2022-2023 College of Natural Science Climate Study
Employee Results

Debra L. Rusz
Project Manager and Analyst

The Office for Survey Research
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

In the fall of 2022, Michigan State University's College of Natural Science invited all current employees (faculty, academic staff and support staff) to participate in a college-wide survey to better understand the current environment within the College, including workplace climate, diversity, inclusiveness, transparency, accountability, and civility.

The data collection instrument was developed by the College with assistance from the Office for Survey Research at Michigan State University and was based on a college-wide survey conducted in 2019.

The data collection instrument contained the following sections:

- Current Climate – 28 questions, 19 asked at both the department and college level.

- Welcoming and Belonging – nine (9) questions asked at both the department and college level

- Leadership Performance and Accountability – 12 questions asked at both the department and college level

- Recruitment – two (2) questions

- Professional Development and Advancement – seven (7) questions asked at both the department and college level

- Innovation – 12 questions, asked at both the department and college level

- College Strategic Priority I – two (2) open-ended questions

- Values and Relationships – 12 questions asked at both the department and college level

- Annual Review – seven (7) questions

- Civility – 28 questions

- RVSM Policies – six (6) questions

- Bias Incidents – 23 questions

- College Strategic Priority II – two (2) open-ended questions

- Assessment of Current Climate – 18 questions

- Demographics – 13 questions

- Final Thoughts – one (1) question

All responses to open-ended questions were reviewed by the Office for Survey Research and coded into thematic categories where appropriate.

The survey landing page contained an introduction explaining the purpose of the study and an informed consent statement

The climate survey was administered to all faculty, academic staff, and support staff employed by the College as of fall 2022, using a web-based data collection platform. All responses to the survey were submitted anonymously.

The initial database provided by the college contained contact information for 1, 132 employees. An additional database containing contact information for 595 employees.

Data collection was conducted between November 17, 2022, and. January 31, 2023. Reminder emails were sent on November 29, December 13, December 20, 2022 and January 9, January 24, and January 31, 2023. During the data collection period, 505 employees accessed the survey, with 319 employees submitting completed surveys (63.2%). The average time to complete the survey was 39.26 minutes (std. 18.87). The response rate for this study is 18.4%.

<u>Population vs. Participation</u>

For this study, all members of the population, not random samples of the populations were used for data collection. Test of Significance, such as Chi-Square and t-test, are designed to test whether the differences seen between groups during analysis exists in the population and are not simply due to sampling error. Since there were no samples used, there can be no sampling error. Differences between groups seen during this study's analysis exist in the population if the overrepresentation or underrepresentation of one group does not bias the results.

Table 1.1 presents a portion of the demographic characteristics that are available for most of the population as well as the respondents. Information on the population was available for gender and race, but not for sexual orientation and disabilities which were also used for analysis in this report.

For each category, there are cases with missing demographic information, so the comparison is not perfect. A negative value for the difference means that the group was underrepresented and a positive value for difference means that the group was overrepresented. Minor differences are not of concern, but there are a few differences that are larger, and potential could bias the results if either 1) those that did not participate are different in some way from those that did or 2) an under- or overrepresented group is very different on key points from the other groups within that characteristic. There is little difference in representation for gender, but there is for race, employee position, and college districts (Table 1.1).

For race, Asians are underrepresented (-7.1%) and Whites are overrepresented (6.2%). For the analysis, we are able to compare Asians against Whites so any differences between the two groups can be evaluated.

In terms of employee position, there is some under and over-representation with tenure-track faculty and academic specialists being over-represented and fixed-term faculty and postdocs being under-represented.

For college districts, Biological Sciences are under-represented and Physical Sciences are over-represented. Given that almost two-thirds of the employees are within the Biological Sciences, it is unlikely that any issues or concerns within the Biological Sciences will go unidentified even with this under-representation.

Table 1.1: Comparison of Population to Participation

Characteristic	Group	Percentage of Population Who Responded	Percentage Within		
			Population	Respondents	Difference
Gender	Female	20.3%	46.0%	47.9%	1.9%
	Male	18.5%	54.0%	52.1%	-1.9%
Race	Asian	12.6%	20.9%	13.8%	-7.1%
	White	20.7%	69.9%	76.1%	6.2%
	People of Color	20.9%	9.2%	10.0%	0.9%

Employee Position	Tenure-track Faculty	19.7%	29.5%	37.6%	8.1%
	Fixed-term Faculty	8.2%	22.9%	12.1%	-10.8%
	Academic Specialist	32.0%	6.3%	13.1%	6.8%
	Postdoctoral	11.6%	15.7%	11.8%	-3.9%
	Support Staff	15.4%	25.5%	25.5%	0.0%
College Districts	Biological Sciences	11.5%	65.6%	51.8%	-13.8%
	Physical Sciences	24.2%	20.2%	33.3%	13.1%
	Mathematics	15.4%	14.2%	14.9%	0.7%

Construction of Demographic Variables

Below are descriptions of the demographic variables used in analysis. Most of the variables were collapsed to reduce the likelihood of possible identification of respondents.

Sex

The Sex variable is based off the University's administrative gender variable. For the few respondents that did not have that information, the self-reported variable was used as a proxy answer, if available.

Sexual Orientation

All those who reported a gender identify other than cisgender and those who reported any sexual orientation other than heterosexual were included in the LGBTQIA2S+ community. It is acknowledged that those who were included in the LGBTQIA2S+ category for this report may have very different experiences from other members of the community, but breaking the community into smaller groups increased the likelihood of potential identification.

Race

The self-reported race from the survey was recoded into three categories: White, Asian, and People of Color. Only White and Asian had sufficient numbers to report as separate categories without concern of potential identification of the respondent. Those in the People of color category include any other race other than White or Asian, those who are multi-racial and/or LatinX.

Disability

The disability variable is a composite variable for all forms of disability based on three questions in the survey – physical, mental/psychological and learning. Again, we acknowledge that Individuals with different forms of disability may have different experiences within the workplace, but this was done to prevent the potential identification of any respondent.

Employee Position

Employee position was self-reported by the respondent. It should be kept in mind when considering the responses of the "support staff" that they category includes a wide range of occupations and containing professional, clerical, and technical staff. They could be full-time, part-time or on-call as well as regular staff or were fixed-term.

College Districts

College districts were based on institutional data of what department/unit that the employee was in. Those whose department/unit was not part of a district, or the employee was dean's office were excluded from the college district analysis.

Interpretation of Tables

When comparing groups within demographic characteristics, minor differences between groups are to be expected and may only be due to non-response. In the following tables that look at differences between demographic characteristics using mean scores, only differences between mean scores of 0.1 or greater are underlined for emphasis. This is not to say that any difference of 0.1 or greater indicates a problem. It is just that differences smaller than 0.1 are more likely to be due to non-response or are unlikely to indicate a problem. For those tables that report percentages, five percent or greater differences were underlined.

Tables that show comparisons of different demographic characteristics groups may have different overall mean scores than the summary table for that question. This is due to non-response for some of the demographic variables which causes those cases to not be included in the demographic characteristic tables.

CLIMATE/RELATIONSHIPS

Within College of Natural Science

Respondents were asked multiple sets of questions about both the College of Natural Sciences, in general, as well as their individual department/unit. Sets of questions covered views of the climate in general as well as how specific groups were treated within both the College of Natural Science and departments/units.

The first set of questions was a series of paired opposite adjectives on a seven-point scale that were asked specifically about the college. With a seven-point scale, any value above four is considered a positive score and any value below four is considered negative. This also applies to the mean values for each set of paired adjectives. All the adjectives presented received a mean score over four with three-quarters having a mean score over five (Table 2.1a). Homophobic vs. Non-homophobic received the highest mean score (5.73), followed by Racist vs. Non-racist (5.47) and Disrespectful vs. Respectful (5.40). Though the mean scores were still in the positive range, the lowest mean scores were for Homogeneous vs. Diverse (4.65), Individualistic vs. Collaborative (4.80), and Competitive vs. Cooperative (4.92).

Table 2.1a: Adjective Pairs Associated with College Climate

For each pair of adjectives, select the point between them that reflects the extent to which you believe the adjectives describe the climate in the college based on your direct experiences.	Negative Aspect						Positive Aspect			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Hostile vs. Friendly	2.2%	4.5%	6.1%	10.9%	21.1%	28.4%	26.8%	313	5.37	1.530

Racist vs. Non-racist	1.3%	4.5%	7.7%	14.2%	13.5%	22.3%	36.5%	310	5.47	1.592
Homogeneous vs. Diverse	2.2%	9.6%	17.0%	15.7%	21.5%	15.4%	18.6%	312	4.65	1.687
Disrespectful vs. Respectful	1.9%	3.5%	7.3%	9.6%	21.7%	29.1%	26.8%	313	5.40	1.491
Unwelcoming vs. Welcoming	2.9%	3.9%	5.5%	12.5%	20.3%	28.0%	27.0%	311	5.35	1.548
Sexist vs. Non-sexist	2.3%	5.2%	13.9%	13.9%	14.2%	22.7%	27.8%	309	5.12	1.691
Individualistic vs. Collaborative	4.2%	7.7%	9.3%	16.0%	25.6%	19.6%	17.6%	312	4.80	1.662
Competitive vs. Cooperative	3.8%	6.1%	9.3%	17.6%	20.8%	22.8%	19.6%	312	4.92	1.650
Homophobic vs. Non-homophobic	0.3%	1.3%	4.6%	17.6%	11.1%	25.4%	39.7%	307	5.73	1.358
Unsupportive vs. Supportive	4.5%	5.4%	8.0%	9.3%	21.7%	28.1%	23.0%	313	5.15	1.675
Ageist vs. Non-ageist	3.3%	6.5%	8.8%	20.2%	12.4%	21.5%	27.4%	307	5.06	1.725
Regressing vs. Improving	3.5%	5.1%	5.1%	17.9%	24.7%	21.8%	21.8%	311	5.35	1.548

The mean scores are based on a seven-point scale where 1 refers to completely the negative adjective (ex. Hostile) and 7 refers to completely the positive adjective (ex. Friendly). With the midpoint of the scale being 4, everything above it is considered more in the direction of the positive adjective and everything below it is considered more in the direction of the negative adjective. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 7) the closer it is to the end attribute (ex. hostile or friendly).

When comparing demographic groups' responses to the paired adjectives, differences are apparent. It should be noted that even for variables where there is a large difference between groups, the lowest mean score was still above four which suggests that though different groups may have different experiences, there was no group that didn't identify with the positive end of the adjective pair. Though this did not hold for each of the adjective pairs, females, heterosexuals, non-Asians, and those with disabilities reported lower mean scores for at least some of the adjective pairs.

Table 2.1b: Adjective Pairs Associated with College Climate by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

For each pair of adjectives, select the point between them that reflects the extent to which you believe the adjectives describe the climate in the college based on your direct experiences.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Hostile vs. Friendly	5.36	5.39	5.33	5.46	5.76	5.53	5.38	5.10	4.95	5.75
Racist vs. Non-racist	5.48	5.72	5.22	5.44	5.58	5.48	5.52	5.14	4.73	5.79
Homogeneous vs. Diverse	4.67	4.83	4.51	4.45	4.83	5.43	4.58	4.38	4.05	4.84
Disrespectful vs. Respectful	5.38	5.40	5.36	5.50	5.78	5.63	5.35	5.34	5.02	5.72
Unwelcoming vs. Welcoming	5.33	5.39	5.27	5.48	5.57	5.67	5.32	5.11	5.03	5.68
Sexist vs. Non-sexist	5.11	5.49	4.70	5.17	5.15	5.58	5.05	5.04	4.48	5.43
Individualistic vs. Collaborative	4.84	4.82	4.85	4.80	5.22	5.23	4.79	4.79	4.56	5.01
Competitive vs. Cooperative	4.96	4.95	4.97	4.93	5.30	5.40	4.93	4.76	4.60	5.19
Homophobic vs. Non-homophobic	5.73	5.83	5.63	5.79	5.57	5.63	5.72	5.89	*5.16*	5.93
Unsupportive vs. Supportive	5.13	5.17	5.10	5.33	5.24	5.60	5.11	4.83	4.71	5.53
Ageist vs. Non-ageist	5.10	5.09	5.10	5.15	5.29	5.43	5.00	5.29	4.63	5.29
Regressing vs. Improving	5.05	5.05	5.06	5.15	5.24	5.45	5.02	4.86	4.74	5.38

The mean scores are based on a seven-point scale where 1 refers to completely the negative adjective (ex. Hostile) and 7 refers to completely the positive adjective (ex. Friendly). With the midpoint of the scale being 4, everything above it is considered more in the direction of the positive adjective and everything below it is considered more in the direction of the negative adjective. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 7) the closer it is to the end attribute (ex. hostile or friendly).

Employee position played a major role in how employees responded to the adjective pair questions (Table 2.1c). Postdocs provided the highest mean scores for all the adjective pairs. Support staff had the second highest mean scores for most of the adjectives, though they were generally much lower than postdocs. Fixed-term faculty reported much lower mean scores compared to the other positions for Hostile vs. Friendly, Individualistic vs. Collaborative, and Ageist vs. Non-ageist. Tenure-track faculty reported much lower mean score for Competitive vs. Cooperative.

Table 2.1c: Adjective Pairs Associated with College Climate by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Employee Position

For each pair of adjectives, select the point between them that reflects the extent to which you believe the adjectives describe the climate in the college based on your direct experiences.		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Hostile vs. Friendly	5.36	5.29	**4.97**	5.45	5.92	5.35
Racist vs. Non-racist	5.48	5.30	5.37	5.23	5.83	5.77
Homogeneous vs. Diverse	4.65	4.33	4.37	4.38	5.41	5.05
Disrespectful vs. Respectful	5.39	5.25	5.24	5.40	6.00	5.40
Unwelcoming vs. Welcoming	5.34	5.29	**5.03**	5.28	5.70	5.44
Sexist vs. Non-sexist	5.14	5.09	4.84	4.78	5.83	5.23
Individualistic vs. Collaborative	4.80	4.62	**4.37**	4.78	5.62	4.90
Competitive vs. Cooperative	4.92	**4.59**	4.82	4.88	5.62	5.13
Homophobic vs. Non-homophobic	5.74	5.68	5.54	5.46	6.11	5.91
Unsupportive vs. Supportive	5.14	4.97	4.92	5.25	5.70	5.15
Ageist vs. Non-ageist	5.06	4.87	**4.56**	5.18	5.69	5.23
Regressing vs. Improving	5.07	4.96	4.89	4.97	5.38	5.22

The mean scores are based on a seven-point scale where 1 refers to completely the negative adjective (ex. Hostile) and 7 refers to completely the positive adjective (ex. Friendly). With the midpoint of the scale being 4, everything above it is considered more in the direction of the positive adjective and everything below it is considered more in the direction of the negative adjective. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 7) the closer it is to the end attribute (ex. hostile or friendly).

Across college districts, Mathematics consistently reported high mean scores for all but one of the adjective pairs compared to Biological Sciences and Physical Sciences (Table 2.1d). Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower mean scores for eight of the twelve adjective pairs and Physical Sciences reported nine.

Table 2.1d: Adjective Pairs Associated with College Climate by College District (Mean Scores)

For each pair of adjectives, select the point between them that reflects the extent to which you believe the adjectives describe the climate in the college based on your direct experiences.	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Hostile vs. Friendly	5.35	<u>5.35</u>	<u>5.27</u>	5.50
Racist vs. Non-racist	5.52	<u>5.45</u>	<u>5.51</u>	5.76
Homogeneous vs. Diverse	4.72	<u>4.49</u>	<u>4.79</u>	5.38
Disrespectful vs. Respectful	5.42	<u>5.41</u>	<u>5.35</u>	5.62
Unwelcoming vs. Welcoming	5.37	<u>5.33</u>	<u>5.37</u>	5.50
Sexist vs. Non-sexist	5.20	<u>5.12</u>	<u>5.24</u>	5.37
Individualistic vs. Collaborative	4.82	4.87	<u>4.67</u>	4.93
Competitive vs. Cooperative	4.93	4.94	4.95	4.90
Homophobic vs. Non-homophobic	5.75	5.79	5.70	5.76
Unsupportive vs. Supportive	5.16	<u>5.12</u>	<u>5.12</u>	5.40
Ageist vs. Non-ageist	5.07	<u>5.04</u>	<u>5.00</u>	5.33
Regressing vs. Improving	5.08	<u>5.01</u>	<u>5.07</u>	5.33

The mean scores are based on a seven-point scale where 1 refers to completely the negative adjective (ex. Hostile) and 7 refers to completely the positive adjective (ex. Friendly). With the midpoint of the scale being 4, everything above it is considered more in the direction of the positive adjective and everything below it is considered more in the direction of the negative adjective. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 7) the closer it is to the end attribute (ex. hostile or friendly).

Respondents were then asked a series of questions about the climate within the College itself for specific groups. For the tables below, the level of negative/positive climate was measured using a five-point scale where a mean below three would be considered negative and a mean over three would be considered positive.

For all groups listed in Table 2.2a, all but one (Christian Religious Affiliations) had at least 50% of the respondents say that the climate was at least somewhat positive for that group. The climate was seen as best for men (76.9%), Whites (75.4%), and Internationals (68.3 %) with all having over two-thirds of the respondents reporting the climate as being at least somewhat positive. In terms of a negative climate, transgender individuals (14.6%), People of Color (13.1%) and women (12.9%) received the highest reported percentages of very negative or somewhat negative responses

Table 2.2a: Climate in College Towards Specific Groups

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science as a whole for employees who are:	Very Negative 1	Somewhat Negative 2	Neutral 3	Somewhat Positive 4	Very Positive 5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Women	2.0%	10.9%	20.6%	27.0%	39.5%	248	3.91	1.102
Men	1.7%	5.8%	15.7%	14.9%	62.0%	242	4.30	1.036
Transgender	2.3%	12.3%	33.1%	18.5%	33.8%	130	3.69	1.133
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual	0.0%	8.9%	26.3%	23.2%	41.6%	190	3.97	1.021
People of Color	0.9%	12.2%	24.4%	21.7%	40.7%	221	3.89	1.102
White	1.6%	3.9%	19.1%	15.6%	59.8%	256	4.28	1.005
Immigrants	0.5%	7.0%	27.5%	20.0%	45.0%	200	4.02	1.027
International	0.0%	6.6%	25.1%	22.9%	45.4%	227	4.07	.984
Non-native English speakers	0.9%	9.2%	28.0%	24.3%	37.6%	218	3.89	1.048
Christian Religious Affiliations	3.3%	7.8%	39.4%	14.4%	35.0%	180	3.70	1.128
Non-Christian Religious Affiliations	0.6%	7.1%	40.0%	21.8%	30.6%	170	3.75	.991

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).

It is important to evaluate if different demographic groups view the climate the same, especially for those who are members of the specific groups included in the table. Data was not available to identify immigrants, internationals, non-native English speakers, or religious affiliation. The LGBTQIA2S+ category was not broken down to prevent possible identification of respondents. It also needs to be noted that individuals can belong to more than one of the groups listed in the table.

Though there are differences amongst groups within the demographic characteristics, the ones that are of most interest are those where the demographic characteristic group is the one listed in Table 2.2b (i.e. females for women). On a five-point scale, anything above a mean of three is a positive response, anything below a three is a negative response. Females felt that women's climate was not as favorable compared to their male counterparts' responses. The reverse was true when looking at the climate of men with males reporting a less favorable climate. Those within the LBGTQIA2S+ community felt that the climate was not as positive for both transgender individuals and those who are gay/lesbian/bisexual than those reported by heterosexuals. Those who were non-White rated the climate less favorable for immigrants, internationals, and non-native English speakers than did those who were White. Employees of color rated the climate less favorable for People of Color than did their counterparts. Also of interest is that those with a disability rated all but two groups listed in the table as having a less favorable environment than did those without disabilities.

Table 2.2b: Climate in College Towards Specific Groups by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science as a whole for employees who are:	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Women	3.91	4.10	3.71	3.99	3.58	4.18	3.92	3.58	3.49	4.12
Men	4.28	3.98	4.63	4.41	4.46	3.81	4.29	4.64	4.39	4.35
Transgender	3.73	3.80	3.66	3.62	3.11	3.64	3.80	3.14	3.24	3.75
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual	3.99	4.02	3.95	4.05	3.72	3.75	4.04	3.84	3.77	4.12
People of Color	3.91	4.05	3.76	3.83	3.88	4.00	3.94	3.62	3.46	4.05
White	4.29	4.10	4.50	4.41	4.46	4.16	4.27	4.58	4.46	4.29
Immigrants	4.02	4.02	4.02	4.07	3.96	3.61	4.11	3.83	3.90	4.10
International	4.07	4.11	4.01	4.06	4.21	3.76	4.14	3.86	3.96	4.18
Non-native English speakers	3.91	3.98	3.83	3.87	4.00	3.58	4.01	3.64	3.76	4.01
Christian Religious Affiliations	3.71	3.69	3.73	3.81	3.71	3.35	3.80	3.72	3.56	3.84
Non-Christian Religious Affiliations	3.77	3.79	3.76	3.72	3.67	3.45	3.83	3.67	3.46	3.84

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).

Tenure-track and fixed-term faculty, and postdocs reported lower mean scores for all eleven groups compared to the highest mean scores reported within employee position (Table 2.2c). Academic specialists reported lower mean scores for five of the groups and support staff for four of the groups.

Table 2.2c: Climate in College Towards Specific Groups by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science as a whole for employees who are:	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Women	3.91	3.98	3.78	3.67	3.85	4.00
Men	4.30	4.28	4.03	4.64	4.13	4.38
Transgender	3.70	3.67	3.56	3.60	3.45	3.89
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual	3.98	4.03	3.85	3.92	3.50	4.15
People of Color	3.89	3.83	3.59	4.04	3.90	4.07
White	4.27	4.29	4.16	4.59	4.00	4.25
Immigrants	4.03	3.94	3.79	4.27	3.72	4.30
International	4.08	3.98	3.86	4.15	4.00	4.34
Non-native English speakers	3.89	3.82	3.62	3.96	3.80	4.18
Christian Religious Affiliations	3.70	3.75	3.46	4.33	3.42	3.60
Non-Christian Religious Affiliations	3.75	3.75	3.54	4.06	3.38	3.91

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).

Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower mean scores for seven of the eleven groups and those in the Physical Sciences reported six (Table 2.2d). Those in Mathematics only reported lower mean scores for immigrants, internationals, and non-native English speakers.

Table 2.2d: Climate in College Towards Specific Groups by College District (Mean Scores)

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science as a whole for employees who are:	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Women	3.97	3.86	4.04	4.14
Men	4.24	4.24	4.23	4.26
Transgender	3.72	3.59	3.76	4.06
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual	3.99	3.95	4.00	4.09
People of Color	3.91	3.89	3.88	4.00
White	4.24	4.26	4.09	4.46
Immigrants	3.99	4.03	3.98	3.88
International	4.06	4.13	4.04	3.91
Non-native English speakers	3.85	3.85	3.92	3.69
Christian Religious Affiliations	3.74	3.63	3.79	4.00
Non-Christian Religious Affiliations	3.75	3.68	3.79	3.90

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).

In addition to the groups listed above, respondents were also asked about climate within the college itself for those with various disabilities and roles outside of work (Table 2.3a). Respondents reported that the climate was at least somewhat positive over 60% of the time for all groups except for those with mental health conditions (54.3%). Those with mental health conditions also received the highest percent of very negative or somewhat negative climate responses (19.1%).

Table 2.3a: Climate in College Towards Specific Disabilities/Roles Outside of Work

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science as a whole for employees who are or have:	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neutral	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive			
	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Mental Health Condition	3.5%	15.6%	26.6%	23.1%	31.2%	173	3.63	1.177
Physical Disability	1.2%	12.7%	22.4%	27.3%	36.4%	165	3.85	1.091
Learning Disability	1.9%	13.0%	24.1%	24.7%	36.4%	162	3.81	1.123
Parents/Guardians of Dependent Children	3.1%	11.5%	20.8%	26.0%	38.5%	192	3.85	1.148
Providing Care for Adults who are Disabled and/or Elderly	1.4%	8.6%	24.3%	27.1%	38.6%	140	3.93	1.050
Serviced/Serving in the Military	0.9%	3.5%	33.9%	12.2%	49.6%	115	4.06	1.028

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).

In terms of race, employees of color reported the lowest mean scores for those with various disabilities and Asians reported the lowest mean scores for roles outside of work. Those with disabilities reported lower mean scores for all disabilities and roles outside of work than those without disabilities.

Table 2.3b: Climate in the College Towards Specific Disabilities/Roles Outside of Work by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science as a whole for employees who are or have:	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Mental Health Condition	3.64	3.67	3.62	3.63	3.42	3.59	3.70	3.58	3.48	3.80
Physical Disability	3.90	3.89	3.92	3.83	3.88	3.84	3.93	3.72	3.27	4.08
Learning Disability	3.83	3.84	3.82	3.80	3.62	3.83	3.90	3.61	3.42	4.07
Parents/Guardians of Dependent Children	3.86	3.92	3.79	3.87	3.93	3.62	3.84	4.10	3.83	3.94
Providing Care for Adults who are Disabled and/or Elderly	3.97	4.00	3.93	3.91	4.00	3.85	4.01	4.00	3.74	4.11
Serviced/Serving in the Military	4.05	4.00	4.11	4.10	4.31	3.57	4.14	4.00	4.04	4.16
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).										

Perceive climates for those with disabilities and those with roles outside of work differed by employment position (Table 2.3c). Both tenured and fixed-term faculty, as well as postdocs, reported lower mean scores for all groups. Academic specialists only reported lower mean scores as did support staff.

Table 2.3c: Climate in the College Towards Specific Disabilities/Roles Outside of Work by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science as a whole for employees who are or have:	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Mental Health Condition	3.64	3.52	3.48	3.78	3.36	3.89
Physical Disability	3.86	3.67	3.80	4.14	3.75	4.05
Learning Disability	3.81	3.78	3.65	4.14	**3.00**	3.92
Parents/Guardians of Dependent Children	3.86	3.74	3.68	3.91	3.87	4.16
Providing Care for Adults who are Disabled and/or Elderly	3.93	3.83	3.64	4.27	3.43	4.26
Serviced/Serving in the Military	4.07	4.00	3.93	4.54	3.22	4.31

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).

