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2021 Employee Climate Survey

- Purpose is to assess the current employee climate
- Language similar to 2018
- 2018-2021 comparison is priority
- Emphasis on disaggregated data
- Cross tabs by gender, racial minoritized status, and employee type
- College/Division level reports posted
  - Department/unit level reports available by request
- Survey Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Survey Launch- October 19th
  - Automated messages signed by Deans and VPs
  - Language similar to 2018
| Data Preparation
  - Data analysis
  - Report writing
  - Report presented at university level |
| Results Dissemination
  - Hired a Qualitative & Survey Research Analyst
  - College/Division level
  - Department/Unit level |
2021 Employee Climate Survey

• Results
  • Tool

• Provide an overall picture of employment experiences and perceptions

• Further CSU’s commitment to institutional accountability

• Be actionable and incite dialogue
  • Inform policies, initiatives, and opportunities that will provide an equitable and exceptional work environment
  • Previous actions: supervisory training, professional development opportunities, unit level Diversity Strategic Plans

• Provide benchmark for longitudinal data collection and comparison
Organizational Themes

Work Culture

- My department/unit promotes a work environment where all employees feel included
- My department/unit treats all employees equitably
- My department/unit is open and transparent in communication
- My department/unit values employee input in major department/unit decisions
- My department/unit promotes respect for cultural differences
- My department/unit understands the value of diversity
- My department/unit communicates the importance of valuing diversity
- I feel valued as an employee
- I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU
- I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college
- I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/unit
- I would recommend CSU as a place of employment
- I would recommend my department/unit as a place of employment
Organizational Themes

Climate

- Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds
- Improves the campus climate for all employees
- Retains diverse employees
- Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds
- Encourages discussions related to diversity
- Provides employees with a positive work experience
- Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees
Organizational Themes

Leadership Accountability

• Leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior
• Leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior
• Leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace
• Leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace
• Leadership addresses issues of inequity
• Leadership holds all employees to the same standards
Organizational Themes

Respect

• My department/unit is treated with respect by other units within my college/division
• My college/division is treated with respect by CSU
• The people I interact with treat each other with respect
• There is respect for religious differences in my department/unit
• There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/unit
• There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/unit
Organizational Themes

Favoritism plays a role in who gets:

- Recognized within my department/unit
- Resources in my department/unit
- Professional development opportunities
- Promoted in my department/unit
- Hired in my department/unit
Organizational Themes

Communications:
- Communications are effective
- Communications are timely
- Communications are relevant
- Communications are informative
- Communications are motivating
- Communications are honest
- Communications are accessible
Demographic Questions

• Expanded our demographic questions for the 2021 survey to include follow up questions regarding race/ethnicity and gender identity

• These questions are helping to inform the work done by the disaggregating race/ethnicity committee

• Intersectionality report forthcoming

• Added a question on identifying as a person with a disability

• Added a question about identifying in the LGBTQIA+ community
Data Collection

• Administered via Qualtrix in Fall 2021 to all CSU employees

• Embedded data included employment type, college/division, department/unit; anonymous

• Survey available in Spanish and English (both web-based and paper hard copy)

• <15 minutes to complete

• Results are reported in aggregate and no identifying information reported; confidential
Sample Weighting

- Weighting was used to ensure that sample demographics align with known population parameters

- Gender, racially-minoritized status, college/division, and employment type were used to weight the overall results

- College/division reports were weighted by racially minoritized status, gender, and employment type as needed

- For comparison purposes, 2018 results were also weighted in the 2021 report
Reporting Standards

• Questions on organizational themes were in a 5 point-likert scale - strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree.

• Summarize organizational themes with a percent agreement.

• Reports include the response distribution per item as well as cross tabs by gender, employee type, and racially minoritized status at the overall level and the college/division level.

• Department level reports are available by request.

• Reports show weighted n’s.

