# The Graduate School and The Office of International Programs: 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.

Due to the smaller number of employees in the divisions, this sub report focuses on the combined results of the survey component of the assessment for the Graduate School and International Programs. Please visit the <a href="2018 Employee Climate Survey website">2018 Employee Climate Survey website</a> 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 Graduate School and International Programs combined, 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. Due to the small numbers of this division, the Appendix: Employee Characteristics Mean Comparisons will be excluded.

#### **Contents**

Appendix A: Item Percentages	2
Appendix B: Division Comparisons to CSU Overall	17

February 2019

# **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** 

			Neither Agree nor			Total	
My department or office	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
Supports a healthy work/life balance	4.0%	16.0%	6.0%	44.0%	30.0%	50	3.80
Understands the value of diversity	0.0%	8.0%	8.0%	36.0%	48.0%	50	4.24
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	8.2%	12.2%	20.4%	36.7%	22.4%	49	3.53
Treats all employees equitably	14.0%	24.0%	12.0%	40.0%	10.0%	50	3.08
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	0.0%	8.0%	6.0%	44.0%	42.0%	50	4.20
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	6.1%	4.1%	2.0%	49.0%	38.8%	49	4.10
Promotes respect for cultural differences	2.0%	2.0%	6.0%	34.0%	56.0%	50	4.40
Is open and transparent in communication	6.0%	26.0%	14.0%	44.0%	10.0%	50	3.26
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	8.0%	26.0%	22.0%	22.0%	22.0%	50	3.24

Table A2 Culture

	Chuanalu Diagana	Neither Agree nor		A	Chunnahi Anuna	Total (N   Avg)	
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N   A	avg)
My division/college is open and	4.1%	30.6%	20.4%	34.7%	10.2%	49	3.16
transparent in communication							
My division/college promotes	2.0%	4.0%	10.0%	36.0%	48.0%	50	4.24
respect for cultural differences	2.070	4.070	10.076	30.070	48.070	30	4.24
I had a performance review of my							
progress as an employee in the last	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%	50.0%	41.3%	46	4.20
year							
I was satisfied with the effort my							
supervisor puts into my	6.4%	17.0%	8.5%	36.2%	31.9%	47	3.70
performance reviews	0.170		0.0,0	33.273	01.070		
I fear negative job consequences if	40.00/	22.00/	22.0%	20.00/	1.6.00/	50	2.00
I were to raise an issue of unfair	10.0%	32.0%	22.0%	20.0%	16.0%	50	3.00
treatment							
I would be able to do my job more							
effectively if I received more	2.0%	20.0%	30.0%	36.0%	12.0%	50	3.36
information from my	2.070	20.070	30.070	30.070	12.070	30	3.30
department/office							
I feel a strong sense of belonging	2.00/	40.00/	16.20/	44.00/	26.50/	40	2.04
to CSU	2.0%	10.2%	16.3%	44.9%	26.5%	49	3.84
I feel a strong sense of belonging							
to my division/college	2.0%	12.0%	16.0%	50.0%	20.0%	50	3.74
-							
I feel a strong sense of belonging	2.0%	16.0%	16.0%	34.0%	32.0%	50	3.78
to my department/office							

**Table A3 Respect** 

			Neither Agree nor			Total	
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
My department/office is treated							
with respect by other	2.0%	10.0%	12.0%	58.0%	18.0%	50	3.80
departments/offices within my	2.070	10.076	12.0%	36.070	18.0%	30	3.00
division/college							
My division/college is treated with	0.0%	4.1%	22.4%	61.2%	12.2%	49	3.82
respect by CSU	0.0%	4.170	22.470	01.2%	12.270	49	5.02
The people I interact with treat	4.0%	12.0%	10.0%	50.0%	24.0%	50	3.78
each other with respect.	4.0%	12.070	10.0%	30.076	24.0%	30	3.70
There is respect for religious							
differences in my	2.4%	4.9%	9.8%	51.2%	31.7%	41	4.05
department/office							
There is respect for liberal							
perspectives in my	2.3%	0.0%	2.3%	55.8%	39.5%	43	4.30
department/office							
There is respect for conservative							
perspectives in my	4.8%	23.8%	23.8%	33.3%	14.3%	42	3.29
department/office							
I feel valued as an employee	4.0%	16.0%	12.0%	46.0%	22.0%	50	3.66

