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Prepared for Human Resource Services
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Chair: VP for Diversity, Mary Ontiveros
Committee: Shannon Archibeque-Engle, Paul Doherty, Gene Gloeckner, Chris Henle, Laura Jensen, Dave McKelfresh, Debra Parker, Jennifer Schneider, Paul Thayer, Ria Vigil
• 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
• 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>3696</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.*

University Operations: 223 employees responded--36.3% RR
**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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Characteristics</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>UO</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>63.5%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender, Non-Binary, Self-Identify</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employees of Color</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Underrepresented</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Professional (includes RA and postdocs)</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Classified</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Employed at CSU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years or less</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 years</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more years</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></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
*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)

<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>
Workload

- **Work Overload**
  - The amount of work I have to do interferes with the quality I want to maintain (45% Agree, 38% Disagree)
  - My workload is too heavy (39% Agree, 39% Disagree)
  - I don't have time to finish my job (37% Agree, 41% Disagree)
  - I'm rushed in doing my job (43% Agree, 37% Disagree)
  - I feel overburdened in my job (41% Agree, 37% Disagree)

- **Time Demands & Expectations**
  - I am expected to work more than 40 hours a week (40% Agree, 40% Disagree)
  - I feel pressure to be reachable for work purposes throughout the day and evening (40% Agree, 42% Disagree)
  - I have to stay too many extra hours at my job (31% Agree, 46% Disagree)
  - I am expected to put my job ahead of my family or personal life (18% Agree, 60% Disagree)

*Agree = Strongly Agree or Agree
Disagree = Strongly Disagree or Disagree*
On average, faculty report significantly higher means for Work Overload and Time Demands & Expectations than Administrative Professional and Staff Classified (effect sizes (d) respectively: Work Overload = .42 & .45; Time Demands & Expectations = .65 & .99).

Administrative Professional have significantly higher mean scores for Time Demands & Expectations than Staff Classified (d = .35), but Work Overload does not significantly differ.
Work Respect

• My work contribution is appreciated (69% Agreement)
• I am cared about at work (67% Agreement)
• I am treated with respect at work (75% Agreement)
• My supervisor supports me and advocates on my behalf (68% Agreement)
Administrative Professionals have significantly higher mean scores for Respect than Staff Classified or Faculty ($d = .29$ and .31 respectively)
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

Percent who Responded Strongly Agree or Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My employment category is treated with respect by other employment categories</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job type is not treated with the same respect as other jobs at CSU</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are inequities between employment categories</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability is different for different employee categories</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An individual or a group of individuals…

- Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way: 36% CSU, 43% Univ. Operations
- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion: 46% CSU, 50% Univ. Operations
- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others: 17% CSU, 21% Univ. Operations
- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately: 25% CSU, 18% Univ. Operations
- Ignored or excluded you or others: 37% CSU, 39% Univ. Operations
- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity: 26% CSU, 28% Univ. Operations
- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters: 17% CSU, 20% Univ. Operations
- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others: 13% CSU, 24% Univ. Operations
Disrespectful Experiences by Gender

An individual or a group of individuals…

- **Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way**
  - Males: 32%
  - Females: 39%
  - Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender: 47%

- **Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion**
  - Males: 42%
  - Females: 47%
  - Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender: 63%

- **Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others**
  - Males: 17%
  - Females: 17%
  - Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender: 30%

- **Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately**
  - Males: 25%
  - Females: 24%
  - Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender: 37%

- **Ignored or excluded you or others**
  - Males: 35%
  - Females: 38%
  - Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender: 47%

- **Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity**
  - Males: 24%
  - Females: 26%
  - Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender: 47%

- **Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters**
  - Males: 17%
  - Females: 16%
  - Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender: 14%

- **Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others**
  - Males: 11%
  - Females: 30%
  - Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender: 34%
Disrespectful Experiences by Underrepresentation (Race/Ethnicity)

An individual or a group of individuals…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Non-Underrepresented</th>
<th>Underrepresented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignored or excluded you or others</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership

• Executive Leadership
  – CSU leadership communicates institutional goals (58% Agree)
  – CSU's strategic goals are taking CSU in a positive direction (55% Agree)
  – CSU leadership is transparent in decision-making (23% Agree)
  – CSU is committed to shared governance (32% Agree)
  – CSU's major strategic initiatives are broadly communicated (55% Agree)
  – University leaders are held accountable for CSU's outcomes (29% Agree)
  – CSU leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace (53% Agree)
  – University leaders address issues of inequities (43% Agree)

