# **Employee Climate Survey 2021**

# **Central Administration**

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*
Central Administration	126	2	7	55	44.4%
Administrative Communications	2	0	0	2	100.0%
Center for the New Energy Economy	8	0	0	3	37.5%
Graduate Program in Ecology-SAU	1	0	0	1	100.0%
Graduate Program in Public Health-SAU	7	0	0	1	14.3%
Honors Program	21	0	1	6	28.6%
Institute for Learning & Teaching	25	0	1	16	64.0%
Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness	8	0	3	3	37.5%
Military Studies	2	1	0	0	0.0%
Office of Inclusive Excellence	7	0	0	5	71.4%
Payroll	4	0	0	1	25.0%
Presidents Office	8	0	0	3	37.5%
Provost/Executive Vice President	11	1	1	5	50.0%
School of Global Environmental Sustainability-SAU	14	0	1	4	28.6%
VP Faculty Affairs	4	0	0	2	50.0%
Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs	4	0	0	3	75.0%

<sup>\*</sup> 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 the Table 2.

Table 2: 2021 Employee Climate Survey Weighting Results

		Division population norm	Unweighted survey sample	Weighted survey population
Respondent gender	Man	28%	18%	26%
	Woman	73%	78%	69%
	Trans, nonbinary, nonconforming (T/NB/NC)		5%	5%
Racially minoritized	Racially minoritized	24%	14%	26%
status	Non-racially minoritized	76%	86%	74%
Employee type	Admin Professional	75%	73%	74%
	Contract, continuing, and adjunct (CCA)	14%	11%	14%
	Tenure or Tenure-track (T/TT) Faculty	0%	0%	0%
	State Classified	9%	16%	12%
	Other Salaried Employee	1%	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** 

Thinking about your work environment during the past 12 months, please indicate your			Neither				
agreement with the following statements about	Strongly		agree nor		Strongly	Total	
work culture.	disagree	Disagree	disagree	Agree	agree	(Pct   Po	pp)
My department/unit promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	5.1%	11.6%	15.5%	42.2%	25.6%	100.0% 1	124
My department/unit treats all employees equitably	10.6%	14.6%	8.9%	34.6%	31.3%	100.0% 1	124
My department/unit is open and transparent in communication	8.7%	27.4%	21.8%	22.7%	19.4%	100.0% 1	124
My department/unit values employee input in major department/unit decisions	10.2%	14.8%	17.4%	35.0%	22.6%	100.0% 1	124
My department/unit promotes respect for cultural differences	1.8%	8.7%	9.5%	38.6%	41.4%	100.0% 1	124
My department/unit understands the value of diversity	1.8%	5.5%	6.9%	38.1%	47.6%	100.0% 1	124
My department/unit communicates the importance of valuing diversity	0.0%	2.1%	8.5%	44.6%	44.8%	100.0% 1	124
I feel valued as an employee	5.1%	13.5%	8.4%	47.5%	25.5%	100.0% 1	124
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	8.7%	13.7%	34.8%	27.3%	15.5%	100.0% 1	124
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	4.7%	16.9%	28.0%	33.0%	17.2%	100.0% 1	124
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/unit	6.6%	12.0%	21.9%	35.1%	24.4%	100.0%	124
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	1.8%	13.4%	23.4%	47.8%	13.6%	100.0% 1	124
I would recommend my department/unit as a place of employment	3.3%	14.1%	23.0%	37.4%	22.3%	100.0% 1	124

**Table 4: Performance Review in Last Year** 

			Total	
	Yes, I had a review	No, I did not have a review	(Pct   Po	p)
Did you have a performance review in the last year?	81.2%	18.8%	100.0%	124

Table 5: Performance Review

Table 5: I criomidice iteview							
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 (Pct   Pop	<b>)</b>
I am satisfied with the effort my supervisor put into my most recent performance review	8.3%	10.5%	7.7%	37.0%	36.5%	100.0% 9	9
I fear negative job consequences if I am to raise an issue of unfair treatment during my review	30.7%	26.7%	23.0%	15.5%	4.1%	100.0% 9	9
I am aware of the process to mediate disagreements with my supervisor regarding my evaluation.	4.1%	5.4%	21.1%	47.8%	21.5%	100.0% 9	9

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

Table 6: Respect

Tubio V. Noopoot							
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	1.9%	9.6%	24.0%	48.3%	16.2%	100.0%	122
My college/division is treated with respect by CSU	6.7%	10.7%	17.0%	49.5%	16.1%	100.0%	122
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	0.0%	4.8%	11.2%	55.0%	29.1%	100.0%	122
There is respect for religious differences in my department/unit	3.3%	5.2%	22.9%	38.7%	29.9%	100.0%	122
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/unit	3.3%	3.3%	16.6%	39.8%	37.0%	100.0%	122
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/unit	3.3%	17.3%	23.6%	36.8%	19.1%	100.0%	122

#### 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	11.3%	35.1%	28.3%	13.4%	11.9%	100.0% 118
Resources in my department/unit	11.3%	44.5%	20.0%	10.7%	13.5%	100.0% 118
Professional development opportunities	13.3%	47.9%	23.5%	4.7%	10.5%	100.0% 118
Promoted in my department/unit	11.3%	40.4%	24.2%	13.1%	10.9%	100.0% 118
Hired in my department/unit	14.8%	49.5%	16.3%	8.6%	10.7%	100.0% 118

Table 8: Leadership Accountability: College/Division Leadership

Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement about	Strongly	•	Neither agree	A	Strongly	Total	
leadership accountability.	disagree	Disagree	nor disagree	Agree	agree	(Pct   Pc	pp)
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	10.0%	8.7%	49.1%	18.9%	13.2%	100.0%	108
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	6.0%	8.1%	51.6%	22.0%	12.3%	100.0%	106
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	4.2%	13.6%	51.8%	21.6%	8.7%	100.0%	108
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	7.9%	7.9%	28.5%	35.5%	20.2%	100.0%	108
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	11.4%	10.1%	34.7%	35.5%	8.4%	100.0%	107
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	11.2%	16.7%	45.6%	13.3%	13.1%	100.0%	108

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	5.8%	14.5%	33.3%	31.6%	14.9%	100.0%	108
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	5.8%	7.0%	35.3%	38.2%	13.7%	100.0%	108
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	4.2%	19.8%	39.8%	25.9%	10.3%	100.0%	108
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	7.9%	7.9%	28.5%	35.5%	20.2%	100.0%	108
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	8.0%	11.3%	24.5%	46.1%	10.0%	100.0%	107
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	7.9%	21.6%	23.8%	30.3%	16.4%	100.0%	108

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	4.2%	18.3%	34.6%	35.3%	7.6%	100.0%	108
Improves the campus climate for all employees	8.4%	23.2%	30.2%	30.3%	7.9%	100.0%	108
Retains diverse employees	13.7%	26.0%	39.9%	16.5%	4.0%	100.0%	106
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	11.7%	17.5%	33.9%	27.0%	9.9%	100.0%	108
Encourages discussions related to diversity	8.4%	3.3%	9.9%	40.0%	38.4%	100.0%	108
Provides employees with a positive work experience	7.9%	20.3%	21.6%	40.7%	9.5%	100.0%	108
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	10.0%	5.0%	36.6%	31.2%	17.3%	100.0%	108

Table 11: Climate: Department/Unit

Table 11. Olimate. Department/Olit							
Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Tota (Pct   P	-
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	2.1%	10.3%	27.3%	38.6%	21.7%	100.0%	
Improves the campus climate for all employees	7.9%	7.4%	16.1%	46.8%	21.8%	100.0%	108
Retains diverse employees	8.1%	21.2%	25.0%	39.6%	6.1%	100.0%	106
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	11.7%	17.5%	33.9%	27.0%	9.9%	100.0%	108
Encourages discussions related to diversity	6.3%	1.6%	10.3%	42.8%	39.0%	100.0%	108
Provides employees with a positive work experience	7.9%	6.3%	20.8%	43.5%	21.4%	100.0%	108
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	7.9%	2.1%	29.5%	35.4%	25.2%	100.0%	108

**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	10.7%	16.1%	15.4%	46.3%	11.5%	100.0% 106
Communications are timely	8.6%	11.2%	18.6%	47.1%	14.5%	100.0% 106
Communications are relevant	6.4%	11.9%	29.5%	40.6%	11.5%	100.0% 106
Communications are informative	2.1%	13.6%	21.2%	49.2%	13.8%	100.0% 106
Communications are motivating	8.6%	18.2%	40.9%	26.9%	5.4%	100.0% 106
Communications are honest	12.4%	20.6%	24.1%	33.6%	9.4%	100.0% 106
Communications are accessible	6.4%	6.0%	21.8%	56.4%	9.4%	100.0% 106

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	p)
Communications are effective	3.8%	13.5%	38.6%	25.2%	18.9%	100.0% 1	106
Communications are timely	4.3%	5.1%	33.5%	38.6%	18.5%	100.0% 1	06
Communications are relevant	2.1%	7.2%	28.6%	44.8%	17.3%	100.0% 1	06
Communications are informative	2.2%	5.2%	27.6%	45.7%	19.3%	100.0% 1	04
Communications are motivating	2.1%	13.2%	64.5%	5.5%	14.7%	100.0% 1	06
Communications are honest	10.2%	5.7%	39.7%	25.4%	18.9%	100.0% 1	06
Communications are accessible	2.1%	6.4%	34.9%	38.8%	17.7%	100.0% 1	06

Table 14: Communications: Department/Unit

Table 14: Communications: Department/Unit						
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	9.4%	10.6%	21.0%	37.4%	21.5%	100.0% 106
Communications are timely	7.7%	1.7%	17.6%	48.5%	24.5%	100.0% 106
Communications are relevant	2.1%	7.2%	15.5%	51.9%	23.2%	100.0% 106
Communications are informative	2.1%	6.7%	10.1%	57.8%	23.2%	100.0% 106
Communications are motivating	2.1%	16.5%	48.5%	18.2%	14.7%	100.0% 106
Communications are honest	10.4%	5.8%	24.1%	39.7%	20.1%	100.0% 104
Communications are accessible	2.1%	6.0%	26.0%	45.3%	20.7%	100.0% 106

**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   Pc	
During the past 12 months, have you had the opportunity to communicate feedback to CSU?	46.0%	46.3%	7.6%	100.0%	106

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   Po	p)
One on one conversations with my supervisor	4.2%	4.7%	10.7%	43.5%	36.8%	100.0%	96
My representation in shared governance (CPC, APC, or Faculty Council)	4.9%	7.0%	60.2%	19.9%	8.0%	100.0%	<del>)</del> 6
My service on committees	2.4%	4.4%	63.6%	27.8%	1.9%	100.0%	96
Annual review process	6.8%	10.3%	23.9%	37.5%	21.5%	100.0%	<b>}</b> 6
Input collection through anonymous surveys	2.4%	13.1%	51.7%	25.9%	6.9%	100.0%	<del>)</del> 4

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 valued by:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total (Pct   Pop
CSU overall	15.1%			13.1%		100.0% 96
My division/college	4.3%	15.5%	31.0%	34.4%	14.7%	100.0% 93
My department/unit	4.2%	15.3%	8.4%	45.9%	26.2%	100.0% 96

