{a,b}	19
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.49 ¹	4003	3.51 ¹	264	3.40 _a	70	3.60 _a	159	3.56 _a	202	3.17 _a	24	4.26 _a	43	3.28 _b	177	3.68 _b	19
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.88 ¹	4007	3.93 ¹	264	4.06 _a	71	4.01 _a	158	4.03 _a	202	3.67 _a	24	4.40 _a	42	3.85 _b	178	3.84 _{a,b}	19

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		CLA		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	3.41 ¹	238	3.49 _a	65	3.45 _a	148	3.47 _a	187	3.17 _a	23	3.60 _a	40	3.40 _a	162	3.47 _a	17
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.69 ¹	3656	2.79 ¹	246	2.55 _a	65	2.87 _a	152	2.79 _a	193	2.77 _a	22	3.37 _a	41	2.54 _b	165	3.47 _a	17
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	3.95 ¹	3999	3.97 ¹	263	3.97 _a	70	4.03 _a	159	4.02 _a	202	3.67 _a	24	4.21 _a	43	3.94 _a	177	3.79 _a	19
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.91 ¹	3459	4.02 ¹	233	4.03 _a	64	4.00 _a	139	4.01 _a	178	4.00 _a	23	4.05 _a	37	3.99 _a	155	3.94 _a	17
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	4.06 ¹	3723	4.32 ¹	254	4.42 _a	65	4.28 _a	157	4.33 _a	196	4.17 _a	23	4.39 _a	41	4.30 _a	171	4.22 _a	18
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.47 ¹	3600	3.40 ¹	240	3.23 _a	62	3.51 _a	147	3.42 _a	184	3.43 _a	23	3.41 _a	37	3.41 _a	163	3.50 _a	18
I feel valued as an employee	3.68 ¹	3991	3.66 ¹	263	3.59 _a	70	3.75 _a	158	3.73 _a	201	3.21 _b	24	4.05 _a	43	3.55 _b	176	3.89 _{a,b}	19

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		CLA		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	3.02 ¹	252	2.75 _a	67	3.09 _b	151	2.97 _a	192	3.39 _a	23	2.72 _a	40	3.08 _a	171	2.94 _a	18
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	2.85 ¹	3670	2.84 ¹	244	2.65 _a	66	2.88 _a	145	2.77 _a	186	3.27 _a	22	2.66 _a	38	2.85 _a	165	2.83 _a	18
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	2.64 ¹	3665	2.58 ¹	247	2.40 _a	67	2.59 _a	146	2.55 _a	187	2.70 _a	23	2.45 _a	38	2.54 _a	168	2.83 _a	18
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	2.88 ¹	3606	2.65 ¹	246	2.37 _a	67	2.67 _a	146	2.56 _a	188	3.00 _a	23	2.59 _a	39	2.59 _a	167	2.89 _a	18
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	2.73 ¹	3568	2.63 ¹	246	2.31 _a	68	2.66 _b	147	2.58 _a	188	3.00 _a	24	2.54 _a	39	2.55 _a	167	3.06 _a	18

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		CLA		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	3.52 ¹	175	3.81 _a	47	3.40 _b	106	3.51 _a	135	3.19 _a	16	3.86 _a	35	3.46 _b	116	3.20 _b	10
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.45 ¹	3343	3.53 ¹	213	3.78 _a	59	3.47 _a	133	3.52 _a	168	3.32 _a	19	3.79 _a	38	3.50 _a	143	3.39 _a	18
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.30 ¹	2849	3.44 ¹	156	3.69 _a	45	3.30 _b	92	3.39 _a	119	3.40 _a	15	3.80 _a	30	3.35 _b	104	* _{a,b}	*