• Accountability Standards
  – Employees are held accountable for negative or inappropriate behavior in the workplace (50% Disagree)
  – Employees are held accountable for poor performance in the workplace (50% Disagree)
  – University leaders adequately address negative or inappropriate behavior in the workplace (32% Disagree)
  – Employees in my immediate work environment act ethically and honestly in the workplace (14% Disagree)
Administrative Professionals have significantly higher mean scores for their perceptions of Executive Leadership and Accountability Standards than Staff Classified or Faculty (effect sizes ($d$) respectively: EAL = .34 and .49; AS = .20 and .30)
• My physical environment supports my successful completion of tasks
  (18% Disagree)
• I am physically comfortable in my work space
  (16% Disagree)
• My physical environment promotes collaboration
  (23% Disagree)
• I have the proper equipment and resources available to complete my work
  (15% Disagree)
• My physical environment is welcoming of employees from different backgrounds
  (10% Disagree)
• My physical environment meets my personal needs (access, bathroom, prayer, lactation)
  (9% Disagree)
• My physical environment (e.g. signage, construction hazards, lighting, parking) supports my sense of safety
  (13% Disagree)
• Employees respect shared space (e.g. classrooms)
  (10% Disagree)
• **Administrative Professionals** have significantly higher mean scores for perceptions of their Physical Environment than **Staff Classified** or **Faculty** ($d = .30$ and $.35$ respectively)
Served on a Search Committee in Past Five Years

- Total: 51%
- SC: 29%
- Faculty: 64%
- AP: 60%
- Females: 52%
- Males: 53%
- Minority: 51%
- Non-Minority: 51%
- Years at CSU 6 or more Years: 63%
- Years at CSU 5 Years or Less: 36%
- CSU Alumni: 52%
- Non-CSU Alumni: 51%
- Dependent: 59%
- No Dependent: 48%
Percent who responded Strongly Agree 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%
The unfilled positions in my area are not being filled quickly enough

The power dynamics of the search committee dictate the decision-making process

I witnessed bias/discrimination during the search process

Percent who responded Strongly Agree or Agree by Employee Category

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80%

AP SC Faculty

67.9% 57.8% 70.0%

47.5% 56.2% 46.6%

30.7% 21.5% 24.4%
I witnessed bias/discrimination during the search process
- Underrepresented: 17.5%
- Non-Underrepresented: 28.2%
- Female: 22.2%
- Male: 35.9%

The power dynamics of the search committee dictate the decision-making process
- Underrepresented: 46.3%
- Non-Underrepresented: 49.2%
- Female: 46.5%
- Male: 56.7%

The unfilled positions in my area are not being filled quickly enough
- Underrepresented: 67.3%
- Non-Underrepresented: 67.8%
- Female: 68.7%
- Male: 59.8%
Percent who responded Strongly Agree or Agree by Employee Characteristic

1. I witnessed bias/discrimination during the search process
   - CSU Alumni: 23.2%
   - Non CSU Alumni: 26.7%
   - 6 or More years at CSU: 26.2%
   - Less than 6 Years at CSU: 22.7%

2. The power dynamics of the search committee dictate the decision-making process
   - CSU Alumni: 49.6%
   - Non CSU Alumni: 47.9%
   - 6 or More years at CSU: 47.9%
   - Less than 6 Years at CSU: 50.8%

3. The unfilled positions in my area are not being filled quickly enough
   - CSU Alumni: 68.1%
   - Non CSU Alumni: 67.3%
   - 6 or More years at CSU: 68.2%
   - Less than 6 Years at CSU: 66.0%
The search process identifies the best talent for the position

Equal Opportunity (EO) Coordinators are effective

The hiring authority respectfully considers the recommendations of the search committee

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

The search process is fair

Selection of committee members is fair

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

Percent who responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree

18.6% 17.9% 17.7% 16.6% 16.5% 15.5% 15.2% 13.0% 0% 2% 4% 6% 8% 10% 12% 14% 16% 18% 20%
Percent who responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree by Employee Category

- The search committee allows members to voice concerns about bias/discrimination
  - AP: 11.7%, SC: 12.1%, Faculty: 17.8%

- I am comfortable voicing concerns about bias/discrimination to members of the search committee
  - AP: 14.0%, SC: 18.0%, Faculty: 23.4%

- Selection of committee members is fair
  - AP: 14.7%, SC: 13.2%, Faculty: 18.8%

- Equal Opportunity (EO) Coordinators are effective
  - AP: 13.8%, SC: 16.7%, Faculty: 25.5%

- The hiring authority respectfully considers the recommendations of the search committee
  - AP: 16.1%, SC: 17.2%, Faculty: 24.4%

- The search process is fair
  - AP: 14.5%, SC: 16.5%, Faculty: 18.7%

- Search committees are fair
  - AP: 14.9%, SC: 14.0%, Faculty: 18.6%

- The search process identifies the best talent for the position
  - AP: 15.5%, SC: 18.8%, Faculty: 20.8%
The search process identifies the best talent for the position