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

Table 18: Discriminatory Attitudes

Table 16: Discriminatory Attitudes	Duablance	-4!4	Duchlametia	in ha	Duablametia	:		
Disease in disease if diseases in terms of the des							Problematic	_
Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes	1		i	_	Departmen			
are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop		
Age	15.4%	19	10.3%	13	13.2%	16		
Physical appearance	9.8%	12	3.6%	5	3.6%	5		
Physical disability	19.2%	24	7.3%	9	7.3%	9		
Mental disability	17.8%	22	7.3%	9	10.2%	13		
Employment classification	36.2%	45	5.5%	7	5.5%	7		
Gender identity	26.7%	33	8.7%	11	10.2%	13		
Job title	32.2%	40	9.5%	12	6.2%	8		
Parental status	14.2%	18	1.8%	*	1.8%	*		
Religion	21.5%	27	3.3%	4	3.3%	4		
Political affiliation	16.8%	21	1.4%	*	1.4%	*		
Sexual orientation	19.2%	24	3.6%	5	3.6%	5		
Socio-economic status	20.3%	25	6.9%	9	6.9%	9		
Ethnic origin	27.9%	35	5.5%	7	5.5%	7		
Veteran status	1.4%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*		
Race or color	32.4%	40	3.3%	4	1.8%	*		
Marital status	5.5%	7	1.8%	*	1.8%	*		
Nationality/country of origin	17.8%	22	1.8%	*	1.8%	*		
None/no response	41.5%	52	76.6%	95	78.5%	98		

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		Problematic Division/Co	•	Problematic in my Department/Unit		
currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	
Sexual harassment	21.0%	26	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	
Bullying	18.5%	23	8.3%	10	11.2%	14	
Bias	38.6%	48	6.9%	9	6.9%	9	
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	
Sexual misconduct	6.2%	8	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	
Verbal abuse	20.0%	25	8.3%	10	8.3%	10	
None/no response	57.1%	71	91.7%	114	88.8%	111	

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

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

Table 20: Gender

Gender (Select all that apply):	Pct	Pop
Agender	0.0%	*
Cisgender	23.6%	25
Trans / Transgender	2.1%	*
Non-binary / Gender Queer / Gender Non-Conforming	4.3%	5
Man	21.9%	23
Trans Man / Masculine	0.0%	*
Trans Woman / Feminine	0.0%	*
Two Spirit	0.0%	*
Woman	58.8%	62
Prefer not to disclose	10.7%	11
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		minin	е	Ma	sculir	ne	Androgynous		
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	Pct	Don	Moon	Dot	Don	Moon	Dot	Don	Moon
yourself? (please answer all three scales)			Mean		_	Mean	Pct	_ •	Mean
0 Not at all	23.5%	21		37.4%	34		71.3%	64	
1	2.7%	*		13.4%	12		12.7%	11	
2	0.0%	*		14.9%	13		5.0%	5	
3	15.9%	14		6.0%	5		4.5%	4	
4	21.3%	19		9.4%	9		3.9%	4	
5	5.4%	5		10.7%	10		0.0%	*	
6 Very	31.1%	28		8.1%	7		2.5%	*	
Total	100.0%	90	3.50	100.0%	90	2.01	100.0%	90	.67

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

# Table 22: Race/Ethnicity

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)	5.9%	6
Black or African American (can include Middle Eastern and North African)	6.4%	7
Hispanic or Latinx	10.7%	11
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	*
White	74.3%	79
Prefer not to disclose	10.7%	11
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.

\* Values reported for items with n >= 3.

#### 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	33.5%	*
Caribbean	66.5%	5
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.

Categories coded from write-in responses.

#### **Table 25: Hispanic or Latinx**

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	60.1%	7
Caribbean	0.0%	*
Puerto Rican	39.9%	5
Cuban	39.9%	5
Central American	0.0%	*
South American	0.0%	*
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.

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

<sup>\*</sup> 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)	100.0%	6
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. \* Values reported for items with n >= 3.

# 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?	25.4%	59.9%	14.7%	100.0% 106

# Table 29: LGBTQIA+

	Yes	No	Unsure	Prefer not to respond	Total (Pct   Pc	
Do you identify in the LGBTQIA+ community?	17.4%	76.1%	2.1%	4.3%	100.0%	106

Table 30: Department/Unit

	Pct	Pop
Administrative Communications	3.9%	5
Center for the New Energy Economy	4.7%	6
Graduate Program in Ecology-SAU	1.1%	*
Graduate Program in Public Health-SAU	1.8%	*
Honors Program	12.2%	15
Institute for Learning & Teaching	25.5%	32
Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness	8.3%	10
Office of Inclusive Excellence	13.8%	17
Payroll	1.4%	*
Presidents Office	4.8%	6
Provost/Executive Vice President	6.9%	9
School of Global Environmental Sustainability-SAU	7.7%	10
VP Faculty Affairs	2.8%	4
Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs	5.1%	6
Total	100.0%	124

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

# Employee Climate Survey 2021

# Table 31: Employee Type

, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	Pct	Pop
Admin Professional	74.3%	92
CCAF Faculty	13.7%	17
State Classified	12.0%	15
Total	100.0%	124

# **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

Thinking shout your work environment during the next 12	Man		Wom	nan	T/NB/	NC:	Ove	rall
Thinking about your work environment during the past 12 months, please indicate your agreement with the following		(A)			(C)	_	OVE	an
statements about work culture.	Pct	Pop	Pct			Pop	Pct	Pop
WORK CULTURE OVERALL	64.7%	_	68.6%			_	66.6%	
My department/unit promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	63.4%	23	75.0%	62	50.0%	5	70.8%	90
My department/unit treats all employees equitably	63.4%	23	67.6%	62	50.0%	5	65.6%	90
My department/unit is open and transparent in communication	47.9%	23	44.2%	62	50.0%	5	45.4%	90
My department/unit values employee input in major department/unit decisions	47.9%	23	67.8%	62	50.0%	5	61.8%	90
My department/unit promotes respect for cultural differences	84.5%	23	87.7%	62	50.0%	5	85.0%	90
My department/unit understands the value of diversity	100.0% C	23	97.2% C	62	50.0%	5	95.5%	90
My department/unit communicates the importance of valuing diversity	73.9%	23	95.8% A	62	100.0%	5	90.4%	90
I feel valued as an employee	58.4%	23	87.3% A	62	50.0%	5	78.0%	90
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	31.5%	23	40.6%	62	50.0%	5	38.8%	90
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	73.9% B	23	43.5%	62	50.0%	5	51.6%	90
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/unit	63.4%	23	62.1%	62	50.0%	5	61.8%	90
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	58.4% C	23	67.8% C	62	0.0%	5	61.9%	90
I would recommend my department/unit as a place of employment	73.9%	23	54.8%	62	50.0%	5	59.5%	90

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** 

Did you have a performance review in the last	Man (A)		Woman (B)		T/NB/N (C)	С	Overa	ıll
year?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Yes, I had a review	79.0%	18	81.4%	51	100.0% <sup>a</sup>	5	81.7%	74
No, I did not have a review	21.0%	5	18.6%	12	0.0% <sup>a</sup>	*	18.3%	17
Total	100.0%	23	100.0%	62	100.0%	5	100.0%	90

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.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

**Table 34: Performance Review** 

	Man		Man Woman		an	T/NB/	NC	Over	all					
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following	(A)		(A)		(A)		(A)		(B	)	(C)	)		
statements about your most recent performance review.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop						
PERFORMANCE REVIEW OVERALL	80.3%	18	85.0%	51	66.7%	5	82.7%	74						
I am satisfied with the effort my supervisor put into my most recent performance review	80.3%	18	69.0%	51	50.0%	5	70.7%	74						
I fear negative job consequences if I am to raise an issue of unfair treatment during my review*	19.7%	18	22.1%	51	0.0%	5	20.1%	74						
I am aware of the process to mediate disagreements with my supervisor regarding my evaluation.	60.6%	18	86.0%	51	50.0%	5	77.5%	74						

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

Table 35: Respect

hinking about your work environment during the past 12 nonths, please indicate your level of agreement with the		Man (A)		nan )	T/NB/I	NC	Ovei	rall
following statements about respect.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
RESPECT OVERALL	68.4%	23	77.1%	62	66.7%	5	74.4%	90
My department/unit is treated with respect by other units within my college/division	68.9%	23	67.8%	62	50.0%	5	67.2%	90
My college/division is treated with respect by CSU	68.9% C	23	73.4% C	62	0.0%	5	68.6%	90
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	100.0%	23	87.1%	62	100.0%	5	91.0%	90
There is respect for religious differences in my department/unit	57.6%	23	83.6% A	62	100.0%	5	77.8%	90
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/unit	57.6%	23	88.6% A	62	100.0%	5	81.2%	90
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/unit	57.6%	23	62.2%	62	50.0%	5	60.4%	90

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

Table 36: Favoritism

During the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about favoritism. Favoritism plays a	Man (A)						Woman T/NB/N (B) (C)			Ove	rall
role in who gets:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop			
FAVORITISM OVERALL	25.1%	23	20.4%	62	20.0%	5	21.6%	90			
Recognized within my department/unit	36.6%	23	23.0%	62	50.0%	5	27.8%	90			
Resources in my department/unit	36.6%	23	17.3%	62	0.0%	5	21.4%	90			
Professional development opportunities	21.0%	23	17.3%	62	0.0%	5	17.4%	90			
Promoted in my department/unit	21.0%	23	26.5%	62	50.0%	5	26.3%	90			
Hired in my department/unit	10.5%	23	17.9%	62	0.0%	5	15.1%	90			

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

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

<sup>\*</sup>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

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> 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. 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 37: Leadership Accountability: College/Division Leadership

	Ма	n	Wom	an	T/NB/I	T/NB/NC		all
Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level	(A)	(A)		)	(C)			
of agreement about leadership accountability.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
COLLEGE/DIVISION LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY OVERALL	30.8%	23	36.9%	61	66.7%	5	36.8%	88
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	21.0%	23	33.4%	62	50.0%	5	31.1%	90
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	31.5%	23	32.1%	62	50.0%	5	32.8%	90
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	31.5%	23	26.4%	62	50.0%	5	28.9%	90
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	47.9%	23	60.6%	62	50.0%	5	56.8%	90
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	31.5%	23	46.3%	61	100.0%	5	45.2%	88
					Α			
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	21.0%	23	23.6%	62	100.0% A B	5	26.8%	90

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 38: Leadership Accountability: Department/Unit Leadership

	Ма	n	Wom	an	T/NB/I	3/NC O		all
Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level	(A)	(A)		)	(C)	(C)		
of agreement about leadership accountability.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY OVERALL	54.4%	23	52.6%	61	66.7%	5	53.8%	88
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	47.1%	23	48.5%	62	50.0%	5	48.2%	90
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	73.9% B	23	44.3%	62	50.0%	5	52.2%	90
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	47.1%	23	30.8%	62	50.0%	5	36.0%	90
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	47.9%	23	60.6%	62	50.0%	5	56.8%	90
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	31.5%	23	64.1% A	61	100.0% A	5	57.4%	88
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	63.4%	23	39.3%	62	100.0% B	5	48.6%	90

