



# Division of Student Affairs

## 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 (excluding 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 .....	18
Appendix C: Division Comparisons to CSU Overall .....	34

## Appendix A: Item Percentages

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	2.0%	10.6%	7.6%	33.8%	46.0%	198	4.11
Understands the value of diversity	0.5%	5.6%	5.6%	28.4%	59.9%	197	4.42
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.1%	9.2%	11.7%	39.8%	36.2%	196	3.97
Treats all employees equitably	4.1%	14.3%	10.2%	43.4%	28.1%	196	3.77
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	1.0%	2.0%	10.2%	31.5%	55.3%	197	4.38
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	0.5%	3.6%	5.1%	35.9%	54.9%	195	4.41
Promotes respect for cultural differences	0.5%	2.1%	9.8%	34.0%	53.6%	194	4.38
Is open and transparent in communication	7.7%	9.3%	11.3%	40.7%	30.9%	194	3.78
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	6.7%	11.3%	9.8%	40.2%	32.0%	194	3.79

**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	2.6%	13.0%	23.3%	41.5%	19.7%	193	3.63
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	0.5%	3.1%	5.2%	44.8%	46.4%	192	4.33
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	1.1%	1.7%	1.7%	37.0%	58.6%	181	4.50
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	5.5%	4.4%	12.2%	30.4%	47.5%	181	4.10
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	29.0%	40.4%	7.8%	13.5%	9.3%	193	2.34
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	8.4%	29.5%	35.3%	20.5%	6.3%	190	2.87
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.6%	7.2%	19.1%	35.6%	34.5%	194	3.90
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	5.7%	11.9%	19.1%	36.1%	27.3%	194	3.68
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.6%	4.1%	8.7%	27.7%	55.9%	195	4.28

**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	1.5%	9.7%	16.9%	47.2%	24.6%	195	3.84
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.1%	5.2%	15.1%	47.9%	28.6%	192	3.94
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	1.0%	4.1%	7.2%	53.3%	34.4%	195	4.16
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	1.1%	3.8%	14.1%	41.8%	39.1%	184	4.14
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	0.0%	1.0%	6.7%	44.6%	47.7%	193	4.39
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	8.2%	20.7%	25.0%	33.7%	12.5%	184	3.22
I feel valued as an employee	5.1%	9.2%	10.7%	41.8%	33.2%	196	3.89

**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	17.9%	37.9%	17.4%	14.2%	12.6%	190	2.66
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	22.0%	40.3%	16.2%	12.6%	8.9%	191	2.46
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	27.2%	45.5%	13.1%	6.8%	7.3%	191	2.21
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	23.0%	33.9%	15.3%	14.2%	13.7%	183	2.62
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	20.5%	32.4%	17.8%	17.3%	11.9%	185	2.68

**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	7.8%	14.3%	18.2%	43.5%	16.2%	154	3.46
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	4.9%	12.0%	10.3%	51.1%	21.7%	184	3.73
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	8.7%	14.7%	23.3%	40.0%	13.3%	150	3.35

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	6.0%	12.6%	14.3%	47.8%	19.2%	182	3.62
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	11.1%	18.1%	25.7%	36.8%	8.3%	144	3.13
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	10.1%	15.7%	14.0%	47.2%	12.9%	178	3.37
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	4.1%	5.2%	14.5%	45.3%	30.8%	172	3.94
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.6%	5.2%	7.8%	48.7%	34.7%	193	4.06
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	6.9%	12.1%	19.1%	39.3%	22.5%	173	3.58
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	5.9%	8.6%	11.8%	48.7%	25.1%	187	3.79
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	11.8%	18.0%	22.4%	31.1%	16.8%	161	3.23
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	12.8%	14.9%	13.3%	38.3%	20.7%	188	3.39

**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	15.5%	6.7%	17.5%	44.8%	0.5%	7.7%	49.0%	194
___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	5.7%	2.1%	8.8%	31.4%	0.0%	4.1%	63.4%	194
___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	1.5%	1.0%	8.8%	21.6%	0.0%	3.1%	75.3%	194
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	8.2%	4.1%	14.9%	26.8%	0.5%	10.3%	63.9%	194

**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	0.5%	1.6%	7.9%	43.2%	46.8%	190	4.34
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	0.5%	10.9%	13.1%	55.2%	20.2%	183	3.84
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.8%	19.2%	31.3%	33.5%	12.1%	182	3.31
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	2.0%	9.9%	29.6%	38.8%	19.7%	152	3.64
CSU handles incidents of bias well	2.8%	16.0%	22.7%	48.6%	9.9%	181	3.47

**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	87.6%	170
No	12.4%	24
Total	100.0%	194

**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	0.9%	11.9%	35.8%	46.8%	4.6%	109	3.42
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	0.8%	3.1%	16.9%	55.4%	23.8%	130	3.98



**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.	0.5%	3.1%	3.1%	30.1%	63.2%	193	4.52
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.3%	9.2%	4.3%	29.3%	53.8%	184	4.21
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	4.9%	6.0%	25.3%	37.9%	25.8%	182	3.74
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	2.8%	6.3%	23.3%	38.6%	29.0%	176	3.85

**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	2.1%	12.4%	16.1%	46.6%	22.8%	193	3.76
Free speech is an important issue on campus	0.0%	2.1%	5.2%	49.2%	43.5%	193	4.34
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	2.1%	15.5%	18.1%	41.5%	22.8%	193	3.67
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	4.2%	17.9%	7.4%	41.1%	29.5%	190	3.74
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.1%	12.1%	27.9%	30.5%	27.4%	190	3.69

**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	2.1%	12.8%	16.6%	51.3%	17.1%	187	3.68
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	1.1%	8.2%	20.1%	55.4%	15.2%	184	3.76
CSU retains diverse employees	6.1%	17.3%	27.4%	35.2%	14.0%	179	3.34
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	1.7%	14.4%	18.8%	50.3%	14.9%	181	3.62
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	0.5%	3.7%	9.1%	56.1%	30.5%	187	4.12
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	2.2%	4.8%	16.1%	56.5%	20.4%	186	3.88
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	2.2%	9.0%	25.3%	44.9%	18.5%	178	3.69
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	0.5%	2.6%	13.7%	47.4%	35.8%	190	4.15

