University Advancement
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 University Advancement. 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 University Advancement 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

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	0.0%	5.1%	5.1%	53.8%	35.9%	78	4.21
Understands the value of diversity	0.0%	9.0%	7.7%	50.0%	33.3%	78	4.08
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	7.7%	12.8%	10.3%	43.6%	25.6%	78	3.67
Treats all employees equitably	9.2%	21.1%	6.6%	36.8%	26.3%	76	3.50
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	0.0%	6.5%	15.6%	44.2%	33.8%	77	4.05
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	1.3%	6.5%	7.8%	40.3%	44.2%	77	4.19
Promotes respect for cultural differences	0.0%	5.2%	10.4%	49.4%	35.1%	77	4.14
Is open and transparent in communication	9.0%	20.5%	11.5%	34.6%	24.4%	78	3.45
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	11.7%	22.1%	11.7%	33.8%	20.8%	77	3.30

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	17.9%	33.3%	17.9%	21.8%	9.0%	78	2.71
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	1.3%	13.2%	18.4%	44.7%	22.4%	76	3.74
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	47.9%	52.1%	73	4.52
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	2.7%	6.8%	6.8%	42.5%	41.1%	73	4.12
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	15.8%	25.0%	21.1%	15.8%	22.4%	76	3.04
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	6.7%	24.0%	29.3%	26.7%	13.3%	75	3.16
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	1.3%	10.4%	15.6%	33.8%	39.0%	77	3.99
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	9.1%	29.9%	16.9%	31.2%	13.0%	77	3.09
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	6.5%	6.5%	9.1%	35.1%	42.9%	77	4.01

Table A3 Respect

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
My department/office is treated with respect by other departments/offices within my division/college	5.3%	22.4%	25.0%	26.3%	21.1%	76	3.36
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	0.0%	5.3%	21.1%	51.3%	22.4%	76	3.91
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	1.3%	10.4%	7.8%	59.7%	20.8%	77	3.88
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	4.2%	5.6%	22.5%	46.5%	21.1%	71	3.75
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	0.0%	1.3%	18.7%	52.0%	28.0%	75	4.07
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	8.0%	18.7%	29.3%	33.3%	10.7%	75	3.20
I feel valued as an employee	3.9%	15.6%	16.9%	35.1%	28.6%	77	3.69

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	14.5%	34.2%	15.8%	22.4%	13.2%	76	2.86
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	19.7%	36.8%	11.8%	14.5%	17.1%	76	2.72
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	18.7%	41.3%	12.0%	21.3%	6.7%	75	2.56
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	16.2%	31.1%	14.9%	16.2%	21.6%	74	2.96
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	18.7%	36.0%	21.3%	12.0%	12.0%	75	2.63

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	12.5%	31.9%	8.3%	31.9%	15.3%	72	3.06
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	8.1%	10.8%	9.5%	48.6%	23.0%	74	3.68
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	10.3%	26.5%	14.7%	35.3%	13.2%	68	3.15

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	7.0%	8.5%	15.5%	47.9%	21.1%	71	3.68
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	9.0%	28.4%	19.4%	38.8%	4.5%	67	3.01
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	5.6%	12.7%	8.5%	59.2%	14.1%	71	3.63
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	18.9%	32.4%	12.2%	23.0%	13.5%	74	2.80
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	6.7%	6.7%	8.0%	45.3%	33.3%	75	3.92
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	12.9%	38.6%	11.4%	27.1%	10.0%	70	2.83
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	5.6%	16.7%	16.7%	41.7%	19.4%	72	3.53
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	20.5%	39.7%	13.7%	16.4%	9.6%	73	2.55
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	10.8%	10.8%	10.8%	45.9%	21.6%	74	3.57

Table A6 Misconduct

Check whether or not the following statements are true based on the type of misconduct. (Select all that apply)	Sexual Harassment	Sexual Misconduct	Bullying	Bias	Physical Assault	Verbal Assault	None	Total (N)
___ is problematic among employees at CSU	2.7%	1.3%	21.3%	34.7%	0.0%	6.7%	61.3%	75
___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	1.3%	2.7%	26.7%	46.7%	0.0%	2.7%	46.7%	75
___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	0.0%	0.0%	9.3%	17.3%	0.0%	1.3%	78.7%	75
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	8.0%	0.0%	20.0%	25.3%	0.0%	9.3%	65.3%	75

