Information Technology and Libraries 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 Information Technology and Libraries. 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 Information Technology and Libraries, 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%	19.6%	11.6%	40.2%	25.0%	112	3.63
Understands the value of diversity	2.7%	7.3%	19.1%	43.6%	27.3%	110	3.85
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	5.4%	25.2%	16.2%	35.1%	18.0%	111	3.35
Treats all employees equitably	5.5%	27.3%	18.2%	30.0%	19.1%	110	3.30
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	4.5%	17.0%	21.4%	36.6%	20.5%	112	3.52
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	1.8%	7.2%	14.4%	43.2%	33.3%	111	3.99
Promotes respect for cultural differences	2.7%	7.3%	28.2%	38.2%	23.6%	110	3.73
Is open and transparent in communication	9.9%	23.4%	17.1%	36.9%	12.6%	111	3.19
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	10.0%	20.9%	20.9%	38.2%	10.0%	110	3.17

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	9.2%	24.8%	20.2%	37.6%	8.3%	109	3.11
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	2.8%	12.3%	27.4%	37.7%	19.8%	106	3.59
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	0.0%	3.7%	4.7%	48.6%	43.0%	107	4.31
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	5.6%	9.3%	12.0%	36.1%	37.0%	108	3.90
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	15.5%	30.0%	22.7%	20.0%	11.8%	110	2.83
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	6.3%	17.0%	32.1%	31.3%	13.4%	112	3.29
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	4.5%	8.9%	27.7%	34.8%	24.1%	112	3.65
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	4.5%	11.6%	31.3%	31.3%	21.4%	112	3.54
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	1.8%	8.0%	20.5%	38.4%	31.3%	112	3.89

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	3.8%	16.0%	23.6%	41.5%	15.1%	106	3.48
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.8%	13.3%	24.8%	42.9%	15.2%	105	3.52
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	1.8%	9.0%	15.3%	45.0%	28.8%	111	3.90
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	1.2%	3.6%	36.1%	39.8%	19.3%	83	3.72
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	2.0%	2.0%	26.5%	48.0%	21.4%	98	3.85
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	8.8%	4.4%	35.2%	42.9%	8.8%	91	3.38
I feel valued as an employee	2.7%	16.2%	18.9%	41.4%	20.7%	111	3.61

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	6.5%	27.8%	23.1%	30.6%	12.0%	108	3.14
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	8.5%	34.9%	29.2%	18.9%	8.5%	106	2.84
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	10.8%	36.3%	32.4%	9.8%	10.8%	102	2.74
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	7.6%	26.7%	26.7%	18.1%	21.0%	105	3.18
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	9.9%	28.7%	28.7%	23.8%	8.9%	101	2.93

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	5.3%	15.8%	30.3%	36.8%	11.8%	76	3.34
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	7.9%	18.0%	19.1%	42.7%	12.4%	89	3.34
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	5.3%	15.8%	35.5%	31.6%	11.8%	76	3.29

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	4.5%	17.0%	25.0%	39.8%	13.6%	88	3.41
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	6.3%	18.8%	38.8%	30.0%	6.3%	80	3.11
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	6.5%	21.5%	25.8%	38.7%	7.5%	93	3.19
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.2%	11.7%	19.1%	42.6%	23.4%	94	3.71
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	4.8%	7.7%	13.5%	50.0%	24.0%	104	3.81
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	10.1%	20.3%	34.2%	25.3%	10.1%	79	3.05
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	6.7%	20.2%	30.3%	32.6%	10.1%	89	3.19
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	8.7%	28.3%	29.3%	20.7%	13.0%	92	3.01
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	12.7%	26.5%	21.6%	25.5%	13.7%	102	3.01

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	6.6%	1.9%	15.1%	29.2%	0.9%	8.5%	66.0%	106
___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	0.9%	0.0%	11.3%	25.5%	0.0%	2.8%	69.8%	106
___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	0.9%	0.0%	17.0%	23.6%	0.0%	4.7%	68.9%	106
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	1.9%	1.9%	13.2%	15.1%	0.0%	8.5%	76.4%	106

