



Walter Scott, Jr. College of Engineering 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 Walter Scott, Jr. College of Engineering . 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 your college, WSCOE, 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

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	1.2%	11.7%	9.8%	45.4%	31.9%	163	3.95
Understands the value of diversity	2.5%	7.5%	9.4%	43.1%	37.5%	160	4.06
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.7%	13.0%	14.3%	41.0%	28.0%	161	3.76
Treats all employees equitably	4.4%	15.8%	12.7%	42.4%	24.7%	158	3.67
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.8%	8.1%	18.8%	41.9%	27.5%	160	3.81
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	2.5%	11.7%	16.0%	35.0%	35.0%	163	3.88
Promotes respect for cultural differences	1.3%	6.9%	13.8%	42.1%	35.8%	159	4.04
Is open and transparent in communication	4.3%	13.0%	17.3%	32.7%	32.7%	162	3.77
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	4.3%	12.4%	19.9%	28.6%	34.8%	161	3.77

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	6.9%	13.2%	32.1%	34.0%	13.8%	159	3.35
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.2%	2.6%	24.4%	39.7%	30.1%	156	3.91
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	0.7%	1.3%	0.7%	39.2%	58.2%	153	4.53
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	2.0%	9.2%	10.5%	35.3%	43.1%	153	4.08
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	22.6%	39.6%	14.5%	13.8%	9.4%	159	2.48
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	10.0%	28.1%	31.3%	21.9%	8.8%	160	2.91
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.0%	13.4%	19.5%	46.3%	17.7%	164	3.62
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	6.1%	20.1%	25.6%	34.8%	13.4%	164	3.29
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.7%	11.0%	11.6%	34.8%	39.0%	164	3.95

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	2.7%	14.4%	17.1%	43.8%	21.9%	146	3.68
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	1.4%	2.1%	15.4%	54.5%	26.6%	143	4.03
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	1.8%	7.8%	9.0%	52.4%	28.9%	166	3.99
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	0.7%	6.6%	19.1%	47.8%	25.7%	136	3.91
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	0.0%	1.3%	15.3%	52.0%	31.3%	150	4.13
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	4.2%	12.7%	23.2%	43.0%	16.9%	142	3.56
I feel valued as an employee	3.7%	11.0%	15.9%	42.7%	26.8%	164	3.78

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	20.1%	31.3%	14.6%	25.0%	9.0%	144	2.72
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	23.9%	31.0%	21.1%	18.3%	5.6%	142	2.51
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	22.0%	37.6%	24.1%	10.6%	5.7%	141	2.40
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	23.6%	31.4%	21.4%	13.6%	10.0%	140	2.55
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	23.7%	30.2%	25.2%	14.4%	6.5%	139	2.50

Table A5 Leadership and Accountability

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	10.7%	19.4%	29.1%	26.2%	14.6%	103	3.15
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	2.5%	20.7%	18.2%	34.7%	24.0%	121	3.57
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	9.5%	20.0%	35.8%	24.2%	10.5%	95	3.06

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.5%	19.1%	27.0%	31.3%	19.1%	115	3.43
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	16.0%	20.2%	34.0%	22.3%	7.4%	94	2.85
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	7.3%	16.9%	21.0%	39.5%	15.3%	124	3.39
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	5.8%	9.2%	16.7%	40.8%	27.5%	120	3.75
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	2.7%	4.7%	12.2%	45.9%	34.5%	148	4.05
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	7.8%	14.6%	29.1%	35.0%	13.6%	103	3.32
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.9%	7.1%	28.3%	37.8%	22.8%	127	3.69
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	13.7%	16.2%	27.4%	28.2%	14.5%	117	3.14
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	5.6%	18.8%	14.6%	33.3%	27.8%	144	3.59

Table A6 Misconduct

Check whether or not the following statements are true based on the type of misconduct. (Select all that apply)	Sexual Harassment	Sexual Misconduct	Bullying	Bias	Physical Assault	Verbal Assault	None	Total (N)
___ is problematic among employees at CSU	3.6%	1.8%	12.1%	24.2%	0.0%	4.8%	72.7%	165
___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	1.8%	0.0%	14.5%	20.0%	0.0%	4.8%	74.5%	165
___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	1.2%	0.0%	10.9%	20.6%	0.0%	7.3%	73.3%	165
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	2.4%	0.6%	15.2%	16.4%	0.6%	11.5%	70.9%	165

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	1.3%	7.0%	12.7%	50.6%	28.5%	158	3.98
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.8%	18.0%	24.1%	39.1%	15.0%	133	3.44
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	2.3%	25.2%	45.0%	22.9%	4.6%	131	3.02
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	2.3%	14.9%	55.2%	21.8%	5.7%	87	3.14
CSU handles incidents of bias well	4.8%	8.9%	36.3%	41.1%	8.9%	124	3.40

