College of Natural Sciences
Employee Climate Survey Results 2018

The 2018 CSU Employee Climate Assessment is a biennial assessment conducted in the fall to assess employee perceptions related to their department/unit, division/college, and CSU. The full assessment comprises three main components: the survey, focus groups, open forums, and open ended results.

This sub report focuses on the results of the survey component of the assessment for the College of Natural Sciences. Please visit the 2018 Employee Climate Survey website for the complete university report, specialized reports, the focus group report, the open end analysis, links to past results, and presentations.

The 2018 instrument focuses on the following employment themes: culture, sense of belonging, respect, favoritism, accountability, misconduct, bias incidents, feedback on employee councils, Principles of Community usage and awareness, freedom of speech, and CSU and department perceptions. All of these items were asked on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree). Only select findings are covered in this report.

For the purposes of this report division refers to the College of Natural Sciences, and "agreement" is defined as a respondent selecting either "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" on the Likert scale. Agreement is generally reported as the proportion or percent of respondents providing the combination of these responses. When a mean (average) score is reported, it is based on this 1 to 5 scale. Generally, with exceptions such as Favoritism, the higher the mean score, the more favorable the rating.

On many of the survey items, respondents could chose a non-evaluative response such as "Don't know/NA" or "Prefer not to disclose." These responses, along with missing data, have been excluded from all analyses.

Data are reported only when there is a large enough response pool (number of respondents to a survey item) to ensure respondent anonymity. Any potentially identifying data has been kept confidential and will not be reported.

Contents

Appendix A: Item Percentages

The following tables display the frequencies for each item asked on the survey for the division's respondents only. For items asked on the 1 to 5 point Likert scale, the mean (average) rating is also displayed.

Table A1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
Supports a healthy work/life balance	3.6%	8.9%	21.0%	41.5%	25.0%	224	3.75
Understands the value of diversity	4.9%	12.6%	11.7%	38.6%	32.3%	223	3.81
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	12.9%	15.6%	14.7%	37.9%	18.8%	224	3.34
Treats all employees equitably	14.9%	20.4%	18.6%	25.8%	20.4%	221	3.16
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	7.3%	15.0%	19.1%	37.7%	20.9%	220	3.50
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	5.8%	12.1%	13.9%	39.5%	28.7%	223	3.73
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.6%	11.5%	20.3%	38.2%	25.3%	217	3.68
Is open and transparent in communication	16.7%	11.3%	21.6%	33.8%	16.7%	222	3.23
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	12.7%	14.9%	15.8%	34.4%	22.2%	221	3.38

Table A2 Culture

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	6.9%	12.5%	28.7%	39.4%	12.5%	216	3.38
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.9%	3.9%	19.3%	47.8%	25.1%	207	3.86
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	0.0%	0.5%	1.9%	44.9%	52.7%	207	4.50
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	6.2%	8.1%	10.0%	39.3%	36.5%	211	3.92
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	21.7%	39.2%	12.4%	9.7%	17.1%	217	2.61
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	6.5%	26.0%	28.8%	22.3%	16.3%	215	3.16
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	6.7%	11.1%	19.1%	44.0%	19.1%	225	3.58
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	7.6%	16.1%	20.1%	37.9%	18.3%	224	3.43
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	8.6%	10.8%	11.7%	40.5%	28.4%	222	3.69

Table A3 Respect

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
My department/office is treated with respect by other departments/offices within my division/college	4.4%	11.5%	23.6%	42.9%	17.6%	182	3.58
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	1.6%	6.5%	21.0%	53.8%	17.2%	186	3.78
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	5.8%	10.8%	13.9%	42.6%	26.9%	223	3.74
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	4.4%	6.1%	25.6%	40.6%	23.3%	180	3.72
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	2.0%	0.5%	13.6%	48.7%	35.2%	199	4.15
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	10.2%	10.8%	32.8%	33.9%	12.4%	186	3.27
I feel valued as an employee	9.5%	13.1%	17.6%	36.9%	23.0%	222	3.51

Table A4 Favoritism

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office	10.4%	25.4%	20.9%	25.4%	17.9%	201	3.15
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	9.2%	28.1%	24.5%	23.0%	15.3%	196	3.07
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	16.2%	36.1%	26.2%	12.6%	8.9%	191	2.62
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	14.8%	32.7%	19.4%	18.9%	14.3%	196	2.85
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	14.7%	36.1%	27.7%	10.5%	11.0%	191	2.67

Table A5 Leadership and Accountability

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	12.0%	16.8%	22.8%	31.7%	16.8%	167	3.25
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	12.3%	19.6%	17.3%	34.6%	16.2%	179	3.23
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	13.6%	14.8%	24.7%	32.7%	14.2%	162	3.19

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	11.6%	18.6%	23.3%	33.7%	12.8%	172	3.17
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	11.3%	16.6%	34.4%	28.5%	9.3%	151	3.08
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	12.9%	19.9%	26.9%	30.4%	9.9%	171	3.05
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	6.6%	5.5%	14.2%	47.5%	26.2%	183	3.81
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	7.6%	7.6%	13.2%	44.7%	26.9%	197	3.76
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	8.1%	11.2%	23.0%	42.2%	15.5%	161	3.46
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	9.0%	15.3%	24.9%	35.6%	15.3%	177	3.33
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	12.3%	13.5%	26.9%	31.6%	15.8%	171	3.25
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	15.7%	18.8%	23.0%	29.3%	13.1%	191	3.05

