

2022 College of Natural Science Climate Study Undergraduate Student Results

Debra L. Ruz
Project Manager and Analyst

The Office for Survey Research
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research
Michigan State University

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW AND METHODOLOGY	6
Data Collection	6
Population vs. Participation.....	7
Table 1.1: Comparison of Population to Participation.....	8
Construction of Demographic Variables	9
Interpretation of Tables.....	10
CLIMATE/RELATIONSHIPS	10
Table 2.1a: Adjective Pairs Associated with College Climate	11
Table 2.1b: Adjective Pairs Associated with College Climate by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores) ..	12
Table 2.1c: Adjective Pairs Associated with College Climate by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores).....	13
Table 2.1d: Adjective Pairs Associated with College Climate by College District (Mean Scores)	14
Table 2.2a: Climate in College Towards Specific Groups	14
Table 2.2b: Climate in College Towards Specific Groups by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)	16
Table 2.2c: Climate in College Towards Specific Groups by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	17
Table 2.2d: Climate in College Towards Specific Groups by College District (Mean Scores).....	18
Table 2.3a: Climate in College Towards Specific Disabilities/Roles Outside of School	18
Table 2.3b: Climate in the College Towards Specific Disabilities/Roles Outside of School by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)	19
Table 2.3c: Climate in the College Towards Specific Disabilities/Roles Outside of School by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	20
Table 2.3d: Climate in the College Towards Specific Disabilities/Roles Outside of School by College District (Mean Scores).....	20
Table 2.4a: Attitudes about Welcoming and Belonging Within College.....	21
Table 2.4b: Attitudes about Welcoming and Belonging Within College by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)	22
Table 2.4c: Attitudes about Welcoming and Belonging Within College by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	23
Table 2.4d: Attitudes about Welcoming and Belonging Within College by College District (Mean Scores)	24
Table 2.5a: Values and Relationships Within Major/Program.....	25
Table 2.5b: Values and Relationships Within the Major/Program by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)	27
Table 2.5c: Values and Relationships Within the Major/Program by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores) ...	28
Table 2.5d: Values and Relationships Within the Major/Program by College Districts (Mean Scores).....	29
DIVERSITY WITHIN THE COLLEGE	29
Table 2.6a: Faculty Diversity Within the College	30
Table 2.6b: Faculty Diversity Within the College by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)	30

Table 2.6c: Faculty Diversity Within the College by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	31
Table 2.6d: Faculty Diversity Within the College by College District (Mean Scores).....	32
Table 2.7a: Undergraduate Student Diversity Within the College.....	33
Table 2.7b: Undergraduate Student Diversity Within the College by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)	34
Table 2.7c: Undergraduate Student Diversity by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	35
Table 2.7d: Undergraduate Student Diversity Within the College by College District (Mean Scores)	35
LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES	36
Table 2.8a: Learning Opportunities Within the College.....	37
Table 2.8b: Learning Opportunities Within the College by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)	38
Table 2.8c: Learning Opportunities Within the College by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores).....	39
Table 2.8d: Learning Opportunities Within the College by College District (Mean Scores)	40
INNOVATION SUPPORT	40
Table 2.9a: Innovation Support Within Major/Program.....	41
Table 2.9b: Innovation Support Within your Major/Program by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores) .	41
Table 2.9c: Innovation Support Within your Major/Program by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	42
Table 2.9d: Innovation Support Within your Major/Program by College District (Mean Scores)	43
ACADEMIC ADVISING	43
Table 2.10a: Academic Advising Resources Within Major/Program	44
Table 2.10b: Academic Advising Resources Within the College by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)	44
Table 2.10c: Academic Advising Resources Within the College by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	45
Table 2.10d: Academic Advising Resources Within Department/Program by College District (Mean Scores) ...	45
Table 2.11a: Academic Advisor Evaluation Within Major/Program	46
Table 2.11b: Academic Advisor Evaluation Within Major/Program by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)	47
Table 2.11c: Academic Advisor Evaluation Within the Major/Program by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	47
Table 2.11d: Academic Advisor Evaluation Within the Major/Program by College District (Mean Scores).....	48
DEGREE PROGRESS AND COURSE GRADES	48
Table 2.12a: Degree Progress and Course Grades.....	49
Table 2.12b: Degree Progress and Course Grades by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores).....	50
Table 2.12c: Degree Progress and Course Grades by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores).....	51
Table 2.12d: Degree Progress and Course Grades by College District (Mean Scores)	51
SEXUAL MISCONDUCT, UNCIVIL BEHAVIOR AND BIAS INCIDENCES	51
Sexual Misconduct.....	52
Table 2.13a: Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policies.....	53

Table 2.13b: Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policies by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)	54
Table 2.13c: Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policies by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	55
Table 2.13d: Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policies by College District (Mean Scores)	56
Uncivil Behavior	56
Table 2.14a: Uncivil Behavior Experienced Within College	57
Table 2.14b: Uncivil Behavior Experienced Within College by Demographic Characteristics (Percentage of Those with at Least one Incident).....	58
Table 2.14c: Uncivil Behavior Experienced Within College by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores) (Percentage of Those with at Least one Incident)	59
Table 2.14d: Uncivil Behavior Experienced Within College by College District (Percentage of Those with at Least one Incident)	60
Table 2.15: Uncivil Behavior Committed by Whom and Frequency.....	61
Biased Incidences	61
Table 2.16: Biased Incidences Experienced Within College.....	62
Table 2.17: Biased Incidences Witnessed Within College.....	63
Table 2.18: Experienced Biased Incidences Committed by Whom	64
Bias Incident Reporting.....	64
Table 2.19a: Bias Incident Reporting	65
Table 2.19b: Bias Incident Reporting by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores).....	66
Table 2.19c: Bias Incident Reporting by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	66
Table 2.20: Reported a Known Bias Incident	67
Table 2.21: Why Didn't Report Known Bias Incident.....	68
Table 2.22: Who Incident Reported to	68
OVERALL COMFORTABLENESS AND SATISFACTION WITH THE COLLEGE.....	68
Table 2.23a: Comfortable with the Climate in the College of Natural Science.....	69
Table 2.23b: Comfortable with the Climate in the College of Natural Science by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores).....	69
Table 2.23c: Comfortable with the Climate in the College of Natural Science by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	70
Table 2.23d: Comfortable with the Climate in the College of Natural Science by College District (Mean Scores)	70
Table 2.24a: Satisfaction as a Student in the College of Natural Science	70
Table 2.24b: Satisfaction as a Student in the College of Natural Science by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)	71
Table 2.24c: Satisfaction as a Student in the College of Natural Science by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	71
Table 2.24d: Satisfaction as a Student in the College of Natural Science by College District (Mean Scores).....	72

Table 2.25a: Attitudes about Student Experiences Within the College of Natural Science	72
Table 2.25b: Attitudes about Student Experiences Within the College of Natural Science by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)	74
Table 2.25c: Attitudes about Student Experiences Within the College of Natural Science by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	74
Table 2.25d: Attitudes about Student Experiences Within the College of Natural Science by College District (Mean Scores).....	75
ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY RESPONDENTS	75
Table 2.26a: Assessment and Recommendations	76
Table 2.26b: Assessment and Recommendations by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)	77
Table 2.26c: Assessment and Recommendations by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)	78
Table 2.26d: Assessment and Recommendations by College District (Mean Scores)	79
SUMMARY	79
Climate/Relationships.....	79
Diversity Within the College	80
<i>Faculty Diversity</i>	80
<i>Undergraduate Student Diversity</i>	81
Learning Opportunities	81
Innovation Support	82
Academic Advising	82
Degree Progress and Course Grades.....	83
Sexual Misconduct, Uncivil Behavior, and Bias Incidences	83
<i>Sexual Misconduct</i>	83
<i>Uncivil Behavior</i>	84
<i>Biased Incidences</i>	84
<i>Bias Incident Reporting</i>	84
Overall Comfortableness and Satisfaction with the College	85
Assessment and Recommendations by Respondents.....	85
FINAL ASSESSMENT	86
College Districts	86
Years at MSU	86
Students with Disabilities	86
LGBTQIA2S+ Students	86
Non-native English Speaking Students	87
Sexual Misconduct	87
Uncivil Behavior	87

Bias Incidences.....	87
Innovation Support.....	87
Access to Learning Opportunities.....	88
Clear communication/Transparency	88
Being Inclusive/Promoting Belonging.....	88
Being a Diverse Community.....	88
Appendix A: Data Collection Instrument	89

OVERVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

In the fall of 2022, Michigan State University's College of Natural Science invited all current undergraduate students 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 – 31 questions
- Diversity – nine (9) questions
- Welcoming and Belonging – nine (9) questions
- Learning Opportunities – seven (7) questions.
- Innovation – six (6) questions
- Academic Advising – eight (8) questions,
- College Strategic Priority I – two (2) open-ended questions
- Values and Relationships – 23 questions
- Degree Progress & Course Grades– five (5) questions
- Civility – 20 questions
- RVSM Policies – six (6) questions
- Bias Incidents – 28 questions
- College Strategic Priority II – two (2) open-ended questions
- Assessment of Current Climate – 18 questions
- Demographics – 14 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 statement¹ which can be found in Appendix A.

The climate survey was administered to all undergraduate students with the College as of fall 2022, using a web-based data collection platform. All responses to the survey were submitted anonymously.

¹ IRB review and approval were not required for this project due to falling into the category "Quality Assurance, Quality Improvement, or Program Evaluation." Quality assurance (QA), quality improvement (QI), and program evaluation (PE) are activities that may collect data about living individuals to measure the effectiveness of a practice, program, or service or to identify ways to improve them. If these activities are not designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge, they do not fit the definition of research in 45 CFR 46, and they do not need IRB approval.

The database provided by the college contained student name and contact (email) information and major program information for 5,156 students after duplicate emails were removed. As a way to encourage participation, students who completed the survey were offered a \$5 Starbucks e-card. Data to send the gift cards was collected separately to maintain confidentiality and anonymity.

Data collection was conducted between December 5, 2022, and. Reminder emails were sent on December 11 and December 20, 2022 and January 11 and January 24, 2023. During the data collection period, 1,338 students accessed the survey, with 979 students submitting completed surveys (71.3%). The average time to complete the survey was 37 minutes. The completion rate for this study is 18.9%.

Population vs. Participation

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. The population information is from institutional data and the respondent data is based on self-reported responses in the survey. Information on the population was available for gender, race, and academic level, but not for sexual orientation, disabilities, and first-generation student status 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 in the table for the difference means that the group was underrepresented and a positive value for difference means that the group was overrepresented (Table 1.1). Minor differences are not of concern, but there are a few differences that are larger, and potentially 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 categories within that characteristic.

Table 1.1: Comparison of Population to Participation

Characteristic	Group	Percentage of Population who Responded	Percentage Within..		
			Population	Respondents	Difference
Gender	Female/Woman	21.7%	58.2%	79.4%	21.2%
	Male/Man	7.9%	41.8%	20.6%	-21.2%
Race	Asian	21.3%	11.1%	15.1%	4.0%
	White	15.5%	63.1%	62.7%	-0.4%
	People of Color	13.5%	25.8%	22.2%	-3.6%
Academic Class	Freshman/1 st year	27.9%	18.2%	28.1%	9.9%
	Sophomore/2 nd year	22.1%	22.1%	27.0%	4.9%
	Junior/3 rd year	17.1%	25.5%	24.1%	-1.4%
	Senior/4 th year or more	11.0%	34.2%	20.7%	-13.5%
College District	Biological Sciences	22.2%	76.1%	83.2%	7.1%
	Physical Sciences	13.6%	11.3%	7.6%	-3.7%
	Mathematics	14.7%	21.4%	9.2%	-3.5%

Percentage of population who responded refers to the percentage of the population that responded to the survey for that specific group, i.e., 21.7% of all women in the undergraduate student population responded to the questionnaire. Percentage within the population refers to the percentage that specific group makes up within the population, i.e., 58.2% of the undergraduate student population is women. Percentage within the respondents refers to the percentage that specific group made up of all the respondents, i.e., 79.4% of the undergraduate student respondents who provided a gender identity were women. Percentage difference reports the difference between the percentage in the population and the percentage within the respondents. A negative number indicates underrepresentation, and a positive number represents overrepresentation, i.e., women are overrepresented compared to their percentage in the population. The larger the difference between these two numbers, the more likely the group that is overrepresented may impact the general findings if that group is different than the other groups within that variable.

For the self-reported gender variables, respondents were given options other than binary (woman/man). A total of 6.7% of the respondents gave a gender other than man and women and could not be used for this comparison. An additional 10.5% of the respondents did not provide an answer to the gender question. The non-binary gender cases and those cases missing gender data cannot entirely explain the large differences seen between women and men population vs. respondent data. The potentially impact is difficult to determine because of the missing data and the non-binary gender respondents, but it could affect the results if women are different than men are key variables which is likely for some of the items in the survey.

There are little differences between the population and respondent data for races. What difference is seen may be due to international students' race data not being included within institutional data.

A student's actual academic level was not collected as part of the survey, though the year they started at MSU was. This data was used to approximate the student's academic level. Using this variable to approximate academic level does have some shortcomings. Students may take longer (or shorter) to reach any given academic level than is typical. Also, those students impacted by the University's response to COVID-19 during their tenure at MSU may also be taking longer to complete their degree for various reasons. The comparison of the population percentages for academic level and the approximation used for the analysis does show that there is a potential

overrepresentation of the lower academic levels and an underrepresentation of the upper levels. This could impact the general results if those in the lower academic levels are different from those in the upper academic levels.

Amongst the college districts, the Biological Sciences district is by far the largest with 76.1% of all undergraduates being within this district. Compounding that, is that those within the Biological Sciences district were more likely to respond than their counterparts in the other districts. Since over 83% of the respondents were from the Biological Sciences, the general results predominantly represent the attitudes/ experiences of the Biological Sciences and not that of the other districts. To understand the attitudes/experiences of the other districts, it is necessary to evaluate the tables and summaries of the tables with the district breakdown (have a “d” ending). Due to the low number of responses by the non-Biological districts, not all sets of tables include breakdown by district.

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.

Gender Identity

The Gender Identify variable is a constructed variable created from the respondent’s self-reported gender identity(ies). Text responses for the “Other” gender identity question were reviewed and those whose response qualified for a different category were recoded (ex. woman, Woman, man, Man, heterosexual Man, etc.). Gender Identity was initially collapsed into three categories – Man, Woman, and Other due to concerns with possible identification of respondents for those who did not identify as man or woman. Those who reported one or more of these gender identities - agender, gender non-conforming, genderqueer, non-binary, two-spirited or other - were assigned to the “not provided” category. Those that weren’t already placed in the “not provided” category and stated that they were cisgender man or transgender man were coded as Man and those who identified as cisgender woman or transgender woman were coded as Woman. It should be noted that there is a relatively high percentage (10.5%) of non-response for this set of questions.

Due to the relatively small percentage of respondents (7.5%) who fell into the “not provided” gender identity category, the “not provided” category will not be included in the analysis for fear of potential respondent identification.

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 Other. 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, LatinX, and/or MENA (Middle Eastern/North African) ethnicities.

Disability

The disability variable is a composite variable for the twelve forms of disability presented in the set of questions in the survey. Of those stating that they had at least one form of disability, 34.1% reported having two or more

forms of disability. This prevented the collapsing of the forms of disability into discrete, mutually exclusive categories since a respondent could fall into more than one category. The most reported form of disability was mental health/psychological condition with 72.1% of those that reported at least one disability selected this category.

Again, we acknowledge that Individuals with different forms of disability may have different experiences within the college, as do those with multiple disabilities.

Years at MSU

The variable “Years at MSU” was estimated using the self-reported year that the student stated they started at MSU. The years were collapsed into 1-2 years and more than two years.

First-generation Students

First-generation student status was based off a self-reported question in the questionnaire.

College Districts

Academic program was provided as institutional data. This information was combined into the three college districts. Those students who identified themselves as “no preference” were excluded. It should be noted that not all the programs were represented by students and that some programs were more represented than others.

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 category mean scores of 0.1 or greater are underlined for emphasis for the groups that have the lower values. 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 for the groups that have the lower values. For those statements that were phrased in a negative form compared to the other statements in that set, differences were bolded and italicized since the larger mean score/percentage would be the group with potential problems.

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

Respondents were asked multiple sets of questions about the College of Natural Science. Sets of questions covered views of the climate in general as well as how specific groups were treated within the College of Natural Science.

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 83% having a mean score over five (Table 2.1a). Homophobic vs. Non-homophobic received the highest mean score (5.64), followed by Hostile vs. Friendly (5.52) and Unwelcoming vs. Welcoming (5.52). Though the mean scores were still in the positive range, the lowest mean scores were for Competitive vs. Cooperative (4.44) and Individualistic vs. Collaborative (4.74).

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				N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Hostile vs. Friendly	0.5%	1.8%	4.7%	12.7%	24.7%	29.5%	25.9%	975	5.52	1.277
Racist vs. Non-racist	0.8%	3.3%	7.6%	14.7%	14.3%	25.1%	34.3%	974	5.51	1.499
Homogeneous vs. Diverse	1.3%	4.3%	8.9%	13.2%	23.0%	25.1%	24.2%	976	5.24	1.500
Disrespectful vs. Respectful	0.7%	2.2%	4.2%	13.4%	23.9%	29.2%	26.4%	972	5.51	1.306
Unwelcoming vs. Welcoming	0.6%	2.1%	4.9%	12.5%	24.2%	28.7%	27.0%	975	5.52	1.306
Sexist vs. Non-sexist	1.6%	4.1%	10.7%	17.5%	18.9%	19.7%	27.4%	973	5.17	1.583
Individualistic vs. Collaborative	1.9%	7.3%	9.8%	25.5%	21.9%	18.3%	15.2%	975	4.74	1.530
Competitive vs. Cooperative	4.1%	9.2%	15.3%	23.0%	20.1%	15.1%	13.3%	976	4.44	1.643
Homophobic vs. Non-homophobic	0.4%	1.8%	6.2%	13.5%	16.3%	25.9%	35.8%	977	5.64	1.377
Unsupportive vs. Supportive	0.6%	2.3%	6.3%	14.1%	26.8%	26.4%	23.5%	970	5.37	1.327
Ageist vs. Non-ageist	0.9%	2.9%	5.5%	21.4%	13.9%	20.3%	35.1%	974	5.46	1.497
Regressing vs. Improving	0.9%	1.9%	4.4%	19.3%	27.8%	24.8%	20.8%	977	5.29	1.300

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 3.5, 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 in general that didn't identify with the positive end of the adjective pair. Though this did not hold for each of the adjective pairs, Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, 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	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Hostile vs. Friendly	5.56	5.69	<u>5.52</u>	5.59	<u>5.42</u>	<u>5.48</u>	5.59	<u>5.48</u>	<u>5.43</u>	5.62
Racist vs. Non-racist	5.58	5.89	<u>5.51</u>	5.70	<u>5.17</u>	<u>5.24</u>	5.68	<u>5.28</u>	<u>5.32</u>	5.70
Homogeneous vs. Diverse	5.23	5.23	5.24	5.35	<u>5.03</u>	<u>5.09</u>	5.41	<u>4.91</u>	<u>5.17</u>	5.29
Disrespectful vs. Respectful	5.53	5.62	<u>5.51</u>	5.57	<u>5.39</u>	<u>5.44</u>	5.56	<u>5.47</u>	<u>5.46</u>	5.61
Unwelcoming vs. Welcoming	5.57	5.66	<u>5.54</u>	5.63	<u>5.37</u>	5.50	5.59	5.51	<u>5.39</u>	5.64
Sexist vs. Non-sexist	5.22	5.60	<u>5.13</u>	5.36	<u>4.76</u>	<u>5.03</u>	5.20	5.19	<u>4.87</u>	5.36
Individualistic vs. Collaborative	4.76	4.87	<u>4.73</u>	4.86	<u>4.50</u>	4.79	4.76	4.72	<u>4.55</u>	4.88
Competitive vs. Cooperative	4.47	4.77	<u>4.39</u>	4.54	<u>4.22</u>	4.63	<u>4.45</u>	<u>4.39</u>	<u>4.26</u>	4.60
Homophobic vs. Non-homophobic	5.71	5.84	<u>5.67</u>	5.83	<u>5.24</u>	<u>5.38</u>	5.77	<u>5.55</u>	<u>5.50</u>	5.80
Unsupportive vs. Supportive	5.42	5.52	<u>5.40</u>	5.49	<u>5.21</u>	5.39	5.39	5.47	<u>5.17</u>	5.55
Ageist vs. Non-ageist	5.51	5.67	<u>5.46</u>	5.54	<u>5.39</u>	<u>5.35</u>	5.58	<u>5.35</u>	5.48	5.54
Regressing vs. Improving	5.34	5.35	5.33	5.37	<u>5.24</u>	<u>5.25</u>	5.37	5.31	<u>5.23</u>	5.39

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 3.5, 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 looking at student characteristics, there were clear differences between groups. Students who had been at MSU for more than two years reported fewer positive responses for all but one of the categories (Unsupportive vs. Supportive). First-generation students gave fewer positive responses for nine of the twelve adjective pairs.