Those in the Biological Sciences and Physical Sciences reported lower mean scores for five of the six disabilities/roles (Table 2.3d) compared to Mathematics. Those in Mathematics reported a lower mean score for parents/guardians of dependent children compared to the other two college districts.

Table 2.3d: Climate in the College Towards Specific Disabilities/Roles Outside of Work by College District (Mean Scores)

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science as a whole for employees who are or have:	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Mental Health Condition	3.67	3.62	3.62	4.00
Physical Disability	3.84	3.73	3.84	4.16
Learning Disability	3.89	3.68	4.04	4.18
Parents/Guardians of Dependent Children	3.85	3.88	3.88	3.70
Providing Care for Adults who are Disabled and/or Elderly	3.98	3.93	3.95	4.20
Serviced/Serving in the Military	4.11	4.02	4.16	4.27

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).

In addition, respondents were asked about how welcoming the college was and their sense of belonging (Table 2.4a). For all but one item ("People take time to get to know new employees."), over 50% of the respondents stated that they at least somewhat agreed with the statements. "I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group." (68.9%) received the highest percent of at least somewhat agree, followed by "I am confident we will become more diverse, inclusive, and equitable over the next five years." (66.9%) and "I feel valued as a person." (61.5%). Three areas had at least one-quarter with the highest percent of strongly or somewhat disagree - "People take time to get to know new employees." (30.6%), "I feel a sense of belonging." (26.0%) and "People take time to welcome new employees." (25.8%).

Table 2.4a: Attitudes about Welcoming and Belonging Within College

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to welcoming and belonging within the college.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree			
	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
People take time to welcome new employees.	10.3%	15.5%	22.4%	35.3%	16.4%	232	3.32	1.217
People take time to get to know new employees.	11.6%	19.0%	25.0%	32.3%	12.1%	232	3.14	1.203
People work closely together.	7.8%	12.2%	22.2%	33.9%	23.9%	230	3.54	1.203
People create a sense of belonging for others.	6.8%	10.2%	25.5%	39.6%	17.9%	235	3.51	1.107
I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.	4.1%	4.6%	22.4%	27.8%	41.1%	241	3.97	1.093
I feel a sense of belonging.	8.8%	17.2%	16.5%	28.7%	28.7%	261	3.51	1.306
I feel supported to actively contribute to a vision of excellence in equity and inclusion across all areas of my work.	8.3%	12.4%	19.9%	26.6%	32.8%	241	3.63	1.281
I feel valued as a person.	7.5%	14.1%	16.9%	32.9%	28.6%	255	3.61	1.243
I am confident we will become more diverse, inclusive, and equitable over the next five years.	5.4%	9.3%	18.3%	32.7%	34.2%	257	3.81	1.165

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

In terms of demographic characteristic differences there was no clear pattern of differences across the statements for gender identify and sexual orientation (Table 2.4b). Those who were non-Asian were more likely to be less in agreement with statements though this did not apply to all the statements. Those with disabilities were less likely to agree with the statements than their counterparts.

Table 2.4b: Attitudes about Welcoming and Belonging Within College by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to welcoming and belonging within the college.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
People take time to welcome new employees.	3.31	3.29	3.32	3.36	3.58	3.92	3.24	3.16	3.12	3.53
People take time to get to know new employees.	3.13	3.20	3.06	3.20	3.29	3.78	3.05	3.00	3.00	3.39
People work closely together.	3.56	3.50	3.63	3.67	3.62	3.68	3.62	3.24	3.50	3.71
People create a sense of belonging for others.	3.51	3.49	3.53	3.56	3.66	4.15	3.46	3.31	3.12	3.80
I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.	3.99	3.93	4.05	4.03	4.03	3.94	4.01	3.96	3.76	4.13
I feel a sense of belonging.	3.51	3.48	3.53	3.64	3.53	3.71	3.45	3.73	3.17	3.75
I feel supported to actively contribute to a vision of excellence in equity and inclusion across all areas of my work.	3.64	3.56	3.74	3.72	3.86	3.61	3.66	3.77	3.31	3.89
I feel valued as a person.	3.61	3.57	3.66	3.71	3.61	3.74	3.59	3.69	3.17	3.86
I am confident we will become more diverse, inclusive, and equitable over the next five years.	3.81	3.85	3.76	3.87	3.85	4.06	3.82	3.54	3.60	4.02

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Fixed-term faculty reported lower agreement for all nine statements (Table 2.4c). Tenure-track faculty, postdocs and support staff all reported lower agreement for five or six of the statements. Academic specialists only reported less agreement with three of the statements.

Table 2.4c: Attitudes about Welcoming and Belonging Within College by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to welcoming and belonging within the college.	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
People take time to welcome new employees.	3.33	3.41	3.06	3.17	3.09	3.55
People take time to get to know new employees.	3.15	3.20	3.00	2.94	3.27	3.25
People work closely together.	3.55	3.49	**3.10**	3.79	3.85	3.67
People create a sense of belonging for others.	3.51	3.54	3.13	3.60	3.60	3.58
I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.	3.97	3.90	3.93	4.17	3.95	4.03
I feel a sense of belonging.	3.50	3.53	3.30	3.72	3.48	3.44
I feel supported to actively contribute to a vision of excellence in equity and inclusion across all areas of my work.	3.62	3.64	3.29	4.06	3.71	3.51
I feel valued as a person.	3.60	3.63	3.38	3.78	3.86	3.49
I am confident we will become more diverse, inclusive, and equitable over the next five years.	3.82	3.91	3.70	3.73	3.68	3.85
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).						

Those in the Biological Sciences reported less agreement with all nine statements about the college being welcoming and feeling like they belonged (Table 2.4d). Those in the Physical Sciences only reported lower mean scores for four of the statements and those in Mathematics only reported it for two.

Table 2.4d: Attitudes about Welcoming and Belonging Within College by College District (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to welcoming and belonging within the college.	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
People take time to welcome new employees.	3.35	3.14	3.49	3.64
People take time to get to know new employees.	3.18	3.06	3.15	3.55
People work closely together.	3.57	3.52	3.67	3.50
People create a sense of belonging for others.	3.57	3.39	3.66	3.91
I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.	3.93	3.87	3.95	4.08
I feel a sense of belonging.	3.51	3.24	3.78	3.72
I feel supported to actively contribute to a vision of excellence in equity and inclusion across all areas of my work.	3.59	3.39	3.78	3.79
I feel valued as a person.	3.57	3.42	3.76	3.61
I am confident we will become more diverse, inclusive, and equitable over the next five years.	3.83	3.78	3.87	3.89
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).				

Respondents were also asked about their values and relationships within the college (Table 2.5a). For all but two of the twelve statements, over 50% of the respondents said that they at least somewhat agreed with the statements. "My leaders/supervisors treat me with respect." (79.8%) had the highest level of agreement with "am confident that college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of sexual harassment, bias, discrimination, or incivility." (76.1%) and "I have access to leaders when I have concerns/problems." (67.5%) receiving high levels agreement as well. Over one-quarter of the respondents strongly or somewhat disagreed with "We operate in a clear and transparent manner." (29.9%), "Leaders make major decisions with input from employees." (26.5%) and "People care about my general satisfaction at work." (26.0%).

Table 2.5a: Values and Relationships Within College

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning values and relationships within the college.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree			
	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
We operate in a clear and transparent manner.	13.9%	16.0%	20.3%	33.8%	16.0%	231	3.22	1.285
Leaders values my contributions.	8.1%	7.6%	19.3%	33.6%	31.4%	223	3.73	1.212
People care about my general satisfaction at work.	11.7%	14.3%	24.2%	29.6%	20.2%	223	3.32	1.271
I can voice my opinions openly.	10.4%	9.9%	14.0%	31.1%	34.7%	222	3.70	1.316
People listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.	9.2%	9.2%	21.0%	37.9%	22.6%	195	3.55	1.202
People care about my personal well-being.	11.1%	8.8%	20.7%	32.3%	27.2%	217	3.56	1.279
Leaders clearly communicate the strategic plan, work plans, and other strategic directions.	8.2%	10.4%	17.3%	35.1%	29.0%	231	3.66	1.229
Leaders make major decisions with input from employees.	13.0%	13.5%	20.0%	33.5%	20.0%	200	3.34	1.297
Leaders provide explanation for major decisions.	9.1%	13.4%	17.3%	33.3%	26.8%	231	3.55	1.267
My leaders/supervisors treat me with respect.	4.9%	4.5%	10.8%	25.1%	54.7%	223	4.20	1.115
I have access to leaders when I have concerns/problems.	7.9%	9.6%	14.9%	28.5%	39.0%	228	3.81	1.268
I am confident that college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of sexual harassment, bias, discrimination, or incivility.	3.5%	5.5%	14.9%	17.4%	58.7%	201	4.22	1.107

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Table 2.5b reports the demographic characteristic breakdown for these statements. Males reported lower levels of agreement than their female counterparts for seven of the twelve statements. Those in the LGBTQIA2S+ community had lower levels of agreement for six of the statements. Those who were non-Asian were more likely to report lower levels of agreement. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement for all statements compared to those without disabilities.

Table 2.5b: Values and Relationships Within the College by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning values and relationships in the college.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
We operate in a clear and transparent manner.	3.25	3.15	3.34	3.35	3.13	3.48	3.24	3.21	2.92	3.48
Leaders values my contributions.	3.71	3.63	3.79	3.84	3.74	4.00	3.66	3.76	3.22	4.03
People care about my general satisfaction at work.	3.32	3.23	3.43	3.41	3.39	3.69	3.29	3.23	2.92	3.70
I can voice my opinions openly.	3.69	3.61	3.78	3.87	3.64	3.69	3.73	3.58	3.30	4.03
People listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.	3.55	3.49	3.63	3.75	3.48	3.80	3.53	3.55	3.15	3.91
People care about my personal well-being.	3.56	3.45	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.68	3.53	3.54	3.13	3.82
Leaders clearly communicate the strategic plan, work plans, and other strategic directions.	3.63	3.64	3.63	3.72	3.69	3.89	3.62	3.56	3.31	3.87
Leaders make major decisions with input from employees.	3.31	3.38	3.24	3.44	3.36	3.92	3.18	3.48	2.95	3.64
Leaders provide explanation for major decisions.	3.54	3.53	3.54	3.65	3.57	3.86	3.53	3.40	3.14	3.78
My leaders/supervisors treat me with respect.	4.17	4.06	4.31	4.39	4.09	4.13	4.18	4.20	3.79	4.43
I have access to leaders when I have concerns/problems.	3.79	3.77	3.82	4.01	3.64	3.90	3.76	4.00	3.55	4.06
I am confident that college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of sexual harassment, bias, discrimination, or incivility.	4.22	4.17	4.26	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.21	4.14	4.00	4.38

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Fixed-term faculty reported less agreement with all twelve statements about values and relationships within the college (Table 2.5c). Support staff were less like to agree with all but one of the statements (People care about my well-being). Tenure-track faculty were less likely to agree with seven of the statements. Academic specialist and postdocs each were less likely to agree with five of the statements.

Table 2.5c: Values and Relationships Within the College by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning values and relationships in the college.	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
We operate in a clear and transparent manner.	3.24	3.18	3.04	3.24	3.52	3.31
Leaders values my contributions.	3.73	3.90	3.45	3.79	3.95	3.45
People care about my general satisfaction at work.	3.32	3.42	3.04	3.46	3.43	3.16
I can voice my opinions openly.	3.70	3.77	3.50	3.89	3.56	3.62
People listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.	3.55	3.65	3.29	3.75	3.94	3.24
People care about my personal well-being.	3.55	3.61	3.04	3.70	3.63	3.62
Leaders clearly communicate the strategic plan, work plans, and other strategic directions.	3.66	3.69	3.66	3.76	3.91	3.45
Leaders make major decisions with input from employees.	3.34	3.43	3.08	3.26	3.71	3.23
Leaders provide explanation for major decisions.	3.56	3.52	3.50	3.86	3.74	3.44
My leaders/supervisors treat me with respect.	4.20	4.38	3.80	4.41	4.06	4.02
I have access to leaders when I have concerns/problems.	3.81	3.96	3.86	3.83	3.62	3.62
I am confident that college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of sexual harassment, bias, discrimination, or incivility.	4.22	4.17	4.30	4.44	4.11	4.21
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).						

Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower mean scores for all statements compared to the district with the highest mean scores (Table 2.5d). Those in the Physical Sciences reported lower mean scores for "Leaders clearly communicate the strategic plan, work plans, and other strategic directions." and "Leaders make major decisions with input from employees." Those in Mathematics reported lower mean scores for "Leaders provide explanation for major decisions." and "My leaders/supervisors treat me with respect."

Table 2.5d: Values and Relationships Within the Major/Program by College Districts (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning values and relationships in the college.	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
We operate in a clear and transparent manner.	3.20	<u>3.10</u>	3.27	3.31
Leaders values my contributions.	3.70	<u>3.52</u>	3.88	<u>3.78</u>
People care about my general satisfaction at work.	3.27	<u>3.07</u>	3.39	3.57
I can voice my opinions openly.	3.70	<u>3.60</u>	3.81	3.73
People listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.	3.53	<u>3.35</u>	3.65	3.72
People care about my personal well-being.	3.49	<u>3.31</u>	3.65	3.63
Leaders clearly communicate the strategic plan, work plans, and other strategic directions.	3.66	<u>3.56</u>	<u>3.73</u>	3.83
Leaders make major decisions with input from employees.	3.35	<u>3.29</u>	<u>3.29</u>	3.64
Leaders provide explanation for major decisions.	3.56	<u>3.46</u>	3.70	<u>3.50</u>
My leaders/supervisors treat me with respect.	4.16	<u>3.98</u>	4.43	<u>4.07</u>
I have access to leaders when I have concerns/problems.	3.77	<u>3.60</u>	3.93	3.84
I am confident that college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of sexual harassment, bias, discrimination, or incivility.	4.19	<u>3.97</u>	4.38	4.30

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Within Department/Unit

Other than the paired adjectives, the same questions that were asked about the college in general, were also asked in terms of the respondents' unit/department. Due to low numbers responding for some of the units/departments, reporting for specific units will not be provided in this report to prevent possible identification of respondents. Due to the combining of all the department/units together, the information from this report should not be used to identify positive or negatives within a specific department/unit.

In terms of the climate towards specific groups, the climate within individual units/departments appears to be somewhat more positive than it is within the College itself. The only group this did not hold true for was for men. Over 50% of the respondents reported a positive climate for all groups at the unit department level. The highest levels of at least somewhat positive climate were with White (77.5%), men (73.9%) and internationals (71.9%). Those with the highest level of reported negative climate were women (15.1%), People of Color (13.0%) and those who are transgendered (12.7%). These are the same patterns as seen within the college itself.

Table 2.6a: Climate in Department/Unit Towards Specific Groups

How would you rate the climate within your department/unit for employees who are:	Very Negative 1	Somewhat Negative 2	Neutral 3	Somewhat Positive 4	Very Positive 5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Women	4.4%	10.7%	16.1%	25.5%	43.3%	298	3.93	1.190
Men	1.4%	5.8%	18.9%	13.4%	60.5%	291	4.26	1.043
Transgender	1.9%	10.8%	28.5%	19.0%	39.9%	158	3.84	1.126
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual	0.4%	6.9%	21.9%	22.7%	48.1%	233	4.11	1.002
People of Color	1.1%	11.9%	24.1%	20.7%	42.2%	270	3.91	1.111
White	1.0%	3.7%	17.8%	16.8%	60.7%	298	4.33	.959
Immigrants	1.6%	7.6%	21.9%	23.1%	45.8%	251	4.04	1.061
International	0.7%	7.9%	19.4%	21.9%	50.0%	278	4.13	1.031
Non-native English speakers	0.7%	11.0%	24.2%	22.0%	42.1%	273	3.94	1.081
Christian Religious Affiliations	2.7%	8.2%	36.4%	18.2%	34.5%	220	3.74	1.104
Non-Christian Religious Affiliations	0.0%	7.5%	39.0%	18.8%	34.7%	213	3.81	1.003

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).

Females did report that the climate was not as positive for women compared to what was reported by males (Table 2.6b). The reverse was found when looking at men with males feeling that the climate was not as positive for men as females did. Interestingly, there was no differences found between heterosexuals and members of the LBGTQIA2S+ community for those who were transgender or gay, lesbian, or bisexual. Those who were non-White reported the climate less positive for immigrants, internationals, and non-native English speakers than did those who were White. Employees of color rated the climate less positive for People of Color than did their counterparts. Those with disabilities were more likely to rate the climate less positive for seven of the groups. In general, the ratings were reported more positive within the units/departments than within the College itself.

Table 2.6b: Climate in Department/Unit Towards Specific Groups by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

How would you rate the climate within your department/unit for employees who are:	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Women	3.92	4.07	3.77	3.91	4.02	4.08	3.92	3.86	3.69	4.04
Men	4.23	3.99	4.51	4.36	4.43	3.86	4.23	4.56	4.31	4.31
Transgender	3.88	3.92	3.84	3.72	3.80	3.74	3.93	3.38	3.43	3.91
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual	4.14	4.12	4.16	4.11	4.17	3.88	4.19	3.85	3.98	4.20
People of Color	3.92	4.03	3.81	3.83	4.21	3.92	3.96	3.66	3.80	3.97
White	4.33	4.18	4.48	4.45	4.50	4.26	4.30	4.61	4.40	4.35
Immigrants	4.05	4.06	4.05	4.03	4.26	3.61	4.16	3.68	4.13	4.06
International	4.13	4.19	4.07	4.08	4.49	3.82	4.19	4.00	4.14	4.21
Non-native English speakers	3.96	4.03	3.89	3.88	4.28	3.73	4.01	3.81	3.87	4.07
Christian Religious Affiliations	3.74	3.72	3.76	3.83	3.83	3.50	3.80	3.73	3.68	3.84
Non-Christian Religious Affiliations	3.86	3.90	3.82	3.75	3.94	3.57	3.92	3.60	3.69	3.83

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).

Tenure-track faculty members reported lower positive climates for all groups and fixed-term faculty members reported lower positive climates for all but women (Table 2.6c). Postdocs reported lower positive climates for all but two of the groups (internationals and non-native English speakers). Academic specialists and support staff reported less groups having a negative climate.

Table 2.6c: Climate in Department/Unit Towards Specific Groups by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Employee Position

How would you rate the climate within your department/unit for employees who are:		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Women	3.93	3.72	4.06	4.13	3.94	4.05
Men	4.26	4.14	4.29	4.45	4.30	4.30
Transgender	3.84	3.73	3.78	3.93	3.64	4.02
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.11	3.88	4.29
People of Color	3.91	3.79	3.86	4.06	3.82	4.07
White	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.68	4.38	4.23
Immigrants	4.04	3.89	3.81	4.35	4.00	4.27
International	4.13	4.01	3.90	4.16	4.24	4.33
Non-native English speakers	3.94	3.81	3.59	4.12	4.04	4.17
Christian Religious Affiliations	3.73	3.71	3.58	4.46	3.46	3.64
Non-Christian Religious Affiliations	3.81	3.82	3.52	4.32	3.56	3.86

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).

Those in the Physical Sciences reported a less positive environment for seven of the eleven groups (Table 2.6d). Those in the Biological Sciences and those in Mathematics reported a less positive environment for four of the groups.

Table 2.6d: Climate in Department/Unit Towards Specific Groups by College District (Mean Scores)

How would you rate the climate within your department/unit for employees who are:	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Women	3.89	3.96	3.83	3.80
Men	4.24	4.28	4.14	4.31
Transgender	3.80	3.77	3.81	3.89
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual	4.09	4.12	4.05	4.07
People of Color	3.88	3.95	3.81	3.80
White	4.29	4.37	4.13	4.40
Immigrants	4.02	4.10	4.00	3.79
International	4.13	4.24	4.06	3.92
Non-native English speakers	3.88	3.88	3.98	3.65
Christian Religious Affiliations	3.75	3.75	3.70	3.86
Non-Christian Religious Affiliations	3.78	3.72	3.87	3.87

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).

In terms of disabilities and roles outside of work for units/departments, the highest percentages for positive were for parents/guardians of dependent children (72.8%), providing care for adults who are disabled and/or elderly (67.7%) and serviced/serving in the military (65.7%) (Table 2.7a). The highest percentages for negative responses were those with a mental health condition (22.0%), those with a physical disability (18.1%) and those with a learning disability (17.2%).

Table 2.7a: Climate in Department/Unit Towards Specific Disabilities/Roles Outside of Work

How would you rate the climate within your department/unit for employees who are or have:	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neutral	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
Mental Health Condition	3.6%	18.4%	21.1%	22.9%	34.1%	223	3.65	1.224
Physical Disability	2.5%	15.6%	17.6%	22.1%	42.2%	199	3.86	1.198
Learning Disability	2.1%	15.1%	22.9%	24.0%	35.9%	192	3.77	1.154
Parents/Guardians of Dependent Children	1.6%	9.6%	16.0%	27.6%	45.2%	250	4.05	1.069
Providing Care for Adults who are Disabled and/or Elderly	1.8%	6.5%	24.1%	22.4%	45.3%	170	4.03	1.057
Serviced/Serving in the Military	0.0%	3.6%	30.7%	16.1%	49.6%	137	4.12	.971

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).

When looking at the climate for those with disabilities and for those who hold certain roles outside of the university, there are differences by demographic characteristics. Females were more likely to report lower levels of positive climate for those with mental health conditions and physical disabilities as well as for adults caring for disabled/elderly. Males reported lower levels of positive climate for those associated with the military. Heterosexuals reported lower levels of positive climate for four of the six categories. Employees of color were more likely to report higher levels of positive climate for all six groups. Those with disability were more likely to report fewer positive climates for all categories associated with disability than those without disabilities.

Table 2.7b: Climate in Department/Unit Towards Specific Disabilities/Roles Outside of Work by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

How would you rate the climate within your department/unit for employees who are or have:	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Mental Health Condition	3.69	3.77	<u>3.61</u>	3.55	3.63	<u>3.63</u>	<u>3.69</u>	3.95	<u>3.54</u>	3.70
Physical Disability	3.92	3.97	<u>3.86</u>	<u>3.78</u>	4.10	<u>3.78</u>	3.91	3.95	<u>3.58</u>	3.97
Learning Disability	3.81	3.82	3.80	3.69	3.75	3.88	3.81	3.83	<u>3.57</u>	3.89
Parents/Guardians of Dependent Children	4.07	4.11	4.03	<u>3.99</u>	4.43	<u>3.85</u>	<u>4.06</u>	4.35	4.17	<u>4.03</u>
Providing Care for Adults who are Disabled and/or Elderly	4.06	4.11	<u>4.01</u>	<u>3.99</u>	4.28	<u>3.90</u>	<u>4.09</u>	4.20	<u>3.94</u>	4.14
Serviced/Serving in the Military	4.13	<u>4.01</u>	4.28	<u>4.14</u>	4.26	<u>3.60</u>	4.20	4.13	4.20	4.13
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).										

Tenure-track and fixed-term faculty members reported all six disabilities/roles as having a less positive climate (Table 2.7c). Postdocs had lower means scores (less positive) for all but those with physical disabilities. Academic specialists only reported a less positive climate for parents/guardians of dependent children. Support staff reported lower means scores for all three disabilities and for those that serviced/serving in the military.

Table 2.7c: Climate in Department/Unit Towards Specific Disabilities/Roles Outside of Work by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

How would you rate the climate within your department/unit for employees who are or have:	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Mental Health Condition	3.65	3.58	3.67	3.83	3.53	3.71
Physical Disability	3.86	3.60	3.62	4.23	4.31	4.05
Learning Disability	3.76	3.62	3.70	4.35	3.29	3.83
Parents/Guardians of Dependent Children	4.06	3.90	3.97	4.16	4.09	4.28
Providing Care for Adults who are Disabled and/or Elderly	4.03	3.86	3.79	4.39	3.70	4.35
Serviced/Serving in the Military	4.13	3.98	4.19	4.79	3.31	4.33
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).						

Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower positive climates for all disabilities and for those providing care for adults and those serviced/serving in the military (Table 2.7d) Those in the Physical Sciences reported lower positive climates for those with mental and physical disabilities and for all three roles. Those in Mathematics only reported a less positive climate for those that are parents/guardians of children.

Table 2.7d: Climate in the Department/Unit Towards Specific Disabilities/Roles Outside of Work by College District (Mean Scores)

How would you rate the climate within your department/unit for employees who are or have:	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Mental Health Condition	3.62	3.55	3.64	3.85
Physical Disability	3.81	3.74	3.76	4.10
Learning Disability	3.78	3.63	3.91	3.96
Parents/Guardians of Dependent Children	4.01	4.13	3.92	3.79
Providing Care for Adults who are Disabled and/or Elderly	4.05	4.06	3.91	4.27
Serviced/Serving in the Military	4.12	4.03	4.12	4.44
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to a very negative climate and 5 refers to a very positive climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered a positive climate and everything below it is considered a negative climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very negative climate or very positive climate).				

When asked about a series of statements about the welcoming nature of their department/unit and their sense of belonging, at least 60% of the respondents reported at least somewhat agreeing with the statements. The statements with the highest level of agreement were "I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group." (79.4%), "I feel valued as a person." (73.3%) and "People take time to welcome new employees." (70.1%). Those with the highest levels of disagreement were "I feel a sense of belonging." (20.7%), "People take time to get to know new employees." (19.0%), and "I feel supported to actively contribute to a vision of excellence in equity and inclusion across all areas of my work." (18.3%). These patterns do not match those within the college itself.

