



State Classified 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 state classified respondents. 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 “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: Employee Type Comparison to CSU Overall	30

Appendix A: Item Percentages

The following tables display the frequencies for each item asked on the survey for the employee type'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	5.0%	12.3%	11.1%	38.7%	33.0%	822	3.82
Understands the value of diversity	2.8%	6.3%	13.2%	41.0%	36.6%	809	4.02
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	8.3%	18.1%	12.1%	36.9%	24.6%	824	3.52
Treats all employees equitably	10.9%	20.1%	13.0%	33.0%	23.0%	822	3.37
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.5%	10.7%	20.1%	37.6%	28.1%	805	3.76
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	8.5%	8.9%	11.1%	40.3%	31.2%	821	3.77
Promotes respect for cultural differences	3.2%	5.2%	18.2%	41.9%	31.5%	813	3.93
Is open and transparent in communication	13.4%	17.4%	16.0%	33.3%	19.9%	823	3.29
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	14.2%	19.8%	16.1%	31.0%	18.9%	819	3.21

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	9.1%	17.3%	22.9%	37.6%	13.1%	800	3.28
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	2.8%	4.5%	19.9%	46.1%	26.7%	794	3.89
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	1.1%	1.5%	1.8%	50.3%	45.3%	792	4.37
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	6.8%	10.0%	11.9%	33.5%	37.9%	792	3.86
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	18.1%	28.5%	18.5%	18.6%	16.3%	806	2.86
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	6.3%	18.9%	31.2%	28.0%	15.5%	804	3.27
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	7.5%	12.3%	20.7%	35.5%	24.1%	823	3.56
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	8.0%	15.0%	23.6%	33.6%	19.7%	821	3.42
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	8.0%	9.1%	14.2%	36.3%	32.3%	823	3.76

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	7.2%	14.6%	20.5%	42.0%	15.7%	792	3.44
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	5.7%	11.8%	21.3%	42.6%	18.6%	770	3.56
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	4.4%	8.7%	11.4%	51.0%	24.5%	824	3.83
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.0%	3.9%	26.5%	43.6%	23.0%	740	3.80
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	2.1%	5.0%	23.5%	42.9%	26.4%	773	3.87
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	7.2%	9.9%	27.7%	38.3%	17.0%	766	3.48
I feel valued as an employee	11.5%	11.9%	15.6%	38.3%	22.8%	826	3.49

Table A4 Favoritism

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office	11.4%	28.4%	19.6%	21.3%	19.4%	790	3.09
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	13.2%	31.1%	23.8%	17.3%	14.6%	781	2.89
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	13.5%	33.6%	23.5%	15.7%	13.7%	788	2.83
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	12.5%	25.9%	22.2%	17.9%	21.5%	776	3.10
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	13.2%	29.6%	26.9%	14.9%	15.4%	766	2.90

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	10.8%	13.2%	26.6%	36.6%	12.8%	650	3.27
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	9.5%	16.6%	18.3%	39.2%	16.4%	745	3.36
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	11.3%	13.8%	27.6%	34.8%	12.5%	646	3.24

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	9.0%	16.9%	19.3%	39.3%	15.5%	735	3.36
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	12.3%	18.1%	29.6%	31.6%	8.3%	651	3.06
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	11.2%	22.6%	16.6%	36.9%	12.7%	757	3.17
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	6.6%	8.5%	22.1%	43.9%	19.0%	716	3.60
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	6.9%	8.3%	16.3%	43.8%	24.8%	799	3.71
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	9.5%	12.8%	34.5%	30.1%	13.1%	655	3.25
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	8.7%	14.0%	28.5%	32.5%	16.3%	726	3.34
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	16.0%	18.8%	25.2%	27.5%	12.5%	687	3.02
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	16.6%	18.5%	18.5%	30.1%	16.3%	790	3.11

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	3.5%	2.7%	13.8%	28.0%	1.2%	8.5%	64.4%	824
___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	1.5%	1.7%	11.2%	24.4%	0.8%	7.0%	69.9%	824
___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	1.2%	1.0%	13.1%	22.7%	0.6%	9.6%	70.4%	824
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	1.7%	1.2%	17.8%	22.6%	1.6%	13.7%	64.4%	824

