



# Division of Student Affairs-All Areas

## 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 Student Affairs (including Housing and Dining and the Health Network) 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 Student Affairs, 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 .....	20
Appendix C: Division Comparisons to CSU Overall .....	36

## Appendix A: Item Percentages

The following tables display the frequencies for each item asked on the survey for the division's respondents only. For items asked on the 1 to 5 point Likert scale, the mean (average) rating is also displayed.

**Table A1 Department/Unit Culture**

My department or office...	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N   Avg)	
Supports a healthy work/life balance	3.5%	11.8%	8.1%	38.6%	38.0%	482	3.96
Understands the value of diversity	1.0%	6.0%	7.9%	31.5%	53.5%	480	4.30
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	5.4%	12.7%	11.7%	39.2%	30.9%	479	3.77
Treats all employees equitably	7.1%	17.4%	14.9%	36.6%	23.9%	476	3.53
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	1.7%	2.9%	11.5%	33.1%	50.8%	478	4.28
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	1.9%	5.5%	5.9%	38.4%	48.4%	477	4.26
Promotes respect for cultural differences	1.3%	2.9%	12.0%	38.3%	45.5%	475	4.24
Is open and transparent in communication	9.2%	14.0%	16.1%	35.4%	25.3%	478	3.54
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	9.7%	15.1%	16.2%	34.9%	24.2%	476	3.49

**Table A2 Culture**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N   Avg)	
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	5.5%	13.9%	22.6%	41.4%	16.7%	474	3.50
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	1.3%	3.2%	9.1%	44.2%	42.3%	473	4.23
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	1.6%	2.7%	1.8%	40.8%	53.1%	448	4.41
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	5.3%	5.8%	14.2%	32.0%	42.7%	450	4.01
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	23.3%	36.4%	12.9%	14.8%	12.5%	472	2.57
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	6.9%	23.1%	33.2%	23.9%	12.9%	464	3.13
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	4.6%	8.2%	20.6%	38.3%	28.2%	475	3.77
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	6.7%	10.1%	23.3%	35.7%	24.2%	476	3.61
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	5.4%	5.9%	13.2%	31.0%	44.6%	478	4.03

**Table A3 Respect**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N   Avg)	
My department/office is treated with respect by other departments/offices within my division/college	3.6%	10.8%	18.7%	44.8%	22.1%	471	3.71
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	2.8%	4.5%	17.2%	50.0%	25.4%	464	3.91
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	2.1%	7.6%	9.7%	51.2%	29.5%	475	3.98
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	2.0%	4.7%	19.0%	42.7%	31.5%	447	3.97
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	0.4%	3.2%	11.3%	41.3%	43.7%	467	4.25
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	8.2%	17.4%	26.3%	33.1%	15.0%	453	3.29
I feel valued as an employee	6.7%	10.0%	13.0%	40.4%	29.9%	478	3.77

**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	13.8%	32.0%	18.4%	21.2%	14.7%	463	2.91
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	17.3%	38.1%	19.7%	14.5%	10.4%	462	2.63
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	20.3%	40.0%	17.5%	11.3%	10.8%	462	2.52
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	16.3%	29.6%	19.9%	15.6%	18.6%	442	2.90
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	16.1%	30.5%	23.3%	16.1%	14.0%	442	2.81

**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	7.2%	14.3%	21.0%	41.6%	15.9%	377	3.45
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	6.9%	15.6%	12.6%	45.3%	19.7%	437	3.55
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	8.9%	14.0%	24.8%	38.5%	13.7%	371	3.34

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	8.4%	14.2%	16.3%	43.7%	17.4%	430	3.48
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	10.9%	20.9%	24.8%	34.8%	8.6%	359	3.09
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	10.9%	20.4%	14.6%	42.2%	11.8%	431	3.24
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	4.8%	5.7%	14.6%	46.9%	28.0%	418	3.88
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	5.6%	6.1%	10.6%	48.2%	29.5%	461	3.90
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	7.8%	10.4%	23.5%	38.1%	20.1%	412	3.52
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	7.0%	9.3%	18.8%	45.0%	19.9%	442	3.62
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	13.0%	18.6%	24.5%	28.1%	15.8%	392	3.15
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	13.6%	20.2%	14.7%	34.7%	16.7%	455	3.21

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	11.1%	4.9%	17.5%	37.3%	0.2%	7.5%	54.4%	4
___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	3.6%	1.5%	12.4%	27.5%	0.0%	5.3%	64.6%	4
___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	1.3%	1.3%	13.4%	22.8%	0.0%	6.8%	69.9%	4
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	5.3%	3.0%	20.7%	22.4%	1.7%	12.6%	62.3%	4

Note: multiple response item.

**Table A7 Bias Incidents**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N   Avg)	
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	0.4%	2.0%	12.3%	46.6%	38.7%	457	4.21
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.1%	7.2%	18.9%	50.5%	20.3%	418	3.78
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.1%	18.7%	35.9%	28.7%	13.6%	418	3.31
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	2.5%	9.3%	32.9%	37.4%	17.8%	353	3.59
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.7%	11.1%	31.2%	44.2%	9.8%	407	3.45



**Table A8 Employee Councils**

Are you aware there is an employee group/organization that represents the interests of my employee group?	%	N
Yes	84.6%	395
No	15.4%	72
Total	100.0%	467

**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	1.9%	8.8%	42.1%	39.5%	7.7%	261	3.42
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	1.3%	3.7%	24.3%	48.2%	22.6%	301	3.87

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

**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.	0.7%	2.6%	3.5%	35.7%	57.5%	459	4.47
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	2.5%	7.6%	7.0%	32.1%	50.9%	446	4.21
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	4.7%	10.6%	27.7%	34.0%	23.0%	444	3.60
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.7%	9.3%	27.1%	35.0%	24.8%	431	3.68

**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	4.3%	14.3%	17.0%	46.5%	17.8%	460	3.59
Free speech is an important issue on campus	0.2%	1.9%	5.6%	51.1%	41.2%	464	4.31
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	0.9%	13.4%	24.3%	46.0%	15.4%	448	3.62
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.0%	17.4%	14.7%	43.3%	21.6%	436	3.63
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.9%	19.6%	28.8%	29.2%	19.4%	448	3.43

**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	1.6%	9.5%	15.2%	54.0%	19.6%	433	3.81
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	1.2%	7.4%	20.0%	56.3%	15.1%	430	3.77
CSU retains diverse employees	3.2%	14.2%	22.7%	42.9%	17.0%	401	3.56
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	1.7%	9.9%	21.0%	50.8%	16.6%	415	3.71
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	1.1%	2.5%	9.7%	54.1%	32.7%	444	4.15
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	2.1%	5.5%	16.8%	55.2%	20.5%	435	3.86
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	1.9%	7.0%	26.0%	46.8%	18.2%	412	3.72
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	1.3%	2.2%	12.0%	46.5%	37.9%	449	4.17