• Statistical tests are provided in the data tables, today’s presentation focuses on average percentage agreement across organizational themes.
Response Rates by College/Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Division</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Overall</td>
<td>7911</td>
<td>3457</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Natural Sciences</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Forest Service</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Athletics</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Engagement and Extension</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Enrollment and Access</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Equity, Equal Opportunity, and Title IX</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of International Programs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Student Affairs</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of the Vice President for Research</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of University Operations</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Advancement</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Marketing and Communications</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Scott, Jr. College of Engineering</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner College of Natural Resources</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics by Gender

- Men: 50%
- Women: 47%
- T/NB/NC: 3%
Demographics by Racially Minoritized Status
Demographics by Employee Type

- State Classified: 6%
- Admin Professional: 49%
- Other Salaried Employee: 4%
- Tenure/Tenure-Track (T/TT) Faculty: 28%
- Contract, continuing, and adjunct (CCA): 14%
Organizational Themes

Average Percent Agreement

- Work Culture: 70%
- CSU Climate: 61%
- Dept/Unit Climate: 63%
- Col/Div Leadership Accountability: 51%
- Dept/Unit Leadership Accountability: 51%
- Respect: 66%
- Favoritism: 18%
Themes by Gender

Average Percent Agreement
Themes by Racially Minoritized Status

Average Percent Agreement

- Work Culture: 33% (Racially minoritized), 61% (Non-racially minoritized), 59% (Div/Col overall)
- CSU Climate: 53% (Racially minoritized), 59% (Non-racially minoritized), 52% (Div/Col overall)
- Dept/Unit Climate: 41% (Racially minoritized), 60% (Non-racially minoritized), 43% (Div/Col overall)
- Col/Div Leadership Accountability: 18% (Racially minoritized), 43% (Non-racially minoritized), 49% (Div/Col overall)
- Dept/Unit Leadership Accountability: 26% (Racially minoritized), 49% (Non-racially minoritized), 58% (Div/Col overall)
- Respect: 60% (Racially minoritized), 58% (Non-racially minoritized), 52% (Div/Col overall)
- Favoritism: 52% (Racially minoritized), 58% (Non-racially minoritized), 27% (Div/Col overall)
Themes Compared Over Time

Average Percent Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Culture</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Climate</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Climate</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col/Div Leadership</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Leadership</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Themes Over Time by Gender

Average Percent Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Culture</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Climate</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Climate</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/DivisioLeadership</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Leadership</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNENC</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Climate</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Climate</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/DivisioLeadership</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Leadership</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Themes Over Time by Racially Minoritized Status

Average Percent Agreement

- Work Culture
  - 2018: 71%
  - 2021: 61%
- CSU Climate
  - 2018: 77%
  - 2021: 69%
- Dept/Unit Climate
  - 2018: 72%
  - 2021: 60%
- Col/Div Leadership
  - 2018: 56%
  - 2021: 43%
- Dept/Unit Leadership
  - 2018: 58%
  - 2021: 49%
- Respect
  - 2018: 67%
  - 2021: 58%
- Favoritism
  - 2018: 22%
  - 2021: 27%
Themes Over Time by Employee Type

Average Percent Agreement

- **2018**
- **2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Culture</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Climate</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep/Unit Climate</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Div Leadership</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AccountAbility</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep/Unit Leadership</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Percent Agreement
CSU Perceptions Over Time

- Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds
- Improves the campus climate for all employees
- Retains diverse employees
- Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds
- Encourages discussions related to diversity
- Provides employees with a positive work experience
- Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees

Average Percent Agreement

- 2014
- 2016
- 2018
- 2021
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds
Improves the campus climate for all employees
Retains diverse employees
Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds
Encourages discussions related to diversity
Provides employees with a positive work experience
Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees
Harassment/Other Problematic Behaviors Over Time

- 2018 CSU Overall:
  - Bias: 13%
  - Bullying: 14%
  - Sexual Harassment/misconduct: 9%
  - Verbal abuse: 0%
  - Physical assault: 0%