Table A7 Bias Incidents

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	1.9%	5.2%	24.3%	46.8%	21.8%	789	3.81
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	5.2%	12.4%	27.5%	39.5%	15.5%	692	3.48
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.8%	17.0%	48.3%	22.4%	8.4%	687	3.15
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	2.9%	13.1%	49.2%	27.3%	7.6%	543	3.23
CSU handles incidents of bias well	7.4%	9.6%	38.7%	35.0%	9.3%	648	3.29

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	81.5%	667
No	18.5%	151
Total	100.0%	818

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	5.8%	10.4%	37.9%	36.2%	9.7%	517	3.33
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	2.3%	4.8%	27.1%	43.3%	22.5%	561	3.79

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.	4.2%	12.3%	9.8%	48.7%	25.0%	779	3.78
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	6.2%	18.2%	16.9%	34.4%	24.3%	741	3.52
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	8.5%	15.9%	43.1%	23.0%	9.5%	696	3.09
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	7.5%	15.1%	42.5%	24.9%	10.0%	663	3.15

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	6.8%	15.9%	21.0%	43.8%	12.5%	767	3.39
Free speech is an important issue on campus	1.2%	2.1%	12.1%	50.1%	34.4%	802	4.14
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	2.4%	13.8%	34.2%	36.8%	12.8%	752	3.44
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	6.2%	26.3%	25.1%	32.2%	10.2%	726	3.14
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	6.9%	30.4%	36.1%	18.8%	7.8%	772	2.90

Table A12 CSU Perceptions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	1.5%	2.4%	14.4%	56.7%	24.9%	742	4.01
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.9%	9.2%	21.8%	49.7%	15.4%	747	3.63
CSU retains diverse employees	2.5%	3.8%	23.3%	50.4%	19.9%	677	3.81
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	2.4%	3.0%	23.0%	52.4%	19.3%	722	3.83
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	2.3%	5.2%	19.0%	48.2%	25.4%	749	3.89
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	4.2%	8.3%	21.0%	49.7%	16.8%	758	3.66
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	4.7%	4.4%	27.8%	45.2%	17.9%	702	3.67
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.3%	4.9%	14.8%	45.1%	31.0%	799	3.94

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	2.8%	9.3%	18.9%	49.0%	20.0%	784	3.74
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	5.8%	12.6%	23.1%	43.4%	15.1%	770	3.49
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.9%	9.7%	24.6%	45.3%	16.5%	751	3.61
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	4.6%	8.0%	22.8%	47.2%	17.5%	767	3.65
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	5.4%	11.5%	29.2%	36.8%	17.0%	763	3.49
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	8.9%	13.8%	17.3%	41.3%	18.7%	807	3.47
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	7.1%	8.1%	29.7%	40.2%	14.9%	737	3.48
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	9.0%	8.3%	17.0%	38.8%	26.9%	807	3.66

Table A14 Discriminatory Attitudes

Discriminatory attitudes are present in your department/office based on:	%	N
No intolerant attitudes are present	39.6%	277
Employment classification	32.5%	227
Job title	30.6%	214
Political affiliation	19.0%	133
Age	18.7%	131
Appearance	10.9%	76
Gender	10.2%	71
Religion	7.3%	51
Socioeconomic status	6.9%	48
Parental status	6.6%	46
Gender identity and expression	5.9%	41
Ethnic origin	5.4%	38
Race or color	5.2%	36
Marital status	5.0%	35
Sexual orientation	4.1%	29
Disability (e.g. physical, mental)	4.1%	29
Nationality/Country of origin	3.4%	24
Other	1.7%	12
Education/professional background	1.6%	11
Veteran status	1.3%	9
Nepotism/favoritism	1.1%	8
Differing opinions/work styles/personalities	0.6%	4
Employment duration	0.3%	2
General bias	0.3%	2
Research area/Grant money brought in	0.1%	1
Bullying	0.1%	1

Table A15 Work-related Stressors

Please select your top THREE work-related stressors	%	N
Lower salary	60.2%	473
Lack of growth/promotion	39.1%	307
Workload	24.4%	192
Office/department climate	20.0%	157
Work/life balance	18.6%	146
Affordable housing near work	17.3%	136
Interpersonal conflict	14.6%	115
Duties outside my job responsibilities/Taking on additional work	14.0%	110
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	10.1%	79
Email overload	8.3%	65
Lack of training/skills to do my work	7.4%	58
Lack of work flexibility	6.9%	54
Misconduct occurring at work/Inequities/Bias	6.7%	53
Ill-defined job	6.0%	47
Health issues	6.0%	47
Physical environment	5.6%	44
Job security	5.0%	39
Lack of work autonomy	3.2%	25
Physical safety	2.7%	21
Other	2.4%	19
Parking and Transportation	1.4%	11