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	89.0%	146
No	11.0%	18
Total	100.0%	164

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	0.0%	16.8%	43.4%	33.6%	6.2%	113	3.29
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	2.4%	5.5%	23.6%	43.3%	25.2%	127	3.83

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.	6.1%	14.9%	8.8%	48.6%	21.6%	148	3.65
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	4.7%	35.7%	17.8%	24.8%	17.1%	129	3.14
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	4.0%	18.5%	47.6%	22.6%	7.3%	124	3.10
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	7.0%	22.8%	42.1%	22.8%	5.3%	114	2.96

Table A11 Freedom of Speech

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
My division/college supports people speaking freely	4.7%	10.1%	18.2%	48.6%	18.2%	148	3.66
Free speech is an important issue on campus	0.7%	2.6%	10.5%	49.0%	37.3%	153	4.20
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	0.7%	14.5%	29.0%	44.8%	11.0%	145	3.51
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	4.8%	30.6%	16.3%	38.8%	9.5%	147	3.18
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	12.1%	34.2%	36.2%	14.8%	2.7%	149	2.62

Table A12 CSU Perceptions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N Avg)	
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	1.5%	6.2%	14.6%	56.9%	20.8%	130	3.89
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.0%	7.5%	17.2%	58.2%	14.2%	134	3.73
CSU retains diverse employees	2.5%	7.6%	21.8%	49.6%	18.5%	119	3.74
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	2.3%	6.2%	20.9%	52.7%	17.8%	129	3.78
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	0.7%	6.6%	16.1%	49.6%	27.0%	137	3.96
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	2.8%	7.6%	15.3%	52.1%	22.2%	144	3.83
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	2.4%	7.2%	20.8%	48.8%	20.8%	125	3.78
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	0.7%	3.9%	13.8%	46.7%	34.9%	152	4.11

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	1.4%	9.5%	14.3%	49.7%	25.2%	147	3.88
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	2.1%	6.2%	17.8%	52.1%	21.9%	146	3.86
Department/office retains diverse employees	0.7%	7.8%	24.8%	44.0%	22.7%	141	3.80
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	0.7%	6.3%	20.8%	47.9%	24.3%	144	3.89
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	2.1%	9.2%	22.0%	46.1%	20.6%	141	3.74
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.3%	5.9%	15.0%	47.7%	28.1%	153	3.92
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	1.5%	8.4%	21.4%	46.6%	22.1%	131	3.79
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.3%	4.0%	17.3%	37.3%	38.0%	150	4.03

Table A14 Discriminatory Attitudes

Discriminatory attitudes are present in your department/office based on:	%	N
No intolerant attitudes are present	35.9%	46
Job title	34.4%	44
Employment classification	32.8%	42
Gender	20.3%	26
Political affiliation	15.6%	20
Age	14.8%	19
Gender identity and expression	10.2%	13
Religion	8.6%	11
Appearance	7.8%	10
Race or color	7.0%	9
Ethnic origin	6.3%	8
Nationality/Country of origin	5.5%	7
Parental status	3.9%	5
Disability (e.g. physical, mental)	3.1%	4
Other (Sexual orientation, Socioeconomic status, Marital status, Education/professional background, Veteran status, General bias, Research area/Grant money brought in)	13.2%	17

Note: multiple response item.

Table A15 Work-related Stressors

Please select your top THREE work-related stressors	%	N
Workload	40.0%	58
Work/life balance	34.5%	50
Lower salary	29.7%	43
Lack of growth/promotion	26.9%	39
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	22.1%	32
Email overload	22.1%	32
Office/department climate	15.9%	23
Job security	13.8%	20
Duties outside my job responsibilities	13.1%	19
Interpersonal conflict	13.1%	19
Physical environment	10.3%	15
Affordable housing near work	9.7%	14
Health issues	4.8%	7
Ill-defined job	4.1%	6
Lack of work flexibility	3.4%	5
Misconduct occurring at work/Inequities/Bias	3.4%	5
Administration/Leadership	3.4%	5
Lack of work autonomy	2.8%	4
Parking and Transportation	2.8%	4
Lack of training/skills to do my work	2.1%	3
Physical safety	1.4%	2
General Climate	1.4%	2
Other	1.4%	2
Feeling Undervalued	0.7%	1
Health Insurance/Benefits	0.7%	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	14.8%	23
No	85.2%	132
Total	100.0%	155

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	65.2%	15
Finding care for a sick child/adult	39.1%	9
Finding child care services	34.8%	8
Scheduling care to match work schedule	34.8%	8
Finding summer care services	30.4%	7
Transportation to/from care services	26.1%	6
Location of care services	26.1%	6
Finding temporary care services	21.7%	5
Dependability of care services	21.7%	5
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	13.0%	3
Finding adult care services	8.7%	2
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	8.7%	2
Quality of care services	8.7%	2
Other	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	53.5%	76
Men	44.4%	63
T/NB/GNC	2.1%	3

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

Table A19 Minoritized Race/Ethnicity

	%	N
Non-minoritized	83.0%	112
Minoritized	17.0%	23

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose.