Table 2.8a: Attitudes about Welcoming and Belonging Within Department/Unit

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to welcoming and belonging within your department/unit.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
People take time to welcome new employees.	4.6%	12.8%	12.5%	39.0%	31.1%	305	3.79	1.150
People take time to get to know new employees.	5.2%	13.8%	16.4%	44.6%	20.0%	305	3.60	1.111
People work closely together.	5.6%	11.5%	13.8%	33.4%	35.7%	305	3.82	1.195
People create a sense of belonging for others.	6.0%	11.3%	15.0%	43.5%	24.3%	301	3.69	1.135
I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.	3.4%	5.7%	11.5%	27.0%	52.4%	296	4.19	1.067
I feel a sense of belonging.	7.8%	12.9%	10.0%	30.1%	39.2%	309	3.80	1.294
I feel supported to actively contribute to a vision of excellence in equity and inclusion across all areas of my work.	8.0%	10.3%	13.3%	31.3%	37.0%	300	3.79	1.264
I feel valued as a person.	6.2%	12.0%	8.4%	32.1%	41.2%	308	3.90	1.236
I am confident we will become more diverse, inclusive, and equitable over the next five years.	7.7%	8.7%	14.0%	34.0%	35.7%	300	3.81	1.226

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

In terms of welcomeness and belonging within departments/units, there are some demographic characteristic differences. Males reported lower level of agreement for two of the statements. Heterosexuals reported lower levels of agreement for all but two of the statements. Employees of color reported lower levels of agreement for all the statements compared to the other two groups. Those with disabilities were more likely to report lower levels of agreement for all but one of the statements.

Table 2.8b: Attitudes about Belonging Within Department/Unit by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to welcoming and belonging within your department/unit.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
People take time to welcome new employees.	3.79	3.74	3.85	3.72	4.17	3.97	3.78	3.68	3.73	3.87
People take time to get to know new employees.	3.62	3.62	3.61	3.54	3.89	3.86	3.60	3.54	3.61	3.71
People work closely together.	3.83	3.80	3.86	3.85	4.09	3.79	3.90	3.55	3.84	3.91
People create a sense of belonging for others.	3.69	3.74	3.65	3.67	3.91	4.06	3.68	3.50	3.38	3.86
I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.	4.20	4.21	4.20	4.24	4.36	4.08	4.26	4.00	4.05	4.42
I feel a sense of belonging.	3.81	3.82	3.80	3.85	3.89	3.93	3.82	3.72	3.35	4.03
I feel supported to actively contribute to a vision of excellence in equity and inclusion across all areas of my work.	3.79	3.74	3.84	3.82	4.00	3.83	3.82	3.72	3.58	4.01
I feel valued as a person.	3.90	3.93	3.86	3.99	4.00	3.90	3.94	3.72	3.52	4.18
I am confident we will become more diverse, inclusive, and equitable over the next five years.	3.80	3.84	3.76	3.82	4.00	3.92	3.83	3.57	3.69	3.92

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Faculty members with more likely to have lower levels of agreement than the other employee positions with tenure-track faculty reporting lower levels of agreement for all attitudes and fixed-term faculty reporting lower levels of agreement for all except confidences in the department becoming more diverse/inclusive/equitable in the next five years (Table 2.8c).

Table 2.8c: Attitudes about Belonging Within Department/Unit by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to welcoming and belonging within your department/unit.	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
People take time to welcome new employees.	3.80	3.61	3.81	3.79	3.83	4.08
People take time to get to know new employees.	3.61	3.41	3.69	3.50	3.71	3.87
People work closely together.	3.83	3.61	3.71	3.97	4.11	4.00
People create a sense of belonging for others.	3.68	3.51	3.68	3.62	3.94	3.85
I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.	4.20	3.97	4.25	4.31	4.39	4.37
I feel a sense of belonging.	3.79	3.70	3.70	3.87	3.94	3.85
I feel supported to actively contribute to a vision of excellence in equity and inclusion across all areas of my work.	3.78	3.67	3.69	4.30	4.00	3.65
I feel valued as a person.	3.90	3.74	3.81	4.15	4.20	3.91
I am confident we will become more diverse, inclusive, and equitable over the next five years.	3.82	3.70	4.03	3.90	3.78	3.90
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).						

Those in the Physical Sciences and Mathematics were more likely to report lower levels of agreement for most of the statements related to welcoming and belonging within their department/unit (Table 2.8d). Those in the biological sciences only had a lower level of agreement with one statement – "I feel a sense of belonging."

Table 2.8d: Attitudes about Welcoming and Belonging Within Department/Unit by College District (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to welcoming and belonging within your department/unit.	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
People take time to welcome new employees.	3.78	3.85	3.70	3.75
People take time to get to know new employees.	3.59	3.70	3.41	3.63
People work closely together.	3.79	3.88	3.78	3.46
People create a sense of belonging for others.	3.68	3.74	3.55	3.74
I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.	4.15	4.25	4.08	3.97
I feel a sense of belonging.	3.78	3.75	3.85	3.71
I feel supported to actively contribute to a vision of excellence in equity and inclusion across all areas of my work.	3.75	3.75	3.76	3.77
I feel valued as a person.	3.86	3.94	3.78	3.75
I am confident we will become more diverse, inclusive, and equitable over the next five years.	3.82	3.91	3.74	3.66

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

In terms of values and relationships within the departments/units, over 50% of the respondents stated that they at least somewhat agreed with each statement. Over three-quarters of the respondents at least somewhat agreed with "My leaders/supervisors treat me with respect." (85.1%), "I have access to leaders when I have concerns/problems." (83.2%), and "Leaders values my contributions." (75.2%). Of concern is that half of the statements in the table have over 20% of the respondents stating that they either somewhat or strongly disagreed with the statement. As stated before, this does not imply that all departments/units have potential problems, but it does indicate that at least some do.

Table 2.9a: Values and Relationships Within Department/Unit

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning values and relationships in your department/unit.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree			
	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
We operate in a clear and transparent manner.	12.9%	16.1%	11.5%	31.8%	27.6%	286	3.45	1.380
Leaders values my contributions.	6.3%	8.7%	9.8%	28.7%	46.5%	286	4.00	1.218
People care about my general satisfaction at work.	11.6%	13.4%	15.5%	31.0%	28.5%	284	3.51	1.338
I can voice my opinions openly.	9.0%	14.2%	8.0%	27.7%	41.2%	289	3.78	1.351
People listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.	9.5%	9.5%	13.9%	39.8%	27.4%	274	3.66	1.240
People care about my personal well-being.	6.7%	8.5%	14.1%	29.3%	41.3%	283	3.90	1.222
Leaders clearly communicate the strategic plan, work plans, and other strategic directions.	11.7%	13.1%	11.0%	31.2%	33.0%	282	3.61	1.367
Leaders make major decisions with input from employees.	14.0%	10.1%	11.5%	32.4%	32.0%	278	3.58	1.391
Leaders provide explanation for major decisions.	11.3%	12.0%	7.8%	29.7%	39.2%	283	3.73	1.380
My leaders/supervisors treat me with respect.	2.4%	6.9%	5.5%	23.4%	61.7%	290	4.35	1.022
I have access to leaders when I have concerns/problems.	3.8%	5.6%	7.3%	25.2%	58.0%	286	4.28	1.072
I am confident that unit leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of sexual harassment, bias, discrimination, or incivility.	3.3%	6.1%	12.6%	19.1%	58.9%	246	4.24	1.094

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

In terms of demographic differences, females reported less agreement on four of the twelve statements. Heterosexuals reported lower agreement on four and members of the LBGTQIA2S+ community reported lower on one. Asians reported higher levels of agreement on all the statements compared to the counterparts. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement for all the statements.

Table 2.9b: Values and Relationships Within Department/Unit by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning values and relationships in your department/unit.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
We operate in a clear and transparent manner.	3.45	3.56	3.34	3.46	3.56	3.78	3.42	3.38	3.23	3.63
Leaders values my contributions.	4.00	4.01	3.98	4.09	4.00	4.17	4.01	3.82	3.62	4.19
People care about my general satisfaction at work.	3.50	3.52	3.48	3.50	3.64	3.60	3.52	3.39	3.12	3.81
I can voice my opinions openly.	3.77	3.79	3.75	3.83	3.91	3.74	3.80	3.71	3.35	4.09
People listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.	3.67	3.77	3.56	3.65	3.71	3.88	3.68	3.44	3.14	3.95
People care about my personal well-being.	3.92	3.89	3.95	3.98	3.95	3.94	3.92	3.83	3.66	4.09
Leaders clearly communicate the strategic plan, work plans, and other strategic directions.	3.57	3.58	3.57	3.63	3.64	3.94	3.53	3.46	3.45	3.74
Leaders make major decisions with input from employees.	3.57	3.58	3.55	3.59	3.74	4.24	3.47	3.52	3.33	3.73
Leaders provide explanation for major decisions.	3.73	3.75	3.72	3.77	3.91	4.11	3.71	3.57	3.56	3.85
My leaders/supervisors treat me with respect.	4.34	4.41	4.28	4.42	4.38	4.41	4.37	4.21	4.08	4.54
I have access to leaders when I have concerns/problems.	4.28	4.31	4.24	4.42	4.16	4.30	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.47
I am confident that unit leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of sexual harassment, bias, discrimination, or incivility.	4.25	4.32	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.11	4.37

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Faculty members reported lower levels of agreement with the statements about values and relationships within their departments with tenure-track faculty reporting lower agreement with all the statements and fixed-term reporting lower agreement with all but one of the statements (having access to leadership) (Table 2.9c). Support staff also reported lower levels of agreement with all statements. Postdocs only reported a lower level of agreement with confidence in leaderships ability to handle reports of sexual misconduct/bias/discrimination/incivility.

Table 2.9c: Values and Relationships Within Department/Unit by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning values and relationships in your department/unit.	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
We operate in a clear and transparent manner.	3.46	3.26	3.35	3.29	4.26	3.51
Leaders values my contributions.	4.01	3.90	4.03	4.26	4.55	3.79
People care about my general satisfaction at work.	3.51	3.35	3.44	3.69	3.82	3.56
I can voice my opinions openly.	3.78	3.71	3.72	3.83	3.94	3.81
People listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.	3.66	3.64	3.64	3.75	4.03	**3.49**
People care about my personal well-being.	3.90	3.66	3.74	4.21	4.16	4.05
Leaders clearly communicate the strategic plan, work plans, and other strategic directions.	3.61	3.36	3.91	3.76	4.26	3.44
Leaders make major decisions with input from employees.	3.58	3.57	3.82	3.44	4.07	3.38
Leaders provide explanation for major decisions.	3.74	3.53	4.09	3.79	4.22	3.64
My leaders/supervisors treat me with respect.	4.35	4.28	4.32	4.54	4.67	4.22
I have access to leaders when I have concerns/problems.	4.28	4.22	4.39	4.39	4.44	4.19
I am confident that unit leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of sexual harassment, bias, discrimination, or incivility.	4.24	4.21	4.31	4.44	4.21	4.19
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).						

Those in the Physical Sciences reported less agreement with three-quarters of the statements about values and relationships within their department/unit (Table 2.9d). Those in Mathematics reported less agreement with five of the twelve statements. Those in the Biological Sciences only had lower levels of agreements for two statements.

Table 2.9d: Values and Relationships Within Department/Unit by College District (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning values and relationships in your department/unit.	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
We operate in a clear and transparent manner.	3.48	3.65	3.23	3.50
Leaders values my contributions.	3.99	4.11	3.76	4.11
People care about my general satisfaction at work.	3.49	3.57	3.37	3.49
I can voice my opinions openly.	3.77	3.82	3.74	3.63
People listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.	3.66	3.63	3.75	3.50
People care about my personal well-being.	3.83	3.94	3.70	3.75
Leaders clearly communicate the strategic plan, work plans, and other strategic directions.	3.62	3.85	3.27	3.60
Leaders make major decisions with input from employees.	3.60	3.81	3.24	3.79
Leaders provide explanation for major decisions.	3.77	3.96	3.43	3.89
My leaders/supervisors treat me with respect.	4.35	4.41	4.25	4.36
I have access to leaders when I have concerns/problems.	4.25	4.32	4.09	4.36
I am confident that college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of sexual harassment, bias, discrimination, or incivility.	4.21	4.09	4.33	4.38

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

LEADERSHIP AND INCLUSION

Respondents were asked a series of questions about leadership in both the college and in their individual departments/units. In terms of the college leadership, over 50% of the respondents at least somewhat agreed with each of the statements (Table 2.10a). The statements with the highest agreement were "Leaders provide time and support to employees to participate in DEI professional development." (74.0%), "Leaders clearly outline expectations for employees for creating a respectful, inclusive, and non-discriminatory environment." (72.0%), and "Leaders take actions that promote an inclusive and equitable work environment." (68.9%). The statements with the highest levels of disagreement were "There is a high level of mutual trust between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion." (23.5%), "Leaders are open to hiring non-traditional job candidates – that is, the skills and potential of the candidate beyond their education and work experience are taken into consideration." (20.5%), "Leaders take actions that maintain an inclusive and equitable work environment." (18.3%), and "Leaders provide time and support to employees to build DEI into unit work, programs, policies, and services." (18.3%)

Table 2.10a: Attitudes about Leadership and Inclusion Within College

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding leadership within the College of Natural Science as a whole.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev

	1	2	3	4	5			
There is a high level of mutual trust between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	9.0%	14.5%	25.3%	29.0%	22.2%	221	3.41	1.235
There is a high level of respect between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	6.8%	7.2%	21.7%	33.0%	31.2%	221	3.75	1.171
Leaders clearly outline expectations for employees for creating a respectful, inclusive, and non-discriminatory environment.	6.2%	9.1%	12.8%	39.1%	32.9%	243	3.84	1.163
Leaders take actions that promote an inclusive and equitable work environment.	7.3%	8.2%	15.5%	37.9%	31.0%	232	3.77	1.186
Leaders take actions that maintain an inclusive and equitable work environment.	10.9%	7.4%	14.3%	37.0%	30.4%	230	3.69	1.277
Leaders serve as role models for promoting equity and inclusion.	7.7%	7.7%	19.7%	35.9%	29.1%	234	3.71	1.187
Leaders make a conscious effort to identify barriers related to DEI.	6.3%	11.3%	16.7%	35.3%	30.3%	221	3.72	1.192
Leaders make a conscious effort to address barriers related to DEI.	7.0%	5.7%	20.0%	35.2%	32.2%	230	3.80	1.157
Leaders provide time and support to employees to build DEI into unit work, programs, policies, and services.	5.4%	12.9%	16.1%	36.6%	29.0%	224	3.71	1.172
Leaders provide time and support to employees to participate in DEI professional development.	3.1%	7.0%	15.9%	33.5%	40.5%	227	4.01	1.062
Leaders recognize employees who contribute positively to create an inclusive and equitable workforce.	7.0%	10.1%	15.9%	33.5%	33.5%	227	3.76	1.218
Leaders are open to hiring non-traditional job candidates – that is, the skills and potential of the candidate beyond their education and work experience are taken into consideration.	9.7%	10.8%	20.4%	30.1%	29.0%	186	3.58	1.276

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Some differences were apparent across demographic characteristics groups in terms of their agreement with the statements about leadership and inclusion (Table 2.10b). Within gender identify, females were lower on two items and males were lower on two items than their counterparts. For sexual orientation, those within the LBGTQIA2S+ community were less in agreement on ten of the twelve statements compared to those who are heterosexual. Those who are Asian reported high levels of agreement than their counterparts across all statements. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement across all statements compared to those without disabilities.

Table 2.10b: Attitudes about Leadership and Inclusion Within College by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding leadership within the College of Natural Science as a whole.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
There is a high level of mutual trust between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	3.43	3.33	3.53	3.46	3.56	3.72	3.40	3.42	2.98	3.77
There is a high level of respect between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	3.73	3.74	3.72	3.87	3.56	3.90	3.75	3.54	3.19	4.07
Leaders clearly outline expectations for employees for creating a respectful, inclusive, and non-discriminatory environment.	3.81	3.82	3.81	3.90	3.89	4.20	3.79	3.67	3.52	4.11
Leaders take actions that promote an inclusive and equitable work environment.	3.77	3.77	3.77	3.89	3.56	3.97	3.78	3.70	3.32	4.09
Leaders take actions that maintain an inclusive and equitable work environment.	3.69	3.76	3.60	3.79	3.58	4.00	3.70	3.39	3.15	4.04
Leaders serve as role models for promoting equity and inclusion.	3.71	3.72	3.70	3.84	3.48	4.03	3.71	3.42	3.12	4.07
Leaders make a conscious effort to identify barriers related to DEI.	3.74	3.79	3.70	3.72	3.44	4.15	3.76	3.41	3.25	3.94
Leaders make a conscious effort to address barriers related to DEI.	3.79	3.80	3.77	3.87	3.60	3.93	3.86	3.39	3.34	4.06
Leaders provide time and support to employees to build DEI into unit work, programs, policies, and services.	3.72	3.67	3.77	3.76	3.62	3.96	3.74	3.57	3.29	3.97
Leaders provide time and support to employees to participate in DEI professional development.	4.02	4.00	4.04	4.03	3.62	4.10	4.07	3.86	3.61	4.13
Leaders recognize employees who contribute positively to create an inclusive and equitable workforce.	3.77	3.76	3.77	3.84	3.63	4.07	3.75	3.75	3.12	4.10
Leaders are open to hiring non-traditional job candidates – that is, the skills and potential of the candidate beyond their education and work experience are taken into consideration.	3.58	3.67	3.47	3.68	3.40	3.96	3.50	3.50	2.92	3.82

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Fixed-term faculty reported lower levels of agreement for all the twelve statements and tenure-track faculty reported lower levels for all but two of the statements (Table 2.10c). Support staff reported lower levels of agreement on all but one of the statements. Academic specialists had lower levels of agreement for seven of the statements and postdocs only had lower levels for four of the statements.

Table 2.10c: Attitudes about Leadership and Inclusion Within College by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding leadership within the College of Natural Science as a whole.	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
There is a high level of mutual trust between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	3.41	3.41	3.21	3.45	3.75	3.41
There is a high level of respect between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	3.75	3.85	3.54	3.84	3.94	3.58
Leaders clearly outline expectations for employees for creating a respectful, inclusive, and non-discriminatory environment.	3.84	3.93	3.52	3.94	4.10	3.69
Leaders take actions that promote an inclusive and equitable work environment.	3.78	3.84	3.52	3.97	4.10	3.60
Leaders take actions that maintain an inclusive and equitable work environment.	3.70	3.83	3.29	3.74	3.95	3.61
Leaders serve as role models for promoting equity and inclusion.	3.72	3.75	3.41	3.82	4.13	3.66
Leaders make a conscious effort to identify barriers related to DEI.	3.74	3.73	3.75	4.10	3.67	3.57
Leaders make a conscious effort to address barriers related to DEI.	3.81	3.87	3.77	4.06	3.76	3.59
Leaders provide time and support to employees to build DEI into unit work, programs, policies, and services.	3.72	3.63	3.52	3.97	3.83	3.79
Leaders provide time and support to employees to participate in DEI professional development.	4.02	3.98	4.00	4.31	3.89	3.96
Leaders recognize employees who contribute positively to create an inclusive and equitable workforce.	3.78	3.90	3.56	3.84	3.84	3.61
Leaders are open to hiring non-traditional job candidates – that is, the skills and potential of the candidate beyond their education and work experience are taken into consideration.	3.59	3.51	3.64	3.46	3.82	3.76

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower levels of agreement with all but one of the twelve statements (leadership provides time/support for DEI training) (Table 2.10c). Those in the Physical Sciences had lower levels of agreement for three-quarters of the statements. Those in Mathematics only had one statement with a lower level of agreement – leadership provides time/support for DEI training.

Table 2.10d: Attitudes about Leadership and Inclusion Within College by College Districts (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding leadership within the College of Natural Science as a whole.	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
There is a high level of mutual trust between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	3.45	3.39	3.51	3.48
There is a high level of respect between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	3.76	3.71	3.79	3.83
Leaders clearly outline expectations for employees for creating a respectful, inclusive, and non-discriminatory environment.	3.85	3.71	3.88	4.24
Leaders take actions that promote an inclusive and equitable work environment.	3.78	3.62	3.87	4.06
Leaders take actions that maintain an inclusive and equitable work environment.	3.72	3.53	3.86	4.00
Leaders serve as role models for promoting equity and inclusion.	3.71	3.53	3.84	3.97
Leaders make a conscious effort to identify barriers related to DEI.	3.73	3.56	3.77	4.17
Leaders make a conscious effort to address barriers related to DEI.	3.82	3.66	3.86	4.18
Leaders provide time and support to employees to build DEI into unit work, programs, policies, and services.	3.69	3.57	3.67	4.07
Leaders provide time and support to employees to participate in DEI professional development.	3.99	4.02	4.01	3.88
Leaders recognize employees who contribute positively to create an inclusive and equitable workforce.	3.79	3.65	3.83	4.13
Leaders are open to hiring non-traditional job candidates – that is, the skills and potential of the candidate beyond their education and work experience are taken into consideration.	3.60	3.51	3.51	4.04

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

When looking at the statements about leadership and inclusion at the department/unit level, there is generally lower levels of agreement with the statements compared to at the college level (Table 2.11a). Again over 50% of the respondents at least somewhat agreed with the statements, but the percentage of respondents who agreed is generally lower than seen at the college level. The highest levels of agreement were for "Leaders provide time and support to employees to participate in DEI professional development." (74.3%), "Leaders clearly outline expectations for employees for creating a respectful, inclusive, and non-discriminatory environment." (68.3%), and "Leaders take actions that promote an inclusive and equitable work environment." (67.9%). The statements with the highest levels of disagreement were "There is a high level of mutual trust between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion." (27.1%), "Leaders make a conscious effort to identify barriers related to DEI." (21.1%), and "Leaders take actions that maintain an inclusive and equitable work environment." (20.0%).

Table 2.11a: Attitudes about Leadership and Inclusion Within Department/Unit

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding leadership within your department/unit.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
There is a high level of mutual trust between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	10.7%	16.4%	17.9%	31.1%	23.9%	280	3.41	1.303
There is a high level of respect between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	9.7%	8.0%	17.3%	31.5%	33.6%	289	3.71	1.274
Leaders clearly outline expectations for employees for creating a respectful, inclusive, and non-discriminatory environment.	10.0%	9.0%	12.8%	39.0%	29.3%	290	3.69	1.259
Leaders take actions that promote an inclusive and equitable work environment.	8.7%	10.1%	13.2%	36.9%	31.0%	287	3.71	1.247
Leaders take actions that maintain an inclusive and equitable work environment.	11.2%	8.8%	13.7%	35.1%	31.2%	285	3.66	1.305
Leaders serve as role models for promoting equity and inclusion.	8.7%	9.7%	15.9%	34.9%	30.8%	289	3.70	1.243
Leaders make a conscious effort to identify barriers related to DEI.	8.4%	12.7%	21.5%	36.4%	21.1%	275	3.49	1.197
Leaders make a conscious effort to address barriers related to DEI.	9.0%	8.3%	18.0%	33.8%	30.9%	278	3.69	1.242
Leaders provide time and support to employees to build DEI into unit work, programs, policies, and services.	6.6%	12.8%	15.8%	31.9%	33.0%	273	3.72	1.233
Leaders provide time and support to employees to participate in DEI professional development.	5.1%	6.2%	14.5%	31.9%	42.4%	276	4.00	1.130
Leaders recognize employees who contribute positively to create an inclusive and equitable workforce.	8.9%	9.6%	18.2%	26.4%	36.8%	280	3.73	1.292
Leaders are open to hiring non-traditional job candidates – that is, the skills and potential of the candidate beyond their education and work experience are taken into consideration.	6.8%	11.6%	20.0%	25.2%	36.4%	250	3.73	1.254

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Unlike at the college level, there are seven statements in which females are reported lower levels of agreement (Table 2.11b). In terms of sexual orientation, there were three of the twelve statements that heterosexuals reported lower levels of agreement. For race, Asians reported higher levels of agreement for all, but one of the statements. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement for all the statements.

Table 2.11b: Attitudes about Leadership and Inclusion Within Department/Unit by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Score)

	Overall	Gender Identity	Sexual Orientation	Race	Disability

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding leadership within your department/unit.	Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
There is a high level of mutual trust between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	3.41	3.40	3.43	3.37	3.61	3.67	3.41	3.26	3.02	3.65
There is a high level of respect between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	3.70	3.73	3.66	3.77	3.70	3.89	3.72	3.44	3.38	3.87
Leaders clearly outline expectations for employees for creating a respectful, inclusive, and non-discriminatory environment.	3.65	3.75	3.55	3.69	3.82	4.00	3.64	3.37	3.44	3.88
Leaders take actions that promote an inclusive and equitable work environment.	3.71	3.78	3.65	3.69	3.82	3.92	3.75	3.33	3.21	3.93
Leaders take actions that maintain an inclusive and equitable work environment.	3.66	3.73	3.60	3.68	3.73	3.84	3.70	3.33	3.25	3.87
Leaders serve as role models for promoting equity and inclusion.	3.69	3.76	3.62	3.72	3.77	4.03	3.70	3.26	3.31	3.89
Leaders make a conscious effort to identify barriers related to DEI.	3.49	3.60	3.38	3.48	3.55	3.59	3.55	3.04	3.22	3.65
Leaders make a conscious effort to address barriers related to DEI.	3.68	3.78	3.58	3.72	3.68	3.74	3.77	3.12	3.38	3.93
Leaders provide time and support to employees to build DEI into unit work, programs, policies, and services.	3.72	3.76	3.68	3.69	3.74	3.86	3.77	3.37	3.40	3.88
Leaders provide time and support to employees to participate in DEI professional development.	4.00	4.02	3.98	3.96	3.93	3.91	4.07	3.89	3.71	4.17
Leaders recognize employees who contribute positively to create an inclusive and equitable workforce.	3.69	3.70	3.69	3.76	3.81	3.89	3.72	3.41	3.35	3.97
Leaders are open to hiring non-traditional job candidates – that is, the skills and potential of the candidate beyond their education and work experience are taken into consideration.	3.70	3.76	3.65	3.69	3.78	3.70	3.72	3.52	3.37	3.81

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Tenure-track faculty and support staff reported lower levels of agreement for all statement regarding leadership/inclusion within their department/unit (Table 2.11c). Fixed-term faculty provided lower levels of agreement for seven of the statements and academic specialists reported them for eight statements. Postdocs only reported lower levels of agreement for two statements.

