2016 Employee Climate Survey: Prepared for the Division of Student Affairs Director’s Meeting

Assessment Group for Diversity Issues

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
Employee climate survey was administered in Fall 16
- Third in past six years with rotating areas of focus
- About a third of employees responded
  - Representative with exception of males and faculty
  - Anonymous, non responder analysis impossible

Objectives
- 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
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
<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><strong>Workload</strong>*</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><strong>Work Respect</strong></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><strong>Leadership</strong></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><strong>Physical Environment</strong></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><strong>Campus Perceptions</strong></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)**
Workload

• Work Overload
  – The amount of work I have to do interferes with the quality I want to maintain
    (45% Agree=Strongly Agree/Agree), Student Affairs=SA: 41%)
  – My workload is too heavy (39% Agree, SA: 35%)
  – I don’t have time to finish my job (37% Agree, SA: 35%)
  – I'm rushed in doing my job (43% Agree, SA: 39%)
  – I feel overburdened in my job (41% Agree, SA: 37%)

• Time Demands & Expectations
  – I am expected to work more than 40 hours a week (40% Agree, SA: 34%)
  – I feel pressure to be reachable for work purposes throughout the day and evening (40% Agree, SA: 32%)
  – I have to stay too many extra hours at my job (31% Agree, SA: 29%)
  – I am expected to put my job ahead of my family or personal life (18% Agree, SA: 14%)
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, SA: 77%)
- I am cared about at work (67% Agree, SA: 78%)
- I am treated with respect at work (75% Agree, SA: 83%)
- My supervisor supports me and advocates on my behalf (68% Agree, SA: 74%)
Administrative Professionals have significantly higher mean scores for Respect than Staff Classified or Faculty (effect sizes = .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

- 57.6% AP
- 61.9% SC
- 58.2% Faculty
- 68.3% SA

- 39.6% AP
- 39.2% SC
- 39.2% Faculty
- 70.8% SA

- 63.0% AP
- 66.7% SC
- 66.7% Faculty
- 74.7% SA

- 35.7% AP
- 49.0% SC
- 44.7% Faculty
- 44.7% SA
An individual or a group of individuals...

- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion: 46.4% (Experienced-All), 42.6% (Experienced-Student Affairs)
- Ignored or excluded you or others: 36.5% (Experienced-All), 37.4% (Experienced-Student Affairs)
- Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way: 36.4% (Experienced-All), 34.3% (Experienced-Student Affairs)
- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity: 26.2% (Experienced-All), 26.5% (Experienced-Student Affairs)
- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately: 24.8% (Experienced-All), 23.5% (Experienced-Student Affairs)
- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others: 17.2% (Experienced-All), 15.4% (Experienced-Student Affairs)
- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters: 16.7% (Experienced-All), 16.7% (Experienced-Student Affairs)
- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others: 13.2% (Experienced-All), 10.2% (Experienced-Student Affairs)
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: 32% (Males), 39% (Females), 47% (Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender)
- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion: 42% (Males), 47% (Females), 47% (Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender)
- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others: 17% (Males), 17% (Females), 30% (Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender)
- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately: 25% (Males), 24% (Females), 37% (Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender)
- Ignored or excluded you or others: 35% (Males), 38% (Females), 47% (Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender)
- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity: 24% (Males), 26% (Females), 47% (Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender)
- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters: 17% (Males), 16% (Females), 34% (Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender)
- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others: 14% (Males), 11% (Females), 30% (Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender)
Disrespectful Experiences by Underrepresentation (Race/Ethnicity)

An individual or a group of individuals...

- Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way:
  - Non-Underrepresented: 35.1%
  - Underrepresented: 40.2%
- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion:
  - Non-Underrepresented: 45.1%
  - Underrepresented: 49.6%
- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others:
  - Non-Underrepresented: 24.6%
  - Underrepresented: 29.5%
- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately:
  - Non-Underrepresented: 15.5%
  - Underrepresented: 23.5%
- Ignored or excluded you or others:
  - Non-Underrepresented: 35.4%
  - Underrepresented: 40.5%
- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity:
  - Non-Underrepresented: 23.9%
  - Underrepresented: 32.4%
- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters:
  - Non-Underrepresented: 15.7%
  - Underrepresented: 20.3%
- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others:
  - Non-Underrepresented: 12.4%
  - Underrepresented: 15.1%
Leadership

• Executive Leadership
  – CSU leadership communicates institutional goals (58% Agree, SA: 70%)
  – CSU's strategic goals are taking CSU in a positive direction (55% Agree, SA: 71%)
  – CSU leadership is transparent in decision-making (23% Agree, SA: 32%)
  – CSU is committed to shared governance (32% Agree, SA: 41%)
  – CSU's major strategic initiatives are broadly communicated (55% Agree, SA: 64%)
  – University leaders are held accountable for CSU's outcomes (29% Agree, SA: 40%)
  – CSU leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace (53% Agree, SA: 62%)
  – University leaders address issues of inequities (43% Agree, SA: 53%)