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 39: Climate: CSU Overall

	1							
	Man		Won	Woman		3/NC	Ove	rall
Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months,	(A)		(B)		(C)			
please indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
CSU CLIMATE OVERALL	59.7%	23	43.0%	62	0.0%	5	45.1%	90
	С		С					
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	68.9%	23	34.2%	62	0.0%	5	41.4%	90
	ВС							
Improves the campus climate for all employees	42.1%	23	43.5%	62	0.0%	5	40.9%	90
Retains diverse employees	47.9%	23	17.1%	62	0.0%	5	24.1%	90
. ,	В							
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse	58.4%	23	27.8%	62	0.0%	5	34.2%	90
backgrounds	ВС							
Encourages discussions related to diversity	100.0%	23	73.4%	62	0.0%	5	76.6%	90
	ВС		С					
Provides employees with a positive work experience	68.9%	23	50.6%	62	0.0%	5	52.8%	90
	С							
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	31.5%	23	54.2%	62	0.0%	5	45.6%	90

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

Table 40: Climate: Department/Unit

	Man		Wom	nan	T/NB/I	NC	Over	all		
Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months,	(A)		(B	)	(C)		(C)			
please indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop		
DEPARTMENT/UNIT CLIMATE OVERALL	65.7%	23	62.5%	62	71.4%	5	63.8%	90		
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	68.9%	23	60.9%	62	100.0%	5	64.9%	90		
Improves the campus climate for all employees	84.5%	23	65.8%	62	50.0%	5	69.8%	90		
Retains diverse employees	58.4%	23	41.4%	62	100.0%	5	48.7%	90		
					В					
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse	58.4%	23	27.8%	62	0.0%	5	34.2%	90		
backgrounds	ВС									
Encourages discussions related to diversity	84.5%	23	77.9%	62	100.0%	5	80.7%	90		
Provides employees with a positive work experience	73.9%	23	67.1%	62	50.0%	5	68.0%	90		
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	31.5%	23	71.5%	62	50.0%	5	60.1%	90		
			Α							

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 41: Communications: CSU Overall

Table 41. Communications. CSO Overall	1		1										
Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about		(A)		Woman T/NB/NC (B) (C)		Over	all						
communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop					
CSU COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	57.3% C	23	59.0% C	62	0.0%	5	55.6%	90					
Communications are effective	73.9% C	23	56.2% C	62	0.0%	5	57.9%	90					
Communications are timely	58.4% C	23	68.4% C	62	0.0%	5	62.4%	90					
Communications are relevant	57.6%	23	52.7%	62	0.0%	5	51.3%	90					
Communications are informative	84.5% C	23	61.2% C	62	0.0%	5	64.1%	90					
Communications are motivating	21.0%	23	43.5%	62	0.0%	5	35.5%	90					
Communications are honest	31.5%	23	54.0%	62	0.0%	5	45.5%	90					
Communications are accessible	73.9% C	23	77.0% C	62	0.0%	5	72.3%	90					

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

Table 42: Communications: Division/College

Table 121 Communication Division, Comege								
Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following	Man (A)		Woman (B)		an T/NB/ (C)		Over	rall
statements about communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
COLLEGE/DIVISION COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	48.0%	23	53.7%	62	50.0%	5	52.0%	90
Communications are effective	47.1%	23	42.9%	62	50.0%	5	44.3%	90
Communications are timely	47.1%	23	65.0%	62	50.0%	5	59.6%	90
Communications are relevant	57.6%	23	62.2%	62	50.0%	5	60.4%	90
Communications are informative	84.5%	23	62.2%	62	50.0%	5	67.3%	90
Communications are motivating	21.0%	23	19.2%	62	50.0%	5	21.3%	90
Communications are honest	31.5%	23	52.7%	62	50.0%	5	47.1%	90
Communications are accessible	47.1%	23	71.4%	62	50.0%	5	64.0%	90

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> 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 43: Communications: Department/Unit

Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following		Man (A)		nan )	n T/NB/I (C)		Over	rall
statements about communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	i e	Pct	1	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	49.5%	23	70.6% A	61	50.0%	5	64.0%	88
Communications are effective	47.1%	23	60.8%	62	50.0%	5	56.7%	90
Communications are timely	57.6%	23	80.8%	62	50.0%	5	73.3%	90
Communications are relevant	57.6%	23	80.8%	62	50.0%	5	73.3%	90
Communications are informative	84.5%	23	80.8%	62	50.0%	5	80.2%	90
Communications are motivating	21.0%	23	37.2%	62	50.0%	5	33.7%	90
Communications are honest	31.5%	23	75.7% A	61	50.0%	5	62.8%	88
Communications are accessible	47.1%	23	83.6% A	62	50.0%	5	72.5%	90

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)		Woma (B)	an	T/NB/(C)	. •	Over	all
communicate feedback to CSU?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Yes, I have the opportunity to provide feedback	31.5%	7	55.6% A	35	0.0%1	*	46.6%	42
Maybe, I can provide feedback in limited situations	68.5% B	16	38.7%	24	50.0%	*	47.0%	42
No, I don't have an opportunity to provide feedback	0.0%1	*	5.7%	4	50.0% B	*	6.5%	6
Total	100.0%	23	100.0%	62	100.0%	5	100.0%	90

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  $n \ge 3.23$ 

- 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 45: Responsiveness to Feedback

	Man W			an	T/NB/N	VC	Over	all
When I use the following channels, leadership is	(A)		(B)	)	(C)			
responsive to my feedback:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
RESPONSIVENESS TO FEEDBACK OVERALL	46.3%	23	48.6%	57	40.0%	*	47.7%	83
One on one conversations with my supervisor	84.5%	23	78.0%	59	100.0%	*	80.3%	84
My representation in shared governance (CPC, APC, or	10.5%	23	37.3%	59	0.0%	*	29.0%	84
Faculty Council)			Α					
My service on committees	26.1%	23	34.0%	59	100.0%	*	33.6%	84
Annual review process	73.9%	23	55.2%	59	0.0%	*	58.9%	84
Input collection through anonymous surveys	36.6%	23	35.1%	57	0.0%	*	34.5%	83

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.\* Values reported for items with n >= 3.

- 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.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

Table 46: Feedback Valued

	Man		Woma	an	T/NB/	/NC	Overa	all
	(A)		(B)		(C	)		
When I give feedback it is valued by:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
FEEDBACK VALUED OVERALL	49.0%	21	50.4%	59	0.0%	*	48.7%	82
CSU overall	10.5%	23	27.1%	59	0.0%	*	21.8%	84
My division/college	52.6%	21	51.5%	59	0.0%	*	50.4%	82
My department/unit	73.9%	23	72.6%	59	0.0%	*	71.0%	84

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.\* Values reported for items with n >= 3.

- 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 47: Discriminatory Attitudes: CSU Overall

Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently	Ma	Man		an	n T/NB/NC		Overall	
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	10.5%	*	15.8%	10	50.0%	*	16.2%	15
Physical appearance	0.0%	*	12.3%	8	100.0%	5	13.5%	12
Physical disability	0.0%	*	27.4%	17	100.0%	5	24.0%	22
Mental disability	0.0%	*	24.5%	15	100.0%	5	22.0%	20
Employment classification	26.8%	6	40.2%	25	100.0%	5	39.8%	36
Gender identity	10.5%	*	34.6%	22	100.0%	5	31.7%	29
Job title	57.9%	13	28.0%	18	50.0%	*	36.9%	33
Parental status	0.0%	*	17.3%	11	50.0%	*	14.5%	13
Religion	10.5%	*	35.3%	22	50.0%	*	29.7%	27
Political affiliation	10.5%	*	25.9%	16	0.0%	*	20.6%	19
Sexual orientation	0.0%	*	34.6%	22	50.0%	*	26.5%	24
Socio-economic status	15.5%	4	27.4%	17	50.0%	*	25.5%	23
Ethnic origin	15.5%	4	35.3%	22	100.0%	5	33.5%	30
Veteran status	0.0%	*	2.8%	*	0.0%	*	2.0%	*
Race or color	26.1%	6	40.3%	25	100.0%	5	39.7%	36
Marital status	0.0%	*	7.3%	5	0.0%	*	5.0%	5
Nationality/country of origin	15.5%	4	22.4%	14	100.0%	5	24.5%	22
None/no response	21.0%	5	38.3%	24	0.0%	*	31.9%	29

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 48: Discriminatory Attitudes: Division/College

	Man		Wom	an	T/NB/	NC	Over	all
Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	10.5%	*	12.9%	8	0.0%	*	11.7%	11
Physical appearance	0.0%	*	7.3%	5	0.0%	*	5.0%	5
Physical disability	0.0%	*	7.3%	5	50.0%	*	7.5%	7
Mental disability	0.0%	*	7.3%	5	50.0%	*	7.5%	7
Employment classification	0.0%	*	7.3%	5	0.0%	*	5.0%	5
Gender identity	0.0%	*	10.1%	6	50.0%	*	9.5%	9
Job title	31.1%	7	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	8.0%	7
Religion	0.0%	*	2.8%	*	0.0%	*	2.0%	*
Political affiliation	0.0%	*	2.8%	*	0.0%	*	2.0%	*
Sexual orientation	0.0%	*	7.3%	5	0.0%	*	5.0%	5
Socio-economic status	0.0%	*	10.1%	6	0.0%	*	7.0%	6
Ethnic origin	0.0%	*	7.3%	5	0.0%	*	5.0%	5
Race or color	0.0%	*	2.8%	*	0.0%	*	2.0%	*
None/no response	58.4%	14	79.8%	50	50.0%	*	72.8%	66

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

Table 49: Discriminatory Attitudes: Department/Unit

· ·	Man		Wom	an	T/NB/NC		Overall	
Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	26.1%	6	12.9%	8	0.0%	*	15.7%	14
Physical appearance	0.0%	*	7.3%	5	0.0%	*	5.0%	5
Physical disability	0.0%	*	7.3%	5	50.0%	*	7.5%	7
Mental disability	15.5%	4	7.3%	5	50.0%	*	11.6%	10
Employment classification	0.0%	*	7.3%	5	0.0%	*	5.0%	5
Gender identity	0.0%	*	12.9%	8	50.0%	*	11.5%	10
Job title	15.5%	4	2.8%	*	0.0%	*	6.0%	5
Religion	0.0%	*	2.8%	*	0.0%	*	2.0%	*
Political affiliation	0.0%	*	2.8%	*	0.0%	*	2.0%	*
Sexual orientation	0.0%	*	7.3%	5	0.0%	*	5.0%	5
Socio-economic status	0.0%	*	10.1%	6	0.0%	*	7.0%	6
Ethnic origin	0.0%	*	7.3%	5	0.0%	*	5.0%	5
None/no response	73.9%	17	74.1%	46	50.0%	*	72.9%	66

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

Table 50: Other Potential Problems: CSU Overall

	Man		Woman		T/NB/NC		Overall	
Please indicate if any of the following are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	30.9%	19	100.0%	5	26.4%	24
Bullying	0.0%	*	18.6%	12	100.0%	5	17.9%	16
Bias	41.6%	10	43.1%	27	100.0%	5	45.6%	41
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	5.0%	3	50.0%	*	6.0%	5
Verbal abuse	15.5%	4	23.0%	14	50.0%	*	22.5%	20
None/no response	58.4%	14	48.3%	30	0.0%	*	48.5%	44

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

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

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

Table 51: Other Potential Problems: Division/College

	Man		Woman		T/NB/NC		Overall	
Please indicate if any of the following are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bullying	0.0%	*	12.9%	8	0.0%	*	9.0%	8
Bias	0.0%	*	10.1%	6	0.0%	*	7.0%	6
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Verbal abuse	0.0%	*	12.9%	8	0.0%	*	9.0%	8
None/no response	100.0%	23	87.1%	54	100.0%	5	91.0%	82

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

Table 52: Other Potential Problems: Department/Unit

	Man		Woman		T/NB/NC		Overall		
Please indicate if any of the following are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	
Bullying	0.0%	*	18.6%	12	0.0%	*	12.9%	12	
Bias	0.0%	*	10.1%	6	0.0%	*	7.0%	6	
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	
Verbal abuse	0.0%	*	12.9%	8	0.0%	*	9.0%	8	
None/no response	100.0%	23	81.4%	51	100.0%	5	87.1%	79	

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

Statistical significance not tested.

