



Division of Engagement

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 Division of Engagement. 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 division refers to the Division of Engagement, 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	33

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	5.1%	16.5%	10.1%	35.4%	32.9%	158	3.75
Understands the value of diversity	2.5%	9.4%	11.9%	40.9%	35.2%	159	3.97
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	9.4%	18.2%	15.1%	30.2%	27.0%	159	3.47
Treats all employees equitably	14.6%	22.8%	12.0%	24.1%	26.6%	158	3.25
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	4.4%	5.7%	15.2%	41.1%	33.5%	158	3.94
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.8%	1.9%	7.0%	38.6%	48.7%	158	4.27
Promotes respect for cultural differences	2.5%	6.3%	13.8%	39.6%	37.7%	159	4.04
Is open and transparent in communication	15.8%	22.2%	15.8%	25.3%	20.9%	158	3.13
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	13.8%	20.1%	19.5%	21.4%	25.2%	159	3.24

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	11.3%	27.7%	19.5%	26.4%	15.1%	159	3.06
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.2%	9.5%	17.1%	41.8%	28.5%	158	3.83
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	2.1%	6.2%	4.8%	43.2%	43.8%	146	4.21
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	8.5%	15.5%	13.4%	28.2%	34.5%	142	3.65
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	14.8%	26.5%	19.4%	22.6%	16.8%	155	3.00
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	7.1%	19.5%	29.9%	30.5%	13.0%	154	3.23
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	8.1%	16.9%	25.6%	29.4%	20.0%	160	3.36
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	13.2%	10.7%	18.2%	38.4%	19.5%	159	3.40
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	10.7%	8.8%	13.2%	30.8%	36.5%	159	3.74

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	5.2%	12.3%	14.8%	45.2%	22.6%	155	3.68
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	5.9%	15.0%	24.2%	35.9%	19.0%	153	3.47
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	6.3%	14.5%	8.8%	45.3%	25.2%	159	3.69
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	5.6%	2.8%	21.8%	36.6%	33.1%	142	3.89
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	6.0%	6.0%	16.6%	43.0%	28.5%	151	3.82
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.3%	10.5%	16.4%	44.1%	25.7%	152	3.78
I feel valued as an employee	15.8%	13.3%	12.0%	31.0%	27.8%	158	3.42

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	13.2%	23.7%	21.7%	23.7%	17.8%	152	3.09
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	15.2%	29.8%	21.2%	17.9%	15.9%	151	2.89
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	19.7%	34.9%	25.0%	11.2%	9.2%	152	2.55
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	17.1%	24.7%	23.3%	15.1%	19.9%	146	2.96
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	17.8%	26.7%	29.5%	15.1%	11.0%	146	2.75

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	18.8%	21.1%	22.7%	30.5%	7.0%	128	2.86
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	13.7%	17.1%	24.7%	32.2%	12.3%	146	3.12
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	19.2%	23.8%	22.3%	27.7%	6.9%	130	2.79

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	14.5%	17.9%	21.4%	33.8%	12.4%	145	3.12
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	13.8%	30.0%	24.6%	23.8%	7.7%	130	2.82
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	12.0%	26.8%	19.7%	30.3%	11.3%	142	3.02
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	7.7%	11.2%	21.0%	39.2%	21.0%	143	3.55
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	7.3%	11.3%	14.7%	41.3%	25.3%	150	3.66
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	16.8%	18.3%	27.5%	26.7%	10.7%	131	2.96
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	13.6%	15.0%	27.9%	30.0%	13.6%	140	3.15
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	18.5%	22.2%	20.7%	28.9%	9.6%	135	2.89
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	17.2%	18.6%	15.9%	34.5%	13.8%	145	3.09

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	2.6%	1.3%	13.5%	30.8%	0.0%	6.4%	65.4%	156
___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	3.8%	0.6%	13.5%	35.3%	0.0%	5.1%	62.2%	156
___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	1.3%	1.9%	17.3%	33.3%	0.6%	9.6%	61.5%	156
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	0.6%	0.0%	23.7%	27.6%	2.6%	12.2%	60.3%	156

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	1.4%	10.2%	21.8%	44.2%	22.4%	147	3.76
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.1%	19.7%	21.3%	36.2%	19.7%	127	3.50
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	5.6%	21.6%	43.2%	22.4%	7.2%	125	3.04
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.4%	19.1%	57.3%	18.0%	2.2%	89	2.97
CSU handles incidents of bias well	6.8%	11.9%	34.7%	31.4%	15.3%	118	3.36

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	81.4%	127
No	18.6%	29
Total	100.0%	156

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	8.9%	16.7%	38.9%	33.3%	2.2%	90	3.03
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.0%	9.9%	18.8%	45.5%	22.8%	101	3.75