Table A7 Bias Incidents

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	1.4%	1.4%	16.4%	49.3%	31.5%	73	4.08
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	0.0%	7.5%	16.4%	46.3%	29.9%	67	3.99
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	2.9%	26.5%	39.7%	23.5%	7.4%	68	3.06
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.8%	28.3%	37.7%	26.4%	3.8%	53	2.98
CSU handles incidents of bias well	6.3%	4.7%	26.6%	48.4%	14.1%	64	3.59

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	93.3%	70
No	6.7%	5
Total	100.0%	75

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	6.0%	10.0%	54.0%	26.0%	4.0%	50	3.12
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.7%	9.3%	29.6%	44.4%	13.0%	54	3.54

Table A10 Principles of Community

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
I am familiar with the Principles of Community.	1.4%	8.2%	5.5%	47.9%	37.0%	73	4.11
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	7.4%	36.8%	10.3%	25.0%	20.6%	68	3.15
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	4.3%	22.9%	50.0%	12.9%	10.0%	70	3.01
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	8.6%	30.0%	42.9%	11.4%	7.1%	70	2.79

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	14.7%	25.3%	25.3%	24.0%	10.7%	75	2.91
Free speech is an important issue on campus	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	57.3%	41.3%	75	4.40
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	0.0%	18.1%	15.3%	54.2%	12.5%	72	3.61
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	2.8%	19.7%	14.1%	43.7%	19.7%	71	3.58
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	8.6%	21.4%	31.4%	27.1%	11.4%	70	3.11

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	0.0%	7.2%	15.9%	53.6%	23.2%	69	3.93
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	1.4%	2.8%	12.5%	56.9%	26.4%	72	4.04
CSU retains diverse employees	1.5%	20.0%	21.5%	44.6%	12.3%	65	3.46
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	0.0%	1.4%	14.3%	64.3%	20.0%	70	4.03
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	0.0%	1.4%	2.8%	69.4%	26.4%	72	4.21
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	0.0%	2.7%	9.5%	62.2%	25.7%	74	4.11
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	0.0%	4.3%	22.9%	47.1%	25.7%	70	3.94
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	0.0%	1.4%	6.8%	48.6%	43.2%	74	4.34

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	0.0%	16.4%	19.2%	47.9%	16.4%	73	3.64
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	4.2%	16.7%	22.2%	38.9%	18.1%	72	3.50
Department/office retains diverse employees	4.1%	31.5%	30.1%	21.9%	12.3%	73	3.07
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	0.0%	14.1%	22.5%	46.5%	16.9%	71	3.66
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	0.0%	11.0%	23.3%	45.2%	20.5%	73	3.75
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	1.4%	18.9%	8.1%	45.9%	25.7%	74	3.76
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	5.5%	13.7%	26.0%	37.0%	17.8%	73	3.48
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	4.1%	16.2%	12.2%	37.8%	29.7%	74	3.73

Table A14 Discriminatory Attitudes

Discriminatory attitudes are present in your department/office based on:	%	N
Age	42.9%	30
Job title	40.0%	28
No intolerant attitudes are present	34.3%	24
Political affiliation	28.6%	20
Employment classification	24.3%	17
Appearance	22.9%	16
Socioeconomic status	17.1%	12
Gender	17.1%	12
Religion	10.0%	7
Parental status	8.6%	6
Sexual orientation	7.1%	5
Gender identity and expression	5.7%	4
Disability (e.g. physical, mental)	5.7%	4
Other (Ethnic origin, Race or color, Marital status, Nationality/Country of origin)	17.2%	12

Note: multiple response item.