Table B5 Leadership and Accountability

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.41 ¹	3241	3.44 ¹	196	3.62 _a	52	3.42 _a	125	3.42 _a	155	3.61 _a	18	3.60 _a	35	3.43 _a	134	3.33 _a	15
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.13 ¹	2894	3.24 ¹	170	3.29 _a	49	3.19 _a	102	3.30 _a	132	2.76 _b	17	3.52 _a	29	3.15 _a	118	3.25 _a	12
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.25 ¹	3365	3.19 ¹	217	3.16 _a	56	3.21 _a	139	3.24 _a	169	2.86 _a	21	3.29 _a	34	3.18 _a	153	3.00 _a	16
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.78 ¹	3369	3.97 ¹	209	4.02 _a	57	3.95 _a	130	3.95 _a	165	3.78 _a	18	4.29 _a	38	3.88 _b	140	3.80 _{a,b}	15
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.89 ¹	3705	4.06 ¹	244	4.18 _a	65	4.07 _a	153	4.08 _a	192	3.95 _a	22	4.21 _a	39	4.05 _a	167	4.05 _a	19
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.37 ¹	3033	3.37 ¹	210	3.46 _a	59	3.37 _a	128	3.42 _a	165	3.00 _a	19	3.88 _a	34	3.24 _b	146	3.47 _{a,b}	15
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.47 ¹	3351	3.52 ¹	230	3.79 _a	62	3.48 _a	142	3.58 _a	178	3.36 _a	22	3.81 _a	37	3.48 _a	157	3.33 _a	18
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.20 ¹	3130	3.32 ¹	193	3.48 _a	52	3.24 _a	119	3.37 _a	151	2.61 _b	18	3.59 _a	34	3.25 _a	129	3.00 _a	15
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.25 ¹	3599	3.17 ¹	241	3.35 _a	65	3.14 _a	150	3.22 _a	189	2.82 _a	22	3.53 _a	38	3.11 _a	165	2.95 _a	19

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 $n \geq 10$.

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		CLA		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	247	7.3%	19	*	*	7.5%	12	8.4%	17	*	*	*	*	9.0%	16	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	3.0%	117	4.2%	11	*	*	*	*	4.9%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	13.3%	519	12.0%	31	*	*	13.1%	21	11.8%	24	*	*	*	*	10.7%	19	*	*
Bias	28.3%	1104	28.2%	73	18.6%	13	31.9%	51	26.1%	53	50.0%	12	30.2%	13	27.5%	49	*	*
Physical Assault	0.6%	23	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.2%	282	6.2%	16	*	*	6.3%	10	5.4%	11	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	65.7%	2566	67.6%	175	78.6%	55	65.0%	104	70.0%	142	50.0%	12	69.8%	30	68.5%	122	68.4%	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		CLA		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.8%	109	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.3%	52	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	10.3%	404	8.1%	21	*	*	8.1%	13	8.4%	17	*	*	*	*	8.4%	15	*	*
Bias	24.1%	940	20.1%	52	14.3%	10	21.3%	34	17.7%	36	*	*	*	*	19.1%	34	*	*
Physical Assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	5.1%	199	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	70.8%	2765	75.7%	196	80.0%	56	75.6%	121	77.3%	157	62.5%	15	79.1%	34	75.8%	135	73.7%	14

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		CLA		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	1.9%	73	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.1%	42	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	12.4%	486	13.5%	35	*	*	13.1%	21	11.8%	24	*	*	*	*	14.0%	25	*	*
Bias	23.3%	911	22.8%	59	15.7%	11	23.1%	37	19.2%	39	*	*	*	*	20.8%	37	*	*
Physical Assault	0.3%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.0%	272	6.9%	18	*	*	6.9%	11	5.4%	11	*	*	*	*	7.3%	13	*	*
None	69.9%	2731	71.0%	184	75.7%	53	71.3%	114	73.9%	150	58.3%	14	76.7%	33	71.3%	127	68.4%	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		CLA		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	15.4%	40	*	*	15.6%	25	15.3%	31	*	*	*	*	14.0%	25	*	*
Bias	20.0%	781	20.5%	53	*	*	23.1%	37	17.2%	35	41.7%	10	*	*	19.7%	35	*	*
Physical Assault	0.9%	37	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	11.0%	428	10.8%	28	*	*	13.1%	21	9.4%	19	*	*	*	*	8.4%	15	*	*
None	68.7%	2682	71.4%	185	78.6%	55	68.8%	110	73.4%	149	54.2%	13	76.7%	33	70.2%	125	68.4%	13