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	0.0%	2.0%	20.0%	49.0%	29.0%	100	4.05
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	2.4%	10.6%	24.7%	45.9%	16.5%	85	3.64
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	4.7%	25.9%	44.7%	17.6%	7.1%	85	2.96
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	1.8%	19.3%	50.9%	26.3%	1.8%	57	3.07
CSU handles incidents of bias well	1.4%	1.4%	42.9%	44.3%	10.0%	70	3.60

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	91.4%	96
No	8.6%	9
Total	100.0%	105

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	4.2%	6.9%	31.9%	51.4%	5.6%	72	3.47
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	1.2%	3.7%	18.3%	56.1%	20.7%	82	3.91

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.	2.0%	12.9%	5.0%	54.5%	25.7%	101	3.89
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	11.4%	30.7%	14.8%	30.7%	12.5%	88	3.02
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.5%	17.4%	45.3%	29.1%	4.7%	86	3.14
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.7%	22.0%	45.1%	25.6%	3.7%	82	3.04

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	4.1%	12.2%	23.5%	45.9%	14.3%	98	3.54
Free speech is an important issue on campus	0.0%	1.0%	7.1%	48.5%	43.4%	99	4.34
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	2.0%	7.1%	41.8%	41.8%	7.1%	98	3.45
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.2%	29.0%	25.8%	34.4%	7.5%	93	3.14
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	11.0%	31.0%	31.0%	17.0%	10.0%	100	2.84

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	1.1%	3.3%	17.4%	60.9%	17.4%	92	3.90
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	1.0%	10.3%	21.6%	53.6%	13.4%	97	3.68
CSU retains diverse employees	1.2%	7.2%	37.3%	42.2%	12.0%	83	3.57
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	1.2%	5.8%	26.7%	54.7%	11.6%	86	3.70
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	1.0%	3.1%	17.7%	57.3%	20.8%	96	3.94
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	2.0%	6.1%	20.2%	61.6%	10.1%	99	3.72
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	2.1%	2.1%	25.0%	55.2%	15.6%	96	3.80
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	2.9%	5.8%	11.7%	50.5%	29.1%	103	3.97

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	3.0%	17.0%	19.0%	44.0%	17.0%	100	3.55
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	5.0%	11.0%	24.0%	47.0%	13.0%	100	3.52
Department/office retains diverse employees	5.2%	15.6%	36.5%	33.3%	9.4%	96	3.26
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	4.2%	14.7%	31.6%	38.9%	10.5%	95	3.37
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.1%	15.5%	25.8%	48.5%	7.2%	97	3.41
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	6.8%	12.6%	17.5%	50.5%	12.6%	103	3.50
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	6.3%	7.3%	36.5%	39.6%	10.4%	96	3.41
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	5.8%	13.5%	19.2%	39.4%	22.1%	104	3.59

Table A14 Discriminatory Attitudes

Discriminatory attitudes are present in your department/office based on:	%	N
No intolerant attitudes are present	36.0%	32
Employment classification	31.5%	28
Gender	25.8%	23
Job title	19.1%	17
Political affiliation	15.7%	14
Age	15.7%	14
Appearance	11.2%	10
Socioeconomic status	7.9%	7
Parental status	6.7%	6
Religion	5.6%	5
Race or color	5.6%	5
Sexual orientation	5.6%	5
Gender identity and expression	5.6%	5
Disability (e.g. physical, mental)	5.6%	5
Ethnic origin	4.5%	4
Marital status	4.5%	4
Other (Education/professional background, Employment duration, Nationality/Country of origin, General bias)	7.7%	7

Note: multiple response item.