Table A4 Favoritism

			Neither Agree nor			То	
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office	4.3%	14.9%	19.1%	29.8%	31.9%	47	3.70
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	6.4%	19.1%	19.1%	31.9%	23.4%	47	3.47
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	4.3%	36.2%	25.5%	21.3%	12.8%	47	3.02
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	6.7%	15.6%	17.8%	22.2%	37.8%	45	3.69
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	7.3%	41.5%	26.8%	12.2%	12.2%	41	2.80

Table A5 Leadership and Accountability

·			Neither Agree nor			То	tal
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
Division/college leadership							
adequately addresses	13.9%	19.4%	25.0%	38.9%	2.8%	36	2.97
inappropriate behavior							
Department/office leadership							
adequately addresses	14.0%	23.3%	11.6%	46.5%	4.7%	43	3.05
inappropriate behavior							
Division/college leadership holds							
employees accountable for	14.3%	14.3%	31.4%	34.3%	5.7%	35	3.03
inappropriate behavior							

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	10.0%	30.0%	17.5%	35.0%	7.5%	40	3.00
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	12.1%	21.2%	24.2%	39.4%	3.0%	33	3.00
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	13.2%	26.3%	15.8%	36.8%	7.9%	38	3.00
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	2.4%	9.5%	21.4%	47.6%	19.0%	42	3.71
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	2.1%	6.4%	14.9%	57.4%	19.1%	47	3.85
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	7.7%	30.8%	15.4%	41.0%	5.1%	39	3.05
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	9.1%	31.8%	13.6%	36.4%	9.1%	44	3.05
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	13.2%	26.3%	21.1%	34.2%	5.3%	38	2.92
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	20.0%	24.4%	13.3%	33.3%	8.9%	45	2.87

#### **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	12.2%	8.2%	24.5%	42.9%	2.0%	20.4%	53.1%	49
is problematic among employees in my division/college	0.0%	0.0%	20.4%	22.4%	0.0%	10.2%	69.4%	49
is problematic among employees in my department/office	0.0%	0.0%	16.3%	22.4%	0.0%	8.2%	69.4%	49
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear	2.0%	4.1%	28.6%	20.4%	0.0%	18.4%	59.2%	49

#### **Table A7 Bias Incidents**

			Neither Agree nor			Total	
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	0.0%	4.3%	6.4%	55.3%	34.0%	47	4.19
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	0.0%	7.0%	9.3%	55.8%	27.9%	43	4.05
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	4.7%	9.3%	30.2%	41.9%	14.0%	43	3.51
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	0.0%	15.6%	31.3%	37.5%	15.6%	32	3.53
CSU handles incidents of bias well	2.6%	2.6%	23.7%	55.3%	15.8%	38	3.79

**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	95.9%	47
No	4.1%	2
Total	100.0%	49

**Table A9 Employee Councils** 

			Neither Agree nor			То	tal
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
I feel my employee council addresses issues and topics that are important and relevant to me	2.9%	17.6%	41.2%	20.6%	17.6%	34	3.32
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	2.6%	7.7%	12.8%	53.8%	23.1%	39	3.87

**Table A10 Principles of Community** 

			Neither Agree nor			То	tal
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
I am familiar with the Principles of	0.0%	2.1%	2.1%	41.7%	54.2%	48	4.48
Community.	0.070						
Within my department/office, the							
Principles of Community are visible	2.3%	9.1%	4.5%	43.2%	40.9%	44	4.11
in my daily working environment	2.370	3.170					
(e.g. posted, displayed)							
I feel the Principles of Community							
have made a positive impact on the	4.5%	4.5%	47.7%	31.8%	11.4%	44	3.41
climate in my department/office							
I feel the Principles of Community							
have made a positive impact on the	4.7%	4.7%	48.8%	30.2%	11.6%	43	3.40
climate in my division/college							

Table A11 Freedom of Speech

			Neither Agree nor			То	tal
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
My division/college supports people speaking freely	2.1%	12.5%	20.8%	54.2%	10.4%	48	3.58
Free speech is an important issue on campus	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%	55.1%	38.8%	49	4.33
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	2.2%	8.9%	28.9%	48.9%	11.1%	45	3.58
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	4.4%	15.6%	20.0%	44.4%	15.6%	45	3.51
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	10.9%	30.4%	19.6%	37.0%	2.2%	46	2.89