**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	2.6%	9.9%	14.7%	48.7%	24.1%	191	3.82
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	2.6%	6.9%	10.1%	55.6%	24.9%	189	3.93
Department/office retains diverse employees	2.2%	11.4%	23.4%	41.8%	21.2%	184	3.68
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	1.6%	10.2%	15.6%	48.4%	24.2%	186	3.83
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	2.1%	5.8%	7.4%	44.2%	40.5%	190	4.15
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	4.8%	6.3%	9.5%	41.8%	37.6%	189	4.01
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	2.7%	6.5%	16.8%	48.1%	25.9%	185	3.88
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	4.2%	5.8%	10.5%	35.8%	43.7%	190	4.09

**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	38.8%	66
Political affiliation	24.1%	41
Job title	22.9%	39
Age	18.8%	32
Employment classification	17.1%	29
Gender	16.5%	28
Religion	12.4%	21
Appearance	10.0%	17
Parental status	8.2%	14
Socioeconomic status	7.1%	12
Disability (e.g. physical, mental)	7.1%	12
Race or color	6.5%	11
Gender identity and expression	6.5%	11
Ethnic origin	5.9%	10
Marital status	5.9%	10
Sexual orientation	3.5%	6
Education/professional background	2.9%	5
Nationality/Country of origin	2.4%	4
Other (employment duration, veteran status, general bias, nepotism/favoritism)	4.8%	8

*Note: multiple response item.*

**Table A15 Work-related Stressors**

Please select your top THREE work-related stressors	%	N
Lower salary	61.7%	113
Workload	33.9%	62
Lack of growth/promotion	33.3%	61
Work/life balance	29.0%	53
Email overload	25.7%	47
Affordable housing near work	24.6%	45
Office/department climate	13.7%	25
Duties outside my job responsibilities	10.4%	19
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	9.8%	18
Interpersonal conflict	9.3%	17
Health issues	6.0%	11
Ill-defined job	4.9%	9
Lack of work flexibility	4.9%	9
Misconduct occurring at work/Inequities/Bias	4.9%	9
Lack of training/skills to do my work	4.9%	9
Job security	4.4%	8
Other	3.8%	7
Parking and Transportation	1.6%	3
Lack of work autonomy	1.1%	2
Feeling Undervalued	1.1%	2
Physical safety	0.5%	1
Physical environment	0.5%	1
Communication	0.5%	1
Dependent Care	0.5%	1
Administration/Leadership	0.5%	1

*Note: multiple response item.*

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

Have you utilized child or adult care services this past year?	%	N
Yes	20.1%	38
No	79.9%	151
Total	100.0%	189

**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	82.5%	33
Scheduling care to match work schedule	42.5%	17
Finding summer care services	42.5%	17
Finding child care services	32.5%	13
Finding care for a sick child/adult	32.5%	13
Transportation to/from care services	32.5%	13
Dependability of care services	25.0%	10
Location of care services	25.0%	10
Finding temporary care services	15.0%	6
Quality of care services	15.0%	6
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	12.5%	5
Finding adult care services	2.5%	1
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	2.5%	1

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

**Table A18 Gender**

	%	N
Women	62.0%	114
Men	35.9%	66
T/NB/GNC	2.2%	4

*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	67.6%	121
Minoritized	32.4%	58

*Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose.*

**Table A20 Employee Type**

	%	N
Administrative Professional	72.1%	137
Faculty	0.5%	1
State Classified	23.2%	44
Other	1.1%	2
Prefer not to disclose	3.2%	6
Total	100.0%	190



**Table A21 Department/Unit**

	%	N
Academic Support:		
Orientation & Transition Programs		13
Academic Advancement Center		
Student-Athlete Support Services	6.9%	
Bookstore	7.9%	15
Campus Life:		
Student Resolution Center		
Student Case Mgt. & Referral Coordination		16
Off-Campus Life		
Adult Learners & Veterans Services Student Legal Services	8.5%	
Career Center	10.1%	19
Collaborative for Student Achievement	16.4%	31
Lory Student Center or Student Leadership, Involvement & Community Engagement or Student Organizations	16.9%	32
Lory Student Center-Dining Services	3.7%	7
Office of the VP for Student Affairs or Support & Safety Assessment	10.6%	20
Student Diversity Programs:		
Women & Gender Advocacy Center		
Pride Resource Center		
Asian/Pacific American Cultural Center		20
Black/African American Cultural Center		
El Centro		
Native American Cultural Center		
Student Disability Center	10.6%	
Prefer not to disclose	8.5%	16
Total	100.0%	189

## 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		SA		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	4.11 <sup>1</sup>	198	3.97 <sub>a</sub>	66	4.24 <sub>a</sub>	114	4.16 <sub>a</sub>	121	4.09 <sub>a</sub>	58	4.13 <sub>a</sub>	137	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.11 <sub>a</sub>	44
Understands the value of diversity	4.06 <sup>1</sup>	3956	4.42 <sup>1</sup>	197	4.52 <sub>a</sub>	66	4.38 <sub>a</sub>	113	4.52 <sub>a</sub>	120	4.24 <sub>b</sub>	58	4.42 <sub>a</sub>	136	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.34 <sub>a</sub>	44
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.62 <sup>1</sup>	3994	3.97 <sup>1</sup>	196	4.03 <sub>a</sub>	66	3.96 <sub>a</sub>	112	4.04 <sub>a</sub>	119	3.84 <sub>a</sub>	58	4.06 <sub>a</sub>	135	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.73 <sub>a</sub>	44
Treats all employees equitably	3.46 <sup>1</sup>	3946	3.77 <sup>1</sup>	196	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	66	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	112	3.83 <sub>a</sub>	121	3.58 <sub>a</sub>	57	3.81 <sub>a</sub>	135	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.64 <sub>a</sub>	44
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.87 <sup>1</sup>	3950	4.38 <sup>1</sup>	197	4.42 <sub>a</sub>	66	4.39 <sub>a</sub>	113	4.47 <sub>a</sub>	120	4.21 <sub>a</sub>	58	4.47 <sub>a</sub>	136	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.07 <sub>b</sub>	44
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.99 <sup>1</sup>	3999	4.41 <sup>1</sup>	195	4.33 <sub>a</sub>	66	4.45 <sub>a</sub>	113	4.45 <sub>a</sub>	120	4.45 <sub>a</sub>	58	4.48 <sub>a</sub>	136	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.23 <sub>a</sub>	44
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.04 <sup>1</sup>	3934	4.38 <sup>1</sup>	194	4.46 <sub>a</sub>	65	4.38 <sub>a</sub>	113	4.49 <sub>a</sub>	119	4.26 <sub>a</sub>	58	4.47 <sub>a</sub>	135	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.16 <sub>b</sub>	44
Is open and transparent in communication	3.44 <sup>1</sup>	4009	3.78 <sup>1</sup>	194	3.77 <sub>a</sub>	66	3.82 <sub>a</sub>	112	3.79 <sub>a</sub>	120	3.74 <sub>a</sub>	57	3.86 <sub>a</sub>	135	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.52 <sub>a</sub>	44
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	3.46 <sup>1</sup>	3952	3.79 <sup>1</sup>	194	3.91 <sub>a</sub>	66	3.76 <sub>a</sub>	113	3.79 <sub>a</sub>	120	3.81 <sub>a</sub>	58	3.92 <sub>a</sub>	136	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.34 <sub>b</sub>	44