Feeling Undervalued	1.1%	9
Administration/Leadership	1.1%	9
Dependent Care	0.9%	7
Bureaucracy	0.8%	6
Communication	0.5%	4
General Climate	0.4%	3
Health Insurance/Benefits	0.1%	1

Table A16 Use of Child and/or Adult Care Services

Have you utilized child or adult care services this past year?	%	N
Yes	10.2%	83
No	89.8%	729
Total	100.0%	812

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	63.0%	58
Scheduling care to match work schedule	35.9%	33
Finding child care services	27.2%	25
Transportation to/from care services	26.1%	24
Finding summer care services	26.1%	24
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	23.9%	22
Finding care for a sick child/adult	21.7%	20
Location of care services	17.4%	16
Dependability of care services	15.2%	14
Quality of care services	12.0%	11
Finding adult care services	7.6%	7
Finding temporary care services	6.5%	6
Other	5.4%	5
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	1.1%	1

Note: only asked of those who used child and/or adult care services.

Table A18 Gender

	%	N
Women	64.7%	499
Men	33.3%	257
T/NB/GNC	1.9%	15

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	83.0%	630
Minoritized	17.0%	129

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose.

Appendix B: Employee Characteristics Mean Comparisons

The following tables show the mean comparison scores by employee characteristics. Mean scores for CSU overall and the employee type are also provided.

Table B1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Supports a healthy work/life balance	3.86 ¹	4008	3.82 ¹	822	3.80 _a	256	3.87 _a	493	3.83 _a	624	3.86 _a	128
Understands the value of diversity	4.06 ¹	3956	4.02 ¹	809	3.99 _a	249	4.07 _a	487	4.06 _a	615	4.00 _a	126
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.62 ¹	3994	3.52 ¹	824	3.63 _a	256	3.51 _a	495	3.54 _a	625	3.56 _a	128
Treats all employees equitably	3.46 ¹	3946	3.37 ¹	822	3.53 _a	254	3.34 _a	495	3.38 _a	624	3.46 _a	128
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.87 ¹	3950	3.76 ¹	805	3.71 _a	251	3.81 _a	483	3.79 _a	611	3.72 _a	127
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.99 ¹	3999	3.77 ¹	821	3.70 _a	254	3.83 _a	495	3.80 _a	625	3.66 _a	127
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.04 ¹	3934	3.93 ¹	813	3.87 _a	253	3.98 _a	489	3.99 _a	620	3.78 _b	125
Is open and transparent in communication	3.44 ¹	4009	3.29 ¹	823	3.37 _a	256	3.29 _a	494	3.30 _a	624	3.34 _a	129
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	3.46 ¹	3952	3.21 ¹	819	3.28 _a	255	3.20 _a	493	3.22 _a	624	3.22 _a	126

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		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	3.39 ¹	3931	3.28 ¹	800	3.34 _a	250	3.29 _a	483	3.31 _a	608	3.39 _a	126
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.97 ¹	3872	3.89 ¹	794	3.83 _a	246	3.96 _a	477	3.95 _a	603	3.78 _a	124
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	4.32 ¹	3691	4.37 ¹	792	4.34 _a	241	4.39 _a	480	4.39 _a	604	4.32 _a	120
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.90 ¹	3687	3.86 ¹	792	3.87 _a	243	3.86 _a	478	3.86 _a	602	3.87 _a	122
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	2.66 ¹	3925	2.86 ¹	806	2.81 _a	248	2.88 _a	485	2.84 _a	615	2.88 _a	123
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	3.10 ¹	3910	3.27 ¹	804	3.28 _a	245	3.28 _a	486	3.22 _a	611	3.44 _b	124
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.65 ¹	4012	3.56 ¹	823	3.51 _a	251	3.66 _a	498	3.61 _a	625	3.67 _a	128
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.49 ¹	4003	3.42 ¹	821	3.43 _a	252	3.46 _a	495	3.43 _a	623	3.61 _a	127
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.88 ¹	4007	3.76 ¹	823	3.75 _a	252	3.82 _a	498	3.79 _a	625	3.78 _a	127