• Accountability Standards
  – Employees are held accountable for negative or inappropriate behavior in the workplace (50% Disagree, SA: 40%)
  – Employees are held accountable for poor performance in the workplace (50% Disagree, SA: 49%)
  – University leaders adequately address negative or inappropriate behavior in the workplace (32% Disagree, SA: 28%)
  – Employees in my immediate work environment act ethically and honestly in the workplace (14% Disagree, SA: 12%)
• **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)
Women employees are treated fairly at CSU

My supervisor promotes a work environment where all employees feel included

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

Employees of color are treated fairly at CSU

Employees at CSU treat each other with respect

Upper-level administrators promote respect for cultural differences at CSU

There is respect for religious differences here at CSU

My supervisor communicates the importance of valuing diversity

CSU understands the importance/value of diversity

The campus offers sufficient opportunity for diversity training

7.5% Non-Underrepresented, 26.2% Underrepresented

12% NU, 27% U

13% males, 27% females, 43% SI/Transgender/NB

Student Affairs  All
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
- 31.5% (All) - 21.6% (Student Affairs)

There is racial conflict among employees here at CSU
- 29.0% (All)

Sexual assault and/or sexual misconduct among employees is problematic at CSU
- 12.1% (All) - 8.5% (Student Affairs)
- 7.8% (M) - 8.4% (F) - 31.8% (T/NB/SI)
I experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:

- 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

CSU
Student Affairs
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I experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:

- Age: 13%, 20%, 23%
- Race and/or ethnicity: 23%, 23%, 20%
- Religion: 14%, 6%, 4%
- Gender: 15%, 45%, 19%
- Sexual orientation: 5%, 24%, 17%
- Disability: 2%, 24%, 4%
- Socioeconomic status: 2%, 21%, 19%
- Job function: 19%, 40%, 26%
- Years of experience: 2%, 19%, 19%
- Unit or college: 14%, 24%, 24%
- Country of origin: 12%, 10%, 7%
- English as 2nd language: 6%, 9%, 6%
- Appearance: 3%, 7%, 7%
- Caregiver status: 14%, 21%, 1%
- Gender identity: 45%, 17%, 24%

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

- Age: 17%
- Race and/or ethnicity: 22%
- Religion: 21%
- Gender: 19%
- Sexual orientation: 14%
- Disability: 8%
- Socioeconomic status: 4%
- Job function: 23%
- Years of experience: 11%
- Unit or college: 27%
- Country of origin: 17%
- English as 2nd language: 13%
- Appearance: 12%
- Caregiver status: 5%
- Gender identity: 6%

Non-Underrepresented and Underrepresented categories are depicted in the chart.
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 (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)
Overall, 77% of respondents would agree that they would recommend **CSU** as a place of employment and 56% would agree they recommend their **department** as a place of employment

- **SA**: 82% CSU and 69% Unit

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

- **SA**: 69% CSU and 75% Unit

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%)
- **SA**: 78% CSU and 72% Unit
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
- SA: CSU Perceptions significantly differed (F: 3.8, M: 3.6)
### Average Responses by Underrepresentation (Race/Ethnicity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Underrepresented</th>
<th>Non-Underrepresented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Demands &amp; Expectations</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Respect</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Administration Leadership</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability Standards</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Physical Environment</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Perceptions</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept./Unit Perceptions</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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
- Student Affairs: CSU Perceptions (NU: 3.8; U: 3.4) and Time Demands & Expectations (NU: 2.6, U: 2.9) 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

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

Unit/Department Perceptions

[Diagram showing relationships between covariates and unit perceptions]
Key Findings

- The 2014 assessment results revealed minimal between-group differences by employee category, while the 2016 assessment finds consistent and significant employee category differences.

- Faculty respondents have less favorable perceptions than AP respondents on all constructs.

- AP respondents have significantly more favorable responses than SC respondents on all constructs except Work Overload and CSU Perceptions.

- SC respondents had significantly more favorable responses than faculty on the constructs of CSU Perceptions, Work Overload, and Time Demands & Expectations.

- Gender was another personal characteristic with notable differences in experiences and perceptions. Respondents who identify as self-identify, transgender, and/or nonbinary reported more negative experiences with regard to disrespectful behavior and negative treatments compared to males and females.
Key Findings

• Executive Leadership and Accountability Standards emerged as having the least favorable perceptions among employees and most favorable perceptions was overall CSU perceptions and Work Respect
  – Workload showed a wide variance among employees

• The areas of focus that were most predictive of an employee’s unit perceptions were their physical environment and perceptions of accountability standards. Executive leadership was the area most influential on employees’ overall perceptions of CSU.