Table A20 Employee Type

	%	N
Administrative Professional	56.2%	86
Faculty	31.4%	48
State Classified	7.8%	12
Other	0.7%	1
Prefer not to disclose	3.9%	6
Total	100.0%	153

Table A21 Department/Unit

	%	N
Atmospheric Science	27.0%	41
Chemical and Biological Engineering or School of Biomedical Engineering	3.3%	5
Civil and Environmental Engineering	19.7%	30
Cooperative Institute for Research in the Atmosphere	7.9%	12
Dean's Office/College of Engineering or Office of Academic and Student Affairs or Engineering Research Center	17.1%	26
Electrical and Computer Engineering	5.3%	8
Mechanical Engineering	8.6%	13
Prefer not to disclose	11.2%	17
Total	100.0%	152

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.

Table B1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		WSCOE		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 ¹	4008	3.95 ¹	163	3.97 _a	61	3.99 _a	74	3.99 _a	108	4.14 _a	22	3.99 _a	83	3.89 _a	46	3.92 _a	12
Understands the value of diversity	4.06 ¹	3956	4.06 ¹	160	4.25 _a	60	4.06 _a	72	4.16 _a	107	4.10 _a	21	4.16 _a	83	4.07 _a	44	3.73 _a	11
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.62 ¹	3994	3.76 ¹	161	4.13 _a	60	3.58 _b	73	3.80 _a	106	3.91 _a	22	3.72 _a	81	3.96 _a	46	3.25 _a	12
Treats all employees equitably	3.46 ¹	3946	3.67 ¹	158	4.05 _a	59	3.53 _b	74	3.72 _a	105	4.00 _a	22	3.60 _a	81	3.96 _a	45	3.25 _a	12
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.87 ¹	3950	3.81 ¹	160	3.98 _a	60	3.86 _a	74	3.88 _a	108	4.00 _a	21	3.88 _a	83	3.93 _a	46	3.55 _a	11
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.99 ¹	3999	3.88 ¹	163	4.06 _a	62	3.89 _a	74	4.01 _a	109	3.78 _a	23	3.87 _a	82	3.96 _a	47	4.00 _a	12
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.04 ¹	3934	4.04 ¹	159	4.20 _a	59	4.05 _a	75	4.13 _a	108	4.00 _a	20	4.10 _{a,b}	81	4.22 _a	46	3.58 _b	12
Is open and transparent in communication	3.44 ¹	4009	3.77 ¹	162	4.06 _a	62	3.67 _b	73	3.77 _a	108	4.09 _a	22	3.65 _a	80	4.08 _b	48	3.33 _a	12
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	3.46 ¹	3952	3.77 ¹	161	3.97 _a	62	3.66 _a	73	3.78 _a	109	3.90 _a	21	3.49 _a	82	4.26 _b	47	3.58 _{a,b}	12

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				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		WSCO		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 ¹	3931	3.35 ¹	159	3.62 _a	61	3.19 _b	72	3.35 _a	107	3.75 _a	20	3.25 _a	80	3.57 _a	46	3.17 _a	12
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.97 ¹	3872	3.91 ¹	156	4.12 _a	59	3.83 _a	70	3.94 _a	103	4.00 _a	21	3.88 _a	78	4.11 _a	46	3.64 _a	11
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	4.32 ¹	3691	4.53 ¹	153	4.56 _a	57	4.58 _a	72	4.54 _a	104	4.70 _a	20	4.56 _a	80	4.65 _a	43	4.55 _a	11
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.90 ¹	3687	4.08 ¹	153	4.19 _a	58	4.13 _a	71	4.14 _a	104	4.25 _a	20	4.05 _a	80	4.12 _a	43	4.27 _a	11
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	2.66 ¹	3925	2.48 ¹	159	2.27 _a	59	2.47 _a	72	2.36 _a	109	2.79 _a	19	2.48 _a	83	2.41 _a	44	2.50 _a	10
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	3.10 ¹	3910	2.91 ¹	160	2.64 _a	61	3.00 _a	73	2.78 _a	110	3.14 _a	22	2.94 _a	83	2.62 _a	45	3.25 _a	12
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.65 ¹	4012	3.62 ¹	164	3.81 _a	59	3.66 _a	76	3.68 _a	111	4.00 _a	20	3.65 _a	85	3.76 _a	45	3.83 _a	12
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.49 ¹	4003	3.29 ¹	164	3.54 _a	59	3.22 _a	76	3.31 _a	111	3.70 _a	20	3.16 _a	85	3.60 _b	45	3.50 _{a,b}	12
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.88 ¹	4007	3.95 ¹	164	4.24 _a	59	3.93 _a	76	4.07 _a	111	3.95 _a	20	3.95 _a	85	4.09 _a	45	3.75 _a	12