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.	1.3%	5.2%	2.6%	43.8%	47.1%	153	4.30
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	5.4%	16.2%	10.1%	33.1%	35.1%	148	3.76
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	9.6%	17.8%	38.4%	24.0%	10.3%	146	3.08
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	9.2%	16.3%	38.3%	27.0%	9.2%	141	3.11

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	11.4%	16.1%	11.4%	43.6%	17.4%	149	3.40
Free speech is an important issue on campus	0.7%	3.5%	12.1%	37.6%	46.1%	141	4.25
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	2.3%	13.6%	28.8%	41.7%	13.6%	132	3.51
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	5.8%	29.2%	21.2%	31.4%	12.4%	137	3.15
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	8.8%	23.6%	29.7%	29.1%	8.8%	148	3.05

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	3.7%	8.1%	12.5%	51.5%	24.3%	136	3.85
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	6.1%	11.4%	21.2%	42.4%	18.9%	132	3.57
CSU retains diverse employees	5.6%	11.2%	27.2%	40.0%	16.0%	125	3.50
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.0%	7.4%	21.5%	48.1%	20.0%	135	3.75
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	1.4%	2.8%	16.1%	44.8%	35.0%	143	4.09
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	5.7%	8.5%	16.3%	48.9%	20.6%	141	3.70
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	6.2%	5.4%	28.7%	34.1%	25.6%	129	3.67
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.7%	4.7%	14.2%	41.9%	34.5%	148	3.97

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	6.6%	17.8%	17.8%	41.4%	16.4%	152	3.43
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	9.9%	19.1%	24.1%	34.0%	12.8%	141	3.21
Department/office retains diverse employees	10.9%	19.0%	30.6%	29.3%	10.2%	147	3.09
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	11.0%	11.0%	26.7%	34.2%	17.1%	146	3.36
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	4.6%	12.5%	19.1%	42.1%	21.7%	152	3.64
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	12.6%	13.9%	15.9%	39.7%	17.9%	151	3.36
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	8.5%	16.2%	31.7%	26.8%	16.9%	142	3.27
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	12.3%	10.4%	16.9%	33.1%	27.3%	154	3.53

Table A14 Discriminatory Attitudes

Discriminatory attitudes are present in your department/office based on:	%	N
Employment classification	38.7%	46
Job title	37.8%	45
Age	28.6%	34
Political affiliation	26.1%	31
No intolerant attitudes are present	21.8%	26
Gender	16.8%	20
Appearance	15.1%	18
Religion	11.8%	14
Race or color	10.9%	13
Gender identity and expression	10.9%	13
Ethnic origin	9.2%	11
Sexual orientation	9.2%	11
Parental status	7.6%	9
Disability (e.g. physical, mental)	7.6%	9
Socioeconomic status	5.0%	6
Nationality/Country of origin	4.2%	5
Marital status	4.2%	5
Other (Employment duration, Nepotism/favoritism, Reverse discrimination, Education/professional background, Differing opinions/work styles/personalities)	8.4%	10

Note: multiple response item.

Table A15 Work-Related Stressors

Please select your top THREE work-related stressors	%	N
Lower salary	42.4%	64
Work/life balance	37.7%	57
Office/department climate	36.4%	55
Lack of growth/promotion	34.4%	52
Workload	27.8%	42
Interpersonal conflict	15.9%	24
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	13.9%	21
Email overload	13.2%	20
Duties outside my job responsibilities	12.6%	19
Affordable housing near work	8.6%	13
Ill-defined job	7.3%	11
Job security	6.6%	10
Lack of work flexibility	4.6%	7
Misconduct occurring at work/Inequities/Bias	4.6%	7
Lack of training/skills to do my work	4.6%	7
Health issues	4.6%	7
Lack of work autonomy	4.0%	6
Physical environment	4.0%	6
Health Insurance/Benefits	2.0%	3
Physical safety	1.3%	2
Other	1.3%	2
Administration/Leadership	1.3%	2
Communication	0.7%	1
Dependent Care	0.7%	1
Bureaucracy	0.7%	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	7.8%	12
No	92.2%	141
Total	100.0%	153

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
Scheduling care to match work schedule	81.8%	9
Cost of care services	72.7%	8
Finding child care services	36.4%	4
Finding care for a sick child/adult	27.3%	3
Finding summer care services	27.3%	3
Finding temporary care services	18.2%	2
Transportation to/from care services	18.2%	2
Finding adult care services	9.1%	1
Dependability of care services	9.1%	1
Quality of care services	9.1%	1
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	0.0%	0
Other	0.0%	0
Location of care services	0.0%	0

I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	0.0%	0
---	------	---

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

Table A18 Gender

	%	N
Women	63.0%	87
Men	35.5%	49
T/NB/GNC	1.4%	2

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	91.9%	125
Minoritized	8.1%	11

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose.