Table 2.11c: Attitudes about Leadership and Inclusion Within Department/Unit by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Employee Position

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding leadership within your department/unit.		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
There is a high level of mutual trust between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	3.41	3.15	3.59	3.28	3.93	3.58
There is a high level of respect between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	3.72	3.51	3.76	3.82	4.28	3.69
Leaders clearly outline expectations for employees for creating a respectful, inclusive, and non-discriminatory environment.	3.68	3.54	3.62	3.67	4.06	3.75
Leaders take actions that promote an inclusive and equitable work environment.	3.72	3.58	3.71	3.83	4.13	3.69
Leaders take actions that maintain an inclusive and equitable work environment.	3.67	3.52	3.69	3.76	4.23	3.61
Leaders serve as role models for promoting equity and inclusion.	3.70	3.45	3.80	3.83	4.19	3.75
Leaders make a conscious effort to identify barriers related to DEI.	3.50	3.36	3.79	3.63	3.76	3.43
Leaders make a conscious effort to address barriers related to DEI.	3.70	3.58	4.00	3.82	4.07	3.54
Leaders provide time and support to employees to build DEI into unit work, programs, policies, and services.	3.72	3.42	3.91	3.97	4.00	3.83
Leaders provide time and support to employees to participate in DEI professional development.	4.00	3.76	4.06	4.39	4.07	4.09
Leaders recognize employees who contribute positively to create an inclusive and equitable workforce.	3.73	3.58	3.97	3.89	3.90	3.69
Leaders are open to hiring non-traditional job candidates – that is, the skills and potential of the candidate beyond their education and work experience are taken into consideration.	3.74	3.61	3.94	3.87	3.61	3.82
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).						

Those in the Physical Sciences reported lower levels of agreement for all twelve statements (Table 2.11d). Those in the Biological Sciences had lower levels for five of the statement and Mathematics only had two statements with a lower level of agreement.

Table 2.11d: Attitudes about Leadership and Inclusion Within Department/Unit by College Districts (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding leadership within your department/unit.	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
There is a high level of mutual trust between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	3.40	3.51	3.23	3.43
There is a high level of respect between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.	3.71	3.89	3.46	3.67
Leaders clearly outline expectations for employees for creating a respectful, inclusive, and non-discriminatory environment.	3.70	3.75	3.57	3.79
Leaders take actions that promote an inclusive and equitable work environment.	3.71	3.76	3.50	4.03
Leaders take actions that maintain an inclusive and equitable work environment.	3.67	3.72	3.55	3.77
Leaders serve as role models for promoting equity and inclusion.	3.70	3.75	3.51	3.95
Leaders make a conscious effort to identify barriers related to DEI.	3.50	3.55	3.35	3.69
Leaders make a conscious effort to address barriers related to DEI.	3.72	3.79	3.55	3.87
Leaders provide time and support to employees to build DEI into unit work, programs, policies, and services.	3.71	3.83	3.48	3.80
Leaders provide time and support to employees to participate in DEI professional development.	3.97	4.07	3.90	3.82
Leaders recognize employees who contribute positively to create an inclusive and equitable workforce.	3.71	3.81	3.46	3.94
Leaders are open to hiring non-traditional job candidates – that is, the skills and potential of the candidate beyond their education and work experience are taken into consideration.	3.74	3.80	3.56	3.94

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

HIRING PRACTICES

Respondents were first asked if they had been members of a hiring committee in the past three years. Forty-seven percent of respondents reported that they had served on a committee (Table 2.12). Of the respondents that stated they had been on a committee, the distribution across the various demographic variables differed from the demographic characteristic distribution of the respondents. Males, heterosexual, Whites, and those without disabilities were more likely to participate on a committee than their counterparts. This underrepresentation of certain groups within hiring committees could create a less diverse applicant pool if other measures to increase participation were not taken.

Table 2.12: Serving on Hiring Committee by Demographic Variables

	Overall	Gender Identity	Sexual Orientation	Race	Disability

In the past three years, (that is since the beginning of the 2019 academic year), did you serve on a committee charged with hiring faculty, academic staff, or leadership?		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Participated on hiring committee		47.0%	48.7%	41.8%	48.9%	34.0%	35.0%	48.2%	39.3%	41.9%	47.6%

For those who had serviced on a hiring committee, a list of hiring practices that could increase the diversity of potential candidates was presented and respondents were asked to select all practices that had been used when they were on the committee (Table 2.13). Over three-quarters of respondents reported encouraging faculty/staff not on the committee to refer candidates from diverse backgrounds (89.0%), using personal/professional networks to identify/recruit candidates from diverse backgrounds (82.9%) and/or reaching out to professional organizations representing diverse groups (75.3%). Least reported practices were attending/engaging in networking events that catered to diverse groups (24.0%) and appointing a person of color as the committee chair (15.8%). All practices had at least some use.

Table 2.13: Resources/Practices used During Hiring Process

	Percent of Cases
Encouraged faculty and staff to refer candidates from diverse backgrounds	89.0%
Used personal and professional networks to identify and recruit candidates from diverse backgrounds	82.9%
Reached out to professional organizations representing diverse groups.	75.3%
Used on-line professional social networking media such as LinkedIn or Facebook	58.2%
Attended or engaged in networking events that catered to a diverse crowd.	24.0%
Advertised the position on women/underrepresented groups websites	67.8%
Contacted colleagues from underrepresented backgrounds to get possible candidate names/recommendations.	50.0%
Appointed a woman as the search committee chair	50.0%
Appointed a person of color as the search committee chair	15.8%

INNOVATION SUPPORT

Respondents were asked about innovation opportunities and support within the college, as well as within their own unit/department. The statement "There is resistance to doing or trying something new" is stated in the negative. When referring to that statement, disagreement will be treated as agreement and agreement as disagreement.

Within the college, the statements with the highest level of agreement were "People here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects." (73.8%), "I have sufficient discretion and freedom to use some of my time to explore new ideas and ways of doing things." (68.8%) and "Leads encourage collaboration across functions and disciplines." (68.4%) (Table 2.14a). In terms of disagreement, five of the twelve statements have levels of disagreement over 20%. The highest levels of disagreement are with "Leaders reward innovation." (26.0%), "Leaders allocate a suitable portion of resources to work that extends beyond the status quo." (25.9%), and "Our announced visions and strategies inspire me." (22.8%).

Table 2.14a: Innovation Support Within College

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to innovation within the college.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
Our announced visions and strategies inspire me.	10.4%	12.4%	31.1%	26.1%	19.9%	241	3.33	1.223
We have an outward focus on impact, purpose, and solutions that helps to drive innovation.	7.0%	7.9%	27.4%	34.4%	23.3%	215	3.59	1.136
I have sufficient discretion and freedom to use some of my time to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.	7.8%	8.3%	15.1%	30.7%	38.1%	218	3.83	1.242
I can have conversations with my supervisor/chair/director about longer-term work goals, not just immediate productivity demands.	12.0%	9.9%	21.5%	20.9%	35.6%	191	3.58	1.374
Leaders support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches to my work.	6.5%	11.4%	22.4%	26.4%	33.3%	201	3.69	1.227
There is resistance to doing or trying something new. (reverse coded) *	22.1%	31.4%	25.0%	13.2%	8.3%	204	2.54	1.209
Leaders recognize innovation.	5.8%	10.1%	19.2%	33.7%	31.3%	208	3.75	1.170
Leaders reward innovation.	11.0%	15.0%	22.0%	31.0%	21.0%	200	3.36	1.272
Leads encourage collaboration across functions and disciplines.	4.9%	6.7%	20.0%	26.2%	42.2%	225	3.94	1.154
Leaders allocate a suitable portion of resources to work that extends beyond the status quo.	9.0%	16.9%	29.1%	27.0%	18.0%	189	3.28	1.203
People here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.	3.6%	8.1%	14.5%	39.4%	34.4%	221	3.93	1.068
Our performance evaluation criteria encourage working in familiar/proven ways and areas.	5.9%	8.9%	31.0%	29.6%	24.6%	203	3.58	1.129

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

* The above does not hold true for "There is resistance to doing or trying something new." which is reverse coded. For this statement, because it is phrased in a negative form, an agree response is means there is resistance towards innovation and a disagree response means there is not.

Males reported lower levels of agreement for seven of the twelve statements than did females (Table 2.14b). In terms of sexual orientation, heterosexuals reported lower levels of agreement for two of the statements and members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community reported lower levels of agreement for eight of the statements. Asians reported higher levels of agreement for all but two of the statements than Whites or employees of color. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement for all statements compared to their counterparts.

Table 2.14b: Innovation Support Within the College by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to innovation within the college.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Our announced visions and strategies inspire me.	3.33	3.20	3.47	3.44	3.47	3.67	3.29	3.35	3.08	3.61
We have an outward focus on impact, purpose, and solutions that helps to drive innovation.	3.60	3.48	3.74	3.61	3.84	3.75	3.60	3.62	3.36	3.84
I have sufficient discretion and freedom to use some of my time to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.	3.82	3.72	3.93	3.96	3.61	4.08	3.86	3.46	3.40	4.07
I can have conversations with my supervisor/chair/director about longer-term work goals, not just immediate productivity demands.	3.55	3.49	3.64	3.75	3.59	3.65	3.54	3.62	3.10	3.95
Leaders support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches to my work.	3.68	3.65	3.71	3.88	3.42	3.75	3.69	3.73	3.21	4.07
There is resistance to doing or trying something new. *(reverse coded)* *	2.53	*2.57*	2.49	2.35	*2.62*	*2.79*	2.47	2.39	*2.74*	2.33
Leaders recognize innovation.	3.75	3.60	3.91	3.85	3.67	4.18	3.69	3.75	3.27	4.07
Leaders reward innovation.	3.34	3.21	3.48	3.48	3.26	3.88	3.29	3.32	2.90	3.74
Leads encourage collaboration across functions and disciplines.	3.91	3.93	3.89	4.10	3.86	4.26	3.87	3.96	3.73	4.16
Leaders allocate a suitable portion of resources to work that extends beyond the status quo.	3.25	3.27	3.22	3.29	3.41	3.83	3.12	3.45	2.87	3.53
People here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.	3.93	3.84	4.02	4.10	3.92	4.04	3.96	3.84	3.62	4.18
Our performance evaluation criteria encourage working in familiar/proven ways and areas.	3.56	3.59	3.53	3.49	3.58	3.48	3.63	3.27	3.18	3.72

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

* The above does not hold true for "There is resistance to doing or trying something new." which is reverse coded. For this statement, because it is phrased in a negative form, an agree response is means there is resistance towards innovation and a disagree response means there is not.

Support staff reported lower levels of agreement for all twelve statements (Table 2.14c). Fixed-term faculty had lower levels of agreement for eleven of the statements and tenure-track faculty provided lower levels for ten of the statements. Academic specialists reported lower levels of agreement for nine of the statements. Postdocs only reported lower levels for two of the statements.

Table 2.14c: Innovation Support Within the College by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to innovation within the college.	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Our announced visions and strategies inspire me.	3.32	3.32	3.31	3.40	3.81	3.12
We have an outward focus on impact, purpose, and solutions that helps to drive innovation.	3.59	3.51	3.37	3.74	4.05	3.61
I have sufficient discretion and freedom to use some of my time to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.	3.84	3.88	3.76	4.09	3.90	3.67
I can have conversations with my supervisor/chair/director about longer-term work goals, not just immediate productivity demands.	3.58	3.60	3.64	3.64	3.60	3.46
Leaders support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches to my work.	3.70	3.70	3.56	3.88	3.79	3.64
There is resistance to doing or trying something new. *(reverse coded)* *	2.53	2.40	*2.68*	*2.66*	*2.64*	*2.54*
Leaders recognize innovation.	3.76	3.77	3.77	3.76	4.06	3.63
Leaders reward innovation.	3.37	3.45	3.20	3.24	3.79	3.29
Leads encourage collaboration across functions and disciplines.	3.95	4.09	3.91	3.68	4.20	3.80
Leaders allocate a suitable portion of resources to work that extends beyond the status quo.	3.28	3.17	3.04	3.31	3.94	3.38
People here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.	3.94	3.98	3.97	3.84	4.14	3.84
Our performance evaluation criteria encourage working in familiar/proven ways and areas.	3.58	3.53	3.44	3.60	4.00	3.59

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).
* The above does not hold true for "There is resistance to doing or trying something new." which is reverse coded. For this statement, because it is phrased in a negative form, an agree response is means there is resistance towards innovation and a disagree response means there is not.

Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower levels of agreement for ten of the twelve statements (Table 2.14c). Physical Sciences reported lower levels for only two of the statements and Mathematics for only three.

Table 2.14d: Innovation Support Within the College by College Districts (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to innovation within the college.	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Our announced visions and strategies inspire me.	3.35	3.25	3.49	3.31
We have an outward focus on impact, purpose, and solutions that helps to drive innovation.	3.57	3.49	3.65	3.64
I have sufficient discretion and freedom to use some of my time to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.	3.82	3.80	3.84	3.81
I can have conversations with my supervisor/chair/director about longer-term work goals, not just immediate productivity demands.	3.56	3.35	3.75	3.72
Leaders support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches to my work.	3.67	3.56	3.82	3.67
There is resistance to doing or trying something new. *(reverse coded)* *	2.53	*2.61*	2.35	*2.70*
Leaders recognize innovation.	3.75	3.56	3.91	3.93
Leaders reward innovation.	3.40	3.20	3.58	3.60
Leads encourage collaboration across functions and disciplines.	4.00	3.98	3.96	4.19
Leaders allocate a suitable portion of resources to work that extends beyond the status quo.	3.32	3.24	3.35	3.48
People here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.	3.97	3.96	4.00	3.92
Our performance evaluation criteria encourage working in familiar/proven ways and areas.	3.56	3.52	3.57	3.68

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).
* The above does not hold true for "There is resistance to doing or trying something new." which is reverse coded. For this statement, because it is phrased in a negative form, an agree response is means there is resistance towards innovation and a disagree response means there is not.

In general, the levels of agreement with the innovation support statements are higher at the department/unit level than it is in the college. The statements with the highest level of agreement are "I have sufficient discretion and freedom to use some of my time to explore new ideas and ways of doing things." (75.5%), "I can have conversations with my supervisor/chair/director about longer-term work goals, not just immediate productivity demands." (74.5%), and "Leads encourage collaboration across functions and disciplines." (72.8%) (Table 2.15a). Though the percentage of agreements are higher at the department/unit level, the levels of disagreement are also higher. Four of the twelve statements have 25% or more of the respondents reporting some level of disagreement. The highest levels of disagreement are with "Leaders reward innovation." (28.7%), "Leaders allocate a suitable portion of resources to work that extends beyond the status quo." (28.7%), and "There is (no) resistance to doing or trying something new." (26.2%).

Table 2.15a: Innovation Support Within Department/Unit

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to innovation within your department/unit.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Our announced visions and strategies inspire me.	11.5%	14.3%	29.7%	24.7%	19.7%	279	3.27	1.254
We have an outward focus on impact, purpose, and solutions that helps to drive innovation.	9.8%	12.0%	25.6%	30.5%	22.2%	266	3.43	1.234
I have sufficient discretion and freedom to use some of my time to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.	5.5%	10.0%	9.0%	30.0%	45.5%	290	4.00	1.203
I can have conversations with my supervisor/chair/director about longer-term work goals, not just immediate productivity demands.	7.3%	8.4%	9.8%	23.8%	50.7%	286	4.02	1.268
Leaders support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches to my work.	7.8%	8.5%	14.2%	28.5%	40.9%	281	3.86	1.259
There is resistance to doing or trying something new. (reverse coded) *	26.9%	29.7%	17.1%	16.1%	10.1%	286	2.53	1.313
Leaders recognize innovation.	5.7%	10.0%	16.8%	34.1%	33.3%	279	3.79	1.175
Leaders reward innovation.	10.2%	18.5%	22.6%	26.8%	21.9%	265	3.32	1.281
Leads encourage collaboration across functions and disciplines.	3.9%	7.1%	16.1%	31.4%	41.4%	280	3.99	1.104
Leaders allocate a suitable portion of resources to work that extends beyond the status quo.	10.4%	18.3%	25.1%	21.5%	24.7%	251	3.32	1.306
People here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.	3.5%	9.4%	10.1%	33.8%	43.2%	287	4.04	1.107
Our performance evaluation criteria encourage working in familiar/proven ways and areas.	6.2%	12.4%	32.2%	25.6%	23.6%	258	3.48	1.161

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).
* The above does not hold true for "There is resistance to doing or trying something new." which is reverse coded. For this statement, because it is phrased in a negative form, an agree response is means there is resistance towards innovation and a disagree response means there is not.

Females reported lower levels of agreement for four of the twelve statements. Heterosexuals reported lower levels of agreement for four statements as did members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community. There is no clear pattern by race through different racial groups did show differences for each of the statements. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement for all the statements compared to those without disabilities.

Table 2.15b: Innovation Support Within Department/Unit by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to innovation within your department/unit.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Our announced visions and strategies inspire me.	3.26	3.25	3.27	3.26	3.58	3.51	3.26	3.17	3.13	3.44
We have an outward focus on impact, purpose, and solutions that helps to drive innovation.	3.43	3.48	3.37	3.40	3.74	3.45	3.41	3.61	3.38	3.56
I have sufficient discretion and freedom to use some of my time to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.	4.00	4.04	3.96	4.08	3.89	3.97	4.07	3.72	3.69	4.18
I can have conversations with my supervisor/chair/director about longer-term work goals, not just immediate productivity demands.	4.00	4.09	3.90	4.13	4.07	4.08	4.01	3.93	3.74	4.27
Leaders support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches to my work.	3.87	3.89	3.84	3.97	3.79	4.09	3.87	3.75	3.50	4.17
There is resistance to doing or trying something new. *(reverse coded)* *	2.51	2.43	*2.60*	2.45	*2.66*	*2.51*	*2.51*	2.36	*2.74*	2.37
Leaders recognize innovation.	3.79	3.82	3.77	3.85	3.80	4.08	3.74	3.86	3.47	4.03
Leaders reward innovation.	3.29	3.33	3.26	3.40	3.24	3.75	3.25	3.26	3.10	3.54
Leads encourage collaboration across functions and disciplines.	3.97	4.01	3.92	4.08	4.09	4.12	3.95	4.07	3.88	4.18
Leaders allocate a suitable portion of resources to work that extends beyond the status quo.	3.30	3.35	3.24	3.31	3.46	3.53	3.29	3.20	3.00	3.48
People here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.	4.02	4.04	4.01	4.09	4.31	3.86	4.08	4.00	3.89	4.25
Our performance evaluation criteria encourage working in familiar/proven ways and areas.	3.46	3.58	3.34	3.46	3.44	3.56	3.49	3.23	3.10	3.61

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

* The above does not hold true for "There is resistance to doing or trying something new." which is reverse coded. For this statement, because it is phrased in a negative form, an agree response is means there is resistance towards innovation and a disagree response means there is not.

Both tenure-track and fixed-term faculty, as well as support staff, all reported lower levels of agreement with all twelve statements as they related to their department/unit (Table 2.15c). Academic specialists provided lower levels of agreement for ten of the statements. Postdocs gave all the statements a higher level of agreement.

Table 2.15c: Innovation Support Within Department/Unit by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Employee Position

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to innovation within your department/unit.		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Our announced visions and strategies inspire me.	3.27	3.02	3.54	3.38	3.88	3.18
We have an outward focus on impact, purpose, and solutions that helps to drive innovation.	3.44	**3.16**	3.58	3.58	4.03	3.41
I have sufficient discretion and freedom to use some of my time to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.	4.01	3.93	4.05	4.22	4.15	3.92
I can have conversations with my supervisor/chair/director about longer-term work goals, not just immediate productivity demands.	4.02	3.90	4.09	4.00	4.44	3.99
Leaders support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches to my work.	3.87	3.66	3.85	4.23	4.27	3.80
There is resistance to doing or trying something new. (reverse coded) *	2.52	*2.53*	*2.43*	*2.72*	2.15	*2.61*
Leaders recognize innovation.	3.80	3.58	3.85	4.00	4.38	3.74
Leaders reward innovation.	3.32	3.26	3.21	3.24	3.93	3.24
Leads encourage collaboration across functions and disciplines.	4.00	3.91	4.06	3.85	4.45	3.97
Leaders allocate a suitable portion of resources to work that extends beyond the status quo.	3.32	3.03	3.19	3.39	3.90	3.48
People here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.	4.05	3.95	4.17	3.92	4.41	4.03
Our performance evaluation criteria encourage working in familiar/proven ways and areas.	3.48	3.49	3.47	3.41	3.85	3.36

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).
* The above does not hold true for "There is resistance to doing or trying something new." which is reverse coded. For this statement, because it is phrased in a negative form, an agree response is means there is resistance towards innovation and a disagree response means there is not.

Those in the Physical Sciences reported lower levels of agreement for ten of the twelve statements and those in Mathematics reported lower levels for nine of the statements (Table 2.15d). For those Biological Sciences, only three statements received a lower level of agreement.

Table 2.15d: Innovation Support Within the Department/Unit by College Districts (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to innovation within your department/unit.	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Our announced visions and strategies inspire me.	3.29	3.45	3.15	3.03
We have an outward focus on impact, purpose, and solutions that helps to drive innovation.	3.43	3.66	3.16	3.27
I have sufficient discretion and freedom to use some of my time to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.	3.98	4.11	3.94	3.62
I can have conversations with my supervisor/chair/director about longer-term work goals, not just immediate productivity demands.	4.02	4.08	3.98	3.94
Leaders support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches to my work.	3.85	3.90	3.79	3.82
There is resistance to doing or trying something new. *(reverse coded)* *	2.52	2.39	2.71	2.53
Leaders recognize innovation.	3.81	*3.88*	3.67	*3.91*
Leaders reward innovation.	3.37	3.41	3.24	3.52
Leads encourage collaboration across functions and disciplines.	4.03	4.20	3.86	3.80
Leaders allocate a suitable portion of resources to work that extends beyond the status quo.	3.34	3.42	3.26	3.23
People here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.	4.07	4.18	4.01	3.77
Our performance evaluation criteria encourage working in familiar/proven ways and areas.	3.50	3.51	3.45	3.58

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, for most items, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).
* The above does not hold true for "There is resistance to doing or trying something new." which is reverse coded. For this statement, because it is phrased in a negative form, an agree response is means there is resistance towards innovation and a disagree response means there is not.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND ADVANCEMENT

Respondents were also asked about opportunities for professional development and advancement at both the college and department/unit level. The statements with the highest level of agreement at the college level were "I have access to resources to support professional development." (69.2%), "I am supported to participate in professional development, committees, and other learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals." (67.1%), and "I have access to resources to support professional development." (65.8%). In terms of high levels of disagreement, there were four of the seven statements that had levels of disagreement exceeding 25%. The highest levels of disagreement were for "Workloads are equitably distributed." (37.6%), "Compared to others, I have equal access to advancement opportunities such as promotions and compensation increases." (36.5%), and "I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals." (27.0%).

Table 2.16a: Professional Development and Advancement Within the College

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to professional opportunities, growth and advancement within the college.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Workloads are equitably distributed.	15.2%	22.4%	21.2%	27.9%	13.3%	165	3.02	1.285
I have professional development opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	5.3%	8.8%	20.2%	34.2%	31.6%	228	3.78	1.140
I have access to resources to support professional development.	5.9%	8.0%	16.9%	39.2%	30.0%	237	3.79	1.133
I am supported to participate in professional development, committees, and other learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals.	6.3%	9.5%	17.1%	29.7%	37.4%	222	3.82	1.211
I have access to informal or formal mentoring opportunities.	10.9%	15.5%	22.3%	24.5%	26.8%	220	3.41	1.323
I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	10.8%	16.2%	30.2%	18.5%	24.3%	222	3.29	1.294
Compared to others, I have equal access to advancement opportunities such as promotions and compensation increases.	20.2%	16.3%	12.5%	25.5%	25.5%	208	3.20	1.489

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Table 2.16b shows the difference between groups for the various demographic characteristics. For gender identity, males reported lower levels of agreement for five of the seven statements and females reported lower agreement for the other two. In terms of sexual orientation, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community reported lower levels of agreement for six of the statements and heterosexuals reported one. Asians reported higher levels of agreement for all seven of the statements compared to their counterparts. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement compared to those without disabilities.

Table 2.16b: Professional Development and Advancement Within the College by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to professional opportunities, growth and advancement within the college.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Workloads are equitably distributed.	3.02	3.14	_2.87_	_3.03_	3.17	3.50	_2.98_	_2.69_	_2.53_	3.18
I have professional development opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.80	_3.68_	3.92	3.94	_3.62_	3.80	3.82	_3.63_	_3.78_	3.92
I have access to resources to support professional development.	3.79	_3.70_	3.90	3.97	_3.56_	3.93	3.81	_3.50_	_3.62_	3.99
I am supported to participate in professional development, committees, and other learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals.	3.81	_3.68_	3.96	3.96	_3.61_	3.93	_3.81_	_3.80_	_3.55_	4.03
I have access to informal or formal mentoring opportunities.	3.39	_3.34_	3.45	3.54	_3.32_	3.59	_3.40_	_3.14_	_3.09_	3.69
I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.29	_3.16_	3.44	3.44	_3.16_	3.43	3.34	_2.96_	_2.93_	3.58
Compared to others, I have equal access to advancement opportunities such as promotions and compensation increases.	3.18	3.22	_3.12_	3.40	_2.90_	3.70	_3.21_	_2.36_	_2.86_	3.59

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Fixed-term faculty members reported lower levels of agreement for all statements (Table 2.16c). Academic specialists, postdocs and support staff all had lower levels of agreement for all but one statement. Tenure-track faculty had three of the seven statements with lower levels of agreement.

