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• This year’s survey was designed to assess the current campus climate of the university

• Results are intended to
  – Provide an overall picture of CSU’s employment experiences and perceptions
  – Further CSU’s commitment to institutional accountability
  – Inform policies, initiatives, and opportunities that will provide an exceptional and equitable work environment
  – Provide a small benchmark for longitudinal data collection and comparison for perceptions of diversity
Administration

- Climate Survey designed by the Assessment Group for Diversity Issues
- Administered via Campus Labs in Fall 2016
  - Spanish and hard copy versions available
  - 15 minutes to complete
  - Anonymous
  - Results are reported in aggregate and no identifying information reported (e.g. small cell sizes)
  - Email initiation sent by President Frank
  - Two week follow-up reminder sent by councils to their employee listserv
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Category</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th># of CSU Employees</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>7,224</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Professional</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>3,696</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Classified</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents may not have completed the entire survey; therefore, respondent counts will vary depending on the topic/question.
### Respondent Overview

8.9% are not full-time appointment

7.2% work off-campus

Approximately a quarter of respondents each are in their 30s (26%), 40s (23%), and 50s (25%)

- 14% are 60+
- 12% are under 30

38.4% are a primary caretaker of a minor and/or an adult

40% are CSU Alumni

---

**Employee Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>CSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>n = 2,191</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>67.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>n = 662</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>31.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender, Non-Binary, Self-Identify</td>
<td>n =7,224</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minority Status (Race & Ethnicity)**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>14.60%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non - Underrepresented</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>85.40%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employee Category**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Professional (includes RA and postdocs)</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Classified</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Years Employed at CSU**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two years or less</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>20.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 years</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more years</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>28.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Valid percent reported (excludes missing data)
Survey Framework

- Workload
- Work Respect
- Leadership
- Search Committee
- Physical Campus Environment
- Diversity in Your Work Environment
- Campus Trainings
- Campus and Department Perceptions
- Personal and Employee Characteristics
### 2016 Employee Climate Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th># of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload*</td>
<td>Work Overload</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>52.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Demands &amp; Expectations</td>
<td>2,124</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>10.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>72.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Executive Leadership</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>46.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability Standards</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>10.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>46.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Perceptions</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>10.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department/Unit</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>48.87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items worded in support of construct. A higher mean can be interpreted as a more negative response.

**All questions were asked on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree & 5 = Strongly Agree)**
• Work Overload
  – The amount of work I have to do interferes with the quality I want to maintain (45% Agree, SC: 40%)
  – My workload is too heavy (39% Agree, SC: 34%)
  – I don't have time to finish my job (37% Agree, SC: 34%)
  – I'm rushed in doing my job (43% Agree, SC: 39%)
  – I feel overburdened in my job (41% Agree, SC: 37%)

• Time Demands & Expectations
  – I am expected to work more than 40 hours a week (40% Agree, SC: 21%)
  – I feel pressure to be reachable for work purposes throughout the day and evening (40% Agree, SC: 26%)
  – I have to stay too many extra hours at my job (31% Agree, SC: 20%)
  – I am expected to put my job ahead of my family or personal life (18% Agree, SC: 16%)
• On average, faculty report significantly higher means for Work Overload and Time Demands & Expectations than Administrative Professional and Staff Classified (effect sizes respectively: Work Overload = .42 & .45; Time Demands & Expectations = .65 & .99)
• Administrative Professional have significantly higher mean scores for Time Demands & Expectations than Staff Classified (effect size = .35), but Work Overload does not significantly differ
Work Respect

- My work contribution is appreciated (69% Agree, SC: 62%)
- I am cared about at work (67% Agree, SC: 60%)
- I am treated with respect at work (75% Agree, SC: 67%)
- My supervisor supports me and advocates on my behalf (68% Agree, SC: 62%)
• **Administrative Professionals** have significantly higher mean scores for Work Respect than **Staff Classified** or **Faculty** (effect sizes = .29 and .31 respectively)
An *individual* or a group of individuals…
An individual or a group of individuals…

- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion: 46% Experienced-All, 47% Experienced-State Classified
- Ignored or excluded you or others: 37% Experienced-All, 35% Experienced-State Classified
- Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way: 36% Experienced-All, 39% Experienced-State Classified
- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity: 26% Experienced-All, 27% Experienced-State Classified
- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately: 25% Experienced-All, 26% Experienced-State Classified
- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others: 17% Experienced-All, 18% Experienced-State Classified
- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters: 17% Experienced-All, 20% Experienced-State Classified
- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others: 13% Experienced-All, 16% Experienced-State Classified
My employment category is treated with respect by other employment categories

My job type is not treated with the same respect as other jobs at CSU

There are inequities between employment categories

Accountability is different for different employee categories
Leadership

**Executive Leadership**
- CSU leadership communicates institutional goals
- CSU's strategic goals are taking CSU in a positive direction
- CSU leadership is transparent in decision-making
- CSU is committed to shared governance
- CSU's major strategic initiatives are broadly communicated
- University leaders are held accountable for CSU's outcomes
- CSU leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace
- University leaders address issues of inequities

**Accountability Standards**
- Employees are held accountable for negative or inappropriate behavior in the workplace
- Employees are held accountable for poor performance in the workplace
- University leaders adequately address negative or inappropriate behavior in the workplace
- Employees in my immediate work environment act ethically and honestly in the workplace
• **Administrative Professionals** have significantly higher mean scores for their perceptions of Executive Leadership and Accountability Standards than **Staff Classified** or **Faculty** (effect sizes respectively: EL = .34 and .49; AS = .20 and .30)

• **AP:** “**CSU is committed to shared governance**”
  - 39% Strongly Agree/Agree and 22% Strongly Disagree/Disagree
• My physical environment supports my successful completion of tasks (18% Disagree, **SC: 20%**)

• I am physically comfortable in my work space (16% Disagree, **SC: 19%**)

• My physical environment promotes collaboration (23% Disagree, **SC: 23%**)

• I have the proper equipment and resources available to complete my work (15% Disagree, **SC: 18%**)

• My physical environment is welcoming of employees from different backgrounds (10% Disagree, **SC: 10%**)

• My physical environment meets my personal needs (access, bathroom, prayer, lactation) (9% Disagree, **SC: 11%**)

• My physical environment (e.g. signage, construction hazards, lighting, parking) supports my sense of safety (13% Disagree, **SC: 17%**)

• Employees respect shared space (e.g. classrooms) (10% Disagree, **SC: 15%**)
Administrative Professionals have significantly higher mean scores for perceptions of their Physical Environment than Staff Classified or Faculty (effect sizes = .30 and .35 respectively)
• 51.1% of respondents have served on a search committee in the past five years
  – 33.3% of State Classified, 63.6% of Faculty, and 60.1% of Administrative Professional

Percent who responded Strongly Agree and/or Agree

- The unfilled positions in my area are not being filled quickly enough: 67.9%
- The power dynamics of the search committee dictate the decision-making process: 48.5%
- I witnessed bias/discrimination during the search process: 25.2%
Percent who responded Strongly Disagree and/or Disagree

The search committee allows members to voice concerns about bias/discrimination if it arises
- 13.0%

Selection of committee members is fair
- 15.2%

Search committees are fair
- 15.5%

The search process is fair
- 16.5%

I am comfortable voicing concerns about bias/discrimination to members of the search committee
- 16.6%

The hiring authority respectfully considers the recommendations of the search committee
- 17.7%

Equal Opportunity (EO) Coordinators are effective
- 17.9%

The search process identifies the best talent for the position
- 18.6%
 Percent who Responded Strongly Disagree/Disagree