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		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	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	3.44 ¹	792	3.43 _a	245	3.51 _a	476	3.49 _a	601	3.39 _a	122
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.69 ¹	3656	3.56 ¹	770	3.40 _a	242	3.70 _b	458	3.59 _a	581	3.72 _a	122
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	3.95 ¹	3999	3.83 ¹	824	3.89 _a	253	3.82 _a	497	3.86 _a	626	3.77 _a	128
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.91 ¹	3459	3.80 ¹	740	3.82 _a	227	3.81 _a	445	3.85 _a	557	3.69 _a	119
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	4.06 ¹	3723	3.87 ¹	773	3.76 _a	237	3.93 _b	467	3.88 _a	585	3.82 _a	123
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.47 ¹	3600	3.48 ¹	766	3.53 _a	235	3.48 _a	463	3.52 _a	580	3.60 _a	121
I feel valued as an employee	3.68 ¹	3991	3.49 ¹	826	3.48 _a	255	3.55 _a	497	3.55 _a	627	3.41 _a	128

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		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	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	790	3.05 _a	241	3.07 _a	480	3.04 _a	603	3.15 _a	117
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	2.85 ¹	3670	2.89 ¹	781	2.89 _a	240	2.86 _a	473	2.84 _a	593	3.01 _a	119
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	2.64 ¹	3665	2.83 ¹	788	2.81 _a	239	2.80 _a	480	2.76 _a	599	3.08 _b	119
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	2.88 ¹	3606	3.10 ¹	776	3.08 _a	237	3.05 _a	470	3.03 _a	589	3.24 _a	117
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	2.73 ¹	3568	2.90 ¹	766	2.92 _a	237	2.85 _a	461	2.83 _a	582	3.05 _a	117

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		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.35 ¹	2953	3.27 ¹	650	3.43 _a	215	3.22 _b	373	3.28 _a	490	3.38 _a	100
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.45 ¹	3343	3.36 ¹	745	3.49 _a	235	3.32 _a	441	3.36 _a	562	3.43 _a	115
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.30 ¹	2849	3.24 ¹	646	3.42 _a	213	3.17 _b	372	3.26 _a	486	3.25 _a	100
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.41 ¹	3241	3.36 ¹	735	3.53 _a	234	3.29 _b	434	3.36 _a	558	3.38 _a	112
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.13 ¹	2894	3.06 ¹	651	3.14 _a	217	3.05 _a	375	3.05 _a	489	3.20 _a	104

Table B5 Leadership and Accountability

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.25 ¹	3365	3.17 ¹	757	3.27 _a	240	3.14 _a	448	3.20 _a	575	3.10 _a	116
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.78 ¹	3369	3.60 ¹	716	3.57 _a	229	3.69 _a	423	3.66 _a	541	3.53 _a	110
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.89 ¹	3705	3.71 ¹	799	3.69 _a	248	3.78 _a	481	3.78 _a	606	3.56 _b	124
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.37 ¹	3033	3.25 ¹	655	3.29 _a	211	3.26 _a	387	3.28 _a	496	3.20 _a	102
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.47 ¹	3351	3.34 ¹	726	3.43 _a	227	3.31 _a	437	3.36 _a	552	3.30 _a	114
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.20 ¹	3130	3.02 ¹	687	3.13 _a	224	3.02 _a	400	3.06 _a	520	2.99 _a	104
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.25 ¹	3599	3.11 ¹	790	3.23 _a	243	3.08 _a	476	3.14 _a	602	3.08 _a	119

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

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

Table B6 Misconduct Among Employees at CSU

___ is problematic among employees at CSU	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	247	3.5%	29	*	*	3.6%	18	3.7%	23	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	3.0%	117	2.7%	22	*	*	2.0%	10	2.2%	14	*	*
Bullying	13.3%	519	13.8%	114	12.5%	32	13.9%	69	14.0%	88	14.3%	18
Bias	28.3%	1104	28.0%	231	28.5%	73	26.3%	130	25.8%	162	35.7%	45
Physical Assault	0.6%	23	1.2%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.2%	282	8.5%	70	7.4%	19	8.5%	42	7.7%	48	14.3%	18
None	65.7%	2566	64.4%	531	62.9%	161	67.1%	332	67.1%	421	51.6%	65