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		CLA		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	4.34 ¹	250	4.21 _a	66	4.44 _b	156	4.36 _a	196	4.30 _a	23	4.36 _a	42	4.33 _a	173	4.29 _a	17
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.64 ¹	3199	3.67 ¹	227	3.67 _a	58	3.73 _a	143	3.73 _a	175	3.39 _a	23	3.92 _a	36	3.63 _a	159	3.75 _a	16
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.10 ¹	3174	3.31 ¹	228	3.00 _a	59	3.45 _b	145	3.37 _a	180	2.76 _b	21	3.12 _a	41	3.34 _a	155	3.47 _a	17
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.21 ¹	2397	3.32 ¹	171	3.07 _a	46	3.44 _b	106	3.29 _a	133	3.33 _a	18	3.17 _a	30	3.38 _a	116	3.21 _a	14
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.44 ¹	2962	3.56 ¹	213	3.46 _a	57	3.64 _a	134	3.59 _a	168	3.45 _a	20	3.87 _a	39	3.50 _b	145	3.80 _{a,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 means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

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

Table B11 Employee Councils

Are you aware there is an employee group/organization that represents my employee group's interests .	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CLA		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	83.9% ¹	3260	91.5% ¹	236	93.0% _a	66	91.8% _a	146	92.6% _a	188	91.7% _a	22	100.0% ²	43	89.9% _a	160	94.7% _a	18
No	16.1% ¹	627	8.5% ¹	22	* _a	*	8.2% _a	13	7.4% _a	15	* _a	*	* ²	*	10.1% _a	18	* _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 $n \geq 10$.

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

Table B11 Employee Councils

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

Table B12 Employee Councils

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CLA		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	3.36 ¹	192	3.21 _a	53	3.44 _a	121	3.37 _a	153	3.06 _a	18	3.58 _a	33	3.31 _a	134	3.40 _a	15
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.87 ¹	2700	4.17 ¹	216	4.16 _a	58	4.19 _a	139	4.21 _a	174	3.89 _a	18	4.13 _a	38	4.23 _a	149	3.83 _a	18

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		CLA		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	4.07 ¹	240	3.81 _a	64	4.17 _b	150	4.10 _a	189	4.13 _a	23	4.35 _a	43	3.98 _b	161	4.28 _{a,b}	18
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.52 ¹	3366	3.60 ¹	213	3.32 _a	56	3.74 _b	132	3.68 _a	167	3.32 _a	22	3.87 _{a,b}	38	3.47 _a	142	4.19 _b	16
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.20 ¹	3209	3.26 ¹	206	3.06 _a	52	3.37 _a	131	3.33 _a	162	3.10 _a	21	3.57 _a	37	3.13 _b	136	3.56 _{a,b}	18
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.26 ¹	3082	3.38 ¹	194	3.04 _a	52	3.52 _b	122	3.43 _a	154	3.05 _a	20	3.71 _a	38	3.21 _b	128	3.67 _{a,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 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		CLA		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	3.99 ¹	249	4.18 _a	67	3.95 _a	156	4.04 _a	197	3.52 _b	23	4.12 _a	42	4.01 _a	173	3.65 _a	17
Free speech is an important issue on campus	4.28 ¹	3697	4.49 ¹	253	4.54 _a	68	4.48 _a	158	4.50 _a	199	4.54 _a	24	4.54 _a	41	4.55 _a	176	4.05 _b	19
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	3.59 ¹	3525	3.83 ¹	246	3.90 _a	67	3.77 _a	153	3.85 _a	194	3.70 _a	23	3.84 _a	38	3.86 _a	173	3.68 _a	19
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.30 ¹	3473	3.56 ¹	242	3.42 _a	65	3.65 _a	150	3.62 _a	191	3.36 _a	22	3.98 _a	41	3.46 _b	168	3.56 _{a,b}	16
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.97 ¹	3648	3.62 ¹	245	3.50 _a	68	3.62 _a	151	3.62 _a	193	3.48 _a	23	3.24 _a	41	3.79 _b	171	3.18 _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 B15 CSU Perceptions