Table A15 Work-related Stressors

Please select your top THREE work-related stressors	%	N
Lower salary	39.0%	39
Lack of growth/promotion	33.0%	33
Workload	32.0%	32
Work/life balance	25.0%	25
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	25.0%	25
Office/department climate	24.0%	24
Interpersonal conflict	13.0%	13
Email overload	13.0%	13
Duties outside my job responsibilities	12.0%	12
Physical environment	12.0%	12
Lack of work flexibility	10.0%	10
Affordable housing near work	10.0%	10
Ill-defined job	9.0%	9
Lack of work autonomy	8.0%	8
Lack of training/skills to do my work	6.0%	6
Job security	6.0%	6
Misconduct occurring at work/Inequities/Bias	4.0%	4
Health issues	3.0%	3
Physical safety	2.0%	2
General Climate	1.0%	1
Parking and Transportation	1.0%	1
Communication	1.0%	1
Dependent Care	1.0%	1
Administration/Leadership	1.0%	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	5.8%	6
No	94.2%	97
Total	100.0%	103

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	25.0%	2
Scheduling care to match work schedule	25.0%	2
Finding summer care services	25.0%	2
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	25.0%	2
Finding child care services	12.5%	1
Finding temporary care services	12.5%	1
Finding care for a sick child/adult	12.5%	1
Finding care for a child or adult with special needs	12.5%	1
Transportation to/from care services	12.5%	1
Dependability of care services	12.5%	1

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

Table A18 Gender

	%	N
Women	51.1%	46
Men	46.7%	42
T/NB/GNC	2.2%	2

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	91.8%	78
Minoritized	8.2%	7

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to disclose.

Table A20 Employee Type

	%	N
Administrative Professional	31.7%	32
Faculty	19.8%	20
State Classified	43.6%	44
Other	0.0%	0
Prefer not to disclose	5.0%	5
Total	100.0%	101

Table A21 Department/Unit

	%	N
Academic Computing and Networking Services	23.2%	23
Information Systems or Telecommunications	25.3%	25
Libraries	43.4%	43
Prefer not to disclose	8.1%	8
Total	100.0%	99

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. Your division had fewer than 10 respondents with a minoritized race/ethnicity; therefore, mean comparisons are not reported by minoritized race/ethnicity.

Table B1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...	Overall		Division		Gender				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Supports a healthy work/life balance	3.86^1	4008	3.63^1	112	4.05_a	42	3.35_b	46	$3.66_{a,b}$	32	3.20_a	20	3.84_b	44
Understands the value of diversity	4.06^1	3956	3.85^1	110	4.00_a	42	3.80_a	45	3.84_a	31	3.95_a	19	3.80_a	44
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.62^1	3994	3.35^1	111	3.74_a	42	2.98_b	45	3.44_a	32	3.05_a	19	3.27_a	44
Treats all employees equitably	3.46^1	3946	3.30^1	110	3.62_a	42	3.11_a	45	3.31_a	32	3.26_a	19	3.32_a	44
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.87^1	3950	3.52^1	112	3.60_a	42	3.48_a	46	3.47_a	32	3.60_a	20	3.45_a	44
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.99^1	3999	3.99^1	111	4.12_a	42	4.04_a	45	$4.10_{a,b}$	31	4.55_a	20	3.77_b	44
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.04^1	3934	3.73^1	110	3.85_a	40	3.70_a	46	3.94_a	31	3.55_a	20	3.58_a	43
Is open and transparent in communication	3.44^1	4009	3.19^1	111	3.40_a	42	2.96_a	45	3.22_a	32	3.11_a	19	3.14_a	44
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	3.46^1	3952	3.17^1	110	3.37_a	41	3.00_a	45	3.22_a	32	3.26_a	19	3.05_a	43

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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	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	3.11^1	109	3.38_a	42	2.89_b	44	3.27_a	30	3.25_a	20	2.95_a	44
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.97^1	3872	3.59^1	106	3.70_a	40	3.60_a	45	3.73_a	30	3.55_a	20	3.47_a	43
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	4.32^1	3691	4.31^1	107	4.24_a	41	4.36_a	42	4.17_a	29	4.44_a	18	4.34_a	44
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.90^1	3687	3.90^1	108	4.02_a	41	3.70_a	43	3.93_a	30	4.00_a	18	3.73_a	44
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	2.66^1	3925	2.83^1	110	2.56_a	41	3.11_a	45	2.91_a	32	2.70_a	20	2.81_a	42
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	3.10^1	3910	3.29^1	112	3.33_a	42	3.33_a	46	3.19_a	32	3.10_a	20	3.41_a	44
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.65^1	4012	3.65^1	112	4.07_a	42	3.50_b	46	3.66_a	32	3.80_a	20	3.61_a	44
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.49^1	4003	3.54^1	112	3.83_a	42	3.41_a	46	3.56_a	32	3.90_a	20	3.41_a	44
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.88^1	4007	3.89^1	112	4.14_a	42	3.80_a	46	3.94_a	32	4.10_a	20	3.75_a	44

