Office of the Vice President for Research 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 OVPR. 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 OVPR, 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	3.8%	16.3%	14.4%	26.9%	38.5%	104	3.80
Understands the value of diversity	1.0%	3.9%	24.5%	31.4%	39.2%	102	4.04
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	5.7%	10.5%	16.2%	31.4%	36.2%	105	3.82
Treats all employees equitably	7.8%	16.5%	10.7%	35.9%	29.1%	103	3.62
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	2.0%	10.8%	24.5%	35.3%	27.5%	102	3.75
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	4.9%	11.8%	3.9%	34.3%	45.1%	102	4.03
Promotes respect for cultural differences	1.0%	6.8%	25.2%	30.1%	36.9%	103	3.95
Is open and transparent in communication	5.8%	17.3%	12.5%	33.7%	30.8%	104	3.66
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	5.0%	17.8%	21.8%	24.8%	30.7%	101	3.58

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%	14.7%	24.5%	34.3%	19.6%	102	3.45
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	1.0%	2.0%	27.0%	43.0%	27.0%	100	3.93
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	1.1%	5.4%	3.3%	45.7%	44.6%	92	4.27
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	6.7%	12.4%	16.9%	32.6%	31.5%	89	3.70
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	16.8%	37.6%	19.8%	11.9%	13.9%	101	2.68
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	4.1%	17.3%	32.7%	30.6%	15.3%	98	3.36
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	1.0%	13.5%	20.2%	40.4%	25.0%	104	3.75
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.8%	14.4%	19.2%	42.3%	20.2%	104	3.61
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	2.9%	11.5%	11.5%	34.6%	39.4%	104	3.96

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	2.0%	10.2%	20.4%	43.9%	23.5%	98	3.77
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	1.0%	7.2%	25.8%	43.3%	22.7%	97	3.79
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	2.0%	8.8%	8.8%	55.9%	24.5%	102	3.92
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	2.2%	2.2%	31.9%	45.1%	18.7%	91	3.76
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	1.1%	0.0%	24.7%	50.5%	23.7%	93	3.96
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	5.5%	11.0%	29.7%	41.8%	12.1%	91	3.44
I feel valued as an employee	6.9%	11.8%	13.7%	45.1%	22.5%	102	3.65

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	15.8%	27.4%	17.9%	26.3%	12.6%	95	2.93
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	18.1%	30.9%	18.1%	20.2%	12.8%	94	2.79
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	19.8%	32.3%	20.8%	17.7%	9.4%	96	2.65
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	16.8%	28.4%	21.1%	16.8%	16.8%	95	2.88
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	22.6%	26.9%	22.6%	17.2%	10.8%	93	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	6.9%	20.8%	31.9%	33.3%	6.9%	72	3.13
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	7.2%	24.1%	20.5%	34.9%	13.3%	83	3.23
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	5.7%	21.4%	34.3%	34.3%	4.3%	70	3.10

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.7%	23.5%	28.4%	32.1%	12.3%	81	3.26
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	10.0%	10.0%	27.1%	44.3%	8.6%	70	3.31
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	7.1%	15.3%	24.7%	38.8%	14.1%	85	3.38
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	2.4%	5.9%	23.5%	41.2%	27.1%	85	3.85
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	4.4%	6.6%	15.4%	38.5%	35.2%	91	3.93
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	5.7%	10.0%	44.3%	22.9%	17.1%	70	3.36
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	8.5%	14.6%	24.4%	34.1%	18.3%	82	3.39
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	5.3%	24.0%	28.0%	30.7%	12.0%	75	3.20
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	8.0%	28.4%	12.5%	31.8%	19.3%	88	3.26

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	5.2%	4.1%	18.6%	24.7%	1.0%	9.3%	67.0%	97
___ is problematic among employees in my division/college	1.0%	0.0%	6.2%	19.6%	0.0%	3.1%	78.4%	97
___ is problematic among employees in my department/office	1.0%	0.0%	11.3%	18.6%	0.0%	6.2%	72.2%	97
There are people at CSU I avoid because I fear ___	6.2%	3.1%	20.6%	21.6%	2.1%	10.3%	68.0%	97