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		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.8%	109	1.5%	12	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.3%	52	1.7%	14	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	10.3%	404	11.2%	92	9.8%	25	12.1%	60	11.2%	70	11.1%	14
Bias	24.1%	940	24.4%	201	26.2%	67	21.0%	104	21.2%	133	32.5%	41
Physical Assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	5.1%	199	7.0%	58	6.6%	17	6.7%	33	5.7%	36	13.5%	17
None	70.8%	2765	69.9%	576	68.8%	176	72.7%	360	72.9%	457	61.1%	77

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		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	1.9%	73	1.2%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.1%	42	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	12.4%	486	13.1%	108	8.2%	21	14.9%	74	12.6%	79	12.7%	16
Bias	23.3%	911	22.7%	187	23.0%	59	21.0%	104	20.9%	131	29.4%	37
Physical Assault	0.3%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.0%	272	9.6%	79	9.8%	25	8.9%	44	8.8%	55	12.7%	16
None	69.9%	2731	70.4%	580	72.7%	186	70.5%	349	72.4%	454	62.7%	79

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		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.5%	99	1.7%	14	*	*	2.0%	10	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.0%	41	1.2%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	16.7%	651	17.8%	147	12.9%	33	18.8%	93	16.6%	104	22.2%	28
Bias	20.0%	781	22.6%	186	24.6%	63	20.2%	100	19.9%	125	32.5%	41
Physical Assault	0.9%	37	1.6%	13	*	*	*	*	1.8%	11	*	*
Verbal Assault	11.0%	428	13.7%	113	13.3%	34	12.9%	64	12.4%	78	17.5%	22
None	68.7%	2682	64.4%	531	64.8%	166	65.9%	326	67.5%	423	53.2%	67

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

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

Table B10 Bias Incidents

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	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	3.81 ¹	789	3.71 _a	247	3.88 _b	473	3.84 _a	602	3.88 _a	121
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.64 ¹	3199	3.48 ¹	692	3.29 _a	217	3.63 _b	414	3.56 _a	520	3.35 _b	111
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.10 ¹	3174	3.15 ¹	687	3.01 _a	211	3.22 _b	414	3.17 _a	518	3.20 _a	110
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.21 ¹	2397	3.23 ¹	543	3.18 _a	164	3.26 _a	324	3.20 _a	397	3.49 _b	93
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.44 ¹	2962	3.29 ¹	648	3.09 _a	203	3.45 _b	383	3.36 _a	485	3.26 _a	102

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 (i.e., Administrative Professional Council, Classified Personnel Council, Faculty Council).	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	83.9% ¹	3260	81.5% ¹	667	77.7% _a	195	84.0% _b	416	83.9% _a	522	70.9% _b	90
No	16.1% ¹	627	18.5% ¹	151	22.3% _a	56	16.0% _b	79	16.1% _a	100	29.1% _b	37

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

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

Table B12 Employee Councils

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	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	3.33 ¹	517	3.22 _a	155	3.42 _b	313	3.34 _a	397	3.43 _a	74
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.87 ¹	2700	3.79 ¹	561	3.68 _a	170	3.86 _b	340	3.82 _a	432	3.78 _a	81

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		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I am familiar with the Principles of Community.	3.91 ¹	3644	3.78 ¹	779	3.65 _a	247	3.88 _b	465	3.78 _a	592	3.83 _a	126
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.52 ¹	3366	3.52 ¹	741	3.51 _a	234	3.57 _a	446	3.54 _a	562	3.52 _a	120
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.20 ¹	3209	3.09 ¹	696	3.04 _a	220	3.18 _a	416	3.13 _a	521	3.14 _a	116
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.26 ¹	3082	3.15 ¹	663	3.09 _a	219	3.25 _a	389	3.19 _a	495	3.22 _a	111

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		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My division/college supports people speaking freely	3.64 ¹	3629	3.39 ¹	767	3.40 _a	245	3.46 _a	455	3.45 _a	579	3.36 _a	121
Free speech is an important issue on campus	4.28 ¹	3697	4.14 ¹	802	4.18 _a	252	4.14 _a	478	4.19 _a	608	4.08 _a	124
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	3.59 ¹	3525	3.44 ¹	752	3.59 _a	238	3.37 _b	445	3.48 _a	568	3.34 _a	120
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.30 ¹	3473	3.14 ¹	726	3.07 _a	230	3.21 _a	427	3.16 _a	542	3.20 _a	118
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.97 ¹	3648	2.90 ¹	772	2.91 _a	240	2.88 _a	460	2.86 _a	581	3.17 _b	122