- 2021 CSU Overall:
  - Bias: 22%
  - Bullying: 11%
  - Sexual Harassment/misconduct: 6%
  - Verbal abuse: 1%
  - Physical assault: 0%

- 2018 College of Agricultural Sciences:
  - Bias: 29%
  - Bullying: 13%
  - Sexual Harassment/misconduct: 11%
  - Verbal abuse: 7%
  - Physical assault: 0%

- 2021 College of Agricultural Sciences:
  - Bias: 24%
  - Bullying: 10%
  - Sexual Harassment/misconduct: 10%
  - Verbal abuse: 7%
  - Physical assault: 0%

Average Percent Agreement
Key Findings for CAS

- Compared to CSU Overall, CAS had higher average agreements across all organizational themes in 2021. Rates were lowest around college/department leadership accountability themes and highest around work culture theme.

- Compared to college/division overall, men had favorable responses in nearly all organizational themes. Women and employees who identified as transgender/non-binary/nonconforming had less favorable results, particularly around work culture and leadership accountability.

- CAS college/division and department/unit leadership accountability average percentage agreements were also lowest among racially minoritized employees and tenure/tenure track faculty.

- State Classified employees reported the highest agreement scores in nearly all organizational themes. All other types had less favorable average agreements, with rates lower than the college/division overall in nearly all organizational themes, and more so around college and department leadership accountability.

- Compared to CUS overall, CAS had lower average agreements in 2021. However, there was a slight increase around favoritism in the college/division in 2021 compared to 2018.

- CAS had higher average agreements of employees who agreed/strongly agreed that the college/division encourages discussions related to diversity. However, rates were significantly lower on themes related to inclusiveness and retention of employees from diverse backgrounds in the college of agricultural sciences.

- While there was a decrease in agreements around most themes related to discrimination and harassment in CAS, results showed increasing rates around socioeconomic status, gender identity, and mental/physical disability. There was a slight decrease in bias, race/ethnicity, bullying, and sexual harassment in the college/division between 2018 and 2021.
Additional Information

Please visit the Office for Inclusive Excellence (OIE) website and review the following reports:
➢ Overall CSU report
➢ College/Division Report

Visit the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness (IR) and review detailed CSU Employee Data for additional information.

Please visit the following websites and explore a variety of resources and training opportunities (FREE) available to support faculty and staff across CSU:
DEI training opportunities (OIE)
Faculty Success (Office of the Provost, OIE, IR)
Faculty Institute for Inclusive Excellence (OIE)
Chairs & Heads Institute for Inclusive Excellence (Office of the Provost, OIE, IR)
A Multicultural Organization

Jackson, Hardiman, and Holvino

1. Clear commitment to creating an inclusive organization
2. Seeks, develops, and values the contributions and talents of all members
3. Includes all members as active participants in decisions that shape the organization
4. Employees reflect diverse social and cultural groups throughout all levels of the organization; and demonstrate the multicultural competencies to serve the increasingly diverse student populations
5. Acts on its commitment to eliminate all forms of exclusion/discrimination within the organization, including racism, sexism, heterosexism, ageism, classism, ableism, religious oppression, etc.
6. Follows through on broader social and environmental responsibilities
Multicultural Organization Development Continuum

Monocultural

Exclusionary
- Exclusion or token presence of marginalized group members

Club
- Marginalized group members encouraged to join but expected to fit in, status quo culture

Non-Discrimination

Compliance
- Culture, climate, and system experience fundamental sustainable change

Affirming

Redefining

Multicultural/Inclusive
- Culture, climate, and system experience fundamental sustainable change
What do you notice?

What suggestions do you have for using this data at the university and college/division levels?

How do you see yourself individually or as a team using the ECS results to create an inclusive work environment?

- Small Groups
- 15-20 minutes
- Name, pronouns
- Be prepared to share out
Thank you