Table A6 Misconduct

Check whether or not the following statements are true based on the type of misconduct. (Select all that apply)	Sexual Harassment	Sexual Misconduct	Bullying	Bias	Physical Assault	Verbal Assault	None	Total (N)
___ is problematic among employees at CSU	13.8%	6.0%	18.0%	30.0%	0.5%	11.5%	62.7%	217
___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	8.8%	2.3%	9.2%	25.3%	0.0%	8.3%	69.6%	217
___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	6.9%	2.3%	22.1%	33.6%	0.5%	12.0%	54.8%	217
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	3.7%	0.5%	22.1%	22.6%	0.9%	14.7%	64.5%	217

Table A7 Bias Incidents

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	0.5%	5.3%	12.1%	46.9%	35.3%	207	4.11
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	5.0%	13.8%	17.7%	42.0%	21.5%	181	3.61
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	5.0%	27.4%	34.6%	21.2%	11.7%	179	3.07
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	6.2%	19.2%	42.3%	27.7%	4.6%	130	3.05
CSU handles incidents of bias well	5.4%	12.5%	36.3%	36.3%	9.5%	168	3.32

Table A8 Employee Councils

Are you aware there is an employee group/organization that represents the interests of my employee group?(multiple response item)	%	N
Yes	91.2%	197
No	8.8%	19
Total	100.0%	216

Table A9 Employee Councils

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
I feel my employee council addresses issues and topics that are important and relevant to me	8.3%	14.1%	35.3%	33.3%	9.0%	156	3.21
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	4.8%	4.2%	20.4%	40.1%	30.5%	167	3.87

Table A10 Principles of Community

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
I am familiar with the Principles of Community.	6.4%	13.9%	10.4%	34.7%	34.7%	202	3.77
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	11.4%	29.1%	17.7%	26.9%	14.9%	175	3.05
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	12.9%	20.2%	47.9%	14.7%	4.3%	163	2.77
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	8.4%	14.3%	46.1%	24.0%	7.1%	154	3.07

Table A11 Freedom of Speech

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
My division/college supports people speaking freely	6.7%	8.8%	16.0%	46.4%	22.2%	194	3.69
Free speech is an important issue on campus	0.5%	1.9%	6.3%	44.7%	46.6%	208	4.35
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	2.5%	12.4%	25.2%	49.5%	10.4%	202	3.53
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	4.0%	30.3%	21.9%	34.8%	9.0%	201	3.14
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	9.6%	42.3%	20.2%	21.2%	6.7%	208	2.73

Table A12 CSU Perceptions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	4.8%	9.7%	18.8%	46.2%	20.4%	186	3.68
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	6.6%	9.1%	23.7%	47.0%	13.6%	198	3.52
CSU retains diverse employees	8.2%	14.5%	26.4%	36.5%	14.5%	159	3.35
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	6.9%	8.6%	19.5%	47.1%	17.8%	174	3.60
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	3.5%	5.6%	15.2%	44.9%	30.8%	198	3.94
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	6.0%	8.0%	17.0%	48.5%	20.5%	200	3.70
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	5.8%	7.5%	27.2%	38.7%	20.8%	173	3.61
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.3%	6.2%	12.8%	42.7%	34.1%	211	3.96

Table A13 Department/Unit Perceptions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total (N | Avg)	
Department/office recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	6.1%	15.7%	19.3%	40.1%	18.8%	197	3.50
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	7.5%	16.6%	25.1%	37.2%	13.6%	199	3.33
Department/office retains diverse employees	10.7%	20.3%	23.7%	32.8%	12.4%	177	3.16
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	10.4%	12.6%	21.9%	39.9%	15.3%	183	3.37
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	10.2%	15.7%	21.3%	35.0%	17.8%	197	3.35
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	9.7%	10.1%	15.5%	44.0%	20.8%	207	3.56
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	11.7%	7.8%	30.0%	31.7%	18.9%	180	3.38
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	9.7%	6.3%	14.0%	38.2%	31.9%	207	3.76

Table A14 Discriminatory Attitudes

Discriminatory attitudes are present in your department/office based on:	%	N
Employment classification	39.2%	69
Job title	39.2%	69
No intolerant attitudes are present	27.8%	49
Gender	23.3%	41
Age	19.9%	35
Political affiliation	12.5%	22
Race or color	11.4%	20
Gender identity and expression	10.8%	19
Ethnic origin	9.7%	17
Socioeconomic status	9.7%	17
Appearance	8.0%	14
Nationality/Country of origin	7.4%	13
Parental status	6.8%	12
Religion	6.3%	11
Disability (e.g. physical, mental)	5.7%	10
Sexual orientation	5.1%	9
Marital status	4.0%	7
Other (Education/professional, , background, Nepotism/favoritism, Differing opinions/work styles/personalities, Research area/Grant money brought in)	4%	7

Note: multiple response item.

Table A15 Work-related Stressors

Please select your top THREE work-related stressors	%	N
Lower salary	47.8%	97
Workload	39.9%	81
Work/life balance	26.6%	54
Office/department climate	24.1%	49
Lack of growth/promotion	21.7%	44
Email overload	21.2%	43
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	20.2%	41
Interpersonal conflict	17.7%	36
Duties outside my job responsibilities	11.8%	24
Job security	11.3%	23
Affordable housing near work	9.4%	19
Misconduct/Inequities/Bias	6.4%	13
Health issues	6.4%	13
Other	3.4%	7
Ill-defined job	3.0%	6
Physical environment	2.0%	4
Lack of training/skills to do my work	2.0%	4
Bureaucracy	2.5%	5
Lack of work autonomy	1.5%	3
Parking and Transportation	1.0%	2
Lack of work flexibility	0.5%	1
Physical safety	0.5%	1
Feeling Undervalued	0.5%	1
Dependent Care	0.5%	1
Health Insurance/Benefits	0.5%	1

Note: multiple response item.