*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		SA		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	3.63 <sup>1</sup>	193	3.68 <sub>a</sub>	65	3.66 <sub>a</sub>	112	3.78 <sub>a</sub>	118	3.41 <sub>b</sub>	58	3.60 <sub>a</sub>	135	*2	*	3.83 <sub>a</sub>	42
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.97 <sup>1</sup>	3872	4.33 <sup>1</sup>	192	4.40 <sub>a</sub>	65	4.32 <sub>a</sub>	111	4.44 <sub>a</sub>	118	4.18 <sub>b</sub>	57	4.35 <sub>a</sub>	133	*2	*	4.28 <sub>a</sub>	43
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	4.32 <sup>1</sup>	3691	4.50 <sup>1</sup>	181	4.47 <sub>a</sub>	62	4.52 <sub>a</sub>	103	4.57 <sub>a</sub>	113	4.39 <sub>a</sub>	51	4.46 <sub>a</sub>	125	*2	*	4.63 <sub>a</sub>	43
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.90 <sup>1</sup>	3687	4.10 <sup>1</sup>	181	4.10 <sub>a</sub>	62	4.10 <sub>a</sub>	103	4.18 <sub>a</sub>	113	3.96 <sub>a</sub>	51	4.06 <sub>a</sub>	125	*2	*	4.14 <sub>a</sub>	43
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	2.66 <sup>1</sup>	3925	2.34 <sup>1</sup>	193	2.18 <sub>a</sub>	65	2.33 <sub>a</sub>	112	2.19 <sub>a</sub>	119	2.49 <sub>a</sub>	57	2.28 <sub>a</sub>	136	*1	*	2.50 <sub>a</sub>	42
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	2.87 <sup>1</sup>	190	2.92 <sub>a</sub>	64	2.83 <sub>a</sub>	109	2.74 <sub>a</sub>	117	3.16 <sub>b</sub>	55	2.86 <sub>a</sub>	133	*2	*	2.86 <sub>a</sub>	42
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.65 <sup>1</sup>	4012	3.90 <sup>1</sup>	194	3.71 <sub>a</sub>	65	4.06 <sub>b</sub>	112	4.00 <sub>a</sub>	118	3.88 <sub>a</sub>	58	3.93 <sub>a</sub>	134	*2	*	3.91 <sub>a</sub>	44
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.49 <sup>1</sup>	4003	3.68 <sup>1</sup>	194	3.55 <sub>a</sub>	65	3.80 <sub>a</sub>	112	3.71 <sub>a</sub>	118	3.79 <sub>a</sub>	58	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	134	*2	*	3.68 <sub>a</sub>	44
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.88 <sup>1</sup>	4007	4.28 <sup>1</sup>	195	4.26 <sub>a</sub>	66	4.35 <sub>a</sub>	113	4.37 <sub>a</sub>	120	4.21 <sub>a</sub>	58	4.35 <sub>a</sub>	136	*2	*	4.14 <sub>a</sub>	44

*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		SA		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	3.84 <sup>1</sup>	195	3.91 <sub>a</sub>	65	3.84 <sub>a</sub>	114	3.88 <sub>a</sub>	121	3.88 <sub>a</sub>	57	3.88 <sub>a</sub>	136	*2	*	3.84 <sub>a</sub>	44
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.69 <sup>1</sup>	3656	3.94 <sup>1</sup>	192	3.86 <sub>a</sub>	64	4.05 <sub>a</sub>	112	4.09 <sub>a</sub>	117	3.83 <sub>a</sub>	58	3.93 <sub>a</sub>	134	*2	*	4.00 <sub>a</sub>	43
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	3.95 <sup>1</sup>	3999	4.16 <sup>1</sup>	195	4.17 <sub>a</sub>	65	4.16 <sub>a</sub>	114	4.22 <sub>a</sub>	120	4.16 <sub>a</sub>	58	4.18 <sub>a</sub>	136	*2	*	4.09 <sub>a</sub>	44
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.91 <sup>1</sup>	3459	4.14 <sup>1</sup>	184	4.13 <sub>a</sub>	64	4.16 <sub>a</sub>	105	4.22 <sub>a</sub>	115	4.02 <sub>a</sub>	52	4.16 <sub>a</sub>	128	*2	*	4.07 <sub>a</sub>	41
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	4.06 <sup>1</sup>	3723	4.39 <sup>1</sup>	193	4.45 <sub>a</sub>	65	4.38 <sub>a</sub>	113	4.42 <sub>a</sub>	119	4.39 <sub>a</sub>	57	4.46 <sub>a</sub>	136	*2	*	4.19 <sub>b</sub>	42
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.47 <sup>1</sup>	3600	3.22 <sup>1</sup>	184	3.44 <sub>a</sub>	61	3.10 <sub>a</sub>	108	3.33 <sub>a</sub>	113	3.06 <sub>a</sub>	54	3.16 <sub>a</sub>	128	*2	*	3.38 <sub>a</sub>	42
I feel valued as an employee	3.68 <sup>1</sup>	3991	3.89 <sup>1</sup>	196	3.83 <sub>a</sub>	66	3.96 <sub>a</sub>	114	3.98 <sub>a</sub>	121	3.78 <sub>a</sub>	58	3.95 <sub>a</sub>	137	*2	*	3.70 <sub>a</sub>	44