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

# **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

Thinking about your work environment during the past 12 months,		lly ized	Non-rac minorit	•	•	
please indicate your agreement with the following statements about	(A)		(B)			
work culture.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
WORK CULTURE OVERALL	60.1%	24	68.3%	70	66.2%	95
My department/unit promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	72.1%	24	69.0%	70	69.8%	95
My department/unit treats all employees equitably	53.5%	24	68.8%	70	64.9%	95
My department/unit is open and transparent in communication	53.5%	24	42.9%	70	45.7%	95
My department/unit values employee input in major department/unit decisions	72.1%	24	57.5%	70	61.2%	95
My department/unit promotes respect for cultural differences	72.1%	24	90.4% A	70	85.7%	95
My department/unit understands the value of diversity	90.6%	24	94.2%	70	93.3%	95
My department/unit communicates the importance of valuing diversity	100.0%	24	87.7%	70	90.8%	95
I feel valued as an employee	90.6% B	24	68.5%	70	74.2%	95
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	9.4%	24	52.9% A	70	41.7%	95
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	34.9%	24	57.3%	70	51.6%	95
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/unit	53.5%	24	63.9%	70	61.2%	95
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	44.1%	24	67.3% A	70	61.3%	95
I would recommend my department/unit as a place of employment	34.9%	24	67.4% A	70	59.0%	95

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** 

	Racially mind	oritized	Non-racially min	Overa	III	
Did you have a performance review in the last	(A)		(B)			
year?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Yes, I had a review	81.4%	20	83.0%	58	82.6%	78
No, I did not have a review	18.6%	5	17.0%	12	17.4%	17
Total	100.0%	24	100.0%	70	100.0%	95

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<sup>a,b</sup>

- 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.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

**Table 55: Performance Review** 

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following	Racially Non-racially minoritized (A) (B)		Ove	rall		
statements about your most recent performance review.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
PERFORMANCE REVIEW OVERALL	77.1%	20	83.4%	58	81.8%	78
I am satisfied with the effort my supervisor put into my most recent performance review	42.9%	20	78.5% A	58	69.5%	78
I fear negative job consequences if I am to raise an issue of unfair treatment during my review*	22.8%	20	17.6%	58	18.9%	78
I am aware of the process to mediate disagreements with my supervisor regarding my evaluation.	88.5%	20	71.6%	58	75.9%	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 minoritized (A) (B)		minoritized		Ove	rall
about respect.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop		
RESPECT OVERALL	65.5%	24	79.1% A	70	75.6%	95		
My department/unit is treated with respect by other units within my college/division	53.5%	24	74.0%	70	68.7%	95		
My college/division is treated with respect by CSU	44.1%	24	79.1% A	70	70.1%	95		
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	81.4%	24	95.0% A	70	91.5%	95		
There is respect for religious differences in my department/unit	74.4%	24	80.4%	70	78.8%	95		
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/unit	74.4%	24	84.8%	70	82.1%	95		
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/unit	65.1%	24	61.4%	70	62.3%	95		

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

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

<sup>\*</sup>Reverse coded when included in overall rating 1,2,3

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> 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)		Non-rac minoriti (B)	Ove	rall	
in who gets:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
FAVORITISM OVERALL	22.3%	24	21.9%	70	22.0%	95
Recognized within my department/unit	27.9%	24	26.0%	70	26.5%	95
Resources in my department/unit	18.6%	24	27.4%	70	25.2%	95
Professional development opportunities	18.6%	24	15.8%	70	16.5%	95
Promoted in my department/unit	27.9%	24	24.0%	70	25.0%	95
Hired in my department/unit	18.6%	24	16.2%	70	16.8%	95

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

Table 58: Leadership Accountability: College/Division Leadership

Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level of	Racia minoriti (A)	•	Non-rac minoriti (B)	ized Ove		all
agreement about leadership accountability.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
COLLEGE/DIVISION LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY OVERALL	19.8%	24	44.9% A	69	38.3%	93
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	9.4%	24	43.1% A	70	34.4%	95
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	9.4%	24	45.3% A	70	36.1%	95
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	9.4%	24	40.3% A	70	32.3%	95
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	53.5%	24	60.7%	70	58.9%	95
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	18.7%	24	51.6% A	69	42.9%	93
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	18.7%	24	27.8%	70	25.5%	95

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.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> 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

Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level of	Racially Non-racially minoritized (A) (B)		Over	all		
agreement about leadership accountability.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY OVERALL	50.0%	24	57.1%	69	55.3%	93
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	27.9%	24	58.6%	70	50.7%	95
			Α			
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	53.5%	24	54.9%	70	54.5%	95
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the	27.9%	24	42.9%	70	39.1%	95
workplace	E0 E0/	0.4	00.70/	70	<b>50.00</b> /	0.5
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	53.5%	24	60.7%		58.9%	
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	55.9%	24	57.5%	69	57.0%	93
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	62.9%	24	43.8%	70	48.7%	95

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,		lly ized	Non-rac minoriti (B)	Ove	rall	
please indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
CSU CLIMATE OVERALL	20.9%	24	54.7% A	70	46.0%	95
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	25.6%	24	50.7% A	70	44.3%	95
Improves the campus climate for all employees	0.0%	24	55.7% A	70	41.3%	95
Retains diverse employees	25.6%	24	22.1%	70	23.0%	95
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	25.6%	24	38.3%	70	35.0%	95
Encourages discussions related to diversity	44.1%	24	89.3% A	70	77.7%	95
Provides employees with a positive work experience	25.6%	24	62.0% A	70	52.6%	95
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	0.0%	24	64.9% A	70	48.2%	95

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 61: Climate: Department/Unit

Table 01. Olimate. Department/Olit						
			Non-racially minoritized		Ove	rall
Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months,	(A)		(B)			
please indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT CLIMATE OVERALL	69.8%	24	62.7%	70	64.5%	95
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	100.0%	24	48.6%	70	61.8%	95
	В					
Improves the campus climate for all employees	72.1%	24	71.0%	70	71.3%	95
Retains diverse employees	62.9%	24	43.9%	70	48.8%	95
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse	25.6%	24	38.3%	70	35.0%	95
backgrounds						
Encourages discussions related to diversity	81.4%	24	81.7%	70	81.6%	95
Provides employees with a positive work experience	53.5%	24	75.1%	70	69.5%	95
			Α			
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	46.5%	24	67.4%	70	62.0%	95

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 indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about	Racially minoritized (A)		Non-racially minoritized (B)		minoritized minoritized Over (A) (B)		Over	rall
communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop		
CSU COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	22.6%	24	66.6% A	70	55.3%	95		
Communications are effective	25.6%	24	68.6% A	70	57.5%	95		
Communications are timely	44.1%	24	67.9% A	70	61.8%	95		
Communications are relevant	0.0%	24	69.0% A	70	51.2%	95		
Communications are informative	25.6%	24	76.5% A	70	63.4%	95		
Communications are motivating	0.0%	24	48.7% A	70	36.2%	95		
Communications are honest	0.0%	24	61.5% A	70	45.7%	95		
Communications are accessible	62.7%	24	74.2%	70	71.3%	95		

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> 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	39.5%	24	58.5% A	70	53.6%	95
Communications are effective	27.9%	24	53.6% A	70	47.0%	95
Communications are timely	46.5%	24	66.8%	70	61.6%	95
Communications are relevant	46.5%	24	67.8%	70	62.3%	95
Communications are informative	72.1%	24	67.8%	70	68.9%	95
Communications are motivating	9.4%	24	27.2%	70	22.6%	95
Communications are honest	27.9%	24	57.2% A	70	49.7%	95
Communications are accessible	46.5%	24	69.2% A	70	63.4%	95

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

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

Table 64: Communications: Department/Unit

Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please	Racially minoritized		Non-racially minoritized		Ove	rall
indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about	(A)		(B)			
communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	58.1%	24	68.0%	69	65.4%	93
Communications are effective	46.5%	24	63.1%	70	58.8%	95
Communications are timely	65.1%	24	77.8%	70	74.5%	95
Communications are relevant	65.1%	24	77.8%	70	74.5%	95
Communications are informative	90.6%	24	77.8%	70	81.1%	95
Communications are motivating	27.9%	24	36.7%	70	34.5%	95
Communications are honest	46.5%	24	71.0%	69	64.6%	93
			Α			
Communications are accessible	65.1%	24	76.9%	70	73.8%	95

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

**Table 65: Communicated Feedback** 

During the past 12 months, have you had the opportunity to	Racially minoritized (A)		minoritized minoritized			•	Over	all
communicate feedback to CSU?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop		
Yes, I have the opportunity to provide feedback	18.6%	5	56.5% A	40	46.7%	44		
Maybe, I can provide feedback in limited situations	72.1% B	18	38.5%	27	47.1%	45		
No, I don't have an opportunity to provide feedback	9.4%	*	5.0%	4	6.1%	6		
Total	100.0%	24	100.0%	70	100.0%	95		

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. 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 66: Responsiveness to Feedback

Table 00. Responsiveness to Leeuback						
When I use the following channels, leadership is	Racially minoritized (A)		minoritized minoritized		Over	all
responsive to my feedback:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
RESPONSIVENESS TO FEEDBACK OVERALL	35.9%	22	52.6% A	65	48.3%	87
One on one conversations with my supervisor	79.5%	22	82.0%	67	81.4%	89
My representation in shared governance (CPC, APC, or Faculty Council)	41.0%	22	26.4%	67	30.0%	89
My service on committees	10.3%	22	39.0% A	67	31.9%	89
Annual review process	48.7%	22	65.0%	67	61.0%	89
Input collection through anonymous surveys	0.0%	22	47.4% A	65	35.3%	87

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 mind (A)				Overa	all
When I give feedback it is valued by:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
FEEDBACK VALUED OVERALL	36.7%	22	55.2% A	64	50.5%	86
CSU overall	0.0%	22	31.0% A	67	23.3%	89
My division/college	41.0%	22	57.1%	64	53.0%	86
My department/unit	69.2%	22	73.6%	67	72.5%	89