**Table A12 CSU Perceptions** 

Table A12 CSU Perceptions			Noith an Association			т.	4-1
			Neither Agree nor				tal
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	4.4%	13.3%	17.8%	55.6%	8.9%	45	3.51
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	4.3%	10.9%	17.4%	52.2%	15.2%	46	3.63
CSU retains diverse employees	6.1%	18.2%	30.3%	36.4%	9.1%	33	3.24
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	2.7%	10.8%	18.9%	59.5%	8.1%	37	3.59
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.3%	0.0%	2.1%	40.4%	53.2%	47	4.38
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	4.4%	8.9%	8.9%	62.2%	15.6%	45	3.76
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	5.0%	5.0%	12.5%	52.5%	25.0%	40	3.87
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	2.1%	2.1%	14.9%	51.1%	29.8%	47	4.04

Table A13 Department/Unit Perceptions

			Neither Agree nor			То	tal
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	(N	Avg)
Department/office recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	4.1%	28.6%	24.5%	36.7%	6.1%	49	3.12
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	4.3%	10.9%	17.4%	52.2%	15.2%	46	3.63
Department/office retains diverse employees	4.9%	26.8%	26.8%	34.1%	7.3%	41	3.12
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	4.8%	7.1%	21.4%	54.8%	11.9%	42	3.62
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	4.3%	2.1%	8.5%	36.2%	48.9%	47	4.23
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	4.3%	10.6%	12.8%	53.2%	19.1%	47	3.72
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	4.7%	2.3%	18.6%	53.5%	20.9%	43	3.84
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	4.3%	6.4%	12.8%	53.2%	23.4%	47	3.85

**Table A14 Discriminatory Attitudes** 

Tuble A14 Discriminatory Attitudes		
Discriminatory attitudes are		
present in your department/office		
based on:	%	N
Employment classification	48.8%	20
Job title	48.8%	20
Age	39.0%	16
Parental status	34.1%	14
Political affiliation	24.4%	10
Gender	22.0%	9
No intolerant attitudes are present	17.1%	7
Socioeconomic status	14.6%	6
Marital status	14.6%	6
Religion	9.8%	4
Other (Appearance, Race or color,		
Gender identity and expression,		
Disability (e.g. physical, mental) ,	26.2%	12
Ethnic origin, Nationality/Country	20.270	12
of origin, Differing opinions/work,		
styles/personalities)		

Note: multiple response item.

**Table A15 Work-related Stressors** 

Please select your top THREE		
work-related stressors	%	N
Lower salary	58.7%	27
Lack of growth/promotion	54.3%	25
Workload	30.4%	14
Office/department climate	21.7%	10
Affordable housing near work	21.7%	10
Interpersonal conflict	15.2%	7
Email overload	15.2%	7
Lack of work flexibility	10.9%	5
Work/life balance	10.9%	5
Physical environment	8.7%	4
Misconduct occurring at work/Inequities/Bias	8.7%	4
III-defined job	6.5%	3
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	6.5%	3
Duties outside my job responsibilities/Taking on additional work	6.5%	3
Health issues	6.5%	3
Lack of work autonomy	2.2%	1
Lack of training/skills to do my work	2.2%	1
Parking and Transportation	2.2%	1
Communication	2.2%	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	28.6%	14				
No	71.4%	35				
Total	100.0%	49				

Table A17 Child and/or Adult Care-related Challenges

Table A17 Child and/or Adult Care-related Challenges					
Please indicate what child care and/or adult care-related challenges, if any, you have					
encountered this past year	%	N			
Cost of care services	85.7%	12			
Quality of care services	64.3%	9			
Transportation to/from care services	57.1%	8			
Finding child care services	50.0%	7			
Scheduling care to match work schedule	50.0%	7			
Finding summer care services	35.7%	5			
Location of care services	35.7%	5			
Finding care for a sick child/adult	28.6%	4			
Dependability of care services	28.6%	4			
Finding temporary care services	21.4%	3			
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	21.4%	3			
Other	14.3%	2			
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	80.4%	37
Men	17.4%	8
T/NB/GNC	2.2%	1

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	93.2%	41
Minoritized	6.8%	3

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose.