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	1.1%	7.6%	19.6%	52.2%	19.6%	92	3.82
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	1.3%	10.3%	23.1%	43.6%	21.8%	78	3.74
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	10.8%	20.3%	47.3%	16.2%	5.4%	74	2.85
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	5.8%	13.5%	59.6%	15.4%	5.8%	52	3.02
CSU handles incidents of bias well	2.8%	8.3%	36.1%	34.7%	18.1%	72	3.57

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	92.6%	88
No	7.4%	7
Total	100.0%	95

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	1.6%	12.7%	50.8%	31.7%	3.2%	63	3.22
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	0.0%	7.0%	26.8%	49.3%	16.9%	71	3.76

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.	0.0%	3.3%	3.3%	44.4%	48.9%	90	4.39
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	2.2%	12.4%	9.0%	29.2%	47.2%	89	4.07
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	2.4%	20.0%	43.5%	18.8%	15.3%	85	3.25
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	2.4%	14.3%	51.2%	19.0%	13.1%	84	3.26

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	1.1%	12.2%	15.6%	46.7%	24.4%	90	3.81
Free speech is an important issue on campus	3.3%	3.3%	7.7%	46.2%	39.6%	91	4.15
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	0.0%	11.0%	28.0%	46.3%	14.6%	82	3.65
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.6%	21.7%	25.3%	34.9%	14.5%	83	3.35
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	9.1%	22.7%	36.4%	25.0%	6.8%	88	2.98

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	0.0%	3.8%	14.1%	50.0%	32.1%	78	4.10
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	2.3%	5.7%	19.5%	55.2%	17.2%	87	3.79
CSU retains diverse employees	0.0%	9.5%	20.3%	45.9%	24.3%	74	3.85
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	0.0%	2.4%	22.9%	47.0%	27.7%	83	4.00
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	0.0%	3.5%	18.8%	45.9%	31.8%	85	4.06
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	0.0%	6.6%	20.9%	47.3%	25.3%	91	3.91
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	2.6%	7.7%	34.6%	33.3%	21.8%	78	3.64
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	0.0%	6.5%	16.3%	42.4%	34.8%	92	4.05

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	0.0%	8.1%	25.6%	47.7%	18.6%	86	3.77
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.4%	3.4%	24.7%	48.3%	20.2%	89	3.79
Department/office retains diverse employees	0.0%	15.1%	27.9%	37.2%	19.8%	86	3.62
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	0.0%	10.3%	24.1%	40.2%	25.3%	87	3.80
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	1.2%	12.9%	41.2%	25.9%	18.8%	85	3.48
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.3%	8.9%	14.4%	45.6%	27.8%	90	3.86
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	2.5%	10.0%	36.3%	31.3%	20.0%	80	3.56
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	1.1%	8.7%	19.6%	39.1%	31.5%	92	3.91

Table A14 Discriminatory Attitudes

Discriminatory attitudes are present in your department/office based on:	%	N
No intolerant attitudes are present	47.4%	37
Job title	30.8%	24
Political affiliation	16.7%	13
Age	15.4%	12
Employment classification	14.1%	11
Gender	14.1%	11
Parental status	6.4%	5
Religion	5.1%	4
Appearance	5.1%	4
Other (Gender identity and expression, Disability (e.g. physical, mental), Sexual orientation, Socioeconomic status, Nationality/Country of origin, Education/professional background)	15%.	12

Note: multiple response item.

Table A15 Work-related Stressors

Please select your top THREE work-related stressors	%	N
Lower salary	45.6%	41
Workload	42.2%	38
Work/life balance	26.7%	24
Lack of growth/promotion	23.3%	21
Lack of resources/Budget/Funding	18.9%	17
Job security	18.9%	17
Email overload	17.8%	16
Office/department climate	12.2%	11
Affordable housing near work	12.2%	11
Interpersonal conflict	11.1%	10
Ill-defined job	10.0%	9
Physical environment	7.8%	7
Health issues	7.8%	7
Lack of training/skills to do my work	6.7%	6
Duties outside my job responsibilities	5.6%	5
Lack of work flexibility	4.4%	4
Lack of work autonomy	4.4%	4
Physical safety	3.3%	3
Parking and Transportation	3.3%	3
Misconduct occurring at work/Inequities/Bias	2.2%	2
Communication	2.2%	2
Other	1.1%	1
Administration/Leadership	1.1%	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	9.7%	9
No	90.3%	84
Total	100.0%	93

