2016 Employee Climate Survey:
Prepared for University Operations

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
• 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
## 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>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.

University Operations:  
36% Total Response Rate (n = 223)  
58% AP Response Rate (n = 73)  
31% SC Response Rate (n = 150)
### Employee Characteristics

<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>15.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Underrepresented</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>84.2%</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)

### Respondent Overview

- 8.9% of all respondents do not have a 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
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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>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; UO: 53%)
  – My workload is too heavy  
    (39% Agree; UO: 46%)
  – I don't have time to finish my job  
    (37% Agree; UO: 47%)
  – I'm rushed in doing my job  
    (43% Agree; UO: 52%)
  – I feel overburdened in my job  
    (41% Agree; UO: 51%)

• **Time Demands & Expectations**
  – I am expected to work more than 40 hours a week  
    (40% Agree; UO: 36%)
  – I feel pressure to be reachable for work purposes throughout the day and evening  
    (40% Agree; UO: 38%)
  – I have to stay too many extra hours at my job  
    (31% Agree; UO: 32%)
  – I am expected to put my job ahead of my family or personal life  
    (18% Agree; UO: 21%)

• **Select additional Workload items not in constructs:**
  – I have to take on work that falls outside my job description  
    (46% Agree; UO: 55%)
  – A healthy work/life balance is supported in my work environment  
    (52% Agree; UO: 45%)
  – My work is acknowledged when I do a good job  
    (52% Agree; UO: 44%)
Employees in University Operations have significantly higher perceptions of their Work Overload than all respondents ($d = .21$); however, on average, their Time Demands & Expectations scores do not significantly differ.

Within University Operations, Administrative Professional have significantly higher mean scores for Time Demands & Expectations (consistent with all employees) ($d = .50$), but also significantly higher mean scores for Work Overload (not consistent with all employees) than Staff Classified ($d = .31$);
• My work contribution is appreciated (69% Agree; UO: 59%)
• I am cared about at work (67% Agree; UO: 58%)
• I am treated with respect at work (75% Agree; UO: 67%)
• My supervisor supports me and advocates on my behalf (68% Agree; UO: 64%)
• Employees under the University Operations division have a significantly lower mean score on average for Respect than all employees \((d = .20)\)

• Within University Operations, Administrative Professionals have significantly higher mean scores for Work Respect than Staff Classified \((d = .36)\)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Category</th>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percent Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My employment category is treated with respect by other employment categories</td>
<td>Strongly Agree or Agree</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job type is not treated with the same respect as other jobs at CSU</td>
<td>Strongly Agree or Agree</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are inequities between employment categories</td>
<td>Strongly Agree or Agree</td>
<td>68.3% 73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability is different for different employee categories</td>
<td>Strongly Agree or Agree</td>
<td>63.0% 66.7% 74.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 41% of University Operations employees agreed their employment category is not treated with the same respect as other jobs at CSU (30% of State Classified and 64% of AP)
- 42% of University Operations employees agreed their job type is not treated with the same respect as other jobs at CSU (45% of State Classified and 38% of AP)
Disrespectful Experiences

An individual or a group of individuals…

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

CSU  Univ. Operations
Executive Leadership

- CSU leadership communicates institutional goals (58% Agree; UO: 49%)
- CSU's strategic goals are taking CSU in a positive direction (55% Agree: UO: 49%)
- CSU leadership is transparent in decision-making (23% Agree; UO: 18%)
- CSU is committed to shared governance (32% Agree; UO: 30%)
- CSU's major strategic initiatives are broadly communicated (55% Agree; UO: 45%)
- University leaders are held accountable for CSU's outcomes (29% Agree; UO: 22%)
- CSU leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace (53% Agree; UO: 44%)
- University leaders address issues of inequities (43% Agree; UO: 32%)

Accountability Standards

- Employees are held accountable for negative or inappropriate behavior in the workplace (50% Disagree; UO: 51%)
- Employees are held accountable for poor performance in the workplace (50% Disagree; UO: 55%)
- University leaders adequately address negative or inappropriate behavior in the workplace (32% Disagree; UO: 41%)
- Employees in my immediate work environment act ethically and honestly in the workplace (14% Disagree; UO: 16%)
• **University Operations** have significantly lower average scores for their perceptions of Executive Leadership and Accountability Standards compared to all respondents ($d = .23$ and .18 respectively)

• There were no significant differences within University Operations by employment category
Physical Environment