**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	2.0%	10.0%	15.9%	49.3%	22.8%	452	3.81
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.8%	8.9%	16.0%	49.9%	21.4%	449	3.76
Department/office retains diverse employees	2.8%	12.5%	21.0%	46.0%	17.8%	433	3.64
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	2.7%	9.2%	17.4%	49.9%	20.8%	437	3.77
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	2.6%	6.8%	11.3%	43.3%	36.0%	453	4.03
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	5.7%	9.7%	12.8%	43.5%	28.3%	453	3.79
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.9%	7.6%	21.4%	45.6%	21.4%	434	3.73
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	6.0%	6.8%	12.6%	35.1%	39.5%	453	3.95

**Table A14 Discriminatory Attitudes**

<b>Discriminatory attitudes are present in your department/office based on:</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>
No intolerant attitudes are present	33.4%	132
Employment classification	29.1%	115
Job title	29.1%	115
Political affiliation	27.1%	107
Age	22.3%	88
Gender	14.9%	59
Appearance	11.6%	46
Religion	10.9%	43
Gender identity and expression	10.4%	41
Parental status	9.1%	36
Race or color	9.1%	36
Ethnic origin	8.1%	32
Disability (e.g. physical, mental)	8.1%	32
Socioeconomic status	6.6%	26
Marital status	5.1%	20
Nationality/Country of origin	4.8%	19
Sexual orientation	3.8%	15
Education/professional background	1.8%	7
Veteran status	1.5%	6
Nepotism/favoritism	1.3%	5
Other	0.8%	3
Employment duration	0.8%	3
General bias	0.5%	2
Bullying	0.3%	1

*Note: multiple response item.*

**Table A15 Work-related Stressors**

<b>Please select your top THREE work-related stressors</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>
Lower salary	53.1%	231
Lack of growth/promotion	29.7%	129
Workload	33.3%	145
Ill-defined job	6.2%	27
Lack of work flexibility	8.0%	35
Physical safety	0.7%	3
Work/life balance	28.3%	123
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	8.3%	36
Lack of work autonomy	4.1%	18
Duties outside my job responsibilities/Taking on additional work	9.7%	42
Office/department climate	18.2%	79
Physical environment	3.4%	15
Interpersonal conflict	15.2%	66
Misconduct occurring at work/Inequities/Bias	6.2%	27
Affordable housing near work	19.3%	84
Lack of training/skills to do my work	5.7%	25
Email overload	20.0%	87
Health issues	5.3%	23
Job security	4.4%	19
Other	2.8%	12
General Climate	0.0%	0
Feeling Undervalued	0.7%	3

Parking and Transportation	1.4%	6
Communication	0.7%	3
Dependent Care	0.2%	1
Administration/Leadership	1.1%	5
Health Insurance/Benefits	0.2%	1
Bureaucracy	0.5%	2

*Note: multiple response item.*

**Table A16 Use of Child and/or Adult Care Services**

<b>Have you utilized child or adult care services this past year?</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>
Yes	16.9%	77
No	83.1%	378
Total	100.0%	455



**Table A17 Child and/or Adult Care-related Challenges**

<b>Please indicate what child care and/or adult care-related challenges, if any, you have encountered this past year</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>
Cost of care services	79.5%	62
Scheduling care to match work schedule	51.3%	40
Finding child care services	34.6%	27
Transportation to/from care services	34.6%	27
Finding summer care services	34.6%	27
Finding care for a sick child/adult	30.8%	24
Dependability of care services	20.5%	16
Location of care services	20.5%	16
Quality of care services	16.7%	13
Finding temporary care services	12.8%	10
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	11.5%	9
Finding adult care services	7.7%	6
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	5.1%	4

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

**Table A18 Gender**

	%	N
Woman	62.5%	282
Man	31.3%	141
Transgender/Non-Binary/Gender Non Conforming	1.5%	7
Prefer not to disclose	4.9%	22

*Note: multiple response item.*

**Table A19 Minoritized Race/Ethnicity**

	%	N
Non-minoritized	75.1%	310
Minoritized	24.9%	103
Total	100.0%	413

**Table A20 Race and/or Ethnicity**

	%	N
White	73.4%	331
Hispanic or Latinx	14.2%	64
Asian	4.0%	18
Black or African American	4.0%	18
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2.7%	12
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.2%	1
Prefer not to disclose	8.4%	38

*Note: multiple response item.*

**Table A21 Employee Type**

	%	N
Administrative Professional	59.0%	268
Faculty	0.2%	1
State Classified	34.1%	155
Other	1.3%	6
Prefer not to disclose	5.3%	24
Total	100.0%	454

## 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		Student Affairs		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 <sup>1</sup>	4008	3.96 <sup>1</sup>	482	3.92 <sub>a</sub>	141	4.02 <sub>a</sub>	281	4.01 <sub>a</sub>	309	3.98 <sub>a</sub>	103	4.02 <sub>a</sub>	268	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.91 <sub>a</sub>	154
Understands the value of diversity	4.06 <sup>1</sup>	3956	4.30 <sup>1</sup>	480	4.42 <sub>a</sub>	140	4.30 <sub>a</sub>	280	4.39 <sub>a</sub>	307	4.24 <sub>a</sub>	103	4.41 <sub>a</sub>	266	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.15 <sub>b</sub>	154
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.62 <sup>1</sup>	3994	3.77 <sup>1</sup>	479	3.94 <sub>a</sub>	141	3.76 <sub>a</sub>	279	3.84 <sub>a</sub>	307	3.83 <sub>a</sub>	103	3.97 <sub>a</sub>	266	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.52 <sub>b</sub>	154
Treats all employees equitably	3.46 <sup>1</sup>	3946	3.53 <sup>1</sup>	476	3.74 <sub>a</sub>	140	3.48 <sub>b</sub>	277	3.55 <sub>a</sub>	305	3.63 <sub>a</sub>	102	3.68 <sub>a</sub>	264	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.29 <sub>b</sub>	154
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.87 <sup>1</sup>	3950	4.28 <sup>1</sup>	478	4.31 <sub>a</sub>	140	4.34 <sub>a</sub>	278	4.37 <sub>a</sub>	306	4.25 <sub>a</sub>	102	4.42 <sub>a</sub>	265	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.07 <sub>b</sub>	153
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.99 <sup>1</sup>	3999	4.26 <sup>1</sup>	477	4.28 <sub>a</sub>	140	4.30 <sub>a</sub>	280	4.31 <sub>a</sub>	308	4.34 <sub>a</sub>	103	4.42 <sub>a</sub>	267	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.03 <sub>b</sub>	153
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.04 <sup>1</sup>	3934	4.24 <sup>1</sup>	475	4.29 <sub>a</sub>	138	4.26 <sub>a</sub>	279	4.31 <sub>a</sub>	306	4.22 <sub>a</sub>	101	4.37 <sub>a</sub>	264	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.06 <sub>b</sub>	154
Is open and transparent in communication	3.44 <sup>1</sup>	4009	3.54 <sup>1</sup>	478	3.67 <sub>a</sub>	141	3.54 <sub>a</sub>	279	3.56 <sub>a</sub>	308	3.62 <sub>a</sub>	102	3.76 <sub>a</sub>	266	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.18 <sub>b</sub>	154
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	3.46 <sup>1</sup>	3952	3.49 <sup>1</sup>	476	3.64 <sub>a</sub>	140	3.51 <sub>a</sub>	279	3.52 <sub>a</sub>	306	3.64 <sub>a</sub>	103	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	265	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.12 <sub>b</sub>	154