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	88.9%	8
Finding child care services	44.4%	4
Transportation to/from care services	44.4%	4
Scheduling care to match work schedule	44.4%	4
Finding summer care services	33.3%	3
Location of care services	33.3%	3
Finding adult care services	22.2%	2
Dependability of care services	22.2%	2
Finding care for a sick child/adult	11.1%	1
I did not encounter any challenges related to care services	0.0%	0

Note: This question was only asked to those who answered they used care

services; multiple response item

Table A18 Gender

	%	N
Women	72.1%	62
Men	26.7%	23
T/NB/GNC	1.2%	1

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	89.5%	68
Minoritized	10.5%	8

Note: Excludes respondents who specified Prefer not to

disclose.

Table A20 Employee Type

	%	N
Administrative Professional	80.4%	74
Faculty	3.3%	3
State Classified	9.8%	9
Other	0.0%	0
Prefer not to disclose	6.5%	6
Total	100.0%	92

Table A21 Department/Unit

	%	N
CSU Energy Institute or Proteomics & Metabolomics Facility or One Health Institute or Biosafety	9.6%	8
Infectious Disease Research Center	22.9%	19
Laboratory Animal Resources	14.5%	12
Office of the VP for Research or Research Integrity & Compl. Review Office or Research Services	31.3%	26
Sponsored Programs	21.7%	18
Total	100.0%	83

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. The Office of the Vice President for Research had fewer than 10 respondents with a minoritized race/ethnicity and who were an employee type other than administrative professional; therefore, mean comparisons are not reported by minoritized race/ethnicity or employee type.

Table B1 Department/Unit Culture

My department or office...	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Supports a healthy work/life balance	3.86^1	4008	3.80^1	104	4.26_a	23	3.85_a	61
Understands the value of diversity	4.06^1	3956	4.04^1	102	4.30_a	20	4.03_a	62
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	3.62^1	3994	3.82^1	105	4.26_a	23	3.76_a	62
Treats all employees equitably	3.46^1	3946	3.62^1	103	4.09_a	22	3.57_a	61
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	3.87^1	3950	3.75^1	102	3.90_a	20	3.81_a	62
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	3.99^1	3999	4.03^1	102	3.95_a	22	4.08_a	61
Promotes respect for cultural differences	4.04^1	3934	3.95^1	103	4.09_a	23	4.00_a	61
Is open and transparent in communication	3.44^1	4009	3.66^1	104	4.26_a	23	3.56_b	62
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	3.46^1	3952	3.58^1	101	3.95_a	22	3.49_a	61

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My division/college is open and transparent in communication	3.39^1	3931	3.45^1	102	4.00_a	22	3.30_b	61
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	3.97^1	3872	3.93^1	100	4.05_a	22	3.95_a	59
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	4.32^1	3691	4.27^1	92	4.67_a	18	4.23_b	56
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	3.90^1	3687	3.70^1	89	4.18_a	17	3.61_a	56
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	2.66^1	3925	2.68^1	101	2.35_a	20	2.73_a	62
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	3.10^1	3910	3.36^1	98	2.90_a	20	3.44_a	59
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	3.65^1	4012	3.75^1	104	4.04_a	23	3.65_a	62
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	3.49^1	4003	3.61^1	104	3.96_a	23	3.55_a	62
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	3.88^1	4007	3.96^1	104	4.17_a	23	4.02_a	62

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	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	3.77^1	98	4.27_a	22	3.60_b	60
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	3.69^1	3656	3.79^1	97	4.29_a	21	3.73_b	60
The people I interact with treat each other with respect.	3.95^1	3999	3.92^1	102	4.35_a	23	3.82_b	62
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	3.91^1	3459	3.76^1	91	4.22_a	18	3.67_b	57
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	4.06^1	3723	3.96^1	93	4.18_a	17	3.88_a	60
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	3.47^1	3600	3.44^1	91	3.65_a	17	3.42_a	59
I feel valued as an employee	3.68^1	3991	3.65^1	102	3.96_a	23	3.69_a	62