Search committees are fair

The hiring authority respectfully considers the recommendations of the search committee

Equal Opportunity (EO) Coordinators are effective

Selection of committee members is fair

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

The search committee allows members to voice concerns about bias/discrimination

Percent who responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree by Gender
Percent who responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree by Underrepresentation (Race/Ethnicity)

- The search committee allows members to voice concerns about bias/discrimination
  - Underrepresented: 12.1%
  - Non-Underrepresented: 16.4%

- I am comfortable voicing concerns about bias/discrimination to members of the search committee
  - Underrepresented: 16.0%
  - Non-Underrepresented: 16.4%

- Selection of committee members is fair
  - Underrepresented: 14.1%
  - Non-Underrepresented: 18.7%

- Equal Opportunity (EO) Coordinators are effective
  - Underrepresented: 14.9%
  - Non-Underrepresented: 22.0%

- The hiring authority respectfully considers the recommendations of the search committee
  - Underrepresented: 14.9%
  - Non-Underrepresented: 19.8%

- The search process is fair
  - Underrepresented: 15.8%
  - Non-Underrepresented: 19.7%

- Search committees are fair
  - Underrepresented: 14.4%
  - Non-Underrepresented: 18.8%

- The search process identifies the best talent for the position
  - Underrepresented: 17.9%
  - Non-Underrepresented: 21.1%
The search committee allows members to voice concerns about bias/discrimination
- Strongly Disagree: 13.9%
- Disagree: 10.6%

I am comfortable voicing concerns about bias/discrimination to members of the search committee
- Strongly Disagree: 16.9%
- Disagree: 15.4%

Selection of committee members is fair
- Strongly Disagree: 15.4%
- Disagree: 14.7%

Equal Opportunity (EO) Coordinators are effective
- Strongly Disagree: 19.1%
- Disagree: 11.5%

The hiring authority respectfully considers the recommendations of the search committee
- Strongly Disagree: 19.1%
- Disagree: 13.5%

The search process is fair
- Strongly Disagree: 17.0%
- Disagree: 15.5%

Search committees are fair
- Strongly Disagree: 16.5%
- Disagree: 12.6%

The search process identifies the best talent for the position
- Strongly Disagree: 19.5%
- Disagree: 16.0%
Percent who responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree by Alumni Status

- The search committee allows members to voice concerns about bias/discrimination
- I am comfortable voicing concerns about bias/discrimination to members of the search committee
- Selection of committee members is fair
- Equal Opportunity (EO) Coordinators are effective
- The hiring authority respectfully considers the recommendations of the search committee
- The search process is fair
- Search committees are fair
- The search process identifies the best talent for the position
Campus Trainings

Percent who responded Strongly Agree and/or Agree

- There are obstacles that prevent me from participating in on-campus training and/or prof. dev. 44.0%
- CSU offers training opportunities aimed at enhancing my ability to work well with others 60.8%
- CSU offers training opportunities aimed at enhancing my ability to do a good job 62.8%
- Diversity training should be required of all supervisors 77.5%
- Supervisory training should be required of all supervisors 91.4%
Women employees are treated fairly at CSU

My supervisor promotes a work environment where all employees feel included

My supervisor communicates the importance of valuing diversity

Prejudice and/or acts of bigotry are not tolerated on this campus

Employees of color are treated fairly at CSU

There is respect for religious differences here at CSU

Employees at CSU treat each other with respect

Upper-level administrators promote respect for cultural differences at CSU

CSU understands the importance/value of diversity

The campus offers sufficient opportunity for diversity training

Employees at CSU treat each other with respect

Prejudice and/or acts of bigotry are not tolerated on this campus

My supervisor communicates the importance of valuing diversity

My supervisor promotes a work environment where all employees feel included

Women employees are treated fairly at CSU

Percent who responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree

- CSU understands the importance/value of diversity: 5% (Univ. Operations), 9% (CSU)
- The campus offers sufficient opportunity for diversity training: 8% (Univ. Operations), 9% (CSU)
- Upper-level administrators promote respect for cultural differences at CSU: 7% (Univ. Operations), 11% (CSU)
- Employees of color are treated fairly at CSU: 7% (Univ. Operations), 11% (CSU)
- There is respect for religious differences here at CSU: 10% (Univ. Operations), 11% (CSU)
- Employees at CSU treat each other with respect: 12% (Univ. Operations), 11% (CSU)
- Prejudice and/or acts of bigotry are not tolerated on this campus: 15% (Univ. Operations), 14% (CSU)
- My supervisor communicates the importance of valuing diversity: 16% (Univ. Operations), 18% (CSU)
- My supervisor promotes a work environment where all employees feel included: 18% (Univ. Operations), 18% (CSU)
- Women employees are treated fairly at CSU: 17% (Univ. Operations), 23% (CSU)