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CLA		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	3.53 ¹	203	3.59 _a	63	3.50 _a	127	3.60 _a	167	2.90 _b	20	3.66 _{a,b}	38	3.41 _a	140	4.16 _b	19
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.72 ¹	3408	3.52 ¹	225	3.58 _a	62	3.52 _a	145	3.57 _a	181	3.13 _b	24	4.07 _a	43	3.41 _b	155	3.47 _b	19
CSU retains diverse employees	3.60 ¹	2992	3.24 ¹	194	3.31 _a	55	3.18 _a	125	3.30 _a	156	2.62 _b	21	3.46 _{a,b}	37	3.12 _a	136	3.87 _b	15
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.77 ¹	3194	3.45 ¹	198	3.56 _a	54	3.38 _a	129	3.50 _a	157	2.88 _b	24	3.79 _a	39	3.36 _b	136	3.59 _{a,b}	17
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.02 ¹	3472	4.05 ¹	238	4.09 _a	67	4.03 _a	152	4.13 _a	192	3.50 _b	24	4.23 _a	43	4.02 _a	166	3.83 _a	18
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	3.84 ¹	3541	3.71 ¹	234	3.76 _a	62	3.70 _a	152	3.75 _a	188	3.29 _b	24	4.20 _a	40	3.62 _b	164	3.58 _b	19
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.76 ¹	3183	3.69 ¹	198	3.79 _a	56	3.70 _a	128	3.77 _a	162	3.10 _b	21	4.10 _a	39	3.60 _b	134	3.65 _{a,b}	17
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.08 ¹	3708	4.00 ¹	246	4.06 _a	69	4.01 _a	156	4.05 _a	199	3.71 _a	24	4.42 _a	43	3.88 _b	173	4.16 _{a,b}	19

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		CLA		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	3.52 ¹	232	3.76 _a	66	3.43 _b	148	3.57 _a	188	3.04 _b	23	3.53 _a	38	3.47 _a	165	3.89 _a	19
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.61 ¹	3548	3.68 ¹	240	3.88 _a	66	3.62 _a	154	3.72 _a	193	3.33 _a	24	4.02 _a	43	3.61 _b	169	3.67 _{a,b}	18
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.50 ¹	3414	3.37 ¹	224	3.50 _a	62	3.31 _a	143	3.45 _a	178	2.75 _b	24	3.51 _a	37	3.30 _a	161	3.76 _a	17
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.68 ¹	3458	3.62 ¹	223	3.95 _a	61	3.47 _b	143	3.68 _a	177	3.00 _b	24	3.85 _a	39	3.56 _a	158	3.67 _a	18
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.66 ¹	3561	3.94 ¹	243	4.01 _a	68	3.92 _a	155	3.99 _a	196	3.54 _b	24	4.12 _a	43	3.91 _a	171	3.78 _a	18
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.71 ¹	3739	3.79 ¹	247	4.00 _a	68	3.75 _a	158	3.84 _a	199	3.42 _a	24	4.14 _a	42	3.74 _b	175	3.58 _{a,b}	19
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.59 ¹	3380	3.66 ¹	216	3.97 _a	59	3.56 _b	140	3.73 _a	173	3.04 _b	23	3.90 _a	40	3.60 _a	150	3.71 _a	17
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.86 ¹	3735	3.95 ¹	246	4.14 _a	69	3.91 _a	156	4.00 _a	199	3.63 _a	24	4.19 _a	42	3.90 _a	174	3.89 _a	19

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		CLA		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	14.1% ¹	533	19.2% ¹	48	22.5% _a	16	20.0% _a	32	19.1% _a	39	* _a	*	* _a	*	21.2% _a	38	* _a	*
No	85.9% ¹	3247	80.8% ¹	202	77.5% _a	55	80.0% _a	128	80.9% _a	165	70.8% _a	17	86.0% _a	37	78.8% _a	141	89.5% _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 proportions. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances. Means and percentages are reported only for items with $n \geq 10$.

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

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CLA		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	79.2%	38	87.5%	14	75.0%	24	84.6%	33	*	*	*	*	78.9%	30	*	*
Finding child care services	31.8%	172	41.7%	20	*	*	37.5%	12	46.2%	18	*	*	*	*	39.5%	15	*	*
Finding adult care services	5.5%	30	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding temporary care services	12.0%	65	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding care for a sick child/adult	28.7%	155	37.5%	18	*	*	37.5%	12	41.0%	16	*	*	*	*	34.2%	13	*	*
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	37.5%	18	*	*	40.6%	13	38.5%	15	*	*	*	*	39.5%	15	*	*
Dependability of care services	15.0%	81	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Quality of care services	17.2%	93	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Scheduling care to match work schedule	40.1%	217	47.9%	23	*	*	50.0%	16	48.7%	19	*	*	*	*	50.0%	19	*	*
Finding summer care services	27.9%	151	29.2%	14	*	*	31.3%	10	30.8%	12	*	*	*	*	31.6%	12	*	*
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 $n \geq 10$.