Table 2.1c: Adjective Pairs Associated with College Climate by Student 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	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
Hostile vs. Friendly	5.55	5.64	<u>5.43</u>	<u>5.48</u>	5.59
Racist vs. Non-racist	5.53	5.75	<u>5.27</u>	<u>5.21</u>	5.64
Homogeneous vs. Diverse	5.25	5.45	<u>5.00</u>	<u>5.16</u>	5.29
Disrespectful vs. Respectful	5.54	5.63	<u>5.42</u>	<u>5.43</u>	5.55
Unwelcoming vs. Welcoming	5.56	5.65	<u>5.45</u>	<u>5.47</u>	5.60
Sexist vs. Non-sexist	5.19	5.37	<u>4.96</u>	<u>4.95</u>	5.26
Individualistic vs. Collaborative	4.76	4.77	4.75	<u>4.69</u>	4.80
Competitive vs. Cooperative	4.47	4.62	<u>4.28</u>	<u>4.28</u>	4.52
Homophobic vs. Non-homophobic	5.68	5.79	<u>5.54</u>	<u>5.58</u>	5.71
Unsupportive vs. Supportive	5.40	5.51	5.26	5.39	5.42
Ageist vs. Non-ageist	5.49	5.57	<u>5.38</u>	5.47	5.51
Regressing vs. Improving	5.32	5.41	<u>5.21</u>	5.33	5.35

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 3.5, 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)

Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower means (less positive) for all but one of the adjective pairs (Homogeneous vs. Diverse) (Table 2.1d). Those in Mathematics reported lower means (less positive) for five of the twelve adjective pairs. Physical Sciences only reported lower means (less positive) for one of the adjective pairs (Ageist vs. Non-ageist).

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	5.52	<u>5.48</u>	5.80	<u>5.62</u>
Racist vs. Non-racist	5.51	<u>5.49</u>	5.57	5.61
Homogeneous vs. Diverse	5.24	5.25	5.26	5.20
Disrespectful vs. Respectful	5.51	<u>5.47</u>	5.75	5.67
Unwelcoming vs. Welcoming	5.52	<u>5.47</u>	5.81	<u>5.70</u>
Sexist vs. Non-sexist	5.17	<u>5.13</u>	5.36	5.33
Individualistic vs. Collaborative	4.74	<u>4.65</u>	5.26	<u>5.13</u>
Competitive vs. Cooperative	4.44	<u>4.35</u>	4.89	4.93
Homophobic vs. Non-homophobic	5.64	<u>5.63</u>	5.80	<u>5.66</u>
Unsupportive vs. Supportive	5.37	<u>5.33</u>	5.64	5.57
Ageist vs. Non-ageist	5.46	<u>5.40</u>	<u>5.69</u>	5.79
Regressing vs. Improving	5.29	<u>5.26</u>	5.50	<u>5.38</u>

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, at least 50% of the respondents said that the climate was at least somewhat positive for that group. The climate was seen as best for men (73.2%), Whites (76.6%), and with women (69.8%) and people of color (67.4%) also having over two-thirds of the respondents reporting the climate as being at least somewhat positive. In terms of a negative climate, non-native English speakers (19.6%) and transgender individuals (14.0%) 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 for undergraduate students who are:	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neutral	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
Women	0.5%	7.6%	22.1%	28.0%	41.8%	940	4.03	.995
Men	0.7%	5.8%	20.4%	19.3%	53.9%	898	4.20	.998

Transgender	2.9%	11.1%	36.0%	23.5%	26.5%	748	3.59	1.082
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual	1.2%	6.4%	28.5%	26.7%	37.2%	843	3.92	1.008
People of Color	0.7%	7.6%	24.3%	25.9%	41.5%	868	4.00	1.013
White	0.5%	4.6%	21.2%	16.6%	57.0%	938	4.25	.976
Immigrants	0.9%	8.0%	31.6%	26.0%	33.5%	800	3.83	1.012
International	0.8%	8.2%	24.8%	27.0%	39.1%	838	3.95	1.021
Non-native English speakers	1.8%	17.8%	28.1%	26.6%	25.7%	822	3.57	1.107
Christian Religious Affiliations	1.7%	6.7%	36.0%	20.5%	35.1%	831	3.81	1.047
Non-Christian Religious Affiliations	1.0%	6.0%	37.5%	24.1%	31.5%	817	3.79	.987

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., women 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. Women felt that women's climate was not as favorable compared to their men counterparts' responses. Those within the LGBTQIA2S+ 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. Students 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 three 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 for undergraduate students who are:	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQ/A2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Women	4.07	4.18	<u>4.05</u>	4.10	<u>3.88</u>	4.03	4.04	4.02	<u>3.88</u>	4.12
Men	4.22	4.16	4.24	<u>4.19</u>	4.31	<u>3.98</u>	4.30	4.18	4.30	4.20
Transgender	3.66	3.83	<u>3.62</u>	3.66	<u>3.43</u>	<u>3.49</u>	3.67	<u>3.46</u>	<u>3.48</u>	3.69
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual	3.98	4.02	3.97	3.97	<u>3.85</u>	<u>3.82</u>	4.00	<u>3.81</u>	3.91	3.97
People of Color	4.07	4.21	<u>4.03</u>	4.12	<u>3.75</u>	<u>3.96</u>	4.10	<u>3.82</u>	<u>3.88</u>	4.11
White	4.28	4.25	4.28	<u>4.22</u>	4.38	<u>4.02</u>	4.35	<u>4.22</u>	4.31	4.26
Immigrants	3.90	4.08	<u>3.85</u>	3.90	<u>3.72</u>	<u>3.72</u>	3.96	<u>3.65</u>	<u>3.73</u>	3.91
International	3.99	4.04	3.98	4.03	<u>3.81</u>	<u>3.81</u>	4.00	3.95	<u>3.85</u>	4.05
Non-native English speakers	3.60	3.83	<u>3.55</u>	3.65	<u>3.34</u>	3.65	3.59	<u>3.45</u>	<u>3.36</u>	3.69
Christian Religious Affiliations	3.83	3.86	3.82	3.84	3.80	<u>3.52</u>	3.93	<u>3.77</u>	<u>3.77</u>	3.88
Non-Christian Religious Affiliations	3.82	3.89	3.80	3.86	<u>3.59</u>	<u>3.65</u>	3.88	<u>3.67</u>	<u>3.71</u>	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).

In terms of student characteristics, those who had been at MSU for more than two years, in general thought that the climate was less favorable for all groups other than men and Whites compared to those who had been at MSU for 2 years or less (Table 2.2c). First-generation students reported lower favorable responses for all groups other than women, transgender individuals, and non-native English speakers compared to those who were not first-generation students.

Table 2.2c: Climate in College Towards Specific Groups by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science for undergraduate students who are:	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
Women	4.04	4.11	<u>3.95</u>	4.01	4.06
Men	4.22	4.22	4.21	<u>4.13</u>	4.27
Transgender	3.60	3.67	<u>3.54</u>	3.55	3.63
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual	3.94	4.01	<u>3.86</u>	<u>3.84</u>	3.97
People of Color	4.01	4.10	<u>3.90</u>	<u>3.84</u>	4.07
White	4.27	4.27	4.27	<u>4.18</u>	4.31
Immigrants	3.86	3.95	<u>3.75</u>	<u>3.77</u>	3.88
International	3.97	4.12	<u>3.79</u>	<u>3.84</u>	4.01
Non-native English speakers	3.57	3.65	<u>3.47</u>	3.54	3.58
Christian Religious Affiliations	3.82	3.88	<u>3.74</u>	<u>3.74</u>	3.86
Non-Christian Religious Affiliations	3.80	3.86	<u>3.72</u>	<u>3.69</u>	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).

Both those in the Biological Sciences and Mathematics reported that the climates for eight of the eleven groups were less positive with each district identifying the same groups, except for one each (Table 2.2d). Those in Mathematics said that the climate was less positive for women and those in Biological Sciences felt that the climate was less positive for Whites.

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 for undergraduate students who are:	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Women	4.03	4.03	4.12	<u>3.98</u>
Men	4.20	<u>4.19</u>	4.29	<u>4.17</u>
Transgender	3.59	<u>3.56</u>	4.02	<u>3.62</u>
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual	3.93	<u>3.91</u>	4.10	<u>3.97</u>
People of Color	4.00	<u>3.99</u>	4.13	<u>3.96</u>
White	4.25	<u>4.24</u>	4.34	4.27
Immigrants	3.83	<u>3.82</u>	4.08	<u>3.76</u>
International	3.95	<u>3.95</u>	4.23	<u>3.81</u>
Non-native English speakers	3.57	<u>3.54</u>	3.86	<u>3.55</u>
Christian Religious Affiliations	3.80	3.81	3.81	3.73
Non-Christian Religious Affiliations	3.79	3.78	3.87	3.79

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 undergraduates with various disabilities and roles outside of school (Table 2.3a). Respondents reported that the climate was at least somewhat positive for over 50% of the time for all groups. Those undergraduates with mental health conditions received the highest percent of very negative or somewhat negative climate responses (21.3%) followed by those with learning disabilities (18.9%).

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

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science for undergraduate students 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	4.3%	17.0%	24.9%	29.2%	24.7%	888	3.53	1.158
Physical Disability	2.2%	13.0%	30.5%	27.1%	27.1%	763	3.64	1.081
Learning Disability	3.3%	15.6%	28.4%	26.3%	26.3%	816	3.57	1.133
Parents/Guardians of Dependent Children	1.3%	8.2%	38.5%	25.7%	26.3%	716	3.67	.993
Providing Care for Adults who are Disabled and/or Elderly	1.7%	8.1%	39.9%	23.6%	26.7%	664	3.66	1.011
Serviced/Serving in the Military	0.9%	4.4%	39.2%	24.9%	30.6%	676	3.80	.957

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 evaluating the perceived climate for the same disabilities/roles across demographic characteristics, there are definite trends (Table 2.3b). Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, and those with disabilities all reported less favorable climates than their counterparts for all disabilities/roles. In terms of race, patterns are less obvious.

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

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science for undergraduate students who are or have:	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Mental Health Condition	3.57	3.78	<u>3.53</u>	3.65	<u>3.28</u>	3.52	3.54	3.53	<u>3.32</u>	3.68
Physical Disability	3.68	3.91	<u>3.63</u>	3.76	<u>3.31</u>	<u>3.58</u>	3.68	3.63	<u>3.45</u>	3.79
Learning Disability	3.61	3.85	<u>3.55</u>	3.70	<u>3.25</u>	3.61	3.55	3.63	<u>3.38</u>	3.70
Parents/Guardians of Dependent Children	3.70	3.96	<u>3.64</u>	3.77	<u>3.43</u>	3.76	3.69	<u>3.65</u>	<u>3.58</u>	3.75
Providing Care for Adults who are Disabled and/or Elderly	3.70	3.87	<u>3.66</u>	3.75	<u>3.40</u>	3.71	3.68	3.64	<u>3.51</u>	3.77
Serviced/Serving in the Military	3.84	4.00	<u>3.80</u>	3.85	<u>3.68</u>	<u>3.76</u>	3.86	<u>3.74</u>	<u>3.70</u>	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).

Years at MSU also impacted how favorable students perceived the climate for different disabilities and roles with those with more than 2 years reporting less favorable for two of the three disabilities and roles of parents (Table 2.3c). First-generation students reported that the climate was less positive for all three roles and those with physical disabilities.

Table 2.3c: Climate in the College Towards Specific Disabilities/Roles Outside of School by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science for undergraduate students who are or have:	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
Mental Health Condition	4.04	4.11	<u>3.95</u>	4.01	4.06
Physical Disability	4.22	4.22	4.21	<u>4.13</u>	4.27
Learning Disability	3.60	3.67	<u>3.54</u>	3.55	3.63
Parents/Guardians of Dependent Children	3.94	4.01	<u>3.86</u>	<u>3.84</u>	3.97
Providing Care for Adults who are Disabled and/or Elderly	4.01	4.10	3.90	<u>3.84</u>	4.07
Serviced/Serving in the Military	4.27	4.27	4.27	<u>4.18</u>	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 those in Mathematics reported that the climates for individuals in all six roles were less positive than those in the Physical Sciences (Table 2.3d).

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

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science for undergraduate students who are or have:	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Mental Health Condition	3.53	<u>3.50</u>	3.76	<u>3.59</u>
Physical Disability	3.64	<u>3.62</u>	3.90	<u>3.63</u>
Learning Disability	3.57	<u>3.56</u>	3.68	<u>3.58</u>
Parents/Guardians of Dependent Children	3.67	<u>3.65</u>	3.93	<u>3.74</u>
Providing Care for Adults who are Disabled and/or Elderly	3.66	<u>3.63</u>	3.89	<u>3.71</u>
Serviced/Serving in the Military	3.80	<u>3.80</u>	3.91	<u>3.70</u>

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). Over 50% of the respondents stated that they at least somewhat agreed with the statements. "I am treated

equally compared to other undergraduate students received the highest percent of somewhat and strongly agree responses followed by “I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.” (73.7%) and “I feel safe (including physical, mental, and emotional safety).” (71.2%). The area with the highest percent of strongly to somewhat disagree responses was “People take time to welcome new students.” (25.3%). “I feel a sense of belonging.” (17.1%) also received a higher percentage of disagreement.

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 of Natural Science.	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 students.	5.4%	19.9%	24.5%	34.5%	15.8%	971	3.35	1.124
People work closely together.	3.3%	10.9%	25.1%	44.0%	16.8%	967	3.60	.996
People create a sense of belonging for others.	2.3%	12.4%	23.7%	43.2%	18.5%	970	3.63	.993
I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.	2.8%	7.6%	16.0%	36.5%	37.2%	971	3.98	1.043
My personal identities are valued in the classroom.	3.5%	10.0%	28.4%	35.4%	22.7%	971	3.64	1.047
Faculty negatively prejudge me. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	36.4%	29.6%	24.3%	7.0%	2.7%	968	2.10	1.058
I feel a sense of belonging.	3.9%	13.2%	20.4%	41.4%	21.2%	972	3.63	1.076
I am treated equally compared to other undergraduate students.	1.9%	8.0%	16.3%	37.1%	36.7%	972	3.99	1.009
I feel safe (including physical, mental, and emotional safety).	2.3%	10.4%	16.2%	42.6%	28.6%	972	3.85	1.022
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 “Faculty negatively prejudge me” which is reverse coded. For this statement, because it is phrased in a negative form, an agree response is unfavorable towards welcoming/belonging and a disagree response is favorable.								

In terms of demographic characteristic differences there were differences across the statements with women being less likely to agree than men for some of the statements (Table 2.4b). Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community were less likely to agree for all the statements. Those who were non-Asian were more likely to be less in agreement with some of 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 of Natural Science.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
People take time to welcome new students.	3.37	3.47	<u>3.34</u>	3.44	<u>3.20</u>	3.48	<u>3.33</u>	3.40	<u>3.18</u>	3.51
People work closely together.	3.64	3.77	<u>3.61</u>	3.68	<u>3.47</u>	3.65	3.63	3.56	<u>3.44</u>	3.76
People create a sense of belonging for others.	3.68	3.87	<u>3.63</u>	3.74	<u>3.43</u>	3.66	3.65	3.66	<u>3.48</u>	3.75
I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.	4.03	4.02	4.03	4.08	<u>3.85</u>	<u>3.74</u>	4.15	<u>3.78</u>	<u>3.91</u>	4.10
My personal identities are valued in the classroom.	3.70	3.69	3.70	3.77	<u>3.41</u>	3.67	3.74	<u>3.49</u>	<u>3.51</u>	3.79
Faculty negatively prejudge me. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	2.06	1.94	2.10	2.05	2.16	2.40	2.01	2.09	2.23	1.96
I feel a sense of belonging.	3.68	3.83	<u>3.64</u>	3.74	<u>3.42</u>	<u>3.55</u>	3.71	<u>3.51</u>	<u>3.48</u>	3.77
I am treated equally compared to other undergraduate students.	4.03	4.20	<u>3.98</u>	4.05	<u>3.96</u>	<u>3.86</u>	4.10	<u>3.91</u>	<u>3.88</u>	4.14
I feel safe (including physical, mental, and emotional safety).	3.91	4.19	<u>3.84</u>	3.96	<u>3.63</u>	3.81	3.89	3.81	<u>3.59</u>	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, 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 “Faculty negatively prejudge me” which is reverse coded. For this statement, because it is phrased in a negative form, an agree response is unfavorable towards welcoming/belonging and a disagree response is favorable.

Students who have been at MSU for more than two years were less likely to agree with most of the statements (Table 2.4c). First-generation students were also less likely to agree with most of the statements.

Table 2.4c: Attitudes about Welcoming and Belonging Within College by Student 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 of Natural Science.	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
People take time to welcome new students.	3.38	3.48	<u>3.25</u>	3.33	3.41
People work closely together.	3.62	3.62	3.62	<u>3.55</u>	3.65
People create a sense of belonging for others.	3.65	3.70	<u>3.59</u>	<u>3.57</u>	3.68
I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.	4.00	4.07	<u>3.92</u>	<u>3.95</u>	4.05
My personal identities are valued in the classroom.	3.67	3.72	<u>3.60</u>	3.63	3.69
Faculty negatively prejudge me. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	2.09	2.00	2.20	2.10	2.07
I feel a sense of belonging.	3.65	3.69	3.60	<u>3.53</u>	3.69
I am treated equally compared to other undergraduate students.	4.02	4.09	<u>3.92</u>	<u>3.84</u>	4.08
I feel safe (including physical, mental, and emotional safety).	3.86	3.89	3.83	<u>3.64</u>	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, 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 "Faculty negatively prejudge me" which is reverse coded. For this statement, because it is phrased in a negative form, an agree response is unfavorable towards welcoming/belonging and a disagree response is favorable.

Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower agreement for all attitudes about welcoming and belonging than those in the Physical Sciences (Table 2.4d). Those in Mathematics reported lower agreement for six of the nine attitudes compared to those in Physical Sciences.

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 of Natural Science.	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
People take time to welcome new students.	3.35	<u>3.34</u>	3.49	3.40
People work closely together.	3.60	<u>3.57</u>	3.96	<u>3.59</u>
People create a sense of belonging for others.	3.63	<u>3.60</u>	3.84	3.76
I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.	3.98	<u>3.93</u>	4.38	<u>4.04</u>
My personal identities are valued in the classroom.	3.64	<u>3.61</u>	3.86	<u>3.69</u>
Faculty negatively prejudge me. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	2.10	2.12	1.92	2.10
I feel a sense of belonging.	3.63	<u>3.61</u>	3.77	<u>3.66</u>
I am treated equally compared to other undergraduate students.	3.99	<u>3.96</u>	4.20	<u>4.04</u>
I feel safe (including physical, mental, and emotional safety).	3.85	<u>3.83</u>	3.96	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, 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 "Faculty negatively prejudge me" which is reverse coded. For this statement, because it is phrased in a negative form, an agree response is unfavorable towards welcoming/belonging and a disagree response is favorable.