Table A16 Use of Child and/or Adult Care Services

Have you utilized child or adult care services this past year?	%	N
Yes	10.8%	23
No	89.2%	189
Total	100.0%	212

Table A17 Child and/or Adult Care-related Challenges

Please indicate what child care and/or adult care-related challenges, if any, you have encountered this past year	%	N
Cost of care services	65.2%	15
Finding summer care services	47.8%	11
Scheduling care to match work schedule	39.1%	9
Finding care for a sick child/adult	30.4%	7
Transportation to/from care services	30.4%	7
Finding child care services	26.1%	6
Quality of care services	21.7%	5
Location of care services	17.4%	4
Finding temporary care services	13.0%	3
Dependability of care services	13.0%	3
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	8.7%	2

Note: This question was only asked to those who answered they used care services; multiple response item

Table A18 Gender

	%	N
Women	56.3%	112
Men	41.7%	83
T/NB/GNC	2.0%	4

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

Table A19 Minoritized Race/Ethnicity

	%	N
Non-minoritized	87.6%	169
Minoritized	12.4%	24

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose.

Table A20 Employee Type

	%	N
Administrative Professional	27.3%	57
Faculty	53.6%	112
State Classified	14.8%	31
Other	1.0%	2
Prefer not to disclose	3.3%	7
Total	100.0%	209

Table A21 Department/Unit

	%	N
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	8.6%	18
Biology	14.3%	30
Chemistry	10.5%	22
Computer Science	10.0%	21
Dean's Office/College of Natural Sciences or Education & Outreach Center	7.1%	15
Mathematics	10.0%	21
Physics	8.6%	18
Prefer not to disclose	12.4%	26
Psychology	12.4%	26
Statistics	6.2%	13
Total	100.0%	210

Note: Smaller departments were combined to ensure confidentiality.

Appendix B: Employee Characteristics Mean Comparisons

The following tables show the mean comparison scores by employee characteristics. Mean scores for CSU overall and the Division are also provided.

Table B1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Supports a healthy work/life balance	3.86^1	4008	3.75^1	224	3.76_a	82	3.75_a	110	3.71_a	166	4.04_a	24	3.88_a	56	3.64_a	110	3.81_a	31
Understands the value of diversity	4.06^1	3956	3.81^1	223	3.95_a	82	3.77_a	108	3.89_a	164	3.71_a	24	3.91_a	55	3.70_a	110	3.97_a	30
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.62^1	3994	3.34^1	224	3.52_a	82	3.30_a	111	3.36_a	168	3.63_a	24	3.71_a	56	3.19_b	111	3.13_b	31
Treats all employees equitably	3.46^1	3946	3.16^1	221	3.37_a	83	3.10_a	107	3.22_a	165	3.39_a	23	3.43_a	53	3.12_a	111	2.84_a	31
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.87^1	3950	3.50^1	220	3.73_a	81	3.37_b	108	3.55_a	164	3.48_a	23	3.42_a	55	3.53_a	109	3.57_a	30
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.99^1	3999	3.73^1	223	3.75_a	81	3.75_a	111	3.72_a	166	4.17_a	24	3.75_a	56	3.70_a	110	3.74_a	31
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.04^1	3934	3.68^1	217	3.91_a	79	3.62_a	107	3.79_a	160	3.54_a	24	3.78_a	54	3.62_a	106	3.90_a	31
Is open and transparent in communication	3.44^1	4009	3.23^1	222	3.36_a	81	3.22_a	110	3.32_a	165	3.21_a	24	3.45_a	55	3.14_a	110	3.13_a	31
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	3.46^1	3952	3.38^1	221	3.56_a	82	3.32_a	108	3.38_a	165	3.83_a	23	3.59_a	54	3.46_a	111	2.67_b	30

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B2 Division/College Culture

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	3.39^1	3931	3.38^1	216	3.47_a	79	3.34_a	107	3.35_a	160	3.63_a	24	3.67_a	54	3.21_b	106	$3.37_{a,b}$	30
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.97^1	3872	3.86^1	207	4.04_a	74	3.81_a	105	3.92_a	153	3.88_a	24	4.00_a	54	3.80_a	100	3.86_a	29
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	4.32^1	3691	4.50^1	207	4.55_a	73	4.50_a	107	4.48_a	155	4.78_b	23	4.36_a	55	4.61_b	99	$4.48_{a,b}$	31
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.90^1	3687	3.92^1	211	3.97_a	75	3.92_a	108	3.89_a	157	4.26_a	23	3.96_a	55	3.93_a	102	3.77_a	31
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	2.66^1	3925	2.61^1	217	2.55_a	80	2.56_a	109	2.59_a	163	2.57_a	23	2.30_a	54	$2.67_{a,b}$	108	3.03_b	31
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	3.10^1	3910	3.16^1	215	3.01_a	77	3.17_a	109	3.10_a	160	3.08_a	24	3.02_a	57	3.16_a	102	3.35_a	31
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.65^1	4012	3.58^1	225	3.47_a	83	3.70_a	112	3.56_a	169	3.96_a	24	3.79_a	57	3.40_b	112	$3.84_{a,b}$	31
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.49^1	4003	3.43^1	224	3.59_a	83	3.43_a	111	3.44_a	168	3.75_a	24	3.65_a	57	3.37_a	111	3.42_a	31
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.88^1	4007	3.69^1	222	3.83_a	81	3.70_a	112	3.71_a	166	4.17_a	24	3.82_a	56	3.62_a	110	3.74_a	31