Table B19 Factors

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CLA		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	3.62 ¹	161	3.67 _a	48	3.61 _a	101	3.69 _a	129	3.09 _b	18	3.94 _a	33	3.52 _b	109	3.81 _{a,b}	14
Department/Unit Perceptions	3.66 ¹	2869	3.67 ¹	190	3.94 _a	52	3.57 _b	122	3.74 _a	150	3.18 _b	22	3.86 _a	33	3.61 _a	134	3.84 _a	16
Department/Unit Leadership	3.42 ¹	2859	3.47 ¹	176	3.69 _a	48	3.43 _a	110	3.49 _a	136	3.34 _a	18	3.66 _a	30	3.47 _a	122	3.23 _a	13
College/Division Leadership	3.31 ¹	2472	3.47 ¹	135	3.67 _a	39	3.37 _a	80	3.48 _a	104	3.13 _a	14	3.83 _a	27	3.38 _b	89	* _b	*
Favoritism	2.80 ¹	3417	2.73 ¹	233	2.49 _a	66	2.78 _a	137	2.69 _a	180	3.10 _a	21	2.59 _a	37	2.70 _a	156	2.91 _a	18
Sense of Belonging	3.67 ¹	3978	3.69 ¹	262	3.70 _a	70	3.75 _a	158	3.76 _a	201	3.37 _b	24	4.32 _a	42	3.52 _b	177	3.74 _b	19
Department/Unit Culture	3.52 ¹	3807	3.51 ¹	249	3.58 _a	66	3.54 _a	149	3.54 _a	189	3.31 _a	23	3.68 _a	41	3.49 _a	167	3.43 _a	18
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	4.00 ¹	3753	4.09 ¹	255	4.20 _a	69	4.05 _a	154	4.12 _a	196	3.73 _b	24	4.22 _a	43	4.05 _a	172	4.06 _a	18

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 $n \geq 10$.

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	Lower	3.66	3.86	-.19	65.0%	72.5%	-7.4
Understands the value of diversity	Similar	4.08	4.06	.02	81.1%	78.6%	2.4
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Similar	3.51	3.62	-.11	62.0%	64.7%	-2.7
Treats all employees equitably	Similar	3.32	3.46	-.15	52.7%	58.5%	-5.8
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Higher	4.04	3.87	.16	78.9%	69.8%	9.0
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Similar	4.06	3.99	.07	79.9%	77.0%	2.9
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Higher	4.20	4.04	.16	82.1%	76.1%	6.0
Is open and transparent in communication	Similar	3.49	3.44	.04	57.7%	57.3%	.5
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Higher	3.71	3.46	.25	66.5%	57.3%	9.2

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

Table C2 Culture

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	Higher	3.51	3.39	.12	59.5%	54.2%	5.3
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	Similar	4.03	3.97	.06	83.0%	76.1%	6.9
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	Similar	4.38	4.32	.06	93.1%	91.6%	1.5
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	Similar	3.94	3.90	.04	76.1%	72.9%	3.2
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Similar	2.62	2.66	-.04	27.0%	28.0%	-1.0
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Lower	2.88	3.10	-.22	27.7%	37.0%	-9.3
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	Similar	3.64	3.65	.00	64.8%	62.4%	2.4
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	Similar	3.51	3.49	.02	55.3%	55.4%	-.1
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	Similar	3.93	3.88	.05	75.0%	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	Lower	3.41	3.64	-.23	52.9%	64.3%	-11.3
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	Lower	2.79	3.69	-.90	34.1%	67.0%	-32.9
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	Similar	3.97	3.95	.01	79.8%	78.9%	1.0
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	Similar	4.02	3.91	.10	75.5%	71.7%	3.9
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	Higher	4.32	4.06	.26	92.5%	79.0%	13.6
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	Similar	3.40	3.47	-.06	51.7%	55.1%	-3.4
I feel valued as an employee	Similar	3.66	3.68	-.02	66.5%	66.7%	-.1