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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	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	3.48^1	106	3.54_a	41	3.44_a	43	3.62_a	29	3.72_a	18	3.27_a	44
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.69^1	3656	3.52^1	105	3.75_a	40	3.39_a	44	3.73_a	30	3.11_b	18	$3.48_{a,b}$	44
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	3.95^1	3999	3.90^1	111	4.14_a	42	3.67_b	46	3.97_a	32	3.80_a	20	3.89_a	44
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.91^1	3459	3.72^1	83	3.71_a	31	3.84_a	32	3.68_a	22	$*_a$	$*$	3.65_a	40
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	4.06^1	3723	3.85^1	98	3.64_a	36	3.90_a	40	3.69_a	26	3.93_a	15	3.74_a	42
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.47^1	3600	3.38^1	91	3.60_a	35	3.31_a	36	3.42_a	24	3.54_a	13	3.27_a	41
I feel valued as an employee	3.68^1	3991	3.61^1	111	3.95_a	42	3.46_b	46	3.72_a	32	3.60_a	20	3.59_a	44

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

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

Table B4 Favoritism

	Overall		Division		Gender				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	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	3.14^1	108	3.00_a	42	3.30_a	44	3.22_a	32	3.00_a	18	3.16_a	44
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	2.85^1	3670	2.84^1	106	2.82_a	40	2.86_a	43	2.97_a	31	2.88_a	17	2.81_a	43
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	2.64^1	3665	2.74^1	102	2.67_a	39	2.76_a	42	2.93_a	30	2.29_a	17	2.81_a	42
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	2.88^1	3606	3.18^1	105	3.07_a	41	3.24_a	42	3.39_a	31	2.76_a	17	3.21_a	43
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	2.73^1	3568	2.93^1	101	2.80_a	40	2.90_a	41	2.89_a	28	2.78_a	18	2.98_a	43

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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	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	3.34[1]	76	3.73$_a$	33	3.03$_b$	31	3.43$_a$	23	3.20$_a$	15	3.36$_a$	33
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.45[1]	3343	3.34[1]	89	3.79$_a$	39	2.83$_b$	35	3.30$_a$	30	3.13$_a$	16	3.51$_a$	35
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.30[1]	2849	3.29[1]	76	3.85$_a$	33	2.87$_b$	31	3.39$_a$	23	3.07$_a$	14	3.38$_a$	34
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.41[1]	3241	3.41[1]	88	3.95$_a$	39	2.89$_b$	35	3.40$_a$	30	3.07$_a$	15	3.58$_a$	36
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.13[1]	2894	3.11[1]	80	3.56$_a$	34	2.94$_b$	32	3.08$_a$	24	3.20$_a$	15	3.26$_a$	35
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.25[1]	3365	3.19[1]	93	3.45$_a$	40	3.08$_a$	37	3.13$_a$	30	3.24$_a$	17	3.32$_a$	38
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.78[1]	3369	3.71[1]	94	4.16$_a$	38	3.59$_b$	39	3.89$_a$	27	3.95$_a$	19	3.68$_a$	40
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.89[1]	3705	3.81[1]	104	4.12$_a$	42	3.68$_b$	44	4.06$_a$	31	3.65$_a$	20	3.75$_a$	44
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.37[1]	3033	3.05[1]	79	3.56$_a$	32	2.88$_b$	32	2.90$_a$	21	3.29$_a$	17	3.15$_a$	34
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.47[1]	3351	3.19[1]	89	3.61$_a$	36	2.89$_b$	36	3.00$_a$	27	3.29$_a$	17	3.25$_a$	36
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.20[1]	3130	3.01[1]	92	3.51$_a$	37	2.82$_b$	38	3.17$_a$	24	3.39$_a$	18	3.00$_a$	41
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.25[1]	3599	3.01[1]	102	3.39$_a$	41	2.77$_b$	43	2.84$_a$	31	3.39$_a$	18	3.09$_a$	43