Table A20 Employee Type

	%	N
Administrative Professional	78.0%	117
Faculty	3.3%	5
State Classified	10.0%	15
Other	1.3%	2
Prefer not to disclose	7.3%	11
Total	100.0%	150

Table A21 Department/Unit

	%	N
Continuing Education (Admin. or Denver)	19.6%	30
CSU Extension	21.6%	33
Extension	2.6%	4
Front Range Region	10.5%	16
Office of the VP or Engagement or Expanded Food & Nutrition Ed. Program or Colorado Water Institute	8.50%	13
Peaks and Plains Region	19.6%	30
Prefer not to disclose	8.5%	13
Western Region	9.2%	14
Total	100%	153

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		Engagement		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	3.75 ¹	158	3.90 _a	49	3.59 _a	86	3.77 _a	124	3.36 _a	11	3.81 _a	116	* _a	*	3.27 _a	15
Understands the value of diversity	4.06 ¹	3956	3.97 ¹	159	3.94 _a	49	3.93 _a	87	4.02 _a	125	3.27 _b	11	3.97 _a	117	* _a	*	4.07 _a	15
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.62 ¹	3994	3.47 ¹	159	3.86 _a	49	3.29 _b	87	3.53 _a	125	3.00 _a	11	3.56 _a	117	* _a	*	3.13 _a	15
Treats all employees equitably	3.46 ¹	3946	3.25 ¹	158	3.65 _a	49	3.06 _b	87	3.30 _a	124	3.09 _a	11	3.33 _a	117	* _a	*	2.93 _a	15
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.87 ¹	3950	3.94 ¹	158	4.06 _a	48	3.83 _a	87	3.98 _a	124	3.09 _b	11	3.96 _a	116	* _a	*	3.93 _a	15
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.99 ¹	3999	4.27 ¹	158	4.44 _a	48	4.10 _a	87	4.24 _a	124	4.09 _a	11	4.33 _a	116	* _a	*	3.93 _a	15
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.04 ¹	3934	4.04 ¹	159	4.16 _a	49	3.94 _a	87	4.12 _a	125	3.18 _b	11	4.06 _a	117	* _a	*	4.00 _a	15
Is open and transparent in communication	3.44 ¹	4009	3.13 ¹	158	3.45 _a	49	2.99 _a	86	3.21 _a	124	2.55 _a	11	3.20 _a	116	* _a	*	2.80 _a	15
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	3.46 ¹	3952	3.24 ¹	159	3.47 _a	49	3.11 _a	87	3.26 _a	125	3.00 _a	11	3.34 _a	117	* _a	*	2.87 _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 $n \geq 10$.

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		Engagement		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	3.06 ¹	159	3.23 _a	48	2.99 _a	87	3.13 _a	124	2.82 _a	11	3.16 _a	116	* _a	*	2.73 _a	15
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.97 ¹	3872	3.83 ¹	158	3.85 _a	48	3.81 _a	86	3.93 _a	123	3.09 _b	11	3.83 _a	116	* _a	*	3.80 _a	15
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	4.32 ¹	3691	4.21 ¹	146	4.35 _a	48	4.09 _a	76	4.20 _a	115	* _a	*	4.21 _a	109	* _a	*	4.14 _a	14
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.90 ¹	3687	3.65 ¹	142	3.98 _a	48	3.42 _b	72	3.67 _a	111	* _a	*	3.61 _a	106	* _a	*	3.50 _a	14
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	2.66 ¹	3925	3.00 ¹	155	3.02 _a	48	2.90 _a	83	2.97 _a	120	3.09 _a	11	2.92 _a	112	* _a	*	2.87 _a	15
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	3.10 ¹	3910	3.23 ¹	154	3.13 _a	48	3.31 _a	83	3.26 _a	120	3.45 _a	11	3.10 _a	112	* _{a,b}	*	3.73 _b	15
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.65 ¹	4012	3.36 ¹	160	3.51 _a	49	3.30 _a	87	3.42 _a	125	2.55 _b	11	3.48 _a	117	* _a	*	2.73 _b	15
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.49 ¹	4003	3.40 ¹	159	3.63 _a	49	3.36 _a	86	3.44 _a	124	3.55 _a	11	3.53 _a	116	* _a	*	2.87 _a	15
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.88 ¹	4007	3.74 ¹	159	4.08 _a	49	3.60 _b	87	3.82 _a	125	3.36 _a	11	3.84 _a	117	* _a	*	3.27 _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 $n \geq 10$.