Table A15 Work-related Stressors

Please select your top THREE work-related stressors	%	N
Lower salary	35.6%	26
Lack of growth/promotion	34.2%	25
Office/department climate	34.2%	25
Work/life balance	27.4%	20
Workload	26.0%	19
Email overload	17.8%	13
Ill-defined job	15.1%	11
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	13.7%	10
Interpersonal conflict	12.3%	9
Misconduct occurring at work/Inequities/Bias	12.3%	9
Physical environment	11.0%	8
Duties outside my job responsibilities/Taking on additional work	9.6%	7
Lack of work flexibility	8.2%	6
Health issues	5.5%	4
Affordable housing near work	4.1%	3
Lack of work autonomy	2.7%	2
Job security	2.7%	2
General Climate	2.7%	2
Lack of training/skills to do my work	1.4%	1
Feeling Undervalued	1.4%	1
Administration/Leadership	1.4%	1
Bureaucracy	1.4%	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	16.0%	12
No	84.0%	63
Total	100.0%	75

Table A17 Child and/or Adult Care-related Challenges

Please indicate what child care and/or adult care-related challenges, if any, you have encountered this past year	%	N
Cost of care services	91.7%	11
Scheduling care to match work schedule	66.7%	8
Finding child care services	50.0%	6
Transportation to/from care services	41.7%	5
Dependability of care services	25.0%	3
Finding summer care services	25.0%	3
Finding temporary care services	16.7%	2
Finding care for a sick child/adult	16.7%	2
Quality of care services	8.3%	1
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	0.0%	0

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

Table A18 Gender

	%	N
Women	75.0%	48
Men	23.4%	15
T/NB/GNC	1.6%	1

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose. T/NB/GNC = Transgender, non-binary, gender non-conforming.

Table A19 Minoritized Race/Ethnicity

	%	N
Non-minoritized	85.7%	54
Minoritized	14.3%	9

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose.

Table A20 Employee Type

	%	N
Administrative Professional	89.3%	67
Faculty	0.0%	0
State Classified	2.7%	2
Other	1.3%	1
Prefer not to disclose	6.7%	5
Total	100.0%	75

Table A21 Department/Unit

	%	N
CSU Events & Donor Engagement Constituent and Gift Information	16.4%	12
Dev. & Advancement Info. Services Talent Management & Training &Support UA Finance & Administration UA Communications	12.3%	9
Office of the VP for University Advancement or Alumni Relations	15.1%	11
University Development	23.3%	17
Prefer not to disclose	32.9%	24
Total	100.0%	73

Note: Smaller departments were combined to ensure confidentiality.

Appendix B: Employee Characteristics Mean Comparisons

The following tables show the mean comparison scores by employee characteristics. Mean scores for CSU overall and the Division are also provided. Your division had fewer than 10 respondents with a minoritized race/ethnicity; therefore, mean comparisons are not reported by minoritized race/ethnicity.

Table B1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Supports a healthy work/life balance	3.86^1	4008	4.21^1	78	3.80_a	15	4.27_b	48
Understands the value of diversity	4.06^1	3956	4.08^1	78	4.13_a	15	4.10_a	48
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.62^1	3994	3.67^1	78	3.47_a	15	3.75_a	48
Treats all employees equitably	3.46^1	3946	3.50^1	76	3.47_a	15	3.60_a	47
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.87^1	3950	4.05^1	77	4.20_a	15	4.02_a	47
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.99^1	3999	4.19^1	77	4.47_a	15	4.15_a	48
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.04^1	3934	4.14^1	77	4.21_a	14	4.19_a	48
Is open and transparent in communication	3.44^1	4009	3.45^1	78	3.53_a	15	3.46_a	48
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	3.46^1	3952	3.30^1	77	3.13_a	15	3.37_a	48

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

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

Table B2 Division/College Culture

	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	3.39[1]	3931	2.71[1]	78	2.73[a]	15	2.71[a]	48
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.97[1]	3872	3.74[1]	76	4.14[a]	14	3.77[a]	48
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	4.32[1]	3691	4.52[1]	73	4.57[a]	14	4.49[a]	45
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.90[1]	3687	4.12[1]	73	3.86[a]	14	4.22[a]	45
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	2.66[1]	3925	3.04[1]	76	2.93[a]	14	2.89[a]	47
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	3.10[1]	3910	3.16[1]	75	3.14[a]	14	3.06[a]	47
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.65[1]	4012	3.99[1]	77	3.60[a]	15	4.06[a]	48
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.49[1]	4003	3.09[1]	77	3.07[a]	14	3.06[a]	48
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.88[1]	4007	4.01[1]	77	3.93[a]	15	3.96[a]	48