*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		SA		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	2.66 <sup>1</sup>	190	2.64 <sub>a</sub>	64	2.72 <sub>a</sub>	111	2.57 <sub>a</sub>	120	2.83 <sub>a</sub>	54	2.64 <sub>a</sub>	133	* <sup>2</sup>	*	2.74 <sub>a</sub>	43
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	2.85 <sup>1</sup>	3670	2.46 <sup>1</sup>	191	2.42 <sub>a</sub>	64	2.49 <sub>a</sub>	111	2.35 <sub>a</sub>	119	2.56 <sub>a</sub>	55	2.44 <sub>a</sub>	133	* <sup>2</sup>	*	2.44 <sub>a</sub>	43
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	2.64 <sup>1</sup>	3665	2.21 <sup>1</sup>	191	2.27 <sub>a</sub>	64	2.22 <sub>a</sub>	112	2.13 <sub>a</sub>	119	2.27 <sub>a</sub>	56	2.13 <sub>a</sub>	135	* <sup>2</sup>	*	2.40 <sub>a</sub>	42
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	2.88 <sup>1</sup>	3606	2.62 <sup>1</sup>	183	2.63 <sub>a</sub>	63	2.61 <sub>a</sub>	106	2.59 <sub>a</sub>	115	2.65 <sub>a</sub>	52	2.58 <sub>a</sub>	127	* <sup>2</sup>	*	2.76 <sub>a</sub>	42
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	2.73 <sup>1</sup>	3568	2.68 <sup>1</sup>	185	2.63 <sub>a</sub>	63	2.71 <sub>a</sub>	108	2.64 <sub>a</sub>	118	2.69 <sub>a</sub>	51	2.63 <sub>a</sub>	128	* <sup>2</sup>	*	2.77 <sub>a</sub>	43

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		SA		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	3.46 <sup>1</sup>	154	3.58 <sub>a</sub>	60	3.39 <sub>a</sub>	85	3.65 <sub>a</sub>	91	3.26 <sub>a</sub>	53	3.37 <sub>a</sub>	110	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.74 <sub>a</sub>	34
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.45 <sup>1</sup>	3343	3.73 <sup>1</sup>	184	4.00 <sub>a</sub>	64	3.59 <sub>b</sub>	107	3.80 <sub>a</sub>	113	3.73 <sub>a</sub>	56	3.76 <sub>a</sub>	127	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.61 <sub>a</sub>	44

**Table B5 Leadership and Accountability**

Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.30 <sup>1</sup>	2849	3.35 <sup>1</sup>	150	3.46 <sub>a</sub>	56	3.30 <sub>a</sub>	84	3.49 <sub>a</sub>	87	3.17 <sub>a</sub>	52	3.29 <sub>a</sub>	105	*2	*	3.51 <sub>a</sub>	35
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.41 <sup>1</sup>	3241	3.62 <sup>1</sup>	182	3.87 <sub>a</sub>	63	3.48 <sub>b</sub>	106	3.68 <sub>a</sub>	111	3.63 <sub>a</sub>	56	3.66 <sub>a</sub>	125	*2	*	3.45 <sub>a</sub>	44
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.13 <sup>1</sup>	2894	3.13 <sup>1</sup>	144	3.20 <sub>a</sub>	54	3.09 <sub>a</sub>	81	3.25 <sub>a</sub>	84	2.92 <sub>a</sub>	50	3.09 <sub>a</sub>	103	*2	*	3.22 <sub>a</sub>	32
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.25 <sup>1</sup>	3365	3.37 <sup>1</sup>	178	3.53 <sub>a</sub>	60	3.29 <sub>a</sub>	104	3.42 <sub>a</sub>	107	3.34 <sub>a</sub>	56	3.43 <sub>a</sub>	125	*2	*	3.15 <sub>a</sub>	41
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.78 <sup>1</sup>	3369	3.94 <sup>1</sup>	172	3.85 <sub>a</sub>	62	4.03 <sub>a</sub>	97	4.15 <sub>a</sub>	104	3.69 <sub>b</sub>	54	3.99 <sub>a</sub>	122	*2	*	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	37
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.89 <sup>1</sup>	3705	4.06 <sup>1</sup>	193	4.03 <sub>a</sub>	66	4.07 <sub>a</sub>	112	4.17 <sub>a</sub>	120	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	57	4.14 <sub>a</sub>	135	*2	*	3.82 <sub>b</sub>	44
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.37 <sup>1</sup>	3033	3.58 <sup>1</sup>	173	3.69 <sub>a</sub>	64	3.58 <sub>a</sub>	97	3.79 <sub>a</sub>	107	3.32 <sub>b</sub>	53	3.57 <sub>a</sub>	123	*2	*	3.63 <sub>a</sub>	38
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.47 <sup>1</sup>	3351	3.79 <sup>1</sup>	187	3.98 <sub>a</sub>	65	3.73 <sub>a</sub>	108	3.90 <sub>a</sub>	115	3.68 <sub>a</sub>	57	3.86 <sub>a</sub>	132	*2	*	3.56 <sub>a</sub>	41
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.20 <sup>1</sup>	3130	3.23 <sup>1</sup>	161	3.24 <sub>a</sub>	58	3.22 <sub>a</sub>	90	3.41 <sub>a</sub>	96	3.00 <sub>a</sub>	52	3.17 <sub>a</sub>	117	*2	*	3.41 <sub>a</sub>	32
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.25 <sup>1</sup>	3599	3.39 <sup>1</sup>	188	3.57 <sub>a</sub>	63	3.31 <sub>a</sub>	111	3.48 <sub>a</sub>	116	3.30 <sub>a</sub>	57	3.38 <sub>a</sub>	133	*2	*	3.37 <sub>a</sub>	41

