Employee Climate Survey 2021

Colorado State Forest Service

The 2021 CSU Employee Climate Survey is a component of a biennial assessment conducted in the fall to assess employee perceptions related to their department/unit, division/college, and CSU. The 2021 is based on the survey developed in 2018 by the Assessment Group for Diversity Issues, a CSU service committee. The 2021 instrument focuses on employment themes of culture, leadership accountability, respect, favoritism, communication, discriminatory attitudes, and performance review.

Most items use a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree). Tables appearing in Frequencies of Results show the complete set of survey frequencies by theme (e.g., Work Culture, Performance Review, Leadership Accountability, etc.) as well as the total (weighted population). On many of the survey items, respondents could choose 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. Subgroup comparisons by gender, minoritized status, and employment type are based on the proportion of respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree" with each item and statistically significant differences (p < .05) between subgroup members are noted within the tables. Additionally, an overall index score representing the average percent agree (e.g., Work Culture Overall) appears within each table. For example, the Work Culture theme includes 13 individual survey items. If an employee selected "agree" or "strongly agree" to 9 out of the 13 items, their Work Culture index score would equal 69%. An employee must have answered all survey items within a theme in order for an index score to be calculated. An overall index score represents the average of the individual index scores or all employees included in the group or category.

Table 1 displays the total number of employees contacted for the survey, the number of employees that responded, and the response rate.

Table 1: Response Rates by Department/Unit

	Sent	Bounce	Opt-out and refusal	Completed	Response rate*
Colorado State Forest Service	122	2	8	39	32.5%

* Response rate = Completed / (Sent - Bounce)

When the proportions of a demographic subgroup in the survey sample differ substantially from known population proportions and when members within a subgroup may meaningfully diverge on variables of interest, data weighting can provide a more accurate summary of the true population response than simple averaging. For the 2021 survey, representation gender, racially minoritized status, and employment type were compared to known population norms. Results of the weighting scheme are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2: 2021 Employee Climate Survey Weighting Results

		Division population norm	Unweighted survey sample	Weighted survey population
Respondent gender	Man	70%	62%	70%
	Woman	30%	38%	30%
	Trans, nonbinary, nonconforming (T/NB/NC)		0%	0%
Racially minoritized	Racially minoritized	6%	6%	5%
status	Non-racially minoritized	94%	94%	95%
Employee type	Admin Professional	88%	92%	90%
	Contract, continuing, and adjunct (CCA)	0%	0%	0%
	Tenure or Tenure-track (T/TT) Faculty	0%	0%	0%
	State Classified	12%	8%	10%
	Other Salaried Employee	0%	0%	0%

Results are weighted by gender, racially minoritized status, and employee type.

Frequencies of Results

The following tables display the complete set of frequencies for each survey question asked on the survey. Percentages and proportions of respondents providing a given response are abbreviated to 'Pct' and the number of respondents representing the total weighted division population are also provided under the abbreviated heading of 'Pop.'

Table 3: Work Culture

Table 3. Work Culture							
Thinking about your work environment during the past 12 months, please indicate your agreement with the following statements about work culture.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Tota	-
My department/unit promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	13.2%	20.6%	15.5%	36.7%	14.0%	100.0%	
My department/unit treats all employees equitably	16.3%	28.1%	5.5%	35.7%	14.4%	100.0%	117
My department/unit is open and transparent in communication	23.4%	12.1%	22.0%	24.6%	17.9%	100.0%	120
My department/unit values employee input in major department/unit decisions	28.9%	15.8%	16.8%	22.5%	16.0%	100.0%	120
My department/unit promotes respect for cultural differences	0.0%	12.2%	28.9%	35.0%	23.9%	100.0%	120
My department/unit understands the value of diversity	2.9%	11.6%	21.9%	46.3%	17.3%	100.0%	117
My department/unit communicates the importance of valuing diversity	2.9%	11.6%	20.2%	47.8%	17.5%	100.0%	117
I feel valued as an employee	21.6%	13.1%	14.5%	39.5%	11.2%	100.0%	120
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	14.2%	33.5%	26.7%	20.1%	5.4%	100.0%	120
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	8.4%	20.8%	38.8%	21.8%	10.1%	100.0%	120
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/unit	10.1%	22.9%	15.4%	32.0%	19.6%	100.0%	120
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	3.9%	9.5%	27.8%	48.7%	10.1%	100.0%	120
I would recommend my department/unit as a place of employment	12.9%	16.1%	16.0%	41.0%	14.0%	100.0%	120

Table 4: Performance Review in Last Year

	Yes, I had a review	No, I did not have a review	Total (Pct Pop)
Did you have a performance review in the last year?	77.5%	22.5%	100.0% 120

Table 5: Performance Review

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about your most recent performance review.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total	-
I am satisfied with the effort my supervisor put into my most recent performance review	0.0%	17.3%	7.2%	31.3%	44.2%	100.0%	93
I fear negative job consequences if I am to raise an issue of unfair treatment during my review	38.1%	33.9%	10.7%	17.3%	0.0%	100.0%	93
I am aware of the process to mediate disagreements with my supervisor regarding my evaluation.	7.2%	8.3%	27.8%	39.3%	17.3%	100.0%	93

Asked only of those respondents who had a performance review in the last year.

Table 6: Respect

Thinking about your work environment during the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about respect.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Tota (Pct P	
My department/unit is treated with respect by other units within my college/division	13.5%	13.5%	42.4%	23.0%	7.5%	100.0%	117
My college/division is treated with respect by CSU	3.9%	23.1%	37.1%	28.4%	7.6%	100.0%	120
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	5.6%	14.8%	14.0%	37.6%	28.0%	100.0%	120
There is respect for religious differences in my department/unit	0.0%	2.0%	46.2%	34.8%	17.0%	100.0%	117
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/unit	0.0%	2.0%	40.7%	40.1%	17.3%	100.0%	117
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/unit	5.5%	10.5%	48.3%	24.2%	11.5%	100.0%	117

Table 7: Favoritism

During the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about favoritism. Favoritism plays a role in who gets:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total (Pct Pop)
Recognized within my department/unit	13.1%	23.3%	14.9%	24.4%	24.3%	100.0% 120
Resources in my department/unit	9.3%	22.4%	30.0%	16.7%	21.6%	100.0% 120
Professional development opportunities	21.3%	28.1%	28.0%	12.2%	10.4%	100.0% 120
Promoted in my department/unit	13.8%	21.6%	17.9%	15.7%	31.0%	100.0% 120
Hired in my department/unit	16.0%	27.2%	21.5%	7.3%	28.0%	100.0% 120

Table 8: Leadership Accountability: College/Division Leadership

able of Education Procedurability. Conceyor Evident Education p										
Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement about leadership accountability.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total (Pct Po	p)			
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	5.8%	18.4%	49.4%	20.4%	6.0%	100.0% 1	17			
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	2.9%	9.8%	63.9%	19.5%	4.0%	100.0% 1	17			
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	7.8%	12.6%	66.8%	8.9%	4.0%	100.0% 1	17			
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	5.8%	6.6%	27.6%	47.7%	12.4%	100.0% 1	17			
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	8.0%	10.9%	41.0%	37.1%	3.0%	100.0% 1	14			
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	4.9%	12.4%	41.1%	29.3%	12.4%	100.0% 1	17			

Table 9: Leadership Accountability: Department/Unit Leadership

Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement about leadership accountability.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total	-
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	14.4%	19.4%	36.3%	23.3%	6.6%	100.0%	117
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	11.5%	19.4%	44.9%	17.5%	6.6%	100.0%	117
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	11.8%	30.6%	37.8%	15.7%	4.1%	100.0%	114
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	5.8%	6.6%	27.6%	47.7%	12.4%	100.0%	117
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	25.4%	12.4%	28.3%	26.7%	7.2%	100.0%	111
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	28.8%	13.2%	17.1%	28.9%	12.1%	100.0%	120

Table 10: Climate: CSU Overall

,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,							
Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Tota (Pct P	-
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	0.0%	3.0%	31.6%	57.4%	7.9%	100.0%	111
Improves the campus climate for all employees	7.0%	3.0%	33.5%	56.5%	0.0%	100.0%	111
Retains diverse employees	0.0%	3.0%	57.1%	33.8%	6.1%	100.0%	111
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	0.0%	7.2%	29.2%	60.5%	3.0%	100.0%	111
Encourages discussions related to diversity	0.0%	3.0%	21.5%	48.1%	27.4%	100.0%	111
Provides employees with a positive work experience	3.0%	4.2%	25.0%	64.7%	3.0%	100.0%	111
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.0%	3.0%	32.2%	55.6%	6.1%	100.0%	111