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	3.02	3.00	.03	39.3%	37.9%	1.3
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	Similar	2.84	2.85	-.01	30.3%	31.3%	-1.0
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	Similar	2.58	2.64	-.06	21.5%	23.7%	-2.2
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	Lower	2.65	2.88	-.23	25.2%	32.3%	-7.1
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	Similar	2.63	2.73	-.10	23.2%	25.6%	-2.4

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	Higher	3.52	3.35	.17	57.7%	51.7%	6.0
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.53	3.45	.08	59.6%	58.2%	1.4
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.44	3.30	.14	53.8%	48.1%	5.7

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.44	3.41	.03	55.6%	55.4%	.2
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.24	3.13	.11	45.9%	41.5%	4.3
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.19	3.25	-.06	46.5%	50.5%	-4.0
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Higher	3.97	3.78	.19	78.0%	69.4%	8.6
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Higher	4.06	3.89	.16	80.7%	75.1%	5.6
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Similar	3.37	3.37	.00	52.4%	50.3%	2.1
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Similar	3.52	3.47	.04	58.3%	55.8%	2.5
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.32	3.20	.13	49.2%	45.8%	3.4
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.17	3.25	-.08	47.3%	51.1%	-3.8

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	Higher	4.34	4.00	.33	90.0%	77.7%	12.3
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Similar	3.67	3.64	.03	61.2%	61.8%	-.6
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Higher	3.31	3.10	.21	43.9%	32.4%	11.5
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Similar	3.32	3.21	.11	39.2%	34.0%	5.1
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Higher	3.56	3.44	.13	58.2%	51.2%	7.0

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	Similar	3.36	3.35	.01	50.5%	46.7%	3.9
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	Higher	4.17	3.87	.29	84.3%	70.8%	13.5

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	4.07	3.91	.16	82.9%	77.2%	5.7
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment	Similar	3.60	3.52	.08	62.9%	58.4%	4.5
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	Similar	3.26	3.20	.06	36.4%	36.0%	.4
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	Similar	3.38	3.26	.12	41.2%	38.4%	2.8

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	Higher	3.99	3.64	.36	79.9%	66.7%	13.2
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Higher	4.49	4.28	.21	95.7%	89.5%	6.2
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Higher	3.83	3.59	.25	70.3%	59.8%	10.5
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Higher	3.56	3.30	.26	59.5%	50.3%	9.2
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Higher	3.62	2.97	.65	61.2%	33.5%	27.7

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	Lower	3.53	3.84	-.32	61.1%	75.0%	-13.9
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Lower	3.52	3.72	-.21	60.9%	69.5%	-8.6
CSU retains diverse employees	Lower	3.24	3.60	-.36	45.9%	61.2%	-15.4
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Lower	3.45	3.77	-.31	56.1%	69.9%	-13.8
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	4.05	4.02	.03	83.2%	79.9%	3.3
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Lower	3.71	3.84	-.12	67.9%	74.0%	-6.0
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.69	3.76	-.07	67.7%	66.6%	1.0
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Similar	4.00	4.08	-.08	79.7%	80.9%	-1.2

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	Lower	3.52	3.67	-.16	60.8%	66.6%	-5.8
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	Similar	3.68	3.61	.07	67.9%	63.7%	4.2
Department/office retains diverse employees	Similar	3.37	3.50	-.13	52.2%	56.8%	-4.6
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Similar	3.62	3.68	-.06	64.6%	65.3%	-.7
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	Higher	3.94	3.66	.29	75.3%	61.8%	13.6
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.79	3.71	.08	72.1%	68.7%	3.4
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.66	3.59	.07	63.9%	59.3%	4.6
Would recommend department/office as a place of employment	Similar	3.95	3.86	.09	74.8%	71.3%	3.5

Table C12 Factors

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Lower	3.62	3.82	-.20
Department/Unit Perceptions	Similar	3.67	3.66	.01
Department/Unit Leadership	Similar	3.47	3.42	.05
College/Division Leadership	Higher	3.47	3.31	.16
Favoritism	Similar	2.73	2.80	-.07
Sense of Belonging	Similar	3.69	3.67	.02
Department/Unit Culture	Similar	3.51	3.52	-.01
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Similar	4.09	4.00	.09