*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		SA		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	247	15.5%	30	15.4%	10	17.5%	20	15.0%	18	20.7%	12	20.6%	28	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	3.0%	117	6.7%	13	*	*	8.8%	10	*	*	*	*	9.6%	13	*	*	*	*
Bullying	13.3%	519	17.5%	34	*	*	22.8%	26	14.2%	17	22.4%	13	20.6%	28	*	*	*	*
Bias	28.3%	1104	44.8%	87	36.9%	24	47.4%	54	37.5%	45	58.6%	34	47.1%	64	*	*	34.1%	15
Physical Assault	0.6%	23	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.2%	282	7.7%	15	*	*	*	*	8.3%	10	*	*	8.1%	11	*	*	*	*
None	65.7%	2566	49.0%	95	56.9%	37	45.6%	52	57.5%	69	32.8%	19	46.3%	63	*	*	59.1%	26

*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		SA		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.8%	109	5.7%	11	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	7.4%	10	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.3%	52	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	10.3%	404	8.8%	17	*	*	11.4%	13	*	*	*	*	8.8%	12	*	*	*	*
Bias	24.1%	940	31.4%	61	26.2%	17	33.3%	38	25.0%	30	43.1%	25	33.1%	45	*	*	25.0%	11
Physical Assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	5.1%	199	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	70.8%	2765	63.4%	123	69.2%	45	61.4%	70	69.2%	83	55.2%	32	62.5%	85	*	*	70.5%	31

*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		SA		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	8.8%	17	*	*	11.4%	13	*	*	*	*	8.8%	12	*	*	*	*
Bias	23.3%	911	21.6%	42	*	*	27.2%	31	19.2%	23	27.6%	16	20.6%	28	*	*	25.0%	11
Physical Assault	0.3%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.0%	272	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	69.9%	2731	75.3%	146	89.2%	58	68.4%	78	77.5%	93	70.7%	41	76.5%	104	*	*	72.7%	32

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

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

**Table B9 Avoidance due to Misconduct**

There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		SA		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.5%	99	8.2%	16	*	*	13.2%	15	8.3%	10	*	*	11.0%	15	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.0%	41	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	16.7%	651	14.9%	29	*	*	16.7%	19	10.0%	12	17.2%	10	17.6%	24	*	*	*	*
Bias	20.0%	781	26.8%	52	27.7%	18	26.3%	30	19.2%	23	39.7%	23	29.4%	40	*	*	*	*
Physical Assault	0.9%	37	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	11.0%	428	10.3%	20	15.4%	10	*	*	10.0%	12	*	*	10.3%	14	*	*	*	*
None	68.7%	2682	63.9%	124	63.1%	41	64.0%	73	70.8%	85	53.4%	31	58.8%	80	*	*	79.5%	35

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

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



**Table B10 Bias Incidents**

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		SA		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	4.34 <sup>1</sup>	190	4.24 <sub>a</sub>	63	4.40 <sub>a</sub>	113	4.33 <sub>a</sub>	118	4.42 <sub>a</sub>	57	4.44 <sub>a</sub>	133	* <sup>1</sup>	*	4.05 <sub>b</sub>	44
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.64 <sup>1</sup>	3199	3.84 <sup>1</sup>	183	3.78 <sub>a</sub>	59	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	112	4.02 <sub>a</sub>	115	3.55 <sub>b</sub>	56	3.85 <sub>a</sub>	130	* <sup>1</sup>	*	3.79 <sub>a</sub>	42
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.10 <sup>1</sup>	3174	3.31 <sup>1</sup>	182	3.00 <sub>a</sub>	61	3.48 <sub>b</sub>	108	3.35 <sub>a</sub>	114	3.25 <sub>a</sub>	55	3.33 <sub>a</sub>	127	* <sup>1</sup>	*	3.26 <sub>a</sub>	43
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.21 <sup>1</sup>	2397	3.64 <sup>1</sup>	152	3.42 <sub>a</sub>	45	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	96	3.61 <sub>a</sub>	96	3.74 <sub>a</sub>	46	3.67 <sub>a</sub>	108	* <sup>1</sup>	*	3.52 <sub>a</sub>	33
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.44 <sup>1</sup>	2962	3.47 <sup>1</sup>	181	3.44 <sub>a</sub>	59	3.53 <sub>a</sub>	109	3.66 <sub>a</sub>	113	3.16 <sub>b</sub>	55	3.44 <sub>a</sub>	128	* <sup>1</sup>	*	3.61 <sub>a</sub>	41

*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		SA		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	87.6% <sup>1</sup>	170	84.6% <sub>a</sub>	55	90.4% <sub>a</sub>	103	93.3% <sub>a</sub>	112	77.6% <sub>b</sub>	45	91.2% <sub>a</sub>	124	* <sup>2,3</sup>	*	84.1% <sub>a</sub>	37
No	16.1% <sup>1</sup>	627	12.4% <sup>1</sup>	24	15.4% <sub>a</sub>	10	9.6% <sub>a</sub>	11	* <sub>a</sub>	*	22.4% <sub>b</sub>	13	8.8% <sub>a</sub>	12	* <sup>2,3</sup>	*	* <sub>a</sub>	*

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		SA		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>	109	3.30 <sub>a</sub>	37	3.48 <sub>a</sub>	63	3.47 <sub>a</sub>	75	3.24 <sub>a</sub>	25	3.42 <sub>a</sub>	76	* <sup>1</sup>	*	3.41 <sub>a</sub>	27
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.87 <sup>1</sup>	2700	3.98 <sup>1</sup>	130	4.07 <sub>a</sub>	42	3.95 <sub>a</sub>	79	4.03 <sub>a</sub>	91	3.90 <sub>a</sub>	30	3.96 <sub>a</sub>	95	* <sup>1</sup>	*	4.07 <sub>a</sub>	28