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				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		WSOE		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 ¹	3673	3.68 ¹	146	3.89 _a	56	3.56 _a	68	3.70 _a	104	3.65 _a	17	3.55 _a	76	3.98 _b	42	3.40 _{a,b}	10
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.69 ¹	3656	4.03 ¹	143	4.13 _a	54	4.06 _a	69	4.08 _a	102	4.16 _a	19	4.04 _a	78	4.13 _a	40	* _a	*
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	3.95 ¹	3999	3.99 ¹	166	4.21 _a	63	3.96 _a	76	4.03 _a	112	3.91 _a	23	3.94 _a	86	4.29 _b	48	3.25 _c	12
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.91 ¹	3459	3.91 ¹	136	4.13 _a	54	3.93 _a	60	4.01 _a	93	3.83 _a	18	3.89 _a	72	4.05 _a	39	* _a	*
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	4.06 ¹	3723	4.13 ¹	150	4.27 _a	56	4.06 _a	70	4.15 _a	102	4.10 _a	20	4.11 _a	80	4.26 _a	42	3.91 _a	11
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.47 ¹	3600	3.56 ¹	142	3.53 _a	55	3.74 _a	66	3.62 _a	99	3.72 _a	18	3.44 _a	78	3.82 _a	39	3.70 _a	10
I feel valued as an employee	3.68 ¹	3991	3.78 ¹	164	4.05 _a	62	3.68 _b	75	3.84 _a	110	4.00 _a	23	3.74 _a	84	4.00 _a	48	3.42 _a	12

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

Table B4 Favoritism

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		WSCOE		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 ¹	3711	2.72 ¹	144	2.58 _a	52	2.68 _a	69	2.61 _a	99	2.78 _a	18	2.80 _a	74	2.57 _a	42	2.70 _a	10
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	2.85 ¹	3670	2.51 ¹	142	2.42 _a	53	2.42 _a	67	2.41 _a	98	2.44 _a	18	2.55 _a	73	2.36 _a	42	2.50 _a	10
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	2.64 ¹	3665	2.40 ¹	141	2.29 _a	52	2.35 _a	68	2.27 _a	98	2.44 _a	18	2.51 _a	72	2.20 _a	41	2.09 _a	11
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	2.88 ¹	3606	2.55 ¹	140	2.33 _a	52	2.49 _a	67	2.38 _a	97	2.50 _a	18	2.69 _a	72	2.21 _a	42	2.50 _a	10
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	2.73 ¹	3568	2.50 ¹	139	2.47 _a	53	2.29 _a	65	2.37 _a	96	2.47 _a	19	2.49 _a	72	2.36 _a	42	* _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 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 B5 Leadership and Accountability

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		WSCOE		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 ¹	2953	3.15 ¹	103	3.52 _a	46	2.88 _b	42	3.10 _a	72	3.47 _a	15	3.12 _a	56	3.37 _a	30	* _a	*
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.45 ¹	3343	3.57 ¹	121	3.92 _a	50	3.38 _b	53	3.65 _a	86	3.53 _a	17	3.47 _a	64	3.89 _a	36	* _a	*

Table B5 Leadership and Accountability

Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.30 ¹	2849	3.06 ¹	95	3.45 _a	42	2.77 _b	39	3.06 _a	67	3.08 _a	13	3.00 _a	52	3.23 _a	26	* _a	*
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.41 ¹	3241	3.43 ¹	115	3.64 _a	47	3.37 _a	52	3.52 _a	84	3.13 _a	15	3.32 _a	60	3.70 _a	33	3.00 _a	10
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.13 ¹	2894	2.85 ¹	94	3.26 _a	39	2.57 _b	37	2.80 _a	61	3.14 _a	14	2.87 _a	46	2.82 _a	28	* _a	*
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.25 ¹	3365	3.39 ¹	124	3.55 _a	47	3.45 _a	58	3.50 _a	84	3.35 _a	17	3.32 _a	62	3.51 _a	37	3.40 _a	10
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.78 ¹	3369	3.75 ¹	120	4.08 _a	50	3.60 _b	52	3.77 _a	83	3.82 _a	17	3.59 _a	61	4.11 _b	37	* _{a,b}	*
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.89 ¹	3705	4.05 ¹	148	4.14 _a	56	4.10 _a	69	4.12 _a	101	4.00 _a	20	3.95 _a	76	4.27 _a	44	3.91 _a	11
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.37 ¹	3033	3.32 ¹	103	3.64 _a	45	3.14 _b	42	3.33 _a	70	3.27 _a	15	3.13 _a	52	3.73 _b	33	* _{a,b}	*
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.47 ¹	3351	3.69 ¹	127	3.84 _a	50	3.67 _a	57	3.76 _a	87	3.56 _a	18	3.58 _a	64	4.00 _b	39	3.20 _a	10
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.20 ¹	3130	3.14 ¹	117	3.50 _a	52	2.92 _b	48	3.14 _a	81	3.19 _a	16	2.97 _a	58	3.54 _b	37	* _{a,b}	*
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.25 ¹	3599	3.59 ¹	144	3.77 _a	57	3.56 _a	64	3.65 _a	99	3.58 _a	19	3.46 _a	72	3.88 _a	43	3.42 _a	12