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		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	3.84 ¹	3315	4.01 ¹	742	3.95 _a	237	4.05 _a	441	4.04 _a	562	3.95 _a	119
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.72 ¹	3408	3.63 ¹	747	3.62 _a	238	3.72 _a	443	3.67 _a	565	3.68 _a	119
CSU retains diverse employees	3.60 ¹	2992	3.81 ¹	677	3.80 _a	226	3.85 _a	388	3.85 _a	506	3.76 _a	112
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.77 ¹	3194	3.83 ¹	722	3.79 _a	230	3.89 _a	428	3.88 _a	543	3.73 _a	118
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.02 ¹	3472	3.89 ¹	749	3.87 _a	234	3.95 _a	449	3.96 _a	568	3.76 _b	119
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	3.84 ¹	3541	3.66 ¹	758	3.66 _a	236	3.74 _a	453	3.72 _a	574	3.71 _a	119
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.76 ¹	3183	3.67 ¹	702	3.65 _a	223	3.76 _a	416	3.74 _a	527	3.66 _a	112
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.08 ¹	3708	3.94 ¹	799	3.87 _a	247	4.05 _b	483	3.99 _a	610	3.98 _a	123

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		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	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	3.74 ¹	784	3.74 _a	246	3.76 _a	470	3.76 _a	596	3.66 _a	121
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.61 ¹	3548	3.49 ¹	770	3.50 _a	243	3.53 _a	457	3.52 _a	582	3.50 _a	120
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.50 ¹	3414	3.61 ¹	751	3.63 _a	235	3.63 _a	450	3.64 _a	570	3.50 _a	116
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.68 ¹	3458	3.65 ¹	767	3.63 _a	238	3.70 _a	462	3.70 _a	580	3.45 _b	121
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.66 ¹	3561	3.49 ¹	763	3.45 _a	242	3.54 _a	455	3.54 _a	579	3.37 _a	120
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.71 ¹	3739	3.47 ¹	807	3.45 _a	249	3.53 _a	490	3.52 _a	616	3.44 _a	123
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.59 ¹	3380	3.48 ¹	737	3.42 _a	229	3.54 _a	443	3.53 _a	555	3.38 _a	116
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.86 ¹	3735	3.66 ¹	807	3.64 _a	250	3.74 _a	486	3.72 _a	615	3.62 _a	122

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		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	14.1% ¹	533	10.2% ¹	83	9.6% _a	24	10.4% _a	51	9.5% _a	59	14.0% _a	17
No	85.9% ¹	3247	89.8% ¹	729	90.4% _a	226	89.6% _a	441	90.5% _a	564	86.0% _a	104

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

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

Table B18 Child and/or Adult Care-related Challenges

	Overall		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Cost of care services	72.3%	391	63.0%	58	55.6%	15	67.3%	37	69.8%	44	*	*
Finding child care services	31.8%	172	27.2%	25	*	*	29.1%	16	27.0%	17	*	*
Finding adult care services	5.5%	30	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding temporary care services	12.0%	65	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding care for a sick child/adult	28.7%	155	21.7%	20	*	*	30.9%	17	22.2%	14	*	*
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	26.1%	24	*	*	29.1%	16	28.6%	18	*	*
Dependability of care services	15.0%	81	15.2%	14	*	*	*	*	15.9%	10	*	*
Quality of care services	17.2%	93	12.0%	11	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Scheduling care to match work schedule	40.1%	217	35.9%	33	*	*	40.0%	22	34.9%	22	*	*
Finding summer care services	27.9%	151	26.1%	24	*	*	32.7%	18	31.7%	20	*	*
Location of care services	15.5%	84	17.4%	16	*	*	*	*	20.6%	13	*	*
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	10.2%	55	23.9%	22	37.0%	10	*	*	15.9%	10	*	*