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		SA		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	4.52 <sup>1</sup>	193	4.57 <sub>a</sub>	65	4.50 <sub>a</sub>	114	4.52 <sub>a</sub>	120	4.59 <sub>a</sub>	58	4.65 <sub>a</sub>	136	*2	*	4.14 <sub>b</sub>	44
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>	184	4.45 <sub>a</sub>	62	4.16 <sub>a</sub>	111	4.27 <sub>a</sub>	116	4.16 <sub>a</sub>	56	4.33 <sub>a</sub>	133	*2	*	3.90 <sub>b</sub>	40
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.20 <sup>1</sup>	3209	3.74 <sup>1</sup>	182	3.95 <sub>a</sub>	59	3.68 <sub>a</sub>	111	3.81 <sub>a</sub>	113	3.73 <sub>a</sub>	56	3.90 <sub>a</sub>	130	*2	*	3.23 <sub>b</sub>	40
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.26 <sup>1</sup>	3082	3.85 <sup>1</sup>	176	3.91 <sub>a</sub>	58	3.87 <sub>a</sub>	105	3.93 <sub>a</sub>	108	3.85 <sub>a</sub>	55	3.98 <sub>a</sub>	124	*2	*	3.50 <sub>b</sub>	40

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		SA		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	3.76 <sup>1</sup>	193	3.91 <sub>a</sub>	65	3.73 <sub>a</sub>	113	3.85 <sub>a</sub>	119	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	58	3.80 <sub>a</sub>	137	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.67 <sub>a</sub>	42
Free speech is an important issue on campus	4.28 <sup>1</sup>	3697	4.34 <sup>1</sup>	193	4.45 <sub>a</sub>	65	4.27 <sub>a</sub>	114	4.42 <sub>a</sub>	120	4.26 <sub>a</sub>	58	4.38 <sub>a</sub>	137	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.16 <sub>a</sub>	43
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	3.59 <sup>1</sup>	3525	3.67 <sup>1</sup>	193	3.94 <sub>a</sub>	64	3.54 <sub>b</sub>	114	3.78 <sub>a</sub>	119	3.52 <sub>a</sub>	58	3.77 <sub>a</sub>	136	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.40 <sub>b</sub>	43
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.30 <sup>1</sup>	3473	3.74 <sup>1</sup>	190	3.92 <sub>a</sub>	63	3.70 <sub>a</sub>	112	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	116	3.59 <sub>a</sub>	58	3.93 <sub>a</sub>	135	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.24 <sub>b</sub>	41
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.97 <sup>1</sup>	3648	3.69 <sup>1</sup>	190	3.87 <sub>a</sub>	61	3.64 <sub>a</sub>	114	3.64 <sub>a</sub>	117	3.86 <sub>a</sub>	57	3.92 <sub>a</sub>	136	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.02 <sub>b</sub>	41

*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		SA		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	3.68 <sup>1</sup>	187	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	64	3.59 <sub>b</sub>	112	3.96 <sub>a</sub>	119	3.19 <sub>b</sub>	57	3.52 <sub>a</sub>	134	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.16 <sub>b</sub>	43
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.72 <sup>1</sup>	3408	3.76 <sup>1</sup>	184	3.88 <sub>a</sub>	65	3.68 <sub>a</sub>	108	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	115	3.56 <sub>b</sub>	57	3.74 <sub>a</sub>	133	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.85 <sub>a</sub>	41
CSU retains diverse employees	3.60 <sup>1</sup>	2992	3.34 <sup>1</sup>	179	3.54 <sub>a</sub>	63	3.19 <sub>b</sub>	106	3.69 <sub>a</sub>	112	2.71 <sub>b</sub>	55	3.11 <sub>a</sub>	129	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.00 <sub>b</sub>	40
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.77 <sup>1</sup>	3194	3.62 <sup>1</sup>	181	3.81 <sub>a</sub>	64	3.52 <sub>a</sub>	106	3.76 <sub>a</sub>	111	3.40 <sub>b</sub>	58	3.52 <sub>a</sub>	131	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.97 <sub>b</sub>	40
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.02 <sup>1</sup>	3472	4.12 <sup>1</sup>	187	4.13 <sub>a</sub>	64	4.15 <sub>a</sub>	113	4.25 <sub>a</sub>	118	3.95 <sub>b</sub>	57	4.12 <sub>a</sub>	134	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.14 <sub>a</sub>	43
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	3.84 <sup>1</sup>	3541	3.88 <sup>1</sup>	186	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	65	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	110	3.97 <sub>a</sub>	116	3.83 <sub>a</sub>	58	3.92 <sub>a</sub>	134	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.83 <sub>a</sub>	42
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.76 <sup>1</sup>	3183	3.69 <sup>1</sup>	178	3.83 <sub>a</sub>	59	3.61 <sub>a</sub>	109	3.82 <sub>a</sub>	112	3.52 <sub>b</sub>	54	3.64 <sub>a</sub>	131	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.82 <sub>a</sub>	39
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.08 <sup>1</sup>	3708	4.15 <sup>1</sup>	190	4.18 <sub>a</sub>	65	4.16 <sub>a</sub>	114	4.28 <sub>a</sub>	120	4.00 <sub>b</sub>	58	4.17 <sub>a</sub>	136	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.11 <sub>a</sub>	44