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 B6 Misconduct Among Employees at CSU

_____ is problematic among employees at CSU	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		WSCO		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	247	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	3.0%	117	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	13.3%	519	12.1%	20	*	*	13.2%	10	10.7%	12	*	*	14.0%	12	*	*	*	*
Bias	28.3%	1104	24.2%	40	*	*	27.6%	21	21.4%	24	*	*	25.6%	22	20.8%	10	*	*
Physical Assault	0.6%	23	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.2%	282	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	65.7%	2566	72.7%	120	82.5%	52	69.7%	53	75.9%	85	65.2%	15	70.9%	61	75.0%	36	91.7%	11

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		WSCO		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.8%	109	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.3%	52	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	10.3%	404	14.5%	24	*	*	15.8%	12	15.2%	17	*	*	16.3%	14	*	*	*	*
Bias	24.1%	940	20.0%	33	*	*	25.0%	19	17.9%	20	*	*	20.9%	18	*	*	*	*
Physical Assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	5.1%	199	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	70.8%	2765	74.5%	123	84.1%	53	69.7%	53	75.9%	85	73.9%	17	74.4%	64	75.0%	36	83.3%	10

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		WSCOE		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	10.9%	18	*	*	*	*	12.5%	14	*	*	14.0%	12	*	*	*	*
Bias	23.3%	911	20.6%	34	*	*	26.3%	20	19.6%	22	*	*	19.8%	17	25.0%	12	*	*
Physical Assault	0.3%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.0%	272	7.3%	12	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	69.9%	2731	73.3%	121	81.0%	51	68.4%	52	74.1%	83	65.2%	15	74.4%	64	72.9%	35	*	*

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		WSCOE		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.5%	99	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.0%	41	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	16.7%	651	15.2%	25	*	*	14.5%	11	14.3%	16	*	*	20.9%	18	*	*	*	*
Bias	20.0%	781	16.4%	27	15.9%	10	*	*	13.4%	15	*	*	19.8%	17	*	*	*	*
Physical Assault	0.9%	37	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	11.0%	428	11.5%	19	*	*	*	*	13.4%	15	*	*	15.1%	13	*	*	*	*
None	68.7%	2682	70.9%	117	71.4%	45	75.0%	57	72.3%	81	65.2%	15	65.1%	56	81.3%	39	*	*

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		WSCOE		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 ¹	3726	3.98 ¹	158	3.94 _a	62	4.00 _a	73	3.91 _a	109	4.24 _a	21	4.00 _a	84	4.07 _a	46	3.70 _a	10
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.64 ¹	3199	3.44 ¹	133	3.51 _a	49	3.63 _a	62	3.55 _a	92	3.41 _a	17	3.59 _a	69	3.32 _a	38	* _a	*
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.10 ¹	3174	3.02 ¹	131	2.89 _a	47	3.14 _a	65	2.96 _a	93	3.13 _a	15	2.99 _a	73	3.06 _a	36	* _a	*
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.21 ¹	2397	3.14 ¹	87	3.03 _a	29	3.19 _a	43	3.02 _a	61	3.64 _b	11	3.17 _a	52	3.00 _a	19	* _a	*
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.44 ¹	2962	3.40 ¹	124	3.55 _a	44	3.52 _a	61	3.49 _a	87	3.40 _a	15	3.40 _a	67	3.53 _a	34	* _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 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		WSCO		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	83.9% ¹	3260	89.0% ¹	146	92.1% _a	58	92.1% _a	70	95.5% _a	107	73.9% _b	17	94.2% _a	81	83.3% _b	40	100.0% ²	12
No	16.1% ¹	627	11.0% ¹	18	* _a	*	* _a	*	* _a	*	* _b	*	* _a	*	* _b	*	* ²	*

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 its column proportion is equal to zero or one.