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		Employee Type		Gender				Minority Status			
	CSU		SC		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
CSU Perceptions	3.82 ¹	2524	3.79 ¹	578	3.77 _a	198	3.88 _a	325	3.84 _a	429	3.78 _a	95
Department/Unit Perceptions	3.66 ¹	2869	3.56 ¹	632	3.53 _a	203	3.63 _a	372	3.61 _a	470	3.47 _a	103
Department/Unit Leadership	3.42 ¹	2859	3.31 ¹	656	3.41 _a	210	3.28 _a	388	3.35 _a	495	3.23 _a	104
College/Division Leadership	3.31 ¹	2472	3.20 ¹	576	3.29 _a	192	3.21 _a	329	3.24 _a	432	3.16 _a	92
Favoritism	2.80 ¹	3417	2.95 ¹	742	2.94 _a	230	2.92 _a	445	2.89 _a	561	3.10 _a	114
Sense of Belonging	3.67 ¹	3978	3.58 ¹	818	3.56 _a	250	3.64 _a	495	3.61 _a	622	3.69 _a	126
Department/Unit Culture	3.52 ¹	3807	3.37 ¹	809	3.45 _a	252	3.37 _a	486	3.39 _a	615	3.39 _a	125
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	4.00 ¹	3753	3.92 ¹	768	3.87 _a	238	3.97 _a	463	3.96 _a	584	3.85 _a	120

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

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

Appendix C: Employee Type Comparisons to CSU Overall

The following tables display the employee type's (State Classified respondents) mean score compared to CSU overall. Results for state classified respondents are noted as being "higher," "similar," or "lower" than the CSU average, meaning that the Employee Type'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...		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Supports a healthy work/life balance	Similar	3.82	3.87	-.05	71.7%	73.0%	-1.4
Understands the value of diversity	Similar	4.02	4.07	-.04	77.6%	79.3%	-1.7
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Lower	3.52	3.63	-.11	61.5%	65.4%	-3.9
Treats all employees equitably	Lower	3.37	3.47	-.10	56.0%	58.9%	-2.9
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Lower	3.76	3.88	-.12	65.7%	70.4%	-4.7
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Lower	3.77	4.00	-.23	71.5%	77.6%	-6.1
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Lower	3.93	4.05	-.12	73.4%	76.7%	-3.3
Is open and transparent in communication	Lower	3.29	3.45	-.16	53.2%	57.6%	-4.4
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Lower	3.21	3.47	-.26	49.9%	57.8%	-7.9

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

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	Lower	3.28	3.38	-.10	50.8%	54.2%	-3.4
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	Lower	3.89	3.98	-.09	72.8%	76.4%	-3.6
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	Similar	4.37	4.35	.02	95.6%	92.6%	3.0
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	Similar	3.86	3.91	-.05	71.3%	73.5%	-2.2
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Higher	2.86	2.63	.23	34.9%	27.3%	7.6
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Higher	3.27	3.08	.19	43.5%	36.2%	7.3
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	Lower	3.56	3.66	-.10	59.5%	63.0%	-3.4
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	Lower	3.42	3.50	-.08	53.3%	56.3%	-3.0
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	Lower	3.76	3.90	-.14	68.7%	72.2%	-3.5

Table C3 Respect

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My department/office is treated with respect by other departments/offices within my division/college	Lower	3.44	3.63	-.19	57.7%	64.2%	-6.5
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	Lower	3.56	3.70	-.13	61.2%	67.4%	-6.2
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	Lower	3.83	3.96	-.14	75.5%	79.3%	-3.8
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	Lower	3.80	3.91	-.11	66.6%	71.2%	-4.6
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	Lower	3.87	4.06	-.20	69.3%	79.1%	-9.7
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	Similar	3.48	3.47	.01	55.2%	55.2%	.0
I feel valued as an employee	Lower	3.49	3.69	-.20	61.0%	67.5%	-6.5

Table C4 Favoritism

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office	Higher	3.09	2.98	.10	40.6%	37.8%	2.8
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	Similar	2.89	2.83	.06	31.9%	30.8%	1.1
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	Higher	2.83	2.62	.20	29.4%	23.2%	6.2
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	Higher	3.10	2.86	.24	39.4%	31.9%	7.5
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	Higher	2.90	2.71	.19	30.3%	25.2%	5.0

Table C5 Leadership and Accountability

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.27	3.35	-.08	49.4%	52.0%	-2.6
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	Lower	3.36	3.45	-.09	55.6%	58.8%	-3.3
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.24	3.30	-.06	47.4%	48.3%	-.9