Note: The data includes percentages for males (NU), females (U), and those identifying as non-binary or transgender (SI/Transgender/NB) with NU being 4% males, 11% females, 43% non-binary or transgender/nongender.
I feel pressure to change the way I speak, act, or dress in order to "fit in" at CSU

There is racial conflict among employees here at CSU

Sexual assault and/or sexual misconduct among employees is problematic at CSU

Percent who responded Agree or Agree
I experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:

- CSU
- Univ. Operations

1. Job function
2. Employee category
3. Years of experience
4. Gender
5. Age
6. Unit or college
7. Appearance
8. Socioeconomic status
9. Caregiver status
10. Religion
11. Race and/or ethnicity
12. Disability
13. Sexual orientation
14. English as 2nd language
15. Country of origin
16. Gender identity
I experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:

- Age
- Race and/or ethnicity
- Religion
- Gender
- Sexual orientation
- Disability
- Socioeconomic status
- Job function
- Years of experience
- Unit or college
- Country of origin
- English as 2nd language
- Caregiver status
- Appearance
- Gender Identity

Males ▪ Females ▪ Transgender/Self-Identify/Non-Binary
I experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Non-Underrepresented</th>
<th>Underrepresented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and/or ethnicity</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of college</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as 2nd language</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver status</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campus Perceptions

- 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 ($d = .34$ and $.35$ respectively)

• Administrative Professional have significantly more favorable unit climate perceptions compared to State Classified and Faculty ($d$: CSU = $.18$ and $.46$ respectively)
• Overall, 77% of respondents would agree that they would recommend **CSU** as a place of employment
  • 56% 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% vs. 17%)
CSU Campus Perceptions: 2016 vs. 2014

- Recommend as a place of employment: 2016 - 77%, 2014 - 79%
- Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees: 2016 - 64%, 2014 - 58%
- Provides employees with a positive work experience: 2016 - 69%, 2014 - 69%
- Encourages discussions related to diversity: 2016 - 66%, 2014 - 63%
- Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds: 2016 - 67%, 2014 - 64%
- Retains diverse employees: 2016 - 53%, 2014 - 53%
- Improves the campus climate for all employees: 2016 - 62%, 2014 - 62%
- Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds: 2016 - 67%, 2014 - 57%

2016 Employee Climate Survey
Department/Unit/Office Perceptions: 2016 vs. 2014

- **Recommend as a place of employment**: 56% in 2016, 68% in 2014
- **Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees**: 50% in 2016, 63% in 2014
- **Provides employees with a positive work experience**: 49% in 2016, 63% in 2014
- **Encourages discussions related to diversity**: 51% in 2016, 63% in 2014
- **Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds**: 55% in 2016, 68% in 2014
- **Retains diverse employees**: 58% in 2016, 55% in 2014
- **Improves the campus climate for all employees**: 58% in 2016, 58% in 2014
- **Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds**: 57% in 2016, 68% in 2014

2016 Employee Climate Survey
### Average Responses by Gender

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload Time Demands &amp; Expectations</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Respect Executive Administration Leadership</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability Standards</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Physical Environment</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Perceptions</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept./Unit Perceptions</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
What impacts 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
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
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

Unit/Department Perceptions
• **CSU alumni** have significantly more positive perceptions of the Executive Leadership and the Campus Climate than non-alumni \((d = .11\text{ and } .16\text{ respectively})\)
  – No significant findings among underrepresented employees

• On average, **employees with no dependents** have significantly more favorable mean scores for all constructs except physical environment than employees with dependents \((d < .20)\)

• 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 \((d < .16\text{ to } .38)\)
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?
An individual or a group of individuals...

- Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way: 37% (Observed), 36% (Experienced)
- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion: 36% (Observed), 36% (Experienced)
- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others: 46% (Observed), 24% (Experienced)
- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately: 22% (Observed), 25% (Experienced)
- Ignored or excluded you or others: 28% (Observed), 37% (Experienced)
- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity: 20% (Observed), 26% (Experienced)
- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters: 13% (Observed), 17% (Experienced)
- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others: 16% (Observed), 13% (Experienced)
I observed and/or experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:

- Job function
- Employee category
- Years of experience
- Gender
- Age
- Unit or college
- Appearance
- Socioeconomic status
- Caregiver status
- Religion
- Race and/or ethnicity
- Disability
- Sexual orientation
- English as 2nd language
- Country of origin
- Gender identity

Observed

Experienced