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 68: Discriminatory Attitudes: CSU Overall

Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently	Racially minoritized		Non-racially minoritized		Overall	
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	27.9%	7	14.3%	10	17.8%	17
Physical appearance	37.3%	9	4.4%	3	12.9%	12
Physical disability	55.9%	14	14.6%	10	25.3%	24
Mental disability	55.9%	14	12.1%	9	23.4%	22
Employment classification	81.4%	20	29.3%	21	42.7%	40
Gender identity	74.4%	18	18.1%	13	32.6%	31
Job title	72.1%	18	25.5%	18	37.5%	36
Parental status	27.9%	7	12.1%	9	16.2%	15
Religion	65.1%	16	15.5%	11	28.2%	27
Political affiliation	37.1%	9	13.5%	10	19.6%	19
Sexual orientation	65.1%	16	11.4%	8	25.2%	24
Socio-economic status	46.5%	11	19.8%	14	26.7%	25
Ethnic origin	74.4%	18	20.4%	14	34.3%	32
Veteran status	0.0%	*	2.5%	*	1.9%	*
Race or color	74.4%	18	28.3%	20	40.2%	38
Marital status	18.6%	5	0.0%	*	4.8%	5
Nationality/country of origin	55.9%	14	12.1%	9	23.4%	22
None/no response	0.0%	*	40.9%	29	30.4%	29

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

Table 69: Discriminatory Attitudes: Division/College

Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently	Racially minoritized		Non-rac minoriti	Over	all	
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	18.6%	5	8.5%	6	11.1%	11
Physical appearance	18.6%	5	0.0%	*	4.8%	5
Physical disability	27.9%	7	0.0%	*	7.2%	7
Mental disability	27.9%	7	0.0%	*	7.2%	7
Employment classification	18.6%	5	0.0%	*	4.8%	5
Gender identity	27.9%	7	2.5%	*	9.1%	9
Job title	0.0%	*	10.3%	7	7.6%	7
Religion	0.0%	*	2.5%	*	1.9%	*
Political affiliation	0.0%	*	2.5%	*	1.9%	*
Sexual orientation	18.6%	5	0.0%	*	4.8%	5
Socio-economic status	18.6%	5	2.5%	*	6.6%	6
Ethnic origin	18.6%	5	0.0%	*	4.8%	5
Race or color	0.0%	*	2.5%	*	1.9%	*
None/no response	53.5%	13	81.2%	57	74.1%	70

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

\* Values reported for items with n >= 3.

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

Table 70: Discriminatory Attitudes: Department/Unit

Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently	Racial minoriti				Over	all
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	18.6%	5	13.6%	10	14.9%	14
Physical appearance	18.6%	5	0.0%	*	4.8%	5
Physical disability	27.9%	7	0.0%	*	7.2%	7
Mental disability	27.9%	7	5.1%	4	11.0%	10
Employment classification	18.6%	5	0.0%	*	4.8%	5
Gender identity	27.9%	7	5.0%	4	10.9%	10
Job title	0.0%	*	7.6%	5	5.7%	5
Religion	0.0%	*	2.5%	*	1.9%	*
Political affiliation	0.0%	*	2.5%	*	1.9%	*
Sexual orientation	18.6%	5	0.0%	*	4.8%	5
Socio-economic status	18.6%	5	2.5%	*	6.6%	6
Ethnic origin	18.6%	5	0.0%	*	4.8%	5
None/no response	53.5%	13	81.3%	57	74.2%	70

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

**Table 71: Other Potential Problems: CSU Overall** 

Please indicate if any of the following are currently	Racially minoritized				Over	rall
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	55.9%	14	14.5%	10	25.2%	24
Bullying	37.3%	9	13.3%	9	19.5%	18
Bias	74.4%	18	35.9%	25	45.8%	43
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	9.4%	*	4.4%	3	5.7%	5
Verbal abuse	46.5%	11	15.9%	11	23.8%	23
None/no response	25.6%	6	56.5%	40	48.5%	46

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	18.6%	5	5.0%	4	8.5%	8
Bias	18.6%	5	2.5%	*	6.6%	6
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Verbal abuse	18.6%	5	5.0%	4	8.5%	8
None/no response	81.4%	20	95.0%	67	91.5%	87

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

Statistical significance not tested.

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

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

Table 73: Other Potential Problems: Department/Unit

Please indicate if any of the following are currently	Racial minoriti	•	Non-racially minoritized						rall
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop			
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*			
Bullying	18.6%	5	10.1%	7	12.3%	12			
Bias	18.6%	5	2.5%	*	6.6%	6			
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*			
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*			
Verbal abuse	18.6%	5	5.0%	4	8.5%	8			
None/no response	81.4%	20	89.9%	63	87.7%	83			

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 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** 

Thinking about your work environment during the past 12	Admin	Pro	CCA F	ac	SC		Over	rall
months, please indicate your agreement with the following	(A	)	(B)		(C)			
statements about work culture.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
WORK CULTURE OVERALL	63.7%	92	57.3%	17	75.3%	15	64.2%	124
My department/unit promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	64.9%	92	63.4%	17	91.0%	15	67.8%	124
My department/unit treats all employees equitably	62.4%	92	78.8%	17	72.9%	15	65.9%	124
My department/unit is open and transparent in communication	43.5%	92	28.8%	17	48.6%	15	42.1%	124
My department/unit values employee input in major department/unit decisions	65.4% B	92	28.8%	17	42.4%	15	57.6%	124
My department/unit promotes respect for cultural differences	78.4%	92	78.8%	17	91.0%	15	79.9%	124
My department/unit understands the value of diversity	83.3%	92	100.0%	17	84.8%	15	85.7%	124
My department/unit communicates the importance of valuing diversity	92.4% B	92	63.4%	17	100.0% B	15	89.4%	124
I feel valued as an employee	76.8% B	92	42.2%	17	84.8% B	15	73.0%	124
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	37.5%	92	42.2%	17	75.7% A	15	42.8%	124
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	46.2%	92	63.4%	17	60.5%	15	50.3%	124
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/unit	56.1%	92	63.4%	17	75.7%	15	59.5%	124
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	65.1% B	92	28.8%	17	75.7% B	15	61.4%	124
I would recommend my department/unit as a place of employment	56.3%	92	63.4%	17	75.7%	15	59.6%	124

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> 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

Did you have a performance review in the last	Admin (A)	Pro	CCA Fa	ac	SC (C)		Overa	all
year?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Yes, I had a review	77.2%	71	100.0% <sup>a</sup>	17	84.8%	13	81.2%	101
No, I did not have a review	22.8%	21	0.0% <sup>a</sup>	*	15.2%	*	18.8%	23
Total	100.0%	92	100.0%	17	100.0%	15	100.0%	124

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.

**Table 76: Performance Review** 

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following	Admin Pro (A)		CCA (B		SC (C		Over	rall
statements about your most recent performance review.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
PERFORMANCE REVIEW OVERALL	81.9%		74.3%		84.5%		80.9%	
I am satisfied with the effort my supervisor put into my most recent performance review	72.6%		78.8%		71.3%	-	73.5%	
I fear negative job consequences if I am to raise an issue of unfair treatment during my review*	20.9%	69	21.2%	17	10.7%	13	19.6%	99
I am aware of the process to mediate disagreements with my supervisor regarding my evaluation.	73.2%	69	44.2%	17	82.0%	13	69.3%	99

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.

- 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 77: Respect

Thinking about your work environment during the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the		Admin Pro (A)		CCA Fac (B)			Over	rall
following statements about respect.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
RESPECT OVERALL	68.4%	90	65.7%	17	78.3%	15	69.2%	122
My department/unit is treated with respect by other units within my college/division	64.4%	90	42.2%	17	91.0% B	15	64.5%	122
My college/division is treated with respect by CSU	68.3% B	90	28.8%	17	91.0% B	15	65.6%	122
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	78.4%	90	100.0%	17	100.0%	15	84.0%	122
There is respect for religious differences in my department/unit	68.1%	90	78.8%	17	60.5%	15	68.6%	122
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/unit	75.1%	90	78.8%	17	84.8%	15	76.8%	122
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/unit	56.3%	90	65.4%	17	42.4%	15	55.8%	122

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.

<sup>\*</sup>Reverse coded when included in overall rating a,b,c

Table 78: Favoritism

During the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about favoritism. Favoritism plays a		Admin Pro (A)		CCA Fac (B)		SC Ov		rall
role in who gets:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
FAVORITISM OVERALL	24.9%	86	8.5%	17	17.5%	15	21.6%	118
Recognized within my department/unit	27.3%	86	21.2%	17	18.1%	15	25.2%	118
Resources in my department/unit	23.1%	86	21.2%	17	33.3%	15	24.2%	118
Professional development opportunities	17.8%	86	0.0%	17	18.1%	15	15.3%	118
Promoted in my department/unit	31.4%	86	0.0%	17	9.0%	15	24.0%	118
	В							
Hired in my department/unit	25.0%	86	0.0%	17	9.0%	15	19.4%	118

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 79: Leadership Accountability: College/Division Leadership

Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level of	Admin (A)		CCA Fac SC (B) (C)			Over	all	
agreement about leadership accountability.	Pct	Рор	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
COLLEGE/DIVISION LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY OVERALL	37.0%	79	24.4%	15	62.3% B	10	37.8%	104
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	29.2%	81	33.3%	15	50.0%	13	32.2%	108
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	34.4%	81	15.5%	15	61.0%	10	34.4%	106
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	30.0%	81	15.5%	15	50.0%	13	30.4%	108
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	54.0%	81	51.0%	15	71.3%	13	55.6%	108
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	47.6%	79	15.5%	15	53.4%	13	43.9%	107
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	27.6%	81	15.5%	15	32.0%	13	26.5%	108

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	CCA	Fac	SC	;	Over	all
Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level of	(A)		(B)	)	(C)	)		
agreement about leadership accountability.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY OVERALL	52.8%	79	44.8%	15	59.5%	13	52.4%	107
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	42.1%	81	57.7%	15	60.7%	13	46.4%	108
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	49.8%	81	40.0%	15	78.7%	13	51.9%	108
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	33.4%	81	40.0%	15	50.0%	13	36.2%	108
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	54.0%	81	51.0%	15	71.3%	13	55.6%	108
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	64.2%	79	15.5%	15	53.4%	13	56.1%	107
	В							
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	50.3%	81	40.0%	15	32.0%	13	46.7%	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.