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 CSU %	Overall CSU N	Division IT & Libraries %	Division IT & Libraries N	Gender Men %	Gender Men N	Gender Women %	Gender Women N	Employee Type Admin Pro %	Employee Type Admin Pro N	Employee Type Faculty %	Employee Type Faculty N	Employee Type SC %	Employee Type SC N
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	247	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	3.0%	117	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	13.3%	519	15.1%	16	*	*	28.3%	13	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bias	28.3%	1104	29.2%	31	*	*	32.6%	15	*	*	*	*	29.5%	13
Physical Assault	0.6%	23	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.2%	282	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	65.7%	2566	66.0%	70	76.2%	32	58.7%	27	75.0%	24	*	*	70.5%	31

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 CSU %	Overall CSU N	Division IT & Libraries %	Division IT & Libraries N	Gender Men %	Gender Men N	Gender Women %	Gender Women N	Employee Type Admin Pro %	Employee Type Admin Pro N	Employee Type Faculty %	Employee Type Faculty N	Employee Type SC %	Employee Type SC N
Sexual Harassment	2.8%	109	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.3%	52	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	10.3%	404	11.3%	12	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bias	24.1%	940	25.5%	27	*	*	34.8%	16	*	*	*	*	27.3%	12
Physical Assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	5.1%	199	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	70.8%	2765	69.8%	74	83.3%	35	58.7%	27	75.0%	24	50.0%	10	72.7%	32

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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	1.9%	73	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.1%	42	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	12.4%	486	17.0%	18	*	*	30.4%	14	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bias	23.3%	911	23.6%	25	*	*	37.0%	17	*	*	*	*	*	*
Physical Assault	0.3%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.0%	272	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	69.9%	2731	68.9%	73	85.7%	36	52.2%	24	65.6%	21	55.0%	11	77.3%	34

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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.5%	99	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.0%	41	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	16.7%	651	13.2%	14	*	*	21.7%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bias	20.0%	781	15.1%	16	*	*	21.7%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Physical Assault	0.9%	37	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	11.0%	428	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	68.7%	2682	76.4%	81	88.1%	37	67.4%	31	78.1%	25	70.0%	14	79.5%	35

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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	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	4.05[1]	100	3.68$_a$	41	4.39$_b$	44	4.00$_a$	30	4.50$_b$	20	3.86$_a$	42
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.64[1]	3199	3.64[1]	85	3.59$_a$	34	3.75$_a$	36	3.88$_a$	24	4.06$_a$	16	3.33$_b$	36
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.10[1]	3174	2.96[1]	85	2.78$_a$	36	3.09$_a$	34	2.56$_a$	25	3.38$_b$	16	3.00$_{a,b}$	36
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.21[1]	2397	3.07[1]	57	3.04$_a$	23	2.90$_a$	21	3.06$_a$	16	3.09$_a$	11	2.96$_a$	24
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.44[1]	2962	3.60[1]	70	3.68$_a$	28	3.61$_a$	28	3.90$_a$	20	3.50$_{a,b}$	12	3.50$_b$	32

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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	83.9%[1]	3260	91.4%[1]	96	90.2%$_a$	37	95.7%$_a$	44	93.8%$_a$	30	100.0%[2]	20	88.4%$_a$	38
No	16.1%[1]	627	*[1]	*	*$_a$	*	*$_a$	*	*$_a$	*	*[2]	*	*$_a$	*

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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	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	3.47[1]	72	3.54$_a$	24	3.50$_a$	36	3.25$_a$	16	3.83$_b$	18	3.41$_{a,b}$	32
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.87[1]	2700	3.91[1]	82	3.83$_a$	29	4.02$_a$	41	3.83$_{a,b}$	24	4.26$_a$	19	3.73$_b$	33