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B3 Respect

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My department/office is treated with respect by other departments/offices within my division/college	3.64[1]	3673	3.58[1]	182	3.65$_a$	72	3.60$_a$	87	3.58$_a$	137	3.70$_a$	20	3.77$_a$	40	3.46$_a$	95	3.65$_a$	26
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.69[1]	3656	3.78[1]	186	3.78$_a$	72	3.82$_a$	90	3.73$_a$	140	4.30$_b$	20	3.82$_a$	49	3.71$_a$	92	4.00$_a$	24
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	3.95[1]	3999	3.74[1]	223	3.70$_a$	83	3.80$_a$	111	3.79$_a$	169	3.83$_a$	23	4.23$_a$	57	3.57$_b$	111	3.42$_b$	31
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.91[1]	3459	3.72[1]	180	3.83$_a$	69	3.73$_a$	86	3.82$_a$	136	3.50$_a$	20	3.98$_a$	45	3.67$_a$	85	3.54$_a$	28
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	4.06[1]	3723	4.15[1]	199	4.15$_a$	74	4.20$_a$	99	4.16$_a$	151	4.18$_a$	22	4.29$_a$	51	4.09$_a$	97	4.10$_a$	30
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.47[1]	3600	3.27[1]	186	3.21$_a$	70	3.34$_a$	90	3.29$_a$	139	3.25$_a$	20	3.58$_a$	45	3.22$_{a,b}$	89	3.03$_b$	30
I feel valued as an employee	3.68[1]	3991	3.51[1]	222	3.52$_a$	82	3.60$_a$	111	3.56$_a$	169	3.73$_a$	22	3.93$_a$	57	3.35$_b$	110	3.26$_b$	31

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B4 Favoritism

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office	3.00[1]	3711	3.15[1]	201	2.90$_a$	78	3.26$_a$	98	3.08$_a$	151	3.05$_a$	22	2.92$_a$	48	3.22$_a$	103	3.23$_a$	30
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	2.85[1]	3670	3.07[1]	196	2.84$_a$	76	3.16$_a$	95	2.99$_a$	146	3.05$_a$	22	2.91$_a$	45	3.14$_a$	101	2.97$_a$	30
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	2.64[1]	3665	2.62[1]	191	2.53$_a$	73	2.56$_a$	95	2.50$_a$	143	2.59$_a$	22	2.40$_a$	47	2.69$_a$	95	2.50$_a$	30
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	2.88[1]	3606	2.85[1]	196	2.57$_a$	76	2.97$_b$	96	2.73$_a$	147	3.14$_a$	22	2.65$_a$	46	2.86$_a$	101	3.03$_a$	30
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	2.73[1]	3568	2.67[1]	191	2.53$_a$	75	2.71$_a$	92	2.59$_a$	143	2.77$_a$	22	2.39$_a$	44	2.79$_a$	99	2.55$_a$	29

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B5 Leadership and Accountability

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.35[1]	2953	3.25[1]	167	3.45$_a$	65	3.17$_a$	84	3.23$_a$	127	3.63$_a$	19	3.73$_a$	40	3.18$_b$	89	2.96$_b$	24
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.45[1]	3343	3.23[1]	179	3.41$_a$	66	3.22$_a$	94	3.33$_a$	135	3.30$_a$	20	3.57$_a$	42	3.17$_a$	94	3.07$_a$	27
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.30[1]	2849	3.19[1]	162	3.39$_a$	61	3.12$_a$	83	3.16$_a$	123	3.63$_a$	19	3.59$_a$	39	3.15$_{a,b}$	85	2.92$_b$	24

Table B5 Leadership and Accountability

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.41^1	3241	3.17^1	172	3.37_a	63	3.16_a	92	3.19_a	134	3.44_a	18	3.43_a	40	3.12_a	91	3.07_a	27
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.13^1	2894	3.08^1	151	3.20_a	60	3.04_a	73	2.98_a	115	3.82_b	17	3.46_a	35	3.00_b	79	$2.96_{a,b}$	24
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.25^1	3365	3.05^1	171	3.32_a	65	2.93_b	89	3.05_a	133	3.26_a	19	3.22_a	40	2.99_a	90	3.14_a	28
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.78^1	3369	3.81^1	183	3.97_a	69	3.84_a	95	3.85_a	142	4.00_a	20	4.16_a	45	3.77_b	96	$3.70_{a,b}$	27
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.89^1	3705	3.76^1	197	3.85_a	73	3.83_a	103	3.84_a	152	3.90_a	21	4.02_a	46	3.73_a	103	3.71_a	31
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.37^1	3033	3.46^1	161	3.67_a	63	3.39_a	80	3.46_a	122	3.94_a	18	3.70_a	40	3.40_a	86	3.45_a	22
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.47^1	3351	3.33^1	177	3.48_a	64	3.28_a	93	3.37_a	134	3.55_a	20	3.40_a	40	3.28_a	92	3.34_a	29
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.20^1	3130	3.25^1	171	3.41_a	68	3.19_a	86	3.22_a	129	3.77_a	22	3.72_a	39	3.23_b	91	2.81_b	27
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.25^1	3599	3.05^1	191	3.19_a	70	3.08_a	100	3.08_a	143	3.48_a	23	3.43_a	44	2.97_b	99	2.84_b	31