Table 2.16c: Professional Development and Advancement Within the College by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to professional opportunities, growth and advancement within the college.	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Workloads are equitably distributed.	3.03	2.93	3.08	2.90	3.73	3.05
I have professional development opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.79	3.90	3.66	3.76	3.54	3.80
I have access to resources to support professional development.	3.79	3.82	3.59	3.77	3.60	3.96
I am supported to participate in professional development, committees, and other learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals.	3.83	3.89	3.59	4.00	3.55	3.87
I have access to informal or formal mentoring opportunities.	3.41	3.66	2.96	3.17	3.37	3.35
I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.29	3.43	3.04	3.21	3.10	3.32
Compared to others, I have equal access to advancement opportunities such as promotions and compensation increases.	3.19	3.52	2.64	2.86	3.00	3.15

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower levels of agreement with all the seven statements. Those in the Physical Sciences reported lower levels for four of the statements and those in Mathematics only had lower levels of agreement for two of the statements.

Table 2.16d: Professional Development and Advancement Within the College by College Districts (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to professional opportunities, growth and advancement within the college.	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Workloads are equitably distributed.	3.04	3.00	3.04	3.20
I have professional development opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.73	3.61	3.90	3.77
I have access to resources to support professional development.	3.76	3.66	3.81	4.00
I am supported to participate in professional development, committees, and other learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals.	3.78	3.57	3.86	4.20
I have access to informal or formal mentoring opportunities.	3.41	3.28	3.50	3.60
I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.31	3.21	3.38	3.45
Compared to others, I have equal access to advancement opportunities such as promotions and compensation increases.	3.27	3.05	3.52	3.36

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

At the department/unit level, the percentage of respondents that at least somewhat agreed increased, compared to the college level, for all the statements. The statements with the highest percentages of agreement were "I have access to resources to support professional development." (72.9%), "I am supported to participate in professional development, committees, and other learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals." (71.1%), and "I have professional development opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals." (68.8%). The statements with the highest level of disagreement were "Workloads are equitably distributed." (39.6%), "Compared to others, I have equal access to advancement opportunities such as promotions and compensation increases." (32.8%), and "I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals." (24.2%).

Table 2.17a: Professional Development and Advancement Within Department/Unit

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to professional opportunities, growth and advancement within your department/unit.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree			
	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Workloads are equitably distributed.	16.6%	23.0%	11.3%	31.4%	17.7%	283	3.11	1.382
I have professional development opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	6.1%	10.5%	14.6%	32.5%	36.3%	295	3.82	1.205
I have access to resources to support professional development.	4.7%	11.4%	11.1%	32.6%	40.3%	298	3.92	1.180
I am supported to participate in professional development, committees, and other learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals.	7.8%	7.8%	13.3%	27.6%	43.5%	294	3.91	1.258
I have access to informal or formal mentoring opportunities.	8.0%	10.8%	17.8%	28.3%	35.0%	286	3.71	1.268
I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	9.0%	15.2%	19.7%	27.6%	28.6%	290	3.52	1.292
Compared to others, I have equal access to advancement opportunities such as promotions and compensation increases.	18.7%	14.1%	11.6%	22.2%	33.5%	284	3.38	1.521

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

In terms of demographic characteristics differences at the department/unit level, there are differences in all four variables (Table 2.17b). Females reported lower levels of agreement for four of the seven variables and males reported lower levels for three of them. For sexual orientation, heterosexuals reported lower levels of agreement for one of the variables and members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community reported them for four variables. In terms of race, there is no clear pattern, employees of color were more likely to report lower levels of agreement than Asians and Whites. Those with disabilities were more likely to report lower levels of agreement than their counterparts.

Table 2.17b: Professional Development and Advancement Within Department/Unit by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to professional opportunities, growth and advancement within your department/unit.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Workloads are equitably distributed.	3.11	3.30	2.92	3.10	3.33	3.14	3.11	3.11	2.91	3.27
I have professional development opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.81	3.65	3.98	3.87	3.89	3.94	3.81	3.59	3.73	4.00
I have access to resources to support professional development.	3.90	3.82	3.99	4.02	3.96	3.92	3.91	3.82	3.77	4.14
I am supported to participate in professional development, committees, and other learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals.	3.89	3.82	3.96	4.01	3.89	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.73	4.09
I have access to informal or formal mentoring opportunities.	3.66	3.74	3.58	3.77	3.71	3.78	3.71	3.30	3.28	3.99
I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.49	3.57	3.40	3.58	3.45	3.54	3.51	3.39	3.05	3.75
Compared to others, I have equal access to advancement opportunities such as promotions and compensation increases.	3.35	3.55	3.13	3.49	3.20	3.68	3.40	2.63	2.97	3.73

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Fixed-term faculty provided lower levels of agreement for all seven of the statements (Table 2.17c). Tenure-track faculty and support staff reported lower levels of all but one of the statements. Academic specialists gave lower levels for four of the statements and postdocs reported lower levels for three of the statements.

Table 2.17c: Professional Development and Advancement Within Department/Unit by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to professional opportunities, growth and advancement within your department/unit.	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Workloads are equitably distributed.	3.11	**2.79**	3.23	3.11	3.97	3.21
I have professional development opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.83	3.65	3.81	4.19	3.91	3.88
I have access to resources to support professional development.	3.93	3.67	3.83	4.17	4.03	4.18
I am supported to participate in professional development, committees, and other learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals.	3.91	3.73	4.00	4.24	4.03	3.91
I have access to informal or formal mentoring opportunities.	3.72	3.85	3.44	3.70	4.12	3.46
I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.52	3.66	3.41	3.50	3.79	3.24
Compared to others, I have equal access to advancement opportunities such as promotions and compensation increases.	3.38	3.62	3.00	3.14	3.63	3.20

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Those in the Physical Sciences reported lower levels of agreement with all the statements except for having equal opportunities for advancement (Table 2.17d). Those in the Biological Sciences only had a lower level of agreement with being supported to participate in professional development, committees, and other learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals. Those in Mathematics only reported a lower level of agreement with "Workloads are equitably distributed."

Table 2.17d: Professional Development and Advancement Within Department/Unit by College Districts (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to professional opportunities, growth and advancement within your department/unit.	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Workloads are equitably distributed.	3.07	3.17	2.98	3.00
I have professional development opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.76	3.77	3.70	3.87
I have access to resources to support professional development.	3.87	3.90	3.79	3.97
I am supported to participate in professional development, committees, and other learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals.	3.86	3.85	3.77	4.08
I have access to informal or formal mentoring opportunities.	3.69	3.72	3.60	3.79
I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.50	3.57	3.40	3.53
Compared to others, I have equal access to advancement opportunities such as promotions and compensation increases.	3.43	3.38	3.47	3.47

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Respondents were presented with a series of statements about annual performance reviews and asked about their agreement with each one. All but two of the statements received somewhat or strongly agree over 50 percent of the time (Table 2.18a). "I am comfortable asking my department/unit chair/director/supervisor questions about performance expectations." (69.1%), "I believe that the performance evaluation/review process in my unit is following MSU's performance review procedures "(59.6%) and "Performance discussions include a focus on my career goals and aspirations." (57.3%) received the highest levels of agreement. Over a quarter of the respondents stated that they either somewhat or strongly disagreed with "I believe that compensation decisions in my unit are linked to performance." (27.0%), "I receive valuable performance feedback." (26.5%) and "The criteria used in my annual performance evaluation/review are clear and transparent." (25.8%).

Table 2.18a: Annual Performance Review

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding your annual performance evaluation/review.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree			
	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
I am comfortable asking my department/unit chair/director/supervisor questions about performance expectations.	6.4%	9.5%	14.9%	25.4%	43.7%	295	3.91	1.242
The criteria used in my annual performance evaluation/review are clear and transparent.	12.2%	13.6%	20.4%	23.8%	29.9%	294	3.46	1.364
I believe that the performance evaluation/review process in my unit is following MSU's performance review procedures.	6.1%	8.2%	26.2%	23.5%	36.1%	294	3.75	1.201
Performance discussions include a focus on my career goals and aspirations.	11.3%	9.9%	21.5%	25.9%	31.4%	293	3.56	1.324
I receive valuable performance feedback.	11.9%	14.6%	18.6%	26.8%	28.1%	295	3.45	1.349
The criteria used in my annual performance review are closely linked to the criteria used in promotion decisions.	8.5%	8.5%	35.8%	21.2%	25.9%	293	3.47	1.207
I believe that compensation decisions in my unit are linked to performance.	16.4%	10.6%	27.1%	22.9%	22.9%	292	3.25	1.361

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

For the annual performance review statements, females reported lower levels of agreement for three of the seven statements (Table 2.18b). Heterosexuals reported lower levels for four of the seven. Employees of color reported lower levels of agreement for all seven of the statements and Asians reported higher levels for all, but one of the statements. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement for all seven of the statements.

Table 2.18b: Annual Performance Review by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding your annual performance evaluation/review.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
I am comfortable asking my department/unit chair/director/supervisor questions about performance expectations.	3.89	3.99	3.80	3.94	4.09	4.00	3.89	3.83	3.66	4.09
The criteria used in my annual performance evaluation/review are clear and transparent.	3.43	3.43	3.43	3.50	3.64	3.41	3.48	3.24	3.31	3.59
I believe that the performance evaluation/review process in my unit is following MSU's performance review procedures.	3.74	3.74	3.73	3.77	3.87	3.62	3.81	3.38	3.57	3.86
Performance discussions include a focus on my career goals and aspirations.	3.57	3.64	3.49	3.55	3.69	3.81	3.59	3.25	3.16	3.77
I receive valuable performance feedback.	3.44	3.48	3.40	3.48	3.49	3.65	3.42	3.38	3.14	3.61
The criteria used in my annual performance review are closely linked to the criteria used in promotion decisions.	3.46	3.53	3.40	3.59	3.38	3.62	3.53	3.07	3.17	3.64
I believe that compensation decisions in my unit are linked to performance.	3.24	3.29	3.20	3.46	3.07	3.50	3.23	2.90	3.09	3.47

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Academic specialists reported lower levels of agreement with all the statements related to annual performance review (Table 2.18c). Support staff and tenure-track faculty gave lower levels of agreement with all but one statement (criteria is clear/transparent). Fix term faculty gave lower levels of agreement with four of the six statements. Postdocs only have two of the statement lower levels of agreement.

Table 2.18c: Annual Performance Review by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding your annual performance evaluation/review.	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
I am comfortable asking my department/unit chair/director/supervisor questions about performance expectations.	3.91	3.90	3.91	3.87	4.13	3.84
The criteria used in my annual performance evaluation/review are clear and transparent.	3.47	3.35	3.56	3.21	3.61	3.65
I believe that the performance evaluation/review process in my unit is following MSU's performance review procedures.	3.76	3.77	3.89	3.76	3.77	3.68
Performance discussions include a focus on my career goals and aspirations.	3.57	3.45	3.53	3.62	3.94	3.59
I receive valuable performance feedback.	3.45	3.25	3.61	3.18	3.87	3.62
The criteria used in my annual performance review are closely linked to the criteria used in promotion decisions.	3.48	3.81	3.20	3.46	3.56	3.12
I believe that compensation decisions in my unit are linked to performance.	3.26	3.49	3.03	3.22	3.42	**2.99**

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Both those in the Physical Sciences and those in Mathematics gave all but one of the seven statements lower levels of agreement. Those in the Biological Sciences gave higher levels of agreement for all seven statements.

Table 2.18d: Annual Performance Review by College Districts (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding your annual performance evaluation/review.	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
I am comfortable asking my department/unit chair/director/supervisor questions about performance expectations.	3.90	4.09	<u>3.64</u>	<u>3.87</u>
The criteria used in my annual performance evaluation/review are clear and transparent.	3.46	3.69	<u>3.24</u>	<u>3.18</u>
I believe that the performance evaluation/review process in my unit is following MSU's performance review procedures.	3.72	3.92	<u>3.51</u>	<u>3.56</u>
Performance discussions include a focus on my career goals and aspirations.	3.53	3.69	<u>3.31</u>	<u>3.49</u>
I receive valuable performance feedback.	3.45	3.74	<u>3.10</u>	<u>3.23</u>
The criteria used in my annual performance review are closely linked to the criteria used in promotion decisions.	3.49	3.52	3.49	<u>3.42</u>
I believe that compensation decisions in my unit are linked to performance.	3.24	3.29	<u>3.15</u>	3.31
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable). The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).				

SEXUAL MISCONDUCT, UNCIVIL BEHAVIOR AND BIAS INCIDENCES

It should be noted that not all employees of the college participated in the survey and that not all incidences of sexual misconduct or bias incidences lead to formal reporting. No one should assume that an incident that they may be aware of was included in the data or in this report.

<u>Sexual Misconduct</u>

The university has a zero-tolerance policy for relationship violence and sexual misconduct. This means theoretically that there should be zero agreement with the statements "I have experienced sexual harassment and/or relationship violence within my department/unit/the college." and "Sexual harassment is a problem within my department/unit/the college." Unfortunately, 8.8% of the respondents stated that they had experienced some form of sexual misconduct within their department/unit or the college and 8.1% stated that it was a problem within their department/unit or the college. On the positive side, 91.2% of the respondents stated that they knew how to report sexual harassment and relationship violence.

In terms of leaderships response, 75.8% of the respondents agreed that "College leaders take reports of sexual harassment and relationship violence seriously.," though 6.8% disagreed. In addition, 73.5% agreed with "I am confident that my department/unit/college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports related to RVSM.," but 6.4% disagreed. Though 75.3% of the respondents stated that "I can report incidences of sexual harassment and/or relationship violence without fear of retaliation.," there were still 7.8% of the respondents that stated that they disagreed.

Table 2.19a: Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policies

This next set of questions is about Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct (RSVM).	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree			
	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
I have experienced sexual harassment and/or relationship violence within my department/unit/the college. *(reverse coding) *	75.7%	8.1%	7.4%	3.7%	5.1%	296	1.54	1.110
Sexual harassment is a problem within my department/unit/the college. *(reverse coding) *	53.4%	15.0%	23.5%	5.4%	2.7%	294	1.89	1.106
I know how to report sexual harassment and relationship violence.	0.3%	2.0%	6.4%	27.9%	63.3%	297	4.52	.736
College leaders take reports of sexual harassment and relationship violence seriously.	1.7%	5.1%	17.4%	19.5%	56.3%	293	4.24	1.022
I am confident that my department/unit/college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports related to RVSM.	2.0%	4.4%	20.0%	22.0%	51.5%	295	4.17	1.025
I can report incidences of sexual harassment and/or relationship violence without fear of retaliation.	2.0%	5.8%	16.9%	24.1%	51.2%	295	4.17	1.035
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable) for the statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree). * The first two statements are in a negative form where agreement with the statement is unfavorable (i.e. event has occurred, is a problem), and disagreement is favorable in terms of RVSM.								

When looking at the means scores in Table 2.19b, those questions in which agreement with the statement is positive (last four statements in table), the difference in means scores are underlined for those mean score differences that are 0.1 or larger (less agreement) from the highest mean score. For those statements in which agreement with the statement is negative (first two statements in table), an asterisk (*) is used to identify those with a mean score difference of 0.1 or larger from the smallest mean score since there are the cases that were more likely to agree with the negative statement, i.e., more likely impacted.

Females, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, Asians, Whites, and those with disabilities were more likely to agree with the statement about experiencing sexual misconduct. Asians and Whites were more likely to say that sexual harassment is a problem. In terms of knowledge how to report, Asian reported less agreement with the statement. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement about leadership taking reports seriously. Heterosexuals and those with disabilities were less to agree that leadership would keep reports confidential. Females, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, Asians, and those with disabilities were less likely to agree that they could report an incident without fear of retaliation. This is of concern since females, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, and those with disabilities are more likely to need to file reports.

Table 2.19b: Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policies by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Gender Identity	Sexual Orientation	Race	Disability

This next set of questions is about Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct (RSVM).	Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
I have experienced sexual harassment and/or relationship violence within my department/unit/the college. *(reverse coding) *| 1.51	1.32	1.71*	1.45	1.57*	1.73*	1.50*	1.18	1.75*	1.39
Sexual harassment is a problem within my department/unit/the college. *(reverse coding) *| 1.86	1.88	1.85	1.88	1.91	1.81*	1.96*	1.39	1.80	1.89
I know how to report sexual harassment and relationship violence.	4.52	4.46	4.58	4.50	4.53	4.38	4.55	4.54	4.52	4.48
College leaders take reports of sexual harassment and relationship violence seriously.	4.24	4.20	4.28	4.33	4.28	4.22	4.24	4.21	4.12	4.34
I am confident that my department/unit/college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports related to RVSM.	4.15	4.04	4.26	4.24	4.22	4.08	4.16	4.11	4.15	4.29
I can report incidences of sexual harassment and/or relationship violence without fear of retaliation.	4.16	4.25	4.07	4.25	4.09	4.05	4.18	4.22	4.00	4.31

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable) for the statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).
* The first two statements are in a negative form where agreement with the statement is unfavorable (i.e. event has occurred, is a problem), and disagreement is favorable in terms of RVSM.

Fixed-term faculty, postdocs and support staff were more likely to have experienced sexual misconduct (Table 2.19c). Only support staff was less likely to report that sexual harassment is a problem in the department/unit/the college. Postdocs were less likely to agree with all four statements about reporting sexual misconduct. Both tenure-track faculty and fixed-term faculty, as well as support staff reported less agreement with all but being able to report without fear of retaliation. Academic staff did not report lower agreement with any of the statements.

Table 2.19c: Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policies by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

This next set of questions is about Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct (RSVM).	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
I have experienced sexual harassment and/or relationship violence within my department/unit/the college. (reverse coding) *	1.53	1.45	*1.50*	1.38	*1.60*	*1.70*

Sexual harassment is a problem within my department/unit/the college. (reverse coding) *	1.89	*2.01*	*2.08*	*1.81*	*2.09*	1.60
I know how to report sexual harassment and relationship violence.	4.52	4.55	4.50	4.68	4.23	4.56
College leaders take reports of sexual harassment and relationship violence seriously.	4.24	4.21	4.06	4.57	4.33	4.16
I am confident that my department/unit/college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports related to RVSM.	4.16	4.11	4.00	4.47	4.09	4.21
I can report incidences of sexual harassment and/or relationship violence without fear of retaliation.	4.16	4.16	4.19	4.25	4.06	4.17
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable) for the statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree). * The first two statements are in a negative form where agreement with the statement is unfavorable (i.e. event has occurred, is a problem), and disagreement is favorable in terms of RVSM.						

Those in the Biological and Physical Sciences were more likely to have experienced sexual misconduct within their department/unit/the college and more likely to think it is a problem compared to those in Mathematics (Table 2.19d). Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower levels of agreement for college leaders taking reports seriously and being confident in confidentiality being maintained. Those in Mathematics reported lower levels of agreement with college leadership taking reports seriously.

Table 2.19d: Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policies by College Districts (Mean Scores)

		College Districts		
This next set of questions is about Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct (RSVM).	Overall	Biological	Physical	Mathematics
I have experienced sexual harassment and/or relationship violence within my department/unit/the college. *(reverse coding)* *	1.55	*1.62*	*1.56*	1.29
Sexual harassment is a problem within my department/unit/the college. *(reverse coding)* *	1.92	*1.99*	*2.01*	1.47
I know how to report sexual harassment and relationship violence.	4.49	4.50	4.49	4.47
College leaders take reports of sexual harassment and relationship violence seriously.	4.19	4.02	4.40	4.29
I am confident that my department/unit/college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports related to RVSM.	4.10	4.01	4.19	4.24
I can report incidences of sexual harassment and/or relationship violence without fear of retaliation.	4.13	4.13	4.13	4.16
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable) for the statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree). * The first two statements are in a negative form where agreement with the statement is unfavorable (i.e. event has occurred, is a problem), and disagreement is favorable in terms of RVSM.				

Uncivil Behavior

In addition to sexual misconduct, uncivil behavior can have a negative impact on the climate within a department/unit or the college at large. All the uncivil behaviors listed in Table 2.20a had at least 20% of the respondents stated that they had experienced or witnessed this behavior, except for "Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion about personal matters." which still had 15.1% of the respondent state that they had experienced it. Three of the behaviors, had over 40% of the respondents stating that they had experienced them at least once – "Paid little attention to your statements or showed little interest in your opinion." (45.7%), "Put you down or acted condescendingly to you." (42.9%), and "Devalued your work and efforts." (42.3%). In addition, 44.1% stated that a student or employee had "Exhibited any of the above behaviors toward others in front of you." Also, for each of these behaviors, respondents were more likely to report that it had happened two or more times.

Table 2.20a: Uncivil Behavior Experienced Within College

In the past three years, how often, if at all, have you been in a situation where a NatSci student or employee has . .	Never	Once	2 or More Times	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	0	1	2	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Put you down or acted condescendingly to you.	57.1%	15.0%	27.9%	301	.71	.876
Made demeaning or derogatory remarks to or about you.	73.3%	11.5%	15.2%	296	.42	.741
Devalued your work and efforts.	57.7%	13.8%	28.5%	298	.71	.883
Inappropriately interrupted or "talked over" you while you were speaking.	58.5%	10.0%	31.4%	299	.73	.911
Ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie.	71.4%	8.8%	19.9%	297	.48	.806
Made negative statements or circulated negative rumors about you.	74.8%	9.1%	16.1%	298	.41	.753
Paid little attention to your statements or showed little interest in your opinion.	54.4%	14.8%	30.9%	298	.77	.894
Addressed you in unprofessional ways.	67.4%	11.3%	21.3%	301	.54	.822
Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion about personal matters.	84.9%	5.4%	9.7%	298	.25	.619
Bullied you.	77.6%	8.7%	13.7%	299	.36	.712
Bullied others in front of you.	74.2%	10.0%	15.7%	299	.41	.748
Distrusted your description of your own personal experiences.	77.0%	8.1%	14.9%	296	.38	.731
Exhibited any of the above behaviors toward others in front of you.	55.9%	12.1%	32.0%	297	.76	.908
Responses for this series of uncivil behaviors were based on "0" for no incidences "1" for one incident, and "2" for two or more incidences. Mean scores range is from "0" for no incidences from any respondent to "2" for two or more incidences experienced by all respondents. Mean scores below 1 mean that the average respondents experienced less than one incident of that uncivil behavior. Mean scores between one and two mean that the average respondent experienced at least one incident.						

When looking at the uncivil behaviors within the College by demographic characteristics, there are definite patterns of who is more likely to experience at least some of the uncivil behaviors (Table 2.20b). Females were more likely than males to experience eight of the thirteen behaviors. Non-Asians were more likely for twelve of the thirteen behaviors than Asians. Those with disabilities were more likely to experience all the behaviors than their counterparts. In terms of sexual orientation, heterosexuals were more likely to experience one of the behaviors and members of the LBGTQIA2S+ community were more likely to experience three of the thirteen behaviors.

Table 2.20b: Uncivil Behavior Experienced Within College by Demographic Characteristics (Percentage of Those with at Least one Incident)

In the past three years, how often, if at all, have you been in a situation where a NatSci student or employee has . .	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Put you down or acted condescendingly to you.	44.1%	35.7%	_52.9%_	40.2%	36.2%	29.7%	_46.2%_	_48.3%_	_55.7%_	28.7%
Made demeaning or derogatory remarks to or about you.	26.2%	24.3%	28.1%	21.8%	21.7%	18.9%	_27.0%_	_27.6%_	_36.1%_	16.4%
Devalued your work and efforts.	42.8%	37.4%	_48.2%_	38.9%	34.8%	29.7%	_42.9%_	_55.2%_	_55.7%_	28.3%
Inappropriately interrupted or "talked over" you while you were speaking.	41.5%	37.9%	_45.3%_	41.9%	42.6%	18.9%	_43.0%_	_57.1%_	_61.7%_	31.7%
Ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie.	28.7%	25.9%	31.6%	_26.1%_	20.0%	16.2%	_28.9%_	_37.9%_	_32.8%_	21.5%
Made negative statements or circulated negative rumors about you.	24.6%	23.7%	25.5%	_25.1%_	12.8%	16.2%	_24.8%_	_32.1%_	_31.1%_	19.5%
Paid little attention to your statements or showed little interest in your opinion.	45.3%	37.7%	_52.9%_	43.3%	46.8%	21.6%	_47.6%_	_57.1%_	_60.0%_	36.3%
Addressed you in unprofessional ways.	32.3%	30.3%	34.3%	28.3%	_36.2%_	18.9%	_33.2%_	_37.9%_	_39.3%_	24.8%
Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion about personal matters.	14.5%	7.9%	_21.2%_	12.3%	_23.4%_	13.5%	14.1%	13.8%	_23.0%_	8.8%
Bullied you.	22.0%	17.7%	_26.5%_	21.7%	21.7%	13.5%	_22.8%_	_24.1%_	_36.7%_	15.5%
Bullied others in front of you.	24.9%	24.3%	25.5%	24.6%	23.4%	16.7%	_27.5%_	13.8%	_36.1%_	21.9%
Distrusted your description of your own personal experiences.	21.8%	18.1%	_25.5%_	21.9%	_27.7%_	10.8%	_22.4%_	_28.6%_	_37.7%_	13.3%
Exhibited any of the above behaviors toward others in front of you.	43.6%	37.0%	_50.4%_	43.9%	46.8%	25.0%	_47.3%_	_37.9%_	_54.1%_	40.0%

The percentages in the table are the percentages of respondents in that category that experienced that incident at least once. Comparisons within demographic variables (ex. gender identity) provide information on whether nor not a specific type of person (women vs. men) are more likely to experience the incident at least once. The groups underlined were ones that reported yes at least 5 percent more often than the group with the lowest percent of incidences.

Tenure-track faculty, academic specialists, and support staff were more likely to report experiencing all thirteen of the behaviors (Table 2.20c). Fixed-term faculty were more likely to have experienced all but being drawn into an unwanted conversation. Postdocs were less likely to experience all the thirteen behaviors.