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Favoritism plays a role in who gets recognized within my department/office	3.00^1	3711	2.93^1	95	2.25_a	20	3.07_b	60
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	2.85^1	3670	2.79^1	94	2.14_a	21	2.86_b	58
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	2.64^1	3665	2.65^1	96	2.19_a	21	2.70_a	60
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	2.88^1	3606	2.88^1	95	2.30_a	20	2.95_a	60
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	2.73^1	3568	2.67^1	93	2.00_a	21	2.75_b	57

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Division/college leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.35[1]	2953	3.13[1]	72	3.40[a]	15	3.09[a]	46
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	3.45[1]	3343	3.23[1]	83	3.44[a]	16	3.21[a]	56
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.30[1]	2849	3.10[1]	70	3.57[a]	14	3.00[a]	45
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	3.41[1]	3241	3.26[1]	81	3.63[a]	16	3.22[a]	54
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.13[1]	2894	3.31[1]	70	3.73[a]	15	3.30[a]	44
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	3.25[1]	3365	3.38[1]	85	3.84[a]	19	3.35[a]	55
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.78[1]	3369	3.85[1]	85	4.09[a]	22	3.87[a]	53
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	3.89[1]	3705	3.93[1]	91	4.09[a]	22	3.97[a]	59

Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.37^1	3033	3.36^1	70	3.81_a	16	3.28_a	43
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	3.47^1	3351	3.39^1	82	3.78_a	18	3.34_a	53
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.20^1	3130	3.20^1	75	3.72_a	18	3.17_a	46
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	3.25^1	3599	3.26^1	88	3.75_a	20	3.18_a	57

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	247	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	3.0%	117	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	13.3%	519	18.6%	18	*	*	22.6%	14
Bias	28.3%	1104	24.7%	24	*	*	29.0%	18
Physical Assault	0.6%	23	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.2%	282	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	65.7%	2566	67.0%	65	78.3%	18	61.3%	38

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.8%	109	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.3%	52	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	10.3%	404	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bias	24.1%	940	19.6%	19	*	*	21.0%	13
Physical Assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	5.1%	199	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	70.8%	2765	78.4%	76	87.0%	20	75.8%	47

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	1.9%	73	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.1%	42	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	12.4%	486	11.3%	11	*	*	*	*
Bias	23.3%	911	18.6%	18	*	*	22.6%	14
Physical Assault	0.3%	10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	7.0%	272	*	*	*	*	*	*
None	69.9%	2731	72.2%	70	87.0%	20	64.5%	40

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexual Harassment	2.5%	99	*	*	*	*	*	*
Sexual Misconduct	1.0%	41	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bullying	16.7%	651	20.6%	20	*	*	24.2%	15
Bias	20.0%	781	21.6%	21	*	*	25.8%	16
Physical Assault	0.9%	37	*	*	*	*	*	*
Verbal Assault	11.0%	428	10.3%	10	*	*	*	*
None	68.7%	2682	68.0%	66	87.0%	20	61.3%	38

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I find it is worthwhile to know about bias incidents at CSU	4.00[1]	3726	3.82[1]	92	3.76$_a$	21	3.87$_a$	61
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	3.64[1]	3199	3.74[1]	78	3.83$_a$	18	3.67$_a$	52
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	3.10[1]	3174	2.85[1]	74	2.87$_a$	15	2.92$_a$	50
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	3.21[1]	2397	3.02[1]	52	*$_a$	*	3.12$_a$	34
CSU handles incidents of bias well	3.44[1]	2962	3.57[1]	72	3.73$_a$	15	3.52$_a$	48

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 n ≥ 10.