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
2. This category is not used in comparisons because the sum of case weights is less than two.

**Table B2 Division/College Culture**

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Student Affairs		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 <sup>1</sup>	3931	3.50 <sup>1</sup>	474	3.57 <sub>a</sub>	138	3.51 <sub>a</sub>	279	3.58 <sub>a</sub>	305	3.38 <sub>a</sub>	102	3.59 <sub>a</sub>	264	*2	*	3.32 <sub>b</sub>	152
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.97 <sup>1</sup>	3872	4.23 <sup>1</sup>	473	4.33 <sub>a</sub>	138	4.24 <sub>a</sub>	278	4.33 <sub>a</sub>	305	4.10 <sub>b</sub>	101	4.35 <sub>a</sub>	262	*2	*	4.08 <sub>b</sub>	153
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	4.32 <sup>1</sup>	3691	4.41 <sup>1</sup>	448	4.39 <sub>a</sub>	129	4.46 <sub>a</sub>	263	4.44 <sub>a</sub>	291	4.39 <sub>a</sub>	93	4.39 <sub>a</sub>	246	*2	*	4.44 <sub>a</sub>	149
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.90 <sup>1</sup>	3687	4.01 <sup>1</sup>	450	4.14 <sub>a</sub>	131	3.98 <sub>a</sub>	262	4.04 <sub>a</sub>	293	4.03 <sub>a</sub>	92	4.04 <sub>a</sub>	246	*2	*	3.95 <sub>a</sub>	150
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	2.66 <sup>1</sup>	3925	2.57 <sup>1</sup>	472	2.34 <sub>a</sub>	140	2.56 <sub>a</sub>	275	2.45 <sub>a</sub>	304	2.56 <sub>a</sub>	101	2.29 <sub>a</sub>	265	*1	*	2.94 <sub>b</sub>	150
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	3.10 <sup>1</sup>	3910	3.13 <sup>1</sup>	464	3.09 <sub>a</sub>	136	3.12 <sub>a</sub>	272	3.04 <sub>a</sub>	301	3.33 <sub>b</sub>	98	2.98 <sub>a</sub>	260	*2	*	3.32 <sub>b</sub>	150
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.65 <sup>1</sup>	4012	3.77 <sup>1</sup>	475	3.71 <sub>a</sub>	139	3.87 <sub>a</sub>	278	3.88 <sub>a</sub>	305	3.70 <sub>a</sub>	102	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	263	*2	*	3.62 <sub>b</sub>	154
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.49 <sup>1</sup>	4003	3.61 <sup>1</sup>	476	3.60 <sub>a</sub>	139	3.65 <sub>a</sub>	279	3.64 <sub>a</sub>	306	3.70 <sub>a</sub>	102	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	264	*2	*	3.42 <sub>b</sub>	154
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.88 <sup>1</sup>	4007	4.03 <sup>1</sup>	478	4.16 <sub>a</sub>	141	4.07 <sub>a</sub>	280	4.12 <sub>a</sub>	308	4.13 <sub>a</sub>	103	4.27 <sub>a</sub>	267	*2	*	3.74 <sub>b</sub>	154

*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
2. This category is not used in comparisons because the sum of case weights is less than two.

**Table B3 Respect**

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Student Affairs		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 <sup>1</sup>	3673	3.71 <sup>1</sup>	471	3.78 <sub>a</sub>	136	3.74 <sub>a</sub>	279	3.75 <sub>a</sub>	307	3.79 <sub>a</sub>	98	3.86 <sub>a</sub>	262	*2	*	3.53 <sub>b</sub>	153
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.69 <sup>1</sup>	3656	3.91 <sup>1</sup>	464	3.84 <sub>a</sub>	134	3.97 <sub>a</sub>	274	3.95 <sub>a</sub>	298	3.88 <sub>a</sub>	100	4.00 <sub>a</sub>	260	*2	*	3.74 <sub>b</sub>	148
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	3.95 <sup>1</sup>	3999	3.98 <sup>1</sup>	475	4.13 <sub>a</sub>	139	3.95 <sub>a</sub>	280	4.05 <sub>a</sub>	307	4.01 <sub>a</sub>	102	4.12 <sub>a</sub>	265	*2	*	3.77 <sub>b</sub>	154
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.91 <sup>1</sup>	3459	3.97 <sup>1</sup>	447	4.02 <sub>a</sub>	132	3.98 <sub>a</sub>	264	4.02 <sub>a</sub>	290	3.99 <sub>a</sub>	96	4.06 <sub>a</sub>	249	*2	*	3.84 <sub>b</sub>	144
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	4.06 <sup>1</sup>	3723	4.25 <sup>1</sup>	467	4.29 <sub>a</sub>	136	4.28 <sub>a</sub>	277	4.29 <sub>a</sub>	302	4.33 <sub>a</sub>	100	4.40 <sub>a</sub>	263	*2	*	4.04 <sub>b</sub>	149
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.47 <sup>1</sup>	3600	3.29 <sup>1</sup>	453	3.42 <sub>a</sub>	130	3.24 <sub>a</sub>	270	3.39 <sub>a</sub>	293	3.16 <sub>a</sub>	96	3.25 <sub>a</sub>	251	*2	*	3.34 <sub>a</sub>	148
I feel valued as an employee	3.68 <sup>1</sup>	3991	3.77 <sup>1</sup>	478	3.82 <sub>a</sub>	140	3.83 <sub>a</sub>	282	3.88 <sub>a</sub>	310	3.71 <sub>a</sub>	102	3.96 <sub>a</sub>	268	*2	*	3.49 <sub>b</sub>	154

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
2. This category is not used in comparisons because the sum of case weights is less than two.