Table 2.20c: Uncivil Behavior Experienced Within College by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

In the past three years, how often, if at all, have you been in a situation where a NatSci student or employee has . .	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Put you down or acted condescendingly to you.	43.4%	43.2%	47.2%	59.5%	20.0%	44.9%
Made demeaning or derogatory remarks to or about you.	26.7%	27.1%	27.8%	25.0%	14.3%	32.1%
Devalued your work and efforts.	42.2%	40.4%	51.4%	56.8%	20.6%	42.9%
Inappropriately interrupted or "talked over" you while you were speaking.	41.7%	41.3%	54.1%	50.0%	31.4%	37.2%
Ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie.	28.3%	32.4%	24.3%	35.1%	17.1%	26.3%
Made negative statements or circulated negative rumors about you.	25.2%	27.8%	35.1%	27.8%	8.6%	23.1%
Paid little attention to your statements or showed little interest in your opinion.	45.9%	42.6%	59.5%	61.1%	34.3%	42.3%
Addressed you in unprofessional ways.	32.7%	33.3%	30.6%	40.5%	22.9%	33.3%
Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion about personal matters.	15.3%	15.5%	8.1%	14.3%	8.8%	21.8%
Bullied you.	22.7%	25.5%	25.0%	21.6%	11.4%	23.4%
Bullied others in front of you.	26.1%	34.5%	24.3%	22.9%	8.6%	24.4%
Distrusted your description of your own personal experiences.	23.3%	27.1%	16.2%	30.6%	20.0%	19.5%
Exhibited any of the above behaviors toward others in front of you.	44.4%	48.6%	47.2%	47.2%	32.4%	41.0%
The percentages in the table are the percentages of respondents in that category that experienced that incident at least once. Comparisons within demographic variables (ex. gender identity) provide information on whether nor not a specific type of person (women vs. men) are more likely to experience the incident at least once. The groups underlined were ones that reported yes at least 5 percent more often than the group with the lowest percent of incidences.						

Problems with uncivil behavior did not appear to be more of a problem in one college district compared to another in terms of the type of behavior (Table 2.20d). Each of the college districts reported being more likely to have four uncivil behaviors.

Table 2.20d: Uncivil Behavior Experienced Within College by College District (Percentage of Those with at Least one Incident)

Since becoming a student in the College of Natural Science, how often, if at all, have you been in a situation where a NatSci student (graduate or undergraduate) or employee has . . .	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Put you down or acted condescendingly to you.	42.1%	42.6%	41.3%	42.1%
Made demeaning or derogatory remarks to or about you.	26.1%	23.5%	28.6%	28.9%
Devalued your work and efforts.	41.8%	39.8%	41.3%	50.0%
Inappropriately interrupted or "talked over" you while you were speaking.	40.2%	40.0%	39.6%	42.1%
Ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie.	28.2%	26.9%	28.9%	31.6%
Made negative statements or circulated negative rumors about you.	24.3%	25.0%	23.6%	23.7%
Paid little attention to your statements or showed little interest in your opinion.	43.7%	43.4%	42.2%	48.6%
Addressed you in unprofessional ways.	31.6%	33.1%	30.4%	28.9%
Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion about personal matters.	12.9%	14.9%	11.0%	10.5%
Bullied you.	21.6%	23.0%	23.9%	10.8%
Bullied others in front of you.	26.5%	27.2%	27.5%	21.6%
Distrusted your description of your own personal experiences.	22.6%	21.6%	21.3%	28.9%
Exhibited any of the above behaviors toward others in front of you.	42.7%	46.6%	43.5%	27.0%
The percentages in the table are the percentages of respondents in that category that experienced that incident at least once. The groups underlined were ones that reported yes at least 5 percent more often than the group with the lowest percent of incidences.				

The sources of uncivil behavior are listed below (Table 2.21). Most of the uncivil behavior has come from faculty/academic staff (61.1%) followed by support staff (23.9%) and unit chair or director (20.0%). It is important to note that for almost all the sources of uncivil behavior, the behavior was not an isolated incident, but occurred at least twice.

Table 2.21: Uncivil Behavior Committed by Whom and Frequency

You indicated that you have experienced at least one incident of uncivil behavior. Please indicate who was involved in the incident(s).	Percent of Cases	Incidences	
		Once	**2 or More Times**
Unit chair or director	20.0%	51.4%	48.6%
College leader (dean, associate dean, program director)	10.6%	35.0%	65.0%
Faculty and/or academic staff	61.1%	29.9%	70.1%
Postdoctoral scholar	5.6%	44.4%	55.6%
Academic advisor	2.8%	20.0%	80.0%
Support staff	23.9%	30.2%	69.8%
Supervisor	11.1%	5.3%	94.7%
Co-worker	17.2%	20.7%	79.3%
Graduate student/Teaching assistant	13.9%	50.0%	50.0%
Undergraduate student	17.2%	12.9%	87.1%
Campus colleague (outside NatSci)	8.9%	26.7%	73.3%
Other	3.3%	33.3%	66.7%

The table only includes cases where there was at least one incident of uncivil behavior. The second column reports the percentage of various college roles involved. The third and fourth columns report, for the cases that had that role involved, the percentage of cases where it occurred once/multiple times.

Biased Incidences

Different forms of bias incidences were presented to the respondents who were asked how often they had personally experienced the event within the College (Table 2.22). The further from 0 the mean score is the more often the incidences have occurred. All forms, but power differentials had over 90% of the respondents stating that they had never experienced that form of bias. Power differentials in the work environment was reported to have happened at least once by 27.6% of the respondents. Of those, almost two-thirds stated that it had happened two or more times. For each form of bias, if it occurred, it was more likely to have occurred at least twice. Breakdown by demographic characteristics was not done due to the relatively low percent of reported incidences.

Table 2.22: Biased Incidences Experienced Within College

In the past three years, how often, if at all, have you <u>experienced</u> an incident of bias/discrimination within your department/unit or within the College based on any of the following?	Never	Once	2 or More Times			
	0	1	2	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Power differentials in the work environment (i.e., role, tenure)	72.4%	9.3%	18.3%	246	.28	.448
Older age	91.8%	3.9%	4.3%	233	.08	.274
Younger age	92.1%	2.6%	5.3%	228	.08	.270
Gender expression and identity	92.6%	2.6%	4.8%	231	.07	.262
Sexual orientation	98.2%	0.0%	1.8%	225	.02	.132
Race/ethnicity	92.2%	1.7%	6.1%	231	.08	.269
Country of origin	97.3%	0.9%	1.8%	224	.03	.162
Religious background	97.8%	0.9%	1.3%	225	.02	.148
A psychological or mental health issue	94.7%	2.2%	3.1%	227	.05	.224
A physical disability or health issue	96.9%	0.9%	2.2%	223	.03	.175
Other (please specify)	62.5%	6.3%	31.3%	16	.38	.500
Responses for this series of experienced biased behaviors were based on "0" for no incidences "1" for one incident, and "2" for two or more incidences. Mean scores range is from "0" for no incidences from any respondent to "2" for two or more incidences experienced by all respondents. Mean scores below 1 mean that the average respondents experienced less than one incident of that biased behavior. Mean scores between one and two mean that the average respondent experienced at least one incident.						

Respondents were then asked how often they had <u>witnessed</u> the same forms of bias within the College of Natural Science (Table 2.23). The further from 0 the mean score is the more often the incidences have occurred. Again, bias actions due to power differentials (32.9%) were the most reported form of bias and over three-quarters of those who witnessed it had witnessed it 2 or more times. Though the percentage of incidences witnessed for the other forms of bias were still relatively low, there was an increase in the biases being witnessed compared to experienced. This may be due to multiple witnesses to the same event or due to underreporting of experiencing bias by respondents.

Table 2.23: Biased Incidences Witnessed Within College

In the past three years, how often, if at all, have you witnessed an incident of bias/discrimination within your department/unit or within the College based on any of the following?	Never	Once	2 or More Times			
	0	1	2	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Power differentials in the work environment (i.e., role, tenure)	67.1%	7.2%	25.7%	237	.33	.471
Older age	86.9%	5.9%	7.2%	221	.13	.338
Younger age	90.9%	3.2%	5.9%	219	.09	.289
Gender expression and identity	86.0%	6.8%	7.2%	221	.14	.348
Sexual orientation	94.4%	1.9%	3.7%	216	.06	.230
Race/ethnicity	82.5%	5.8%	11.7%	223	.17	.381
Country of origin	88.0%	2.8%	9.2%	217	.12	.325
Religious background	96.7%	1.9%	1.4%	215	.03	.178
A psychological or mental health issue	88.4%	4.7%	7.0%	215	.12	.321
A physical disability or health issue	88.9%	4.2%	6.9%	216	.11	.315
Other (please specify)	53.3%	13.3%	33.3%	15	.47	.516
Responses for this series of witnessed biased behaviors were based on "0" for no incidences "1" for one incident, and "2" for two or more incidences. Mean scores range is from "0" for no incidences from any respondent to "2" for two or more incidences witnessed by all respondents. Mean scores below 1 mean that the average respondents witnessed less than one incident of that biased behavior. Mean scores between one and two mean that the average respondent witnessed at least one incident.						

Faculty/academic staff (53.8%) were the most reported as committing the bias, followed by unit chair/director (26.4%), support staff (23.1%) and co-workers (22.0%) (Table 2.24).

Table 2.24: Experienced Biased Incidences Committed by Whom

You indicated that you personally experienced an incident of bias/discrimination. Please indicate who was involved.	Percent of Cases
Unit chair or director	26.4%
College leader (dean, associate dean, program director)	18.7%
Faculty and/or academic staff	53.8%
Postdoctoral scholar	7.7%
Academic advisor	3.3%
Support staff	23.1%
Supervisor	13.2%
Co-worker	22.0%
Graduate student/Teaching assistant	9.9%
Undergraduate student	5.5%
Campus colleague (outside NatSci)	12.1%
Other (please specify)	1.1%
The table only includes cases where there was at least one incident of bias experienced. The second column reports the percentage of various college roles involved. More than one role could have been selected by the respondent.	

Confidence in Addressing Bias Incidents

When respondents were asked how confident they were to address various bias incidents, over 80% stated that they were confident in handling each of the forms of bias. Sexist comments/events (91.2%), negative racial comments/events (88.1%), and comments/events against those with disabilities (88.0%) were the incidents that respondents felt most confident in their ability to address.

Table 2.25a: Confidence in Your Own Ability to Address Bias Incidents

How confident are you in your own ability to effectively address the following events when or if they occur?	Not at all Confident	Not Very Confident	Somewhat Confident	Very Confident			
	1	2	3	4	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Negative racial comments and racial events.	3.1%	8.8%	36.8%	51.3%	261	3.36	.771
Sexist comments and sexist events.	1.5%	7.3%	41.2%	50.0%	260	3.40	.692
Homophobic/transphobic comments and homophobic/transphobic events.	3.8%	9.6%	35.8%	50.8%	260	3.33	.805
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward people with disabilities.	3.1%	8.8%	34.2%	53.8%	260	3.39	.776
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward international employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.4%	11.1%	39.7%	45.8%	262	3.28	.794
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward the religious affiliations of employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.8%	13.1%	40.8%	42.3%	260	3.22	.815
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward age.	4.6%	14.9%	40.6%	39.8%	261	3.16	.843
The mean scores are based on a four-point scale where 1 refers to no confidence at all in their ability to handle the situation and 4 very confident with their ability. With the midpoint of the scale being 2.5, everything above it is considered having confidence and everything below lacking confidence in their ability. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 4) the closer it is to the end attribute (not at all confident or very confident).							

There were differences in who felt confident in dealing with the various bias events. Females were less confident for five of the seven biases. Race did play a part in the level of confidence, though it was not consistent by racial category. Of concern is that those with disabilities were less confident in dealing with bias events/comments directed at those with disabilities.

Table 2.25b: Confidence in Your Own Ability to Address Bias Incidents by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

How confident are you in your own ability to effectively address the following events when or if they occur?	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Negative racial comments and racial events.	3.35	3.41	3.29	3.34	3.32	3.00	3.37	3.56	3.33	3.37
Sexist comments and sexist events.	3.39	3.42	3.36	3.40	3.36	3.14	3.40	3.54	3.29	3.41
Homophobic/transphobic comments and homophobic/transphobic events.	3.33	3.34	3.32	3.33	3.34	3.14	3.33	3.54	3.36	3.32
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward people with disabilities.	3.39	3.49	3.30	3.39	3.25	3.29	3.42	3.54	3.24	3.45
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward international employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.29	3.38	3.20	3.25	3.18	3.00	3.35	3.33	3.21	3.30
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward the religious affiliations of employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.22	3.29	3.15	3.18	3.18	3.00	3.27	3.19	3.16	3.23
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward age.	3.17	3.25	3.10	3.12	3.07	2.93	3.20	3.42	2.98	3.19
The mean scores are based on a four-point scale where 1 refers to no confidence at all in their ability to handle the situation and 4 very confident with their ability. With the midpoint of the scale being 2.5, everything above it is considered having confidence and everything below lacking confidence in their ability. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 4) the closer it is to the end attribute (not at all confident or very confident).										

Fixed-term faculty and postdocs reported less agreement with their ability to handle the various bias incidences across all the biases (Table 2.25c). Supported staff were less confident in handling four of the incidences and tenure-track faculty were less confident with three. Academic specialists were only less confident in their ability to handle incidences involving internationals.

Table 2.25c: Confidence in Your Own Ability to Address Bias Incidents by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

How confident are you in your own ability to effectively address the following events when or if they occur?	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Negative racial comments and racial events.	3.37	3.39	3.27	3.45	2.96	3.50
Sexist comments and sexist events.	3.40	3.43	3.27	3.58	3.18	3.43
Homophobic/transphobic comments and homophobic/transphobic events.	3.34	3.35	3.20	3.39	3.14	3.43
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward people with disabilities.	3.40	3.45	3.33	3.61	3.04	3.41
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward international employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.28	3.43	3.17	3.30	2.86	3.30
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward the religious affiliations of employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.22	3.27	3.03	3.30	2.93	3.30
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward age.	3.16	3.18	3.10	3.24	2.89	3.21
The mean scores are based on a four-point scale where 1 refers to no confidence at all in their ability to handle the situation and 4 very confident with their ability. With the midpoint of the scale being 2.5, everything above it is considered having confidence and everything below lacking confidence in their ability. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 4) the closer it is to the end attribute (not at all confident or very confident).						

Those in Mathematics were less confident in handling all but sexist incidences (Table 2.25d). Those in the Biological Sciences were less confident in dealing with incidences related to internationals and age. Those in the Physical Sciences didn't report lower confidence within any of the incident types.

Table 2.25d: Confidence in Your Own Ability to Address Bias Incidents by College Districts (Mean Scores)

How confident are you in your own ability to effectively address the following events when or if they occur?	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Negative racial comments and racial events.	3.36	3.35	3.41	3.28
Sexist comments and sexist events.	3.38	3.39	3.38	3.31
Homophobic/transphobic comments and homophobic/transphobic events.	3.33	3.35	3.33	3.25
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward people with disabilities.	3.40	3.43	3.40	3.31
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward international employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.29	3.25	3.41	3.09
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward the religious affiliations of employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.21	3.20	3.28	3.09
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward age.	3.14	3.09	3.26	3.03

The mean scores are based on a four-point scale where 1 refers to no confidence at all in their ability to handle the situation and 4 very confident with their ability. With the midpoint of the scale being 2.5, everything above it is considered having confidence and everything below lacking confidence in their ability. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 4) the closer it is to the end attribute (not at all confident or very confident).

In addition to asking about their confidence in dealing with bias comments/events, respondents were asked about their confidence in leadership, at both the college and at the department unit level, to address bias events.

In terms of college leadership, over three-quarters of the respondents reported being at least somewhat confident in the leadership for all the biases listed. Two of the bias had higher levels of either not very or not at all confident – ageist (20.0%) and sexist (19.7%) comments/events.

Table 2.26a: Confidence in College Leadership to Address Bias Incidents

How confident are you in NatSci (College) Leadership's ability to effectively address the following events when or if they occur?	Not at all Confident	Not Very Confident	Somewhat Confident	Very Confident	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4			
Negative racial comments and racial events.	6.3%	7.3%	33.0%	53.4%	206	3.33	.866
Sexist comments and sexist events.	9.1%	10.6%	33.2%	47.1%	208	3.18	.956
Homophobic/transphobic comments and homophobic/transphobic events.	6.4%	7.8%	38.7%	47.1%	204	3.26	.859
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward people with disabilities.	6.1%	7.7%	35.2%	51.0%	196	3.31	.859
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward international employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	5.5%	8.5%	36.3%	49.8%	201	3.30	.844
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward the religious affiliations of employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	5.0%	12.4%	37.6%	45.0%	202	3.23	.851
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward age.	7.6%	12.6%	38.9%	40.9%	198	3.13	.908
The mean scores are based on a four-point scale where 1 refers to no confidence at all in leadership's ability to handle the situation and 4 very confident with leadership's ability. With the midpoint of the scale being 2.5, everything above it is considered having confidence and everything below lacking confidence in leadership's ability. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 4) the closer it is to the end attribute (not at all confident or very confident).							

The level of confidence in college leadership to effectively address events differed by demographic characteristics groups (Table 2.26b). Males were less confident in terms of their handling of homophobic/transphobic events, as well as ageist events than their female counterparts. Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community were less confident for all events other than those associated with religious affiliation. Asians were less confident for all the bias forms. Those with disabilities were less confident for all biases other than those associated with internationals.

Table 2.26b: Confidence in College Leadership by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

How confident are you in NatSci (College) Leadership's ability to effectively address the following events when or if they occur?	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Negative racial comments and racial events.	3.35	3.30	3.39	3.40	3.28	3.25	3.37	3.30	3.27	3.40
Sexist comments and sexist events.	3.21	3.19	3.23	3.28	3.00	3.22	3.17	3.35	2.96	3.29
Homophobic/transphobic comments and homophobic/transphobic events.	3.28	3.23	3.34	3.36	2.89	3.17	3.28	3.42	3.13	3.31
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward people with disabilities.	3.33	3.35	3.31	3.36	2.96	3.25	3.38	3.36	3.11	3.39
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward international employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.32	3.33	3.31	3.37	3.15	3.13	3.40	3.27	3.33	3.33
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward the religious affiliations of employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.24	3.28	3.20	3.26	3.20	3.13	3.31	3.16	3.16	3.33
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward age.	3.16	3.12	3.22	3.16	3.04	3.09	3.15	3.48	2.96	3.21

The mean scores are based on a four-point scale where 1 refers to no confidence at all in leadership's ability to handle the situation and 4 very confident with leadership's ability. With the midpoint of the scale being 2.5, everything above it is considered having confidence and everything below lacking confidence in leadership's ability. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 4) the closer it is to the end attribute (not at all confident or very confident).

Postdocs were less confident in college leadership's ability to handle any of the seven bias incidences (Table 2.26c). Fixed-term faculty were less confident in college leadership's ability in dealing with racial, sexist, and homophobic/transphobic incidences and those dealing with internationals. Tenure-track faculty were less confident in college leadership's ability to deal with racial and age-related incidences. Academic specialists were less confident with college leadership's ability to handle racial incidences and support staff were less confident in their ability to deal with incidences related to disabilities

Table 2.26c: Confidence in College Leadership by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

How confident are you in NatSci (College) Leadership's ability to effectively address the following events when or if they occur?	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Negative racial comments and racial events.	3.34	3.38	3.24	3.37	2.80	3.48
Sexist comments and sexist events.	3.20	3.22	3.04	3.30	2.80	3.29
Homophobic/transphobic comments and homophobic/transphobic events.	3.27	3.34	3.12	3.30	2.87	3.35
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward people with disabilities.	3.32	3.40	3.38	3.31	3.00	3.28
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward international employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.31	3.33	3.35	3.38	2.73	3.41
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward the religious affiliations of employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.24	3.31	3.08	3.26	2.81	3.31
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward age.	3.14	3.08	3.22	3.24	2.80	3.24

The mean scores are based on a four-point scale where 1 refers to no confidence at all in leadership's ability to handle the situation and 4 very confident with leadership's ability. With the midpoint of the scale being 2.5, everything above it is considered having confidence and everything below lacking confidence in leadership's ability. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 4) the closer it is to the end attribute (not at all confident or very confident).

Those in the Physical Sciences more confidence in the college's leadership's ability to address bias than the other two districts (Table 2.26d). Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower confidence in all seven events and those in mathematics reported lower confidence in leadership's abilities for all but racial events.

Table 2.26d: Confidence in College Leadership to Address Bias Incidents by College Districts (Mean Scores)

How confident are you in NatSci (College) Leadership's ability to effectively address the following events when or if they occur?	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Negative racial comments and racial events.	3.31	3.20	3.42	3.36
Sexist comments and sexist events.	3.16	3.01	3.33	3.20
Homophobic/transphobic comments and homophobic/transphobic events.	3.24	3.15	3.38	3.16
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward people with disabilities.	3.32	3.29	3.42	3.16
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward international employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.29	3.22	3.40	3.20
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward the religious affiliations of employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.24	3.11	3.48	3.00
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward age.	3.11	3.07	3.21	3.00
The mean scores are based on a four-point scale where 1 refers to no confidence at all in their ability to handle the situation and 4 very confident with their ability. With the midpoint of the scale being 2.5, everything above it is considered having confidence and everything below lacking confidence in their ability. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 4) the closer it is to the end attribute (not at all confident or very confident).				

The level of confidence with department/unit leadership is similar to that found with the college leadership (Table 2.27a). Primary differences are that there is more confidence in the department/unit leadership in dealing with sexist comments/events than college leadership and there is less confidence in department leadership in terms of ageist comments/events.

Table 2.27a: Confidence in Department/Unit Leadership to Address Bias Incidents

How confident are NatSci (Department/Unit) Leadership's ability to effectively address the following events when or if they occur?	Not at all Confident	Not Very Confident	Somewhat Confident	Very Confident	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4			
Negative racial comments and racial events.	4.6%	8.9%	38.0%	48.5%	237	3.30	.819
Sexist comments and sexist events.	6.2%	10.7%	38.4%	44.6%	242	3.21	.871
Homophobic/transphobic comments and homophobic/transphobic events.	5.1%	10.6%	38.1%	46.2%	236	3.25	.842
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward people with disabilities.	4.8%	9.5%	36.4%	49.4%	231	3.30	.831
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward international employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	5.0%	9.7%	39.1%	46.2%	238	3.26	.833
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward the religious affiliations of employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	4.7%	11.5%	40.9%	43.0%	235	3.22	.828
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward age.	7.3%	13.7%	40.3%	38.6%	233	3.10	.899
The mean scores are based on a four-point scale where 1 refers to no confidence at all in their ability to handle the situation and 4 very confident with their ability. With the midpoint of the scale being 2.5, everything above it is considered having confidence and everything below lacking confidence in their ability. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 4) the closer it is to the end attribute (not at all confident or very confident).							

As with college leadership, there is a difference in the level of confidence with department/unit leadership amongst different demographic characteristics groups (Table 2.27b). Females were less confident than their male counterparts of five of the seven biases listed. Members of the LBGTQIA2S+ community were less confident in leaderships ability to do with homophonic/transphobic comments/events than heterosexuals. In terms of race, there is no clear pattern across all the biases, though there are differences seen across the racial groups. Those with disabilities had less confidence in leadership ability to deal with biases for all biases except those dealing with internationals.

Table 2.27b: Confidence in Department/Unit Leadership by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

How confident are NatSci (Department/Unit) Leadership's ability to effectively address the following events when or if they occur?	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Negative racial comments and racial events.	3.30	3.31	3.29	3.30	3.38	3.26	3.33	3.08	3.12	3.41
Sexist comments and sexist events.	3.23	3.28	3.17	3.23	3.23	3.26	3.20	3.32	3.02	3.29
Homophobic/transphobic comments and homophobic/transphobic events.	3.26	3.28	3.24	3.29	3.10	3.15	3.26	3.33	3.04	3.32
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward people with disabilities.	3.32	3.40	3.23	3.30	3.21	3.26	3.34	3.40	3.06	3.42
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward international employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.28	3.34	3.21	3.25	3.33	3.11	3.34	3.19	3.31	3.28
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward the religious affiliations of employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.23	3.30	3.17	3.22	3.28	3.15	3.28	3.16	3.10	3.32
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward age.	3.13	3.19	3.06	3.09	3.13	3.08	3.13	3.36	2.85	3.19
The mean scores are based on a four-point scale where 1 refers to no confidence at all in their ability to handle the situation and 4 very confident with their ability. With the midpoint of the scale being 2.5, everything above it is considered having confidence and everything below lacking confidence in their ability. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 4) the closer it is to the end attribute (not at all confident or very confident).										

Fixed-term faculty and postdocs were less confident in their department/unit's leadership's ability to effectively handle all the events listed (Table 2.27c). Tenure-track faculty were less confident in their department/unit's leadership's ability to handle racial, sexist events and those towards people with disabilities. Support staff were less confident in terms of sexist events and those towards people with disabilities and those who are internationals. Academic staff only had less confidence in their ability to handle events related to internationals.

Table 2.27c: Confidence in Department/Unit Leadership by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

How confident are NatSci (Department/Unit) Leadership's ability to effectively address the following events when or if they occur?	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Negative racial comments and racial events.	3.37	3.39	3.27	3.45	2.96	3.50
Sexist comments and sexist events.	3.40	3.43	3.27	3.58	3.18	3.43
Homophobic/transphobic comments and homophobic/transphobic events.	3.34	3.35	3.20	3.39	3.14	3.43
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward people with disabilities.	3.40	3.45	3.33	3.61	3.04	3.41
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward international employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.28	3.43	3.17	3.30	2.86	3.30
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward the religious affiliations of employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.22	3.27	3.03	3.30	2.93	3.30
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward age.	3.16	3.18	3.10	3.24	2.89	3.21
The mean scores are based on a four-point scale where 1 refers to no confidence at all in their ability to handle the situation and 4 very confident with their ability. With the midpoint of the scale being 2.5, everything above it is considered having confidence and everything below lacking confidence in their ability. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 4) the closer it is to the end attribute (not at all confident or very confident).						