Table B12 Employee Councils

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		WSCO		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 ¹	2437	3.29 ¹	113	3.33 _a	46	3.35 _a	52	3.34 _a	83	3.50 _a	12	3.24 _a	62	3.36 _a	33	* _a	*
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.87 ¹	2700	3.83 ¹	127	3.72 _a	50	3.97 _a	60	3.84 _a	91	4.14 _a	14	3.84 _a	68	3.86 _a	37	* _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 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		WSCOE		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 ¹	3644	3.65 ¹	148	3.64 _a	58	3.85 _a	65	3.79 _a	101	3.68 _a	19	3.80 _a	76	3.49 _a	43	4.18 _a	11
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.52 ¹	3366	3.14 ¹	129	3.06 _a	49	3.15 _a	60	3.08 _a	91	3.50 _a	16	3.09 _a	68	2.94 _a	36	3.91 _b	11
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.20 ¹	3209	3.10 ¹	124	3.19 _a	48	3.12 _a	57	3.10 _a	86	3.20 _a	15	3.14 _a	65	3.06 _a	35	3.30 _a	10
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.26 ¹	3082	2.96 ¹	114	3.09 _a	44	2.92 _a	50	2.99 _a	80	3.00 _a	14	2.95 _a	59	2.97 _a	32	* _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 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 B14 Freedom of Speech

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		WSCO		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 ¹	3629	3.66 ¹	148	4.02 _a	57	3.60 _b	70	3.70 _a	103	3.80 _a	20	3.49 _a	76	4.13 _b	45	3.50 _{a,b}	12
Free speech is an important issue on campus	4.28 ¹	3697	4.20 ¹	153	4.29 _a	58	4.16 _a	73	4.17 _a	107	4.38 _a	21	4.19 _a	81	4.29 _a	45	4.00 _a	12
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	3.59 ¹	3525	3.51 ¹	145	3.78 _a	58	3.36 _b	67	3.59 _a	101	3.10 _b	20	3.32 _a	76	3.76 _b	46	3.70 _{a,b}	10
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.30 ¹	3473	3.18 ¹	147	3.30 _a	57	3.15 _a	68	3.32 _a	101	2.75 _b	20	3.09 _a	77	3.24 _a	45	3.60 _a	10
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.97 ¹	3648	2.62 ¹	149	2.55 _a	58	2.53 _a	70	2.59 _a	105	2.45 _a	20	2.66 _a	80	2.43 _a	44	2.67 _a	12

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				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		WSCOE		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 ¹	3315	3.89 ¹	130	3.93 _a	56	3.97 _a	58	3.91 _a	91	3.95 _a	20	3.82 _a	66	4.02 _a	43	4.00 _a	11
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.72 ¹	3408	3.73 ¹	134	3.96 _a	56	3.74 _a	61	3.75 _a	95	4.10 _a	20	3.69 _a	71	3.90 _a	42	3.82 _a	11
CSU retains diverse employees	3.60 ¹	2992	3.74 ¹	119	3.76 _a	54	3.88 _a	49	3.76 _a	84	3.79 _a	19	3.71 _a	62	3.80 _a	40	* _a	*
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.77 ¹	3194	3.78 ¹	129	3.92 _a	53	3.83 _a	60	3.87 _a	91	3.71 _a	21	3.78 _a	67	3.83 _a	41	3.83 _a	12
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.02 ¹	3472	3.96 ¹	137	4.00 _a	56	3.98 _a	65	3.98 _a	96	3.95 _a	22	4.04 _a	73	3.96 _{a,b}	45	3.45 _b	11
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	3.84 ¹	3541	3.83 ¹	144	4.03 _a	61	3.80 _a	66	3.84 _a	103	4.09 _a	22	3.75 _a	75	3.96 _a	47	3.83 _a	12
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.76 ¹	3183	3.78 ¹	125	3.83 _a	53	3.88 _a	58	3.79 _a	90	3.83 _a	18	3.67 _a	67	3.95 _a	41	* _a	*
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.08 ¹	3708	4.11 ¹	152	4.24 _a	62	4.08 _a	73	4.14 _a	110	4.18 _a	22	4.11 _a	83	4.11 _a	47	4.08 _a	12

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 B16 Department/Unit Perceptions

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		WSCOE		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 ¹	3603	3.88 ¹	147	4.03 _a	61	3.81 _a	69	3.85 _a	103	4.05 _a	22	3.78 _a	80	4.02 _a	46	4.00 _a	10
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.61 ¹	3548	3.86 ¹	146	4.08 _a	59	3.83 _a	71	3.88 _a	103	4.05 _a	22	3.76 _a	80	4.07 _a	46	3.60 _a	10
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.50 ¹	3414	3.80 ¹	141	3.88 _a	59	3.76 _a	66	3.79 _a	100	3.82 _a	22	3.71 _a	76	3.91 _a	44	3.64 _a	11
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.68 ¹	3458	3.89 ¹	144	4.03 _a	59	3.88 _a	68	3.98 _a	102	3.73 _a	22	3.90 _a	77	3.91 _a	45	3.75 _a	12
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.66 ¹	3561	3.74 ¹	141	3.84 _a	57	3.68 _a	69	3.75 _a	100	3.82 _a	22	3.83 _a	78	3.71 _{a,b}	45	3.20 _b	10
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.71 ¹	3739	3.92 ¹	153	4.13 _a	63	3.85 _a	73	3.97 _a	110	3.96 _a	23	3.84 _{a,b}	83	4.13 _a	48	3.42 _b	12
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.59 ¹	3380	3.79 ¹	131	3.80 _a	55	3.90 _a	63	3.84 _a	95	3.67 _a	18	3.71 _a	73	3.93 _a	41	* _a	*
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.86 ¹	3735	4.03 ¹	150	4.21 _a	62	3.96 _a	71	4.07 _a	107	3.96 _a	23	3.96 _{a,b}	81	4.19 _a	47	3.50 _b	12