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B6 Misconduct Among Employees at CSU

___ is problematic among employees at CSU	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	247	13.8%	30	*	*	15.3%	17	11.9%	20	*	*	*	*	18.9%	21	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	3.0%	117	6.0%	13	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9.9%	11	*	*
Bullying	13.3%	519	18.0%	39	18.3%	15	15.3%	17	16.1%	27	*	*	*	*	21.6%	24	*	*
Bias	28.3%	1104	30.0%	65	17.1%	14	36.0%	40	24.4%	41	52.2%	12	24.6%	14	31.5%	35	32.3%	10
Physical Assault	0.6%	23	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.2%	282	11.5%	25	*	*	11.7%	13	8.9%	15	*	*	*	*	11.7%	13	*	*
None	65.7%	2566	62.7%	136	72.0%	59	59.5%	66	69.0%	116	*	*	71.9%	41	58.6%	65	64.5%	20

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with n ≥ 10.

Table B7 Misconduct Among Division/College

___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.8%	109	8.8%	19	*	*	*	*	7.1%	12	*	*	*	*	14.4%	16	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.3%	52	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	10.3%	404	9.2%	20	*	*	*	*	8.3%	14	*	*	*	*	9.0%	10	*	*
Bias	24.1%	940	25.3%	55	17.1%	14	29.7%	33	20.2%	34	43.5%	10	*	*	29.7%	33	*	*
Physical Assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	5.1%	199	8.3%	18	*	*	*	*	6.0%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	70.8%	2765	69.6%	151	75.6%	62	67.6%	75	75.0%	126	56.5%	13	82.5%	47	64.0%	71	71.0%	22

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with n ≥ 10.

Table B8 Misconduct Among Department/Office

___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	1.9%	73	6.9%	15	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	10.8%	12	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.1%	42	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	12.4%	486	22.1%	48	23.2%	19	19.8%	22	22.6%	38	*	*	*	*	22.5%	25	32.3%	10
Bias	23.3%	911	33.6%	73	30.5%	25	32.4%	36	27.4%	46	52.2%	12	19.3%	11	40.5%	45	32.3%	10
Physical Assault	0.3%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.0%	272	12.0%	26	*	*	11.7%	13	11.3%	19	*	*	*	*	12.6%	14	*	*
None	69.9%	2731	54.8%	119	58.5%	48	55.9%	62	58.9%	99	47.8%	11	75.4%	43	47.7%	53	51.6%	16

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with n ≥ 10.

Table B9 Avoidance due to Misconduct

There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.5%	99	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.0%	41	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	16.7%	651	22.1%	48	25.6%	21	18.0%	20	20.8%	35	*	*	*	*	24.3%	27	*	*
Bias	20.0%	781	22.6%	49	18.3%	15	24.3%	27	17.3%	29	*	*	*	*	26.1%	29	*	*
Physical Assault	0.9%	37	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	11.0%	428	14.7%	32	*	*	16.2%	18	14.3%	24	*	*	*	*	14.4%	16	*	*
None	68.7%	2682	64.5%	140	65.9%	54	65.8%	73	67.9%	114	56.5%	13	75.4%	43	60.4%	67	64.5%	20

Note: multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with n ≥ 10.

Table B10 Bias Incidents

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	4.00^1	3726	4.11^1	207	4.03_a	79	4.18_a	110	4.04_a	162	4.52_b	23	4.22_a	55	4.18_a	107	3.74_b	31
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.64^1	3199	3.61^1	181	3.64_a	64	3.65_a	101	3.61_a	139	3.95_a	22	4.02_a	47	3.48_b	94	$3.54_{a,b}$	26
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.10^1	3174	3.07^1	179	2.69_a	70	3.32_b	94	3.01_a	140	3.48_a	23	3.00_a	49	3.10_a	92	3.12_a	24
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.21^1	2397	3.05^1	130	2.80_a	50	3.17_b	69	2.99_a	102	3.35_a	17	3.06_a	33	3.05_a	64	3.00_a	22
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.44^1	2962	3.32^1	168	3.24_a	59	3.37_a	95	3.31_a	128	3.41_a	22	3.58_a	45	3.21_b	87	$3.25_{a,b}$	24

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B11 Employee Councils

Are you aware there is an employee group/organization that represents my employee group's interests (i.e., Administrative Professional Council, Classified Personnel Council, Faculty Council).	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	83.9%[1]	3260	91.2%[1]	197	91.6%$_a$	76	91.1%$_a$	102	91.1%$_a$	154	91.7%$_a$	22	86.0%$_a$	49	92.0%$_a$	103	100.0%[2]	31
No	16.1%[1]	627	8.8%[1]	19	*$_a$	*	8.9%$_a$	10	8.9%$_a$	15	*$_a$	*	*$_a$	*	*$_a$	*	*[2]	*

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

Means and percentages are reported only for items with n ≥ 10.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

2. This category is not used in comparisons because its column proportion is equal to zero or one.

Table B12 Employee Councils

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I feel my employee council addresses issues and topics that are important and relevant to me	3.35[1]	2437	3.21[1]	156	2.88$_a$	59	3.52$_b$	82	3.20$_a$	120	3.30$_a$	20	3.47$_{a,b}$	30	3.03$_a$	87	3.52$_b$	27
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.87[1]	2700	3.87[1]	167	3.60$_a$	63	4.10$_b$	91	3.92$_a$	133	3.60$_a$	20	4.08$_a$	37	3.70$_a$	92	4.07$_a$	27