Those in the Physical Sciences reported higher mean scores than either of the two other districts (Table 2.27d). Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower levels of confidence in department/unit leadership's ability in dealing with events related to those with disabilities and those related to religious affiliation. Those in Mathematics had lower levels of confidence in department/unit leadership's ability to deal with racial events.

Table 2.27d: Confidence in Department/Unit Leadership by College Districts (Mean Scores)

How confident are NatSci (Department/Unit) Leadership's ability to effectively address the following events when or if they occur?	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Negative racial comments and racial events.	3.30	3.32	3.30	3.25
Sexist comments and sexist events.	3.22	3.20	3.27	3.14
Homophobic/transphobic comments and homophobic/transphobic events.	3.27	3.24	3.33	3.19
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward people with disabilities.	3.32	3.30	3.41	3.14
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward international employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.28	3.28	3.31	3.21
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward the religious affiliations of employees, leadership, students, and visitors.	3.23	3.19	3.36	3.04
Comments and events that are discriminatory toward age.	3.12	3.12	3.15	3.04
The mean scores are based on a four-point scale where 1 refers to no confidence at all in their ability to handle the situation and 4 very confident with their ability. With the midpoint of the scale being 2.5, everything above it is considered having confidence and everything below lacking confidence in their ability. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 4) the closer it is to the end attribute (not at all confident or very confident).				

Bias Incident Reporting

Over 75% of the respondents reported that they knew how to report bias incidents if they occur within the college, but 14.9% at least somewhat disagreed with the statement. In terms of not fearing retaliation, 70.5% agreed with the statement, but 16.2% disagreed which implies that they would fear retaliation. Only 61.2% felt that leadership would take appropriate actions based on the claimant's desire and 17.4% disagreed with this statement. Three-quarters of the respondents said that they were confident that leadership would keep the reports confidential, but 11.7% did not.

Table 2.28a: Bias Incident Reporting

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about reporting bias/discrimination incidents in the College of Natural Science.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
I know how to report bias incidents if they occur within the College.	7.1%	7.8%	9.5%	31.8%	43.8%	283	3.98	1.219
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation	6.7%	9.5%	13.3%	30.5%	40.0%	285	3.88	1.226
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leaders will take appropriate actions to address them based on the claimant's desires.	7.8%	9.6%	21.4%	27.4%	33.8%	281	3.70	1.247
I am confident that college/unit leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of bias, discrimination, or incivility.	6.4%	5.3%	13.1%	29.3%	45.9%	283	4.03	1.174

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable) for the statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Given that there were those who stated that they feared retaliation or were concerned about how leadership handled it, it is important to see if those who have those concerns are within demographic groups that are more likely to need to report an incident – females, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Whites, and those with disabilities. Females, non-Whites, and those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement when asked about reporting without fear of retaliation. In terms of belief in actions being taken being based on claimants' desire, non-Asians and those with disabilities had lower levels of agreement. In terms of confidence in maintaining confidentiality, non-Whites and those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement.

Table 2.28b: Bias Incident Reporting by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about reporting bias/discrimination incidents in the College of Natural Science.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
I know how to report bias incidents if they occur within the College.	3.98	4.01	3.96	3.91	3.96	3.74	4.07	3.79	3.75	4.05
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation	3.87	3.96	3.77	3.97	4.00	3.69	3.95	3.61	3.59	4.19
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leaders will take appropriate actions to address them based on the claimant's desires.	3.71	3.71	3.71	3.76	3.68	3.97	3.72	3.46	3.28	4.00
I am confident that college/unit leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of bias, discrimination, or incivility.	4.03	4.06	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.94	4.08	3.89	3.84	4.30

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable) for the statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

Postdocs were the least likely to know how to report bias incidents within the College and the least likely to agree that they could report bias incidents without fear of retaliation (Table 2.28c). Fixed-term faculty were the least likely to agree that leadership would take the appropriate actions based on claimant's desires and the least confident that college leadership would keep it confidential. Academic specialists were reported the highest level of agreement for all the statements.

Table 2.28c: Bias Incident Reporting by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about reporting bias/discrimination incidents in the College of Natural Science.	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
I know how to report bias incidents if they occur within the College.	3.98	4.09	4.00	4.27	3.36	3.95
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation	3.88	3.88	3.94	4.00	3.55	3.92
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leaders will take appropriate actions to address them based on the claimant's desires.	3.70	3.68	3.40	3.94	3.70	3.75
I am confident that college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of bias, discrimination, or incivility.	4.03	4.06	3.83	4.33	4.03	3.96
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable) for the statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).						

Those in the Biological Sciences reported less agreement for all four statements (Table 2.28d). Those in the Physical Sciences had less agreement in terms of leadership taking the appropriate actions based on the claimant's desires. Those in Mathematics reported lower agreement in terms of know how to report bias incidents and their confidence in leadership's ability to keep it confidential.

Table 2.28d: Bias Incident Reporting by College District (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about reporting bias/discrimination incidents in the College of Natural Science.	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
I know how to report bias incidents if they occur within the College.	3.96	3.90	4.06	3.91
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation	3.84	3.80	3.90	3.83
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leaders will take appropriate actions to address them based on the claimant's desires.	3.69	3.64	3.71	3.85
I am confident that college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of bias, discrimination, or incivility.	4.01	3.89	4.23	3.91
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable) for the statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).				

Table 2.29 reports the level of reporting by respondents who knew of at least one incident of bias within the College. Only 18.2% of respondents reported all the incidents they knew of and an additional 19.0% reported at least one of the incidents they knew about. The fact that 62.8% of the respondents did not report is of great concern.

Table 2.29: Reported a Known Bias Incident

Thinking about the incident(s) of bias/discrimination you experienced or witnessed, did you report the incident(s)?	Percent of Cases
Reported the incident or all incidents	18.2%
Reported some of the incidents	19.0%
Did not report the incident(s)	62.8%
Table only includes those who stated that they experienced/witnessed a bias incident.	

For those that did not report some or all the incidents they knew, they were asked why they did not report it (Table 2.30). The most common response was they were unsure if it violated university policy (42.3%) which is an indicator that additional training/educating may be needed. The other three categories – fear of retaliation (27.9%), concern with not being believed (13.5%), and lack of confidence in an appropriate action being taken (42.3%) all indicate that there is a lack of confidence in leadership's ability to deal appropriately with reporting by those who were either victims or witnesses.

Table 2.30: Why Didn't Report Known Bias Incident

What are the reasons why you decided not to report the incident(s)?	Percent of Cases
I feared retaliation	27.9%
I did not think I would be believed	13.5%
I did not think appropriate action would be taken	42.3%
I was unsure if the incident violated university policies	54.1%
Other reason	35.1%
Table only includes those who experienced/witnessed a bias incident and did not report it.	

For those incidents that were reported, most of the reporting was to department/unit leadership (60.0%), followed by direct supervisor (34.0%) and college leadership (32.0%) (Table 2.31). Rarely was the incident reported outside of the college.

Table 2.31: Who Incident Reported to

To which individual(s) or unit(s) did you report bias/discrimination incidents?	Percent of Cases
Office of Institutional Equity (OIE)	28.0%

Office for Civil Rights and Title IX Compliance (OCR)	10.0%
Ombudsperson Office	2.0%
Faculty Grievance and Dispute Resolution Office	6.0%
My department/unit supervisor/chair/director	60.0%
Dean, associate dean, assistant dean	32.0%
NatSci DEI Office	6.0%
Graduate Program Director	6.0%
Supervisor	34.0%
Staff member	12.0%
Other (please specify)	6.0%
Table only includes those who reported at least one bias incident. Respondents may have selected more than one of the categories.	

OVERALL COMFORTABLENESS AND SATISFACTION WITH THE COLLEGE

Respondents were asked how comfortable they are with the climate within the College. Over 60% (64.0%) stated that they were at least somewhat comfortable (Table 2.32a).

Table 2.32a: Comfortable with the Climate in the College of Natural Science

	Very Uncomfortable	Somewhat Uncomfortable	Neither Comfortable nor Uncomfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Very Comfortable			
	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Overall, how comfortable or uncomfortable are you with the climate in the College of Natural Science?	8.0%	12.7%	15.3%	34.3%	29.7%	300	3.65	1.249
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to very comfortable with the climate and 5 refers to very comfortable with the climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered comfortable and everything below uncomfortable with the climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very uncomfortable or very comfortable).								

When looking at the level of comfort across the different demographic groups, only those with disabilities (3.18) reported a mean score difference greater than 0.1 for from their counterpart – those without a disability (3.96) (Table 2.32b). This suggests that the level of comfort with the College's climate is relatively consistent across groups other than those with disabilities.

Table 2.32b: Comfortable with the Climate in the College of Natural Science by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Overall, how comfortable or uncomfortable are you with the climate in the College of Natural Science?	3.66	3.70	3.61	3.77	3.85	3.71	3.68	3.64	<u>3.18</u>	3.96
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to very comfortable with the climate and 5 refers to very comfortable with the climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered comfortable and everything below uncomfortable with the climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very uncomfortable or very comfortable).										

Postdocs reported the highest level of comfort with the climate in the college (Table 2.32c). Tenure-track and fixed-term faculty, along with support staff, reported the lowest level of agreement with being comfortable with the climate within the college.

Table 2.32c: Comfortable with the Climate in the College of Natural Science by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Overall, how comfortable or uncomfortable are you with the climate in the College of Natural Science?	3.65	3.59	3.59	3.81	3.97	3.56
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to very comfortable with the climate and 5 refers to very comfortable with the climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered comfortable and everything below uncomfortable with the climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very uncomfortable or very comfortable).						

Those in the Physical Sciences reported the highest level of comfort with the climate in the College (Table 2.32d). Those in Mathematics reported the lowest level.

Table 2.32d: Comfortable with the Climate in the College of Natural Science by College District (Mean Scores)

	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Overall, how comfortable or uncomfortable are you with the climate in the College of Natural Science?	3.64	3.61	3.77	3.39
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to very comfortable with the climate and 5 refers to very comfortable with the climate. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered comfortable and everything below uncomfortable with the climate. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very uncomfortable or very comfortable).				

Respondents were then asked about their satisfaction as an employee of the College (Table 2.33a). Over two-thirds (68.4%) reported that they were at least somewhat satisfied with 17.8% reporting that they were very or somewhat dissatisfied.

Table 2.33a: Satisfaction as an Employee in the College of Natural Science

	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied			
	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your experience as an employee in the College of Natural Science?	5.7%	12.1%	13.8%	35.2%	33.2%	300	3.65	1.249
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to very dissatisfied with experience in college and 5 refers to very satisfied with experience in college. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered satisfied, and everything below dissatisfied with experience in college. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very dissatisfied or very satisfied).								

Though all the mean scores for each group were above 3.0 (satisfied), males (3.69), employees of color (3.64) and those with disabilities (3.28) reported lower satisfaction than their counterparts (Table 2.33b). Those without disabilities reported a much higher level of satisfaction than any of the other groups.

Table 2.33b: Satisfaction as an Employee in the College of Natural Science by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your experience as an employee in the College of Natural Science?	3.79	3.69	3.89	3.87	3.93	3.79	3.82	3.64	3.28	4.08
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to very dissatisfied with experience in college and 5 refers to very satisfied with experience in college. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered satisfied, and everything below dissatisfied with experience in college. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very dissatisfied or very satisfied).										

Postdocs reported the highest level of satisfaction as an employee (Table 2.33c). Both tenure-track and fixed-term faculty had the lowest level of satisfaction.

Table 2.33c: Satisfaction as an Employee in the College of Natural Science by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your experience as an employee in the College of Natural Science?	3.78	3.69	3.73	3.83	3.97	3.83
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to very dissatisfied with experience in college and 5 refers to very satisfied with experience in college. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered satisfied, and everything below dissatisfied with experience in college. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very dissatisfied or very satisfied).						

Both the those in the Biological and in the Physical Sciences reported higher levels of satisfaction as an employee than those in Mathematics (Table 2.33d).

Table 2.33d: Satisfaction as an Employee in the College of Natural Science by College District (Mean Scores)

	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your experience as an employee in the College of Natural Science?	3.77	3.81	3.76	3.62
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to very dissatisfied with experience in college and 5 refers to very satisfied with experience in college. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered satisfied, and everything below dissatisfied with experience in college. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very dissatisfied or very satisfied).				

Almost 70% (69.5%) of the respondents stated that they were proud to be part of the College of Natural Sciences and almost 80 percent (79.1%) stated that they intended to stay within the College for the next twelve months (Table 2.34a). Of concern is that 36.8% of the respondents did at least somewhat agree with the statement that they have seriously considered leaving their position in the College. It should be noted that this does not necessarily mean that they are considering leaving the College entirely, only their current position. This may mean dissatisfaction within a unit, not within the College in general.

Table 2.34a: Attitudes about Employee Experience Within the College of Natural Science

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about your experiences as an employee in the College of Natural Science.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree			
	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
I am proud to be part of NatSci.	5.4%	6.4%	18.8%	26.2%	43.3%	298	3.96	1.167
I have seriously considered leaving my position in NatSci. *(reverse coding)* *	37.5%	13.4%	12.4%	17.4%	19.4%	299	2.68	1.577
I intend to stay at NatSci for at least the next twelve months.	4.7%	4.1%	12.2%	17.6%	61.5%	296	4.27	1.120

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable) for most statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).
* The statement "I have seriously considered leaving my position in NatSci" is reverse coded which means that agreement with the statement is unfavorable in terms of staying in the position and a disagree response is favorable.

Table 23.4b offers further insight into who may be more likely to consider leaving their current position and who are more satisfied with the College. For "I am proud to be part of NatSci." and "I intend to stay at NatSci for at least the next twelve months.," the higher the mean the better. Females (4.03), heterosexuals (4.08) and those without disabilities (4.21) were more likely to be proud to be part of the College of Natural Science than their counterparts. Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community (4.04), non-Whites (4.09/3.93) and those with disabilities (3.90) were less likely to state that they planned on staying within the college for the next 12 months.

For the statement "I have seriously considered leaving my position in NatSci.," a higher mean suggests greater likelihood of leaving their position. In terms of leaving their position, females (2.77), non-Asians (2.78/2.50) and those with disabilities (2.95) were likely to state that they were thinking of leaving.

Table 2.34b: Attitudes about Employee Experience Within the College of Natural Science by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about your experiences as an employee in the College of Natural Science.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
I am proud to be part of NatSci.	3.96	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.98	4.00	3.96	3.96	3.58	4.21
I have seriously considered leaving my position in NatSci. *(reverse coding)**	2.69	2.60	2.77	2.62	2.65	2.22	2.78	2.50	2.95	2.36
I intend to stay at NatSci for at least the next twelve months.	4.25	4.25	4.24	4.40	4.04	4.09	4.33	3.93	3.90	4.48

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable) for most statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).
* The statement "I have seriously considered leaving my position in NatSci" is reverse coded which means that agreement with the statement is unfavorable in terms of staying in the position and a disagree response is favorable.

Tenure-track faculty, postdocs and support staff were all less likely to say they were proud to be part of NatSci though their numbers were still in the positive direction (Table 2.34c). Academic specialists were the most likely to state that they have seriously considered leaving their position in NatSci though they were also the ones who were most likely to agree that they were proud to be part of NatSci. Postdocs and support staff were least likely to say that they intended to stay in NatSci for at least the next twelve months. This may be, in part, due to the end date for some of their positions.

Table 2.34c: Attitudes about Employee Experience Within the College of Natural Science by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about your experiences as an employee in the College of Natural Science.	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
I am proud to be part of NatSci.	3.96	3.94	4.19	4.28	3.76	3.81
I have seriously considered leaving my position in NatSci. (reverse coding) *	2.67	2.62	*2.70*	*2.83*	2.53	*2.72*
I intend to stay at NatSci for at least the next twelve months.	4.27	4.45	4.49	4.31	4.03	3.99

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable) for most statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).
* The statement "I have seriously considered leaving my position in NatSci" is reverse coded which means that agreement with the statement is unfavorable in terms of staying in the position and a disagree response is favorable.

Those in Mathematics were less likely to report that they were proud to be part of NatSci (Table 2.34d). Yet, they were the least likely to state that they had seriously considered leaving their position in NatSci. Those in the

Biological Sciences were slightly less likely to intend to stay in NatSci for at least the next twelve months compared to those in Mathematics.

Table 2.34d: Attitudes about Employee Experiences Within the College of Natural Science by College District (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about your experiences as an employee in the College of Natural Science.	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
I am proud to be part of NatSci.	3.95	3.93	4.01	<u>3.89</u>
I have seriously considered leaving my position in NatSci. *(reverse coding) **	2.64	*2.65*	*2.79*	2.24
I intend to stay at NatSci for at least the next twelve months.	4.30	<u>4.27</u>	4.30	4.38
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to strongly disagreeing with the statement and 5 refers to strongly agreeing with the statement. With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable) for most statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree). * The statement "I have seriously considered leaving my position in NatSci" is reverse coded which means that agreement with the statement is unfavorable in terms of staying in the position and a disagree response is favorable.				

ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY RESPONDENTS

Finally, respondents were asked to assess the current situation of the college in terms of needed improvement/current strength in several areas (Table 2.35a). Areas with a mean score greater than 3 were seen as a strength and those with a mean score below three were areas identified as needing improvement. In terms of strengths, "Contributing to the greater good of all." (45.5%), "Demonstrating professionalism and high ethical standards." (42.4%) and "Demonstrating respectful communication." (42.2%) received the most responses of at least a significant strength. The areas that received the most response of no greater than "Needs Improvement" were "Being a diverse community. "(46.5%), "Being inclusive and promoting belonging." (41.0%), and "Demonstrating transparency and openness." (40.5%).

Table 2.35a: Assessment and Recommendations

For each area covered in this survey, what is your assessment and recommendation to NatSci leaders?	Needs Significant Improvement	Needs Improvement	Is Acceptable	Is a Significant Strength	Is Exemplary, Best Possible	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Being a welcoming, safe, and supportive community.	10.9%	22.5%	27.3%	32.4%	6.9%	275	3.02	1.125
Being a diverse community.	18.5%	28.0%	25.8%	21.8%	5.8%	275	2.68	1.174

Being inclusive and promoting belonging.	11.5%	29.5%	27.3%	25.9%	5.8%	278	2.85	1.107
Empowering the best outcomes for all regardless of role, identity, or ability status.	11.4%	27.8%	32.6%	22.7%	5.5%	273	2.83	1.075
Being open to perspectives and ideas.	7.4%	19.9%	33.9%	33.2%	5.5%	271	3.10	1.021
Creating an environment of trust where ideas are freely shared and discussed.	8.5%	21.5%	33.3%	28.5%	8.1%	270	3.06	1.080
Being innovative.	5.9%	17.4%	38.5%	28.1%	10.0%	270	3.19	1.030
Demonstrating transparency and openness.	14.0%	26.5%	37.1%	17.3%	5.1%	272	2.73	1.065
Demonstrating accountability and integrity.	11.2%	21.6%	39.0%	22.3%	5.9%	269	2.90	1.057
Demonstrating professionalism and high ethical standards.	5.9%	14.9%	36.8%	32.0%	10.4%	269	3.26	1.029
Demonstrating respectful communication.	8.9%	11.1%	37.8%	32.2%	10.0%	270	3.23	1.067
Contributing to the greater good of all.	7.5%	17.3%	29.7%	35.0%	10.5%	266	3.24	1.092

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to the area "Needs significant improvement" and 5 refers to the area "Is Exemplary, Best Possible". With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered an area of significant strength or better, and everything below is an area needing at least some improvement. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (needs significant improvement or exemplary, best possible).

In terms of demographic characteristics, females, heterosexuals, non-Asians, and those with disabilities were the groups most likely to provide a more negative response, thought it did not necessarily mean that the responses were in the range of needing improvement. For those with disabilities, all but one of the categories had mean responses in the "Needs Improvement" range. For all others, the mean score was in the same range found in Table 2.35a.

Table 2.35b: Assessment and Recommendations by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

For each area covered in this survey, what is your assessment and recommendation to NatSci leaders?	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Male	Female	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Being a welcoming, safe, and supportive community.	3.07	3.15	2.98	3.09	3.16	3.35	3.06	2.89	2.66	3.28
Being a diverse community.	2.74	2.93	2.53	2.58	2.73	3.09	2.68	2.67	2.17	2.87
Being inclusive and promoting belonging.	2.90	3.06	2.74	2.87	3.07	3.21	2.89	2.74	2.46	3.12
Empowering the best outcomes for all regardless of role, identity, or ability status.	2.86	3.04	2.68	2.89	2.96	3.06	2.89	2.48	2.43	3.11
Being open to perspectives and ideas.	3.14	3.22	3.05	3.16	3.27	3.38	3.16	2.81	2.80	3.32
Creating an environment of trust where ideas are freely shared and discussed.	3.09	3.15	3.02	3.12	3.29	3.38	3.09	2.81	2.72	3.31
Being innovative.	3.21	3.17	3.25	3.22	3.31	3.09	3.25	3.19	2.97	3.35
Demonstrating transparency and openness.	2.77	2.79	2.74	2.80	2.89	3.09	2.76	2.56	2.40	2.97
Demonstrating accountability and integrity.	2.94	2.98	2.90	2.97	3.11	3.16	2.96	2.63	2.57	3.15
Demonstrating professionalism and high ethical standards.	3.30	3.36	3.23	3.34	3.47	3.28	3.33	3.22	3.00	3.50
Demonstrating respectful communication.	3.27	3.37	3.17	3.33	3.33	3.44	3.28	3.19	2.92	3.43
Contributing to the greater good of all.	3.28	3.34	3.22	3.31	3.36	3.41	3.31	3.04	2.78	3.54

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to the area "Needs significant improvement" and 5 refers to the area "Is Exemplary, Best Possible". With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered an area of significant strength or better, and everything below is an area needing at least some improvement. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (needs significant improvement or exemplary, best possible).

An employee's position within the College did impact their assessment of the different areas (Table 2.35c). Postdocs had the highest levels of assessment and none of their mean scores fell into the need's improvement range. Fixed-term faculty had the lowest mean scores for almost all the areas with the others still being very low. Tenure-track faculty had the second lowest mean scores for most of the areas.

Table 2.35c: Assessment and Recommendations by Employee Position (Mean Scores)

For each area covered in this survey, what is your assessment and recommendation to NatSci leaders?	Overall	Employee Position				
		Faculty Tenure	Faculty Fixed	Academic Specialist	Postdoc	Support Staff
Being a welcoming, safe, and supportive community.	3.03	2.96	2.86	3.06	3.29	3.08
Being a diverse community.	2.69	2.40	2.46	2.45	3.29	3.07
Being inclusive and promoting belonging.	2.86	2.73	2.66	2.82	3.13	3.04
Empowering the best outcomes for all regardless of role, identity, or ability status.	2.84	2.77	2.71	2.79	3.16	2.90
Being open to perspectives and ideas.	3.10	3.14	2.94	3.19	3.37	2.99
Creating an environment of trust where ideas are freely shared and discussed.	3.07	3.03	3.00	3.16	3.37	3.00
Being innovative.	3.20	3.08	3.12	3.25	3.63	3.19
Demonstrating transparency and openness.	2.74	2.62	2.50	2.79	3.23	2.79
Demonstrating accountability and integrity.	2.91	2.76	2.79	3.00	3.27	2.99
Demonstrating professionalism and high ethical standards.	3.27	3.18	3.21	3.41	3.50	3.25
Demonstrating respectful communication.	3.24	3.22	3.12	3.30	3.57	3.14
Contributing to the greater good of all.	3.24	3.16	3.24	3.29	3.60	3.18
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to the area "Needs significant improvement" and 5 refers to the area "Is Exemplary, Best Possible". With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered an area of significant strength or better, and everything below is an area needing at least some improvement. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (needs significant improvement or exemplary, best possible).						

Those in Mathematics only had three areas with lower mean scores – being innovative, professionalism/high standards, and contributing to the greater good (Table 2.35d). Both those in the Biological Sciences and those in the Physical Sciences had six areas that had lower mean scores.

Table 2.35d: Assessment and Recommendations by College District (Mean Scores)

Since becoming a student in the College of Natural Science, how often, if at all, have you been in a situation where a NatSci student (graduate or undergraduate) or employee has . . .	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Being a welcoming, safe, and supportive community.	3.05	3.03	3.04	3.15
Being a diverse community.	2.73	2.67	2.73	2.97
Being inclusive and promoting belonging.	2.88	2.84	2.87	3.09
Empowering the best outcomes for all regardless of role, identity, or ability status.	2.86	2.84	2.88	2.91
Being open to perspectives and ideas.	3.11	3.11	3.06	3.23
Creating an environment of trust where ideas are freely shared and discussed.	3.07	3.10	2.96	3.20
Being innovative.	3.19	3.24	3.22	2.97
Demonstrating transparency and openness.	2.73	2.71	2.73	2.83
Demonstrating accountability and integrity.	2.90	2.90	2.89	2.91
Demonstrating professionalism and high ethical standards.	3.26	3.24	3.31	3.20
Demonstrating respectful communication.	3.22	3.23	3.19	3.26
Contributing to the greater good of all.	3.25	3.29	3.26	3.11

The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to the area "Needs significant improvement" and 5 refers to the area "Is Exemplary, Best Possible". With the midpoint of the scale being 3, everything above it is considered an area of significant strength or better, and everything below is an area needing at least some improvement. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (needs significant improvement or exemplary, best possible).

SUMMARY

Below is a summary of the findings for each section of the report. Due to low numbers of respondents for some of the departments/units, all findings that are department/unit specific are reported as summary across all departments/units. Due to the combining of all the department/units together, the information from this report should not be used to identify positive or negative aspects within a specific department/unit.