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

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

Table B3 Respect

	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My department/office is treated with respect by other departments/offices within my division/college	3.64[1]	3673	3.36[1]	76	3.40$_a$	15	3.26$_a$	47
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.69[1]	3656	3.91[1]	76	3.87$_a$	15	3.96$_a$	47
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	3.95[1]	3999	3.88[1]	77	4.07$_a$	15	3.87$_a$	48
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.91[1]	3459	3.75[1]	71	3.75$_a$	12	3.83$_a$	46
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	4.06[1]	3723	4.07[1]	75	4.31$_a$	13	4.02$_a$	48
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.47[1]	3600	3.20[1]	75	3.15$_a$	13	3.31$_a$	48
I feel valued as an employee	3.68[1]	3991	3.69[1]	77	3.93$_a$	15	3.69$_a$	48

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

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

Table B4 Favoritism

	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office	3.00^1	3711	2.86^1	76	3.20_a	15	2.67_a	48
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	2.85^1	3670	2.72^1	76	2.87_a	15	2.52_a	48
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	2.64^1	3665	2.56^1	75	2.50_a	14	2.48_a	48
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	2.88^1	3606	2.96^1	74	3.08_a	13	2.83_a	48
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	2.73^1	3568	2.63^1	75	2.67_a	15	2.52_a	48

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

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

Table B5 Leadership and Accountability

	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.35[1]	2953	3.06[1]	72	2.79[a]	14	3.20[a]	46
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.45[1]	3343	3.68[1]	74	3.67[a]	15	3.74[a]	47
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.30[1]	2849	3.15[1]	68	3.29[a]	14	3.26[a]	43
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.41[1]	3241	3.68[1]	71	3.67[a]	15	3.76[a]	45
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.13[1]	2894	3.01[1]	67	3.07[a]	14	3.10[a]	42
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.25[1]	3365	3.63[1]	71	3.80[a]	15	3.71[a]	45
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.78[1]	3369	2.80[1]	74	2.93[a]	15	2.87[a]	47
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.89[1]	3705	3.92[1]	75	4.00[a]	15	4.00[a]	48

Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.37^1	3033	2.83^1	70	3.33_a	15	2.79_a	43
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.47^1	3351	3.53^1	72	3.93_a	15	3.47_a	45
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.20^1	3130	2.55^1	73	2.93_a	15	2.54_a	46
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.25^1	3599	3.57^1	74	3.93_a	15	3.55_a	47

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

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

Table B6 Misconduct Among Employees at CSU

___ is problematic among employees at CSU	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	247	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	3.0%	117	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	13.3%	519	21.3%	16	*	*	*	*
Bias	28.3%	1104	34.7%	26	*	*	33.3%	16
Physical Assault	0.6%	23	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.2%	282	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	65.7%	2566	61.3%	46	66.7%	10	62.5%	30

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			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.8%	109	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.3%	52	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	10.3%	404	26.7%	20	*	*	20.8%	10
Bias	24.1%	940	46.7%	35	*	*	41.7%	20
Physical Assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	5.1%	199	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	70.8%	2765	46.7%	35	*	*	50.0%	24

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			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	1.9%	73	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.1%	42	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	12.4%	486	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bias	23.3%	911	17.3%	13	*	*	*	*
Physical Assault	0.3%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.0%	272	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	69.9%	2731	78.7%	59	80.0%	12	79.2%	38

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			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.5%	99	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.0%	41	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	16.7%	651	20.0%	15	*	*	*	*
Bias	20.0%	781	25.3%	19	*	*	*	*
Physical Assault	0.9%	37	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	11.0%	428	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	68.7%	2682	65.3%	49	80.0%	12	66.7%	32

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			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	4.00[1]	3726	4.08[1]	73	4.20$_a$	15	4.02$_a$	46
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.64[1]	3199	3.99[1]	67	4.08$_a$	13	4.00$_a$	42
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.10[1]	3174	3.06[1]	68	2.54$_a$	13	3.16$_a$	43
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.21[1]	2397	2.98[1]	53	2.40$_a$	10	3.12$_b$	32
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.44[1]	2962	3.59[1]	64	3.58$_a$	12	3.80$_a$	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.