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B13 Principles of Community

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I am familiar with the Principles of Community.	3.91[1]	3644	3.77[1]	202	3.71$_a$	78	3.82$_a$	106	3.78$_a$	160	3.86$_a$	22	3.85$_a$	55	3.79$_a$	106	3.79$_a$	28
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.52[1]	3366	3.05[1]	175	2.97$_a$	63	3.10$_a$	94	3.14$_a$	135	2.81$_a$	21	3.35$_a$	52	2.80$_b$	83	3.19$_{a,b}$	27
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.20[1]	3209	2.77[1]	163	2.92$_a$	62	2.76$_a$	85	2.85$_a$	124	2.82$_a$	22	3.18$_a$	45	2.65$_b$	80	2.59$_b$	27
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.26[1]	3082	3.07[1]	154	3.08$_a$	62	3.19$_a$	78	3.19$_a$	117	3.00$_a$	21	3.54$_a$	41	2.95$_b$	78	2.88$_b$	24

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B14 Freedom of Speech

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My division/college supports people speaking freely	3.64^1	3629	3.69^1	194	3.76_a	78	3.75_a	99	3.72_a	151	3.91_a	23	4.12_a	52	3.64_b	103	3.27_b	26
Free speech is an important issue on campus	4.28^1	3697	4.35^1	208	4.30_a	81	4.40_a	109	4.34_a	166	4.45_a	22	4.36_a	56	4.39_a	109	4.27_a	30
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	3.59^1	3525	3.53^1	202	3.79_a	77	3.35_b	107	3.54_a	160	3.26_a	23	3.56_a	55	3.63_a	104	3.10_b	30
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.30^1	3473	3.14^1	201	3.23_a	77	3.09_a	106	3.17_a	162	3.14_a	21	3.31_a	55	$3.18_{a,b}$	104	2.76_b	29
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.97^1	3648	2.73^1	208	2.70_a	81	2.65_a	108	2.59_a	166	3.33_b	21	2.52_a	54	2.81_a	109	2.61_a	31

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B15 CSU Perceptions

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	3.84^1	3315	3.68^1	186	3.81_a	75	3.65_a	95	3.79_a	145	3.45_a	22	$3.82_{a,b}$	51	3.49_a	100	4.28_b	25
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.72^1	3408	3.52^1	198	3.50_a	78	3.63_a	104	3.57_a	157	3.59_a	22	3.84_a	56	3.41_b	100	3.30_b	30
CSU retains diverse employees	3.60^1	2992	3.35^1	159	3.40_a	67	3.34_a	79	3.41_a	121	3.29_a	21	3.59_a	37	3.14_b	87	3.72_a	25
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.77^1	3194	3.60^1	174	3.58_a	66	3.72_a	92	3.71_a	133	3.41_a	22	4.02_a	49	3.32_b	88	3.92_a	26
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.02^1	3472	3.94^1	198	3.89_a	80	4.05_a	102	4.02_a	155	3.83_a	24	4.33_a	55	3.72_b	103	$4.07_{a,b}$	28
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	3.84^1	3541	3.70^1	200	3.62_a	79	3.87_a	105	3.72_a	158	4.00_a	23	4.18_a	55	3.58_b	102	3.35_b	31
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.76^1	3183	3.61^1	173	3.67_a	63	3.65_a	94	3.69_a	134	3.70_a	20	3.93_a	46	3.49_b	88	$3.61_{a,b}$	28
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.08^1	3708	3.96^1	211	3.99_a	83	4.04_a	112	4.02_a	168	4.08_a	24	4.39_a	56	3.82_b	112	3.77_b	31

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at $p< .05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B16 Department/Unit Perceptions

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Department/office recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	3.67[1]	3603	3.50[1]	197	3.86$_a$	79	3.29$_b$	102	3.58$_a$	156	3.45$_a$	22	3.52$_a$	50	3.46$_a$	105	3.67$_a$	30
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.61[1]	3548	3.33[1]	199	3.57$_a$	80	3.27$_a$	104	3.37$_a$	158	3.55$_a$	22	3.54$_a$	52	3.31$_a$	105	3.07$_a$	30
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.50[1]	3414	3.16[1]	177	3.32$_a$	72	3.11$_a$	93	3.26$_a$	139	3.00$_a$	20	3.32$_a$	40	2.99$_a$	97	3.45$_a$	29
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.68[1]	3458	3.37[1]	183	3.49$_a$	69	3.40$_a$	98	3.49$_a$	142	3.14$_a$	22	3.60$_a$	45	3.15$_b$	97	3.76$_a$	29
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.66[1]	3561	3.35[1]	197	3.54$_a$	80	3.30$_a$	102	3.42$_a$	155	3.30$_a$	23	3.33$_a$	51	3.30$_a$	106	3.46$_a$	28
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.71[1]	3739	3.56[1]	207	3.70$_a$	81	3.63$_a$	110	3.63$_a$	165	3.70$_a$	23	3.91$_a$	53	3.54$_{a,b}$	111	3.19$_b$	31
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.59[1]	3380	3.38[1]	180	3.62$_a$	66	3.36$_a$	99	3.50$_a$	141	3.35$_a$	20	3.58$_a$	45	3.34$_a$	94	3.40$_a$	30
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.86[1]	3735	3.76[1]	207	3.94$_a$	82	3.74$_a$	111	3.85$_a$	165	3.88$_a$	24	4.13$_a$	55	3.74$_{a,b}$	110	3.27$_b$	30