Table 11: Climate: Department/Unit

Table 11. Climate. Department/Offit							
Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months, please indicate your level of	Strongly		Neither agree		Strongly	Tota	I
agreement regarding the climate.	disagree	Disagree	nor disagree	Agree	agree	(Pct P	op)
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	6.5%	19.8%	35.5%	24.9%	13.3%	100.0%	109
Improves the campus climate for all employees	3.0%	24.5%	30.4%	31.9%	10.3%	100.0%	111
Retains diverse employees	7.3%	20.4%	42.9%	16.1%	13.3%	100.0%	111
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	0.0%	7.2%	29.2%	60.5%	3.0%	100.0%	111
Encourages discussions related to diversity	2.1%	20.5%	30.4%	39.8%	7.2%	100.0%	111
Provides employees with a positive work experience	11.2%	15.5%	20.2%	38.6%	14.5%	100.0%	111
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	7.3%	30.5%	24.3%	30.7%	7.2%	100.0%	111

Table 12: Communications: CSU Overall

Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about communications.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total (Pct Pop))
Communications are effective	0.0%	12.7%	21.6%	65.6%	0.0%	100.0% 10	8
Communications are timely	0.0%	12.7%	21.5%	54.2%	11.6%	100.0% 10	8
Communications are relevant	0.0%	19.7%	31.8%	46.3%	2.2%	100.0% 10	8
Communications are informative	2.9%	10.6%	23.1%	61.3%	2.2%	100.0% 10	8
Communications are motivating	6.0%	10.6%	32.5%	48.8%	2.2%	100.0% 10	8
Communications are honest	2.9%	10.6%	20.0%	59.1%	7.5%	100.0% 10	8
Communications are accessible	0.0%	0.0%	22.8%	74.0%	3.1%	100.0% 10	8

Table 13: Communications: Division/College

rable to: Communications: Division/Conlege							
Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate your level of			Neither				
agreement with the following statements about	Strongly		agree nor		Strongly	Total	
communications.	disagree	Disagree	disagree	Agree	agree	(Pct Po	pp)
Communications are effective	0.0%	11.6%	38.8%	45.4%	4.3%	100.0% 1	108
Communications are timely	2.2%	9.4%	28.0%	49.9%	10.6%	100.0% 1	108
Communications are relevant	3.1%	11.6%	23.1%	57.9%	4.3%	100.0% 1	108
Communications are informative	5.5%	3.2%	24.6%	62.3%	4.5%	100.0% 1	105
Communications are motivating	3.1%	14.7%	44.1%	33.8%	4.3%	100.0% 1	108
Communications are honest	5.3%	9.1%	27.5%	50.7%	7.4%	100.0% 1	108
Communications are accessible	0.0%	5.4%	25.6%	61.4%	7.6%	100.0% 1	106

Table 14: Communications: Department/Unit

Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate your level of			Neither			
agreement with the following statements about communications.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total (Pct Pop)
Communications are effective	20.0%	14.3%	21.2%	31.8%		100.0% 108
Communications are timely	15.6%	27.3%	17.8%	28.7%	10.6%	100.0% 108
Communications are relevant	6.3%	18.5%	11.4%	52.0%	11.8%	100.0% 108
Communications are informative	11.6%	9.4%	14.3%	54.2%	10.6%	100.0% 108
Communications are motivating	17.8%	19.0%	31.4%	24.3%	7.4%	100.0% 108
Communications are honest	18.8%	15.8%	17.8%	40.2%	7.4%	100.0% 108
Communications are accessible	3.1%	8.4%	29.2%	51.8%	7.4%	100.0% 108

Table 15: Communicated Feedback

	Yes, I have the opportunity to provide feedback	Maybe, I can provide feedback in limited situations	No, I don't have an opportunity to provide feedback	Total (Pct Po	p)
During the past 12 months, have you had the opportunity to communicate feedback to CSU?	44.4%	41.1%	14.4%	100.0% 1	80

Table 16: Responsiveness to Feedback

When I use the following channels,	Strongly		Neither agree		Strongly	Total	
leadership is responsive to my feedback:	disagree	Disagree	nor disagree	Agree	agree	(Pct Pop	o)
One on one conversations with my supervisor	3.7%	8.7%	12.4%	41.8%	33.5%	100.0% 9	93
My representation in shared governance (CPC, APC, or Faculty Council)	0.0%	10.1%	72.2%	17.7%	0.0%	100.0% 9	90
My service on committees	0.0%	11.3%	45.6%	35.8%	7.3%	100.0% 9	90
Annual review process	0.0%	6.2%	38.2%	40.7%	14.9%	100.0% 9	93
Input collection through anonymous surveys	0.0%	7.3%	54.1%	34.9%	3.7%	100.0% 9	93

Asked only of those respondents who yes or maybe had the opportunity to communicate feedback.

Table 17: Feedback Valued

When I give feedback it is	Strongly		Neither agree nor		Strongly	Total	
valued by:	disagree	Disagree	disagree	Agree	agree	(Pct Pop	o)
CSU overall	5.0%	7.3%	55.4%	32.2%	0.0%	100.0% 9) 3
My division/college	0.0%	6.2%	40.5%	48.2%	5.0%	100.0% 9) 3
My department/unit	15.4%	6.5%	19.4%	37.6%	21.0%	100.0% 8	38

Asked only of those respondents who yes or maybe had the opportunity to communicate feedback.

Table 18: Discriminatory Attitudes

Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes	Problematic at CSU		Problemation Division/Co	-	Problemation Department	_
are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	0.0%	*	1.9%	*	19.7%	24
Physical appearance	2.8%	3	2.8%	3	2.8%	3
Physical disability	0.0%	*	1.9%	*	10.6%	13
Mental disability	0.0%	*	1.9%	*	11.3%	14
Employment classification	13.2%	16	13.2%	16	32.9%	40
Gender identity	0.0%	*	1.9%	*	6.7%	8
Job title	8.4%	10	13.2%	16	36.8%	44
Parental status	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Religion	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Political affiliation	5.4%	6	5.4%	6	7.3%	9
Sexual orientation	2.8%	3	4.8%	6	6.7%	8
Socio-economic status	13.2%	16	11.2%	14	16.0%	19
Ethnic origin	0.0%	*	1.9%	*	4.8%	6
Veteran status	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Race or color	0.0%	*	1.9%	*	6.7%	8
Marital status	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.9%	5
Nationality/country of origin	0.0%	*	1.9%	*	4.8%	6
None/no response	73.9%	89	71.9%	87	48.3%	58

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option. * Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Table 19: Other Potential Problems

Please indicate if any of the following are	Problematic at CSU		Problemation Division/Co	•	Problematic in my Department/Unit		
currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	2.8%	3	
Bullying	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	14.3%	17	
Bias	12.9%	16	10.4%	12	34.0%	41	
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	2.8%	3	
Verbal abuse	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	4.8%	6	
None/no response	87.1%	105	89.6%	108	58.4%	70	

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Table 20: Gender

14010 201 0011401		
Gender (Select all that apply):	Pct	Pop
Agender	0.0%	*
Cisgender	17.4%	18
Trans / Transgender	0.0%	*
Non-binary / Gender Queer / Gender Non-Conforming	0.0%	*
Man	70.1%	74
Trans Man / Masculine	0.0%	*
Trans Woman / Feminine	0.0%	*
Two Spirit	0.0%	*
Woman	29.9%	31
Prefer not to disclose	0.0%	*
The gender I most closely align with is not listed (please specify)	0.0%	*

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option. * Values reported for items with n >= 3.

Table 21: Gender Scales

Table 21: Gender Scales									
Gender is often not easily captured through categorical measures. Gender is much more complex and nuanced. In an attempt to understand this complexity and how various genders experience the campus, we are using these scales to measure how individuals view themselves. Scaled measures of gender, as seen below, are also an attempt to understand the experiences of all genders on campus. In general, how do you see	Fe	minin	e	Ma	sculir	ne	Andr	ogyno	ous
yourself? (please answer all three scales)	Pct	Pop	Mean	Pct	Pop	Mean	Pct	Pop	Mean
0 Not at all	58.5%	57		17.9%	17		87.1%	84	
1	7.0%	7		7.3%	7		2.4%	*	
2	5.9%	6		0.0%	*		3.5%	3	
3	10.8%	10		3.5%	3		7.0%	7	
4	2.4%	*		17.7%	17		0.0%	*	
5	8.2%	8		18.8%	18		0.0%	*	
6 Very	7.3%	7		34.9%	34		0.0%	*	
Total	100.0%	97	1.45	100.0%	97	3.92	100.0%	97	.30

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Table 22: Race/Ethnicity

Race and/or Ethnicity (Select all that apply):	Pct	Pop
Native American or Alaska Native or First Nations	0.0%	*
Asian (can include Middle Eastern and North African)	0.0%	*
Black or African American (can include Middle Eastern and North African)	0.0%	*
Hispanic or Latinx	4.5%	5
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	*
White	94.5%	99
Prefer not to disclose	3.2%	3
The race/ethnicity I most closely align with is not listed (please specify)	0.0%	*

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Table 23: Black or African American

You indicated that you identify as Black or African American, please select any additional identities that		
you align with (select all that apply):	Pct	Pop
Black American	0.0%	*
Caribbean	0.0%	*
Eastern Africa (i.e., Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia)	0.0%	*
Central Africa (i.e., Congo, Zaire)	0.0%	*
Northern Africa (i.e., Morocco, Sudan)	0.0%	*
Southern Africa (i.e., South Africa)	0.0%	*
Western Africa (i.e., Ghana, Nigeria)	0.0%	*
Prefer not to disclose	0.0%	*
The Black identity that I most closely align with is not listed (please specify)	0.0%	*

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option. * Values reported for items with n >= 3.