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			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	83.9%[1]	3260	93.3%[1]	70	86.7%$_a$	13	93.8%$_a$	45
No	16.1%[1]	627	*[1]	*	*$_a$	*	*$_a$	*

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column 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 ≥ 10.

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

Table B12 Employee Councils

	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I feel my employee council addresses issues and topics that are important and relevant to me	3.35[1]	2437	3.12[1]	50	*$_a$	*	3.35$_a$	31
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.87[1]	2700	3.54[1]	54	*$_a$	*	3.71$_a$	35

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 ≥ 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			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I am familiar with the Principles of Community.	3.91[1]	3644	4.11[1]	73	3.64[a]	14	4.19[a]	47
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.52[1]	3366	3.15[1]	68	2.92[a]	13	3.12[a]	43
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.20[1]	3209	3.01[1]	70	3.08[a]	13	3.11[a]	45
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.26[1]	3082	2.79[1]	70	3.00[a]	14	2.86[a]	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.

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

Table B14 Freedom of Speech

	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My division/college supports people speaking freely	3.64^1	3629	2.91^1	75	3.00_a	15	2.90_a	48
Free speech is an important issue on campus	4.28^1	3697	4.40^1	75	4.73_a	15	4.31_b	48
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	3.59^1	3525	3.61^1	72	3.73_a	15	3.60_a	45
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.30^1	3473	3.58^1	71	3.07_a	15	3.82_b	44
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.97^1	3648	3.11^1	70	2.79_a	14	3.18_a	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.

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

Table B15 CSU Perceptions

	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	3.84^1	3315	3.93^1	69	4.36_a	14	3.93_a	44
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.72^1	3408	4.04^1	72	4.07_a	15	4.00_a	47
CSU retains diverse employees	3.60^1	2992	3.46^1	65	4.21_a	14	3.29_b	41
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.77^1	3194	4.03^1	70	4.50_a	14	3.91_b	46
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.02^1	3472	4.21^1	72	4.43_a	14	4.15_a	47
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	3.84^1	3541	4.11^1	74	4.27_a	15	4.13_a	48
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.76^1	3183	3.94^1	70	4.27_a	15	3.91_a	44
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.08^1	3708	4.34^1	74	4.40_a	15	4.27_a	48

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

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

Table B16 Department/Unit Perceptions

	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Department/office recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	3.67^1	3603	3.64^1	73	4.13_a	15	3.55_b	47
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.61^1	3548	3.50^1	72	3.53_a	15	3.57_a	47
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.50^1	3414	3.07^1	73	3.60_a	15	2.89_b	47
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.68^1	3458	3.66^1	71	4.13_a	15	3.56_b	45
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.66^1	3561	3.75^1	73	4.00_a	14	3.71_a	48
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.71^1	3739	3.76^1	74	3.87_a	15	3.81_a	48
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.59^1	3380	3.48^1	73	3.87_a	15	3.49_a	47
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.86^1	3735	3.73^1	74	3.93_a	15	3.77_a	48

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

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

Table B17 Use of Child and/or Adult Care Services

Have you utilized child or adult care services this past year?	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	14.1%[1]	533	16.0%[1]	12	*[a]	*	20.8%[a]	10
No	85.9%[1]	3247	84.0%[1]	63	93.3%[a]	14	79.2%[a]	38

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 ≥ 10.