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.36	3.42	-.06	54.8%	55.9%	-1.1
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.06	3.13	-.07	39.9%	41.6%	-1.7
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.17	3.25	-.08	49.5%	50.8%	-1.3
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Lower	3.60	3.79	-.19	62.8%	70.2%	-7.3
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Lower	3.71	3.91	-.20	68.6%	76.0%	-7.4
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Lower	3.25	3.38	-.13	43.2%	50.8%	-7.6
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Lower	3.34	3.48	-.15	48.8%	56.5%	-7.7
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Lower	3.02	3.20	-.18	40.0%	45.9%	-5.9
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Lower	3.11	3.26	-.15	46.5%	51.8%	-5.3

Table C6 Bias Incidents

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	Lower	3.81	4.01	-.20	68.6%	78.1%	-9.5
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Lower	3.48	3.66	-.18	54.9%	62.6%	-7.7
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Similar	3.15	3.10	.04	30.9%	32.6%	-1.7
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Similar	3.23	3.20	.03	34.8%	33.9%	.9
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Lower	3.29	3.45	-.16	44.3%	51.8%	-7.6

Table C7 Employee Councils

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I feel my employee council addresses issues and topics that are important and relevant to me	Similar	3.33	3.34	-.01	45.8%	46.8%	-.9
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	Lower	3.79	3.88	-.10	65.8%	71.4%	-5.7

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

Table C8 Principles of Community

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I am familiar with the Principles of Community	Lower	3.78	3.95	-.17	73.7%	78.4%	-4.8
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment	Similar	3.52	3.54	-.01	58.7%	59.1%	-.4
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	Lower	3.09	3.21	-.12	32.5%	36.6%	-4.2
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	Lower	3.15	3.28	-.14	34.8%	39.3%	-4.4

Table C9 Freedom of Speech

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college supports people speaking freely	Lower	3.39	3.65	-.25	56.3%	67.3%	-11.0
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Lower	4.14	4.29	-.15	84.5%	90.1%	-5.6
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Lower	3.44	3.59	-.16	49.6%	60.2%	-10.6
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Lower	3.14	3.30	-.17	42.4%	50.7%	-8.2
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Similar	2.90	2.96	-.06	26.6%	33.1%	-6.5

Table C10 CSU Perceptions

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	Higher	4.01	3.85	.16	81.7%	75.2%	6.4
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Lower	3.63	3.73	-.10	65.1%	70.0%	-4.9
CSU retains diverse employees	Higher	3.81	3.59	.22	70.3%	61.0%	9.4
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Similar	3.83	3.77	.06	71.6%	70.0%	1.6
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Lower	3.89	4.03	-.13	73.6%	80.1%	-6.6
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Lower	3.66	3.85	-.18	66.5%	74.6%	-8.1
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Lower	3.67	3.77	-.10	63.1%	67.0%	-3.9
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Lower	3.94	4.10	-.16	76.1%	81.7%	-5.7

Table C11 Department/Unit Perceptions

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Employee Type percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Department/office recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	Similar	3.74	3.68	.06	69.0%	66.7%	2.3
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	Lower	3.49	3.63	-.13	58.4%	64.3%	-5.9
Department/office retains diverse employees	Higher	3.61	3.51	.10	61.8%	57.0%	4.8
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Similar	3.65	3.68	-.03	64.7%	65.6%	-.9
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	Lower	3.49	3.66	-.17	53.9%	62.0%	-8.1
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	Lower	3.47	3.73	-.26	60.0%	69.5%	-9.5
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Lower	3.48	3.61	-.13	55.1%	59.9%	-4.8
Would recommend department/office as a place of employment	Lower	3.66	3.87	-.21	65.7%	72.1%	-6.5

Table C12 Factors

		Employee Type average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Similar	3.79	3.83	-.03
Department/Unit Perceptions	Lower	3.56	3.67	-.11
Department/Unit Leadership	Lower	3.31	3.44	-.13
College/Division Leadership	Lower	3.20	3.32	-.11
Favoritism	Higher	2.95	2.78	.17
Sense of Belonging	Lower	3.58	3.69	-.11
Department/Unit Culture	Lower	3.37	3.53	-.16
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Lower	3.92	4.01	-.09