**Table B4 Favoritism**

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Student Affairs		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 <sup>1</sup>	3711	2.91 <sup>1</sup>	463	2.67 <sub>a</sub>	135	3.03 <sub>b</sub>	275	2.85 <sub>a</sub>	304	3.01 <sub>a</sub>	95	2.76 <sub>a</sub>	262	*2	*	3.24 <sub>b</sub>	149
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	2.85 <sup>1</sup>	3670	2.63 <sup>1</sup>	462	2.40 <sub>a</sub>	134	2.69 <sub>b</sub>	274	2.54 <sub>a</sub>	301	2.71 <sub>a</sub>	96	2.53 <sub>a</sub>	261	*2	*	2.78 <sub>b</sub>	148
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	2.64 <sup>1</sup>	3665	2.52 <sup>1</sup>	462	2.36 <sub>a</sub>	135	2.58 <sub>a</sub>	275	2.44 <sub>a</sub>	302	2.60 <sub>a</sub>	97	2.33 <sub>a</sub>	263	*2	*	2.86 <sub>b</sub>	148
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	2.88 <sup>1</sup>	3606	2.90 <sup>1</sup>	442	2.74 <sub>a</sub>	129	2.98 <sub>a</sub>	262	2.90 <sub>a</sub>	288	2.90 <sub>a</sub>	91	2.70 <sub>a</sub>	247	*2	*	3.33 <sub>b</sub>	144
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	2.73 <sup>1</sup>	3568	2.81 <sup>1</sup>	442	2.69 <sub>a</sub>	132	2.85 <sub>a</sub>	259	2.78 <sub>a</sub>	290	2.80 <sub>a</sub>	89	2.63 <sub>a</sub>	249	*2	*	3.10 <sub>b</sub>	143

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

2. This category is not used in comparisons because the sum of case weights is less than two.

**Table B5 Leadership and Accountability**

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Student Affairs		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 <sup>1</sup>	2953	3.45 <sup>1</sup>	377	3.57 <sub>a</sub>	118	3.38 <sub>a</sub>	219	3.53 <sub>a</sub>	238	3.28 <sub>a</sub>	89	3.46 <sub>a</sub>	212	*2	*	3.35 <sub>a</sub>	125

**Table B5 Leadership and Accountability**

Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.45 <sup>1</sup>	3343	3.55 <sup>1</sup>	437	3.82 <sub>a</sub>	130	3.45 <sub>b</sub>	263	3.60 <sub>a</sub>	286	3.63 <sub>a</sub>	95	3.66 <sub>a</sub>	244	*2	*	3.35 <sub>b</sub>	150
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.30 <sup>1</sup>	2849	3.34 <sup>1</sup>	371	3.49 <sub>a</sub>	114	3.25 <sub>a</sub>	216	3.43 <sub>a</sub>	231	3.14 <sub>b</sub>	88	3.35 <sub>a</sub>	203	*2	*	3.22 <sub>a</sub>	128
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.41 <sup>1</sup>	3241	3.48 <sup>1</sup>	430	3.73 <sub>a</sub>	129	3.37 <sub>b</sub>	256	3.52 <sub>a</sub>	277	3.54 <sub>a</sub>	96	3.60 <sub>a</sub>	235	*2	*	3.25 <sub>b</sub>	151
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.13 <sup>1</sup>	2894	3.09 <sup>1</sup>	359	3.16 <sub>a</sub>	110	3.03 <sub>a</sub>	208	3.12 <sub>a</sub>	225	2.88 <sub>a</sub>	83	3.08 <sub>a</sub>	197	*2	*	2.98 <sub>a</sub>	123
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.25 <sup>1</sup>	3365	3.24 <sup>1</sup>	431	3.34 <sub>a</sub>	131	3.18 <sub>a</sub>	254	3.27 <sub>a</sub>	280	3.19 <sub>a</sub>	94	3.31 <sub>a</sub>	241	*2	*	3.06 <sub>a</sub>	147
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.78 <sup>1</sup>	3369	3.88 <sup>1</sup>	418	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	126	3.93 <sub>a</sub>	246	4.03 <sub>a</sub>	270	3.68 <sub>b</sub>	93	4.00 <sub>a</sub>	237	*2	*	3.69 <sub>b</sub>	134
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.89 <sup>1</sup>	3705	3.90 <sup>1</sup>	461	3.99 <sub>a</sub>	138	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	275	4.01 <sub>a</sub>	304	3.81 <sub>a</sub>	99	4.07 <sub>a</sub>	259	*2	*	3.65 <sub>b</sub>	154
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.37 <sup>1</sup>	3033	3.52 <sup>1</sup>	412	3.64 <sub>a</sub>	127	3.50 <sub>a</sub>	242	3.64 <sub>a</sub>	269	3.32 <sub>b</sub>	91	3.67 <sub>a</sub>	236	*2	*	3.27 <sub>b</sub>	132
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.47 <sup>1</sup>	3351	3.62 <sup>1</sup>	442	3.84 <sub>a</sub>	135	3.56 <sub>b</sub>	261	3.69 <sub>a</sub>	287	3.60 <sub>a</sub>	99	3.79 <sub>a</sub>	251	*2	*	3.34 <sub>b</sub>	145
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.20 <sup>1</sup>	3130	3.15 <sup>1</sup>	392	3.21 <sub>a</sub>	121	3.11 <sub>a</sub>	226	3.24 <sub>a</sub>	249	2.93 <sub>b</sub>	89	3.20 <sub>a</sub>	223	*2	*	2.93 <sub>a</sub>	124
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.25 <sup>1</sup>	3599	3.21 <sup>1</sup>	455	3.35 <sub>a</sub>	135	3.15 <sub>a</sub>	273	3.22 <sub>a</sub>	297	3.28 <sub>a</sub>	101	3.29 <sub>a</sub>	255	*2	*	3.03 <sub>a</sub>	152

*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

2. This category is not used in comparisons because the sum of case weights is less than two.



**Table B6 Misconduct Among Employees at CSU**

_____ is problematic among employees at CSU	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Student Affairs		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	247	11.1%	52	12.1%	17	12.5%	35	11.0%	34	16.5%	17	17.3%	46	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	3.0%	117	4.9%	23	*	*	6.8%	19	4.5%	14	*	*	7.9%	21	*	*	*	*
Bullying	13.3%	519	17.5%	82	13.6%	19	21.0%	59	14.6%	45	24.3%	25	19.2%	51	*	*	18.1%	28
Bias	28.3%	1104	37.3%	175	31.4%	44	39.9%	112	32.1%	99	51.5%	53	39.8%	106	*	*	34.8%	54
Physical Assault	0.6%	23	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.2%	282	7.5%	35	*	*	7.8%	22	6.2%	19	9.7%	10	7.9%	21	*	*	7.1%	11
None	65.7%	2566	54.4%	255	60.7%	85	51.6%	145	59.7%	184	38.8%	40	51.9%	138	*	*	56.8%	88

*Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested*

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

**Table B7 Misconduct Among Division/College**

_____ is problematic among employees in my division/college	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Student Affairs		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.8%	109	3.6%	17	*	*	4.6%	13	4.2%	13	*	*	4.9%	13	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.3%	52	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	10.3%	404	12.4%	58	7.1%	10	15.3%	43	9.4%	29	18.4%	19	11.7%	31	*	*	14.8%	23
Bias	24.1%	940	27.5%	129	23.6%	33	27.8%	78	22.1%	68	37.9%	39	27.8%	74	*	*	27.7%	43
Physical Assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	5.1%	199	5.3%	25	*	*	4.6%	13	3.2%	10	*	*	3.8%	10	*	*	7.1%	11
None	70.8%	2765	64.6%	303	72.1%	101	63.7%	179	70.1%	216	56.3%	58	65.0%	173	*	*	63.9%	99

*Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested*

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

**Table B8 Misconduct Among Department/Office**

____ is problematic among employees in my department/office	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Student Affairs		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	1.9%	73	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.1%	42	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	12.4%	486	13.4%	63	*	*	17.1%	48	11.7%	36	13.6%	14	12.0%	32	*	*	18.7%	29
Bias	23.3%	911	22.8%	107	14.3%	20	26.3%	74	19.5%	60	28.2%	29	21.4%	57	*	*	25.8%	40
Physical Assault	0.3%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.0%	272	6.8%	32	*	*	7.1%	20	4.5%	14	*	*	5.3%	14	*	*	9.0%	14
None	69.9%	2731	69.9%	328	83.6%	117	65.1%	183	73.7%	227	66.0%	68	72.2%	192	*	*	65.2%	101

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

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

**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		Student Affairs		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.5%	99	5.3%	25	*	*	7.5%	21	4.5%	14	10.7%	11	7.5%	20	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.0%	41	3.0%	14	*	*	4.6%	13	*	*	*	*	4.1%	11	*	*	*	*
Bullying	16.7%	651	20.7%	97	14.3%	20	22.8%	64	15.3%	47	27.2%	28	19.5%	52	*	*	23.2%	36
Bias	20.0%	781	22.4%	105	20.7%	29	22.4%	63	16.6%	51	37.9%	39	21.4%	57	*	*	21.9%	34
Physical Assault	0.9%	37	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	11.0%	428	12.6%	59	14.3%	20	11.7%	33	9.4%	29	17.5%	18	11.7%	31	*	*	13.5%	21
None	68.7%	2682	62.3%	292	65.7%	92	61.6%	173	69.5%	214	46.6%	48	63.9%	170	*	*	59.4%	92

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

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

**Table B10 Bias Incidents**

**Table B9 Avoidance due to Misconduct**

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Student Affairs		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 <sup>1</sup>	3726	4.21 <sup>1</sup>	457	4.18 <sub>a</sub>	137	4.25 <sub>a</sub>	276	4.18 <sub>a</sub>	304	4.40 <sub>b</sub>	100	4.34 <sub>a</sub>	261	*1	*	4.01 <sub>b</sub>	152
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.64 <sup>1</sup>	3199	3.78 <sup>1</sup>	418	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	126	3.83 <sub>a</sub>	253	3.90 <sub>a</sub>	273	3.53 <sub>b</sub>	98	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	245	*1	*	3.60 <sub>b</sub>	136
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.10 <sup>1</sup>	3174	3.31 <sup>1</sup>	418	2.98 <sub>a</sub>	125	3.48 <sub>b</sub>	253	3.36 <sub>a</sub>	276	3.28 <sub>a</sub>	94	3.29 <sub>a</sub>	245	*1	*	3.37 <sub>a</sub>	135
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.21 <sup>1</sup>	2397	3.59 <sup>1</sup>	353	3.31 <sub>a</sub>	99	3.70 <sub>b</sub>	218	3.52 <sub>a</sub>	229	3.86 <sub>b</sub>	81	3.61 <sub>a</sub>	211	*1	*	3.52 <sub>a</sub>	109
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.44 <sup>1</sup>	2962	3.45 <sup>1</sup>	407	3.42 <sub>a</sub>	122	3.47 <sub>a</sub>	245	3.57 <sub>a</sub>	265	3.20 <sub>b</sub>	94	3.51 <sub>a</sub>	237	*1	*	3.39 <sub>a</sub>	131

*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		Student Affairs		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	83.9% <sup>1</sup>	3260	84.6% <sup>1</sup>	395	84.2% <sub>a</sub>	117	85.4% <sub>a</sub>	240	87.6% <sub>a</sub>	269	74.8% <sub>b</sub>	77	88.8% <sub>a</sub>	237	* <sup>2,3</sup>	*	82.4% <sub>a</sub>	126
No	16.1% <sup>1</sup>	627	15.4% <sup>1</sup>	72	15.8% <sub>a</sub>	22	14.6% <sub>a</sub>	41	12.4% <sub>a</sub>	38	25.2% <sub>b</sub>	26	11.2% <sub>a</sub>	30	* <sup>2,3</sup>	*	17.6% <sub>a</sub>	27

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 the sum of case weights is less than two.
3. 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		Student Affairs		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 <sup>1</sup>	2437	3.42 <sup>1</sup>	261	3.35 <sub>a</sub>	79	3.44 <sub>a</sub>	155	3.43 <sub>a</sub>	181	3.40 <sub>a</sub>	48	3.41 <sub>a</sub>	147	* <sup>1</sup>	*	3.43 <sub>a</sub>	92
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.87 <sup>1</sup>	2700	3.87 <sup>1</sup>	301	3.98 <sub>a</sub>	88	3.86 <sub>a</sub>	184	3.90 <sub>a</sub>	210	3.93 <sub>a</sub>	56	3.90 <sub>a</sub>	172	* <sup>1</sup>	*	3.88 <sub>a</sub>	101