Respondents were also asked about their values and relationships within their major/program (Table 2.5a). It should be noted that the findings do not necessarily reflect any one major/program. For all twelve statements, over 58% of the respondents said that they at least somewhat agreed with the statements. "I am treated with respect by graduate students/teaching assistants." (83.1%) had the highest level of agreement with "I am treated with respect by staff." (83.0%), "I am treated with respect by advisor" (82.4%), and "I am treated with respect by faculty." (82.3%) all receiving over 80% agreement. In terms of higher levels of disagreement, "Students are provided an explanation for major decisions." (21.1%), "Program goals, changes, and important milestones are clearly communicated." (18.5%), and "Administrators care about my general satisfaction." (16.6%) all received higher levels of disagreement with the statements.

Table 2.5a: Values and Relationships Within Major/Program

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning values and relationships in your major/program.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
Instructors value my contributions in the classroom.	1.5%	4.1%	16.8%	40.9%	36.8%	936	4.07	.910
Other students value my contributions in the classroom.	2.5%	6.1%	26.3%	39.2%	25.9%	918	3.80	.976
Advisors care about my general satisfaction.	4.2%	7.6%	17.2%	34.2%	36.8%	934	3.92	1.102
Faculty care about my general satisfaction.	2.9%	9.7%	22.0%	39.4%	26.0%	928	3.76	1.035
Graduate students care about my general satisfaction.	3.7%	8.5%	29.0%	32.4%	26.5%	846	3.70	1.064
Administrators care about my general satisfaction.	5.6%	11.0%	24.7%	33.3%	25.3%	885	3.62	1.141
Staff care about my general satisfaction.	2.5%	8.4%	20.9%	40.5%	27.7%	914	3.82	1.010
Advisors care about my personal well-being.	4.4%	7.2%	18.2%	32.9%	37.2%	927	3.91	1.111
Faculty care about my personal well-being.	2.7%	9.0%	22.7%	35.7%	29.9%	920	3.81	1.047
Graduate students care about my personal well-being.	3.0%	9.0%	29.5%	32.5%	26.0%	836	3.69	1.045
Administrators students care about my personal well-being.	3.2%	7.1%	29.1%	35.6%	25.0%	815	3.72	1.018
Staff care about my personal well-being.	2.6%	7.9%	21.1%	39.7%	28.7%	914	3.84	1.012
I can voice my opinions openly.	3.3%	10.5%	20.1%	37.5%	28.7%	937	3.78	1.075
People listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.	3.8%	9.8%	26.0%	39.9%	20.4%	915	3.63	1.034
Program goals, changes, and important milestones are clearly communicated.	4.9%	13.6%	16.6%	35.8%	29.0%	932	3.70	1.166
Students are provided an explanation for major decisions.	6.3%	14.8%	19.1%	33.6%	26.2%	917	3.58	1.202
I am treated with respect by faculty.	1.5%	2.9%	13.3%	37.2%	45.1%	938	4.22	.888
I am treated with respect by advisors.	1.8%	4.4%	11.5%	26.9%	55.5%	934	4.30	.960
I am treated with respect by administrators.	2.3%	3.4%	20.1%	37.6%	36.6%	885	4.03	.952
I am treated with respect by graduate students/teaching assistants.	1.6%	2.4%	12.9%	34.8%	48.3%	922	4.26	.888
I am treated with respect by other undergraduate students.	1.8%	3.3%	15.0%	39.9%	40.0%	938	4.13	.911
I am treated with respect by staff.	1.5%	2.5%	13.0%	37.2%	45.8%	936	4.23	.876
I have access to administrators when I have concerns/problems.	4.2%	8.2%	16.8%	36.6%	34.1%	899	3.88	1.098

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. Women reported lower levels of agreement than their Men counterparts for eight of the statements. Those in the LGBTQIA2S+ community had lower levels of agreement for 15 of the statements. Those who were Asian were more likely to report lower levels

of agreement. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement for all but one of the statements compared to those without disabilities.

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

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning values and relationships in your major/program.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQ/A2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Instructors value my contributions in the classroom.	4.10	4.16	4.08	4.09	4.08	4.10	4.08	4.09	<u>4.01</u>	4.17
Other students value my contributions in the classroom.	3.82	3.88	3.81	3.83	<u>3.73</u>	3.86	3.81	3.77	<u>3.71</u>	3.89
Advisors care about my general satisfaction.	3.94	3.91	3.94	3.93	3.97	3.98	<u>3.91</u>	4.01	<u>3.86</u>	4.03
Faculty care about my general satisfaction.	3.78	3.84	3.76	3.82	<u>3.63</u>	<u>3.74</u>	<u>3.74</u>	3.89	<u>3.60</u>	3.89
Graduate students care about my general satisfaction.	3.72	3.92	<u>3.67</u>	3.75	<u>3.59</u>	3.71	3.70	3.73	<u>3.55</u>	3.79
Administrators care about my general satisfaction.	3.65	3.71	3.64	3.72	<u>3.44</u>	3.68	3.60	3.71	<u>3.38</u>	3.79
Staff care about my general satisfaction.	3.85	3.95	<u>3.82</u>	3.89	<u>3.74</u>	3.79	3.84	3.86	<u>3.68</u>	3.97
Advisors care about my personal well-being.	3.92	4.04	<u>3.89</u>	3.93	3.96	4.02	<u>3.91</u>	3.95	<u>3.84</u>	4.01
Faculty care about my personal well-being.	3.84	3.98	<u>3.81</u>	3.86	3.79	<u>3.70</u>	3.86	3.81	<u>3.66</u>	3.98
Graduate students care about my personal well-being.	3.72	3.90	<u>3.67</u>	3.71	3.69	3.68	3.69	3.76	<u>3.58</u>	3.76
Administrators students care about my personal well-being.	3.73	3.83	<u>3.70</u>	3.79	<u>3.57</u>	3.77	3.72	3.74	<u>3.58</u>	3.83
Staff care about my personal well-being.	3.86	4.04	<u>3.82</u>	3.90	<u>3.78</u>	<u>3.75</u>	3.87	3.89	<u>3.68</u>	4.00
I can voice my opinions openly.	3.81	3.78	3.82	3.81	3.73	<u>3.74</u>	3.78	3.88	<u>3.67</u>	3.89
People listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.	3.67	3.73	3.65	3.69	<u>3.54</u>	3.69	<u>3.61</u>	3.77	<u>3.53</u>	3.74
Program goals, changes, and important milestones are clearly communicated.	3.72	3.75	3.71	3.77	<u>3.55</u>	3.85	<u>3.64</u>	3.78	<u>3.57</u>	3.83
Students are provided an explanation for major decisions.	3.60	3.62	3.60	3.64	<u>3.52</u>	3.63	3.57	3.66	<u>3.45</u>	3.73
I am treated with respect by faculty.	4.25	4.28	4.24	4.27	<u>4.16</u>	<u>4.09</u>	4.26	4.24	<u>4.14</u>	4.35
I am treated with respect by advisors.	4.31	4.36	4.30	4.29	4.36	4.33	4.29	4.36	4.29	4.38
I am treated with respect by administrators.	4.06	4.11	4.05	4.09	<u>3.93</u>	<u>3.95</u>	4.06	4.10	<u>3.88</u>	4.20
I am treated with respect by graduate students/teaching assistants.	4.28	4.37	<u>4.26</u>	4.28	4.25	<u>4.14</u>	4.31	4.27	<u>4.23</u>	4.34
I am treated with respect by other undergraduate students.	4.16	4.18	4.15	4.19	<u>4.03</u>	4.09	4.18	<u>4.05</u>	<u>4.02</u>	4.21
I am treated with respect by staff.	4.26	4.27	4.26	4.29	<u>4.17</u>	<u>4.15</u>	4.30	<u>4.18</u>	<u>4.18</u>	4.33
I have access to administrators when I have concerns/problems.	3.90	<u>3.88</u>	3.90	3.94	<u>3.75</u>	4.00	<u>3.87</u>	3.92	<u>3.76</u>	4.00

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 student characteristics, those who had been at MSU for more than two years reported lower levels of agreement for 16 of the statements (Table 2.5c). For the most part, there was little difference between those who were first-generation and those who weren't for the statements.

Table 2.5c: Values and Relationships Within the Major/Program by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning values and relationships in your major/program.	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
Instructors value my contributions in the classroom.	4.08	4.10	4.04	4.10	4.08
Other students value my contributions in the classroom.	3.81	3.83	3.79	3.80	3.82
Advisors care about my general satisfaction.	3.93	4.04	<u>3.79</u>	3.93	3.96
Faculty care about my general satisfaction.	3.76	3.86	<u>3.65</u>	<u>3.68</u>	3.80
Graduate students care about my general satisfaction.	3.70	3.72	3.69	3.64	3.73
Administrators care about my general satisfaction.	3.63	3.80	<u>3.42</u>	3.58	3.66
Staff care about my general satisfaction.	3.83	3.90	<u>3.76</u>	3.83	3.85
Advisors care about my personal well-being.	3.92	4.01	<u>3.82</u>	3.89	3.95
Faculty care about my personal well-being.	3.82	3.90	<u>3.74</u>	3.81	3.85
Graduate students care about my personal well-being.	3.69	3.70	3.69	3.65	3.73
Administrators students care about my personal well-being.	3.73	3.80	<u>3.63</u>	3.72	3.73
Staff care about my personal well-being.	3.85	3.90	<u>3.78</u>	<u>3.76</u>	3.88
I can voice my opinions openly.	3.78	3.85	<u>3.71</u>	3.74	3.82
People listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.	3.64	3.72	<u>3.56</u>	3.63	3.66
Program goals, changes, and important milestones are clearly communicated.	3.71	3.82	<u>3.57</u>	3.65	3.73
Students are provided an explanation for major decisions.	3.60	3.70	<u>3.47</u>	3.58	3.61
I am treated with respect by faculty.	4.22	4.27	<u>4.17</u>	4.21	4.25
I am treated with respect by advisors.	4.30	4.35	<u>4.23</u>	4.32	4.32
I am treated with respect by administrators.	4.03	4.15	<u>3.89</u>	4.13	<u>4.03</u>
I am treated with respect by graduate students/teaching assistants.	4.27	4.32	<u>4.22</u>	4.25	4.29
I am treated with respect by other undergraduate students.	4.13	4.13	4.13	4.13	4.15
I am treated with respect by staff.	4.23	4.26	4.20	4.25	4.26
I have access to administrators when I have concerns/problems.	3.88	4.01	3.72	3.90	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, 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 but four of the statements 23 statements (Table 2.5d). Those in Mathematics reported less agreement with all but five of the statements. Those in the Physical Sciences report less agreement with only one statement – “I am treated with respect by faculty.”

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 your major/program.	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Instructors value my contributions in the classroom.	4.07	<u>4.06</u>	4.11	4.20
Other students value my contributions in the classroom.	3.80	<u>3.78</u>	3.97	<u>3.82</u>
Advisors care about my general satisfaction.	3.92	<u>3.89</u>	4.22	<u>3.88</u>
Faculty care about my general satisfaction.	3.76	<u>3.74</u>	4.04	<u>3.73</u>
Graduate students care about my general satisfaction.	3.69	<u>3.65</u>	4.08	<u>3.75</u>
Administrators care about my general satisfaction.	3.62	<u>3.58</u>	3.91	<u>3.67</u>
Staff care about my general satisfaction.	3.82	<u>3.79</u>	4.04	<u>3.92</u>
Advisors care about my personal well-being.	3.91	<u>3.88</u>	4.25	<u>3.95</u>
Faculty care about my personal well-being.	3.81	<u>3.80</u>	3.93	3.85
Graduate students care about my personal well-being.	3.69	<u>3.66</u>	4.08	<u>3.69</u>
Administrators students care about my personal well-being.	3.72	<u>3.68</u>	4.03	<u>3.83</u>
Staff care about my personal well-being.	3.84	3.83	3.92	3.85
I can voice my opinions openly.	3.78	<u>3.77</u>	3.92	<u>3.76</u>
People listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.	3.63	<u>3.60</u>	3.88	<u>3.77</u>
Program goals, changes, and important milestones are clearly communicated.	3.70	3.70	3.79	<u>3.67</u>
Students are provided an explanation for major decisions.	3.59	3.60	3.64	<u>3.42</u>
I am treated with respect by faculty.	4.22	4.21	<u>4.18</u>	4.29
I am treated with respect by advisors.	4.30	<u>4.27</u>	4.52	<u>4.38</u>
I am treated with respect by administrators.	4.03	<u>4.01</u>	4.18	<u>4.08</u>
I am treated with respect by graduate students/teaching assistants.	4.26	<u>4.23</u>	4.49	<u>4.31</u>
I am treated with respect by other undergraduate students.	4.13	<u>4.10</u>	4.29	4.26
I am treated with respect by staff.	4.23	<u>4.22</u>	4.34	<u>4.24</u>
I have access to administrators when I have concerns/problems.	3.88	<u>3.88</u>	3.97	<u>3.86</u>

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).

DIVERSITY WITHIN THE COLLEGE

Respondents were asked a series of questions about faculty and student diversity within the college (Table 2.6a). Three of the statements had over 50% of the respondents reporting agreeing – “The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty.”, “There are enough faculty I identify with.”, and “Within the college, I am satisfied with the level of faculty diversity “. The two statements about the level of diversity of women faculty and

faculty of color were asked in a negative form (too few). This means that the relatively high percentage of students that agreed with the statements suggests a potential problem with 39.8% of the students stating that there were too few faculty of color and 26.3% felt that there were too few women faculty members.

Table 2.6a: Faculty Diversity Within the College

Now we would like you to think about the faculty in the College of Natural Science. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty.	2.6%	7.7%	30.1%	38.4%	21.2%	972	3.68	.975
There are enough faculty I identify with.	7.0%	15.2%	22.5%	30.9%	24.4%	973	3.50	1.209
Within the college, I am satisfied with the level of faculty diversity (e.g., in terms of race / ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, nationality, and people with disabilities).	4.4%	13.5%	23.0%	34.8%	24.3%	972	3.61	1.122
There are too few faculty of color. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	8.1%	15.7%	36.4%	29.6%	10.2%	973	3.18	1.074
There are too few women faculty. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	11.4%	23.3%	39.0%	19.2%	7.1%	973	2.87	1.073

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 first three statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

* The last two statements are reverse coded which means that an agree statement is unfavorable in terms of faculty diversity and a disagree statement is favorable.

When looking at the first three statements, women were less likely to agree as were members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community and those with disabilities (Table 2.6b). Non-Whites were less likely to agree for two of the three first statements.

In terms of the last two statements, women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, and students with disabilities were more likely to agree with them. Students of color were more likely to agree that there were too few faculty of color.

Table 2.6b: Faculty Diversity Within the College by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Now we would like you to think about the faculty in the College of Natural Science. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty.	3.71	3.81	<u>3.68</u>	3.79	<u>3.42</u>	<u>3.57</u>	3.81	<u>3.46</u>	<u>3.60</u>	3.78
There are enough faculty I identify with.	3.56	3.69	<u>3.52</u>	3.63	<u>3.20</u>	<u>3.10</u>	3.83	2.89	<u>3.42</u>	3.59

Within the college, I am satisfied with the level of faculty diversity (e.g., in terms of race / ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, nationality, and people with disabilities).	3.65	3.89	<u>3.59</u>	3.79	<u>3.12</u>	<u>3.46</u>	3.75	<u>3.31</u>	<u>3.35</u>	3.81
There are too few faculty of color. (reverse coded)*	3.17	2.86	3.25	3.05	3.57	3.23	3.14	3.40	3.43	3.04
There are too few women faculty. (reverse coded)*	2.87	2.60	2.93	2.80	3.13	2.82	2.90	2.91	3.07	2.82

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) for the first three statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

* The last two statements are reverse coded which means that an agree statement is unfavorable in terms of faculty diversity and a disagree statement is favorable.

Students who were at MSU for more than two years were less likely to agree that the college had demonstrated a commitment to hire diverse faculty (Table 2.6c). They were also more likely to agree that there were too few faculty of color and women faculty members. First-generation students were less likely to agree with the first three statements and that there were too few faculty of color. Students who were not first-generation were more likely to agree that there were too few women faculty members.

Table 2.6c: Faculty Diversity Within the College by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
Now we would like you to think about the faculty in the College of Natural Science. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.					
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty.	3.69	3.76	<u>3.60</u>	<u>3.56</u>	3.75
There are enough faculty I identify with.	3.52	3.57	3.44	<u>3.25</u>	3.61
Within the college, I am satisfied with the level of faculty diversity (e.g., in terms of race / ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, nationality, and people with disabilities).	3.62	3.75	3.46	<u>3.46</u>	3.69
There are too few faculty of color. (reverse coded)*	3.19	3.11	3.30	3.32	3.18
There are too few women faculty. (reverse coded)*	2.89	2.80	2.99	2.83	2.93

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 first three statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

* The last two statements are reverse coded which means that an agree statement is unfavorable in terms of faculty diversity and a disagree statement is favorable.

There was little difference between districts in terms of their agreement with the college demonstrating a commitment to hire a diverse faculty (Table 2.6d). Those in the Biological Sciences reported less agreement that there were enough faculty they identified with compared to the other two districts. Those in the Physical Sciences were less likely to be satisfied with the level of diversity compared to the other two districts.

Those in the Physical Sciences were more likely to agree that there were too few women faculty members and faculty of color. Those in the Biological Sciences were more likely to agree that there were few faculty of color and those within Mathematics were more likely to agree that there were too few women faculty members.

Table 2.6d: Faculty Diversity Within the College by College District (Mean Scores)

	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Now we would like you to think about the faculty in the College of Natural Science. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.				
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty.	3.68	3.68	3.70	3.63
There are enough faculty I identify with.	3.51	<u>3.50</u>	3.51	3.60
Within the college, I am satisfied with the level of faculty diversity (e.g., in terms of race / ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, nationality, and people with disabilities).	3.61	3.61	<u>3.56</u>	3.70
There are too few faculty of color. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	3.18	3.18	3.38	2.98
There are too few women faculty. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	2.87	2.80	3.24	3.17
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 first three statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree). * The last two statements are reverse coded which means that an agree statement is unfavorable in terms of faculty diversity and a disagree statement is favorable.				

Students were then asked about their views related to the diversity of the student population (Table 2.7a). Over 50 percent of the students agreed that the college was committed to recruiting students from diverse backgrounds and that they were satisfied with the level of diversity with the undergraduate student population within the college. In terms of the actual diversity within the undergraduate student population, only 32.8% disagreed that there were too few undergraduate students of color and 48.3% disagreed about too few women undergraduate students. Almost one-third (31.3%) of the students felt that there were too few undergraduate students of color.

Table 2.7a: Undergraduate Student Diversity Within the College

Now we would like you to think about undergraduate students in the College of Natural Science. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
Has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting students from diverse backgrounds.	1.3%	7.8%	31.3%	38.4%	21.1%	971	3.70	.932
I am satisfied with the level of undergraduate student diversity (e.g., in terms of race / ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, nationality, and people with disabilities).	3.0%	12.3%	26.1%	37.4%	21.2%	973	3.61	1.043
There are too few undergraduate students of color. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	10.0%	21.3%	35.8%	25.5%	7.3%	971	2.99	1.078
There are too few women undergraduate students. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	18.5%	29.8%	37.5%	10.8%	3.4%	971	2.51	1.021
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 first three statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree). * The last two statements are reverse coded which means that an agree statement is unfavorable in terms of faculty diversity and a disagree statement is favorable.								

Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, and students with disabilities were less likely to agree with the first two statements (Table 2.7b). Students of color were less likely to agree with both statements and Asian students were less likely to be satisfied with the level of diversity of undergraduate students within the college. Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Asian students, and students with disabilities were more likely to agree that there were too few students of color within the college. Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Asian students, and those with disabilities were more likely to agree that there were too few women undergraduates.

Table 2.7b: Undergraduate Student Diversity Within the College by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Now we would like you to think about undergraduate students in the College of Natural Science. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQ/A2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting students from diverse backgrounds.	3.75	3.86	<u>3.72</u>	3.77	<u>3.55</u>	3.73	3.79	<u>3.44</u>	<u>3.61</u>	3.79
I am satisfied with the level of undergraduate student diversity (e.g., in terms of race / ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, nationality, and people with disabilities).	3.67	3.75	<u>3.65</u>	3.75	<u>3.29</u>	<u>3.54</u>	3.75	<u>3.32</u>	<u>3.42</u>	3.76
There are too few undergraduate students of color. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	2.97	2.66	3.05	2.88	3.29	2.88	2.96	3.23	3.18	2.91
There are too few women undergraduate students. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	2.50	2.43	2.51	2.47	2.61	2.40	2.54	2.54	2.65	2.42

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 first three statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

* The last two statements are reverse coded which means that an agree statement is unfavorable in terms of faculty diversity and a disagree statement is favorable.

Students who had been at MSU for more than two years and first-generation students were less likely to agree that the college was committed to recruiting a diverse student population and were less satisfied with the level of diversity amongst the student population (Table 2.7c). They were both also more likely to agree that there were too few women students and students of color.

Table 2.7c: Undergraduate Student Diversity by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Now we would like you to think about undergraduate students in the College of Natural Science. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
Has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting students from diverse backgrounds.	3.71	3.77	<u>3.64</u>	<u>3.55</u>	3.77
I am satisfied with the level of undergraduate student diversity (e.g., in terms of race / ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, nationality, and people with disabilities).	3.62	3.70	<u>3.52</u>	<u>3.42</u>	3.69
There are too few undergraduate students of color. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	3.00	2.91	3.10	3.13	2.98
There are too few women undergraduate students. <i>(reverse coded)*</i>	2.51	2.46	2.58	2.49	2.53

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 first three statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

* The last two statements are reverse coded which means that an agree statement is unfavorable in terms of faculty diversity and a disagree statement is favorable.

In terms of districts, there was little difference in their agreement on the college’s level of commitment in recruiting students of diverse backgrounds (Table 2.7d). Those in the Physical Sciences did report lower satisfaction in the level of diversity amongst undergraduate students. They also were more likely to agree that there were too few students of color and women students. Those in Mathematics were also more likely to agree that there were too few women undergraduate students.

Table 2.7d: Undergraduate Student Diversity Within the College by College District (Mean Scores)

Now we would like you to think about undergraduate students in the College of Natural Science. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting students from diverse backgrounds.	3.70	3.70	3.74	3.73
I am satisfied with the level of undergraduate student diversity (e.g., in terms of race / ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, nationality, and people with disabilities).	3.62	3.62	<u>3.50</u>	3.70
There are too few undergraduate students of color. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	2.99	2.98	3.11	2.93
There are too few women undergraduate students. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	2.51	2.43	2.84	2.92

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, everything above it is considered agreeing (favorable) and everything below disagreeing (unfavorable) for the first three statements. The closer to the endpoints (1 and 5) the closer it is to the end attribute (very disagree or very agree).

* The last two statements are reverse coded which means that an agree statement is unfavorable in terms of faculty diversity and a disagree statement is favorable.

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

Students were asked several questions about access to learning opportunities within the college (Table 2.8a). More than two-thirds of the students agreed that they had learning opportunities available relevant to their career goals (76.8%), were supported to participate in learning and educational opportunities (76.3%), had equal access to resources to support pre-professional learning (72.7%), that they had similar opportunities for success compared to other students (71.2%), and had access to informal and formal mentoring opportunities (67.6%). Two areas had over 20 percent of the students disagreeing with the statements – that they had faculty role models (22.9%), and mentoring relationships were available to them that were relevant to their career goals (20.2%)

Table 2.8a: Learning Opportunities Within the College

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to learning opportunities within your major/program.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
I have learning opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	2.3%	7.4%	13.5%	41.5%	35.3%	969	4.00	.995
I have equal access to resources to support pre-professional learning.	3.0%	6.5%	17.8%	39.3%	33.4%	969	3.94	1.019
I am supported to participate in learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals.	2.1%	6.0%	15.7%	42.5%	33.8%	970	4.00	.959
I have access to informal and formal mentoring opportunities.	3.4%	10.4%	18.5%	38.2%	29.4%	968	3.80	1.079
I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	6.8%	13.4%	21.5%	32.3%	26.0%	969	3.57	1.201
Compared to other students, I have similar opportunities for success.	3.4%	9.5%	15.9%	37.8%	33.4%	968	3.88	1.080
I have faculty role models.	6.7%	16.2%	27.3%	28.6%	21.2%	970	3.41	1.181

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).

Women were less likely to agree that they had equal access to resources that supported pre-professional learning and access to informal and formal mentoring opportunities (Table 2.8b). Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community were less likely to agree that they were supported to participate in learning and education opportunities to advance their career goals, had access to informal and formal mentoring opportunities, had mentoring relationships available that were relevant to their career goals, and they had similar opportunities for success compared to other students. Asian students were less likely to agree that they had equal access to resources to support pre-professional learning, availability of mentoring relationships relevant to their career goals, having similar opportunities compared to other students, and that they had faculty role models. Students of color were less likely to agree that they had equal access to resources to support pre-professional learning, having similar opportunities compared to other students, and that they had faculty role models. Students with disabilities were less likely to agree with any of the statements related to access to learning opportunities.

Table 2.8b: Learning Opportunities 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 learning opportunities within your major/program.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
I have learning opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	4.06	4.03	4.07	4.05	4.05	4.01	4.06	4.01	<u>3.97</u>	4.11
I have equal access to resources to support pre-professional learning.	3.98	4.10	<u>3.94</u>	3.99	3.93	<u>3.90</u>	4.03	<u>3.82</u>	<u>3.89</u>	4.02
I am supported to participate in learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals.	4.04	4.08	4.04	4.08	<u>3.91</u>	3.96	4.04	4.05	<u>3.94</u>	4.08
I have access to informal and formal mentoring opportunities.	3.84	3.97	<u>3.81</u>	3.87	<u>3.73</u>	3.82	3.84	3.80	<u>3.62</u>	3.94
I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.61	3.68	3.60	3.64	<u>3.50</u>	<u>3.54</u>	3.58	3.67	<u>3.41</u>	3.71
Compared to other students, I have similar opportunities for success.	3.91	3.95	3.90	3.95	<u>3.78</u>	<u>3.71</u>	4.04	<u>3.66</u>	<u>3.72</u>	4.02
I have faculty role models.	3.45	3.49	3.44	3.46	3.41	<u>3.34</u>	3.52	<u>3.31</u>	<u>3.36</u>	3.50

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).

Students who had been at MSU for more than two years were less likely to agree that they had learning opportunities related to their career goals, had equal access to resources to support pre-professional learning, had access to informal and formal mentoring opportunities, and had similar opportunities for success compared to other students (Table 2.8c). First-generation students were less likely to agree had equal access to resources to support pre-professional learning, had access to informal and formal mentoring opportunities, had similar opportunities for success compared to other students and had faculty role models.

Table 2.8c: Learning Opportunities Within the College by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to learning opportunities within your major/program.	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
I have learning opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	4.03	4.09	<u>3.95</u>	4.03	4.06
I have equal access to resources to support pre-professional learning.	3.96	4.03	<u>3.86</u>	<u>3.86</u>	4.02
I am supported to participate in learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals.	4.02	4.06	3.97	3.96	4.05
I have access to informal and formal mentoring opportunities.	3.82	3.89	<u>3.73</u>	<u>3.77</u>	3.86
I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.58	3.59	3.57	3.54	3.61
Compared to other students, I have similar opportunities for success.	3.90	3.98	<u>3.80</u>	<u>3.78</u>	3.97
I have faculty role models.	3.43	3.40	3.46	<u>3.34</u>	3.49

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 were less likely to agree with all seven statements about learning opportunities within their major/program compared to those in the Physical Sciences (Table 2.8d). Those in Mathematics were less likely to agree with all statements other than “I have equal access to resources to support professional learning.” than those in the Physical Sciences.

Table 2.8d: Learning Opportunities Within the College by College District (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to learning opportunities within your major/program.	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
I have learning opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	4.00	<u>3.99</u>	4.23	<u>3.92</u>
I have equal access to resources to support professional learning.	3.94	<u>3.92</u>	4.07	4.02
I am supported to participate in learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals.	4.00	<u>3.99</u>	4.15	<u>4.00</u>
I have access to informal and formal mentoring opportunities.	3.80	<u>3.76</u>	4.14	<u>3.84</u>
I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	3.57	<u>3.55</u>	3.81	<u>3.58</u>
Compared to other students, I have similar opportunities for success.	3.88	<u>3.85</u>	4.12	<u>4.01</u>
I have faculty role models.	3.41	<u>3.39</u>	3.76	<u>3.38</u>
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).				

INNOVATION SUPPORT

Respondents were asked about innovation opportunities and support within the college (Table 2.9a). Two statements had over 60 percent agreement - “I can have conversations with advisors and/or faculty about longer-term career goals, not just immediate undergraduate major/program demands.” (62.3%) and “Advisors and/or faculty here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.” (60.5%). The statement “There is resistance to doing or trying something new.” was phrased negatively and therefore the agreement categories are equivalent to the disagreement categories for the other statements. The statement with the highest level of “disagreement” is “There is resistance to doing or trying something new” (56.5%) followed by “Faculty support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches in my work.” (37.7%) and “I have sufficient discretion and freedom within course assignments to explore new ideas and ways of doing things” (25.0%) which had over 50 percent of the students agree with.

Table 2.9a: Innovation Support Within Major/Program

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to innovation within your major/program.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
I have sufficient discretion and freedom within course assignments to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.	5.1%	19.9%	24.9%	36.1%	14.0%	966	3.34	1.099
I can have conversations with advisors and/or faculty about longer-term career goals, not just immediate undergraduate major/program demands.	5.7%	11.9%	20.1%	34.1%	28.2%	967	3.67	1.168
Faculty support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches in my work.	8.5%	29.2%	34.1%	23.0%	5.2%	964	3.44	1.037
There is resistance to doing or trying something new. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	12.0%	9.9%	21.5%	20.9%	35.6%	965	2.87	1.027
Faculty engage undergraduate students in work that extends beyond the status quo.	3.1%	11.3%	36.6%	35.3%	13.8%	967	3.45	.967
Advisors and/or faculty here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.	3.6%	8.0%	28.0%	39.9%	20.6%	966	3.66	1.007

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 "There is resistance to doing or trying something new" is reverse coded which means that an agree statement is unfavorable in terms of innovation support and a disagree statement is favorable.

Women were less likely to agree with only one of the statements (Table 2.9b). Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community were less likely to agree with four of the six statements, with heterosexuals being less likely to “agree” with one. Whites were less likely to agree with three of the statements and Asian students and students of color were less likely to agree with one of the statements. Students with disabilities were less likely to agree with all but one of the statements.

Table 2.9b: Innovation Support Within your Major/Program 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 major/program.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
I have sufficient discretion and freedom within course assignments to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.	3.36	3.35	3.37	3.44	<u>3.15</u>	3.41	<u>3.29</u>	3.50	<u>3.19</u>	3.48

I can have conversations with advisors and/or faculty about longer-term career goals, not just immediate undergraduate major/program demands.	3.71	3.82	<u>3.68</u>	3.75	<u>3.63</u>	3.76	<u>3.67</u>	3.77	<u>3.58</u>	3.80
Faculty support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches in my work.	3.46	3.50	3.45	3.52	<u>3.34</u>	3.50	3.44	3.51	<u>3.34</u>	3.53
There is resistance to doing or trying something new. (<i>reverse coding</i>)*	2.84	2.89	2.83	2.88	2.78	3.04	2.82	2.86	2.88	2.80
Faculty engage undergraduate students in work that extends beyond the status quo.	3.48	3.53	3.47	3.52	<u>3.37</u>	3.65	<u>3.46</u>	<u>3.41</u>	<u>3.41</u>	3.53
Advisors and/or faculty here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.	3.70	3.77	3.68	3.70	3.69	3.71	3.70	3.65	<u>3.60</u>	3.75

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 "There is resistance to doing or trying something new" is reverse coded which means that an agree statement is unfavorable in terms of innovation support and a disagree statement is favorable.

In terms of student characteristics, students who had been at MSU for more than two years were less likely to agree with five of the statements (Table 2.9c). First-generation students were only less likely to agree with one of the statements.

Table 2.9c: Innovation Support Within your Major/Program by Student 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 major/program.	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
I have sufficient discretion and freedom within course assignments to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.	3.36	3.43	<u>3.27</u>	3.36	3.35
I can have conversations with advisors and/or faculty about longer-term career goals, not just immediate undergraduate major/program demands.	3.70	3.79	<u>3.59</u>	3.70	3.71
Faculty support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches in my work.	3.45	3.52	<u>3.36</u>	3.44	3.47
There is resistance to doing or trying something new. (<i>reverse coding</i>)*	2.85	2.84	2.88	2.92	2.83
Faculty engage undergraduate students in work that extends beyond the status quo.	3.47	3.51	<u>3.41</u>	3.46	3.49
Advisors and/or faculty here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.	3.68	3.73	<u>3.63</u>	<u>3.59</u>	3.74

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 "There is resistance to doing or trying something new" is reverse coded which means that an agree statement is unfavorable in terms of innovation support and a disagree statement is favorable.

Attitudes about innovation support within the college differed by college district. Those in the Biological Sciences and Mathematics felt that they had less discretion and freedom within course assignments, were less able to talk with their advisors/faculty about long-term goals and that faculty engaged them in work past status quo than did their Physical Science counterparts (Table 2.9d). Those in the Physical Sciences were less likely to agree that faculty members supported them in taking initiative/risks than those in the other districts. Both those in the Physical Sciences and Mathematics were more likely to agree that there was resistance to trying something new compared to those in the Biological Sciences.

Table 2.9d: Innovation Support Within your Major/Program by College District (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to innovation within your major/program.	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Our announced visions and strategies inspire me.	3.34	3.35	3.28	3.33
I have sufficient discretion and freedom within course assignments to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.	3.67	<u>3.64</u>	3.91	<u>3.77</u>
I can have conversations with advisors and/or faculty about longer-term career goals, not just immediate undergraduate major/program demands.	3.44	<u>3.42</u>	3.58	<u>3.45</u>
Faculty support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches in my work.	2.87	2.90	<u>2.53</u>	2.86
There is resistance to doing or trying something new. (<i>reverse coding</i>)*	3.45	3.42	3.68	3.52
Faculty engage undergraduate students in work that extends beyond the status quo.	3.66	<u>3.63</u>	3.92	<u>3.67</u>
Advisors and/or faculty here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.	3.34	3.35	3.28	3.33

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 "There is resistance to doing or trying something new" is reverse coded which means that an agree statement is unfavorable in terms of innovation support and a disagree statement is favorable.

ACADEMIC ADVISING

Students were asked two sets of questions about academic advising within their major/program. First, they were asked about resources that their advisor had shared with them (Table 2.10a). Each resource listed had at least half of the students stating that they agreed that their advisor had shared that resource with them. Career opportunities has the most share with 72.3% of the students stating that they agreed with the statement. Professional networking had almost one-quarter (24.8%) of the students disagreeing that the resource had been shared with them.

Table 2.10a: Academic Advising Resources Within Major/Program

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to advising within your major/program. My advisor shares resources about:	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
Research opportunities	7.8%	10.9%	15.0%	28.6%	37.6%	951	3.77	1.271
Career opportunities and pathways	6.4%	9.2%	12.2%	31.6%	40.7%	954	3.91	1.211
Career preparation	7.1%	9.5%	14.8%	30.7%	37.8%	954	3.83	1.233
Professional Networking	9.6%	15.2%	19.2%	25.1%	30.9%	946	3.52	1.323

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 level of sharing of resources by advisors appeared to differ by both demographic characteristics and student characteristics. Women were less likely to agree for all four of the resources listed (Table 2.10b). Differences were seen by race though there was not a clear pattern across all four resources. Students with disabilities were less likely to agree about having career opportunities and pathways, and career preparation resources being shared with them than those without disabilities.

Table 2.10b: Academic Advising Resources 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 advising within your major/program. My advisor shares resources about:	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Research opportunities	3.78	4.05	<u>3.71</u>	3.76	3.84	<u>3.77</u>	<u>3.75</u>	3.91	3.76	3.79
Career opportunities and pathways	3.93	4.15	<u>3.88</u>	3.94	3.90	4.06	<u>3.92</u>	<u>3.89</u>	<u>3.86</u>	4.00
Career preparation	3.86	4.03	<u>3.81</u>	3.85	3.85	3.94	<u>3.82</u>	3.88	<u>3.76</u>	3.91
Professional Networking	3.53	3.75	<u>3.48</u>	3.52	3.56	3.71	<u>3.44</u>	3.69	3.51	3.55

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).

Students who had been at MSU for more than two years were less likely to agree that career opportunities and pathways, and career preparation resources had been shared with them (Table 2.10c). There were no differences seen when comparing first-generation students to their counterparts.

Table 2.10c: Academic Advising Resources Within the College by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to advising within your major/program. My advisor shares resources about:	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
Research opportunities	3.78	3.81	3.75	3.72	3.83
Career opportunities and pathways	3.93	4.03	<u>3.81</u>	3.90	3.98
Career preparation	3.85	3.93	<u>3.75</u>	3.81	3.90
Professional Networking	3.53	3.56	3.50	3.57	3.56

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 lower agreement with all four statements about resources shared by their advisor within their department/program than those in Mathematics (Table 2.10d). Those in the Physical Sciences reported lower agreement with career opportunities/pathways and professional networking.

Table 2.10d: Academic Advising Resources Within Department/Program by College District (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to advising within your major/program. My advisor shares resources about:	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Research opportunities	3.77	<u>3.70</u>	4.15	4.18
Career opportunities and pathways	3.91	<u>3.85</u>	<u>4.12</u>	4.26
Career preparation	3.83	<u>3.79</u>	4.01	3.98
Professional Networking	3.52	<u>3.46</u>	<u>3.79</u>	3.93

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).

Students were then asked to evaluate their advisor (Table 2.11a). The vast majority of students found their advisors helpful (74.4%), had been connected with an advisor upon enrollment into the major/program (71.4%) and were satisfied with their advisor (69.4%). The one area that had high levels of agreement was that the students met regularly with their advisor with 40.7% disagreeing with the statement.

Table 2.11a: Academic Advisor Evaluation Within Major/Program

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to advising within your major/program.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
My advisor has been helpful.	7.0%	8.8%	9.8%	26.0%	48.4%	957	4.00	1.251
I meet regularly with my advisor.	17.2%	23.5%	16.1%	27.5%	15.8%	958	3.01	1.353
I am satisfied with my advisor.	7.5%	9.2%	13.9%	22.2%	47.2%	958	3.92	1.285
I was connected with an advisor upon enrolling in my major/program.	10.6%	10.0%	8.1%	19.8%	51.6%	954	3.92	1.394
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).								

Women were less likely to agree that they found their advisor helpful, and men were less likely to meet regularly with their advisor (Table 2.11b). Heterosexuals were less likely to agree that they found their advisor helpful, were satisfied with their advisor and that they had been connected with an advisor upon enrollment in their major/program. Asian students were the most likely to agree with all four statements. Students with disabilities were less likely to say their advisor was helpful and that they were satisfied with their advisor.