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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	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	3.89[1]	101	3.76$_a$	41	4.16$_a$	44	4.07$_a$	30	4.40$_a$	20	3.62$_b$	42
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.52[1]	3366	3.02[1]	88	3.09$_a$	35	3.05$_a$	40	3.08$_a$	24	3.21$_a$	19	2.97$_a$	38
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.20[1]	3209	3.14[1]	86	3.13$_a$	32	3.20$_a$	40	3.08$_a$	24	3.67$_b$	18	2.89$_a$	36
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.26[1]	3082	3.04[1]	82	3.13$_a$	31	3.13$_a$	38	3.18$_{a,b}$	22	3.61$_a$	18	2.80$_b$	35

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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	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	3.54[1]	98	3.95$_a$	41	3.43$_b$	42	3.73$_a$	30	3.74$_a$	19	3.39$_a$	41
Free speech is an important issue on campus	4.28[1]	3697	4.34[1]	99	4.25$_a$	40	4.49$_a$	43	4.41$_a$	29	4.47$_a$	19	4.21$_a$	43
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	3.59[1]	3525	3.45[1]	98	3.57$_a$	40	3.40$_a$	42	3.77$_a$	30	3.32$_{a,b}$	19	3.22$_b$	41
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.30[1]	3473	3.14[1]	93	3.24$_a$	38	3.20$_a$	40	3.36$_a$	28	3.28$_a$	18	2.90$_a$	40
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.97[1]	3648	2.84[1]	100	2.34$_a$	41	3.28$_b$	43	2.60$_a$	30	3.53$_b$	19	2.65$_a$	43

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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	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	3.90[1]	92	4.13$_a$	39	3.78$_b$	41	3.96$_a$	27	3.78$_a$	18	3.97$_a$	40
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.72[1]	3408	3.68[1]	97	3.98$_a$	40	3.53$_b$	43	3.86$_a$	28	3.63$_a$	19	3.64$_a$	42
CSU retains diverse employees	3.60[1]	2992	3.57[1]	83	3.84$_a$	37	3.46$_b$	35	3.70$_a$	23	3.06$_b$	16	3.82$_a$	38
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.77[1]	3194	3.70[1]	86	4.00$_a$	37	3.64$_b$	36	3.71$_a$	24	3.50$_a$	16	3.79$_a$	38
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.02[1]	3472	3.94[1]	96	4.05$_a$	38	4.05$_a$	43	3.86$_a$	28	4.15$_a$	20	3.90$_a$	40
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	3.84[1]	3541	3.72[1]	99	4.00$_a$	39	3.68$_b$	44	3.86$_a$	29	3.70$_a$	20	3.69$_a$	42
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.76[1]	3183	3.80[1]	96	3.89$_a$	38	3.98$_a$	42	4.00$_a$	27	3.83$_a$	18	3.72$_a$	43
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.08[1]	3708	3.97[1]	103	4.17$_a$	42	4.04$_a$	46	4.06$_a$	32	3.95$_a$	20	4.02$_a$	43

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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	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	3.55^1	100	3.76_a	41	3.43_a	44	3.77_a	30	3.37_a	19	3.51_a	43
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.61^1	3548	3.52^1	100	3.90_a	41	3.32_b	44	3.76_a	29	3.42_a	19	3.48_a	44
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.50^1	3414	3.26^1	96	3.45_a	40	3.17_a	42	$3.17_{a,b}$	29	2.82_a	17	3.56_b	43
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.68^1	3458	3.37^1	95	3.67_a	39	3.27_a	41	3.21_a	28	3.18_a	17	3.60_a	42
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.66^1	3561	3.41^1	97	3.55_a	40	3.44_a	43	3.23_a	30	3.79_b	19	$3.40_{a,b}$	40
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.71^1	3739	3.50^1	103	3.90_a	41	3.35_b	46	3.58_a	31	3.50_a	20	3.50_a	44
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.59^1	3380	3.41^1	96	3.55_a	38	3.40_a	42	3.43_a	28	3.44_a	18	3.40_a	42
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.86^1	3735	3.59^1	104	3.98_a	42	3.37_b	46	3.63_a	32	3.50_a	20	3.70_a	44