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		Student Affairs		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 <sup>1</sup>	3644	4.47 <sup>1</sup>	459	4.50 <sub>a</sub>	139	4.49 <sub>a</sub>	276	4.46 <sub>a</sub>	303	4.58 <sub>a</sub>	102	4.63 <sub>a</sub>	265	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.27 <sub>b</sub>	150
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.52 <sup>1</sup>	3366	4.21 <sup>1</sup>	446	4.36 <sub>a</sub>	135	4.20 <sub>a</sub>	271	4.29 <sub>a</sub>	298	4.09 <sub>a</sub>	97	4.37 <sub>a</sub>	259	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.01 <sub>b</sub>	147
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.20 <sup>1</sup>	3209	3.60 <sup>1</sup>	444	3.71 <sub>a</sub>	133	3.61 <sub>a</sub>	270	3.67 <sub>a</sub>	296	3.65 <sub>a</sub>	97	3.79 <sub>a</sub>	256	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.29 <sub>b</sub>	147
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.26 <sup>1</sup>	3082	3.68 <sup>1</sup>	431	3.75 <sub>a</sub>	127	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	261	3.76 <sub>a</sub>	284	3.73 <sub>a</sub>	95	3.91 <sub>a</sub>	246	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.34 <sub>b</sub>	143

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
2. This category is not used in comparisons because the sum of case weights is less than two.

**Table B14 Freedom of Speech**

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Student Affairs		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 <sup>1</sup>	3629	3.59 <sup>1</sup>	460	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	138	3.58 <sub>a</sub>	277	3.68 <sub>a</sub>	301	3.56 <sub>a</sub>	103	3.77 <sub>a</sub>	266	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.27 <sub>b</sub>	149
Free speech is an important issue on campus	4.28 <sup>1</sup>	3697	4.31 <sup>1</sup>	464	4.30 <sub>a</sub>	139	4.32 <sub>a</sub>	281	4.36 <sub>a</sub>	306	4.29 <sub>a</sub>	103	4.40 <sub>a</sub>	267	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.16 <sub>b</sub>	153
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	3.59 <sup>1</sup>	3525	3.62 <sup>1</sup>	448	3.73 <sub>a</sub>	138	3.58 <sub>a</sub>	267	3.67 <sub>a</sub>	295	3.53 <sub>a</sub>	101	3.71 <sub>a</sub>	261	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.47 <sub>b</sub>	144
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.30 <sup>1</sup>	3473	3.63 <sup>1</sup>	436	3.59 <sub>a</sub>	132	3.68 <sub>a</sub>	262	3.70 <sub>a</sub>	286	3.54 <sub>a</sub>	96	3.82 <sub>a</sub>	259	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.31 <sub>b</sub>	137
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.97 <sup>1</sup>	3648	3.43 <sup>1</sup>	448	3.34 <sub>a</sub>	132	3.50 <sub>a</sub>	272	3.37 <sub>a</sub>	297	3.67 <sub>b</sub>	97	3.68 <sub>a</sub>	260	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.03 <sub>b</sub>	145

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
2. This category is not used in comparisons because the sum of case weights is less than two.

**Table B15 CSU Perceptions**

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Student Affairs		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 <sup>1</sup>	3315	3.81 <sup>1</sup>	433	3.80 <sub>a</sub>	133	3.80 <sub>a</sub>	265	3.95 <sub>a</sub>	292	3.44 <sub>b</sub>	98	3.66 <sub>a</sub>	253	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.08 <sub>b</sub>	145
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.72 <sup>1</sup>	3408	3.77 <sup>1</sup>	430	3.82 <sub>a</sub>	137	3.74 <sub>a</sub>	262	3.85 <sub>a</sub>	291	3.57 <sub>b</sub>	97	3.81 <sub>a</sub>	255	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.77 <sub>a</sub>	142
CSU retains diverse employees	3.60 <sup>1</sup>	2992	3.56 <sup>1</sup>	401	3.62 <sub>a</sub>	128	3.51 <sub>a</sub>	243	3.75 <sub>a</sub>	269	3.07 <sub>b</sub>	92	3.31 <sub>a</sub>	237	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.97 <sub>b</sub>	133
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.77 <sup>1</sup>	3194	3.71 <sup>1</sup>	415	3.83 <sub>a</sub>	130	3.65 <sub>a</sub>	251	3.80 <sub>a</sub>	273	3.50 <sub>b</sub>	98	3.62 <sub>a</sub>	244	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.90 <sub>b</sub>	137
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.02 <sup>1</sup>	3472	4.15 <sup>1</sup>	444	4.11 <sub>a</sub>	137	4.18 <sub>a</sub>	273	4.21 <sub>a</sub>	302	4.02 <sub>b</sub>	97	4.22 <sub>a</sub>	259	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.03 <sub>b</sub>	151
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	3.84 <sup>1</sup>	3541	3.86 <sup>1</sup>	435	3.91 <sub>a</sub>	135	3.85 <sub>a</sub>	266	3.94 <sub>a</sub>	294	3.78 <sub>a</sub>	98	3.95 <sub>a</sub>	256	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.74 <sub>b</sub>	144
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.76 <sup>1</sup>	3183	3.72 <sup>1</sup>	412	3.78 <sub>a</sub>	129	3.71 <sub>a</sub>	252	3.82 <sub>a</sub>	279	3.62 <sub>a</sub>	91	3.77 <sub>a</sub>	247	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.67 <sub>a</sub>	136
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.08 <sup>1</sup>	3708	4.17 <sup>1</sup>	449	4.23 <sub>a</sub>	137	4.16 <sub>a</sub>	278	4.29 <sub>a</sub>	304	4.00 <sub>b</sub>	101	4.25 <sub>a</sub>	261	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.08 <sub>b</sub>	153

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
2. This category is not used in comparisons because the sum of case weights is less than two.