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	83.9%[1]	3260	92.6%[1]	88	87.0%$_a$	20	93.5%$_a$	58
No	16.1%[1]	627	*[1]	*	*$_a$	*	*$_a$	*

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

Table B12 Employee Councils

	Overall		Division		Gender			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	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	3.22[1]	63	3.00$_a$	13	3.27$_a$	41
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	3.87[1]	2700	3.76[1]	71	3.93$_a$	15	3.77$_a$	47

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
I am familiar with the Principles of Community.	3.91^1	3644	4.39^1	90	4.41_a	22	4.34_a	59
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment (e.g. posted, displayed)	3.52^1	3366	4.07^1	89	4.38_a	21	4.02_a	59
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	3.20^1	3209	3.25^1	85	3.40_a	20	3.20_a	56
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	3.26^1	3082	3.26^1	84	3.37_a	19	3.23_a	56

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
My division/college supports people speaking freely	3.64[1]	3629	3.81[1]	90	4.32[a]	22	3.67[b]	60
Free speech is an important issue on campus	4.28[1]	3697	4.15[1]	91	4.55[a]	22	4.10[b]	61
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	3.59[1]	3525	3.65[1]	82	4.05[a]	20	3.48[b]	54
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	3.30[1]	3473	3.35[1]	83	3.45[a]	20	3.27[a]	55
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	2.97[1]	3648	2.98[1]	88	2.60[a]	20	3.05[a]	60

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
CSU recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	3.84^{1}	3315	4.10^{1}	78	4.37_{a}	19	4.06_{a}	51
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	3.72^{1}	3408	3.79^{1}	87	3.95_{a}	20	3.80_{a}	59
CSU retains diverse employees	3.60^{1}	2992	3.85^{1}	74	4.17_{a}	18	3.79_{a}	48
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.77^{1}	3194	4.00^{1}	83	4.20_{a}	20	3.95_{a}	55
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	4.02^{1}	3472	4.06^{1}	85	4.05_{a}	20	4.05_{a}	57
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	3.84^{1}	3541	3.91^{1}	91	4.23_{a}	22	3.89_{a}	61
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.76^{1}	3183	3.64^{1}	78	3.76_{a}	17	3.68_{a}	53
I would recommend CSU as a place of employment	4.08^{1}	3708	4.05^{1}	92	4.36_{a}	22	4.03_{a}	62

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
Department/office recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds	3.67^1	3603	3.77^1	86	4.00_a	20	3.66_a	58
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	3.61^1	3548	3.79^1	89	4.05_a	20	3.67_a	61
Department/office retains diverse employees	3.50^1	3414	3.62^1	86	4.05_a	20	3.47_b	58
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	3.68^1	3458	3.80^1	87	4.05_a	20	3.69_a	59
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	3.66^1	3561	3.48^1	85	3.74_a	19	3.36_a	58
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	3.71^1	3739	3.86^1	90	4.18_a	22	3.78_a	60
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	3.59^1	3380	3.56^1	80	3.88_a	17	3.47_a	55
I would recommend my department/office as a place of employment	3.86^1	3735	3.91^1	92	4.14_a	22	3.87_a	62

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	14.1%[1]	533	*[1]	*	*a	*	*a	*
No	85.9%[1]	3247	90.3%[1]	84	95.7%a	22	90.3%a	56

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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	%	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			
	CSU		Research		Men		Women	
	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N	Avg	N
CSU Perceptions	3.82^1	2524	3.88^1	65	4.10_a	15	3.86_a	42
Department/Unit Perceptions	3.66^1	2869	3.76^1	72	4.02_a	17	3.66_a	47
Department/Unit Leadership	3.42^1	2859	3.39^1	75	3.69_a	16	3.40_a	49
College/Division Leadership	3.31^1	2472	3.30^1	59	3.67_a	12	3.32_a	37
Favoritism	2.80^1	3417	2.78^1	88	2.20_a	20	2.85_b	53
Sense of Belonging	3.67^1	3978	3.77^1	104	4.06_a	23	3.74_a	62
Department/Unit Culture	3.52^1	3807	3.66^1	99	4.12_a	22	3.58_b	60
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	4.00^1	3753	3.94^1	97	4.10_a	20	3.98_a	58