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		Engagement		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	3.68 ¹	155	3.82 _a	49	3.67 _a	84	3.75 _a	122	3.36 _a	11	3.81 _a	114	* _{a,b}	*	2.87 _b	15
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.69 ¹	3656	3.47 ¹	153	3.47 _a	49	3.44 _a	82	3.49 _a	120	3.36 _a	11	3.53 _a	112	* _a	*	2.93 _a	15
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	3.95 ¹	3999	3.69 ¹	159	4.08 _a	49	3.52 _b	87	3.71 _a	125	3.82 _a	11	3.70 _a	117	* _a	*	3.67 _a	15
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.91 ¹	3459	3.89 ¹	142	3.85 _a	46	3.92 _a	76	3.96 _a	111	2.91 _b	11	3.83 _a	106	* _a	*	4.08 _a	12
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	4.06 ¹	3723	3.82 ¹	151	3.85 _a	48	3.81 _a	83	3.90 _a	119	3.09 _b	11	3.78 _a	112	* _a	*	3.93 _a	14
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.47 ¹	3600	3.78 ¹	152	3.71 _a	48	3.81 _a	83	3.81 _a	119	3.18 _a	11	3.73 _a	113	* _a	*	3.86 _a	14
I feel valued as an employee	3.68 ¹	3991	3.42 ¹	158	3.71 _a	49	3.26 _a	86	3.48 _a	124	2.82 _a	11	3.58 _a	116	* _{a,b}	*	2.67 _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.

Means and percentages are reported only for items with \geq .

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		Engagement		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	3.09 ¹	152	2.92 _a	48	3.20 _a	84	3.05 _a	120	3.73 _a	11	3.06 _a	114	* _a	*	3.40 _a	15
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	2.85 ¹	3670	2.89 ¹	151	2.70 _a	47	3.01 _a	84	2.87 _a	119	3.27 _a	11	2.83 _a	113	* _a	*	3.27 _a	15
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	2.64 ¹	3665	2.55 ¹	152	2.58 _a	48	2.60 _a	84	2.53 _a	120	3.36 _b	11	2.48 _a	114	* _a	*	3.07 _a	15
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	2.88 ¹	3606	2.96 ¹	146	2.72 _a	46	3.12 _a	80	2.91 _a	116	3.80 _b	10	2.92 _a	110	* _a	*	3.43 _a	14
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	2.73 ¹	3568	2.75 ¹	146	2.55 _a	47	2.94 _a	79	2.73 _a	116	3.50 _b	10	2.69 _a	110	* _a	*	3.36 _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 $n \geq 10$.

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		Engagement		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	2.86 ¹	128	3.18 _a	44	2.67 _b	67	2.93 _a	101	* _b	*	2.92 _a	97	* _a	*	2.77 _a	13
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.45 ¹	3343	3.12 ¹	146	3.36 _a	47	2.97 _a	79	3.14 _a	117	* _a	*	3.10 _a	113	* _a	*	3.17 _a	12

Table B5 Leadership and Accountability

Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.30 ¹	2849	2.79 ¹	130	3.07 _a	45	2.67 _a	69	2.90 _a	103	* _b	*	2.78 _a	98	* _a	*	2.85 _a	13
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.41 ¹	3241	3.12 ¹	145	3.37 _a	46	2.95 _a	80	3.16 _a	116	2.40 _a	10	3.05 _a	111	* _a	*	3.38 _a	13
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.13 ¹	2894	2.82 ¹	130	2.89 _a	45	2.79 _a	68	2.84 _a	102	* _a	*	2.81 _a	98	* _a	*	2.92 _a	13
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.25 ¹	3365	3.02 ¹	142	3.11 _a	46	2.90 _a	77	3.02 _a	114	* _a	*	2.95 _a	108	* _b	*	2.77 _a	13
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.78 ¹	3369	3.55 ¹	143	3.72 _a	46	3.49 _a	78	3.59 _a	113	3.10 _a	10	3.58 _a	109	* _a	*	3.43 _a	14
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.89 ¹	3705	3.66 ¹	150	3.79 _a	47	3.63 _a	83	3.72 _a	119	3.18 _a	11	3.63 _a	114	* _a	*	3.86 _a	14
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.37 ¹	3033	2.96 ¹	131	3.22 _a	46	2.84 _a	68	3.08 _a	102	2.20 _b	10	3.01 _a	98	* _a	*	2.85 _a	13
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.47 ¹	3351	3.15 ¹	140	3.28 _a	46	3.10 _a	77	3.26 _a	110	2.36 _b	11	3.17 _{a,b}	107	* _a	*	2.75 _b	12
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.20 ¹	3130	2.89 ¹	135	3.07 _a	46	2.88 _a	74	2.98 _a	109	* _a	*	2.98 _a	101	* _a	*	2.73 _a	15
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.25 ¹	3599	3.09 ¹	145	3.20 _a	46	3.00 _a	82	3.13 _a	117	2.70 _a	10	3.12 _a	109	* _a	*	2.67 _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 $n \geq 10$.