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

	Overall		Division		Gender				Employee Type					
Have you utilized child or adult care services this past year?	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	$14.1\%^1$	533	$*^1$	*	$*_a$	*	$*_a$	*	$*_a$	*	$*_a$	*	$*_a$	*
No	$85.9\%^1$	3247	$94.2\%^1$	97	$95.2\%_a$	40	$91.1\%_a$	41	$96.9\%_a$	31	$85.0\%_a$	17	$95.3\%_a$	41

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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Cost of care services	72.3%	391	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
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	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
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				Employee Type					
	CSU		IT & Libraries		Men		Women		Admin Pro		Faculty		SC	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
CSU Perceptions	3.82^1	2524	3.74^1	74	4.03_a	34	3.69_b	29	3.86_a	20	3.63_a	14	3.79_a	34
Department/Unit Perceptions	3.66^1	2869	3.38^1	83	3.70_a	35	3.24_b	35	3.44_a	23	3.31_a	15	3.42_a	38
Department/Unit Leadership	3.42^1	2859	3.31^1	77	3.79_a	33	2.91_b	30	3.26_a	25	3.23_a	14	3.44_a	31
College/Division Leadership	3.31^1	2472	3.28^1	67	3.88_a	28	2.94_b	27	3.29_a	19	3.35_a	13	3.37_a	30
Favoritism	2.80^1	3417	2.94^1	94	2.80_a	37	2.99_a	38	2.99_a	27	2.81_a	16	2.94_a	40
Sense of Belonging	3.67^1	3978	3.69^1	112	4.02_a	42	3.57_b	46	3.72_a	32	3.93_a	20	3.59_a	44
Department/Unit Culture	3.52^1	3807	3.31^1	108	3.60_a	41	3.09_b	45	3.38_a	32	3.24_a	19	3.26_a	43
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	4.00^1	3753	3.66^1	104	3.79_a	40	3.63_a	44	3.70_a	29	3.64_a	19	3.58_a	43

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	Lower	3.63	3.86	-.22	65.2%	72.5%	-7.3
Understands the value of diversity	Lower	3.85	4.06	-.20	70.9%	78.6%	-7.7
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Lower	3.35	3.62	-.27	53.2%	64.7%	-11.5
Treats all employees equitably	Similar	3.30	3.46	-.16	49.1%	58.5%	-9.4
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Lower	3.52	3.87	-.36	57.1%	69.8%	-12.7
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Similar	3.99	3.99	.00	76.6%	77.0%	-.5
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Lower	3.73	4.04	-.31	61.8%	76.1%	-14.3
Is open and transparent in communication	Lower	3.19	3.44	-.26	49.5%	57.3%	-7.7
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Lower	3.17	3.46	-.29	48.2%	57.3%	-9.2

---

[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	Lower	3.11	3.39	-.28	45.9%	54.2%	-8.3
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	Lower	3.59	3.97	-.38	57.5%	76.1%	-18.6
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	Similar	4.31	4.32	-.01	91.6%	91.6%	.0
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	Similar	3.90	3.90	.00	73.1%	72.9%	.2
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Similar	2.83	2.66	.17	31.8%	28.0%	3.8
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Similar	3.29	3.10	.18	44.6%	37.0%	7.6
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	Similar	3.65	3.65	.00	58.9%	62.4%	-3.5
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	Similar	3.54	3.49	.05	52.7%	55.4%	-2.7
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	Similar	3.89	3.88	.02	69.6%	71.3%	-1.7

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	3.48	3.64	-.16	56.6%	64.3%	-7.6
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	Similar	3.52	3.69	-.17	58.1%	67.0%	-8.9
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	Similar	3.90	3.95	-.05	73.9%	78.9%	-5.0
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	Lower	3.72	3.91	-.19	59.0%	71.7%	-12.6
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	Lower	3.85	4.06	-.21	69.4%	79.0%	-9.6
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	Similar	3.38	3.47	-.08	51.6%	55.1%	-3.5
I feel valued as an employee	Similar	3.61	3.68	-.06	62.2%	66.7%	-4.5