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B17 Use of Child and/or Adult Care Services

Have you utilized child or adult care services this past year?	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	14.1%[1]	533	10.8%[1]	23	*a	*	12.5%a	14	12.4%a	21	*a	*	*a	*	12.5%a	14	*a	*
No	85.9%[1]	3247	89.2%[1]	189	90.4%a	75	87.5%a	98	87.6%a	148	91.7%a	22	94.7%a	54	87.5%a	98	90.3%a	28

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

Means and percentages are reported only for items with n ≥ 10.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Table B18 Child and/or Adult Care-related Challenges

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Cost of care services	72.3%	391	65.2%	15	*	*	71.4%	10	66.7%	14	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding child care services	31.8%	172	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding adult care services	5.5%	30	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding temporary care services	12.0%	65	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding care for a sick child/adult	28.7%	155	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	3.5%	19	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Other	2.2%	12	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Transportation to/from care services	29.2%	158	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Dependability of care services	15.0%	81	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Quality of care services	17.2%	93	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Scheduling care to match work schedule	40.1%	217	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Finding summer care services	27.9%	151	47.8%	11	*	*	*	*	47.6%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Location of care services	15.5%	84	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	10.2%	55	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: only asked of those who used child and/or adult care services; multiple response item; statistical significance not tested

Means and percentages are reported only for items with n ≥ 10.

Table B19 Factors

	Overall		Division		Gender				Minoritized Race/Ethnicity				Employee Type					
	CSU		CNS		Men		Women		Non-minoritized		Minoritized		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
CSU Perceptions	3.82^1	2524	3.61^1	129	3.65_a	53	3.69_a	63	3.68_a	94	3.72_a	18	4.01_a	32	3.42_b	67	$3.76_{a,b}$	21
Department/Unit Perceptions	3.66^1	2869	3.36^1	146	3.57_a	60	3.32_a	75	3.46_a	111	3.39_a	18	3.58_a	31	3.29_a	81	3.38_a	24
Department/Unit Leadership	3.42^1	2859	3.24^1	151	3.43_a	57	3.22_a	78	3.29_a	114	3.43_a	18	3.51_a	33	3.17_a	79	3.23_a	26
College/Division Leadership	3.31^1	2472	3.28^1	127	3.49_a	51	3.23_a	61	3.26_a	96	3.73_a	15	3.57_a	30	3.27_a	67	3.15_a	19
Favoritism	2.80^1	3417	2.84^1	180	2.65_a	71	2.91_a	87	2.75_a	134	2.92_a	22	2.59_a	42	2.94_a	91	2.83_a	29
Sense of Belonging	3.67^1	3978	3.56^1	221	3.61_a	81	3.62_a	111	3.56_a	165	3.96_a	24	3.74_a	56	3.45_a	109	3.67_a	31
Department/Unit Culture	3.52^1	3807	3.30^1	211	3.46_a	79	3.28_a	103	3.35_a	161	3.51_a	20	3.61_a	52	3.22_b	105	3.01_b	30
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	4.00^1	3753	3.74^1	201	3.96_a	72	3.67_b	101	3.82_a	148	3.71_a	23	3.80_a	52	3.68_a	98	3.92_a	27

Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.

1. This category is not used in comparisons because there are no other valid categories to compare

Appendix C: Division Comparisons to CSU Overall

The following tables display the Division's mean score compared to CSU overall. Division results are noted as being "higher," "similar," or "lower" than the CSU average, meaning that the Division's score for the item is either statistically similar to or different than (higher or lower)[1] the university's score.

Table C1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Supports a healthy work/life balance	Similar	3.75	3.86	-.10	66.5%	72.5%	-5.9
Understands the value of diversity	Lower	3.81	4.06	-.25	70.9%	78.6%	-7.8
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Lower	3.34	3.62	-.28	56.7%	64.7%	-8.0
Treats all employees equitably	Lower	3.16	3.46	-.30	46.2%	58.5%	-12.3
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Lower	3.50	3.87	-.37	58.6%	69.8%	-11.2
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Lower	3.73	3.99	-.26	68.2%	77.0%	-8.9
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Lower	3.68	4.04	-.36	63.6%	76.1%	-12.5
Is open and transparent in communication	Lower	3.23	3.44	-.22	50.5%	57.3%	-6.8
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Similar	3.38	3.46	-.08	56.6%	57.3%	-.8

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

Table C2 Culture

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	Similar	3.38	3.39	-.01	51.9%	54.2%	-2.3
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	Similar	3.86	3.97	-.11	72.9%	76.1%	-3.2
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	Higher	4.50	4.32	.18	97.6%	91.6%	6.0
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	Similar	3.92	3.90	.02	75.8%	72.9%	2.9
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Similar	2.61	2.66	-.05	26.7%	28.0%	-1.3
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Similar	3.16	3.10	.05	38.6%	37.0%	1.6
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	Similar	3.58	3.65	-.07	63.1%	62.4%	.7
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	Similar	3.43	3.49	-.06	56.3%	55.4%	.9
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	Lower	3.69	3.88	-.18	68.9%	71.3%	-2.4