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		Engagement		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	247	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	3.0%	117	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	13.3%	519	13.5%	21	*	*	17.2%	15	12.8%	16	*	*	13.7%	16	*	*	*	*
Bias	28.3%	1104	30.8%	48	22.4%	11	33.3%	29	26.4%	33	*	*	29.1%	34	*	*	*	*
Physical Assault	0.6%	23	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.2%	282	6.4%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	65.7%	2566	65.4%	102	75.5%	37	62.1%	54	69.6%	87	*	*	68.4%	80	*	*	*	*

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

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

Table B7 Misconduct Among Division/College

___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Engagement		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	13.5%	21	*	*	13.8%	12	10.4%	13	*	*	15.4%	18	*	*	*	*
Bias	24.1%	940	35.3%	55	28.6%	14	35.6%	31	29.6%	37	*	*	32.5%	38	*	*	*	*
Physical Assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	5.1%	199	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	70.8%	2765	62.2%	97	67.3%	33	62.1%	54	68.8%	86	*	*	64.1%	75	*	*	73.3%	11

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

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

Table B8 Misconduct Among Department/Office

___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Engagement		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	17.3%	27	*	*	19.5%	17	16.0%	20	*	*	19.7%	23	*	*	*	*
Bias	23.3%	911	33.3%	52	20.4%	10	35.6%	31	28.0%	35	*	*	31.6%	37	*	*	*	*
Physical Assault	0.3%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.0%	272	9.6%	15	*	*	14.9%	13	10.4%	13	*	*	10.3%	12	*	*	*	*
None	69.9%	2731	61.5%	96	73.5%	36	59.8%	52	66.4%	83	*	*	63.2%	74	*	*	66.7%	10

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		Engagement		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	23.7%	37	*	*	26.4%	23	24.0%	30	*	*	23.1%	27	*	*	*	*
Bias	20.0%	781	27.6%	43	20.4%	10	27.6%	24	21.6%	27	*	*	27.4%	32	*	*	*	*
Physical Assault	0.9%	37	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	11.0%	428	12.2%	19	*	*	13.8%	12	12.0%	15	*	*	12.0%	14	*	*	*	*
None	68.7%	2682	60.3%	94	75.5%	37	55.2%	48	63.2%	79	*	*	61.5%	72	*	*	*	*

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		Engagement		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	3.76 ¹	147	3.62 _a	48	3.86 _a	81	3.80 _a	118	3.50 _a	10	3.77 _a	112	* _a	*	3.80 _a	15
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.64 ¹	3199	3.50 ¹	127	3.39 _a	41	3.55 _a	71	3.54 _a	101	* _a	*	3.53 _a	98	* _a	*	3.54 _a	13
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.10 ¹	3174	3.04 ¹	125	2.81 _a	42	3.17 _b	70	3.05 _a	102	* _a	*	3.02 _a	97	* _a	*	3.14 _a	14
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.21 ¹	2397	2.97 ¹	89	2.81 _a	31	3.08 _a	50	2.99 _a	75	* _a	*	2.94 _a	70	* _a	*	* _a	*
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.44 ¹	2962	3.36 ¹	118	3.43 _a	40	3.40 _a	65	3.45 _a	95	* _a	*	3.48 _a	91	* _a	*	3.00 _a	13

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

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

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		Engagement		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	83.9% ¹	3260	81.4% ¹	127	87.8% _a	43	80.5% _a	70	86.4% _a	108	* _b	*	84.6% _a	99	* ²	*	73.3% _a	11
No	16.1% ¹	627	18.6% ¹	29	* _a	*	19.5% _a	17	13.6% _a	17	* _b	*	15.4% _a	18	* ²	*	* _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
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		Engagement		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	3.03 ¹	90	3.14 _a	37	3.00 _a	44	3.08 _a	77	* _a	*	3.10 _a	70	* _{a,b}	*	* _b	*
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.87 ¹	2700	3.75 ¹	101	3.82 _a	39	3.73 _a	52	3.79 _a	86	* _b	*	3.74 _a	81	* _a	*	* _a	*

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

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

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		Engagement		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	4.30 ¹	153	4.17 _a	48	4.35 _a	85	4.34 _a	122	3.82 _a	11	4.36 _a	114	* _a	*	3.93 _a	15
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.52 ¹	3366	3.76 ¹	148	3.55 _a	47	3.80 _a	82	3.70 _a	118	3.50 _a	10	3.78 _a	111	* _a	*	3.64 _a	14
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.20 ¹	3209	3.08 ¹	146	3.15 _a	47	3.09 _a	81	3.19 _a	115	2.45 _b	11	3.13 _a	111	* _a	*	3.00 _a	14
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.26 ¹	3082	3.11 ¹	141	3.13 _a	47	3.16 _a	76	3.23 _a	110	2.73 _a	11	3.20 _a	107	* _a	*	2.93 _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 $n \geq 10$.