Climate/Relationships

Within College
Overall, the climate within the college received positive scores. When presented with negative-positive adjective pairs that described various aspects of climate, all the mean score responses were in the positive range. Though all mean scores were still in the positive range, females, heterosexuals, non-Asians, and those with disabilities reported lower mean scores for at least some of the adjective pairs.

Employee position played a major role in how employees responded to the adjective pair questions with postdocs providing the highest mean scores for all the adjective pairs. Fixed-term faculty reported much lower mean scores

compared to the other positions for Hostile vs. Friendly, Individualistic vs. Collaborative, and Ageist vs. Non-ageist. Tenure-track faculty reported a much lower mean score for Competitive vs. Cooperative.

Mathematics consistently reported high mean scores for all but one of the adjective pairs compared to Biological Sciences and Physical Sciences. Both Biological Sciences and Physical Sciences reported lower mean scores for at least two-thirds of the adjective pairs.

In terms of the climate within the college for specific demographic groups, all the groups had at least 50% of the respondents stating that the climate was positive with men, Whites and Internationals having the most positive responses. Transgendered individuals, People of Color, and women did receive the highest percentage of negative climate responses. Tenure-track and fixed-term faculty, and postdocs reported lower mean scores for all eleven groups compared to the highest mean scores reported within employee position. Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower mean scores for seven of the eleven groups and those in the Physical Sciences reported six.

Respondents were also asked about the climate for people with certain disabilities as well as roles outside of work. Over 60% of the respondents reported the climate for all these groups to be positive other than those who had a mental health condition which has a lower percentage. Those with disabilities reported lower mean scores (less positive) for all disabilities and roles outside of work. Race also played a role in the level of positivity reported for some of the disabilities/roles. Both tenured and fixed-term faculty, as well as postdocs, reported lower mean scores for all groups. Those in the Biological Sciences and Physical Sciences reported lower mean scores for five of the six disabilities/roles compared to Mathematics.

In terms of the level of welcoming and belonging within the College, over 50% of the respondents agreed with each statement. There were three areas in which over one-quarter of the respondents disagreed – "People take time to get to know new employees.," "I feel a sense of belonging.," and "People take time to welcome new employees." Those who were non-Asian or had disabilities were less likely to agree with the statements. Fixed-term faculty reported lower agreement for all statements. Tenure-track faculty, postdocs and support staff reported lower agreement for half or more of the statements. Those in the Biological Sciences reported less agreement with all nine statements about the college being welcoming and feeling like they belonged.

Respondents were also asked about their values and relationships within the college. For most of the values/relationships, over half of the respondents reported agreeing with the statements. For three of the areas, over one-quarter of the respondents disagreed with the statements - "We operate in a clear and transparent manner.," "Leaders make major decisions with input from employees." and "People care about my general satisfaction at work." Males, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, and non-Asians reported lower levels of agreement for some of the values/relationship statements. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement for all the statements. Fixed-term faculty reported less agreement with all twelve statements about values and relationships within the college and support staff were less likely to agree with all but one of the statements. Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower mean scores for all statements.

Within Departments/Units
In terms of the climate towards specific groups, the climate within individual units/departments appears to be somewhat more positive than it is within the College itself. Groups that had higher reported negative climates at the college level are also higher for departments/units – women, People of Color and those who are transgender. The same demographic differences seen at college level are also true at the department/unit level. The pattern of which employee groups felt that the climate was less positive for all the groups compared to others with tenure-track and fixed-term faculty members reporting lower positive climates for all or almost all groups. Those in the Physical Sciences reported a less positive environment for most of the groups within their department/unit though those in the Biological Sciences were more likely to report that certain groups had a less positive climate within the College.

For the specific disabilities and outside work roles, those with disabilities, in particular mental health conditions, received the highest percentage for negative climate. Demographic characteristics did impact the level reported for of negative/positive climate through it was disability/role specific. Tenure-track and fixed-term faculty members reported all six disabilities/roles as having a less positive climate and postdocs for all but those with physical disabilities.

In terms of the department/unit feeling welcoming and belonging, there appears to be an overall agreement with all the statements. As with the college, there are a few areas that received higher levels of disagreement - "I feel a sense of belonging.," "People take time to get to know new employees.," and "I feel supported to actively contribute to a vision of excellence in equity and inclusion across all areas of my work." There were also demographic differences with heterosexuals reporting lower levels of agreement for most of the statements as did those with disabilities. Employees of color reported lower levels of agreement for all the statements. Tenure-track and fixed-term faculty members with more likely to have lower levels of agreement than the other employee positions. Those in the Physical Sciences and Mathematics were more likely to report lower levels of agreement for most of the statements.

In terms of values and relationships within the departments/units, over 50% of the respondents stated that they agreed with each statement. Of concern is that half of the statements in the table have over 20% of the respondents stating that they either somewhat or strongly disagreed with the statement. The statement with almost 30% of respondents disagreeing was "We operate in a clear and transparent manner.". Females and heterosexuals disagreed with four of the statements and those with disabilities disagreed with all the statements. Tenure-track and fixed-term faculty members with more likely to have lower levels of agreement than the other employee positions. Those in the Physical Sciences reported less agreement with three-quarters of the statements.

Leadership and Inclusion

Within College
Over half of the respondents agreed with all the statements in the section on leadership and inclusion. There were two statements that received over 20% disagreement – "There is a high level of mutual trust between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion." and "Leaders are open to hiring non-traditional job candidates – that is, the skills and potential of the candidate beyond their education and work experience are taken into consideration.". There were apparent differences across demographic characteristics. Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community were less in agreement on ten of the twelve statements and those with disabilities were less in agreement on all statements. Asians were more likely to agree than their counterparts. Faculty members, along with support staff, had lower levels of agreement for most, if not all, of the statements. Those in the Biological and Physical Sciences reported lower levels of agreement with almost all the statements.

Within Departments/Units
As with the college level statements, over 50% of the respondents at least somewhat agreed with the statements, but the percentage of respondents who agreed is generally lower than at the college level. Three of the statements had 20% or more of the respondents report that they disagreed with the statement - "There is a high level of mutual trust between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion.", "Leaders make a conscious effort to identify barriers related to DEI.", and "Leaders take actions that maintain an inclusive and equitable work environment.". Asians reported higher levels of agreement than their counterparts for all but one statement and those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement for all the statements. Tenure-track faculty and support staff reported lower levels of agreement for all statements and fixed-faculty and academic specialists reported lower levels of agreement for most of the statements. Those in the Physical Sciences reported lower levels of agreement for all twelve statements

Hiring Practices

Almost half of those who responded had participated on a hiring committee. Males, heterosexuals, Whites, and those without disabilities were more likely to be on a hiring committee than their counterparts. It is unknown if this under-representativeness seen in the data truly exists or is just an artifact of who participated in the climate survey. It is also unknown if any true underrepresentation created any impact on the process. When asked about using practices that could potentially increase the diversity of the applicant pool, all but two of the practices had at least 50% of the respondents stating that they had used that practice which also means that multiple practices were used by each committee to improve diversity.

Innovation Support

Within College
Ten of the twelve statements about innovation support within the college had over 50% of the respondents in agreement. Some of the statements had over 70%. There were three statements that had over 20% of the respondents disagreeing - "Leaders reward innovation.", "Leaders allocate a suitable portion of resources to work that extends beyond the status quo." and "Our announced visions and strategies inspire me.". Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community reported lower levels of agreement for eight of the twelve items and those with disabilities reported lower levels for all items. Asians reported higher levels of agreement for all items. All but postdocs reported lower levels of agreement with at least three-quarters of the statement. Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower levels of agreement for most of the statements.

Within Departments/Units
In general, the levels of agreement with the innovation support statements are higher at the department/unit level than in the college itself. Six out of the twelve statements had over 60% of the respondents agreeing with three of those having over 70% of the respondents agreeing. Four of the twelve statements had a quarter or more of the respondents reporting some level of disagreement - "Leaders reward innovation.," "Leaders allocate a suitable portion of resources to work that extends beyond the status quo.," "There is (no) resistance to doing or trying something new." and "Our announced visions and strategies inspire me." Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement for all the statements. Both tenure-track and fixed term faculty, as well as support staff, all reported lower levels of agreement with all statements. Those in the Physical Sciences and those in Mathematics reported lower levels for most of the statements.

Professional Development and Advancement

Within College
At the college level, three of the statements related to professional development and advancement had over 60% of the respondents agreeing to them. Unfortunately, the other four statements had 25% or more of the respondents disagreeing with the statements. The areas with higher levels of disagreement were "Workloads are equitably distributed." "Compared to others, I have equal access to advancement opportunities such as promotions and compensation increases." and "I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals." Males reported lower levels of agreement for five of the seven statements and females reported lower agreement for the other two. In terms of sexual orientation, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community reported lower levels of agreement for six of the statements and heterosexuals reported one. Asians reported higher levels of agreement for all seven of the statements compared to their counterparts. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement. The same areas of higher disagreement as those at the college level were also apparent at the department/unit level. Tenure-track faculty members were the least likely to report lower levels of agreement.

Within Departments/Units
At the department/unit level, the percentage of respondents that at least somewhat agreed increased, compared to the college level, for all the statements. For both gender identity and sexual orientation, differences between groups were apparent, but which group reported lower levels of agreement differed by statement. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement for all items. Faculty and support staff reported lower levels of agreement for most if not all the statements. Those in the Physical Sciences reported lower levels of agreement with all the statements except for having equal opportunities for advancement.

Annual Performance Review

In terms of annual performance review, the process itself received generally positive responses. There are three areas that did receive higher levels of negative responses (over 25% of respondents disagreed with the statement). The areas involve the perceived lack of connection between performance and compensation decisions, the need for more valuable feedback, and the transparency and clearness of the criteria used for performance review. There was also variability in levels of agreement with some statements for females, heterosexuals, and non-Asians. For all the statements in this section, those with disabilities were more likely to give lower levels of agreement. Academic specialists, support staff and tenure-track faculty gave lower levels of agreement with most if not all the statements.

Sexual Misconduct, Uncivil Behavior, and Bias Incidences

Sexual Misconduct
Given the University's stance on sexual misconduct, any agreement with the statement "I have experienced sexual harassment and/or relationship violence within my department/unit/the college." needs to be given great attention, as does "Sexual harassment is a problem within my department/unit/the college." In terms of experiencing it, 8.8% reported that they at least somewhat agreed with the statement and 8.1% stated that it was a problem in their department/unit or within the college.

Females, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, Asians, Whites, and those with disabilities were more likely to agree with the statement about experiencing sexual misconduct. Fixed-term faculty, postdocs and support staff were more likely to have experienced sexual misconduct. Those in the Biological and Physical Sciences were more likely to have experienced sexual misconduct.

Asians and Whites were more likely to say that sexual harassment is a problem. Only support staff was less likely to report that sexual harassment is a problem. Those in the Biological and Physical Sciences were more likely to state that sexual harassment is a problem.

In terms of leadership handling of sexual misconduct, approximately three-quarters of the respondents felt leadership took reports seriously and that confidentiality would be maintained. Males were less likely to agree that confidentiality would be maintained and those with disabilities more likely to report lower levels of agreement on both these points. Academic specialists were the only employees that did not report lower levels of agreement that leadership would take it seriously and that confidentiality would be maintained. Those in the Biological Sciences were less likely to believe that college leadership would take reports seriously and would maintain confidentiality. Those in Mathematics were less likely to agree that leadership would take reports seriously.

Over 90% of the respondents stated that they knew how to report sexual harassment and relationship violence. Of concern is that 7.8% of the respondents disagreed that they could report an incident without fear of retaliation. This is even more concerning when considering that those most likely to need to file a report are also the ones most likely to fear retaliation – females, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, and those with disabilities.

Though all but academic specialists reported lower agreement with this, postdocs were the least likely to agree with this statement. They were also the ones most likely to fear retaliation.

Uncivil Behavior
There does appear to be an issue with uncivil behavior within the college for almost all the behaviors that were presented in the questionnaire. Ten of the behaviors were about personal experiencing the behaviors and two were about witnessing them. The only personal behavior that did not have at least 20% of the respondents stating that it had occurred at least once involved someone attempting to draw them into a personal discussion that was unwanted. Three of the ten behaviors had over 40% of the respondents stating that they had happened at least once. Someone witnessing bullying was reported by over one-quarter of the respondents and over 40% reported witnessing at least one of the behaviors being experienced by someone else. All the reported behaviors (experienced and witnessed) were more likely to have happened at least twice. Females and non-Asians were more likely to have experienced at least some of the behaviors and those with disabilities were more likely to experience all of them. Only postdocs did not report having experienced most, if not all the behaviors. Well over half of the uncivil behavior was committed by faculty and/or academic staff followed by support staff and unit chair or director.

It should be noted that even though there is a higher than desired level of uncivility, it should not necessarily be taken that it is a general problem within the college. The survey was not designed to identify specific sources of problems. It could be a systemic problem within the college or a department/unit, or it could be only a few individuals who are having a significant impact. This only identifies that there is a problem.

Biased Incidences
In terms of bias, most forms of bias were witnessed or experienced in relatively low percentages, but those that were experienced/witness occurred more than once. Even with less than 10 percent experiencing any of the other forms of bias, the fact that it is occurring should still be viewed as a possible problem. Of greater concern is that over one-quarter of the respondents stated that they had experience bias due to a power differential in the work environment at least once. Respondents were also more likely to report that they had experienced any of the forms of bias at least twice, not just once. Respondents were then asked about the frequency they had witnessed others experiencing bias incidences. Again, power differentials were the main form of bias incidences with almost one-third of the respondents reporting that they had witnessed at least one incident with over three-quarters of those who witnessed it saying that they had witnessed it two or more times. As with uncivil behavior, faculty and/or academic staff were the most responsible with over half of the bias incidences involving them.

Confidence in Addressing Bias Incidents
Respondents were asked about their confidence in their ability to address bias, as well as the college and departmental/unit leadership. Overall, respondents were confident in their own abilities to address the various forms of bias. Females were less confident for some forms of bias as were those with disabilities. Of concern is that those with disabilities were less confident in their ability to address bias events/comments directed at those with disabilities. Fixed-term faculty and postdocs reported less agreement with their ability to handle the various bias incidences across all the biases. Those in Mathematics were less confident in handling all but sexist incidences.

Overall, respondents appeared to be confident in leaderships ability to handle the various forms of bias, thought there was less confidence in their ability to handle ageist and sexist comments/events. The level of confidence with college leadership did differ by demographic characteristics for some of the biases. Member of the LGBTQIA2S+ and those with disabilities were less confident for most forms of bias and Asians were less confident for all forms. Postdocs were less confident in college leadership's ability to handle any of the seven bias incidences. Those in the Physical Sciences had more confidence in the college's leadership's ability to address bias than the other two districts.

Similar patterns of confidence were also found in terms of department/unit leadership. The only difference was that both postdocs and fixed-term faculty were less confident in department/unit leadership across all the bias events listed.

Bias Incident Reporting

Over 75% of the respondents stated they knew now to report a bias incident, which is lower than the percentage that had said that they knew how to report a sexual misconduct event. When asked about fear of retaliation for reporting an event, 14.9% stated that they disagreed with the statement that they would not fear retaliation. Females, non-Whites, and those with disability were more likely to disagree with the statement. Postdocs were the least likely to know how to report bias incidents within the College and the least likely to agree that they could report bias incidents without fear of retaliation. Those in the Biological Sciences were less likely to state they knew how to report bias incidents and more likely to be concerned about fear of retaliation. Those in Mathematics were also less likely to know how to file a report.

In terms of leadership's handling of the reporting, 61.2% felt that leadership would take the appropriate actions based on the claimant's desires, but 17.4% disagreed. Non-Asians and those with disabilities had lower levels of agreement. Three-quarters of the respondents said that they were confident that leadership would keep the reports confidential, but 11.7% did not. Non-Whites and those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement. Fixed-term faculty were the least likely to agree that leadership would take the appropriate actions based on claimant's desires and the least confident that college leadership would keep it confidential. Those in the Biological Sciences reported less agreement with confidence in leadership taking the appropriate action and keeping the report confidential.

Those who had stated that they knew of at least one incident of bias were asked if they had reported it. Of serious concern is that 62.8% stated they did not and 19.0% stated that they only reported some of the incidents they knew about. The primary reason given was that they were unsure if violated university policy (training/education need). Other reasons reported all dealt with confidence in leadership – fear of retaliation, concern with not being believed, and leadership's ability to deal appropriately with the situation. For those incidences reported, more than half were reported to department/unit leadership.

Overall Comfortableness and Satisfaction with the College

Over 60% of the respondents stated that they were at least somewhat comfortable with the current climate within the college. This was relatively consistent across the demographic groups other than those with disabilities who were less likely to state that they were comfortable with the climate. Postdocs reported the highest level of comfort with the climate in the college. Tenure-track and fixed term faculty, along with support staff, reported the lowest level of agreement with being comfortable with the climate within the college. Those in the Physical Sciences reported the highest level of comfort with the climate in the College. Those in Mathematics reported the lowest level.

When asked about their satisfaction with being an employee in the college, over two-thirds stated that they were at least somewhat satisfied. Males, those in employees of color and those with disabilities were less likely to be satisfied. Both tenure-track and fixed term faculty had the lowest level of satisfaction. Both the those in the Biological and in the Physical Sciences reported higher levels of satisfaction as an employee than those in Mathematics.

In addition, almost 70% of the respondents stated that they were proud to be part of the College of Natural Science. Females, heterosexuals, and those without disabilities were more likely to be proud to be part of the College of Natural Science than their counterparts. Postdocs reported the highest level of satisfaction as an employee. Those in Mathematics were less likely to report that they were proud to be part of NatSci.

When asked about considering leaving their position, 36.8% stated that they at least somewhat agreed with considering leaving. This is of concern, but it needs to be kept in mind that the question asks about "position" and it may be the department/unit, not the college that the respondent is thinking of leaving. It could also mean that they would prefer a different type of position than they currently have. Females, non-Asians, and those with disabilities were likely to state that they were thinking of leaving. Academic specialists were the most likely to state that they have seriously considered leaving their position in NatSci though they were also the ones who were most likely to agree that they were proud to be part of NatSci. Though those in Mathematics were the least proud of the College, but they were also the least likely to state that they had seriously considered leaving their position in NatSci.

Respondents were also asked how much they agreed that they planned on staying at NatSci for at least the next twelve months. Almost 80% agreed with the statement. Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Whites and those with disabilities were less likely to state that they planned on staying within the College for the next 12 months. Postdocs and support staff were least likely to say that they intended to stay in NatSci for at least the next twelve months. Those in the Biological Sciences were slightly less likely to intend to stay in NatSci for at least the next twelve months compared to those in Mathematics.

Assessment and Recommendations by Respondents

The final section asked respondents to access the current situation within the college for several areas. Areas identified as the highest strengths were "Contributing to the greater good of all.," "Demonstrating professionalism and high ethical standards." and "Demonstrating respectful communication." Areas that were most likely to be identified as needing improvement were "Being a diverse community," "Being inclusive and promoting belonging." and "Demonstrating transparency and openness." In terms of demographic characteristics, females, heterosexuals, non-Asians, and those with disabilities were the groups less likely to provide a more positive response, thought it did not necessarily mean that the responses were in the range of needing improvement. For those with disabilities, all but one of the categories had mean score responses in the "Needs Improvement" range.

An employee's position within the College did impact their assessment of the different areas. Postdocs had the highest levels of assessment and none of their mean scores fell into the need's improvement range. Fixed-term faculty had the lowest mean scores for almost all the areas with the others still being very low. Tenure-track faculty had the second lowest mean scores for most of the areas.

Those in Mathematics only had three areas with lower mean scores – being innovative, professionalism/high standards, and contributing to the greater good. Both those in the Biological Sciences and those in the Physical Sciences had lower mean scores for half of the areas.

FINAL ASSESSMENT

Overall, there are many areas within the report that demonstrate that the College of Natural Science is creating a quality work environment, but as with any workplace there are areas of needed improvement. There are several areas in this report that warrant consideration and future actions. These are not all the areas that could use improvement, but they are the areas that were either identified by the respondents or patterns developed across the report.

Employees with Disabilities

Those with disabilities appear to have a general dissatisfaction within the College of Natural Science. For almost all the sections of the questionnaire, those with disabilities continuously reported lower mean scores (higher disagreement/lower satisfaction) than their counterparts.

Due to concerns about the possibility of identification of a respondent, all forms of disability were merged for analysis. Still, it is unlikely that it is only one form of disability driving the differences seen between those with disabilities and those without. When respondents were asked about climate at the college level for those with disabilities, those with mental health conditions did have lower levels of positive climate reported, as well as higher levels of negative climate responses. At the department/unit level, all three forms of disability listed were given lower positive climate responses than would have been expected if their climates were similar to others. All three forms of disabilities also received the highest percentage of negative climate responses.

Professional Development and Advancement

There is a potential issue in terms of equitable distribution of work and professional development and advancement opportunities that appears at both the college and department unit level. At both levels, equal access to advancement opportunities and availability of mentoring relationships both received higher levels of disagreement than other statements, as did workloads being equitably distributed. Also related was higher level of disagreement by respondents in terms of compensation decisions at the department/unit level being linked to performance.

If these issues are indeed occurring and especially if the burden/inequity is occurring for only certain groups within the college, this is a major concern. If these are only perceived differences, there can still be a major impact on the climate, morale, and relationships within the college and departments/units.

Sexual Misconduct

Given that the university has a zero-tolerance policy for relationship violence and sexual misconduct, any evidence that this is not the case in the college or in department/units needs to be taken seriously. With 8.8% of the respondents stating that they have experienced sexual harassment or relationship violence within the college and 8.1% stating that it is a problem in their department/unit or within the college demonstrates that there is a problem within the college. There also appears to be some concern about retaliation for reporting an incident and that confidentiality will be maintained by leadership and that leadership will take the report seriously.

Uncivil Behavior

This is one of the key areas that needs to be addressed. The level of incivility identified in this report is concerning. Given that at least 20% of the respondents reporting that they experienced at least one form of incivility and most of those experienced it more than once, it is not just a few isolated incidences. The data does not allow us to determine if it is a systemic problem or if there are certain individuals who have a significant impact on the entire college. It is known that over half of the incidences reported in the survey were by faculty and/or academic specialists.

Power Differentials

In terms of bias, power differentials were the most reported form, both as experienced and as witnessed with 27.6% experiencing it and 32.9% witnessing it. For those that reported either experiencing or witnessing, the majority either experienced it or witnessed it more than once. Though it was not asked specifically of power differentials, for bias incidences in general, over half of the incidences were committed by faculty and/or academic staff and another quarter were committed by a unit chair/director.

Reporting of bias incidences was only asked in general and not for any specific form of bias. Since most bias incidences were related to power differentials, it can be assumed that the general findings would apply to power differentials. There are multiple concerns with bias reporting. The first is that 16.2% of the respondents stated that they disagreed with the statement that they wouldn't fear retaliation if they reported an incident. This fear also shows in that 27.9% of the non-reported incidences were due to fear of retaliation. Another major concern is that 62.8% of the respondents did not report a known incident and an additional 19.0% only reported part of the incidences that they were aware of. The most reported reason for not reporting was being unsure if it violated

university policy which is an indication that additional training/education is needed. Other reasons were not thinking they would be believed and that they didn't think appropriate action would be taken.

Transparency/Openness

A repeated theme in the was the lack of transparency and openness. Over a quarter of the respondents disagreed that the college operated in a clear and transparent manner and also that major decisions were made with input from employees (Values and Relationship Section of questionnaire). Leaders providing explanations on major decisions also received over 20% negative responses at the college level.

At the department/unit level, the same statements as above from the Values and Relationship Section also had over 20% disagreement, as did leaders clearly communicating strategic plan, work plans and other strategic directions.

The transparency issue also appeared within the Annual Performance Review where over one-quarter of the respondents disagreed that the criteria used for evaluation/review was clear and transparent.

Being Inclusive/Promoting Belonging

This was one of the areas that was identified in the Assessment and Recommendation section of the questionnaire as needing improvement. In other parts of the report, it also appeared to be a possible problem with the areas of getting to know new employees, and welcoming new employees, and feeling a sense of belonging (Welcoming and Belonging Section of the questionnaire) for which over 25% of the respondents had disagreed with the statements. These statements also had higher levels of disagreement when asked about the respondent's department/unit though the percentages were not as high which suggestions that there may be less of a problem within departments/units.

Being a Diverse Community

This was also identified as an area that needed improvement by respondents in the Assessment and Recommendation Section. Within the Leadership and Inclusion Section, there were several areas at the college level that received higher percentages of negative responses related to leadership and diversity. These involved mutual trust between leaders and employees related to equity and inclusion, leaders being open to hiring non-traditional candidates, and leaders acting to maintain an inclusive/equitable work environment. At the department/unit level, mutual trust and acting again received higher percentages of disagreement, as did leaders making a conscious effort to identify barriers related to DEI.

Considering Leaving Position

When asked about if they were seriously considering leaving their position, over one-third stated that they agreed (considered leaving). It should be noted that the statement asks about "position," not the department/unit or college which could be they want to just leave the position, but not leave the department/unit and/or the college. Females, non-Asians, and those with disabilities were more likely to say that they had considered leaving their position. When asked if they intended to stay within the college for the next twelve months, 8.8% stated that they disagreed with the statement (intending on leaving). Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Whites and those with disabilities were less likely to state that they planned on staying within the College for the next 12 months. Responses to these two statements suggest that these potential departures would decrease the diversity of the college.

Employee Position

There were definite differences amongst the employee positions within several areas. Postdocs seemed the most positive across almost all aspects of the survey. Fixed-term faculty reported the least number of positive responses, followed by tenure-track faculty. Though these patterns exist, it is important to look at the individual sections to see the differences within each of the employee positions.

<u>College Districts</u>
Those in Mathematics overall were more likely to provide positive responses for most areas, yet they were less likely to be comfortable with the current climate, less satisfied as an employee and less proud of the college compared to the other districts. Those in the Biological Sciences were less likely to provide positive responses to sections related to the college in general but were more likely to give positive responses for those associated with their individual departments/units. Those in the Physical Sciences were generally less likely to give positive responses.