Table 2.11b: Academic Advisor Evaluation Within Major/Program by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to advising within your major/program.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQ/A2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
My advisor has been helpful.	4.02	4.10	<u>4.00</u>	<u>3.98</u>	4.14	4.24	<u>3.98</u>	<u>4.04</u>	<u>3.92</u>	4.11
I meet regularly with my advisor.	3.03	<u>2.94</u>	3.06	3.00	3.03	3.12	<u>2.96</u>	3.08	2.94	2.99
I am satisfied with my advisor.	3.94	3.99	3.93	<u>3.92</u>	4.02	4.18	<u>3.90</u>	<u>3.96</u>	<u>3.88</u>	4.00
I was connected with an advisor upon enrolling in my major/program.	3.95	4.01	3.93	<u>3.89</u>	4.06	4.17	<u>3.89</u>	<u>3.93</u>	3.90	3.98

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).

Students who had been at MSU for more than two years were less likely to agree that their advisor had been helpful, being satisfied with their advisor, and being connected with an advisor upon enrollment into their major/program than those who had been at MSU for less time (Table 2.11c). Those who had been at MSU two years or less were less likely to meet with their advisor on a regular basis. First-generation students were also less likely to meet with their advisor on a regular basis than their counterparts.

Table 2.11c: Academic Advisor Evaluation Within the Major/Program by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to advising within your major/program.	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
My advisor has been helpful.	4.02	4.08	<u>3.95</u>	4.03	4.05
I meet regularly with my advisor.	3.01	<u>2.93</u>	3.12	<u>2.89</u>	3.05
I am satisfied with my advisor.	3.94	4.02	<u>3.85</u>	3.95	3.98
I was connected with an advisor upon enrolling in my major/program.	3.93	4.07	<u>3.77</u>	3.94	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 lower agreement with all four statements (Table 2.11d). Those in the Physical Sciences reported lower agreement with meeting with their advisor regularly and those in Mathematics were less likely to agree that they were assigned to an advisor upon enrollment in their major/program.

Table 2.11d: Academic Advisor Evaluation Within the Major/Program by College District (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to advising within your major/program.	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
My advisor has been helpful.	4.00	<u>3.96</u>	4.18	4.17
I meet regularly with my advisor.	3.01	<u>3.01</u>	<u>2.91</u>	3.13
I am satisfied with my advisor.	3.92	<u>3.90</u>	4.04	3.99
I was connected with an advisor upon enrolling in my major/program.	3.92	<u>3.86</u>	4.38	<u>4.02</u>
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).				

DEGREE PROGRESS AND COURSE GRADES

Students were presented with a series of statements associated with their degree progress and course grading (Table 2.12a). Over two-thirds of the students agreed with three of the statements – “I am comfortable asking my advisor questions about progress toward my degree.” (79.3%), “The criteria used in determining course grades are clear and transparent.” (75.7%), and “Advising discussions include a focus on my career goals and aspirations.” (67.2%). Two statements had levels of disagreement around 30 percent – “I am regularly informed about my progress toward my degree.” (32.8%) and “I am aware that there is an ombudsperson to whom I can bring concerns about the grading process.” (29.9%).

Table 2.12a: Degree Progress and Course Grades

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding your degree progress and course grades.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
I am regularly informed about my progress toward my degree.	12.4%	20.4%	18.4%	24.8%	24.1%	937	3.28	1.355
I am comfortable asking my advisor questions about progress toward my degree.	2.9%	7.9%	9.9%	24.5%	54.8%	936	4.20	1.088
Advising discussions include a focus on my career goals and aspirations.	7.1%	11.1%	14.5%	31.6%	35.6%	929	3.78	1.239
The criteria used in determining course grades are clear and transparent.	3.7%	8.7%	11.8%	37.1%	38.6%	938	3.98	1.091
I am aware that there is an ombudsperson to whom I can bring concerns about the grading process.	15.4%	14.5%	16.2%	23.4%	30.5%	924	3.39	1.436

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).

Women were less likely to agree with being regularly informed about their progress towards their degree and being comfortable about asking questions of their advisor about their progress (Table 2.12b). Heterosexuals were less likely to be comfortable asking questions of their advisor about their progress and members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community were less likely to agree that advising discussions included a focus on career goals and aspirations, as well as being aware that there was an ombudsperson. Non-Asians were less likely to agree that they were regularly informed about their progress and being aware of an ombudsperson. Students of color were also less likely to agree that the criteria used for determining course grades were clear and transparent. Those with disabilities were less likely to agree with all but being comfortable asking questions of their advisor about their progress towards their degree.

Table 2.12b: Degree Progress and Course Grades by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding your degree progress and course grades.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQ/A2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
I am regularly informed about my progress toward my degree.	3.26	3.39	<u>3.23</u>	3.31	3.24	3.52	<u>3.24</u>	<u>3.26</u>	<u>3.17</u>	3.35
I am comfortable asking my advisor questions about progress toward my degree.	4.22	4.34	<u>4.18</u>	<u>4.17</u>	4.31	4.24	4.21	4.16	4.16	4.25
Advising discussions include a focus on my career goals and aspirations.	3.81	3.83	3.81	3.85	<u>3.69</u>	3.83	3.77	3.86	<u>3.69</u>	3.90
The criteria used in determining course grades are clear and transparent.	4.02	3.94	4.03	4.01	3.95	3.99	4.02	<u>3.89</u>	<u>3.89</u>	4.06
I am aware that there is an ombudsperson to whom I can bring concerns about the grading process.	3.38	3.40	3.37	3.44	<u>3.32</u>	3.53	<u>3.41</u>	<u>3.30</u>	<u>3.25</u>	3.46

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).

Students who had been at MSU for more than two years were less likely to agree that their advising discussions included a focus on their career goals and aspirations. Students with two years or less were less likely to be aware of the ombudsperson (Table 2.12c). First-generation students were less likely to agree that they were regularly informed about their progress towards their degree and being comfortable asking the advising about their progress.

Table 2.12c: Degree Progress and Course Grades by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding your degree progress and course grades.	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
I am regularly informed about my progress toward my degree.	3.28	3.28	3.27	<u>3.17</u>	3.32
I am comfortable asking my advisor questions about progress toward my degree.	4.21	4.22	4.19	<u>4.14</u>	4.24
Advising discussions include a focus on my career goals and aspirations.	3.78	3.84	<u>3.72</u>	3.77	3.81
The criteria used in determining course grades are clear and transparent.	3.98	3.96	4.01	3.95	4.02
I am aware that there is an ombudsperson to whom I can bring concerns about the grading process.	3.39	<u>3.25</u>	3.55	3.33	3.42
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 were less likely to agree with all the statements about their degree progression and course grades (Table 2.12d). Those in the Physical Sciences were less likely to agree with the criteria for determining grades is clear and transparent. Those in Mathematics were less likely to agree that they are regularly informed about their progress and that advising discussions focus on career goals/aspirations.

Table 2.12d: Degree Progress and Course Grades by College District (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding your degree progress and course grades.	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
I am regularly informed about my progress toward my degree.	3.28	<u>3.27</u>	3.45	<u>3.23</u>
I am comfortable asking my advisor questions about progress toward my degree.	4.20	<u>4.18</u>	4.32	4.32
Advising discussions include a focus on my career goals and aspirations.	3.78	<u>3.78</u>	3.88	<u>3.65</u>
The criteria used in determining course grades are clear and transparent.	3.98	<u>3.97</u>	<u>3.92</u>	4.13
I am aware that there is an ombudsperson to whom I can bring concerns about the grading process.	3.39	<u>3.37</u>	3.52	3.48
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 the statements. 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 INCIDENTS

It should be noted that not all students of the College of Natural Science 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.

Sexual Misconduct

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 major/program/the college.” and “Sexual harassment is a problem within my major/program/the college.” Unfortunately, 9.7% of the students stated that they had experienced some form of sexual misconduct within their major/program/the college and 19.0% stated that it was a problem within their major/program/the college. When asked if they knew how to report sexual harassment and relationship violence, 78.9% of the students agree that they did with 8.8% disagreeing with the statement.

In terms of leaderships response, 65.0% of the respondents agreed that “College leaders take reports of sexual harassment and relationship violence seriously.”, though 13.5% disagreed. In addition, 74.4% agreed with “I am confident that my major/program/college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports related to RVSM.”, but 7.2% disagreed. Though 75.3% of the students stated that “I can report incidences of sexual harassment and/or relationship violence without fear of retaliation.”, there were still 11.8% of them that stated that they disagreed.

Table 2.13a: 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	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
I have experienced sexual harassment and/or relationship violence within my major/program/the college. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	69.0%	10.8%	10.5%	6.1%	3.6%	934	1.65	1.115
Sexual harassment is a problem within my major/program/the college. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	29.0%	19.4%	32.6%	12.5%	6.5%	936	2.48	1.213
I know the steps to take if a person comes to me with a problem with sexual harassment and relationship violence.	2.1%	6.7%	12.2%	40.1%	38.8%	937	4.07	.984
College leaders take reports of sexual harassment and/or relationship violence seriously.	5.6%	7.9%	21.5%	29.0%	36.0%	935	3.82	1.167
I am confident that my major/program/college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports related to RVSM.	2.4%	4.8%	18.5%	37.3%	37.1%	936	4.02	.980
I can report incidences of sexual harassment and/or relationship violence without fear of retaliation.	4.2%	7.6%	14.8%	36.1%	37.4%	937	3.95	1.095
<p>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).</p> <p>* 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.</p>								

When looking at the means scores in Table 2.13b, 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), those with a mean score difference of 0.1 or larger from the smallest mean score are bolded and italicized.

Asian students and those with disabilities were more likely to agree with the statement about experiencing sexual misconduct. Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Whites and students with disabilities were more likely to say that sexual harassment is a problem. In terms of knowledge how to report, Asians reported less agreement with the statement. Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Whites and those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement about leadership taking reports seriously. Women, Asian students, and student with disabilities were less to agree that leadership would keep reports confidential. Women, 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 Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, and those with disabilities are more likely to need to file reports.

Table 2.13b: Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policies by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

This next set of questions is about Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct (RSVM).	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQ/A2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
I have experienced sexual harassment and/or relationship violence within my major/program/the college. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	1.62	1.56	1.63	1.65	1.63	1.97	1.56	1.63	1.70	1.59
Sexual harassment is a problem within my major/program/the college. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	2.45	2.37	2.47	2.41	2.66	2.87	2.39	2.51	2.64	2.39
I know how to report sexual harassment and relationship violence.	4.10	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.08	<u>3.95</u>	4.11	4.08	4.03	4.12
College leaders take reports of sexual harassment and relationship violence seriously.	3.85	4.07	<u>3.80</u>	3.92	<u>3.64</u>	<u>3.75</u>	3.92	<u>3.68</u>	<u>3.69</u>	3.96
I am confident that my major/program/college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports related to RVSM.	4.05	4.17	<u>4.03</u>	4.06	3.99	<u>3.77</u>	4.10	4.05	<u>4.00</u>	4.10
I can report incidences of sexual harassment and/or relationship violence without fear of retaliation.	3.97	4.27	<u>3.90</u>	4.02	<u>3.81</u>	<u>3.69</u>	4.00	4.02	<u>3.90</u>	4.00
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.										

Students who had been at MSU for more than two years were more likely to agree that they had experienced sexual misconduct within their major/program/the college (Table 2.13c). Students who had been at MSU for more than two years and first-generation students were more likely to agree that sexual harassment is a problem in their major/program/the college. Students that had been at MSU for longer than two years were less likely to agree that the college leadership takes reports seriously. First-generation students were less likely to agree that the leadership would maintain confidentiality and that there would be no retaliation if they reported an incident.

Table 2.13c: Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policies by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

This next set of questions is about Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct (RSVM).	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
I have experienced sexual harassment and/or relationship violence within my department/unit/the college. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	1.64	1.59	1.71	1.60	1.63
Sexual harassment is a problem within my department/unit/the college. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	2.49	2.40	2.59	2.36	2.51
I know how to report sexual harassment and relationship violence.	4.08	4.06	4.09	4.10	4.09
College leaders take reports of sexual harassment and relationship violence seriously.	3.83	3.94	<u>3.70</u>	3.80	3.87
I am confident that my department/unit/college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports related to RVSM.	4.03	4.06	3.99	<u>3.96</u>	4.09
I can report incidences of sexual harassment and/or relationship violence without fear of retaliation.	3.95	3.99	3.91	<u>3.86</u>	4.00
<p>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).</p> <p>* 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.</p>					

Those in the Biological Sciences and Mathematics were more likely to have experienced sexual misconduct than the counterparts in the Physical Sciences (Table 2.13d). Those in the Biological Sciences and in Mathematics were less likely to know how to report sexual misconduct and less likely to believe that leadership would take reports seriously or keep them confidential. Those in the Biological Sciences were also more likely to be concerned with retaliation for filing a report than those in the Physical Sciences and in Mathematics.

Table 2.13d: Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policies by College District (Mean Scores)

This next set of questions is about Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct (RSVM).	Overall	College Districts		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
I have experienced sexual harassment and/or relationship violence within my department/unit/the college. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	1.65	1.67	1.44	1.62
Sexual harassment is a problem within my department/unit/the college. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	2.48	2.49	2.48	2.44
I know how to report sexual harassment and relationship violence.	4.07	<u>4.04</u>	4.32	<u>4.13</u>
College leaders take reports of sexual harassment and relationship violence seriously.	3.82	<u>3.81</u>	4.00	<u>3.79</u>
I am confident that my department/unit/college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports related to RVSM.	4.02	<u>4.00</u>	4.22	<u>3.99</u>
I can report incidences of sexual harassment and/or relationship violence without fear of retaliation.	3.95	<u>3.91</u>	4.21	4.12
<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>				

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. Three of the behaviors, had over 25 percent 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.” (31.9%), “Inappropriately interrupted or “talked over” you while you were speaking.” (28.4%), and “Put you down or acted condescendingly to you.” (28.2%). In addition, 22.1% stated that a student or employee had “Exhibited any of the above behaviors toward others in front of you”.

Table 2.14a: Uncivil Behavior Experienced Within College

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 . . .	Never	Once	2 or More Times	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	0	1	2			
Put you down or acted condescendingly to you.	71.8%	16.4%	11.8%	946	.40	.691
Made demeaning or derogatory remarks to or about you.	88.4%	7.5%	4.1%	947	.16	.464
Devalued your work and efforts.	77.2%	13.9%	8.9%	947	.32	.628
Inappropriately interrupted or "talked over" you while you were speaking.	71.6%	13.5%	14.9%	947	.43	.737
Ignored or excluded you during group activities in the classroom.	83.0%	9.3%	7.7%	949	.25	.583
Made negative statements or circulated negative rumors about you.	93.9%	4.1%	2.0%	946	.08	.339
Paid little attention to your statements or showed little interest in your opinion.	68.1%	19.2%	12.7%	948	.45	.708
Addressed you in unprofessional ways.	84.6%	10.7%	4.7%	948	.20	.506
Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion about personal matters.	90.4%	6.4%	3.2%	947	.13	.418
Bullied you.	93.5%	4.5%	2.0%	948	.09	.344
Bullied others in front of you.	90.4%	5.9%	3.7%	947	.13	.435
Distrusted your description of your own personal experiences.	84.7%	10.3%	5.0%	948	.20	.511
Exhibited any of the above behaviors toward others in front of you.	77.8%	9.0%	13.1%	943	.35	.701
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 2.14b). Women were more likely than men to experience eight of the thirteen behaviors. Asians were more likely for four of the thirteen behaviors than non-Asians and students of color were more likely for one. Those with disabilities were more likely to experience nine of the behaviors than their counterparts. In terms of sexual orientation members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community were more likely to experience ten of the thirteen behaviors.

Table 2.14b: Uncivil Behavior Experienced Within College by Demographic Characteristics (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	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Put you down or acted condescendingly to you.	26.3%	16.6%	<u>28.8%</u>	24.1%	<u>38.4%</u>	27.3%	28.6%	27.6%	<u>36.3%</u>	23.0%
Made demeaning or derogatory remarks to or about you.	10.5%	7.3%	<u>11.3%</u>	9.7%	<u>16.2%</u>	<u>15.0%</u>	10.0%	13.1%	<u>14.4%</u>	9.5%
Devalued your work and efforts.	21.8%	16.4%	<u>23.2%</u>	20.1%	<u>30.0%</u>	<u>25.6%</u>	23.4%	20.1%	<u>28.8%</u>	18.7%
Inappropriately interrupted or "talked over" you while you were speaking.	27.1%	17.1%	<u>29.7%</u>	24.7%	<u>39.2%</u>	27.8%	29.3%	26.1%	<u>36.1%</u>	23.5%
Ignored or excluded you during group activities in the classroom.	15.5%	12.7%	16.3%	15.2%	<u>21.5%</u>	<u>22.6%</u>	15.3%	<u>19.0%</u>	19.4%	15.0%
Made negative statements or circulated negative rumors about you.	5.2%	7.4%	4.7%	5.1%	7.9%	9.8%	5.2%	5.6%	7.5%	4.2%
Paid little attention to your statements or showed little interest in your opinion.	31.0%	21.3%	<u>33.4%</u>	28.5%	<u>40.2%</u>	<u>35.3%</u>	32.1%	29.1%	<u>41.9%</u>	25.3%
Addressed you in unprofessional ways.	13.9%	12.2%	14.4%	12.4%	<u>22.9%</u>	17.3%	14.6%	16.1%	<u>18.5%</u>	12.5%
Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion about personal matters.	8.5%	4.2%	<u>9.5%</u>	7.6%	<u>14.6%</u>	11.4%	8.6%	11.6%	11.3%	7.8%
Bullied you.	5.3%	5.5%	5.3%	5.8%	7.5%	9.8%	5.2%	6.5%	8.8%	4.2%
Bullied others in front of you.	8.7%	9.1%	8.6%	7.8%	<u>14.5%</u>	11.3%	8.9%	9.0%	<u>13.2%</u>	6.6%
Distusted your description of your own personal experiences.	13.5%	8.5%	<u>14.8%</u>	11.6%	<u>23.8%</u>	13.5%	14.6%	16.6%	<u>22.3%</u>	11.0%
Exhibited any of the above behaviors toward others in front of you.	21.6%	17.1%	<u>22.8%</u>	18.7%	<u>32.1%</u>	23.5%	23.0%	20.1%	<u>28.7%</u>	18.3%

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.

In terms of student characteristics, students who had been at MSU for more than two years were more likely to experience nine of the thirteen behaviors (Table 2.14c). First-generation students were more likely to experience one of the behaviors.

Table 2.14c: Uncivil Behavior Experienced Within College by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores) (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	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
Put you down or acted condescendingly to you.	27.7%	20.5%	<u>36.5%</u>	27.5%	27.7%
Made demeaning or derogatory remarks to or about you.	11.2%	8.9%	13.9%	12.8%	10.7%
Devalued your work and efforts.	22.5%	16.5%	<u>29.8%</u>	22.6%	22.7%
Inappropriately interrupted or "talked over" you while you were speaking.	28.2%	21.8%	<u>36.1%</u>	30.3%	27.6%
Ignored or excluded you during group activities in the classroom.	16.7%	14.5%	19.4%	<u>21.5%</u>	15.0%
Made negative statements or circulated negative rumors about you.	5.6%	3.4%	8.3%	8.8%	5.0%
Paid little attention to your statements or showed little interest in your opinion.	31.4%	24.3%	<u>40.1%</u>	34.0%	30.5%
Addressed you in unprofessional ways.	14.9%	10.9%	<u>19.8%</u>	12.8%	15.3%
Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion about personal matters.	9.3%	6.8%	<u>12.4%</u>	10.8%	8.9%
Bullied you.	5.9%	4.2%	8.0%	8.7%	5.3%
Bullied others in front of you.	9.2%	6.9%	<u>11.9%</u>	9.2%	9.1%
Distrusted your description of your own personal experiences.	14.9%	9.9%	<u>21.0%</u>	15.9%	14.6%
Exhibited any of the above behaviors toward others in front of you.	22.0%	17.7%	<u>27.1%</u>	25.8%	21.3%
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.					