Table 81: Climate: CSU Overall

	Admin	Pro	CCA	Fac	Fac SC		Over	all
Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months,	(A)	)	(B	)	(C)			
please indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
CSU CLIMATE OVERALL	45.6%	79	19.7%	15		13	44.4%	106
	В		0.00/		В	4.0	40.00/	400
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	47.9% B	81	0.0%	15	60.7% B	13	42.9%	108
Improves the campus climate for all employees	36.8%	81	17.8%	15		13	38.2%	108
	00.00/	70	47.00/	4-	AB	40	00 50/	400
Retains diverse employees	20.9%	79	17.8%	15	21.3%	13	20.5%	106
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	38.3%	81	17.8%	15	50.0%	13	36.9%	108
Encourages discussions related to diversity	78.8%	81	66.7%	15	89.3%	13	78.4%	108
Provides employees with a positive work experience	56.0%	81	0.0%	15	71.3%	13	50.2%	108
	В				В			
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	45.9%	81	17.8%	15	100.0% A B	13	48.4%	108

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

Table 82: Climate: Department/Unit

	Admin	Pro	CCA	Fac	SC		Over	all
Thinking about your work environment during the last 12 months,	(A)		(A) (B) (C)					
please indicate your level of agreement regarding the climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT CLIMATE OVERALL	62.5%	79	48.8%	15	72.9%	13	61.9%	106
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	63.1%	81	51.0%	15	53.4%	13	60.3%	108
Improves the campus climate for all employees	68.5%	81	57.7%	15	82.0%	13	68.6%	108
Retains diverse employees	45.2%	79	51.0%	15	42.7%	13	45.7%	106
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	38.3%	81	17.8%	15	50.0%	13	36.9%	108
Encourages discussions related to diversity	85.0% B	81	57.7%	15	89.3%	13	81.8%	108
Provides employees with a positive work experience	63.6%	81	57.7%	15	82.0%	13	65.0%	108
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	59.3%	81	33.3%	15	100.0% A B	13	60.5%	108

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

**Table 83: Communications: CSU Overall** 

Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months,			in Pro CCA Fac SC A) (B) (C)		Over	all		
please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about communications.	Pct	′	` '		` ,	Рор	Pct	Рор
CSU COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	50.6%	79	47.0%	15	80.6% A B	13	53.7%	106
Communications are effective	52.3%	79	60.0%	15	89.3% A	13	57.8%	106

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

**Table 83: Communications: CSU Overall** 

rable 03. Communications. COO Overall								
Communications are timely	60.3%	79	35.6%	15	100.0% A B	13	61.6%	106
Communications are relevant	43.0%	79	60.0%	15	100.0% A	13	52.2%	106
Communications are informative	57.6%	79	60.0%	15	100.0% A	13	63.0%	106
Communications are motivating	28.7%	79	17.8%	15	71.3% A B	13	32.3%	106
Communications are honest	41.5%	79	35.6%	15	60.7%	13	42.9%	106
Communications are accessible	70.5%	79	60.0%	15	42.7%	13	65.8%	106

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 84: Communications: Division/College

Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with the following	Admir (A		CCA (B		SC (C)		Over	all
statements about communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
COLLEGE/DIVISION COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	44.5%	79	63.4%	15	71.4%	10	49.9%	104
Communications are effective	36.0%	79	57.7%	15	78.7%	13	44.1%	106
					Α			
Communications are timely	48.5%	79	75.5%	15	89.3%	13	57.1%	106
					Α			
Communications are relevant	55.1%	79	75.5%	15	89.3%	13	62.0%	106
Communications are informative	60.1%	79	75.5%	15	87.0%	10	65.0%	104
Communications are motivating	15.9%	79	33.3%	15	32.0%	13	20.2%	106
Communications are honest	40.5%	79	51.0%	15	60.7%	13	44.4%	106
Communications are accessible	55.2%	79	75.5%	15	42.7%	13	56.5%	106

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 85: Communications: Department/Unit

Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months,	Admin Pro (A)		CCA Fac (B)		SC (C)		Over	all
please indicate your level of agreement with the following								
statements about communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	60.9%	77	63.4%	15	77.5%	13	63.3%	104
Communications are effective	54.3%	79	57.7%	15	89.3%	13	58.9%	106
Communications are timely	69.9%	79	75.5%	15	89.3%	13	73.0%	106
Communications are relevant	72.8%	79	75.5%	15	89.3%	13	75.1%	106
Communications are informative	80.7%	79	75.5%	15	89.3%	13	81.0%	106
Communications are motivating	31.3%	79	33.3%	15	42.7%	13	32.9%	106
Communications are honest	59.5%	77	51.0%	15	71.3%	13	59.7%	104
Communications are accessible	63.2%	79	75.5%	15	71.3%	13	65.9%	106
D								

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 86: Communicated Feedback** 

	Admin Pro		CCA Fac		c SC		Overa	
During the past 12 months, have you had the opportunity to	(A)		(B)		(C)			
communicate feedback to CSU?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Yes, I have the opportunity to provide feedback	45.6%	36	35.6%	5	60.7%	8	46.0%	49
Maybe, I can provide feedback in limited situations	47.0%	37	49.0%	7	39.3%	5	46.3%	49
No, I don't have an opportunity to provide feedback	7.4%	6	15.5%	*	0.0% <sup>a</sup>	*	7.6%	8
Total	100.0%	79	100.0%	15	100.0%	13	100.0%	106

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.

**Table 87: Responsiveness to Feedback** 

	Admin Pro		CCA Fac		SC	;	Overall	
When I use the following channels, leadership is	(A)		(B)		(C)			
responsive to my feedback:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
RESPONSIVENESS TO FEEDBACK OVERALL	43.6%	69	44.2%	12	62.8%	13	46.3%	94
One on one conversations with my supervisor	80.3%	71	71.0%	12	89.3%	13	80.3%	96
My representation in shared governance (CPC, APC, or	28.8%	71	0.0%	12	50.0%	13	27.9%	96
Faculty Council)					В			
My service on committees	29.3%	71	29.0%	12	32.0%	13	29.6%	96
Annual review process	54.7%	71	71.0%	12	71.3%	13	59.0%	96
Input collection through anonymous surveys	22.5%	69	50.0%	12	71.3%	13	32.8%	94
					Α			

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	Pro	CCA F	ac	SC		Overall	
	(A)		(B)		(C)			
When I give feedback it is valued by:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
FEEDBACK VALUED OVERALL	47.9%	68	47.4%	12	52.4%	13	48.4%	93
CSU overall	18.5%	71	21.0%	12	39.3%	13	21.6%	96
My division/college	50.8%	68	50.0%	12	39.3%	13	49.1%	93
My department/unit	71.1%	71	71.0%	12	78.7%	13	72.1%	96

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 89: Discriminatory Attitudes: CSU Overall** 

Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently problematic. Admin Pro CCA Fac SC Overall		Please indicate if discriminator	y attitudes are currently	problematic.	Admin Pro	CCA Fac	SC	Overall
---	--	----------------------------------	---------------------------	--------------	-----------	---------	----	---------

Table 89: Discriminatory Attitudes: CSU Overall

rusis oo: Dissimiliarity / Minadosi ooo ovolaii	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	18.2%	17	0.0%	*	15.2%	*	15.4%	19
Physical appearance	9.3%	9	13.4%	*	9.0%	*	9.8%	12
Physical disability	18.0%	17	13.4%	*	33.3%	5	19.2%	24
Mental disability	16.1%	15	13.4%	*	33.3%	5	17.8%	22
Employment classification	37.9%	35	13.4%	*	51.4%	8	36.2%	45
Gender identity	30.5%	28	13.4%	*	18.1%	*	26.7%	33
Job title	29.2%	27	42.4%	7	39.5%	6	32.2%	40
Parental status	16.1%	15	0.0%	*	18.1%	*	14.2%	18
Religion	27.5%	25	0.0%	*	9.0%	*	21.5%	27
Political affiliation	22.6%	21	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	16.8%	21
Sexual orientation	22.9%	21	0.0%	*	18.1%	*	19.2%	24
Socio-economic status	20.5%	19	21.2%	4	18.1%	*	20.3%	25
Ethnic origin	29.8%	28	34.6%	6	9.0%	*	27.9%	35
Veteran status	1.9%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	1.4%	*
Race or color	34.3%	32	34.6%	6	18.1%	*	32.4%	40
Marital status	7.4%	7	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	5.5%	7
Nationality/country of origin	16.1%	15	34.6%	6	9.0%	*	17.8%	22
None/no response	42.3%	39	44.2%	8	33.3%	5	41.5%	52

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

Table 90: Discriminatory Attitudes: Division/College

	Admin Pro		CCA	CA Fac SC		;	Over	all
Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	13.8%	13	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	10.3%	13
Physical appearance	4.9%	5	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.6%	5
Physical disability	9.8%	9	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	7.3%	9
Mental disability	9.8%	9	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	7.3%	9
Employment classification	7.4%	7	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	5.5%	7
Gender identity	11.8%	11	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	8.7%	11
Job title	2.5%	*	42.4%	7	15.2%	*	9.5%	12
Parental status	2.5%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	1.8%	*
Religion	4.4%	4	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.3%	4
Political affiliation	1.9%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	1.4%	*
Sexual orientation	4.9%	5	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.6%	5
Socio-economic status	9.3%	9	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	6.9%	9
Ethnic origin	7.4%	7	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	5.5%	7
Race or color	4.4%	4	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.3%	4
Marital status	2.5%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	1.8%	*
Nationality/country of origin	2.5%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	1.8%	*
None/no response	78.8%	73	57.6%	10	84.8%	13	76.6%	95

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

Table 91: Discriminatory Attitudes: Department/Unit

rable 31. Discriminatory Attitudes. Department of the											
Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently	Admin Pro		Admin Pro CCA Fac SC 0		CCA Fac		ic SC		Over	all	
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop			
Age	13.8%	13	21.2%	4	0.0%	*	13.2%	16			
Physical appearance	4.9%	5	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.6%	5			
Physical disability	9.8%	9	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	7.3%	9			
Mental disability	9.8%	9	21.2%	4	0.0%	*	10.2%	13			

Statistical significance not tested.

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

Statistical significance not tested.

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

Table 91: Discriminatory Attitudes: Department/Unit

Employment classification	7.4%	7	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	5.5%	7
Gender identity	13.7%	13	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	10.2%	13
Job title	4.4%	4	21.2%	4	0.0%	*	6.2%	8
Parental status	2.5%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	1.8%	*
Religion	4.4%	4	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.3%	4
Political affiliation	1.9%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	1.4%	*
Sexual orientation	4.9%	5	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.6%	5
Socio-economic status	9.3%	9	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	6.9%	9
Ethnic origin	7.4%	7	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	5.5%	7
Race or color	2.5%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	1.8%	*
Marital status	2.5%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	1.8%	*
Nationality/country of origin	2.5%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	1.8%	*
None/no response	75.0%	69	78.8%	13	100.0%	15	78.5%	98

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

Table 92: Other Potential Problems: CSU Overall

	Admin	Admin Pro		Fac	c SC		Overall	
Please indicate if any of the following are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	24.3%	22	13.4%	*	9.0%	*	21.0%	26
Bullying	22.4%	21	13.4%	*	0.0%	*	18.5%	23
Bias	38.7%	36	55.8%	10	18.1%	*	38.6%	48
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	4.4%	4	13.4%	*	9.0%	*	6.2%	8
Verbal abuse	23.0%	21	21.2%	4	0.0%	*	20.0%	25
None/no response	55.5%	51	44.2%	8	81.9%	12	57.1%	71

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		CCA Fac		SC		Overall	
Please indicate if any of the following are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bullying	11.2%	10	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	8.3%	10
Bias	9.3%	9	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	6.9%	9
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Verbal abuse	11.2%	10	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	8.3%	10
None/no response	88.8%	82	100.0%	17	100.0%	15	91.7%	114

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

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

Table 94: Other Potential Problems: Department/Unit

	Admin Pro		CCA F	ac	c SC		Overall	
Please indicate if any of the following are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bullying	15.0%	14	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	11.2%	14
Bias	9.3%	9	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	6.9%	9
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Verbal abuse	11.2%	10	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	8.3%	10
None/no response	85.0%	79	100.0%	17	100.0%	15	88.8%	111

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 Department/Unit**

Some departments with a small number of employees may have been combined for these comparisons. Groupings appear in the following table.