Table C3 Respect

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My department/office is treated with respect by other departments/offices within my division/college	Similar	3.58	3.64	-.06	60.4%	64.3%	-3.8
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	Similar	3.78	3.69	.09	71.0%	67.0%	3.9
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	Lower	3.74	3.95	-.21	69.5%	78.9%	-9.4
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	Lower	3.72	3.91	-.19	63.9%	71.7%	-7.8
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	Similar	4.15	4.06	.09	83.9%	79.0%	5.0
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	Lower	3.27	3.47	-.19	46.2%	55.1%	-8.9
I feel valued as an employee	Lower	3.51	3.68	-.17	59.9%	66.7%	-6.8

Table C4 Favoritism

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office	Similar	3.15	3.00	.15	43.3%	37.9%	5.3
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	Higher	3.07	2.85	.22	38.3%	31.3%	6.9
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	Similar	2.62	2.64	-.03	21.5%	23.7%	-2.2
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	Similar	2.85	2.88	-.03	33.2%	32.3%	.8
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	Similar	2.67	2.73	-.06	21.5%	25.6%	-4.1

Table C5 Leadership and Accountability

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.25	3.35	-.10	48.5%	51.7%	-3.2
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	Lower	3.23	3.45	-.22	50.8%	58.2%	-7.3
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.19	3.30	-.10	46.9%	48.1%	-1.2

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Lower	3.17	3.41	-.24	46.5%	55.4%	-8.9
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.08	3.13	-.05	37.7%	41.5%	-3.8
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Lower	3.05	3.25	-.20	40.4%	50.5%	-10.2
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.81	3.78	.04	73.8%	69.4%	4.4
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.76	3.89	-.14	71.6%	75.1%	-3.6
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Similar	3.46	3.37	.09	57.8%	50.3%	7.5
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Similar	3.33	3.47	-.15	50.8%	55.8%	-4.9
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.25	3.20	.06	47.4%	45.8%	1.6
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Lower	3.05	3.25	-.20	42.4%	51.1%	-8.7

Table C6 Bias Incidents

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	Similar	4.11	4.00	.11	82.1%	77.7%	4.4
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Similar	3.61	3.64	-.03	63.5%	61.8%	1.7
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Similar	3.07	3.10	-.03	33.0%	32.4%	.6
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Similar	3.05	3.21	-.16	32.3%	34.0%	-1.7
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Similar	3.32	3.44	-.12	45.8%	51.2%	-5.3

Table C7 Employee Councils

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I feel my employee council addresses issues and topics that are important and relevant to me	Similar	3.21	3.35	-.14	42.3%	46.7%	-4.3
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	Similar	3.87	3.87	.00	70.7%	70.8%	-.1

Note: This question was only asked to those who answered they were aware of employee councils.

Table C8 Principles of Community

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
I am familiar with the Principles of Community	Similar	3.77	3.91	-.14	69.3%	77.2%	-7.9
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment	Lower	3.05	3.52	-.47	41.7%	58.4%	-16.7
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	Lower	2.77	3.20	-.43	19.0%	36.0%	-16.9
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	Lower	3.07	3.26	-.19	31.2%	38.4%	-7.3

Table C9 Freedom of Speech

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
My division/college supports people speaking freely	Similar	3.69	3.64	.05	68.6%	66.7%	1.8
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Similar	4.35	4.28	.07	91.3%	89.5%	1.9
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Similar	3.53	3.59	-.06	59.9%	59.8%	.1
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Lower	3.14	3.30	-.16	43.8%	50.3%	-6.5
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Lower	2.73	2.97	-.24	27.9%	33.5%	-5.6

Table C10 CSU Perceptions

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	Lower	3.68	3.84	-.17	66.7%	75.0%	-8.3
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Lower	3.52	3.72	-.20	60.6%	69.5%	-8.9
CSU retains diverse employees	Lower	3.35	3.60	-.25	50.9%	61.2%	-10.3
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Lower	3.60	3.77	-.16	64.9%	69.9%	-4.9
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	3.94	4.02	-.08	75.8%	79.9%	-4.1
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.70	3.84	-.14	69.0%	74.0%	-5.0
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.61	3.76	-.15	59.5%	66.6%	-7.1
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Similar	3.96	4.08	-.12	76.8%	80.9%	-4.1

Table C11 Department/Unit Perceptions

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap	Division percent agree	CSU percent agree	PP Gap
Department/office recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	Lower	3.50	3.67	-.18	58.9%	66.6%	-7.7
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	Lower	3.33	3.61	-.28	50.8%	63.7%	-12.9
Department/office retains diverse employees	Lower	3.16	3.50	-.34	45.2%	56.8%	-11.6
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Lower	3.37	3.68	-.31	55.2%	65.3%	-10.1
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	Lower	3.35	3.66	-.31	52.8%	61.8%	-9.0
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.56	3.71	-.15	64.7%	68.7%	-3.9
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Lower	3.38	3.59	-.21	50.6%	59.3%	-8.8
Would recommend department/office as a place of employment	Similar	3.76	3.86	-.10	70.0%	71.3%	-1.3

Table C12 Factors

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Lower	3.61	3.82	-.21
Department/Unit Perceptions	Lower	3.36	3.66	-.29
Department/Unit Leadership	Lower	3.24	3.42	-.19
College/Division Leadership	Similar	3.28	3.31	-.02
Favoritism	Similar	2.84	2.80	.04
Sense of Belonging	Similar	3.56	3.67	-.11
Department/Unit Culture	Lower	3.30	3.52	-.22
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Lower	3.74	4.00	-.26