Table 24: Native American or Alaska Native or First Nations

You indicated that you identify as Native American or Alaska Native or First Nations, please list your Tribal Nation affiliation(s) in the text box below.	Pct	Pop
Apache	0.0%	*
Cherokee	0.0%	*
Oglala Lakota Sioux	0.0%	*
Navajo/Diné	0.0%	*
Pueblo (e.g., Acoma, Cochiti, Taos)	0.0%	*
Another tribal affiliation	0.0%	*
Unknown/not disclosed	0.0%	*

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Table 25: Hispanic or Latinx

Table 20. Hispanie of Eather		
You indicated that you identify as Hispanic or Latinx, please select any additional identities that you		
align with (select all that apply):	Pct	Pop
Mexican or Chicano/a	50.0%	*
Caribbean	0.0%	*
Puerto Rican	0.0%	*
Cuban	0.0%	*
Central American	0.0%	*
South American	50.0%	*
Prefer not to disclose	0.0%	*
The Latinx/Hispanic identity that I most closely align with is not listed (please specify)	0.0%	*
Spanish or Portuguese	0.0%	*

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Categories coded from write-in responses.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Table 26: Asian

You indicated that you identify as Asian, please select any additional identities that you align with (select		
all that apply):	Pct	Pop
Central Asians (i.e., Afghani, Armenian, Azerbaijani, Georgians, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Mongolian, Tajik, Turkman, Uzbek)	0.0%	*
Southeast Asians (i.e., Bruneian, Burmese, Cambodian, Filipino, Hmong, Indonesian, Laotian, Malaysian, Mien, Singaporean, Timorese, Thai, Vietnamese)	0.0%	*
South Asians (i.e., Bangladeshi, Bhutanese, Indian, Maldivians, Nepali, Pakistani, Sri Lankan)	0.0%	*
East Asians (i.e., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Okinawan, Taiwanese, Tibetan)	0.0%	*
West Asians/Middle East (i.e., Bahrain, Rian, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen)	0.0%	*
Prefer not to disclose	0.0%	*
The Asian identity that I most closely align with is not listed (please specify)	0.0%	*

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Table 27: Hawaiian/Pacific Islander

You indicated that you identify as a Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, please select any additional identities that you align with (select all that apply):	Pct	Pop
Guamanian or Chamorro	0.0%	*
Native Hawaiian	0.0%	*
Samoan	0.0%	*
Prefer not to disclose	0.0%	*
The Pacific Islander identity that I most closely align with is not listed (please specify)	0.0%	*

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option. * Values reported for items with n >= 3.

Table 28: Disability

	Yes	No	Prefer not to respond	Total (Pct Pop))
Do you identify as a person with a disability?	10.8%	86.0%	3.1%	100.0%	108

Table 29: LGBTQIA+

	Yes	No	Unsure	Prefer not to respond	Total (Pct Pc	
Do you identify in the LGBTQIA+ community?	9.9%	83.7%	3.2%	3.2%	100.0%	105

Table 30: Department/Unit

	Pct	Рор
Colorado State Forest Service	100.0%	120
Total	100.0%	120

Table 31: Employee Type

	Pct	Pop
Admin Professional	89.6%	108
State Classified	10.4%	13
Total	100.0%	120

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Comparisons by Gender

The gender of respondents is based on responses to the multiple response gender survey question (Table 20). If a respondent selected 'Man' alone or in combination with 'Cisgender, they are coded a 'Man.' Similarly, if a respondent selected 'Woman' alone or in combination with 'Cisgender,' they are coded as 'Woman.' If a respondent selected any combination of 'Agender,' 'Non-binary/Gender Queer/Gender Non-Conforming,' 'Trans/Transgender,' 'Trans Man/Masculine,' 'Trans Woman/Feminine,' and/or 'Two Spirit' they are coded as 'Trans, non-binary, or non-conforming' (T/NB/NC). Gender could not be determined for respondents who skipped the question or selected 'Prefer not to disclose;' these respondents are excluded from these analyses.

Table 32: Work Culture

	Ma	Man		an	Over	rall
Thinking about your work environment during the past 12 months, please	(A))	(B)			
indicate your agreement with the following statements about work culture.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
WORK CULTURE OVERALL	51.9%	74	45.6%	31	50.0%	105
My department/unit promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	58.6% B	74	37.4%	31	52.3%	105
My department/unit treats all employees equitably	52.3%	74	44.8%	31	50.1%	105
My department/unit is open and transparent in communication	49.4%	74	37.4%	31	45.8%	105
My department/unit values employee input in major department/unit decisions	38.5%	74	37.4%	31	38.2%	105
My department/unit promotes respect for cultural differences	67.8%	74	37.4%	31	58.7%	105
	В					
My department/unit understands the value of diversity	63.2%	74	59.8%	31	62.2%	105
My department/unit communicates the importance of valuing diversity	72.4% B	74	44.8%	31	64.2%	105
I feel valued as an employee	52.3%	74	52.3%	31	52.3%	105
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	18.4%	74	44.8% A	31	26.3%	105
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	32.2%	74	37.4%	31	33.7%	105
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/unit	56.9%	74	44.8%	31	53.3%	105
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	50.6%	74	77.6% A	31	58.6%	105
I would recommend my department/unit as a place of employment	61.5% B	74	37.4%	31	54.3%	105

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

Table 33: Performance Review in Last Year

	Man		Woma	n	Overall		
	(A)		(B)				
Did you have a performance review in the last year?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	
Yes, I had a review	77.0%	57	77.6%	24	77.2%	81	
No, I did not have a review	23.0%	17	22.4%	7	22.8%	24	
Total	100.0%	74	100.0%	31	100.0%	105	

Results are based on two-sided tests. For each significant pair, the key of the category with the smaller column proportion appears in the category with the larger column proportion.

Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05^{a,b}

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

a. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

b. Cell counts of some categories are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing column proportions tests.

Table 34: Performance Review

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about	Man (A)		Man Woman (A) (B)			all
your most recent performance review.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
PERFORMANCE REVIEW OVERALL	74.6%	57	80.7%	24	76.5%	81
I am satisfied with the effort my supervisor put into my most recent performance review	67.9%	57	80.7%	24	71.8%	81
I fear negative job consequences if I am to raise an issue of unfair treatment during my review*	20.2%	57	19.3%	24	19.9%	81
I am aware of the process to mediate disagreements with my supervisor regarding my evaluation.	56.0%	57	61.5%	24	57.6%	81

Asked only of those respondents who had a performance review in the last year.

Table 35: Respect

Tubic Co. Noopeon	1				_	
	Man		Man Woma		Ove	rall
Thinking about your work environment during the past 12 months, please	(A)		(B)			
indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about respect.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
RESPECT OVERALL	51.5% B	74	35.4%	31	46.7%	105
My department/unit is treated with respect by other units within my college/division	33.9% B	74	14.9%	31	28.2%	105
My college/division is treated with respect by CSU	38.5%	74	47.7%	31	41.3%	105
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	66.1%	74	67.3%	31	66.4%	105
There is respect for religious differences in my department/unit	61.5%	74	29.9%	31	52.0%	105
	В					
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/unit	66.1% B	74	29.9%	31	55.3%	105
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/unit	43.1% B	74	22.4%	31	36.9%	105

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

Table 36: Favoritism

Burling the great 40 menths are resident to the second of	Man						Over	rall
During the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about favoritism. Favoritism plays a role in who gets:	Pct	Pop	Pct		Pct	Pop		
FAVORITISM OVERALL	40.6%		38.1%		39.8%			
Recognized within my department/unit	47.7%	74	55.2%	31	49.9%	105		
Resources in my department/unit	41.4%	74	40.2%	31	41.0%	105		
Professional development opportunities	23.0%	74	32.7%	31	25.9%	105		
Promoted in my department/unit	47.7%	74	47.7%	31	47.7%	105		
Hired in my department/unit	43.1%	74	14.9%	31	34.7%	105		
	В							

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item.