**Table B16 Department/Unit Perceptions**

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		Student Affairs		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 <sup>1</sup>	3603	3.81 <sup>1</sup>	452	3.95 <sub>a</sub>	139	3.78 <sub>a</sub>	278	3.86 <sub>a</sub>	308	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	99	3.82 <sub>a</sub>	265	*2	*	3.84 <sub>a</sub>	152
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.61 <sup>1</sup>	3548	3.76 <sup>1</sup>	449	3.91 <sub>a</sub>	140	3.75 <sub>a</sub>	274	3.84 <sub>a</sub>	305	3.79 <sub>a</sub>	99	3.91 <sub>a</sub>	264	*2	*	3.57 <sub>b</sub>	150
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.50 <sup>1</sup>	3414	3.64 <sup>1</sup>	433	3.78 <sub>a</sub>	135	3.62 <sub>a</sub>	266	3.75 <sub>a</sub>	293	3.45 <sub>b</sub>	96	3.57 <sub>a</sub>	257	*2	*	3.74 <sub>a</sub>	144
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.68 <sup>1</sup>	3458	3.77 <sup>1</sup>	437	3.90 <sub>a</sub>	135	3.74 <sub>a</sub>	268	3.83 <sub>a</sub>	295	3.71 <sub>a</sub>	98	3.80 <sub>a</sub>	256	*2	*	3.75 <sub>a</sub>	147
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.66 <sup>1</sup>	3561	4.03 <sup>1</sup>	453	4.09 <sub>a</sub>	140	4.06 <sub>a</sub>	278	4.11 <sub>a</sub>	308	4.00 <sub>a</sub>	100	4.23 <sub>a</sub>	265	*2	*	3.72 <sub>b</sub>	153
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.71 <sup>1</sup>	3739	3.79 <sup>1</sup>	453	3.90 <sub>a</sub>	139	3.79 <sub>a</sub>	280	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	308	3.77 <sub>a</sub>	101	3.98 <sub>a</sub>	265	*2	*	3.49 <sub>b</sub>	154
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.59 <sup>1</sup>	3380	3.73 <sup>1</sup>	434	3.87 <sub>a</sub>	134	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	268	3.80 <sub>a</sub>	295	3.75 <sub>a</sub>	95	3.88 <sub>a</sub>	257	*2	*	3.52 <sub>b</sub>	147
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.86 <sup>1</sup>	3735	3.95 <sup>1</sup>	453	4.06 <sub>a</sub>	139	3.97 <sub>a</sub>	280	4.08 <sub>a</sub>	308	3.87 <sub>a</sub>	101	4.08 <sub>a</sub>	265	*2	*	3.77 <sub>b</sub>	154

*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
2. This category is not used in comparisons because the sum of case weights is less than two.



**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		Student Affairs		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	14.1% <sup>1</sup>	533	16.9% <sup>1</sup>	77	15.7% <sub>a</sub>	22	18.5% <sub>a</sub>	52	19.2% <sub>a</sub>	59	14.6% <sub>a</sub>	15	22.1% <sub>a</sub>	59	* <sup>2,3</sup>	*	10.4% <sub>b</sub>	16
No	85.9% <sup>1</sup>	3247	83.1% <sup>1</sup>	378	84.3% <sub>a</sub>	118	81.5% <sub>a</sub>	229	80.8% <sub>a</sub>	249	85.4% <sub>a</sub>	88	77.9% <sub>a</sub>	208	* <sup>2,3</sup>	*	89.6% <sub>b</sub>	138

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 the sum of case weights is less than two.
3. 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		Student Affairs		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Cost of care services	72.3%	391	79.5%	62	72.7%	16	81.1%	43	78.3%	47	80.0%	12	81.4%	48	*	*	76.5%	13
Finding child care services	31.8%	172	34.6%	27	*	*	37.7%	20	30.0%	18	*	*	37.3%	22	*	*	*	*
Finding adult care services	5.5%	30	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding temporary care services	12.0%	65	12.8%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding care for a sick child/adult	28.7%	155	30.8%	24	*	*	39.6%	21	28.3%	17	*	*	33.9%	20	*	*	*	*
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	34.6%	27	*	*	43.4%	23	33.3%	20	*	*	35.6%	21	*	*	*	*
Dependability of care services	15.0%	81	20.5%	16	*	*	22.6%	12	18.3%	11	*	*	22.0%	13	*	*	*	*
Quality of care services	17.2%	93	16.7%	13	*	*	20.8%	11	*	*	*	*	16.9%	10	*	*	*	*
Scheduling care to match work schedule	40.1%	217	51.3%	40	45.5%	10	52.8%	28	51.7%	31	*	*	47.5%	28	*	*	64.7%	11
Finding summer care services	27.9%	151	34.6%	27	*	*	43.4%	23	35.0%	21	*	*	35.6%	21	*	*	*	*
Location of care services	15.5%	84	20.5%	16	*	*	28.3%	15	21.7%	13	*	*	20.3%	12	*	*	*	*
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		Student Affairs		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 <sup>1</sup>	2524	3.84 <sup>1</sup>	351	3.93 <sub>a</sub>	113	3.80 <sub>a</sub>	210	3.94 <sub>a</sub>	231	3.66 <sub>b</sub>	82	3.82 <sub>a</sub>	207	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.91 <sub>a</sub>	116
Department/Unit Perceptions	3.66 <sup>1</sup>	2869	3.80 <sup>1</sup>	391	3.91 <sub>a</sub>	123	3.79 <sub>a</sub>	239	3.90 <sub>a</sub>	262	3.71 <sub>a</sub>	87	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	236	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.65 <sub>b</sub>	128
Department/Unit Leadership	3.42 <sup>1</sup>	2859	3.48 <sup>1</sup>	391	3.68 <sub>a</sub>	116	3.40 <sub>b</sub>	232	3.54 <sub>a</sub>	248	3.49 <sub>a</sub>	89	3.61 <sub>a</sub>	216	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.24 <sub>b</sub>	134
College/Division Leadership	3.31 <sup>1</sup>	2472	3.35 <sup>1</sup>	334	3.44 <sub>a</sub>	105	3.30 <sub>a</sub>	192	3.43 <sub>a</sub>	211	3.16 <sub>b</sub>	77	3.40 <sub>a</sub>	184	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.17 <sub>a</sub>	113
Favoritism	2.80 <sup>1</sup>	3417	2.76 <sup>1</sup>	430	2.56 <sub>a</sub>	129	2.83 <sub>b</sub>	252	2.69 <sub>a</sub>	281	2.85 <sub>a</sub>	87	2.58 <sub>a</sub>	240	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.08 <sub>b</sub>	141
Sense of Belonging	3.67 <sup>1</sup>	3978	3.80 <sup>1</sup>	472	3.82 <sub>a</sub>	138	3.87 <sub>a</sub>	277	3.88 <sub>a</sub>	303	3.84 <sub>a</sub>	102	3.96 <sub>a</sub>	261	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.60 <sub>b</sub>	154
Department/Unit Culture	3.52 <sup>1</sup>	3807	3.61 <sup>1</sup>	463	3.75 <sub>a</sub>	138	3.62 <sub>a</sub>	273	3.66 <sub>a</sub>	300	3.68 <sub>a</sub>	101	3.81 <sub>a</sub>	259	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.31 <sub>b</sub>	153
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	4.00 <sup>1</sup>	3753	4.26 <sup>1</sup>	466	4.33 <sub>a</sub>	136	4.28 <sub>a</sub>	274	4.34 <sub>a</sub>	300	4.21 <sub>a</sub>	100	4.38 <sub>a</sub>	258	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.09 <sub>b</sub>	152

*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
2. This category is not used in comparisons because the sum of case weights is less than two.