Those in the Biological and Physical Sciences were more likely to have experiences at least once being put down, experiencing demeaning/derogatory remarks, being "talked over", and having little attention paid to their statement than their Mathematics counterparts (Table 2.14d). Those in the Biological Sciences were also more likely to have experienced at least once having their work devalued and being ignored/excluded than their Physical Science and Mathematics counterparts.

Table 2.14d: 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.	28.3%	<u>29.4%</u>	<u>26.4%</u>	19.8%
Made demeaning or derogatory remarks to or about you.	11.6%	<u>11.8%</u>	<u>15.1%</u>	6.9%
Devalued your work and efforts.	22.8%	<u>23.9%</u>	17.8%	17.2%
Inappropriately interrupted or "talked over" you while you were speaking.	28.4%	<u>28.3%</u>	<u>35.6%</u>	23.3%
Ignored or excluded you during group activities in the classroom.	17.0%	<u>17.9%</u>	13.7%	11.5%
Made negative statements or circulated negative rumors about you.	6.1%	6.2%	8.2%	3.5%
Paid little attention to your statements or showed little interest in your opinion.	31.9%	<u>32.5%</u>	<u>34.2%</u>	24.1%
Addressed you in unprofessional ways.	15.4%	16.2%	12.3%	10.5%
Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion about personal matters.	9.6%	10.1%	9.6%	5.7%
Bullied you.	6.5%	6.5%	6.8%	6.9%
Bullied others in front of you.	9.6%	9.8%	9.6%	8.0%
Distrusted your description of your own personal experiences.	15.3%	15.2%	13.7%	17.2%
Exhibited any of the above behaviors toward others in front of you.	22.2%	22.4%	20.5%	21.2%
The percentages in the table are the percentages of respondents in that category that experienced that incident at least once. Comparisons within student characteristic variables (ex. Years at MSU) provide information on whether or not a specific type of person (1-2 years vs. more than 2 years) are more likely to experience the incident at least once.				

The sources of uncivil behavior are listed below (Table 2.15). Most of the uncivil behavior has come from other undergraduate students (70.1%) followed by support staff (23.9%) faculty members/instructors (36.5%) and graduate student/teaching assistant (19.8%). Other than for incidences related to other undergraduate students, the sources were more likely to be a single incident.

Table 2.15: 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
Faculty member/instructor	36.5%	68.1%	31.9%
Academic advisor	9.3%	66.7%	33.3%
Graduate student/Teaching assistant	19.8%	64.5%	35.5%
Administrator	4.8%	70.6%	29.4%
Staff	6.3%	61.9%	38.1%
Another undergraduate student	70.1%	41.1%	58.9%
Other	0.8%	25.0%	75.0%

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 2.16). 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 learning environment was reported to have happened at least once by 12.8% of the respondents. Of those, less than half occurred more than once. Breakdown by demographic characteristics was not done due to the relatively low percent of reported incidences.

Table 2.16: Biased Incidences Experienced Within College

Since becoming a student in the College of Natural Science, how often, if at all, have you experienced an incident of bias/discrimination within your major/program or within the College based on any of the following?	Never	Once	2 or More Times	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	0	1	2			
Power differentials in the learning environment	87.2%	7.6%	5.2%	820	.18	.503
Older age	95.4%	2.8%	1.7%	810	.06	.306
Younger age	93.8%	4.0%	2.2%	809	.08	.349
Gender expression and identity	93.1%	3.9%	3.0%	811	.10	.385
Sexual orientation	94.7%	3.3%	2.0%	808	.07	.328
Race/ethnicity	91.8%	4.2%	4.1%	814	.12	.435
Country of origin	96.2%	2.1%	1.7%	807	.06	.296
Religious background	95.1%	3.1%	1.7%	804	.07	.311
A psychological or mental health issue	90.5%	5.1%	4.4%	811	.14	.457
A physical disability or health issue	95.3%	2.7%	2.0%	805	.07	.320
Other	98.3%	1.7%	0.0%	119	.02	.129

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 witnessed the same forms of bias within the College of Natural Science (Table 2.17). The further from 0 the mean score is the more often the incidences have occurred. Again, bias actions due to power differentials (17.2%) were the most reported form of bias and about half 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 those experienced. This may be due to multiple witnesses to the same event or due to underreporting of experiencing bias by respondents.

Table 2.17: Biased Incidences Witnessed Within College

Since becoming a student in the College of Natural Science, how often, if at all, have you witnessed an incident of bias/discrimination within your major/program or within the College based on any of the following?	Never	Once	2 or More Times	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	0	1	2			
Power differentials in the learning environment	82.8%	8.7%	8.5%	779	.26	.601
Older age	91.4%	5.9%	2.7%	776	.11	.394
Younger age	93.1%	4.4%	2.5%	768	.09	.367
Gender expression and identity	84.7%	6.3%	8.9%	772	.24	.602
Sexual orientation	88.1%	5.2%	6.7%	771	.19	.536
Race/ethnicity	84.7%	7.6%	7.7%	778	.23	.576
Country of origin	88.4%	6.1%	5.6%	774	.17	.504
Religious background	91.3%	4.7%	4.0%	771	.13	.438
A psychological or mental health issue	86.3%	6.8%	6.8%	775	.21	.548
A physical disability or health issue	90.5%	4.0%	5.5%	769	.15	.487
Other	98.2%	1.8%	0.0%	112	.02	.133

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.

Undergraduate students (71.4%) were the most reported as committing the bias action, followed by faculty members (29.1%), graduate students/teaching assistants 17.2%) and staff members (14.8%) (Table 2.18).

Table 2.18: 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
Academic Advisor(s)	10.3%
Campus visitor(s)	11.3%
Dean / Associate Dean / Assistant Dean	3.0%
Major/Program Director	1.0%
Faculty member(s)	29.1%
Graduate student(s) / Teaching assistant(s)	17.2%
Postdoctoral scholar(s)	1.5%
Staff member(s)	14.8%
Undergraduate student(s)	71.4%
Other (please specify)	3.4%
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.	

Bias Incident Reporting

Less than 60 percent of the students reported that they knew how to report bias incidents if they occur within the college with 26.2% stating that they at least somewhat disagreed with the statement (Table 2.19a). In terms of not fearing retaliation, 69.3% agreed with the statement, but 10.6% disagreed which implies that they would fear retaliation. Only 64.7% felt that leadership would take appropriate actions based on the claimant’s desire and 14.5% disagreed with this statement. Almost 73 percent of the students said that they were confident that leadership would keep the reports confidential, but 9.2% did not agree.

Table 2.19a: 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.	8.1%	18.1%	16.5%	33.7%	23.7%	924	3.47	1.254
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation	3.0%	7.6%	20.2%	37.3%	32.0%	923	3.88	1.041
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leaders will take appropriate actions to address them based on the claimant's desires.	4.2%	10.3%	20.9%	39.7%	25.0%	925	3.71	1.080
I am confident that college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of bias, discrimination, or incivility.	2.4%	6.8%	17.9%	41.0%	31.9%	924	3.93	.991
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 – Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Whites, and those with disabilities (Table 2.19b). Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, Asians, 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, women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, students of color and those with disabilities had lower levels of agreement. In terms of confidence in maintaining confidentiality, Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, Asians, and those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement.

Table 2.19b: 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	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
I know how to report bias incidents if they occur within the College.	3.46	3.65	<u>3.42</u>	3.54	<u>3.34</u>	<u>3.35</u>	3.49	3.55	<u>3.36</u>	3.58
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation	3.89	4.02	<u>3.86</u>	3.94	<u>3.73</u>	<u>3.58</u>	3.96	3.90	<u>3.76</u>	4.03
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leaders will take appropriate actions to address them based on the claimant's desires.	3.74	3.88	<u>3.71</u>	3.84	<u>3.43</u>	3.68	3.77	<u>3.63</u>	<u>3.49</u>	3.91
I am confident that college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of bias, discrimination, or incivility.	3.96	4.04	<u>3.94</u>	4.01	<u>3.80</u>	<u>3.72</u>	4.01	3.94	<u>3.83</u>	4.06

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).

In terms of reporting without fearing retaliation, students who had been at MSU for more than two years and first-generation students were less likely to agree with the statement (Table 2.19c). Those who had been at MSU for more than two years were also less likely to believe leaders would take appropriate actions based on the claimant’s desires.

Table 2.19c: Bias Incident Reporting by Student 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	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
I know how to report bias incidents if they occur within the College.	3.48	3.51	3.43	3.54	3.47
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation	3.89	3.93	<u>3.83</u>	<u>3.81</u>	3.92
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leaders will take appropriate actions to address them based on the claimant's desires.	3.72	3.81	<u>3.60</u>	3.80	3.72
I am confident that college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of bias, discrimination, or incivility.	3.94	3.99	3.87	3.92	3.97

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 were less likely to know how to report biases incidences (Table 2.19d). Biological Science students and those in Mathematics were less likely to agree that leadership would handle the reported incident they way that the claimant’s desires and that leadership would maintain confidentiality than they felt their Physical Science counterparts.

Table 2.19d: 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.	3.47	<u>3.45</u>	3.63	3.55
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation	3.88	3.86	3.93	3.95
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leaders will take appropriate actions to address them based on the claimant's desires.	3.71	<u>3.70</u>	3.88	<u>3.69</u>
I am confident that college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of bias, discrimination, or incivility.	3.93	<u>3.92</u>	4.15	<u>3.91</u>
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 2.20 reports the level of reporting by respondents who knew of at least one incident of bias within the College. Only 6.9% of respondents reported all the incidents they knew of and an additional 9.2% reported at least one of the incidents they knew about. The fact that 83.9% of the respondents did not report is of great concern.

Table 2.20: 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	6.9%
Reported some of the incidents	9.2%
Did not report the incident(s)	83.9%
Table only includes those who stated that they experienced/witnessed a bias incident.	

For those that did not report some or all of the incidents they knew, they were asked why they did not report it (Table 2.21). The most common reason reported was they were unsure if the incident violated university policy (65.2%), which is an indicator that additional training/educating may be needed. The other three categories – fear of retaliation (17.9%), concern with not being believed (20.4%), and lack of confidence in an appropriate action

being taken (38.0%) 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 2.21: 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	17.9%
I did not think I would be believed	20.4%
I did not think appropriate action would be taken	38.0%
I was unsure if the incident violated university policies	65.2%
Other reason	21.5%
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 a staff member (40.0%), followed by supervisor (26.7.0%) and Office of Institutional Equity (OIE) (17.8%) (Table 2.22). Incidences could have been reported to more than one person/office.

Table 2.22: 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)	17.8%
Office for Civil Rights and Title IX Compliance (OCR)	8.9%
Ombudsperson Office	6.7%
Faculty Grievance and Dispute Resolution Office	2.2%
My major/program supervisor/chair/director	8.9%
Dean, associate dean, assistant dean	8.9%
NatSci DEI Office	4.4%
Graduate Program Director	4.4%
Undergraduate Program Director	11.1%
Supervisor	26.7%
Staff member	40.0%
Other	13.3%
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 three-quarters (77.3%) of the students stated that they were at least somewhat comfortable (Table 2.23a).

Table 2.23a: Comfortable with the Climate in the College of Natural Science

	Very Uncomfortable	Somewhat Uncomfortable	Neither Comfortable nor Uncomfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Very Comfortable	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
Overall, how comfortable or uncomfortable are you with the climate in the College of Natural Science?	3.7%	5.3%	13.6%	41.6%	35.7%	938	4.00	1.022
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to very comfortable with the climate and 5 refers to very uncomfortable 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, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community and those with disabilities reported being less comfortable than their counterparts (Table 2.23b). The respondents’ gender identity and their race does not appear to impact their level of comfort in the college.

Table 2.23b: Comfortable with the Climate in the College of Natural Science by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	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?	4.06	4.13	4.04	4.09	<u>3.86</u>	3.97	4.05	3.97	<u>3.90</u>	4.12
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to very comfortable with the climate and 5 refers to very uncomfortable 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).										

In terms of student characteristics, only years at MSU appeared to impact their level of comfort with the climate (Table 2.23c). Those that had been at MSU for two years or less were less likely to report that they were comfortable with the climate in the college.

Table 2.23c: Comfortable with the Climate in the College of Natural Science by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
Overall, how comfortable or uncomfortable are you with the climate in the College of Natural Science?	4.01	4.08	<u>3.92</u>	3.98	4.03
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to very comfortable with the climate and 5 refers to very uncomfortable 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 Biological Sciences and in Mathematics were less comfortable with the climate within the college than those in the Physical Sciences (Table 2.23d).

Table 2.23d: 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?	4.00	<u>3.98</u>	4.29	<u>3.99</u>
The mean scores are based on a five-point scale where 1 refers to very comfortable with the climate and 5 refers to very uncomfortable 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 a student within the College (Table 2.24a). Over three-quarters (78.2%) reported that they were at least somewhat satisfied with 7.6% reporting that they were very or somewhat dissatisfied.

Table 2.24a: Satisfaction as a Student in the College of Natural Science

	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	N	Mean	Std. Dev
	1	2	3	4	5			
Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your experience as a student in the College of Natural Science?	1.2%	6.4%	14.2%	42.0%	36.2%	931	4.06	0.930

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 well above 3.0 (satisfied), members of the LGBTTQIA2S+ community (3.92), Asian students (4.01) and those with disabilities (3.89) reported lower satisfaction than their counterparts (Table 2.24b). Those without disabilities reported a much higher level of satisfaction than any of the other demographic groups.

Table 2.24b: Satisfaction as a Student in the College of Natural Science by Demographic Characteristics (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your experience as a student in the College of Natural Science?	4.11	4.13	4.10	4.15	<u>3.92</u>	<u>4.01</u>	4.12	4.05	<u>3.89</u>	4.22

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).

In terms of student characteristics, those who had been at MSU for more than two years reported a lower level of satisfaction even though it was still well above 3 (Table 2.24c).

Table 2.24c: Satisfaction as a Student in the College of Natural Science by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your experience as a student in the College of Natural Science?	4.07	4.18	<u>3.94</u>	4.08	4.11

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).

Those within the Biological Sciences and Mathematics were less likely to be satisfied as a student within the College of Natural Science than those in the Physical Sciences (Table 2.24d).

Table 2.24d: Satisfaction as a Student 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 a student in the College of Natural Science?	4.06	<u>4.04</u>	4.31	<u>3.99</u>
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).				

Over three-quarters 75 (76.6%) of the respondents stated that they were proud to be part of the College of Natural Sciences and 86.4% stated that they intended to stay within the College until they graduate (Table 2.25a). When asked about whether they considered leaving their program because of negative experiences, only 8.6% stated that they did. The question asks specifically about their program and does not necessarily mean that they considering leaving the college in general.

Table 2.25a: Attitudes about Student Experiences Within the College of Natural Science

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about your experiences as a student 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 am proud to be part of NatSci.	5.9%	3.4%	14.1%	32.3%	44.3%	931	4.06	1.118
I have seriously considered leaving my program in NatSci because of negative experiences. (<i>reverse coding</i>)*	42.2%	37.8%	10.3%	6.2%	3.4%	929	1.91	1.038
I intend to stay at NatSci until graduation.	7.1%	1.5%	5.0%	14.1%	72.3%	935	4.43	1.133
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 program in NatSci because of negative experiences" is reverse coded which means that agreement with the statement is unfavorable in terms of staying in the program and a disagree response is favorable.								

Table 2.25b offers further insight into who may be more likely to consider leaving their current program 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. Asian students were more likely to be proud to be part of the College of Natural Science than their counterparts. Women and heterosexuals were less likely to state that they planned on staying within the college until they graduate.

For the statement “I have seriously considered leaving my program in NatSci because of negative experiences”, a higher mean suggests greater likelihood of leaving their program. In terms of leaving their program, Non-White and those with disabilities were more likely to state that they were thinking of leaving due to negative experiences.

Table 2.25b: Attitudes about Student Experiences 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 a student in the College of Natural Science.	Overall	Gender Identity		Sexual Orientation		Race			Disability	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
I am proud to be part of NatSci.	4.09	4.06	4.10	4.08	4.07	<u>3.95</u>	4.07	4.16	4.03	4.11
I have seriously considered leaving my program in NatSci because of negative experiences. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	1.88	1.83	1.89	1.91	1.88	1.96	1.86	1.96	1.97	1.87
I intend to stay at NatSci until graduation.	4.46	4.55	<u>4.43</u>	<u>4.41</u>	4.56	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.40

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 program in NatSci because of negative experiences" is reverse coded which means that agreement with the statement is unfavorable in terms of staying in the program and a disagree response is favorable.

Students who had been at MSU for more than two years were less likely to be proud of the college and more likely to seriously consider leaving their program due to negative experiences (Table 2.25c). Students with two or few years were less likely to stay they were planning on staying in NatSci until graduation.

Table 2.25c: Attitudes about Student Experiences Within the College of Natural Science by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about your experiences as a student in the College of Natural Science.	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
I am proud to be part of NatSci.	4.07	4.15	<u>3.97</u>	4.06	4.09
I have seriously considered leaving my program in NatSci because of negative experiences. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	1.90	1.83	2.00	1.90	1.88
I intend to stay at NatSci until graduation.	4.45	<u>4.39</u>	4.51	4.43	4.47

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) 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 program in NatSci because of negative experiences" is reverse coded which means that agreement with the statement is unfavorable in terms of staying in the program and a disagree response is favorable.

Those in the Biological Sciences and in Mathematics were less likely to be proud to be part of the College of Natural Science (Table 2.25d). Those in Mathematics were also more likely to be seriously considering changing their program than their counterparts, but they were also as likely to plan to stay within the college until graduation so this may be more of an issue with a program(s) than the college itself.

Table 2.25d: Attitudes about Student 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 a student in the College of Natural Science.	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
I am proud to be part of NatSci.	4.06	<u>4.05</u>	4.22	<u>3.94</u>
I have seriously considered leaving my program in NatSci because of negative experiences. <i>(reverse coding)*</i>	1.91	1.90	1.84	2.02
I intend to stay at NatSci until graduation.	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.48
<p>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).</p> <p>* The statement "I have seriously considered leaving my program in NatSci because of negative experiences" is reverse coded which means that agreement with the statement is unfavorable in terms of staying in the program and a disagree response is favorable.</p>				

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 2.26a). 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." (53.9%), "Demonstrating professionalism and high ethical standards." (53.4%), "Being innovative." (52.4%), and "Demonstrating respectful communication" (51.2%) all had at least 50 percent of the students select them as a strength. No area received extremely high levels of needing improvement, but "Being a diverse community" (20.8%), "Demonstrating transparency and openness" (19.2%), "Being inclusive and promoting belonging" (17.6%) and "Empowering the best outcomes for all regardless of role, identity, or ability status." (17.5%) received the most response of no greater than "Needs Improvement".