^{*}Reverse coded when included in overall ratinGa,b,c

a. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

b. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

c. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A. B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 37: Leadership Accountability: College/Division Leadership

	Man		Woman		Over	all
Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement	(A)	(B))		
about leadership accountability.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
COLLEGE/DIVISION LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY OVERALL	41.5%	74	26.2%	31	36.9%	105
	В					
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	29.3%	74	29.9%	31	29.5%	105
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	31.1%	74	14.9%	31	26.2%	105
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	17.3%	74	7.5%	31	14.3%	105
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	72.4%	74	44.8%	31	64.2%	105
	В					
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	49.4%	74	29.9%	31	43.6%	105
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	49.4%	74	29.9%	31	43.6%	105

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

- 1. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05
- 2. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 3. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 38: Leadership Accountability: Department/Unit Leadership

	Man		Woman		Over	all
Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement	(A)	A) (B))		
about leadership accountability.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY OVERALL	34.7%	74	29.9%	31	33.2%	105
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	33.9%	74	22.4%	31	30.5%	105
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	24.7%	74	22.4%	31	24.0%	105
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	20.1%	74	14.9%	31	18.6%	105
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	72.4%	74	44.8%	31	64.2%	105
	В					
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	38.5%	74	29.9%	31	35.9%	105
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	38.5%	74	37.4%	31	38.2%	105

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 39: Climate: CSU Overall

		Man		an	Over	rall
Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months, please	(A	(A)		(B)		
indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
CSU CLIMATE OVERALL	55.8%	74	79.7% A	31	63.0%	105
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	67.8%	74	62.6%	31	66.3%	105
Improves the campus climate for all employees	52.3%	74	77.6% A	31	59.9%	105
Retains diverse employees	29.3%	74	62.6% A	31	39.3%	105
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	52.3%	74	92.5% A	31	64.3%	105
Encourages discussions related to diversity	66.1%	74	92.5% A	31	74.0%	105
Provides employees with a positive work experience	66.1%	74	85.1% A	31	71.8%	105
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	56.9%	74	85.1% A	31	65.3%	105

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

Table 40: Climate: Department/Unit

	Man		Woman		Overall	
Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months, please	(A))	(B)			
indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT CLIMATE OVERALL	47.0% B	74	21.9%	29	39.9%	103
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	52.3% B	74	0.0%	29	37.5%	103
Improves the campus climate for all employees	47.7%	74	37.4%	31	44.6%	105
Retains diverse employees	33.9% B	74	14.9%	31	28.2%	105
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	52.3%	74	92.5% A	31	64.3%	105
Encourages discussions related to diversity	47.7%	74	44.8%	31	46.8%	105
Provides employees with a positive work experience	56.9%	74	44.8%	31	53.3%	105
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	47.7% B	74	22.4%	31	40.1%	105

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 41: Communications: CSU Overall

	Ма	n	Woman		Overal	
Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate	(A))	(B)			
your level of agreement with the following statements about communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
CSU COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	57.1%	74	81.4% A	31	64.4%	105
Communications are effective	56.9%	74	92.5% A	31	67.6%	105
Communications are timely	61.5%	74	82.2% A	31	67.7%	105
Communications are relevant	47.7%	74	55.2%	31	49.9%	105
Communications are informative	56.9%	74	85.1% A	31	65.3%	105
Communications are motivating	38.5%	74	85.1% A	31	52.4%	105
Communications are honest	61.5%	74	85.1% A	31	68.5%	105
Communications are accessible	77.0%	74	85.1%	31	79.4%	105

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

Table 42: Communications: Division/College

	Man		Woman		Over	rall
Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate	(A)		(B)			
your level of agreement with the following statements about communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
COLLEGE/DIVISION COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	56.6%	70	59.2%	29	57.4%	99
Communications are effective	49.4%	74	55.2%	31	51.2%	105
Communications are timely	63.2%	74	59.8%	31	62.2%	105
Communications are relevant	67.8%	74	55.2%	31	64.0%	105
Communications are informative	61.5%	70	85.1% A	31	68.8%	102
Communications are motivating	35.7%	74	47.7%	31	39.3%	105
Communications are honest	58.6%	74	62.6%	31	59.8%	105
Communications are accessible	72.4%	74	67.7%	29	71.1%	103

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 43: Communications: Department/Unit

·	Man		Woman		Over	rall
Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate	(A)		(B)			
your level of agreement with the following statements about communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	49.5%	74	56.6%	31	51.6%	105
Communications are effective	43.1%	74	52.3%	31	45.9%	105
Communications are timely	38.5%	74	44.8%	31	40.4%	105
Communications are relevant	58.6%	74	82.2%	31	65.7%	105
			Α			
Communications are informative	63.2%	74	74.7%	31	66.7%	105
Communications are motivating	33.9%	74	29.9%	31	32.7%	105
Communications are honest	47.7%	74	52.3%	31	49.1%	105
Communications are accessible	61.5%	74	59.8%	31	61.0%	105

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

- 1. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05
- 2. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 3. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 44: Communicated Feedback

During the past 12 months, have you had the opportunity to	Man (A)		Man Woman (A) (B)			Overa	all
communicate feedback to CSU?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	
Yes, I have the opportunity to provide feedback	32.2%	24	77.6% A	24	45.8%	48	
Maybe, I can provide feedback in limited situations	54.0% B	40	14.9%	5	42.3%	44	
No, I don't have an opportunity to provide feedback	13.8%	10	7.5%	*	11.9%	12	
Total	100.0%	74	100.0%	31	100.0%	105	

Results are based on two-sided tests. For each significant pair, the key of the category with the smaller column proportion appears in the category with the larger column proportion.

Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): $.05^*$ Values reported for items with $n \ge 3.1,2$

- 1. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 2. Cell counts of some categories are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing column proportions tests.

Table 45: Responsiveness to Feedback

When I use the following channels, leadership is responsive to my	Man (A)								Woman (B)		Over	all
feedback:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop						
RESPONSIVENESS TO FEEDBACK OVERALL	40.4%	63	57.2% A	27	45.4%	90						
One on one conversations with my supervisor	71.3%	63	83.8%	29	75.3%	93						
My representation in shared governance (CPC, APC, or Faculty Council)	12.7%	63	29.7%	27	17.7%	90						
My service on committees	41.4%	63	47.3%	27	43.1%	90						
Annual review process	50.0%	63	67.7%	29	55.6%	93						
Input collection through anonymous surveys	26.7%	63	64.6% A	29	38.6%	93						

Asked only of those respondents who yes or maybe had the opportunity to communicate feedback. Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

- 1. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05
- 2. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 3. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 46: Feedback Valued

	Man	Man Woman			Overa	Ш
	(A)		(B)			
When I give feedback it is valued by:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
FEEDBACK VALUED OVERALL	39.8%	59	58.6% A	29	46.0%	88
CSU overall	23.3%	63	51.5% A	29	32.2%	93
My division/college	46.7%	63	67.7%	29	53.3%	93
My department/unit	59.7%	59	56.5%	29	58.7%	88

Asked only of those respondents who yes or maybe had the opportunity to communicate feedback.

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

- 1. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05
- 2. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 3. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 47: Discriminatory Attitudes: CSU Overall

	Man		Woman		Overall	
Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Physical appearance	4.6%	3	0.0%	*	3.2%	3
Employment classification	18.4%	14	7.5%	*	15.1%	16
Job title	13.8%	10	0.0%	*	9.7%	10
Political affiliation	4.6%	3	0.0%	*	3.2%	3
Sexual orientation	4.6%	3	0.0%	*	3.2%	3
Socio-economic status	18.4%	14	7.5%	*	15.1%	16
None/no response	67.8%	50	85.1%	27	73.0%	77

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Table 48: Discriminatory Attitudes: Division/College

	Man		Woman		n Overa	
Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	0.0%	*	7.5%	*	2.2%	*
Physical appearance	4.6%	3	0.0%	*	3.2%	3
Physical disability	0.0%	*	7.5%	*	2.2%	*
Mental disability	0.0%	*	7.5%	*	2.2%	*
Employment classification	18.4%	14	7.5%	*	15.1%	16
Gender identity	0.0%	*	7.5%	*	2.2%	*
Job title	18.4%	14	7.5%	*	15.1%	16
Political affiliation	4.6%	3	0.0%	*	3.2%	3
Sexual orientation	4.6%	3	7.5%	*	5.5%	6
Socio-economic status	18.4%	14	0.0%	*	12.9%	14
Ethnic origin	0.0%	*	7.5%	*	2.2%	*
Race or color	0.0%	*	7.5%	*	2.2%	*
Nationality/country of origin	0.0%	*	7.5%	*	2.2%	*
None/no response	67.8%	50	77.6%	24	70.7%	74

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option. Statistical significance not tested.

Statistical significance not tested.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Table 49: Discriminatory Attitudes: Department/Unit

	Man		Woman		Overall	
Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	24.7%	18	17.8%	6	22.6%	24
Physical appearance	4.6%	3	0.0%	*	3.2%	3
Physical disability	10.9%	8	14.9%	5	12.1%	13
Mental disability	10.9%	8	17.8%	6	13.0%	14
Employment classification	43.1%	32	25.3%	8	37.8%	40
Gender identity	4.6%	3	14.9%	5	7.7%	8
Job title	43.1%	32	40.2%	13	42.2%	44
Political affiliation	4.6%	3	7.5%	*	5.5%	6
Sexual orientation	4.6%	3	14.9%	5	7.7%	8
Socio-economic status	23.0%	17	7.5%	*	18.3%	19
Ethnic origin	4.6%	3	7.5%	*	5.5%	6
Race or color	4.6%	3	14.9%	5	7.7%	8
Marital status	0.0%	*	14.9%	5	4.5%	5
Nationality/country of origin	4.6%	3	7.5%	*	5.5%	6
None/no response	43.1%	32	44.8%	14	43.6%	46

None/no response

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Statistical significance not tested.