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	3.14	3.00	.14	42.6%	37.9%	4.7
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	Similar	2.84	2.85	-.01	27.4%	31.3%	-4.0
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	Similar	2.74	2.64	.09	20.6%	23.7%	-3.1
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	Higher	3.18	2.88	.30	39.0%	32.3%	6.7
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	Similar	2.93	2.73	.20	32.7%	25.6%	7.1

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	3.34	3.35	.00	48.7%	51.7%	-3.0
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.34	3.45	-.11	55.1%	58.2%	-3.1
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.29	3.30	-.01	43.4%	48.1%	-4.7

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.41	3.41	.00	53.4%	55.4%	-2.0
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.11	3.13	-.02	36.3%	41.5%	-5.3
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.19	3.25	-.06	46.2%	50.5%	-4.3
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.71	3.78	-.06	66.0%	69.4%	-3.4
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.81	3.89	-.09	74.0%	75.1%	-1.1
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Lower	3.05	3.37	-.32	35.4%	50.3%	-14.8
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Lower	3.19	3.47	-.28	42.7%	55.8%	-13.1
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.01	3.20	-.18	33.7%	45.8%	-12.1
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.01	3.25	-.24	39.2%	51.1%	-11.9

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	4.05	4.00	.05	78.0%	77.7%	.3
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Similar	3.64	3.64	.00	62.4%	61.8%	.6
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Similar	2.96	3.10	-.14	24.7%	32.4%	-7.7
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Similar	3.07	3.21	-.14	28.1%	34.0%	-6.0
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Similar	3.60	3.44	.16	54.3%	51.2%	3.1

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	3.47	3.35	.12	56.9%	46.7%	10.3
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	Similar	3.91	3.87	.04	76.8%	70.8%	6.1

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	3.89	3.91	-.02	80.2%	77.2%	3.0
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment	Lower	3.02	3.52	-.50	43.2%	58.4%	-15.2
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	Similar	3.14	3.20	-.06	33.7%	36.0%	-2.2
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	Lower	3.04	3.26	-.22	29.3%	38.4%	-9.2

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	3.54	3.64	-.10	60.2%	66.7%	-6.5
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Similar	4.34	4.28	.07	91.9%	89.5%	2.5
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Similar	3.45	3.59	-.14	49.0%	59.8%	-10.8
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Similar	3.14	3.30	-.16	41.9%	50.3%	-8.4
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Similar	2.84	2.97	-.13	27.0%	33.5%	-6.5

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	Similar	3.90	3.84	.06	78.3%	75.0%	3.3
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Similar	3.68	3.72	-.04	67.0%	69.5%	-2.5
CSU retains diverse employees	Similar	3.57	3.60	-.03	54.2%	61.2%	-7.0
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Similar	3.70	3.77	-.07	66.3%	69.9%	-3.6
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	3.94	4.02	-.08	78.1%	79.9%	-1.8
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.72	3.84	-.12	71.7%	74.0%	-2.2
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.80	3.76	.04	70.8%	66.6%	4.2
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Similar	3.97	4.08	-.11	79.6%	80.9%	-1.3

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	Similar	3.55	3.67	-.12	61.0%	66.6%	-5.6
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	Similar	3.52	3.61	-.09	60.0%	63.7%	-3.7
Department/office retains diverse employees	Lower	3.26	3.50	-.24	42.7%	56.8%	-14.1
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Lower	3.37	3.68	-.31	49.5%	65.3%	-15.8
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	Lower	3.41	3.66	-.24	55.7%	61.8%	-6.1
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	Lower	3.50	3.71	-.22	63.1%	68.7%	-5.5
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.41	3.59	-.19	50.0%	59.3%	-9.3
Would recommend department/office as a place of employment	Lower	3.59	3.86	-.27	61.5%	71.3%	-9.8

Table C12 Factors

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Similar	3.74	3.82	-.08
Department/Unit Perceptions	Lower	3.38	3.66	-.28
Department/Unit Leadership	Similar	3.31	3.42	-.12
College/Division Leadership	Similar	3.28	3.31	-.02
Favoritism	Similar	2.94	2.80	.14
Sense of Belonging	Similar	3.69	3.67	.02
Department/Unit Culture	Lower	3.31	3.52	-.22
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Lower	3.66	4.00	-.34