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		SA		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	3.82 <sup>1</sup>	191	4.02 <sub>a</sub>	66	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	114	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	121	3.60 <sub>a</sub>	58	3.81 <sub>a</sub>	137	*2	*	3.77 <sub>a</sub>	44
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.61 <sup>1</sup>	3548	3.93 <sup>1</sup>	189	4.05 <sub>a</sub>	66	3.87 <sub>a</sub>	112	4.05 <sub>a</sub>	119	3.76 <sub>b</sub>	58	3.96 <sub>a</sub>	136	*2	*	3.86 <sub>a</sub>	43
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.50 <sup>1</sup>	3414	3.68 <sup>1</sup>	184	3.95 <sub>a</sub>	62	3.58 <sub>b</sub>	112	3.87 <sub>a</sub>	115	3.39 <sub>b</sub>	57	3.69 <sub>a</sub>	134	*2	*	3.65 <sub>a</sub>	40
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.68 <sup>1</sup>	3458	3.83 <sup>1</sup>	186	4.03 <sub>a</sub>	65	3.73 <sub>b</sub>	110	3.97 <sub>a</sub>	116	3.64 <sub>b</sub>	58	3.86 <sub>a</sub>	133	*2	*	3.81 <sub>a</sub>	43
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.66 <sup>1</sup>	3561	4.15 <sup>1</sup>	190	4.27 <sub>a</sub>	66	4.14 <sub>a</sub>	113	4.27 <sub>a</sub>	120	4.02 <sub>a</sub>	58	4.25 <sub>a</sub>	136	*2	*	3.86 <sub>b</sub>	44
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.71 <sup>1</sup>	3739	4.01 <sup>1</sup>	189	4.03 <sub>a</sub>	65	4.04 <sub>a</sub>	113	4.14 <sub>a</sub>	120	3.82 <sub>a</sub>	57	4.07 <sub>a</sub>	136	*2	*	3.84 <sub>a</sub>	43
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.59 <sup>1</sup>	3380	3.88 <sup>1</sup>	185	4.08 <sub>a</sub>	63	3.79 <sub>a</sub>	112	3.97 <sub>a</sub>	117	3.80 <sub>a</sub>	56	3.96 <sub>a</sub>	135	*2	*	3.66 <sub>a</sub>	41
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.86 <sup>1</sup>	3735	4.09 <sup>1</sup>	190	4.09 <sub>a</sub>	65	4.11 <sub>a</sub>	114	4.21 <sub>a</sub>	121	3.96 <sub>a</sub>	57	4.11 <sub>a</sub>	136	*2	*	4.02 <sub>a</sub>	44

*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		SA		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	20.1% <sup>1</sup>	38	15.4% <sub>a</sub>	10	23.9% <sub>a</sub>	27	21.8% <sub>a</sub>	26	19.0% <sub>a</sub>	11	24.3% <sub>a</sub>	33	* <sup>2,3</sup>	*	* <sub>b</sub>	*
No	85.9% <sup>1</sup>	3247	79.9% <sup>1</sup>	151	84.6% <sub>a</sub>	55	76.1% <sub>a</sub>	86	78.2% <sub>a</sub>	93	81.0% <sub>a</sub>	47	75.7% <sub>a</sub>	103	* <sup>2,3</sup>	*	90.7% <sub>b</sub>	39

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		SA		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	82.5%	33	*	*	85.7%	24	78.6%	22	90.9%	10	82.4%	28	*	*	*	*
Finding child care services	31.8%	172	32.5%	13	*	*	35.7%	10	*	*	*	*	35.3%	12	*	*	*	*
Finding adult care services	5.5%	30	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding temporary care services	12.0%	65	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding care for a sick child/adult	28.7%	155	32.5%	13	*	*	39.3%	11	*	*	*	*	35.3%	12	*	*	*	*
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	32.5%	13	*	*	39.3%	11	*	*	*	*	35.3%	12	*	*	*	*
Dependability of care services	15.0%	81	25.0%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Quality of care services	17.2%	93	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Scheduling care to match work schedule	40.1%	217	42.5%	17	*	*	50.0%	14	42.9%	12	*	*	38.2%	13	*	*	*	*
Finding summer care services	27.9%	151	42.5%	17	*	*	50.0%	14	50.0%	14	*	*	41.2%	14	*	*	*	*
Location of care services	15.5%	84	25.0%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
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		SA		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	3.78 <sup>1</sup>	162	3.96 <sub>a</sub>	55	3.70 <sub>b</sub>	98	3.94 <sub>a</sub>	99	3.54 <sub>b</sub>	52	3.73 <sub>a</sub>	117	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.96 <sub>a</sub>	37
Department/Unit Perceptions	3.66 <sup>1</sup>	2869	3.90 <sup>1</sup>	170	4.03 <sub>a</sub>	57	3.85 <sub>a</sub>	104	4.03 <sub>a</sub>	105	3.72 <sub>b</sub>	53	3.93 <sub>a</sub>	125	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.77 <sub>a</sub>	36
Department/Unit Leadership	3.42 <sup>1</sup>	2859	3.64 <sup>1</sup>	164	3.83 <sub>a</sub>	56	3.55 <sub>a</sub>	96	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	98	3.60 <sub>a</sub>	52	3.72 <sub>a</sub>	116	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.39 <sub>a</sub>	36
College/Division Leadership	3.31 <sup>1</sup>	2472	3.41 <sup>1</sup>	133	3.46 <sub>a</sub>	52	3.36 <sub>a</sub>	74	3.54 <sub>a</sub>	78	3.24 <sub>a</sub>	46	3.36 <sub>a</sub>	96	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.49 <sub>a</sub>	29
Favoritism	2.80 <sup>1</sup>	3417	2.53 <sup>1</sup>	178	2.52 <sub>a</sub>	63	2.57 <sub>a</sub>	102	2.46 <sub>a</sub>	113	2.63 <sub>a</sub>	49	2.50 <sub>a</sub>	123	* <sup>2</sup>	*	2.63 <sub>a</sub>	41
Sense of Belonging	3.67 <sup>1</sup>	3978	3.96 <sup>1</sup>	191	3.82 <sub>a</sub>	64	4.08 <sub>a</sub>	111	4.03 <sub>a</sub>	116	3.96 <sub>a</sub>	58	3.99 <sub>a</sub>	132	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.91 <sub>a</sub>	44
Department/Unit Culture	3.52 <sup>1</sup>	3807	3.84 <sup>1</sup>	188	3.89 <sub>a</sub>	66	3.84 <sub>a</sub>	108	3.88 <sub>a</sub>	117	3.76 <sub>a</sub>	57	3.92 <sub>a</sub>	131	* <sup>2</sup>	*	3.59 <sub>a</sub>	44
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	4.00 <sup>1</sup>	3753	4.37 <sup>1</sup>	189	4.44 <sub>a</sub>	64	4.37 <sub>a</sub>	110	4.47 <sub>a</sub>	116	4.23 <sub>b</sub>	57	4.42 <sub>a</sub>	131	* <sup>2</sup>	*	4.21 <sub>a</sub>	43