- My physical environment supports my successful completion of tasks (18% Disagree; UO: 23%)
- I am physically comfortable in my work space (16% Disagree; UO: 20%)
- My physical environment promotes collaboration (23% Disagree; UO: 27%)
- I have the proper equipment and resources available to complete my work (15% Disagree; UO: 24%)
- My physical environment is welcoming of employees from different backgrounds (10% Disagree; UO: 12%)
- My physical environment meets my personal needs (access, bathroom, prayer, lactation) (9% Disagree; UO: 12%)
- My physical environment (e.g. signage, construction hazards, lighting, parking) supports my sense of safety (13% Disagree; UO: 14%)
- Employees respect shared space (e.g. classrooms) (10% Disagree; UO: 14%)

10/26/2017 2016 Employee Climate Survey
• **University Operations** have significantly lower perceptions on average of their Physical Environment compared to all CSU respondents \((d = .21)\)

• Among **University Operations**, Administrative Professionals have significantly higher mean scores for perceptions of their Physical Environment than Staff Classified (consistent with all employees) \((d < .05)\)
• 51.1% of respondents have served on a search committee in the past five years
  – 33.3% of State Classified, 63.6% of Faculty, 60.1% of Administrative Professional
  – 36.8% of University Operations

Percent who responded Strongly Agree/Agree

- I witnessed bias/discrimination during the search process: 15.0%
- The unfilled positions in my area are not being filled quickly enough: 80.0%
- The power dynamics of the search committee dictate the decision-making process: 55.7%
# 2016 Employee Climate Survey

## Percent who responded Strongly Disagree/Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Univ. Operations</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The search committee allows members to voice concerns about bias/discrimination if it arises</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of committee members is fair</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search committees are fair</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The search process is fair</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable voicing concerns about bias/discrimination to members of the search committee</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hiring authority respectfully considers the recommendations of the search committee</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity (EO) Coordinators are effective</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The search process identifies the best talent for the position</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 do a good job.

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

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

- University Operations: 44.0%, 62.8%, 45.7%, 85.1%, 97.3%
- All: 40.8%, 60.8%, 57.5%, 77.5%, 91.4%
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 at CSU treat each other with respect

There is respect for religious differences here at CSU

Upper-level administrators promote respect for cultural differences at CSU

The campus offers sufficient opportunity for diversity training

CSU understands the importance/value of diversity

CSU: 13% of males, 27% females, 43% SI/Transgender/NB

CSU: 7.5% NU, 26.2% U

CSU: 12% NU, 27% U

CSU: 13% of males, 27% females, 43% SI/Transgender/NB
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
I experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Univ. Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job function</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee category</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit or college</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver status</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and/or ethnicity</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as 2nd language</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
Employees in University Operations have significantly less favorable Dept./Unit climate perceptions compared to CSU employees; however, they do not significantly differ in their overall CSU perceptions (d: CSU = .22)

There were no employment category differences within University Operations
• Overall, 88% of UO respondents would agree that they would recommend CSU as a place of employment
  • 48% would agree they recommend their unit as a place of employment

• The majority of UO respondents agree that CSU’s (65%) and the unit’s (55%) campus climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees

• 73% of UO respondents agree that CSU encourages discussions related to diversity and 43% of respondents agree that their unit encourages these discussions
**Univ. Operations:** Females had significantly more favorable perceptions of their Time Demands & Expectations, Work Respect, Physical Environment, Executive Administration Leadership and Accountability Standards compared to males.

This finding was consistent among State Classified University Operations employees and had the addition of a gender difference (females more favorable) by Unit perception.

The only gender difference among University Operations Administrative Professional employees was work respect: Females had higher perceptions of their work respect than males.
Average Responses by Underrepresentation (Race/Ethnicity)

- **Univ. Operations:** There were no significant differences by underrepresentation (only 32 underrepresented employees).
Overall 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 and race/ethnicity were personal characteristics with notable differences in experiences and perceptions. Respondents who identify as self-identify, transgender, and/or non-binary or of an underrepresented race/ethnicity reported more negative experiences with regard to disrespectful behavior and negative treatments compared to males and females and non-underrepresented employees respectively.
• Employees in Univ. Operations had significantly less favorable responses in all areas except Time Demands and Expectations and overall CSU Perceptions compared to all respondents

• Univ. Operations experienced more disrespectful experiences when compared to all respondents

• Executive Leadership and Work Respect emerged as having the least favorable perceptions among Univ. Operations employees

• Of particular note, was the more negative perceptions of one’s Work Respect by State Classified employees within Univ. Operations

• Work Respect was the variable most predictive of an employee’s unit perceptions