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

Table B18 Child and/or Adult Care-related Challenges

	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Cost of care services	72.3%	391	91.7%	11	*	*	*	*
Finding child care services	31.8%	172	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding adult care services	5.5%	30	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding temporary care services	12.0%	65	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding care for a sick child/adult	28.7%	155	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	3.5%	19	*	*	*	*	*	*
Other	2.2%	12	*	*	*	*	*	*
Transportation to/from care services	29.2%	158	*	*	*	*	*	*
Dependability of care services	15.0%	81	*	*	*	*	*	*
Quality of care services	17.2%	93	*	*	*	*	*	*
Scheduling care to match work schedule	40.1%	217	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding summer care services	27.9%	151	*	*	*	*	*	*
Location of care services	15.5%	84	*	*	*	*	*	*
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	10.2%	55	*	*	*	*	*	*

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

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

Table B19 Factors

	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		UA		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
CSU Perceptions	3.82^1	2524	3.99^1	56	4.20_a	12	3.94_a	35
Department/Unit Perceptions	3.66^1	2869	3.57^1	66	3.81_a	14	3.56_a	42
Department/Unit Leadership	3.42^1	2859	3.67^1	68	3.83_a	15	3.72_a	42
College/Division Leadership	3.31^1	2472	2.86^1	64	3.07_a	14	2.90_a	39
Favoritism	2.80^1	3417	2.73^1	73	2.85_a	13	2.60_a	48
Sense of Belonging	3.67^1	3978	3.70^1	76	3.55_a	14	3.69_a	48
Department/Unit Culture	3.52^1	3807	3.51^1	76	3.51_a	15	3.57_a	47
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	4.00^1	3753	4.00^1	75	4.21_a	14	4.01_a	47

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

subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

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

Appendix C: Division Comparisons to CSU Overall

The following tables display the Division's mean score compared to CSU overall. Division results are noted as being "higher," "similar," or "lower" than the CSU average, meaning that the Division's score for the item is either statistically similar to or different than (higher or lower)[1] the university's score.

Table C1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Supports a healthy work/life balance	Higher	4.21	3.86	.35	89.7%	72.5%	17.3
Understands the value of diversity	Similar	4.08	4.06	.02	83.3%	78.6%	4.7
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Similar	3.67	3.62	.04	69.2%	64.7%	4.6
Treats all employees equitably	Similar	3.50	3.46	.04	63.2%	58.5%	4.7
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Similar	4.05	3.87	.18	77.9%	69.8%	8.1
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Similar	4.19	3.99	.21	84.4%	77.0%	7.4
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Similar	4.14	4.04	.10	84.4%	76.1%	8.3
Is open and transparent in communication	Similar	3.45	3.44	.00	59.0%	57.3%	1.7
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Similar	3.30	3.46	-.16	54.5%	57.3%	-2.8

[1] Based a 95% confidence interval where the margin of error for any given item is calculated as 1.96 × (σ ÷ √n).

Table C2 Culture

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	Lower	2.71	3.39	-.68	30.8%	54.2%	-23.4
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	Lower	3.74	3.97	-.23	67.1%	76.1%	-9.0
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	Higher	4.52	4.32	.20	100.0%	91.6%	8.4
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	Similar	4.12	3.90	.23	83.6%	72.9%	10.7
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Higher	3.04	2.66	.38	38.2%	28.0%	10.1
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Similar	3.16	3.10	.06	40.0%	37.0%	3.0
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	Higher	3.99	3.65	.34	72.7%	62.4%	10.3
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	Lower	3.09	3.49	-.40	44.2%	55.4%	-11.2
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	Similar	4.01	3.88	.14	77.9%	71.3%	6.6

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	Lower	3.36	3.64	-.28	47.4%	64.3%	-16.9
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	Higher	3.91	3.69	.21	73.7%	67.0%	6.6
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	Similar	3.88	3.95	-.07	80.5%	78.9%	1.6
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	Similar	3.75	3.91	-.17	67.6%	71.7%	-4.1
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	Similar	4.07	4.06	.01	80.0%	79.0%	1.0
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	Lower	3.20	3.47	-.27	44.0%	55.1%	-11.1
I feel valued as an employee	Similar	3.69	3.68	.01	63.6%	66.7%	-3.0

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	2.86	3.00	-.14	35.5%	37.9%	-2.4
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	Similar	2.72	2.85	-.13	31.6%	31.3%	.2
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	Similar	2.56	2.64	-.08	28.0%	23.7%	4.3
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	Similar	2.96	2.88	.08	37.8%	32.3%	5.5
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	Similar	2.63	2.73	-.10	24.0%	25.6%	-1.6