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	3.80	3.86	-.06	65.4%	72.5%	-7.1
Understands the value of diversity	Similar	4.04	4.06	-.02	70.6%	78.6%	-8.0
Promotes a work environment where all employees feel included	Similar	3.82	3.62	.20	67.6%	64.7%	2.9
Treats all employees equitably	Similar	3.62	3.46	.16	65.0%	58.5%	6.6
Communicates the importance of valuing diversity	Similar	3.75	3.87	-.12	62.7%	69.8%	-7.1
Provides me with opportunities for professional development	Similar	4.03	3.99	.04	79.4%	77.0%	2.4
Promotes respect for cultural differences	Similar	3.95	4.04	-.09	67.0%	76.1%	-9.1
Is open and transparent in communication	Similar	3.66	3.44	.22	64.4%	57.3%	7.2
Values employee input in major department/office decisions	Similar	3.58	3.46	.12	55.4%	57.3%	-1.9

---

[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	3.45	3.39	.06	53.9%	54.2%	-.3
My division/college promotes respect for cultural differences	Similar	3.93	3.97	-.04	70.0%	76.1%	-6.1
I had a performance review of my progress as an employee in the last year	Similar	4.27	4.32	-.05	90.2%	91.6%	-1.4
I was satisfied with the effort my supervisor puts into my performance reviews	Similar	3.70	3.90	-.20	64.0%	72.9%	-8.9
I fear negative job consequences if I were to raise an issue of unfair treatment	Similar	2.68	2.66	.02	25.7%	28.0%	-2.3
I would be able to do my job more effectively if I received more information from my department/office	Higher	3.36	3.10	.25	45.9%	37.0%	8.9
I feel a strong sense of belonging to CSU	Similar	3.75	3.65	.10	65.4%	62.4%	3.0
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my division/college	Similar	3.61	3.49	.12	62.5%	55.4%	7.1
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my department/office	Similar	3.96	3.88	.08	74.0%	71.3%	2.7

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	3.77	3.64	.13	67.3%	64.3%	3.1
My division/college is treated with respect by CSU	Similar	3.79	3.69	.10	66.0%	67.0%	-1.1
The people I interact with treat each other with respect	Similar	3.92	3.95	-.03	80.4%	78.9%	1.5
There is respect for religious differences in my department/office	Similar	3.76	3.91	-.16	63.7%	71.7%	-7.9
There is respect for liberal perspectives in my department/office	Similar	3.96	4.06	-.10	74.2%	79.0%	-4.8
There is respect for conservative perspectives in my department/office	Similar	3.44	3.47	-.03	53.8%	55.1%	-1.3
I feel valued as an employee	Similar	3.65	3.68	-.03	67.6%	66.7%	1.0

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	2.93	3.00	-.07	38.9%	37.9%	1.0
Favoritism plays a role in who gets resources in my department/office	Similar	2.79	2.85	-.06	33.0%	31.3%	1.6
Favoritism plays a role in who gets professional development opportunities	Similar	2.65	2.64	.00	27.1%	23.7%	3.4
Favoritism plays a role in who gets promoted in my department/office	Similar	2.88	2.88	.01	33.7%	32.3%	1.3
Favoritism plays a role in who gets hired in my department/office	Similar	2.67	2.73	-.06	28.0%	25.6%	2.4

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	3.13	3.35	-.22	40.3%	51.7%	-11.4
Department/office leadership adequately addresses inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.23	3.45	-.22	48.2%	58.2%	-10.0
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.10	3.30	-.20	38.6%	48.1%	-9.6

Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for inappropriate behavior	Similar	3.26	3.41	-.15	44.4%	55.4%	-10.9
Division/college leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.31	3.13	.19	52.9%	41.5%	11.3
Department/office leadership holds employees accountable for poor performance in the workplace	Similar	3.38	3.25	.13	52.9%	50.5%	2.4
Division/college leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.85	3.78	.07	68.2%	69.4%	-1.2
Department/office leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace	Similar	3.93	3.89	.04	73.6%	75.1%	-1.5
Division/college leadership addresses issues of inequity	Similar	3.36	3.37	-.01	40.0%	50.3%	-10.3
Department/office leadership addresses issues of inequity	Similar	3.39	3.47	-.08	52.4%	55.8%	-3.3
Division/college leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.20	3.20	.00	42.7%	45.8%	-3.1
Department/office leaders hold all employees to the same standards	Similar	3.26	3.25	.01	51.1%	51.1%	.0