**Table 95: Department Grouping** 

		Pct
Academic	Graduate Program in Ecology-SAU	1.1%
	Graduate Program in Public Health-SAU	1.8%
	Honors Program	12.2%
	School of Global Environmental Sustainability-SAU	7.7%
Administrative	Administrative Communications	3.9%
	Payroll	1.4%
	Presidents Office	4.8%
	Provost/Executive Vice President	6.9%
	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs	5.1%
	VP Faculty Affairs	2.8%
Other	Center for the New Energy Economy	4.7%
	Institute for Learning & Teaching	25.5%
	Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness	8.3%
	Office of Inclusive Excellence	13.8%

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

Table 96: Work Culture

Thinking about your work environment during the past 12	Acade	mic	<b>Administ</b>	rative	Oth	er	Over	rall
months, please indicate your agreement with the following	(A)		(B)		(C	)		
statements about work culture.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
WORK CULTURE OVERALL	66.8%	28	78.3% C	31	56.4%	65	64.2%	124
My department/unit promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	78.1%	28	74.7%	31	60.0%	65	67.8%	124
My department/unit treats all employees equitably	87.3% C	28	74.7%	31	52.4%	65	65.9%	124
My department/unit is open and transparent in communication	43.1%	28	58.9%	31	33.7%	65	42.1%	124
My department/unit values employee input in major department/unit decisions	51.1%	28	62.9%	31	58.0%	65	57.6%	124
My department/unit promotes respect for cultural differences	79.3%	28	95.6% C	31	72.8%	65	79.9%	124
My department/unit understands the value of diversity	100.0% C	28	92.6%	31	76.2%	65	85.7%	124
My department/unit communicates the importance of valuing diversity	78.1%	28	100.0% A	31	89.2%	65	89.4%	124
I feel valued as an employee	65.4%	28	71.7%	31	77.0%	65	73.0%	124
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	51.1% C	28	77.1% C	31	22.7%	65	42.8%	124
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	57.6%	28	74.7% C	31	35.4%	65	50.3%	124
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/unit	57.6%	28	74.7%	31	53.1%	65	59.5%	124
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	59.1%	28	73.8%	31	56.4%	65	61.4%	124
I would recommend my department/unit as a place of employment	60.8%	28	86.9% C	31	46.1%	65	59.6%	124

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

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

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 97: Performance Review in Last Year

	Acader	nic	Administr	ative	Othe	r	Overa	ıll
Did you have a performance review in the last	(A)	(A) (B) (C)						
year?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
No, I did not have a review	8.0%	*	21.5%	7	22.2%	14	18.8%	23
Yes, I had a review	92.0%	26	78.5%	24	77.8%	51	81.2%	101
Total	100.0%	28	100.0%	31	100.0%	65	100.0%	124

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. 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 98: Performance Review** 

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following	Academic (A)						Ove	rall
statements about your most recent performance review.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
PERFORMANCE REVIEW OVERALL	75.9%	26	88.8%	24	79.8%	48	80.9%	99
I am satisfied with the effort my supervisor put into my most recent performance review	79.4%	26	85.1%	24	64.5%	48	73.5%	99
I fear negative job consequences if I am to raise an issue of unfair treatment during my review*	13.8%	26	7.3%	24	29.0%	48	19.6%	99
I am aware of the process to mediate disagreements with my supervisor regarding my evaluation.	48.1%	26	81.2% A	24	74.8% A	48	69.3%	99

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.\*Reverse coded when included in overall rating 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 99: Respect

							_	
Thinking about your work environment during the past 12	Acade	mıc	Administ	rative	Oth	er	Over	rall
months, please indicate your level of agreement with the	(A)		(B)		(C)	)		
following statements about respect.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
RESPECT OVERALL	66.5%	28	81.9% C	31	64.2%	63	69.2%	122
My department/unit is treated with respect by other units within my college/division	44.9%	28	82.5% A	31	64.5%	63	64.5%	122
My college/division is treated with respect by CSU	43.1%	28	86.9% A	31	65.2%	63	65.6%	122
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	100.0% C	28	81.2%	31	78.2%	63	84.0%	122
There is respect for religious differences in my department/unit	73.0%	28	81.2%	31	60.4%	63	68.6%	122
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/unit	79.3%	28	88.6%	31	69.9%	63	76.8%	122
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/unit	58.8%	28	71.1%	31	47.0%	63	55.8%	122

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 100: Favoritism

								-
During the past 12 months, please indicate your level of	Acade	emic	Administ	rative	Oth	er	Over	rall
agreement with the following statements about favoritism.	(A	)	(B)		(C	)		
Favoritism plays a role in who gets:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
FAVORITISM OVERALL	6.7%	28	22.3%	31	28.5%	58	21.6%	118
					Α			
Recognized within my department/unit	12.7%	28	22.3%	31	32.9%	58	25.2%	118
Resources in my department/unit	12.7%	28	37.1%	31	22.9%	58	24.2%	118
Professional development opportunities	0.0%	28	16.6%	31	22.0%	58	15.3%	118
					Α			
Promoted in my department/unit	0.0%	28	18.0%	31	39.0%	58	24.0%	118
					Α			
Hired in my department/unit	8.0%	28	17.5%	31	25.9%	58	19.4%	118

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

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

Table 101: Leadership Accountability: College/Division Leadership

Acade	emic	Administ	rative	Oth	er	Over	all
(A)	)	(B)		(C)	)		
Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
39.8%	24	68.2%	29	20.0%	52	37.8%	104
С		A C					
41.8%	24	63.5%	29	11.9%	56	32.2%	108
С		С					
30.8%	24	78.2%	29	12.5%	54	34.4%	106
		A C					
30.8%	24	72.0%	29	8.8%	56	30.4%	108
		A C					
62.3%	24	74.4%	29	43.1%	56	55.6%	108
		С					
40.3%	24	73.2%	29	29.8%	54	43.9%	107
		A C					
32.9%	24	47.6%	29	12.9%	56	26.5%	108
		С					
	(A Pct 39.8% C 41.8% C 30.8% 30.8% 62.3%	Pct         Pop           39.8%         24           C         24           30.8%         24           30.8%         24           62.3%         24           40.3%         24	(A)         (B)           Pct         Pop         Pct           39.8%         24         68.2%           C         A C           41.8%         24         63.5%           C         C           30.8%         24         78.2%           A C           30.8%         24         72.0%           A C           62.3%         24         74.4%           C           40.3%         24         73.2%           A C	(A)         (B)           Pct         Pop           39.8%         24         68.2%         29           C         A C         C           41.8%         24         63.5%         29           C         C         C           30.8%         24         78.2%         29           A C         A C         A C           62.3%         24         74.4%         29           C         C         A C	(A)         (B)         (C)           Pct         Pop         Pct         Pop         Pct           39.8%         24         68.2%         29         20.0%           C         A C           41.8%         24         63.5%         29         11.9%           C         C         C         20         12.5%           A C         A C         30.8%         24         72.0%         29         8.8%           A C         A C         43.1%         C         29         43.1%           C         40.3%         24         73.2%         29         29.8%           A C         A C         A C         A C         A C         A C	(A)         (B)         (C)           Pct         Pop         Pct         Pop         Pct         Pop           39.8%         24         68.2%         29         20.0%         52           C         A C         29         11.9%         56           C         C         C         29         11.9%         56           C         C         C         29         12.5%         54           A C         A C         A C         29         8.8%         56           A C         A C         A C         29         43.1%         56           C         C         C         29         29.8%         54           A C         A C         A C         54         54	(A)         (B)         (C)           Pct         Pop         Pct         Pop         Pct           39.8%         24         68.2%         29         20.0%         52         37.8%           41.8%         24         63.5%         29         11.9%         56         32.2%           C         C         C         C         54         34.4%           A C         A C         29         8.8%         56         30.4%           A C         A C         A C         55.6%           40.3%         24         73.2%         29         29.8%         54         43.9%

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 102: Leadership Accountability: Department/Unit Leadership

	Acade	mic	Administ	rative	Oth	er	Over	all
Thinking about the past 12 months, please indicate your level	(A)		(B)		(C)	)		
of agreement about leadership accountability.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY OVERALL	56.1% C	24	79.7% A C	29	36.3%	54	52.4%	107
Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	64.3% C	24	82.9% C	29	20.0%	56	46.4%	108
Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	53.3%	24	89.1% A C	29	32.1%	56	51.9%	108
Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	38.5% C	24	78.2% A C	29	13.7%	56	36.2%	108
Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	62.3%	24	74.4% C	29	43.1%	56	55.6%	108
Leadership addresses issues of inequity	40.3%	24	81.2% A C	29	49.8%	54	56.1%	107
Leadership holds all employees to the same standards	55.5%	24	61.8%	29	35.3%	56	46.7%	108

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

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

Table 103: Climate: CSU Overall

Thinking about your work environment during the last 12	Acade	emic	Administ	rative	Oth	er	Over	rall
months, please indicate your level of agreement regarding the	(A	)	(B)		(C	)		
climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
CSU CLIMATE OVERALL	42.2%	24	64.4%	26	35.9%	56	44.4%	106
			A C					
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	10.2%	24	85.9%	29	34.7%	56	42.9%	108
			A C					
Improves the campus climate for all employees	51.3%	24	57.6%	29	22.7%	56	38.2%	108
	С		С					
Retains diverse employees	21.2%	24	32.9%	26	14.3%	56	20.5%	106
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse	51.3%	24	60.9%	29	18.4%	56	36.9%	108
backgrounds	С		С					
Encourages discussions related to diversity	81.6%	24	81.2%	29	75.6%	56	78.4%	108
Provides employees with a positive work experience	30.8%	24	65.6%	29	50.6%	56	50.2%	108
			Α					
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	49.2%	24	73.5%	29	35.2%	56	48.4%	108
			С					

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 104: Climate: Department/Unit

Thinking about your work environment during the last 12	Acade	emic	Administ	trative	Oth	er	Over	all
months, please indicate your level of agreement regarding the	(A	_	(B)		(C)	)		
climate.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT CLIMATE OVERALL	54.6%	24	81.1% A C	26	55.9%	56	61.9%	106
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	39.6%	24	77.9% A	29	60.1%	56	60.3%	108
Improves the campus climate for all employees	66.5%	24	93.8% C	29	56.5%	56	68.6%	108
Retains diverse employees	47.1%	24	71.2% C	26	33.0%	56	45.7%	106
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	51.3% C	24	60.9% C	29	18.4%	56	36.9%	108
Encourages discussions related to diversity	73.9%	24	89.1%	29	81.5%	56	81.8%	108
Provides employees with a positive work experience	64.3%	24	73.0%	29	61.1%	56	65.0%	108
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	49.2%	24	87.7% A C	29	51.4%	56	60.5%	108