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	3.06	3.35	-.29	47.2%	51.7%	-4.5
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.68	3.45	.23	71.6%	58.2%	13.4
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.15	3.30	-.15	48.5%	48.1%	.4

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Higher	3.68	3.41	.27	69.0%	55.4%	13.6
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.01	3.13	-.11	43.3%	41.5%	1.7
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Higher	3.63	3.25	.38	73.2%	50.5%	22.7
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Lower	2.80	3.78	-.98	36.5%	69.4%	-32.9
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.92	3.89	.03	78.7%	75.1%	3.5
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Lower	2.83	3.37	-.54	37.1%	50.3%	-13.1
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Similar	3.53	3.47	.05	61.1%	55.8%	5.3
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Lower	2.55	3.20	-.65	26.0%	45.8%	-19.8
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Higher	3.57	3.25	.31	67.6%	51.1%	16.4

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	Similar	4.08	4.00	.08	80.8%	77.7%	3.1
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Higher	3.99	3.64	.35	76.1%	61.8%	14.3
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Similar	3.06	3.10	-.05	30.9%	32.4%	-1.5
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Similar	2.98	3.21	-.23	30.2%	34.0%	-3.9
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Similar	3.59	3.44	.16	62.5%	51.2%	11.3

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	3.12	3.35	-.23	30.0%	46.7%	-16.7
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	Lower	3.54	3.87	-.34	57.4%	70.8%	-13.4

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	Similar	4.11	3.91	.20	84.9%	77.2%	7.7
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment	Lower	3.15	3.52	-.37	45.6%	58.4%	-12.8
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	Similar	3.01	3.20	-.18	22.9%	36.0%	-13.1
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	Lower	2.79	3.26	-.48	18.6%	38.4%	-19.9

Table C9 Freedom of Speech

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college supports people speaking freely	Lower	2.91	3.64	-.73	34.7%	66.7%	-32.0
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Higher	4.40	4.28	.12	98.7%	89.5%	9.2
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Similar	3.61	3.59	.02	66.7%	59.8%	6.9
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Higher	3.58	3.30	.28	63.4%	50.3%	13.1
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Similar	3.11	2.97	.14	38.6%	33.5%	5.1

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	3.93	3.84	.08	76.8%	75.0%	1.8
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Higher	4.04	3.72	.32	83.3%	69.5%	13.8
CSU retains diverse employees	Similar	3.46	3.60	-.14	56.9%	61.2%	-4.3
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Higher	4.03	3.77	.26	84.3%	69.9%	14.4
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Higher	4.21	4.02	.19	95.8%	79.9%	15.9
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Higher	4.11	3.84	.27	87.8%	74.0%	13.9
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.94	3.76	.18	72.9%	66.6%	6.2
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Higher	4.34	4.08	.26	91.9%	80.9%	11.0

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	Similar	3.64	3.67	-.03	64.4%	66.6%	-2.2
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	Similar	3.50	3.61	-.11	56.9%	63.7%	-6.7
Department/office retains diverse employees	Lower	3.07	3.50	-.43	34.2%	56.8%	-22.6
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Similar	3.66	3.68	-.02	63.4%	65.3%	-1.9
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	3.75	3.66	.10	65.8%	61.8%	4.0
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.76	3.71	.04	71.6%	68.7%	3.0
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.48	3.59	-.11	54.8%	59.3%	-4.5
Would recommend department/office as a place of employment	Similar	3.73	3.86	-.13	67.6%	71.3%	-3.7

Table C12 Factors

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Higher	3.99	3.82	.17
Department/Unit Perceptions	Similar	3.57	3.66	-.09
Department/Unit Leadership	Higher	3.67	3.42	.25
College/Division Leadership	Lower	2.86	3.31	-.45
Favoritism	Similar	2.73	2.80	-.08
Sense of Belonging	Similar	3.70	3.67	.03
Department/Unit Culture	Similar	3.51	3.52	-.01
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Similar	4.00	4.00	.01