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		Engagement		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	3.40 ¹	149	3.50 _a	48	3.40 _a	82	3.52 _a	120	* _a	*	3.46 _a	114	* _a	*	3.07 _a	14
Free speech is an important issue on campus	4.28 ¹	3697	4.25 ¹	141	4.11 _a	45	4.29 _a	78	4.28 _a	114	* _a	*	4.32 _a	106	* _a	*	3.93 _a	14
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	3.59 ¹	3525	3.51 ¹	132	3.67 _a	43	3.44 _a	71	3.53 _a	104	* _a	*	3.51 _a	98	* _a	*	3.38 _a	13
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.30 ¹	3473	3.15 ¹	137	3.21 _a	43	3.13 _a	76	3.24 _a	110	* _a	*	3.19 _{a,b}	103	* _a	*	2.71 _b	14
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.97 ¹	3648	3.05 ¹	148	3.20 _a	45	2.96 _a	83	3.10 _a	117	2.64 _a	11	3.04 _a	111	* _a	*	3.07 _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 $n \geq 10$.

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		Engagement		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	3.85 ¹	136	3.80 _a	46	3.85 _a	73	3.88 _a	109	* _a	*	3.91 _a	102	* _a	*	3.64 _a	14
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.72 ¹	3408	3.57 ¹	132	3.51 _a	43	3.61 _a	72	3.59 _a	105	* _a	*	3.62 _a	99	* _a	*	3.50 _a	12
CSU retains diverse employees	3.60 ¹	2992	3.50 ¹	125	3.60 _a	40	3.45 _a	67	3.55 _a	98	* _a	*	3.54 _a	92	* _a	*	3.55 _a	11
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.77 ¹	3194	3.75 ¹	135	3.75 _a	44	3.76 _a	72	3.78 _a	107	* _a	*	3.80 _a	102	* _a	*	3.82 _a	11
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.02 ¹	3472	4.09 ¹	143	4.02 _a	45	4.16 _a	79	4.13 _a	115	* _a	*	4.18 _a	108	* _a	*	3.79 _a	14
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	3.84 ¹	3541	3.70 ¹	141	3.74 _a	47	3.74 _a	77	3.73 _a	114	* _a	*	3.80 _a	106	* _{a,b}	*	3.00 _b	14
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.76 ¹	3183	3.67 ¹	129	3.68 _a	44	3.79 _a	67	3.76 _a	101	* _a	*	3.70 _a	98	* _a	*	3.36 _a	11
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.08 ¹	3708	3.97 ¹	148	4.07 _a	46	3.96 _a	83	4.08 _a	119	3.20 _b	10	4.10 _a	114	* _{a,b}	*	3.08 _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.

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 B16 Department/Unit Perceptions

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Engagement		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	3.43 ¹	152	3.46 _a	48	3.33 _a	85	3.48 _a	122	2.64 _b	11	3.44 _a	115	* _a	*	3.27 _a	15
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.61 ¹	3548	3.21 ¹	141	3.24 _a	45	3.20 _a	79	3.29 _a	112	2.64 _a	11	3.24 _a	105	* _a	*	3.07 _a	14
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.50 ¹	3414	3.09 ¹	147	3.30 _a	47	2.94 _a	82	3.18 _a	117	2.18 _b	11	3.12 _a	109	* _a	*	3.00 _a	15
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.68 ¹	3458	3.36 ¹	146	3.52 _a	48	3.22 _a	80	3.44 _a	116	2.36 _b	11	3.38 _a	113	* _a	*	3.17 _a	12
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.66 ¹	3561	3.64 ¹	152	3.69 _a	48	3.62 _a	85	3.66 _a	122	3.36 _a	11	3.69 _a	116	* _a	*	3.43 _a	14
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.71 ¹	3739	3.36 ¹	151	3.49 _a	47	3.34 _a	86	3.42 _a	122	2.82 _a	11	3.46 _a	114	* _a	*	2.87 _a	15
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.59 ¹	3380	3.27 ¹	142	3.43 _a	46	3.25 _a	77	3.40 _a	112	2.45 _b	11	3.31 _a	108	* _a	*	3.08 _a	12
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.86 ¹	3735	3.53 ¹	154	3.73 _a	49	3.47 _a	86	3.64 _a	124	3.00 _a	11	3.66 _a	117	* _{a,b}	*	2.87 _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.