Table 2.26a: 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			
Being a welcoming, safe, and supportive community.	2.1%	11.1%	37.6%	34.9%	14.3%	898	3.48	.941
Being a diverse community.	4.9%	15.9%	34.4%	31.0%	13.7%	897	3.33	1.053
Being inclusive and promoting belonging.	3.4%	14.2%	35.4%	34.6%	12.3%	892	3.38	.985
Empowering the best outcomes for all regardless of role, identity, or ability status.	4.0%	13.5%	34.8%	32.0%	15.7%	894	3.42	1.034
Being open to perspectives and ideas.	2.6%	12.0%	40.1%	31.4%	14.0%	893	3.42	.959
Creating an environment of trust where ideas are freely shared and discussed.	2.6%	13.6%	38.2%	30.7%	14.9%	892	3.42	.984
Being innovative.	1.5%	8.6%	37.6%	34.8%	17.6%	892	3.58	.925
Demonstrating transparency and openness.	3.8%	15.4%	42.3%	26.3%	12.1%	889	3.28	.991
Demonstrating accountability and integrity.	2.8%	12.3%	41.6%	29.2%	14.0%	891	3.39	.967
Demonstrating professionalism and high ethical standards.	2.0%	6.6%	38.0%	35.2%	18.2%	892	3.61	.925
Demonstrating respectful communication.	1.9%	8.5%	38.4%	33.6%	17.6%	893	3.56	.940
Contributing to the greater good of all.	1.6%	7.3%	37.2%	34.6%	19.3%	892	3.63	.927
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, women were less likely to identify seven of the areas as a strength though all the mean scores were still above three (Table 2.26b). Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community reported lower means for all the categories and had the only mean score reported that was below the three threshold – “Being a diverse community.” (2.95). Non-Whites reported lower mean scores for ten of the areas compared to their counterparts though none were below three. Those with disabilities reported lower mean scores for all but one of the areas compared to those without disabilities, but no responses were in the range of needing improvement.

Table 2.26b: 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	
		Man	Woman	Heterosexual	LGBTQIA2S+	Asian	White	People of Color	Yes	No
Being a welcoming, safe, and supportive community.	3.51	3.63	<u>3.48</u>	3.57	<u>3.25</u>	<u>3.39</u>	3.53	3.43	<u>3.33</u>	3.58
Being a diverse community.	3.36	3.54	<u>3.31</u>	3.47	<u>2.95</u>	<u>3.27</u>	3.42	<u>3.07</u>	<u>3.11</u>	3.45
Being inclusive and promoting belonging.	3.42	3.59	<u>3.37</u>	3.51	<u>3.08</u>	<u>3.30</u>	3.43	<u>3.29</u>	<u>3.18</u>	3.51
Empowering the best outcomes for all regardless of role, identity, or ability status.	3.45	3.63	<u>3.41</u>	3.54	<u>3.15</u>	3.36	3.45	3.37	<u>3.22</u>	3.56
Being open to perspectives and ideas.	3.45	3.52	3.43	3.52	<u>3.21</u>	3.40	3.43	3.44	<u>3.30</u>	3.50
Creating an environment of trust where ideas are freely shared and discussed.	3.46	3.49	3.45	3.52	<u>3.20</u>	3.46	3.45	<u>3.30</u>	<u>3.25</u>	3.55
Being innovative.	3.61	3.66	3.60	3.64	<u>3.47</u>	<u>3.45</u>	3.66	<u>3.52</u>	3.55	3.63
Demonstrating transparency and openness.	3.31	3.40	<u>3.29</u>	3.39	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.22</u>	3.32	<u>3.22</u>	<u>3.14</u>	3.39
Demonstrating accountability and integrity.	3.43	3.43	3.42	3.52	<u>3.12</u>	<u>3.27</u>	3.45	<u>3.34</u>	<u>3.24</u>	3.52
Demonstrating professionalism and high ethical standards.	3.65	3.72	3.63	3.67	<u>3.49</u>	<u>3.50</u>	3.67	<u>3.55</u>	<u>3.47</u>	3.73
Demonstrating respectful communication.	3.59	3.72	<u>3.56</u>	3.63	<u>3.43</u>	<u>3.48</u>	3.61	<u>3.49</u>	<u>3.42</u>	3.69
Contributing to the greater good of all.	3.67	3.73	3.66	3.70	<u>3.50</u>	<u>3.53</u>	3.69	<u>3.57</u>	<u>3.50</u>	3.72

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 student characteristics, students who had been at MSU for more than two years reported lower mean scores for all areas though none of the means scores were below three (Table 2.26c). First-generation student reported lower mean scores for “Being a diverse community.” and “Being inclusive and promoting belonging.” though all the mean scores were above three. Students who were not first-generation reported a lower mean score for “Demonstrating professionalism and high ethical standards.” though it was again above three.

Table 2.26c: Assessment and Recommendations by Student Characteristics (Mean Scores)

For each area covered in this survey, what is your assessment and recommendation to NatSci leaders?	Overall	Years at MSU		First-generation	
		1-2 Years	More than 2	Yes	No
Being a welcoming, safe, and supportive community.	3.48	3.63	<u>3.30</u>	3.43	3.50
Being a diverse community.	3.33	3.46	<u>3.16</u>	<u>3.25</u>	3.35
Being inclusive and promoting belonging.	3.39	3.51	<u>3.23</u>	<u>3.26</u>	3.43
Empowering the best outcomes for all regardless of role, identity, or ability status.	3.42	3.54	<u>3.28</u>	3.37	3.45
Being open to perspectives and ideas.	3.43	3.50	<u>3.33</u>	3.44	3.43
Creating an environment of trust where ideas are freely shared and discussed.	3.42	3.52	<u>3.30</u>	3.38	3.45
Being innovative.	3.59	3.69	<u>3.46</u>	3.54	3.62
Demonstrating transparency and openness.	3.28	3.40	<u>3.12</u>	3.30	3.28
Demonstrating accountability and integrity.	3.40	3.53	<u>3.23</u>	3.35	3.42
Demonstrating professionalism and high ethical standards.	3.61	3.72	<u>3.47</u>	3.71	<u>3.60</u>
Demonstrating respectful communication.	3.57	3.69	<u>3.41</u>	3.62	3.56
Contributing to the greater good of all.	3.63	3.71	<u>3.53</u>	3.61	3.66
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 college districts, no area had a mean scores less than three (needs improvement) though there were differences between districts (Table 2.26d). For all but “Demonstrating accountability and integrity.”, those in the Biological Sciences reported lower mean scores. Mathematics students reported lower mean scores for six of the twelve areas. Those in the Physical Sciences only reported a lower mean score for “Being a diverse community.”

Table 2.26d: Assessment and Recommendations by College District (Mean Scores)

For each area covered in this survey, what is your assessment and recommendation to NatSci leaders?	Overall	College District		
		Biological	Physical	Mathematics
Being a welcoming, safe, and supportive community.	3.48	<u>3.46</u>	3.62	<u>3.51</u>
Being a diverse community.	3.33	3.34	<u>3.12</u>	3.36
Being inclusive and promoting belonging.	3.38	<u>3.36</u>	3.57	<u>3.46</u>
Empowering the best outcomes for all regardless of role, identity, or ability status.	3.42	<u>3.40</u>	3.54	3.50
Being open to perspectives and ideas.	3.42	<u>3.40</u>	3.49	3.56
Creating an environment of trust where ideas are freely shared and discussed.	3.42	<u>3.40</u>	3.57	3.49
Being innovative.	3.58	<u>3.58</u>	3.74	<u>3.51</u>
Demonstrating transparency and openness.	3.28	<u>3.27</u>	3.38	<u>3.26</u>
Demonstrating accountability and integrity.	3.39	3.39	3.42	3.38
Demonstrating professionalism and high ethical standards.	3.61	<u>3.60</u>	3.80	<u>3.56</u>
Demonstrating respectful communication.	3.56	<u>3.54</u>	3.70	3.66
Contributing to the greater good of all.	3.63	<u>3.62</u>	3.77	<u>3.56</u>
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.

Climate/Relationships

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, Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Asians, and those with disabilities reported lower mean scores for at least some of the adjective pairs. Students who had been at MSU for more than two years and first-generation students were more likely to report lower levels of positive responses. In terms of college districts, those in the Biological Sciences were more likely to report lower mean scores for all but one adjective pair and those in Mathematics reported lower mean scores for five of the twelve adjective pairs.

In terms of the climate within the college for specific demographic groups, all the groups presented had at least 50% of the respondents stating that the climate was positive. Groups receiving at least two-thirds of the

respondents stating that the climate was good for that group were men, Whites, women, and students of color. Non-native English speakers and transgendered individuals receive the highest percentage of negative climate responses. Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Whites and those with disabilities were more likely to report any given group as having a less positive climate. Students who have been at MSU for more than two years and first-generation students were also more likely to report a less positive climate for any group than their counterparts. Those in the Biological Sciences and Mathematics reported climates being less positive for over half of the groups.

Respondents were also asked about the climate for people with certain disabilities as well as roles outside of work. Over 50% of the respondents reported the climate for all these groups to be positive. The climate for those with mental health conditions received the highest percentage of negative responses. Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, and 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. Students who had been at MSU for more than two years reported lower positive response for those with mental health conditions, learning disabilities, and parents/guardians of dependent children. First-generation students reported lower positive responses for those with physical disabilities and all three of the out-of-school roles. Those in the Biological Sciences and those in Mathematics reported that the climates for individuals in all six roles were less positive than those in the Physical Sciences

In terms of the level of welcoming and belonging within the college, over 50% of the respondents agreed with each statement. Two areas had higher levels of negative responses– “People take time to get to know new students.” and “I feel a sense of belonging.” Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community and non-Asians and those with disabilities were less likely to agree with at least some of the statements. Students with more than 2 years at MSU and first-generation students were less likely to agree with most of the statements. Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower agreement for all attitudes about welcoming and belonging than those in the Physical Sciences and those in Mathematics reported lower agreement for six of the nine attitudes compared to those in Physical Sciences.

Respondents were also asked about their values and relationships within the college. For all the values/relationships, over half of the respondents reported agreeing with the statements. The statements with the highest levels of agreement all were associated with respect being shown to the students by various positions within the college (faculty, graduate assistants, and staff). Two of the areas with the lowest level of disagreement were associated with communication - “Students are provided an explanation for major decisions.” and “Program goals, changes, and important milestones are clearly communicated.”. Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, and Asians reported lower levels of agreement for some of the values/relationship statements. Those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement for all but one of the statements. Those who had been at MSU for more than two years were more likely to report lower levels of agreement for two-thirds of the statements. Those in the Biological Sciences and those in Mathematics reported less agreement with over three-quarters of the statements.

Diversity Within the College

Faculty Diversity

Most students agreed that the College had demonstrated that they were committed to creating a diverse faculty and that there was faculty that they could identify with. The majority of students also said that they were satisfied with the level of diversity of the faculty. Yet, a relatively large percentage of the students also stated that they felt that there were too few faculty members who were women and/or people of color.

Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, and students with disabilities were less likely to agree that they felt that the college had demonstrated commitment, that they could identify with members of the faculty and that

they were satisfied with the diversity of the faculty members. Non-whites were also less likely to agree with two of the statements. Students who had attended MSU for more than two years were less likely to agree that the college had demonstrated commitment and first-generation students were less likely to agree with all three statements. Those in the Biological Sciences reported less agreement that there were enough faculty they identified with compared to the other two districts. Those in the Physical Sciences were less likely to be satisfied with the level of diversity compared to the other two districts.

Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, students with disabilities, those who had been at MSU for two or more years and those in the Physical Sciences were also more likely to agree that there were too few faculty that were of color and/or women. Students of color and those in the Biological Sciences were more likely to agree that there were too few faculty of color. First-generation students and those in Mathematics were more likely to agree that there were too few women faculty members.

Undergraduate Student Diversity

Students were also asked about the undergraduate student population diversity. Over half reported that they felt that the college had demonstrated commitment to recruiting students from diverse backgrounds and that they were satisfied with the level of diversity within the undergraduate population. When asked specifically if there were too few undergraduate students of color and women undergraduates, less than half disagreed that there were too few women undergraduates in the college and almost a third agreed that there were too few undergraduate students of color.

Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, and students with disabilities were less likely to agree with that the college was committed to recruiting a diverse student population and that they were satisfied with the level of diversity. Students of color were less likely to agree with both statements and Asian students were less likely to be satisfied with the level of diversity. Students who had been at MSU for more than two years and first-generation students were less likely to agree with both statements. Those in the Physical Sciences did report lower satisfaction in the level of diversity amongst undergraduate students.

Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Asian students, and students with disabilities were more likely to agree that there were too few students of color within the college, as were students with more than two years at MSU and first-generation students. This was also true for those in the Physical Sciences. Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Asian students, and those with disabilities were more likely to agree that there were too few women undergraduates. Students who had been at MSU for over two years and first-generation students also were more likely to agree that there were too few women undergraduate students. Those in Mathematics also felt that there were too few women undergraduate students.

Learning Opportunities

Students were asked about their access to learning opportunities within the college. For five areas, more than two-thirds of the students agreed with the statements. Two areas had over 20 percent of the students disagreeing – having faculty role models and having mentoring relationships available that were relevant to their career goals.

There was a difference in levels of agreement for all the statements by demographic and student characteristics. Students with disabilities were less likely to agree with all the statements. Students who had been at MSU for more than two years were less likely to agree that they had learning opportunities available to them that were relevant to their career goals. In terms of equal access to resources to support pre-professional learning, women and non-White students were less likely to agree. Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ communities were less likely to agree that they were supported to participate in learning and education opportunities that could advance their career goals, as were students who had been at MSU for longer than two years and first-generation students. Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, students who had been at MSU for longer than two years and

first-generation students were less likely to agree that they had access to informal and formal mentoring opportunities. Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community and Asian students were less likely to agree that they had mentoring relationships available that were relevant to the career goals. In terms of having similar opportunities for success as other students, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-White students, students who had been at MSU for longer than two years and first-generation students were less likely to agree. Non-white students and first-generation students were less likely to agree that they had faculty role models.

Those in the Biological Sciences were less likely to agree with all seven statements about learning opportunities within their major/program compared to those in the Physical Sciences Those in Mathematics were less likely to agree with all statements other than “I have equal access to resources to support professional learning.” than those in the Physical Sciences.

Innovation Support

Two of the statements related to innovation support by faculty received over 60 percent agreement - “I can have conversations with advisors and/or faculty about longer-term career goals, not just immediate undergraduate major/program demands.” and “Advisors and/or faculty here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.”. The question asking about resistance to trying new things had over 50 percent of the students agreeing (i.e., there was resistance). In addition, two areas had at least one-quarter of the students disagree with the statements - “Faculty support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches in my work.” and “I have sufficient discretion and freedom within course assignments to explore new ideas and ways of doing things. “

There were differences amongst the demographic and student groups. The largest disagreements were with students with disabilities who were less likely to agree with all six of the statements followed by students who had been at MSU for more than two years who were less likely to agree with five of the statements and members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community being less likely to agree with four of the statements. Those in the Biological Sciences were less likely to agree with three of the statements and those in Mathematics were less likely to agree with four of the statements.

Academic Advising

In general, most students agreed that advisors had shared at least one of listed resources with them. Professional networking did have almost one-quarter of the students disagree with it. Women were less likely to agree that the resources had been shared with them for all four resources. Students with disabilities were less likely to agree that career opportunities and pathways, and career preparation resources had been shared with them as were students that had been at MSU for more than two years.

Overall, students found their major/program academic advisors to be helpful and were satisfied with them. Most also stated that they had been connected with an advisor when they enrolled in their major/program. Heterosexuals were less likely to agree on these three points and students with disabilities were less likely to say their advisor was helpful and that they were satisfied with their advisor.

Those in the Biological Sciences reported lower agreement with all four statements about resources shared by their advisors in their department/program than those in Mathematics. Those in the Physical Sciences reported lower agreement with career opportunities/pathways and professional networking.

The only potential general issue that appeared when evaluating the students' academic advisors was related to meeting regularly with the advisor. This may be more of an issue with students understanding or realizing the importance of meeting with an advisor more than an issue with the advisors themselves given the general satisfaction with advisors.

Degree Progress and Course Grades

Over two-thirds of the students agreed with “I am comfortable asking my advisor questions about progress toward my degree.”, “The criteria used in determining course grades are clear and transparent.”, and “Advising discussions include a focus on my career goals and aspirations.”. Two statements had levels of disagreement around 30 percent – “I am regularly informed about my progress toward my degree.” and “I am aware that there is an ombudsperson to whom I can bring concerns about the grading process.”.

Women, non-Asian students, students with disability, and first-generation students were less likely to agree that they were regularly informed about their progress toward their degree. Women and heterosexuals were less comfortable asking their advisor about their progress, as were first-generation students. Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, students with disabilities, and students that had been at MSU for more than two years were less likely to agree that their advising discussions included a focus on their career goals and aspirations. Students of color and students with disabilities were less likely to agree that criteria used for grading was clear and transparent. Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Asian students, students with disabilities, and students who had been at MSU for two years or less were less likely to be aware of the ombudsperson.

Those in the Biological Sciences were less likely to agree with all the statements about their degree progression and course grades. Those in the Physical Sciences were less likely to agree with the criteria for determining grades is clear and transparent. Those in Mathematics were less likely to agree that they are regularly informed about their progress and that advising discussions focus on career goals/aspirations.

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 major/program/the college.” needs to be given great attention, as does “Sexual harassment is a problem within my major/program/the college”. In terms of experiencing it, 9.7% reported that they at least somewhat agreed with the statement and 19.0% stated that it was a problem in their major/program or within the college. Asian students, those with disabilities and those who had been at MSU for more than two years were more likely to agree with the statement about experiencing sexual misconduct. Those in the Biological Sciences and Mathematics were more likely to have experienced sexual misconduct than their counterparts in the Physical Sciences. Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Whites, students with disabilities, students who had been at MSU for more than two years and first-generation students were more likely to say that sexual harassment is a problem.

In terms of leadership handling of sexual misconduct, a little less than two-thirds of the respondents felt leadership took reports seriously and about three-quarters felt that confidentiality would be maintained. Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Whites, those with disabilities, and students who had been at MSU for more than two years reported lower levels of agreement about leadership taking reports seriously. Women, Asian students, student with disabilities, and first-generation students were less to agree that leadership would keep reports confidential. Those in the Biological Sciences and in Mathematics were less likely to believe that leadership would take reports seriously or keep them confidential than their counterparts in the Physical Sciences.

Almost 80 percent of the respondents stated that they knew how to report sexual harassment and relationship violence. Of concern is that 11.8% 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 – Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, Asian students, those with disabilities, and first-generation students. Those in the Biological Sciences were also more likely to be concerned with retaliation for filing a report than those in the Physical Sciences and in Mathematics.

Uncivil Behavior

There does appear to be a minor issue with uncivil behavior within the college for some of the behaviors that were presented in the questionnaire. Ten of the behaviors were about personal experiencing the behaviors and two were about witnessing them. Four of the personal behavior had at least 20% of the respondents stating that it had occurred at least once. Over 20% reported witnessing at least one of the behaviors being experienced by someone else. Almost all the reported behaviors (experienced and witnessed) were more likely to have happened only once. Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community and those with disabilities were more likely to experience most of the uncivil behavior and Asians were more likely to have experienced at least some of the. Well over two-thirds of the uncivil behavior was committed by fellow undergraduate students followed by support staff, faculty/instructors and graduate students/teaching assistants.

Those in the Biological Sciences were more likely to experience at least one form of incivility than their counterparts in the other districts, but there were incidences within all districts. It should be noted that even though there is a level of uncivility, it should not necessarily be taken that it is a general problem within the college districts or programs/majors. The survey was not designed to identify specific sources of problems. It could be a systemic problem within the college or a major/program 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 low percentages and those that were experienced/witnessed generally only happened 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. Power differentials in the learning environment were the most reported though they were reported by only 12.8% as happening at least once. All other bias incidences listed were reported by less than ten percent of the respondents. 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 17.2% of the respondents reporting that they had witnessed at least one incident. As with uncivil behavior, fellow undergraduate students were the most responsible with over 70 percent of the bias incidences in general involving them.

Bias Incident Reporting

Less than 60 percent of the respondents stated they knew how 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, 10.6% stated that they disagreed with the statement that they would not fear retaliation. Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, Asians, those with disabilities, students who had been at MSU for more than two years and first-generation students reported lower levels of agreement when asked about reporting without fear of retaliation.