* Values reported for items with n >= 3.

Table 50: Other Potential Problems: CSU Overall

	Man		Woman		Overall	
Please indicate if any of the following are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bullying	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bias	13.8%	10	7.5%	*	11.9%	12
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Verbal abuse	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
None/no response	86.2%	63	92.5%	29	88.1%	93

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option. Statistical significance not tested.

Table 51: Other Potential Problems: Division/College

	Man		Woman		Overall	
Please indicate if any of the following are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bullying	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bias	13.8%	10	7.5%	*	11.9%	12
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Verbal abuse	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
None/no response	86.2%	63	92.5%	29	88.1%	93

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Statistical significance not tested.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Table 52: Other Potential Problems: Department/Unit

·	Man		Woman		Overall	
Please indicate if any of the following are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	4.6%	3	0.0%	*	3.2%	3
Bullying	13.8%	10	22.4%	7	16.4%	17
Bias	38.5%	28	40.2%	13	39.0%	41
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	4.6%	3	0.0%	*	3.2%	3
Verbal abuse	4.6%	3	7.5%	*	5.5%	6
None/no response	52.3%	38	52.3%	16	52.3%	55

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option. Statistical significance not tested. * Values reported for items with n >= 3.

Comparisons by Racially Minoritized Status

Racially minoritized status is based on responses to the multiple response race and ethnicity survey question (Table 22). If a respondent selected only one race and that one race was Asian, Black, Hispanic or Latinx, Native American or Alaska Native or First Nations, or Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or they selected 'The race/ethnicity I most closely align with is not listed,' they are coded as racially minoritized. If a respondent selected one race and that one race was White, they are coded as non-racially minoritized. If a respondent selected more than one race in any combination, they are coded as racially minoritized. Racially minoritized status could not be determined for respondents who skipped the question or selected 'Prefer not to disclose;' these respondents are excluded from these analyses.

Table 53: Work Culture

Table 55: Work Culture	in					
Thinking about your work environment during the past 12 months, please indicate your agreement with the following statements about		Racially minoritized (A)		Non-racially minoritized (B)		rall
work culture.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
WORK CULTURE OVERALL	23.1%	5	51.4%	97	50.1%	102
My department/unit promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	0.0%	5	56.6% A	97	54.0%	102
My department/unit treats all employees equitably	0.0%	5	54.2% A	97	51.7%	102
My department/unit is open and transparent in communication	0.0%	5	49.7% A	97	47.4%	102
My department/unit values employee input in major department/unit decisions	0.0%	5	41.4%	97	39.4%	102
My department/unit promotes respect for cultural differences	0.0%	5	60.1% A	97	57.3%	102
My department/unit understands the value of diversity	50.0%	5	65.0%	97	64.3%	102
My department/unit communicates the importance of valuing diversity	50.0%	5	63.6%	97	63.0%	102
I feel valued as an employee	50.0%	5	54.2%	97	54.0%	102
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	50.0%	5	22.6%	97	23.8%	102
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	0.0%	5	33.0%	97	31.5%	102
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/unit	50.0%	5	51.8%	97	51.7%	102
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	50.0%	5	57.6%	97	57.3%	102
I would recommend my department/unit as a place of employment	0.0%	5	58.8% A	97	56.1%	102

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

Table 54: Performance Review in Last Year

Did you have a performance review in the last	Racially mino (A)	ritized	Non-racially mi	Overa	all	
year?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Yes, I had a review	100.0% ^a	5	75.3%	73	76.4%	78
No, I did not have a review	0.0% ^a	*	24.7%	24	23.6%	24
Total	100.0%	5	100.0%	97	100.0%	102

Results are based on two-sided tests. For each significant pair, the key of the category with the smaller column proportion appears in the category with the larger column proportion.

Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): $.05^*$ Values reported for items with $n \ge 3.5^{b,c}$

- a. This category is not used in comparisons because its column proportion is equal to zero or one.
- b. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- c. Cell counts of some categories are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing column proportions tests.

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 55: Performance Review

Table 33. I efformatice iteview								
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following	Racially minoritized (A)		minoritized minoritized		minoritized		Over	rall
statements about your most recent performance review.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop		
PERFORMANCE REVIEW OVERALL	83.3%	5	74.9%	73	75.4%	78		
I am satisfied with the effort my supervisor put into my most recent performance review	100.0%	5	68.6%	73	70.5%	78		
I fear negative job consequences if I am to raise an issue of unfair treatment during my review*	0.0%	5	22.1%	73	20.8%	78		
I am aware of the process to mediate disagreements with my supervisor regarding my evaluation.	50.0%	5	56.1%	73	55.8%	78		

Asked only of those respondents who had a performance review in the last year.

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

Table 56: Respect

Thinking about your work environment during the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements	Racially minoritized (A)		minoritized (A)		Non-racially minoritized (B)			
about respect.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop		
RESPECT OVERALL	8.3%	5	48.4% A	97	46.6%	102		
My department/unit is treated with respect by other units within my college/division	0.0%	5	27.1%	97	25.9%	102		
My college/division is treated with respect by CSU	0.0%	5	44.7% A	97	42.6%	102		
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	50.0%	5	69.6%	97	68.7%	102		
There is respect for religious differences in my department/unit	0.0%	5	52.9% A	97	50.4%	102		
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/unit	0.0%	5	56.4% A	97	53.8%	102		
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/unit	0.0%	5	40.0%	97	38.1%	102		

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item.

^{*}Reverse coded when included in overall ratinG^{a,b,c}

a. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A. B, C): .05

b. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

c. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 57: Favoritism

During the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about favoritism. Favoritism plays a role	Racially minoritized (A)		minoritized minoritized (A) (I		Non-rac minorit (B)	Ove	rall
in who gets:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	
FAVORITISM OVERALL	50.0%	5	38.0%	97	38.5%	102	
Recognized within my department/unit	50.0%	5	48.2%	97	48.3%	102	
Resources in my department/unit	50.0%	5	38.5%	97	39.1%	102	
Professional development opportunities	50.0%	5	25.6%	97	26.8%	102	
Promoted in my department/unit	50.0%	5	45.8%	97	46.0%	102	
Hired in my department/unit	50.0%	5	31.7%	97	32.5%	102	

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. a,b,c

Table 58: Leadership Accountability: College/Division Leadership

hinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level of		Racially minoritized (A)				•	Over	all
agreement about leadership accountability.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop		
COLLEGE/DIVISION LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY OVERALL	0.0%	5	37.7% A	97	35.9%	102		
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	0.0%	5	31.9%	97	30.5%	102		
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	0.0%	5	24.9%	97	23.8%	102		
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	0.0%	5	15.5%	97	14.8%	102		
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	0.0%	5	66.0% A	97	63.0%	102		
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	0.0%	5	43.7%	97	41.7%	102		
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	0.0%	5	43.7%	97	41.7%	102		

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

a. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

b. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

c. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 59: Leadership Accountability: Department/Unit Leadership

hinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level of		Racially minoritized (A)		minoritized minoritized		minoritized		minoritized		minoritized		all
agreement about leadership accountability.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop						
DEPARTMENT/UNIT LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY OVERALL	8.3%	5	35.6%	97	34.4%	102						
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	0.0%	5	33.0%	97	31.5%	102						
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	0.0%	5	26.0%	97	24.8%	102						
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	0.0%	5	20.1%	97	19.2%	102						
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	0.0%	5	66.0% A	97	63.0%	102						
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	0.0%	5	38.9%	97	37.1%	102						
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	0.0%	5	41.4%	97	39.4%	102						

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

Table 60: Climate: CSU Overall

Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months,	Racially Non-racially minoritized (A) (B)		minoritized		Over	all
please indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
CSU CLIMATE OVERALL	85.7%	5	60.6%	97	61.7%	102
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	50.0%	5	65.9%	97	65.1%	102
Improves the campus climate for all employees	100.0%	5	56.5%	97	58.5%	102
Retains diverse employees	100.0% B	5	34.2%	97	37.3%	102
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	100.0%	5	61.4%	97	63.1%	102
Encourages discussions related to diversity	100.0%	5	71.8%	97	73.1%	102
Provides employees with a positive work experience	50.0%	5	71.8%	97	70.8%	102
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	100.0%	5	62.4%	97	64.2%	102

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 61: Climate: Department/Unit

Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months,	Racially minoritized (A)		minoritized minoritized (Overall	
please indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT CLIMATE OVERALL	14.3%	5	41.6%	95	40.3%	99
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	0.0%	5	37.1%	95	35.4%	99
Improves the campus climate for all employees	0.0%	5	48.3% A	97	46.1%	102
Retains diverse employees	0.0%	5	27.1%	97	25.9%	102
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	100.0%	5	61.4%	97	63.1%	102
Encourages discussions related to diversity	50.0%	5	48.3%	97	48.4%	102
Provides employees with a positive work experience	50.0%	5	55.3%	97	55.1%	102
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	0.0%	5	43.5%	97	41.5%	102

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

Table 62: Communications: CSU Overall

Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please		Racially minoritized		ially ized	Over	all
indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about	(A)		(B)			
communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
CSU COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	92.9%	5	61.8%	97	63.2%	102
Communications are effective	100.0%	5	64.8%	97	66.5%	102
Communications are timely	100.0%	5	65.0%	97	66.6%	102
Communications are relevant	50.0%	5	48.2%	97	48.3%	102
Communications are informative	100.0%	5	62.4%	97	64.2%	102
Communications are motivating	100.0% B	5	48.5%	97	50.8%	102
Communications are honest	100.0%	5	65.9%	97	67.5%	102
Communications are accessible	100.0%	5	77.7%	97	78.7%	102

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 63: Communications: Division/College

Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about		Racially minoritized (A)		Non-racially minoritized (B)		rall
communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
COLLEGE/DIVISION COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	42.9%	5	56.6%	91	55.9%	96
Communications are effective	0.0%	5	51.9% A	97	49.5%	102
Communications are timely	0.0%	5	63.9% A	97	60.9%	102
Communications are relevant	50.0%	5	63.5%	97	62.8%	102
Communications are informative	100.0%	5	66.1%	94	67.7%	98
Communications are motivating	50.0%	5	36.6%	97	37.2%	102
Communications are honest	0.0%	5	61.3% A	97	58.5%	102
Communications are accessible	100.0%	5	68.6%	95	70.1%	99

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

- 1. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05
- 2. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 3. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 64: Communications: Department/Unit

Table on Communication Department Comm								
Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about	Racially minoritized (A)		minoritized minoritized		minoritized		Over	all
communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop		
DEPARTMENT/UNIT COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	57.1%	5	52.2%	97	52.4%	102		
Communications are effective	50.0%	5	47.3%	97	47.4%	102		
Communications are timely	0.0%	5	43.8%	97	41.8%	102		
Communications are relevant	100.0%	5	66.3%	97	67.9%	102		
Communications are informative	100.0%	5	63.9%	97	65.6%	102		
Communications are motivating	0.0%	5	35.4%	97	33.8%	102		
Communications are honest	50.0%	5	50.8%	97	50.7%	102		
Communications are accessible	100.0%	5	57.7%	97	59.7%	102		

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. a,b,c

Table 65: Communicated Feedback

During the past 12 months, have you had the opportunity to	Racially minoritized (A)		Non-racia minoritiz (B)	•	Over	all
communicate feedback to CSU?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Yes, I have the opportunity to provide feedback	100.0% ^a	5	44.7%	43	47.3%	48
Maybe, I can provide feedback in limited situations	0.0%ª	*	45.9%	44	43.8%	44
No, I don't have an opportunity to provide feedback	0.0% ^a	*	9.4%	9	9.0%	9
Total	100.0%	5	100.0%	97	100.0%	102

Results are based on two-sided tests. For each significant pair, the key of the category with the smaller column proportion appears in the category with the larger column proportion.

Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): $.05^*$ Values reported for items with n >= 3.

- a. This category is not used in comparisons because its column proportion is equal to zero or one.
- b. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- c. Cell counts of some categories are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing column proportions tests.

a. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

b. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

c. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 66: Responsiveness to Feedback

When I use the following channels, leadership is	minoritized mino		Non-racially minoritized (B)		Over	all
responsive to my feedback:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
RESPONSIVENESS TO FEEDBACK OVERALL	20.0%	5	46.8% A	85	45.4%	90
One on one conversations with my supervisor	50.0%	5	76.6%	88	75.3%	93
My representation in shared governance (CPC, APC, or Faculty Council)	0.0%	5	18.7%	85	17.7%	90
My service on committees	0.0%	5	45.5% A	85	43.1%	90
Annual review process	50.0%	5	55.9%	88	55.6%	93
Input collection through anonymous surveys	0.0%	5	40.6%	88	38.6%	93

Asked only of those respondents who yes or maybe had the opportunity to communicate feedback. Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

- 1. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05
- 2. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 3. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 67: Feedback Valued

	Racially minoritized (A)		Non-racially minoritized (B)		Overa	all
When I give feedback it is valued by:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
FEEDBACK VALUED OVERALL	50.0%	5	45.8%	83	46.0%	88
CSU overall	50.0%	5	31.2%	88	32.2%	93
My division/college	50.0%	5	53.5%	88	53.3%	93
My department/unit	50.0%	5	59.2%	83	58.7%	88

Asked only of those respondents who yes or maybe had the opportunity to communicate feedback. Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. a,b,c

- a. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05
- b. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- c. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 68: Discriminatory Attitudes: CSU Overall

Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently	Racially minoritized		Non-raci minoriti	Ove	1	
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Physical appearance	0.0%	*	3.5%	3	3.3%	3
Employment classification	0.0%	*	16.4%	16	15.6%	16
Job title	0.0%	*	10.5%	10	10.0%	10
Political affiliation	0.0%	*	3.5%	3	3.3%	3
Sexual orientation	0.0%	*	3.5%	3	3.3%	3
Socio-economic status	0.0%	*	16.4%	16	15.6%	16
None/no response	100.0%	5	70.7%	69	72.1%	73

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option. Statistical significance not tested.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Table 69: Discriminatory Attitudes: Division/College

Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently	Raciall minoritiz	,	Non-raci minoriti	Overall		
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	0.0%	*	2.4%	*	2.3%	*
Physical appearance	0.0%	*	3.5%	3	3.3%	3
Physical disability	0.0%	*	2.4%	*	2.3%	*
Mental disability	0.0%	*	2.4%	*	2.3%	*
Employment classification	0.0%	*	16.4%	16	15.6%	16
Gender identity	0.0%	*	2.4%	*	2.3%	*
Job title	0.0%	*	16.4%	16	15.6%	16
Political affiliation	0.0%	*	3.5%	3	3.3%	3
Sexual orientation	0.0%	*	5.9%	6	5.6%	6
Socio-economic status	0.0%	*	14.0%	14	13.3%	14
Ethnic origin	0.0%	*	2.4%	*	2.3%	*
Race or color	0.0%	*	2.4%	*	2.3%	*
Nationality/country of origin	0.0%	*	2.4%	*	2.3%	*
None/no response	100.0%	5	68.3%	66	69.8%	71

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option. Statistical significance not tested.

Table 70: Discriminatory Attitudes: Department/Unit

Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently	Racially minoritized		Non-raci minoritiz	Overall		
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	50.0%	*	18.6%	18	20.1%	20
Physical appearance	0.0%	*	3.5%	3	3.3%	3
Physical disability	0.0%	*	13.1%	13	12.5%	13
Mental disability	0.0%	*	14.1%	14	13.4%	14
Employment classification	50.0%	*	35.0%	34	35.7%	36
Gender identity	0.0%	*	8.3%	8	7.9%	8
Job title	50.0%	*	39.8%	39	40.3%	41
Political affiliation	0.0%	*	5.9%	6	5.6%	6
Sexual orientation	0.0%	*	8.3%	8	7.9%	8
Socio-economic status	0.0%	*	19.9%	19	19.0%	19
Ethnic origin	0.0%	*	5.9%	6	5.6%	6
Race or color	0.0%	*	8.3%	8	7.9%	8
Marital status	0.0%	*	4.8%	5	4.6%	5
Nationality/country of origin	0.0%	*	5.9%	6	5.6%	6
None/no response	50.0%	*	44.8%	43	45.1%	46

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option. Statistical significance not tested.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Table 71: Other Potential Problems: CSU Overall

Please indicate if any of the following are currently	Racially minoritized		Non-racia minoritiz	Overall		
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bullying	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bias	50.0%	*	10.5%	10	12.3%	12
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Verbal abuse	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
None/no response	50.0%	*	89.5%	87	87.7%	89

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Statistical significance not tested.

Table 72: Other Potential Problems: Division/College

Please indicate if any of the following are currently		Racially minoritized		Non-racially minoritized		
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bullying	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bias	50.0%	*	10.5%	10	12.3%	12
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Verbal abuse	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
None/no response	50.0%	*	89.5%	87	87.7%	89

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Statistical significance not tested.