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	Lower	3.82	4.00	-.19	71.7%	77.7%	-6.0
The university is transparent in reporting bias incidents at CSU	Similar	3.74	3.64	.10	65.4%	61.8%	3.6
I am alarmed about the number of bias incidents reported at CSU	Lower	2.85	3.10	-.25	21.6%	32.4%	-10.7
The number of bias incidents have increased at CSU in the past year	Similar	3.02	3.21	-.19	21.2%	34.0%	-12.9
CSU handles incidents of bias well	Similar	3.57	3.44	.13	52.8%	51.2%	1.6

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	3.22	3.35	-.13	34.9%	46.7%	-11.7
I feel that the councils' collective participation in shared governance is pertinent to the success of our institution	Similar	3.76	3.87	-.11	66.2%	70.8%	-4.6

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	Higher	4.39	3.91	.48	93.3%	77.2%	16.1
Within my department/office, the Principles of Community are visible in my daily working environment	Higher	4.07	3.52	.55	76.4%	58.4%	18.0
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my department/office	Similar	3.25	3.20	.05	34.1%	36.0%	-1.8
I feel the Principles of Community have made a positive impact on the climate in my division/college	Similar	3.26	3.26	.00	32.1%	38.4%	-6.3

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	3.81	3.64	.18	71.1%	66.7%	4.4
Free speech is an important issue on campus	Similar	4.15	4.28	-.12	85.7%	89.5%	-3.7
I have the skills to navigate free speech questions on campus	Similar	3.65	3.59	.06	61.0%	59.8%	1.2
I know who to ask/where to go if I have questions about free speech	Similar	3.35	3.30	.05	49.4%	50.3%	-.9
Issues related to freedom of speech impact my work	Similar	2.98	2.97	.00	31.8%	33.5%	-1.7

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	Higher	4.10	3.84	.26	82.1%	75.0%	7.1
CSU improves the campus climate for all employees	Similar	3.79	3.72	.07	72.4%	69.5%	2.9
CSU retains diverse employees	Higher	3.85	3.60	.25	70.3%	61.2%	9.0
CSU creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Higher	4.00	3.77	.23	74.7%	69.9%	4.8
CSU encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	4.06	4.02	.04	77.6%	79.9%	-2.2
CSU provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.91	3.84	.08	72.5%	74.0%	-1.4
CSU climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.64	3.76	-.12	55.1%	66.6%	-11.5
Would recommend CSU as a place of employment	Similar	4.05	4.08	-.02	77.2%	80.9%	-3.7

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	3.77	3.67	.09	66.3%	66.6%	-.3
Department/office improves the campus climate for all employees	Similar	3.79	3.61	.17	68.5%	63.7%	4.9
Department/office retains diverse employees	Similar	3.62	3.50	.11	57.0%	56.8%	.2
Department/office creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds	Similar	3.80	3.68	.13	65.5%	65.3%	.2
Department/office encourages discussions related to diversity	Similar	3.48	3.66	-.17	44.7%	61.8%	-17.0
Department/office provides employees with a positive work experience	Similar	3.86	3.71	.14	73.3%	68.7%	4.7
Department/office climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees	Similar	3.56	3.59	-.03	51.3%	59.3%	-8.1
Would recommend department/office as a place of employment	Similar	3.91	3.86	.05	70.7%	71.3%	-.6

Table C12 Factors

		Division average	CSU average	Avg Gap
CSU Perceptions	Similar	3.88	3.82	.06
Department/Unit Perceptions	Similar	3.76	3.66	.10
Department/Unit Leadership	Similar	3.39	3.42	-.03
College/Division Leadership	Similar	3.30	3.31	-.01
Favoritism	Similar	2.78	2.80	-.02
Sense of Belonging	Similar	3.77	3.67	.10
Department/Unit Culture	Similar	3.66	3.52	.13
Department/Unit Diversity Culture	Similar	3.94	4.00	-.06