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 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		WSCO		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	14.1% ¹	533	14.8% ¹	23	* _a	*	21.1% _b	16	16.1% _a	18	* _a	*	17.4% _a	15	* _a	*	* ²	*
No	85.9% ¹	3247	85.2% ¹	132	92.1% _a	58	78.9% _b	60	83.9% _a	94	91.3% _a	21	82.6% _a	71	85.4% _a	41	100.0% ²	12

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 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		WSCOPE		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	65.2%	15	*	*	75.0%	12	72.2%	13	*	*	80.0%	12	*	*	*	*
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				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		WSCOE		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 ¹	2524	3.84 ¹	94	3.91 _a	44	3.91 _a	38	3.87 _a	64	3.88 _a	16	3.82 _a	48	3.90 _a	33	* _a	*
Department/Unit Perceptions	3.66 ¹	2869	3.86 ¹	111	3.91 _a	49	3.91 _a	50	3.91 _a	77	3.74 _a	18	3.82 _a	61	3.98 _a	36	* _a	*
Department/Unit Leadership	3.42 ¹	2859	3.55 ¹	98	3.69 _a	42	3.56 _a	42	3.65 _a	70	3.29 _a	13	3.42 _a	52	3.88 _b	29	* _a	*
College/Division Leadership	3.31 ¹	2472	3.07 ¹	76	3.44 _a	35	2.77 _b	29	3.04 _a	52	3.15 _a	12	2.91 _a	39	3.39 _a	22	* _a	*
Favoritism	2.80 ¹	3417	2.53 ¹	132	2.45 _a	50	2.42 _a	63	2.43 _a	92	2.50 _a	18	2.59 _a	70	2.31 _a	39	* _a	*
Sense of Belonging	3.67 ¹	3978	3.62 ¹	164	3.86 _a	59	3.61 _a	76	3.69 _a	111	3.88 _a	20	3.59 _a	85	3.81 _a	45	3.69 _a	12
Department/Unit Culture	3.52 ¹	3807	3.72 ¹	148	4.01 _a	57	3.61 _b	69	3.77 _a	102	3.92 _a	19	3.63 _a	76	4.00 _a	43	3.37 _a	12
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	4.00 ¹	3753	3.98 ¹	149	4.14 _a	59	3.98 _a	67	4.05 _a	100	4.06 _a	20	4.05 _a	75	4.11 _a	44	3.59 _a	11

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

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	Similar	3.95	3.86	.10	77.3%	72.5%	4.8
Understands the value of diversity	Similar	4.06	4.06	.00	80.6%	78.6%	2.0
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Similar	3.76	3.62	.14	68.9%	64.7%	4.3
Treats all employees equitably	Higher	3.67	3.46	.21	67.1%	58.5%	8.6
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Similar	3.81	3.87	-.06	69.4%	69.8%	-.5
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Similar	3.88	3.99	-.10	69.9%	77.0%	-7.1
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Similar	4.04	4.04	.01	78.0%	76.1%	1.9
Is open and transparent in communication	Higher	3.77	3.44	.32	65.4%	57.3%	8.2
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Higher	3.77	3.46	.31	63.4%	57.3%	6.0

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

Table C2 Culture

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	Similar	3.35	3.39	-.04	47.8%	54.2%	-6.4
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	Similar	3.91	3.97	-.06	69.9%	76.1%	-6.2
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	Higher	4.53	4.32	.21	97.4%	91.6%	5.8
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	Higher	4.08	3.90	.19	78.4%	72.9%	5.5
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Similar	2.48	2.66	-.18	23.3%	28.0%	-4.8
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Lower	2.91	3.10	-.19	30.6%	37.0%	-6.4
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	Similar	3.62	3.65	-.03	64.0%	62.4%	1.6
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	Lower	3.29	3.49	-.20	48.2%	55.4%	-7.2
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	Similar	3.95	3.88	.07	73.8%	71.3%	2.5