**Table A20 Employee Type** 

Tuble A20 Employee Type				
	%	N		
Administrative Professional	58.3%	28		
Faculty	4.2%	2		
State Classified	25.0%	12		
Other	0.0%	0		
Prefer not to disclose	12.5%	6		
Total	100.0%	48		

Table A21 Department/Unit

	%	N		
International Programs	64.0%	32		
The Graduate School	24.0%	12		
Prefer not to disclose	12.0%	6		
Total	100.0%	50		

# **Appendix B: 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** 

Table C1 Department/Ont Culture					Division percent		
My department or office		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Supports a healthy work/life balance	Similar	3.80	3.86	06	74.0%	72.5%	1.5
Understands the value of diversity	Similar	4.24	4.06	.18	84.0%	78.6%	5.4
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Similar	3.53	3.62	09	59.2%	64.7%	-5.5
Treats all employees equitably	Lower	3.08	3.46	38	50.0%	58.5%	-8.5
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Higher	4.20	3.87	.33	86.0%	69.8%	16.2
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Similar	4.10	3.99	.11	87.8%	77.0%	10.7
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Higher	4.40	4.04	.36	90.0%	76.1%	13.9
Is open and transparent in communication	Similar	3.26	3.44	18	54.0%	57.3%	-3.3
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Similar	3.24	3.46	22	44.0%	57.3%	-13.3

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

**Table C2 Culture** 

Table C2 Culture					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	Similar	3.16	3.39	22	44.9%	54.2%	-9.3
	Higher	4.24	3.97	.27	84.0%	76.1%	7.9
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	Similar	4.20	4.32	13	91.3%	91.6%	3
	Similar	3.70	3.90	19	68.1%	72.9%	-4.8
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Similar	3.00	2.66	.34	36.0%	28.0%	8.0
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Similar	3.36	3.10	.26	48.0%	37.0%	11.0
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	Similar	3.84	3.65	.19	71.4%	62.4%	9.0
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	Similar	3.74	3.49	.25	70.0%	55.4%	14.6
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	Similar	3.78	3.88	10	66.0%	71.3%	-5.3

**Table C3 Respect** 

Table C3 Respect							
					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My department/office is treated	Similar						
with respect by other		3.80	3.64	.16	76.0%	64.3%	11.7
departments/offices within my		3.80	3.04	.10	70.070	04.570	11.7
division/college							
My division/college is treated with	Similar	3.82	3.69	.12	73.5%	67.0%	6.4
respect by CSU		3.62	3.03	.12	75.570	07.070	0.4
The people I interact with treat	Similar	3.78	3.95	17	74.0%	78.9%	-4.9
each other with respect		3.78	3.33	1/	74.070	76.570	-4.5
There is respect for religious	Similar						
differences in my		4.05	3.91	.14	82.9%	71.7%	11.3
department/office							
There is respect for liberal	Higher						
perspectives in my		4.30	4.06	.24	95.3%	79.0%	16.4
department/office							
There is respect for conservative	Similar						
perspectives in my		3.29	3.47	18	47.6%	55.1%	-7.5
department/office							
I feel valued as an employee	Similar	3.66	3.68	02	68.0%	66.7%	1.3

Table C4 Favoritism

	Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Favoritism plays a role in who gets Higher recognized within my department/office	3.70	3.00	.71	61.7%	37.9%	23.8
Favoritism plays a role in who gets Higher resources in my department/office	3.47	2.85	.62	55.3%	31.3%	24.0
Favoritism plays a role in who gets Higher professional development opportunities	3.02	2.64	.38	34.0%	23.7%	10.4
Favoritism plays a role in who gets Higher promoted in my department/office	3.69	2.88	.81	60.0%	32.3%	27.7
Favoritism plays a role in who gets Similar hired in my department/office	2.80	2.73	.08	24.4%	25.6%	-1.2

Table C5 Leadership and Accountability

					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Division/college leadership	Lower						
adequately addresses		2.97	3.35	37	41.7%	51.7%	-10.0
inappropriate behavior							
Department/office leadership	Lower						
adequately addresses		3.05	3.45	40	51.2%	58.2%	-7.0
inappropriate behavior							
Division/college leadership holds	Similar						
employees accountable for		3.03	3.30	27	40.0%	48.1%	-8.1
inappropriate behavior							

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Lower	3.00	3.41	41	42.5%	55.4%	-12.9
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.00	3.13	13	42.4%	41.5%	.9
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.00	3.25	25	44.7%	50.5%	-5.8
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.71	3.78	06	66.7%	69.4%	-2.7
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.85	3.89	04	76.6%	75.1%	1.5
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Similar	3.05	3.37	32	46.2%	50.3%	-4.1
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Lower	3.05	3.47	43	45.5%	55.8%	-10.3
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	2.92	3.20	27	39.5%	45.8%	-6.3
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	2.87	3.25	39	42.2%	51.1%	-8.9