• Employees in Student Affairs had significantly more favorable responses in all areas of focus except CSU Perceptions; however, their experiences were not more favorable when examining negative/disrespectful experiences
Questions/Comments?
• 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/Agree

I witnessed bias/discrimination during the search process
- 26.9% (Student Affairs), 25.2% (All)

The unfilled positions in my area are not being filled quickly enough
- 66.1% (Student Affairs), 67.9% (All)

The power dynamics of the search committee dictate the decision-making process
- 48.9% (Student Affairs), 48.5% (All)
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

Selection of committee members is fair

Search committees are fair

The search process is fair

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

Percent who responded Strongly Disagree/Disagree
• My physical environment supports my successful completion of tasks (18% Disagree, SA: 18%)
• I am physically comfortable in my work space (16% Disagree, SA: 14%)
• My physical environment promotes collaboration (23% Disagree, SA: 18%)
• I have the proper equipment and resources available to complete my work (15% Disagree, SA: 10%)
• My physical environment is welcoming of employees from different backgrounds (10% Disagree, SA: 8%)
• My physical environment meets my personal needs (access, bathroom, prayer, lactation) (9% Disagree, SA: 9%)
• My physical environment (e.g. signage, construction hazards, lighting, parking) supports my sense of safety (13% Disagree, SA: 14%)
• Employees respect shared space (e.g. classrooms) (10% Disagree, SA: 9%)
• **Administrative Professionals** have significantly higher mean scores for perceptions of their Physical Environment than **Staff Classified** or **Faculty** (effect sizes = .30 and .35 respectively)
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/Agree

- Student Affairs vs. All

8/11/2017

2016 Employee Climate Survey

42.2% vs. 44.0%

74.6% vs. 60.8%

75.4% vs. 62.8%

86.4% vs. 77.5%

93.8% vs. 91.4%
CSU Campus Perceptions: 2016 vs. 2014

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

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

- Recommend as a place of employment: 2016 - 56%, 2014 - 68%
- Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees: 2016 - 68%, 2014 - 69%
- Provides employees with a positive work experience: 2016 - 63%, 2014 - 69%
- Encourages discussions related to diversity: 2016 - 50%, 2014 - 49%
- Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds: 2016 - 63%, 2014 - 68%
- Retains diverse employees: 2016 - 51%, 2014 - 55%
- Improves the campus climate for all employees: 2016 - 58%, 2014 - 58%
- Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds: 2016 - 59%, 2014 - 57%

2016 Strongly Agree/Agree vs. 2014 Strongly Agree/Agree
An individual or a group of individuals…

- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion: 35.6%, 36.4%
- Ignored or excluded you or others: 27.6%, 25.6%
- Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way: 37.2%, 34.6%
- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity: 20.0%, 19.6%
- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately: 22.5%, 20.9%
- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others: 23.8%, 19.6%
- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters: 12.7%, 12.5%
- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others: 16.3%, 10.2%

Legend:
- Observed-All
- Observed-Student Affairs
I observed negative treatment or behavior based on:

- Gender: 21%
- Race and/or ethnicity: 22%
- Socioeconomic status: 18%
- English as 2nd language: 18%
- Religion: 18%
- Caregiver status: 15%
- Disability: 9%
- Sexual orientation: 9%
- Country of origin: 8%
- Gender identity: 7%

Other categories:
- Age: 17%
- Unit or college: 20%
- Appearance: 16%
- Years of experience: 20%
Personal and Employee Characteristics

- **CSU alumni** have significantly more positive perceptions of the Executive Leadership and the Campus Climate than non-alumni (effect sizes = .11 and .16 respectively)
  - Student Affairs: None

- 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)
  - Student Affairs: None; Work respect directionally

- 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)
  - Student Affairs: All significant except CSU and Unit Perceptions and Phys. Environment
• 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
### Response Rate Summary Table

<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.*
Employee Characteristics

Gender
- Female: 63.5% (n = 2,191) vs. 69.5% (n = 306) vs. 52.4% (n = 7224)
- Male: 34.9% (n = 2,191) vs. 28.9% (n = 306) vs. 47.6% (n = 7224)
- Transgender, Non-Binary, Self-Identify: 1.6% (n = 2,191) vs. 1.7% (n = 306) vs. 47.6% (n = 7224)

Employees of Color
- Underrepresented: 13.8% (n = 2,191) vs. 21.0% (n = 306) vs. 14.9% (n = 7224)
- Non-Underrepresented: 86.2% (n = 2,191) vs. 79.0% (n = 306) vs. 85.1% (n = 7224)

Employee Category
- Administrative Professional (includes RA and postdocs): 54.0% (n = 2,191) vs. 66.0% (n = 306) vs. 51.2% (n = 7224)
- Faculty: 15.8% (n = 2,191) vs. 0.0% (n = 306) vs. 25.6% (n = 7224)
- State Classified: 30.3% (n = 2,191) vs. 34.0% (n = 306) vs. 23.3% (n = 7224)

Years Employed at CSU
- Two years or less: 19.7% (n = 2,191) vs. 23.3% (n = 306)
- 3 to 5 years: 21.4% (n = 2,191) vs. 25.7% (n = 306)
- 6 to 10 years: 20.5% (n = 2,191) vs. 18.7% (n = 306)
- 11 to 15 years: 14.6% (n = 2,191) vs. 10.0% (n = 306)
- 16 or more years: 23.7% (n = 2,191) vs. 8.3% (n = 306)

*Valid percent reported (excludes missing data)

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