Table C3 Respect

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My department/office is treated with respect by other departments/offices within my division/college	Similar	3.68	3.64	.04	65.8%	64.3%	1.5
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	Higher	4.03	3.69	.33	81.1%	67.0%	14.1
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	Similar	3.99	3.95	.03	81.3%	78.9%	2.5
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	Similar	3.91	3.91	.00	73.5%	71.7%	1.9
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	Similar	4.13	4.06	.07	83.3%	79.0%	4.4
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	Similar	3.56	3.47	.09	59.9%	55.1%	4.7
I feel valued as an employee	Similar	3.78	3.68	.10	69.5%	66.7%	2.8

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	2.72	3.00	-.28	34.0%	37.9%	-3.9
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	Lower	2.51	2.85	-.34	23.9%	31.3%	-7.4
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	Lower	2.40	2.64	-.24	16.3%	23.7%	-7.3
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	Lower	2.55	2.88	-.33	23.6%	32.3%	-8.8
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	Lower	2.50	2.73	-.23	20.9%	25.6%	-4.7

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	3.15	3.35	-.20	40.8%	51.7%	-10.9
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.57	3.45	.12	58.7%	58.2%	.5
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Lower	3.06	3.30	-.23	34.7%	48.1%	-13.4
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.43	3.41	.03	50.4%	55.4%	-4.9

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Lower	2.85	3.13	-.28	29.8%	41.5%	-11.7
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.39	3.25	.14	54.8%	50.5%	4.3
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.75	3.78	-.03	68.3%	69.4%	-1.1
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Higher	4.05	3.89	.15	80.4%	75.1%	5.3
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Similar	3.32	3.37	-.05	48.5%	50.3%	-1.7
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Higher	3.69	3.47	.21	60.6%	55.8%	4.9
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.14	3.20	-.06	42.7%	45.8%	-3.1
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Higher	3.59	3.25	.34	61.1%	51.1%	10.0

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	3.98	4.00	-.02	79.1%	77.7%	1.4

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Lower	3.44	3.64	-.20	54.1%	61.8%	-7.7
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Similar	3.02	3.10	-.08	27.5%	32.4%	-4.9
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Similar	3.14	3.21	-.07	27.6%	34.0%	-6.5
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Similar	3.40	3.44	-.03	50.0%	51.2%	-1.2

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	3.29	3.35	-.06	39.8%	46.7%	-6.8
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	Similar	3.83	3.87	-.04	68.5%	70.8%	-2.3

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	Lower	3.65	3.91	-.26	70.3%	77.2%	-7.0

CSU | Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness

Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment	Lower	3.14	3.52	-.38	41.9%	58.4%	-16.5
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	Similar	3.10	3.20	-.09	29.8%	36.0%	-6.1
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	Lower	2.96	3.26	-.30	28.1%	38.4%	-10.4

Table C9 Freedom of Speech

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college supports people speaking freely	Similar	3.66	3.64	.02	66.9%	66.7%	.2
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Similar	4.20	4.28	-.08	86.3%	89.5%	-3.2
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Similar	3.51	3.59	-.08	55.9%	59.8%	-3.9
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Similar	3.18	3.30	-.12	48.3%	50.3%	-2.0
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Lower	2.62	2.97	-.36	17.4%	33.5%	-16.0

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	3.89	3.84	.05	77.7%	75.0%	2.7
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Similar	3.73	3.72	.01	72.4%	69.5%	2.9
CSU retains diverse employees	Similar	3.74	3.60	.14	68.1%	61.2%	6.8
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Similar	3.78	3.77	.01	70.5%	69.9%	.7
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	3.96	4.02	-.07	76.6%	79.9%	-3.3
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.83	3.84	.00	74.3%	74.0%	.3
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.78	3.76	.03	69.6%	66.6%	3.0
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Similar	4.11	4.08	.03	81.6%	80.9%	.7

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	3.88	3.67	.20	74.8%	66.6%	8.2
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	Higher	3.86	3.61	.24	74.0%	63.7%	10.3
Department/office retains diverse employees	Higher	3.80	3.50	.30	66.7%	56.8%	9.8
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Higher	3.89	3.68	.21	72.2%	65.3%	7.0
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	3.74	3.66	.08	66.7%	61.8%	4.9
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	Higher	3.92	3.71	.20	75.8%	68.7%	7.2
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Higher	3.79	3.59	.20	68.7%	59.3%	9.4
Would recommend department/office as a place of employment	Higher	4.03	3.86	.17	75.3%	71.3%	4.0

Table C12 Factors

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Similar	3.84	3.82	.02
Department/Unit Perceptions	Higher	3.86	3.66	.21
Department/Unit Leadership	Similar	3.55	3.42	.12
College/Division Leadership	Lower	3.07	3.31	-.24
Favoritism	Lower	2.53	2.80	-.27
Sense of Belonging	Similar	3.62	3.67	-.05
Department/Unit Culture	Higher	3.72	3.52	.19
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Similar	3.98	4.00	-.02