Table 73: Other Potential Problems: Department/Unit

Please indicate if any of the following are currently	Raciall minoritiz	,	Non-racia minoritiz	Over	rall	
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	3.5%	3	3.3%	3
Bullying	0.0%	*	17.7%	17	16.9%	17
Bias	100.0%	5	33.9%	33	37.0%	38
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	3.5%	3	3.3%	3
Verbal abuse	0.0%	*	5.9%	6	5.6%	6
None/no response	0.0%	*	56.7%	55	54.0%	55

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Statistical significance not tested.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Comparisons by Employee Type

Employment type is based on the employee's current classification within the Human Resources system. State Classified (SC) employees are those with positions within the State Personnel System under Colorado statutes. Administrative professional (Admin Pro) employees hold positions exempt from the State Personnel System under Colorado statutes and are not faculty positions. Research Associates and Research Scientists are considered Admin Pro. Faculty includes all personnel who carry academic rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, master instructor, senior instructor, instructor, and faculty affiliate) and the University President. Faculty have been coded into two groups. Tenure and Tenure Track (T/TT) faculty include tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and faculty with transitional appointments. Contract, Continuing, and Adjunct (CCA) faculty include contract faculty, continuing faculty, and adjunct faculty as well as faculty with temporary, special, and/or senior teaching appointments. As employment type was included as part of the survey sample meta data (and not asked on the survey), employment type could not be determined for employees who completed a hard copy survey. These employees as well as other salaried employees are excluded from these analyses.

Table 74: Work Culture

	Admin Pro		sc		Over	all
Thinking about your work environment during the past 12 months, please	(A)		(B)			
indicate your agreement with the following statements about work culture.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
WORK CULTURE OVERALL	50.6%	105	44.8%	13	50.0%	117
My department/unit promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	48.0%	108	74.2%	13	50.7%	120
My department/unit treats all employees equitably	51.6%	105	37.1%	13	50.1%	117
My department/unit is open and transparent in communication	38.8%	108	74.2%	13	42.5%	120
			Α			
My department/unit values employee input in major department/unit decisions	38.6%	108	37.1%	13	38.4%	120
My department/unit promotes respect for cultural differences	57.1%	108	74.2%	13	58.9%	120
My department/unit understands the value of diversity	62.3%	105	74.2%	13	63.6%	117
My department/unit communicates the importance of valuing diversity	64.2%	105	74.2%	13	65.3%	117
I feel valued as an employee	52.3%	108	37.1%	13	50.7%	120
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	28.5%	108	0.0%	13	25.5%	120
	В					
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	35.7%	108	0.0%	13	32.0%	120
	В					
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/unit	53.3%	108	37.1%	13	51.6%	120
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	62.7%	108	25.8%	13	58.8%	120
	В					
I would recommend my department/unit as a place of employment	57.1%	108	37.1%	13	55.0%	120

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 75: Performance Review in Last Year

	Admin I	Pro	SC		Overa	II
	(A)		(B)			
Did you have a performance review in the last year?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Yes, I had a review	74.9%	81	100.0% ^a	13	77.5%	93
No, I did not have a review	25.1%	27	0.0% ^a	*	22.5%	27
Total	100.0%	108	100.0%	13	100.0%	120

Results are based on two-sided tests. For each significant pair, the key of the category with the smaller column proportion appears in the category with the larger column proportion.

Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): $.05^*$ Values reported for items with $n \ge 3.$

- a. This category is not used in comparisons because its column proportion is equal to zero or one.
- b. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- c. Cell counts of some categories are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing column proportions tests.

Table 76: Performance Review

	Admin Pro		SC		Over	all
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about	(A)		(B)			
your most recent performance review.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
PERFORMANCE REVIEW OVERALL	77.7%	81	75.3%	13	77.4%	93
I am satisfied with the effort my supervisor put into my most recent performance	77.5%	81	62.9%	13	75.5%	93
review						
I fear negative job consequences if I am to raise an issue of unfair treatment	14.2%	81	37.1%	13	17.3%	93
during my review*			Α			
I am aware of the process to mediate disagreements with my supervisor regarding	55.6%	81	62.9%	13	56.6%	93
my evaluation.						

Asked only of those respondents who had a performance review in the last year.

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item.

- 1. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A. B, C): .05
- 2. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 3. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 77: Respect

		Admir	Pro	SC	;	Ove	rall
Thinking about your work e	environment during the past 12 months, please	(A)	(B)			
indicate your level of agreer	ment with the following statements about respect.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
RESPECT OVERALL		46.7%	105	41.4%	13	46.2%	117
My department/unit is treated	with respect by other units within my college/division	29.7%	105	37.1%	13	30.5%	117
My college/division is treated	with respect by CSU	32.8%	108	62.9%	13	36.0%	120
				Α			
The people I interact with trea	at each other with respect	68.9%	108	37.1%	13	65.6%	120
		В					
There is respect for religious of	differences in my department/unit	53.6%	105	37.1%	13	51.8%	117
There is respect for liberal per	rspectives in my department/unit	59.8%	105	37.1%	13	57.3%	117
-	tive perspectives in my department/unit	35.5%	105	37.1%	13	35.7%	117
My department/unit is treated My college/division is treated. The people I interact with treatment is respect for religious of there is respect for liberal per	with respect by CSU at each other with respect differences in my department/unit rspectives in my department/unit tive perspectives in my department/unit	29.7% 32.8% 68.9% B 53.6% 59.8%	105 108 108 105 105	37.1% 62.9% A 37.1% 37.1%	13 13 13 13 13	30.5% 36.0% 65.6% 51.8% 57.3%	11 ¹ 12 ⁰ 11 ¹ 11 ¹

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

- 1. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A. B. C): .05
- 2. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 3. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

^{*}Reverse coded when included in overall ratinG^{1,2,3}

Table 78: Favoritism

	Admin Pro		SC		Over	all
During the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the	(A))	(B)			
following statements about favoritism. Favoritism plays a role in who gets:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
FAVORITISM OVERALL	37.8%	108	42.9%	13	38.3%	120
Recognized within my department/unit	47.0%	108	62.9%	13	48.7%	120
Resources in my department/unit	39.8%	108	25.8%	13	38.3%	120
Professional development opportunities	22.2%	108	25.8%	13	22.6%	120
Promoted in my department/unit	44.8%	108	62.9%	13	46.7%	120
Hired in my department/unit	35.2%	108	37.1%	13	35.4%	120

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. a,b,c

- a. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A. B. C): .05
- b. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- c. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 79: Leadership Accountability: College/Division Leadership

	Admin Pro		SC		Over	all
Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement about leadership accountability.	Pct	Pop	(B) Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
COLLEGE/DIVISION LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY OVERALL	30.7%			13		
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	25.1%	105	37.1%	13	26.4%	117
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	17.4%	105	74.2% A	13	23.5%	117
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	5.5%	105	74.2% A	13	12.8%	117
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	58.3%	105	74.2%	13	60.1%	117
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	35.8%	102	74.2% A	13	40.1%	114
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	37.7%	105	74.2% A	13	41.6%	117

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

- 1. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05
- 2. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 3. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 80: Leadership Accountability: Department/Unit Leadership

	Admin Pro		SC		Over	all
Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement	(A) ()		
about leadership accountability.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY OVERALL	32.2%	99	37.1%	13	32.8%	111
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	29.0%	105	37.1%	13	29.9%	117
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	22.6%	105	37.1%	13	24.1%	117
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	17.6%	102	37.1%	13	19.8%	114
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	58.3%	105	74.2%	13	60.1%	117
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	33.5%	99	37.1%	13	33.9%	111
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	41.4%	108	37.1%	13	41.0%	120

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

- a. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05
- b. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- c. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 81: Climate: CSU Overall

	Admin Pro		SC		Over	all
Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months, please	(A))	(B)			
indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
CSU CLIMATE OVERALL	60.6%	99	68.2%	13	61.5%	111
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	61.0%	99	100.0%	13	65.4%	111
			Α			
Improves the campus climate for all employees	55.7%	99	62.9%	13	56.5%	111
Retains diverse employees	36.9%	99	62.9%	13	39.9%	111
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	63.6%	99	62.9%	13	63.5%	111
Encourages discussions related to diversity	77.0%	99	62.9%	13	75.4%	111
Provides employees with a positive work experience	68.4%	99	62.9%	13	67.8%	111
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	61.5%	99	62.9%	13	61.7%	111

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

- 1. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05
- 2. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 3. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 82: Climate: Department/Unit

	Admin Pro		SC		Over	all
Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months, please	(A))	(B)			
indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT CLIMATE OVERALL	40.0%	96	37.1%	13	39.7%	109
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	38.3%	96	37.1%	13	38.2%	109
Improves the campus climate for all employees	42.8%	99	37.1%	13	42.1%	111
Retains diverse employees	28.5%	99	37.1%	13	29.4%	111
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	63.6%	99	62.9%	13	63.5%	111
Encourages discussions related to diversity	48.3%	99	37.1%	13	47.0%	111
Provides employees with a positive work experience	55.1%	99	37.1%	13	53.1%	111
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	38.0%	99	37.1%	13	37.9%	111

