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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

**2021**
- Survey Launched- October 19th
  - Automated messages signed by Deans and VPs
  - Language similar to 2018
- Survey Closed- November 22nd

**2022**
- Data Preparation
  - Data analysis
  - Report writing
  - Report reported at university level

**2023**
- 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

- Recruit's 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 sample size…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: 85%
- Women: 10%
- T/NB/NC: 5%
Demographics by Racially Minoritized Status

Non-Racially Minoritized Employees 89%

Racially-Minoritized Employees 7.5%

- Black/African American 0%
- Hispanic/Latinx American 0%
- Native American 3%
- Asian American 5%
- Native Hawaiian/Pac. Islander 0%
Demographics by Employee Type

- State Classified: 23%
- Admin Professional: 77%
Organizational Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Div/Col Overall</th>
<th>CSU Overall</th>
<th>Average Percent Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Culture</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Climate</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Climate</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col/Div Leadership Accountability</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Leadership Accountability</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Themes by Gender

- Work Culture: Man 78%, Woman 61%, T/NB/NC 23%
- CSU Climate: Man 58%, Woman 54%, T/NB/NC 0%
- Dept/Unit Climate: Man 62%, Woman 63%, T/NB/NC 0%
- Col/Div Leadership Accountability: Man 48%, Woman 28%, T/NB/NC 0%
- Dept/Unit Leadership Accountability: Man 48%, Woman 28%, T/NB/NC 0%
- Respect: Man 83%, Woman 74%, T/NB/NC 17%
- Favoritism: Man 45%, Woman 40%, T/NB/NC 60%

Average Percent Agreement
Themes by Racially Minoritized Status

- **Work Culture**: 70% (Racially minoritized), 38% (Non-racially minoritized), 56% (Div/Col overall)
- **CSU Climate**: 56% (Racially minoritized), 41% (Non-racially minoritized), 28% (Div/Col overall)
- **Dept/Unit Climate**: 64% (Racially minoritized), 34% (Non-racially minoritized), 0% (Div/Col overall)
- **Col/Div Leadership Accountability**: 34% (Racially minoritized), 34% (Non-racially minoritized), 0% (Div/Col overall)
- **Dept/Unit Leadership Accountability**: 71% (Racially minoritized), 65% (Non-racially minoritized), 55% (Div/Col overall)
- **Respect**: 44% (Racially minoritized), 55% (Non-racially minoritized), 71% (Div/Col overall)
- **Favoritism**:
Themes by Employee Type

- Work Culture: Admin Professional 76%, CSU Climate 45%, Dept/Unit Climate 62%
- CSU Climate: State Classified 46%, Col/Div Leadership Accountability 38%
- Dept/Unit Climate: Col/Div Leadership Accountability 23%, Dept/Unit Leadership Accountability 23%
- Col/Div Leadership Accountability: Respect 73%, Favorism 35%
- Dept/Unit Leadership Accountability: Respect 59%, Favorism 60%

Average Percent Agreement
Themes Compared Over Time

- Work Culture: 2021 - 69%, 2018 - 68%
- CSU Climate: 2021 - 53%, 2018 - 73%
- Dept/Unit Climate: 2021 - 59%, 2018 - 59%
- Col/Div Leadership Accountability: 2021 - 34%, 2018 - 37%
- Dept/Unit Leadership Accountability: 2021 - 34%, 2018 - 45%
- Respect: 2021 - 70%, 2018 - 75%
- Favoritism: 2021 - 41%, 2018 - 51%

Average Percent Agreement
Themes Over Time by Gender

![Bar chart showing average percent agreement over time for different themes by gender. The chart includes themes such as Work Culture, CSU Climate, Dept/Unit Climate, Col/Div Leadership Accountability, Dept/Unit Leadership Accountability, Respect, and Favoritism. The data is presented for both 2018 and 2021, with some themes showing a significant increase in percent agreement between the two years.](chart.png)

Average Percent Agreement
Themes Over Time by Racially Minoritized Status

Average Percent Agreement
Themes Over Time by Employee Type

Average Percent Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Culture</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Climate</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Climate</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col/Div Leadership</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Leadership</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Percent Agreement
CSU Perceptions Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the campus climate for all employees</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retains diverse employees</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages discussions related to diversity</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides employees with a positive work experience</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
**International Programs Perceptions Over Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the campus climate for all employees</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retains diverse employees</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages discussions related to diversity</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides employees with a positive work experience</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average Percent Agreement*
Reported Discriminatory Attitudes Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic status</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnic origin</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political affiliation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical appearance</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental status</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality/country of origin</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment classification</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (mental &amp; physical)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Harassment/Other Problematic Behaviors Over Time

2018 CSU Overall
- Bias: 33%
- Bullying: 12%
- Sexual Harassment/misconduct: 6%
- Verbal abuse: 0%
- Physical assault: 0%

2018 International Programs
- Bias: 25%
- Bullying: 10%
- Sexual Harassment/misconduct: 8%
- Verbal abuse: 3%
- Physical assault: 0%

2021 CSU Overall
- Bias: 37%
- Bullying: 24%
- Sexual Harassment/misconduct: 11%
- Verbal abuse: 8%
- Physical assault: 3%

2021 Office of International Programs
- Bias: 27%
- Bullying: 23%
- Sexual Harassment/misconduct: 23%
- Verbal abuse: 0%
- Physical assault: 8%

Average Percent Agreement

0%: small sample size, n ≤ 3
Key Findings: Office of International Programs

- Compared to CSU overall, the division of international programs (IPO) had lower average agreements in nearly all organizational themes in 2021, except for work culture, department/unit climate, and respect. Rates were lowest (<50%) regarding department/unit climate and division/college and department/unit leadership accountability. Extremely high rates (41%) were reported around favoritism, which is undesirable.

- Compared to college/division overall, women had lower average agreements across all themes, particularly regarding college/division and department/unit leadership accountability. Transgender and gender nonconforming employees had the lowest rates (<30%) regarding work culture and respect. T/NB/NC also reported the highest agreements (60%) regarding favoritism, followed by men at 45%.

- Compared to college/division overall, racially minoritized employees had lower average agreements in nearly all themes in 2021, with lowest rates around college/division and department/unit leadership accountability.

- Compared to college/division overall, racially minoritized and state classified employees reported undesirable average agreements across all organizational themes, with extremely high rates (55%-60%) for favoritism, respectively.

- When looking at perceptions over time for the division, we found a decrease in average agreements in nearly all themes in 2021 compared to 2018, except for encouragement around discussions related to diversity. However, average agreements were lowest (<50%) regarding campus climate and retention of employees from diverse backgrounds.

- While there was a decrease in reported discriminatory attitudes in nearly all themes in 2021 compared to 2018, we found less desirable average agreements related to discriminatory behaviors related to nationality/country of origin.

- Additionally, there was an increase in problematic behaviors related to bullying and sexual harassment in 2021 compared to 2018. We found a slight decrease in problematic behaviors regarding verbal abuse in the division.
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

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

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

  - Affirming
  - Multicultural/Inclusive
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