## 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)<sup>1</sup> 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	Higher	3.96	3.86	.10	76.6%	72.5%	4.1
Understands the value of diversity	Higher	4.30	4.06	.25	85.0%	78.6%	6.4
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Higher	3.77	3.62	.15	70.1%	64.7%	5.5
Treats all employees equitably	Similar	3.53	3.46	.06	60.5%	58.5%	2.0
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Higher	4.28	3.87	.41	83.9%	69.8%	14.0
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Higher	4.26	3.99	.27	86.8%	77.0%	9.7
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Higher	4.24	4.04	.20	83.8%	76.1%	7.7
Is open and transparent in communication	Similar	3.54	3.44	.09	60.7%	57.3%	3.4
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Similar	3.49	3.46	.03	59.0%	57.3%	1.7

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

**Table C2 Culture**

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	Higher	3.50	3.39	.11	58.0%	54.2%	3.8
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	Higher	4.23	3.97	.26	86.5%	76.1%	10.4
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	Higher	4.41	4.32	.09	94.0%	91.6%	2.3
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	Higher	4.01	3.90	.11	74.7%	72.9%	1.8
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Similar	2.57	2.66	-.09	27.3%	28.0%	-.7
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Similar	3.13	3.10	.03	36.9%	37.0%	-.2
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	Higher	3.77	3.65	.13	66.5%	62.4%	4.1
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	Higher	3.61	3.49	.12	59.9%	55.4%	4.5
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	Higher	4.03	3.88	.16	75.5%	71.3%	4.2

**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	3.71	3.64	.07	66.9%	64.3%	2.6
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	Higher	3.91	3.69	.21	75.4%	67.0%	8.4
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	Similar	3.98	3.95	.03	80.6%	78.9%	1.8
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	Similar	3.97	3.91	.06	74.3%	71.7%	2.6
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	Higher	4.25	4.06	.19	85.0%	79.0%	6.0
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	Lower	3.29	3.47	-.18	48.1%	55.1%	-7.0
I feel valued as an employee	Similar	3.77	3.68	.09	70.3%	66.7%	3.6

**Table C4 Favoritism**

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office	Similar	2.91	3.00	-.09	35.9%	37.9%	-2.1
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	Lower	2.63	2.85	-.22	24.9%	31.3%	-6.4
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	Lower	2.52	2.64	-.12	22.1%	23.7%	-1.6
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	Similar	2.90	2.88	.03	34.2%	32.3%	1.8
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	Similar	2.81	2.73	.08	30.1%	25.6%	4.5

**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	Similar	3.45	3.35	.10	57.6%	51.7%	5.8
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.55	3.45	.11	65.0%	58.2%	6.8
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.34	3.30	.05	52.3%	48.1%	4.2
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.48	3.41	.07	61.2%	55.4%	5.8
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.09	3.13	-.03	43.5%	41.5%	1.9
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.24	3.25	-.01	54.1%	50.5%	3.5
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.88	3.78	.10	74.9%	69.4%	5.5
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.90	3.89	.00	77.7%	75.1%	2.5
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Higher	3.52	3.37	.16	58.3%	50.3%	8.0



CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Higher	3.62	3.47	.14	64.9%	55.8%	9.2
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.15	3.20	-.04	43.9%	45.8%	-1.9
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.21	3.25	-.05	51.4%	51.1%	.3

**Table C6 Bias Incidents**

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	Higher	4.21	4.00	.21	85.3%	77.7%	7.6
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Higher	3.78	3.64	.14	70.8%	61.8%	9.0
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Higher	3.31	3.10	.21	42.3%	32.4%	10.0
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Higher	3.59	3.21	.38	55.2%	34.0%	21.2
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Similar	3.45	3.44	.02	54.1%	51.2%	2.9

**Table C7 Employee Councils**

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I feel my employee council addresses issues and topics that are important and relevant to me	Similar	3.42	3.35	.07	47.1%	46.7%	.5
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	Similar	3.87	3.87	.00	70.8%	70.8%	.0

*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	4.47	3.91	.56	93.2%	77.2%	16.0
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment	Higher	4.21	3.52	.69	83.0%	58.4%	24.6
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	Higher	3.60	3.20	.40	57.0%	36.0%	21.0
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	Higher	3.68	3.26	.42	59.9%	38.4%	21.4

**Table C9 Freedom of Speech**

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college supports people speaking freely	Similar	3.59	3.64	-.04	64.3%	66.7%	-2.4
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Similar	4.31	4.28	.03	92.2%	89.5%	2.8
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Similar	3.62	3.59	.03	61.4%	59.8%	1.6
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Higher	3.63	3.30	.33	64.9%	50.3%	14.6
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Higher	3.43	2.97	.45	48.7%	33.5%	15.2

**Table C10 CSU Perceptions**

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	Similar	3.81	3.84	-.04	73.7%	75.0%	-1.3
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Similar	3.77	3.72	.04	71.4%	69.5%	1.9
CSU retains diverse employees	Similar	3.56	3.60	-.04	59.9%	61.2%	-1.4
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Similar	3.71	3.77	-.06	67.5%	69.9%	-2.4
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Higher	4.15	4.02	.12	86.7%	79.9%	6.8
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.86	3.84	.03	75.6%	74.0%	1.7
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.72	3.76	-.04	65.0%	66.6%	-1.6
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Higher	4.17	4.08	.10	84.4%	80.9%	3.5

**Table C11 Department/Unit Perceptions**

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Department/office recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	Higher	3.81	3.67	.14	72.1%	66.6%	5.5
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	Higher	3.76	3.61	.15	71.3%	63.7%	7.6
Department/office retains diverse employees	Higher	3.64	3.50	.13	63.7%	56.8%	6.9
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Higher	3.77	3.68	.09	70.7%	65.3%	5.4
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	Higher	4.03	3.66	.38	79.2%	61.8%	17.5
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.79	3.71	.07	71.7%	68.7%	3.1
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Higher	3.73	3.59	.14	67.1%	59.3%	7.7
Would recommend department/office as a place of employment	Similar	3.95	3.86	.10	74.6%	71.3%	3.3

**Table C12 Factors**

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Similar	3.84	3.82	.03
Department/Unit Perceptions	Higher	3.80	3.66	.14
Department/Unit Leadership	Similar	3.48	3.42	.05
College/Division Leadership	Similar	3.35	3.31	.04
Favoritism	Similar	2.76	2.80	-.04
Sense of Belonging	Higher	3.80	3.67	.13
Department/Unit Culture	Similar	3.61	3.52	.09
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Higher	4.26	4.00	.26