**Table C6 Bias Incidents** 

					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	Similar	4.19	4.00	.19	89.4%	77.7%	11.6
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Higher	4.05	3.64	.41	83.7%	61.8%	21.9
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Higher	3.51	3.10	.41	55.8%	32.4%	23.5
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Similar	3.53	3.21	.32	53.1%	34.0%	19.1
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Higher	3.79	3.44	.35	71.1%	51.2%	19.9

**Table C7 Employee Councils** 

Table C7 Employee Councils							
					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I feel my employee council	Similar						
addresses issues and topics that		3.32	3.35	02	38.2%	46.7%	-8.4
are important and relevant to me							
I feel that the councils' collective	Similar						
participation in shared governance		3.87	3.87	.00	76.9%	70.00/	6.1
is pertinent to the success of our		3.87	3.87	.00	76.9%	70.8%	6.1
institution							

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

**Table C8 Principles of Community** 

	Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I am familiar with the Principles of Higher Community	4.48	3.91	.57	95.8%	77.2%	18.6
Within my department/office, the Higher Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment	4.11	3.52	.59	84.1%	58.4%	25.7
I feel the Principles of Community Similar have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.41	3.20	.21	43.2%	36.0%	7.2
I feel the Principles of Community Similar have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.40	3.26	.13	41.9%	38.4%	3.4

Table C9 Freedom of Speech

					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college supports people speaking freely	Similar	3.58	3.64	05	64.6%	66.7%	-2.1
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Similar	4.33	4.28	.05	93.9%	89.5%	4.4
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Similar	3.58	3.59	01	60.0%	59.8%	.2
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Similar	3.51	3.30	.21	60.0%	50.3%	9.7
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Similar	2.89	2.97	08	39.1%	33.5%	5.6

**Table C10 CSU Perceptions** 

Table C10 C30 Perceptions					Division percent		
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	Lower	3.51	3.84	33	64.4%	75.0%	-10.5
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Similar	3.63	3.72	09	67.4%	69.5%	-2.1
CSU retains diverse employees	Similar	3.24	3.60	36	45.5%	61.2%	-15.8
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Similar	3.59	3.77	17	67.6%	69.9%	-2.3
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Higher	4.38	4.02	.36	93.6%	79.9%	13.7
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.76	3.84	08	77.8%	74.0%	3.8
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.87	3.76	.12	77.5%	66.6%	10.9
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Similar	4.04	4.08	04	80.9%	80.9%	1

Table C11 Department/Unit Perceptions

Table C11 Department/Onit Percept					Division noment		
		Division susuans	CCII average	A C	Division percent	CCII wassant assan	PP Gap
		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	agree	CSU percent agree	РР Сар
Department/office recruits	Lower						
employees from a diverse set of		3.12	3.67	55	42.9%	66.6%	-23.8
backgrounds							
Department/office improves the	Similar	3.63	3.61	.02	67.4%	63.7%	3.7
campus climate for all employees		3.03	3.01	.02	67.4%	03.7%	3.7
Department/office retains diverse	Lower	2.42	2.50	20	44 50/	56.00/	45.4
employees		3.12	3.50	38	41.5%	56.8%	-15.4
Department/office creates a	Similar						
supportive environment for		2.62	2.60	0.0	66.70/	65.20/	4.4
employees from diverse		3.62	3.68	06	66.7%	65.3%	1.4
backgrounds							
Department/office encourages	Higher	4.22	2.66	F.0.	05.40/	64.00/	22.4
discussions related to diversity		4.23	3.66	.58	85.1%	61.8%	23.4
Department/office provides	Similar						
employees with a positive work		3.72	3.71	.01	72.3%	68.7%	3.7
experience							
Department/office climate has	Similar						
become consistently more inclusive		3.84	3.59	.24	74.4%	59.3%	15.1
of all employees							
Would recommend	Similar						
	Jiiiiiai	3.85	3.86	01	76.6%	71.3%	5.3
department/office as a place of		3.63	3.60	01	70.0%	/1.5/0	3.5
employment							

**Table C12 Factors** 

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Similar	3.79	3.82	02
Department/Unit Perceptions	Similar	3.70	3.66	.04
Department/Unit Leadership	Lower	3.05	3.42	38
College/Division Leadership	Similar	3.02	3.31	29
Favoritism	Higher	3.29	2.80	.49
Sense of Belonging	Similar	3.81	3.67	.14
Department/Unit Culture	Similar	3.35	3.52	18
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Higher	4.27	4.00	.27