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 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		Engagement		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	14.1% ¹	533	7.8% ¹	12	* _a	*	* _a	*	8.1% _a	10	* _a	*	9.4% _a	11	* ²	*	* ²	*
No	85.9% ¹	3247	92.2% ¹	141	93.9% _a	46	90.7% _a	78	91.9% _a	114	* _a	*	90.6% _a	106	* ²	*	100.0% ²	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 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
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		Engagement		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	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding child care services	31.8%	172	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding adult care services	5.5%	30	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding temporary care services	12.0%	65	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding care for a sick child/adult	28.7%	155	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	3.5%	19	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Other	2.2%	12	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Transportation to/from care services	29.2%	158	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Dependability of care services	15.0%	81	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Quality of care services	17.2%	93	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Scheduling care to match work schedule	40.1%	217	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding summer care services	27.9%	151	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Location of care services	15.5%	84	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	10.2%	55	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

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

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

Table B19 Factors

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Engagement		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	3.79 ¹	107	3.78 _a	39	3.87 _a	52	3.86 _a	82	* _a	*	3.84 _a	82	* _a	*	* _a	*
Department/Unit Perceptions	3.66 ¹	2869	3.37 ¹	122	3.49 _a	43	3.28 _a	64	3.46 _a	94	2.68 _b	11	3.41 _a	94	* _a	*	3.06 _a	10
Department/Unit Leadership	3.42 ¹	2859	3.14 ¹	128	3.34 _a	45	3.01 _a	69	3.18 _a	104	* _a	*	3.10 _a	99	* _a	*	3.03 _a	11
College/Division Leadership	3.31 ¹	2472	2.91 ¹	119	3.20 _a	44	2.80 _b	61	3.01 _a	95	* _a	*	2.95 _a	90	* _a	*	2.81 _a	12
Favoritism	2.80 ¹	3417	2.81 ¹	143	2.67 _a	46	2.93 _a	77	2.78 _a	113	3.54 _b	10	2.76 _a	108	* _a	*	3.32 _a	13
Sense of Belonging	3.67 ¹	3978	3.50 ¹	158	3.74 _a	49	3.41 _a	86	3.56 _a	124	3.15 _a	11	3.61 _a	116	* _{a,b}	*	2.96 _b	15
Department/Unit Culture	3.52 ¹	3807	3.31 ¹	155	3.63 _a	49	3.14 _b	85	3.36 _a	122	2.89 _a	11	3.41 _a	115	* _a	*	2.88 _a	15
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	4.00 ¹	3753	3.96 ¹	156	4.01 _a	47	3.90 _a	86	4.03 _a	122	3.16 _b	11	3.95 _a	115	* _a	*	3.95 _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 $n \geq 10$.

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	Similar	3.75	3.86	-.11	68.4%	72.5%	-4.1
Understands the value of diversity	Similar	3.97	4.06	-.09	76.1%	78.6%	-2.5
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Similar	3.47	3.62	-.15	57.2%	64.7%	-7.4
Treats all employees equitably	Similar	3.25	3.46	-.21	50.6%	58.5%	-7.9
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Similar	3.94	3.87	.06	74.7%	69.8%	4.8
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Higher	4.27	3.99	.28	87.3%	77.0%	10.3
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Similar	4.04	4.04	.00	77.4%	76.1%	1.2
Is open and transparent in communication	Lower	3.13	3.44	-.31	46.2%	57.3%	-11.1
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Lower	3.24	3.46	-.22	46.5%	57.3%	-10.8

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	Lower	3.06	3.39	-.32	41.5%	54.2%	-12.7
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	Similar	3.83	3.97	-.14	70.3%	76.1%	-5.9
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	Similar	4.21	4.32	-.12	87.0%	91.6%	-4.6
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	Lower	3.65	3.90	-.25	62.7%	72.9%	-10.2
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Higher	3.00	2.66	.34	39.4%	28.0%	11.3
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Similar	3.23	3.10	.12	43.5%	37.0%	6.5
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	Lower	3.36	3.65	-.29	49.4%	62.4%	-13.0
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	Similar	3.40	3.49	-.09	57.9%	55.4%	2.5
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	Similar	3.74	3.88	-.14	67.3%	71.3%	-4.0