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

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

Table 105: Communications: CSU Overall

Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months,	Acade	emic	Administ	rative	Oth	er	Over	rall
please indicate your level of agreement with the following	(A	)	(B)		(C)	)		
statements about communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
CSU COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	72.3% C	24	60.6%	26	42.4%	56	53.7%	106
Communications are effective	84.9% C	24	55.9%	26	47.1%	56	57.8%	106
Communications are timely	69.7%	24	62.6%	26	57.7%	56	61.6%	106
Communications are relevant	77.4% C	24	62.6%	26	36.4%	56	52.2%	106
Communications are informative	84.9% C	24	69.3%	26	50.8%	56	63.0%	106
Communications are motivating	41.8%	24	40.0%	26	24.6%	56	32.3%	106
Communications are honest	62.3% C	24	62.6% C	26	25.4%	56	42.9%	106
Communications are accessible	84.9% C	24	70.9%	26	55.2%	56	65.8%	106

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

Table 106: Communications: Division/College

Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months,	Acade	emic	Administ	trative	Oth	er	Over	all
please indicate your level of agreement with the following	(A	)	(B)		(C)			
statements about communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
COLLEGE/DIVISION COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	60.0% C	24	77.2% C	26	31.9%	54	49.9%	104
Communications are effective	49.5%	24	76.3% C	26	26.6%	56	44.1%	106
Communications are timely	67.9% C	24	88.2% C	26	37.8%	56	57.1%	106
Communications are relevant	77.4% C	24	81.5% C	26	46.3%	56	62.0%	106
Communications are informative	77.4%	24	81.5% C	26	51.4%	54	65.0%	104
Communications are motivating	26.9%	24	45.0% C	26	5.6%	56	20.2%	106
Communications are honest	52.7% C	24	81.5% C	26	23.2%	56	44.4%	106
Communications are accessible	67.9% C	24	86.2% C	26	37.7%	56	56.5%	106

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

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

Table 107: Communications: Department/Unit

Thinking about work communications over the last 12 months,	Acade	emic	Administ	trative	e Other		Ove	rall
please indicate your level of agreement with the following	(A	)	(B)		(C)			
statements about communications.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
DEPARTMENT/UNIT COMMUNICATIONS OVERALL	66.3%	24	78.9% C	26	54.3%	54	63.3%	104
Communications are effective	56.9%	24	81.5% C	26	49.2%	56	58.9%	106
Communications are timely	75.3%	24	88.2%	26	64.8%	56	73.0%	106
Communications are relevant	84.9%	24	81.5%	26	68.0%	56	75.1%	106
Communications are informative	84.9%	24	81.5%	26	79.1%	56	81.0%	106
Communications are motivating	26.9%	24	45.0%	26	29.7%	56	32.9%	106
Communications are honest	60.2%	24	81.5%	26	48.9%	54	59.7%	104
			С					
Communications are accessible	75.3%	24	93.3%	26	48.9%	56	65.9%	106
	C		C					

Percent "Agree" or "Strongly agree"

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

<sup>1.</sup> 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

<sup>2.</sup> Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.

<sup>3.</sup> Cell counts in some subtables are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integers before performing pairwise comparisons.

**Table 108: Communicated Feedback** 

	Acade	mic	Administ	rative	Othe	er	Overa	all
During the past 12 months, have you had the opportunity to	(A)	(A)		(A) (B) (C)				
communicate feedback to CSU?	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Yes, I have the opportunity to provide feedback	52.7%	13	70.9% C	19	31.4%	18	46.0%	49
Maybe, I can provide feedback in limited situations	37.7%	9	13.8%	4	65.4% B	37	46.3%	49
No, I don't have an opportunity to provide feedback	9.6%	*	15.3%	4	3.2%	*	7.6%	8
Total	100.0%	24	100.0%	26	100.0%	56	100.0%	106

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 >= 3.1,2

- 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 109: Responsiveness to Feedback

	Acade	mic	Administ	rative	Othe	er	Over	all
When I use the following channels, leadership is	(A)	(A)			(C)			
responsive to my feedback:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
RESPONSIVENESS TO FEEDBACK OVERALL	52.4%	22	61.2% C	21	37.8%	52	46.3%	94
One on one conversations with my supervisor	83.3%	22	86.0%	22	76.6%	52	80.3%	96
My representation in shared governance (CPC, APC, or Faculty Council)	17.6%	22	47.9%	22	23.5%	52	27.9%	96
My service on committees	31.2%	22	31.7%	22	28.0%	52	29.6%	96
Annual review process	75.1%	22	67.2%	22	48.8%	52	59.0%	96
Input collection through anonymous surveys	54.7% C	22	61.9% C	21	12.1%	52	32.8%	94

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 110: Feedback Valued

	Acadeı	mic	Administr	ative	Othe	er	Overa	all
	(A)		(B)		(C)			
When I give feedback it is valued by:	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
FEEDBACK VALUED OVERALL	61.4% C	22	64.4% C	20	36.9%	52	48.4%	93
CSU overall	38.0% C	22	40.0% C	22	6.8%	52	21.6%	96
My division/college	62.9%	22	70.7% C	20	35.1%	52	49.1%	93
My department/unit	83.3%	22	69.1%	22	68.8%	52	72.1%	96

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 111: Discriminatory Attitudes: CSU Overall

Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently	Acade	mic	Administ	rative	Oth	er	Overa	
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	6.2%	*	13.1%	4	20.5%	13	15.4%	19
Physical appearance	0.0%	*	13.1%	4	12.6%	8	9.8%	12
Physical disability	6.2%	*	26.2%	8	21.6%	14	19.2%	24
Mental disability	0.0%	*	26.2%	8	21.6%	14	17.8%	22
Employment classification	12.5%	4	36.6%	11	46.4%	30	36.2%	45
Gender identity	0.0%	*	31.9%	10	35.8%	23	26.7%	33
Job title	31.6%	9	18.8%	6	38.9%	25	32.2%	40
Parental status	12.5%	4	11.7%	4	16.1%	10	14.2%	18
Religion	6.2%	*	25.0%	8	26.5%	17	21.5%	27
Political affiliation	0.0%	*	25.0%	8	20.2%	13	16.8%	21
Sexual orientation	0.0%	*	17.2%	5	28.6%	19	19.2%	24
Socio-economic status	18.9%	5	18.8%	6	21.6%	14	20.3%	25
Ethnic origin	12.7%	4	31.9%	10	32.7%	21	27.9%	35
Veteran status	0.0%	*	5.7%	*	0.0%	*	1.4%	*
Race or color	12.7%	4	31.9%	10	41.3%	27	32.4%	40
Marital status	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	10.5%	7	5.5%	7
Nationality/country of origin	12.7%	4	18.8%	6	19.5%	13	17.8%	22
None/no response	62.1%	18	38.4%	12	33.9%	22	41.5%	52

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

Table 112: Discriminatory Attitudes: Division/College

Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently	Academic		Administrative		Other		Ove	rall
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	0.0%	*	5.7%	*	17.0%	11	10.3%	13
Physical appearance	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	7.0%	5	3.6%	5
Physical disability	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	14.0%	9	7.3%	9
Mental disability	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	14.0%	9	7.3%	9
Employment classification	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	10.5%	7	5.5%	7
Gender identity	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	16.7%	11	8.7%	11
Job title	25.4%	7	0.0%	*	7.0%	5	9.5%	12
Parental status	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.5%	*	1.8%	*
Religion	0.0%	*	5.7%	*	3.5%	*	3.3%	4
Political affiliation	0.0%	*	5.7%	*	0.0%	*	1.4%	*
Sexual orientation	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	7.0%	5	3.6%	5
Socio-economic status	0.0%	*	5.7%	*	10.5%	7	6.9%	9
Ethnic origin	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	10.5%	7	5.5%	7
Race or color	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	6.2%	4	3.3%	4
Marital status	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.5%	*	1.8%	*
Nationality/country of origin	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.5%	*	1.8%	*
None/no response	74.6%	21	94.3%	29	69.1%	45	76.6%	95

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

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

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

Table 113: Discriminatory Attitudes: Department/Unit

Please indicate if discriminatory attitudes are currently	Academic		Administrative		Other		Overall	
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Age	12.7%	4	5.7%	*	17.0%	11	13.2%	16
Physical appearance	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	7.0%	5	3.6%	5
Physical disability	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	14.0%	9	7.3%	9
Mental disability	12.7%	4	0.0%	*	14.0%	9	10.2%	13
Employment classification	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	10.5%	7	5.5%	7
Gender identity	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	19.4%	13	10.2%	13
Job title	12.7%	4	5.7%	*	3.5%	*	6.2%	8
Parental status	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.5%	*	1.8%	*
Religion	0.0%	*	5.7%	*	3.5%	*	3.3%	4
Political affiliation	0.0%	*	5.7%	*	0.0%	*	1.4%	*
Sexual orientation	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	7.0%	5	3.6%	5
Socio-economic status	0.0%	*	5.7%	*	10.5%	7	6.9%	9
Ethnic origin	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	10.5%	7	5.5%	7
Race or color	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.5%	*	1.8%	*
Marital status	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.5%	*	1.8%	*
Nationality/country of origin	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	3.5%	*	1.8%	*
None/no response	87.3%	25	88.6%	27	69.8%	45	78.5%	98

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

Statistical significance not tested.

**Table 114: Other Potential Problems: CSU Overall** 

	Academic		Administrative		Other		Overall	
Please indicate if any of the following are currently problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	6.2%	*	24.5%	8	25.8%	17	21.0%	26
Bullying	0.0%	*	31.9%	10	20.2%	13	18.5%	23
Bias	31.6%	9	42.0%	13	40.0%	26	38.6%	48
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	13.1%	4	5.6%	4	6.2%	8
Verbal abuse	12.7%	4	24.5%	8	21.0%	14	20.0%	25
None/no response	62.1%	18	58.0%	18	54.6%	35	57.1%	71

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

Table 115: Other Potential Problems: Division/College

Please indicate if any of the following are currently	Academic		Administrative		Other		Overall	
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bullying	0.0%	*	5.7%	*	13.2%	9	8.3%	10
Bias	0.0%	*	5.7%	*	10.5%	7	6.9%	9
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Verbal abuse	0.0%	*	5.7%	*	13.2%	9	8.3%	10
None/no response	100.0%	28	94.3%	29	86.8%	56	91.7%	114

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

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

Statistical significance not tested.

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

Statistical significance not tested.

<sup>\*</sup> Values reported for items with  $n \ge 3$ .

**Table 116: Other Potential Problems: Department** 

Tubic 110. Other Fotoritian Frobleme. Department								
Please indicate if any of the following are currently	Acade	Academic		rative	Other		Overall	
problematic.	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop	Pct	Pop
Sexual harassment	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Bullying	0.0%	*	11.4%	4	15.9%	10	11.2%	14
Bias	0.0%	*	5.7%	*	10.5%	7	6.9%	9
Physical assault	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Sexual misconduct	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	*
Verbal abuse	0.0%	*	5.7%	*	13.2%	9	8.3%	10
None/no response	100.0%	28	88.6%	27	84.1%	55	88.8%	111

Inone/no response  $\begin{bmatrix} 100.0\% & 28 \end{bmatrix}$  8

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

\* Values reported for items with n >= 3.