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. a,b,c

Table 83: Communications: CSU Overall

	Admin Pro		SC		Over	rall
Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate	(A)	(B)			
your level of agreement with the following statements about communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
CSU COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	62.3%	96	64.5%	13	62.6%	108
Communications are effective	66.0%	96	62.9%	13	65.6%	108
Communications are timely	69.5%	96	37.1%	13	65.8%	108
	В					
Communications are relevant	46.6%	96	62.9%	13	48.5%	108
Communications are informative	63.5%	96	62.9%	13	63.5%	108
Communications are motivating	49.4%	96	62.9%	13	50.9%	108
Communications are honest	67.1%	96	62.9%	13	66.6%	108
Communications are accessible	74.1%	96	100.0%	13	77.2%	108
			Α			

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

a. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A. B. C): .05

b. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

c. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 84: Communications: Division/College

	Admin Pro		SC		Over	all
Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate	(A)		(B)			
your level of agreement with the following statements about communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
COLLEGE/DIVISION COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	50.0%	90	96.3% A	13	55.7%	102
Communications are effective	43.1%	96	100.0% A	13	49.7%	108
Communications are timely	58.6%	96	74.2%	13	60.4%	108
Communications are relevant	57.2%	96	100.0% A	13	62.2%	108
Communications are informative	62.2%	92	100.0% A		66.7%	
Communications are motivating	30.0%	96	100.0% A	13	38.1%	108
Communications are honest	52.6%	96	100.0% A	13	58.1%	108
Communications are accessible	64.8%	93	100.0% A	13	69.0%	106

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

Table 85: Communications: Department/Unit

	Admin Pro		Admin Pro SC		Over	rall		
Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate	(A	(A)		A) (B))		
your level of agreement with the following statements about communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop		
DEPARTMENT/UNIT COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	50.5%	96	47.7%	13	50.2%	108		
Communications are effective	45.5%	96	37.1%	13	44.6%	108		
Communications are timely	39.5%	96	37.1%	13	39.3%	108		
Communications are relevant	62.4%	96	74.2%	13	63.8%	108		
Communications are informative	63.5%	96	74.2%	13	64.8%	108		
Communications are motivating	31.1%	96	37.1%	13	31.8%	108		
Communications are honest	49.1%	96	37.1%	13	47.7%	108		
Communications are accessible	62.2%	96	37.1%	13	59.2%	108		
	•							

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

^{1.} Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05

^{2.} Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

^{3.} Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

a. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05
b. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

c. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 86: Communicated Feedback

	Admin Pro		Admin Pro		SC		Overa	all
During the past 12 months, have you had the opportunity to	(A)		(A)		(B)			
communicate feedback to CSU?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop		
Yes, I have the opportunity to provide feedback	46.9%	45	25.8%	3	44.4%	48		
Maybe, I can provide feedback in limited situations	36.8%	35	74.2%	9	41.1%	44		
			Α					
No, I don't have an opportunity to provide feedback	16.3%	16	$0.0\%^{1}$	*	14.4%	16		
Total	100.0%	96	100.0%	13	100.0%	108		

Results are based on two-sided tests. For each significant pair, the key of the category with the smaller column proportion appears in the category with the larger column proportion.

Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): $.05^*$ Values reported for items with $n \ge 3.2,3$

- 1. This category is not used in comparisons because its column proportion is equal to zero or one.
- 2. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 3. Cell counts of some categories are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing column proportions tests.

Table 87: Responsiveness to Feedback

	Admin Pro		Pro SC		Admin Pro SC		Over	all
When I use the following channels, leadership is responsive to my	(A)	(A) (B)		(B)				
feedback:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop		
RESPONSIVENESS TO FEEDBACK OVERALL	43.4%	78	57.7%	13	45.4%	90		
One on one conversations with my supervisor	77.2%	80	62.9%	13	75.3%	93		
My representation in shared governance (CPC, APC, or Faculty Council)	10.4%	78	62.9% A	13	17.7%	90		
My service on committees	33.9%	78	100.0% A	13	43.1%	90		
Annual review process	54.4%	80	62.9%	13	55.6%	93		
Input collection through anonymous surveys	44.6% B	80	0.0%	13	38.6%	93		

Asked only of those respondents who yes or maybe had the opportunity to communicate feedback. Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

The reported population reflects the number of respondents who answered the survey item. 1,2,3

- 1. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05
- 2. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 3. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 88: Feedback Valued

	Admin I				Overa	ıll
When I give feedback it is valued by:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
FEEDBACK VALUED OVERALL	44.0%	80	66.7%	8	46.0%	88
CSU overall	27.4%	80	62.9% A	13	32.2%	93
My division/college	45.9%	80	100.0% A	13	53.3%	93
My department/unit	58.6%	80	59.0%	8	58.7%	88

Asked only of those respondents who yes or maybe had the opportunity to communicate feedback. Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

- 1. Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears in the category with the larger mean. Significance level for upper case letters (A, B, C): .05
- 2. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.
- 3. Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 89: Discriminatory Attitudes: CSU Overall

	Admin Pro		SC		Overall	
Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Physical appearance	3.1%	3	0.0%	*	2.8%	3
Employment classification	14.7%	16	0.0%	*	13.2%	16
Job title	9.4%	10	0.0%	*	8.4%	10
Political affiliation	6.0%	6	0.0%	*	5.4%	6
Sexual orientation	3.1%	3	0.0%	*	2.8%	3
Socio-economic status	14.7%	16	0.0%	*	13.2%	16
None/no response	70.8%	76	100.0%	13	73.9%	89

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option. Statistical significance not tested.

Table 90: Discriminatory Attitudes: Division/College

,	Admin Pro		Admin Pro SC			all
Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	2.2%	*	0.0%	*	1.9%	*
Physical appearance	3.1%	3	0.0%	*	2.8%	3
Physical disability	2.2%	*	0.0%	*	1.9%	*
Mental disability	2.2%	*	0.0%	*	1.9%	*
Employment classification	14.7%	16	0.0%	*	13.2%	16
Gender identity	2.2%	*	0.0%	*	1.9%	*
Job title	14.7%	16	0.0%	*	13.2%	16
Political affiliation	6.0%	6	0.0%	*	5.4%	6
Sexual orientation	5.3%	6	0.0%	*	4.8%	6
Socio-economic status	12.5%	14	0.0%	*	11.2%	14
Ethnic origin	2.2%	*	0.0%	*	1.9%	*
Race or color	2.2%	*	0.0%	*	1.9%	*
Nationality/country of origin	2.2%	*	0.0%	*	1.9%	*
None/no response	68.7%	74	100.0%	13	71.9%	87

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option. Statistical significance not tested.

Table 91: Discriminatory Attitudes: Department/Unit

	Admin Pro		SC		Over	all
Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	14.7%	16	62.9%	8	19.7%	24
Physical appearance	3.1%	3	0.0%	*	2.8%	3
Physical disability	7.5%	8	37.1%	5	10.6%	13
Mental disability	5.3%	6	62.9%	8	11.3%	14
Employment classification	29.4%	32	62.9%	8	32.9%	40
Gender identity	7.5%	8	0.0%	*	6.7%	8
Job title	33.8%	36	62.9%	8	36.8%	44
Political affiliation	8.2%	9	0.0%	*	7.3%	9
Sexual orientation	7.5%	8	0.0%	*	6.7%	8
Socio-economic status	17.9%	19	0.0%	*	16.0%	19
Ethnic origin	5.3%	6	0.0%	*	4.8%	6
Race or color	7.5%	8	0.0%	*	6.7%	8
Marital status	4.4%	5	0.0%	*	3.9%	5
Nationality/country of origin	5.3%	6	0.0%	*	4.8%	6
None/no response	49.6%	54	37.1%	5	48.3%	58

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Statistical significance not tested. * Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Table 92: Other Potential Problems: CSU Overall

	Admin Pro		SC		Overall	
Please indicate if any of the following are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bullying	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bias	14.4%	16	0.0%	*	12.9%	16
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Verbal abuse	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
None/no response	85.6%	92	100.0%	13	87.1%	105

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Statistical significance not tested.

Table 93: Other Potential Problems: Division/College

	Admin Pro		SC		SC Overa	
Please indicate if any of the following are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bullying	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bias	11.6%	12	0.0%	*	10.4%	12
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Verbal abuse	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
None/no response	88.4%	95	100.0%	13	89.6%	108

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Table 94: Other Potential Problems: Department/Unit

	Admin	Admin Pro		Admin Pro SC		SC Overa		all
Please indicate if any of the following are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop		
Sexual harassment	3.1%	3	0.0%	*	2.8%	3		
Bullying	15.9%	17	0.0%	*	14.3%	17		
Bias	30.7%	33	62.9%	8	34.0%	41		
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*		
Sexual misconduct	3.1%	3	0.0%	*	2.8%	3		
Verbal abuse	5.3%	6	0.0%	*	4.8%	6		
None/no response	60.9%	66	37.1%	5	58.4%	70		

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Statistical significance not tested.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.

Statistical significance not tested.

^{*} Values reported for items with $n \ge 3$.