- CSU understands the importance/value of diversity: 4% State Classified, 5% All
- The campus offers sufficient opportunity for diversity training: 7% State Classified, 8% All
- Upper-level administrators promote respect for cultural differences at CSU: 11% State Classified, 9% All
- Employees of color are treated fairly at CSU: 8% State Classified, 11% All
- There is respect for religious differences here at CSU: 11% State Classified, 11% All
- Employees at CSU treat each other with respect: 12% State Classified, 16% All
- Prejudice and/or acts of bigotry are not tolerated on this campus: 13% State Classified, 14% All
- My supervisor communicates the importance of valuing diversity: 18% State Classified, 16% All
- My supervisor promotes a work environment where all employees feel included: 18% State Classified, 20% All
- Women employees are treated fairly at CSU: 15% State Classified, 23% All

Distribution by Gender:
- 13% of males, 27% females, 43% SI/Transgender/NB
Percent who responded Strongly Agree/Agree

- I feel pressure to change the way I speak, act, or dress in order to "fit in" at CSU: 22.9% (State Classified), 21.6% (All)
- There is racial conflict among employees here at CSU: 15.0% (State Classified), 15.7% (All); 12% NM; 37% M
- Sexual assault and/or sexual misconduct among employees is problematic at CSU: 8.8% (State Classified), 8.5% (All); 7.8% M; 8.4% F; 31.8% T/NB/SI
I observed negative treatment or behavior based on:

- Job function: 32% ALL, 31% State Classified
- Gender: 30% ALL, 28% State Classified
- Years of experience: 21%
- Age: 20% ALL, 21% State Classified
- Unit or college: 19% ALL, 17% State Classified
- Appearance: 17% ALL, 17% State Classified
- Race and/or ethnicity: 16% ALL, 17% State Classified
- Socioeconomic status: 11% ALL, 11% State Classified
- English as 2nd language: 11% ALL, 11% State Classified
- Religion: 10% ALL, 10% State Classified
- Caregiver status: 9% ALL, 8% State Classified
- Disability: 8% ALL, 7% State Classified
- Country of origin: 7% ALL, 7% State Classified
- Sexual orientation: 7% ALL, 8% State Classified
- Gender identity: 6% ALL, 6% State Classified
I experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:

- 30% in Job function
- 29% in Gender
- 23% in Years of experience
- 24% in Age
- 19% in Unit or college
- 19% in Appearance
- 15% in Race and/or ethnicity
- 14% in Socioeconomic status
- 14% in English as 2nd language
- 10% in Religion
- 8% in Caregiver status
- 6% in Disability
- 5% in Country of origin
- 3% in Sexual orientation
- 2% in Gender identity
Supervisory training should be required of all supervisors.

Diversity training should be required of all supervisors.

CSU offers training opportunities aimed at enhancing my ability to work well with others.

CSU offers training opportunities aimed at enhancing my ability to do a good job.

There are obstacles that prevent me from participating in on-campus training and/or prof. dev.

Percent who responded Strongly Agree and/or Agree:

- There are obstacles that prevent me from participating in on-campus training and/or prof. dev.: 45.2% (State Classified) / 44.0% (All)
- CSU offers training opportunities aimed at enhancing my ability to work well with others: 62.7% (State Classified) / 60.8% (All)
- CSU offers training opportunities aimed at enhancing my ability to do a good job: 60.5% (State Classified) / 62.8% (All)
- Diversity training should be required of all supervisors: 77.3% (State Classified) / 77.5% (All)
- Supervisory training should be required of all supervisors: 94.9% (State Classified) / 91.4% (All)
Perceptions were asked for both CSU and Unit/Department

- Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds
- Retains diverse employees
- Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds
- Improves the campus climate for all employees
- Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees
- Encourages discussions related to diversity
- Provides employees with a positive work experience
- Recommend as a place of employment
• Administrative Professional and State Classified, on average, have significantly more favorable CSU climate perceptions than Faculty (effect sizes = .34 and .35 respectively)

• Administrative Professional have significantly more favorable unit climate perceptions compared to State Classified and Faculty (effect sizes: CSU = .18 and .46 respectively)
Sign: Differences by Employee Category:

- AP: Significant differences by gender for Accountability Standards, Unit Perceptions, CSU Perceptions (Males more favorable)
- SC: All means were significantly different (Females more favorable) except CSU Perceptions and Accountability Standards
- Faculty: No significant differences
Average Responses by Underrepresentation (Race/Ethnicity)

Sign: Differences by Employee Category:
(All significant differences: underrepresented had less favorable means)
- AP: Time Demands & Expectations, Accountability Standards, and CSU Perceptions all significantly differed
- SC: No significant differences
- Faculty: CSU Perceptions significantly differed
Overall, 77% (SC: 69%) of respondents would agree that they would recommend CSU as a place of employment and 56% (SC: 48%) would agree they recommend their department as a place of employment.

The majority of respondents agree that CSU’s (64%) and the department’s (68%) campus climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees.

63% of respondents agree that CSU encourages discussions related to diversity and half of respondents agree that their department encourages these discussions.
  - Smaller gap than in 2014 (12.3% vs. 17.3%)
Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds
- 2016: 57.3%
- 2014: 62.3%

Improves the campus climate for all employees
- 2016: 67.4%
- 2014: 62.1%

Retains diverse employees
- 2016: 52.7%
- 2014: 52.9%

Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds
- 2016: 64.0%
- 2014: 67.3%

Encourages discussions related to diversity
- 2016: 62.8%
- 2014: 66.2%

Provides employees with a positive work experience
- 2016: 69.4%
- 2014: 68.9%

Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees
- 2016: 64.1%
- 2014: 58.0%

Recommend as a place of employment
- 2016: 76.8%
- 2014: 79.0%
Recommend as a place of employment
- 2016: 56.0%
- 2014: 68.2%

Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees
- 2016: 69.4%
- 2014: 62.9%

Provides employees with a positive work experience
- 2016: 62.8%
- 2014: 67.6%

Encourages discussions related to diversity
- 2016: 69.4%
- 2014: 54.8%

Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds
- 2016: 59.3%
- 2014: 57.7%

Retains diverse employees
- 2016: 59.3%
- 2014: 57.4%

Improves the campus climate for all employees
- 2016: 57.8%
- 2014: 57.7%

Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds
- 2016: 57.7%
- 2014: 57.4%

- 2016 Strongly Agree/Agree
- 2014 Strongly Agree/Agree
What impacts employees’ perceptions of work respect?

Covariates
- Gender
- Minority Status
- Alumni Status
- Less established (5 years or less) vs. established employee
- Dependent Status

- Work Overload
- Time Demands & Expectations
- Physical Environment
- Executive Leadership
- Accountability Standards

Work Respect
What impacts CSU perceptions?

Covariates:
- Gender
- Minority Status
- Alumni Status
- Less established (5 years or less) vs. established employee
- Dependent Status

- Work Overload
- Time Demands & Expectations
- Physical Environment
- Executive Leadership
- Accountability Standards

CSU Perceptions
What impacts unit perceptions?

Covariates
- Gender
- Minority Status
- Alumni Status
- Less established (5 years or less) vs. established employee
- Dependent Status

- Work Overload
- Time Demands & Expectations
- Physical Environment
- Executive Leadership
- Accountability Standards
• **CSU alumni** have significantly more positive perceptions of the Executive Leadership and the Campus Climate than non-alumni (effect sizes = .11 and .16 respectively)
  – **SC**: No sign. differences except Time Demands and contrary effect

• On average, **employees with no dependents** have significantly more favorable mean scores for all constructs except physical environment than employees with dependents (effect sizes < .20)
  – **SC**: All except Accountability Standards, Work Overload, and Work Respect

• Employees who have **worked at CSU for five years or less** have significantly more favorable mean scores for all constructs than those who have worked at CSU for six or more years (effect sizes < .16 -.38)
  – **SC**: All
Thoughts on Impact and Potential Action Items

- Workload
- Work Respect
- Leadership
- Search Committee
- Physical Campus Environment
- Diversity in Your Work Environment
- Campus Trainings
- Campus and Department Perceptions
- Personal and Employee Characteristics
Questions/Comments?