*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	4.11	3.86	.26	79.8%	72.5%	7.3
Understands the value of diversity	Higher	4.42	4.06	.36	88.3%	78.6%	9.7
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Higher	3.97	3.62	.35	76.0%	64.7%	11.3
Treats all employees equitably	Higher	3.77	3.46	.31	71.4%	58.5%	12.9
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Higher	4.38	3.87	.51	86.8%	69.8%	17.0
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Higher	4.41	3.99	.42	90.8%	77.0%	13.7
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Higher	4.38	4.04	.34	87.6%	76.1%	11.5
Is open and transparent in communication	Higher	3.78	3.44	.33	71.6%	57.3%	14.4
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Higher	3.79	3.46	.33	72.2%	57.3%	14.8

<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	3.63	3.39	.24	61.1%	54.2%	7.0
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	Higher	4.33	3.97	.36	91.1%	76.1%	15.0
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	Higher	4.50	4.32	.18	95.6%	91.6%	4.0
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	Higher	4.10	3.90	.20	77.9%	72.9%	5.0
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Lower	2.34	2.66	-.32	22.8%	28.0%	-5.2
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Lower	2.87	3.10	-.24	26.8%	37.0%	-10.2
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	Higher	3.90	3.65	.25	70.1%	62.4%	7.7
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	Higher	3.68	3.49	.19	63.4%	55.4%	8.0
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	Higher	4.28	3.88	.40	83.6%	71.3%	12.3

**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	Higher	3.84	3.64	.20	71.8%	64.3%	7.5
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	Higher	3.94	3.69	.24	76.6%	67.0%	9.5
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	Higher	4.16	3.95	.21	87.7%	78.9%	8.8
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	Higher	4.14	3.91	.23	81.0%	71.7%	9.3
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	Higher	4.39	4.06	.33	92.2%	79.0%	13.3
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	Lower	3.22	3.47	-.25	46.2%	55.1%	-8.9
I feel valued as an employee	Higher	3.89	3.68	.21	75.0%	66.7%	8.3

**Table C4 Favoritism**

	Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office Lower	2.66	3.00	-.34	26.8%	37.9%	-11.1
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office Lower	2.46	2.85	-.39	21.5%	31.3%	-9.9
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities Lower	2.21	2.64	-.43	14.1%	23.7%	-9.5
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office Lower	2.62	2.88	-.26	27.9%	32.3%	-4.5
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office Similar	2.68	2.73	-.05	29.2%	25.6%	3.6

**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	3.46	3.35	.11	59.7%	51.7%	8.0
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior Higher	3.73	3.45	.28	72.8%	58.2%	14.6

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.35	3.30	.05	53.3%	48.1%	5.2
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Higher	3.62	3.41	.21	67.0%	55.4%	11.6
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.13	3.13	.00	45.1%	41.5%	3.6
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.37	3.25	.12	60.1%	50.5%	9.6
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Higher	3.94	3.78	.16	76.2%	69.4%	6.8
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Higher	4.06	3.89	.16	83.4%	75.1%	8.3
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Higher	3.58	3.37	.22	61.8%	50.3%	11.6
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Higher	3.79	3.47	.31	73.8%	55.8%	18.0
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.23	3.20	.03	47.8%	45.8%	2.0
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.39	3.25	.14	59.0%	51.1%	7.9

**Table C6 Bias Incidents**

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	Higher	4.34	4.00	.34	90.0%	77.7%	12.3
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Higher	3.84	3.64	.20	75.4%	61.8%	13.6
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Higher	3.31	3.10	.20	45.6%	32.4%	13.2
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Higher	3.64	3.21	.44	58.6%	34.0%	24.5
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Similar	3.47	3.44	.03	58.6%	51.2%	7.4

**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	51.4%	46.7%	4.7
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	Similar	3.98	3.87	.11	79.2%	70.8%	8.5

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

**Table C8 Principles of Community**

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I am familiar with the Principles of Community	Higher	4.52	3.91	.61	93.3%	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	83.2%	58.4%	24.8
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	Higher	3.74	3.20	.54	63.7%	36.0%	27.8
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	Higher	3.85	3.26	.59	67.6%	38.4%	29.2

**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	3.76	3.64	.12	69.4%	66.7%	2.7
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Similar	4.34	4.28	.07	92.7%	89.5%	3.3
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Similar	3.67	3.59	.09	64.2%	59.8%	4.4
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Higher	3.74	3.30	.44	70.5%	50.3%	20.2
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Higher	3.69	2.97	.72	57.9%	33.5%	24.4



**Table C10 CSU Perceptions**

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	Lower	3.68	3.84	-.16	68.4%	75.0%	-6.5
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Similar	3.76	3.72	.03	70.7%	69.5%	1.1
CSU retains diverse employees	Lower	3.34	3.60	-.26	49.2%	61.2%	-12.1
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Lower	3.62	3.77	-.14	65.2%	69.9%	-4.7
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	4.12	4.02	.10	86.6%	79.9%	6.7
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.88	3.84	.05	76.9%	74.0%	2.9
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.69	3.76	-.07	63.5%	66.6%	-3.2
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Similar	4.15	4.08	.07	83.2%	80.9%	2.3

**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	3.82	3.67	.14	72.8%	66.6%	6.2
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	Higher	3.93	3.61	.32	80.4%	63.7%	16.8
Department/office retains diverse employees	Higher	3.68	3.50	.18	63.0%	56.8%	6.2
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Higher	3.83	3.68	.16	72.6%	65.3%	7.3
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	Higher	4.15	3.66	.50	84.7%	61.8%	23.0
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	Higher	4.01	3.71	.30	79.4%	68.7%	10.7
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Higher	3.88	3.59	.29	74.1%	59.3%	14.7
Would recommend department/office as a place of employment	Higher	4.09	3.86	.23	79.5%	71.3%	8.2

**Table C12 Factors**

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Similar	3.78	3.82	-.04
Department/Unit Perceptions	Higher	3.90	3.66	.24
Department/Unit Leadership	Higher	3.64	3.42	.22
College/Division Leadership	Similar	3.41	3.31	.10
Favoritism	Lower	2.53	2.80	-.27
Sense of Belonging	Higher	3.96	3.67	.29
Department/Unit Culture	Higher	3.84	3.52	.31
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Higher	4.37	4.00	.38