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	3.68	3.64	.04	67.7%	64.3%	3.5
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	Lower	3.47	3.69	-.22	54.9%	67.0%	-12.1
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	Lower	3.69	3.95	-.27	70.4%	78.9%	-8.4
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	Similar	3.89	3.91	-.03	69.7%	71.7%	-1.9
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	Lower	3.82	4.06	-.24	71.5%	79.0%	-7.4
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	Higher	3.78	3.47	.31	69.7%	55.1%	14.6
I feel valued as an employee	Lower	3.42	3.68	-.26	58.9%	66.7%	-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	3.09	3.00	.10	41.4%	37.9%	3.5
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	Similar	2.89	2.85	.05	33.8%	31.3%	2.4
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	Similar	2.55	2.64	-.09	20.4%	23.7%	-3.3
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	Similar	2.96	2.88	.08	34.9%	32.3%	2.6
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	Similar	2.75	2.73	.02	26.0%	25.6%	.5

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	Lower	2.86	3.35	-.49	37.5%	51.7%	-14.2
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	Lower	3.12	3.45	-.32	44.5%	58.2%	-13.7
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Lower	2.79	3.30	-.50	34.6%	48.1%	-13.5

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Lower	3.12	3.41	-.29	46.2%	55.4%	-9.2
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Lower	2.82	3.13	-.31	31.5%	41.5%	-10.0
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Lower	3.02	3.25	-.23	41.5%	50.5%	-9.0
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Lower	3.55	3.78	-.23	60.1%	69.4%	-9.3
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Lower	3.66	3.89	-.23	66.7%	75.1%	-8.5
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Lower	2.96	3.37	-.40	37.4%	50.3%	-12.9
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Lower	3.15	3.47	-.32	43.6%	55.8%	-12.2
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Lower	2.89	3.20	-.31	38.5%	45.8%	-7.3
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.09	3.25	-.16	48.3%	51.1%	-2.8

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	Lower	3.76	4.00	-.24	66.7%	77.7%	-11.1
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Similar	3.50	3.64	-.14	55.9%	61.8%	-5.9
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Similar	3.04	3.10	-.06	29.6%	32.4%	-2.8
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Lower	2.97	3.21	-.24	20.2%	34.0%	-13.8
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Similar	3.36	3.44	-.07	46.6%	51.2%	-4.6

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	Lower	3.03	3.35	-.31	35.6%	46.7%	-11.1
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	Similar	3.75	3.87	-.12	68.3%	70.8%	-2.5

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	4.30	3.91	.39	90.8%	77.2%	13.6
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment	Higher	3.76	3.52	.24	68.2%	58.4%	9.9
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	Similar	3.08	3.20	-.12	34.2%	36.0%	-1.7
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	Similar	3.11	3.26	-.15	36.2%	38.4%	-2.3

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	Lower	3.40	3.64	-.24	61.1%	66.7%	-5.6
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Similar	4.25	4.28	-.03	83.7%	89.5%	-5.8
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Similar	3.51	3.59	-.08	55.3%	59.8%	-4.5
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Similar	3.15	3.30	-.15	43.8%	50.3%	-6.5

Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Similar	3.05	2.97	.08	37.8%	33.5%	4.3
--	---------	------	------	-----	-------	-------	-----

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	3.85	3.84	.00	75.7%	75.0%	.7
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Similar	3.57	3.72	-.16	61.4%	69.5%	-8.1
CSU retains diverse employees	Similar	3.50	3.60	-.10	56.0%	61.2%	-5.2
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Similar	3.75	3.77	-.02	68.1%	69.9%	-1.7
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	4.09	4.02	.07	79.7%	79.9%	-.2
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.70	3.84	-.13	69.5%	74.0%	-4.5
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.67	3.76	-.08	59.7%	66.6%	-6.9
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Similar	3.97	4.08	-.11	76.4%	80.9%	-4.6

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	3.43	3.67	-.24	57.9%	66.6%	-8.7
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	Lower	3.21	3.61	-.41	46.8%	63.7%	-16.9
Department/office retains diverse employees	Lower	3.09	3.50	-.41	39.5%	56.8%	-17.4
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Lower	3.36	3.68	-.32	51.4%	65.3%	-13.9
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	3.64	3.66	-.02	63.8%	61.8%	2.1
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	Lower	3.36	3.71	-.35	57.6%	68.7%	-11.0
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Lower	3.27	3.59	-.32	43.7%	59.3%	-15.7
Would recommend department/office as a place of employment	Lower	3.53	3.86	-.33	60.4%	71.3%	-10.9

Table C12 Factors

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Similar	3.79	3.82	-.03
Department/Unit Perceptions	Lower	3.37	3.66	-.29
Department/Unit Leadership	Lower	3.14	3.42	-.29
College/Division Leadership	Lower	2.91	3.31	-.40
Favoritism	Similar	2.81	2.80	.01
Sense of Belonging	Similar	3.50	3.67	-.17
Department/Unit Culture	Lower	3.31	3.52	-.22
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Similar	3.96	4.00	-.04