In terms of leadership's handling of the reporting, 64.7 felt that leadership would take the appropriate actions based on the claimant's desires, but 14.5% disagreed. Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, students of color, those with disabilities, and those who had been at MSU for more than two years had lower levels of agreement. About three-quarters of the respondents said that they were confident that leadership would keep the reports confidential, but 9.2% did not. Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, Asians, and those with disabilities reported lower levels of agreement.

Biological Science students and those in Mathematics were less likely to agree that leadership would handle the reported incident the way that the claimant's desires and that leadership would maintain confidentiality than they felt their Physical Science counterparts.

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 83.9% stated they did not and 9.2% 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 three-quarters of the respondents stated that they were at least somewhat comfortable with the current climate within the college. Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, those with disabilities and those who had been at MSU for more than two years were less likely to say they were comfortable with the climate. Those in the Biological Sciences and in Mathematics were less comfortable with the climate within the college than those in the Physical Sciences

When asked about their satisfaction with being a student in the college, over three-quarters stated that they were at least somewhat satisfied. Members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, Asian students, those with disabilities and students who had been at MSU for more than two years reported lower satisfaction than their counterparts. Those within the Biological Sciences and Mathematics were less likely to be satisfied as a student within the College of Natural Science than those in the Physical Sciences.

In addition, over three-quarters of the students stated that they were proud to be part of the College of Natural Science. Asian students were more likely to be proud to be part of the College of Natural Science than their counterparts. Students who had been at MSU for more than two years were less likely to agree. Those in the Biological Sciences and in Mathematics were less likely to be proud to be part of the College of Natural Science

Respondents were also asked how much they agreed that they planned on staying at NatSci until they graduate. Over 85 percent agreed with the statement. Women and heterosexuals were less likely to state that they planned on staying within the college until they graduate. Students with two or few years were less likely to say they were planning on staying in NatSci until graduation.

When asked about considering leaving their major/program due to negative experiences, only 8.6% 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 “major/program” and it may be the major/program, not the college that the respondent is thinking of leaving. Non-White and those with disabilities were more likely to state that they were thinking of leaving due to negative experiences, as were students who had been at MSU for more than two years. Those in Mathematics were also more likely to be seriously considering changing their program than their counterparts, but they were as likely to plan to stay within the college until graduation so this may be more of an issue with a program(s) than the college itself.

Assessment and Recommendations by Respondents

The final section asked respondents to assess 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.”, “Being innovative.”, and “Demonstrating respectful communication”. No area received extremely high levels of needing improvement, but “Being a diverse community”, “Demonstrating transparency and openness”, “Being inclusive and promoting belonging” and “Empowering the best outcomes for all regardless of role, identity, or ability status.” received the most response of no greater than “Needs Improvement”. In terms of demographic characteristics, Women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, non-Whites, and those with disabilities were the groups less likely to provide a more positive response, though it did not necessarily mean that the responses were in the range of needing improvement. Students who had been at MSU for longer than two years and first-generation students were also more likely to give lower responses.

For all but “Demonstrating accountability and integrity.”, those in the Biological Sciences reported lower mean scores. Mathematics students reported lower mean scores for six of the twelve areas. Those in the Physical Sciences only reported a lower mean score for “Being a diverse community.”

FINAL ASSESSMENT

Overall, there are many areas within the report that demonstrate that the College of Natural Science is creating a quality learning environment, but as with all places there are areas of needed improvement. There are 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. The order of the areas should not be taken as the prioritized order of importance.

College Districts

There are definite differences between the college districts. Those in the Biological Sciences consistently provided less favorable responses across of the survey areas. Given that this is the district with the highest percentage of undergraduate students who participated, most of the results were impacted by their less favorable responses. Though the frequency of less favorable responses were lower for those in Mathematics, there were still concerns within each of the survey areas. There were almost no concerns raised for those in the Physical Sciences except for those associated with low diversity related to women.

Years at MSU

Those students who have been at MSU for more than two years reported less favorable responses to many of the sections in the questionnaire. Students who were here when MSU implemented its response to the COVID epidemic experienced a very different learning climate than is normally experienced at MSU. This could have created the less favorable responses. Another possible reason for the less favorable responses is that the students who have been at MSU longer are in the higher-level courses and have more interaction with the departments/programs than they would have during the more general course work of their first year or two. They may also have experienced different faculty/staff/graduate students that those in the lower levels have not. Without further investigation, such as focus groups or topic specific survey, it is not possible to differentiate all the possible causes.

Students 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. They were likely to have experienced sexual misconduct, uncivil behavior and biased behavior. They were more likely to fear retaliation for both sexual misconduct and biased behaviors. They also reported being less comfortable with the current climate and were more likely to consider leaving their major/program due to negative experiences.

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 for those with disabilities, those with mental health conditions and learning disabilities did have lower levels of positive climate reported, as well as higher levels of negative climate responses.

LGBTQIA2S+ Students

One of the groups that was identified as having a negative climate was transgendered students. This may explain the lower mean scores (higher disagreement/lower satisfaction) that students in the LGBTQIA2S+ community reported for many of the statements throughout the survey. LGBTQIA2S+ students were also more likely to have

experienced uncivil and biased behaviors and fear retaliation for reporting. Due to concerns about possible identification, looking at specific groups within the LGBTQIA2S+ community is not an option.

Non-native English Speaking Students

One of the groups that was identified as having a more negative climate was non-native English speakers. The survey did not include questions about first language, nor about international status so it was not possible to determine which students fell into this category. This may be an area to be aware of when considering improvements to the college's climate.

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 9.7% of the respondents stating that they have experienced sexual harassment or relationship violence within the college and 19.0% stating that it is a problem in their major/program 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. It appears that certain demographic groups are more likely to be victims of this behavior than others.

Uncivil Behavior

This is one of the key areas that needs to be addressed. The level of incivility identified in this report is concerning. Over 45% of the respondents reported that they had experienced or witnessed at least one form of incivility. 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 70 percent of the incidences were by fellow undergraduate students. It also appears that certain demographic groups may be more likely to be targets of this type of behavior.

Bias Incidences

In terms of bias, power differentials were the most reported form, both as experienced and as witnessed with 12.8% experiencing it and 17.2% witnessing it. Though it was not asked specifically of power differentials, for bias incidences in general, over 70 percent of the incidences were fellow undergraduates.

When asked if they could report a bias incident without fear of retaliation, 10.6% of the students disagreed that they could report with a fear of retaliation. Those who were more likely to fear retaliation are also the groups that are more likely to report an incident on their own behalf - women, members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community, Asians, and those with disabilities.

Reporting of bias incidences was only asked in general and not for any specific form of bias. There are multiple concerns with bias reporting. The first is that less than 60 percent agreed that they knew how to report bias incidences. In addition, 83.9% of respondents who knew of at least one incident didn't report anything. An additional 9.2% of the respondents only reported some of the incidences they knew. The primary reason for not reporting was being unsure if the incident 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.

Innovation Support

Innovation support appears to be an area of concern. Over half of the students reported that there was resistance by the faculty to try something new. In addition, over one-third of the students disagreed that faculty supported taking initiatives and risks with new ventures or approaches in the students' work and one-quarter stated that they disagreed that they had sufficient discretion and freedom with course assignments to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.

Access to Learning Opportunities

When asked about learning opportunities, two areas had over 20 percent of the students disagreeing – having faculty role models and having mentoring relationships available that were relevant to their career goals.

There appears to be potential differences in access to learning opportunities based on demographic characteristics. Women, LGBTQIA2S+ students, those with disabilities, non-Whites, and first-generation students were reported lower levels of agreement for at least some of the learning opportunities listed in the survey.

Clear communication/Transparency

When asked to assess the college on several points on strength and weakness, demonstrating transparency and openness did receive a lower mean score though it was still in the range of “strength”. In addition, when students were asked about their values and relationships within the college. The two areas with the lowest mean scores (negative responses) were associated with communication - “Students are provided an explanation for major decisions.” and “Program goals, changes, and important milestones are clearly communicated.”. Another indication that communication within the college may need improvement is that almost one-third of the students stated that they were not informed on a regular basis about their progress towards their degree.

Being Inclusive/Promoting Belonging

This was one of the areas that was identified in the Assessment and Recommendation section of the questionnaire with one of the lowest mean scores though it was still in the “strength” range. In other parts of the report, it also appeared to be a possible problem with the areas of people taking the time to get to know new students, and welcoming new employees, and feeling a sense of belonging (Welcoming and Belonging Section of the questionnaire) receiving more negative responses.

Being a Diverse Community

This was also identified as an area that potentially needed improvement by respondents in the Assessment and Recommendation Section. The general mean score was still in the strength zone but was at the lower end of it. It was also the only category that received a “needs improvement” mean score when comparing different demographic characteristics (members of the LGBTQIA2S+ community).

Appendix A: Data Collection Instrument

NatSci Undergraduate Survey

Start of Block: CONSENT

Q1

Welcome!

The College of Natural Science (NatSci) leadership is asking all employees and students to help us advance our [Strategic Plan](#) and core values of inclusiveness, innovation, openness, and professionalism by telling us about your experiences in and perceptions of the College.

Through the survey that follows, we are seeking to understand the current environment within the College, including climate, diversity, inclusiveness, transparency, accountability, and civility. We will conduct this survey again in 2024 and 2026 to provide metrics for how successful we have been in meeting our strategic priorities to:

- Grow and support a welcoming, diverse NatSci community that empowers the best outcomes for all regardless of role, identity, or ability status.
- Demonstrate transparency, accountability, professionalism, and respectful communication in ways that contribute to the greater good of all.

We invite and encourage your participation in this voluntary and confidential survey. We encourage you to be honest and constructive in your feedback. We appreciate your contribution to sharing your experience within NatSci and we are committed to growing and improving from the insights we gain from the combined ratings and open-ended comments.

Time Estimate: The survey will require about 25 minutes of your time to complete but may take more or less time depending on the amount of detail you choose to provide. Please know that if you take the time to add detailed comments, we will review them. As a way of thanking you for participating, all students who submit their completed surveys may choose to receive a \$5 Starbucks e-card. The information to distribute the gift cards is collected independently from your responses to the survey.

Confidentiality and Consent: MSU's Office for Survey Research will administer the survey and all results will be reported in the aggregate. No results will be reported that could identify any individual or group of individuals. All comments will be reviewed by OSR and redacted before sharing with the College. You may decline to participate, decline to answer certain questions, or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. Declining to participate will not affect your status or position within the College in any way.

The Office for Survey Research will make every effort to keep your data private to the full extent allowed under the law. However, there are certain times that law or Michigan State University policies require survey

administrators to share some data with the proper authorities if someone reported child abuse, sexual assault, or child pornography. Participation in this study does not involve any known physical, financial, emotional or legal risk to you.

Your responses will help create an increasingly positive climate at the College of Natural Science. You are welcome to contact Karen Clark, Project Manager at OSR (clarkk@msu.edu), or email NatSci.dean@msu.edu at any time if you have questions about the survey.

By selecting yes below and then proceeding with the survey, you are voluntarily consenting to participate in the survey and allowing your responses to be used for institutional research purposes.

- YES - I consent
- NO - I decline consent

Q2 Definition of Key Terms

For the purposes of this survey, we are using the following definitions:

Climate

By "climate" we mean "current attitudes, behaviors, and standards and practices of employees and students...particularly those that concern the access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and potential" (Rankin, S. & Reason, R. (2008). *Transformational Tapestry Model: A Comprehensive Approach to Transforming Campus Climate. Journal of Diversity in Higher Education. 1. 262-274. 10.1037/a0014018*).

Leadership/Administration

- **Department/Program leaders/leadership/administration** is defined as the department chair, associate chairs, and program directors.
- **College leaders/leadership/administration** is defined as the dean, associate/assistant deans, and program directors.

Q3 I. Current Climate

Q4 I. Current Climate

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science for undergraduate students who are:

Women	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
Men	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
Transgender	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
Gay, lesbian, or bisexual	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
People of color	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
White	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
Immigrants	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
International	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
Non-native English speakers	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
From Christian religious affiliations	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
From religious affiliations other than Christian	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
Other (please specify)	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate

Q5 I. Current Climate

How would you rate the climate within the College of Natural Science for undergraduate students who are or have:

A mental health condition	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
A physical disability	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
Learning disabilities	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
Parents / guardians of dependent children	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
Providing care for adults who are disabled and/or elderly	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
Served / serving in the military	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate
Other (please specify)	▼ Very Negative ... Unable to Evaluate

Q6 II. Diversity

Now we would like you to think about the faculty in the College of Natural Science. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

(NOTE: Think about "diversity" in terms of categories such as race / ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, nationality, and people with disabilities).

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There are enough faculty I identify with.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Within the college, I am satisfied with the level of faculty diversity (e.g., in terms of race / ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, nationality, and people with disabilities).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There are too few faculty of color.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There are too few women faculty.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q7 II. Diversity

Now we would like you to think about undergraduate students in the College of Natural Science. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

(NOTE: Think about "diversity" in terms of categories such as race / ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual

orientation, nationality, and people with disabilities).

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
Has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting students from diverse backgrounds.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am satisfied with the level of undergraduate student diversity (e.g., in terms of race / ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, nationality, and people with disabilities).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There are too few undergraduate students of color.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There are too few women undergraduate students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8 III. Welcoming and Belonging

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to welcoming and belonging within the College of Natural Science.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
People take time to welcome new students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
People work closely together.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
People create a sense of belonging for others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am treated as an individual rather than as a representative of a racial, ethnic, cultural, national origin, or gender group.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My personal identities are valued in the classroom.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty negatively prejudge me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel a sense of belonging.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am treated equally compared to other undergraduate students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel safe (including physical, mental, and emotional safety).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q9 IV. Learning Opportunities

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to

learning opportunities within your major/program.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
I have learning opportunities available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have equal access to resources to support pre-professional learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am supported to participate in learning and educational opportunities that could advance my career goals.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have access to informal and formal mentoring opportunities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have mentoring relationships available to me that are relevant to my career goals.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Compared to other students, I have similar opportunities for success.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have faculty role models.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

Start of Block: INNOVATION

Q10 V. Innovation

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to innovation within your major/program.

In this context, innovation is defined as the development of new products, designs, ideas, or new ways of doing things.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
I have sufficient discretion and freedom within course assignments to explore new ideas and ways of doing things.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I can have conversations with advisors and/or faculty about longer-term career goals, not just immediate undergraduate major/program demands.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty support me in taking initiative and risks with new ventures or approaches in my work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There is resistance to doing or trying something new.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty engage undergraduate students in work that extends beyond the status quo.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Advisors and/or faculty here have interest and curiosity about new ideas and projects.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: INNOVATION

Start of Block: MENTORING

Q11 VI. Academic Advising

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to advising within your major/program.

My advisor shares resources about:

Research opportunities	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Not Applicable
Career opportunities and pathways	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Not Applicable
Career preparation	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Not Applicable
Professional Networking	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Not Applicable

Q12

My advisor has been helpful.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Not Applicable
I meet regularly with my advisor.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Not Applicable
I am satisfied with my advisor.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Not Applicable
I was connected with an advisor upon enrolling in my major/program.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Not Applicable

End of Block: MENTORING

Start of Block: STRATEGIC PRIORITY

Q13 VII. Strategic Priority

A strategic priority of the college is to "grow and support a welcoming, diverse NatSci community that empowers the best outcomes for all regardless of role, identity, or ability status."

What is the next thing your major/program leadership and college leadership should do to improve this?

- Major/Program Leadership: _____
- College of Natural Science Leadership:

End of Block: STRATEGIC PRIORITY

Start of Block: VALUES & RELATIONSHIPS

Q14 VIII. Values and Relationships

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning values and relationships in your major/program.

Instructors value my contributions in the classroom.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
Other students value my contributions in the classroom.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
<u>Advisors</u> care about my general satisfaction.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
<u>Faculty</u> care about my general satisfaction.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
<u>Graduate students</u> care about my general satisfaction.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
<u>Administrators</u> care about my general satisfaction.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
<u>Staff</u> care about my general satisfaction.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
<u>Advisors</u> care about my personal well-being.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
<u>Faculty</u> care about my personal well-being.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
<u>Graduate students</u> care about my personal well-being.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
<u>Administrators</u> <u>students</u> care about my personal well-being.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
<u>Staff</u> care about my personal well-being.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
I can voice my opinions openly.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
People listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
Program goals, changes, and important milestones are clearly communicated.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
Students are provided an explanation for major decisions.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
I am treated with respect by <u>faculty</u> .	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
I am treated with respect by <u>advisors</u> .	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
I am treated with respect by <u>administrators</u> .	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
I am treated with respect by <u>graduate students/teaching assistants</u> .	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
I am treated with respect by other <u>undergraduate students</u> .	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
I am treated with respect by staff.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
I have access to administrators when I have concerns/problems.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate

Start of Block: Degree Progress & Course Grades



Q15 IX. Degree Progress & Course Grades

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding your degree progress and course grades.

I am regularly informed about my progress toward my degree.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
I am comfortable asking my advisor questions about progress toward my degree.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
Advising discussions include a focus on my career goals and aspirations.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
The criteria used in determining course grades are clear and transparent.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate
I am aware that there is an ombudsperson to whom I can bring concerns about the grading process.	▼ Strongly Disagree ... Unable to Evaluate

End of Block: Degree Progress & Course Grades

Start of Block: CIVILITY



Q16 X. Civility

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 . . .

	Never	Once	2 or More Times
Put you down or acted condescendingly to you.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Made demeaning or derogatory remarks to or about you.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Devalued your work and efforts.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Inappropriately interrupted or "talked over" you while you were speaking.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ignored or excluded you during group activities in the classroom.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Made negative statements or circulated negative rumors about you.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Paid little attention to your statements or showed little interest in your opinion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Addressed you in unprofessional ways.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion about personal matters.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bullied you.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bullied others in front of you.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Distrusted your description of your own personal experiences.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exhibited any of the above behaviors toward others in front of you.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Display This Question:

If CIVILITY: [Once] (Count) >= 1

Or CIVILITY: [2 or More Times] (Count) >= 1

Q17 X. Civility

You indicated that you have experienced at least one incident of uncivil behavior. Please indicate who was involved in the incident(s), and for those involved, how often the behavior occurred.

	Involved in Incident(s)	How often behavior occurred
	Please select all that apply	
Faculty member/instructor	<input type="checkbox"/>	▼ Once ... 2 or More Times
Academic advisor	<input type="checkbox"/>	▼ Once ... 2 or More Times
Graduate student/Teaching assistant	<input type="checkbox"/>	▼ Once ... 2 or More Times
Administrator	<input type="checkbox"/>	▼ Once ... 2 or More Times
Staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	▼ Once ... 2 or More Times
Another undergraduate student	<input type="checkbox"/>	▼ Once ... 2 or More Times
Other (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	▼ Once ... 2 or More Times

End of Block: CIVILITY

Start of Block: RVSM

Q18 XI. RVSM Policies

This next set of questions is about Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct (RVSM).

If you are currently experiencing or have experienced an incident of relationship violence or sexual misconduct, there are resources available to you at [Office for Civil Rights and Title IX Education and Compliance](#).

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
I have experienced sexual harassment and/or relationship violence within my major/program/the college.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sexual harassment is a problem within my major/program/the college.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I know the steps to take if a person comes to me with a problem with sexual harassment and relationship violence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
College leaders take reports of sexual harassment and/or relationship violence seriously.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am confident that my major/program/college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports related to RVSM.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I can report incidences of sexual harassment and/or relationship violence without fear of retaliation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: RVSM

Start of Block: BIAS

Q19 XII. Bias Incidents

In this section, we would like to know about bias incidents. A bias incident is an incident of verbal or non-verbal conduct that is threatening, harassing, intimidating, discriminatory or hostile and is based on a category protected under the [MSU Anti-Discrimination Policy](#).

Since becoming a student in the College of Natural Science, how often, if at all, have you witnessed or experienced an incident of bias/discrimination within your major/program or within the College based on any of the following?

	Experienced	Witnessed
Power differentials in the learning environment	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times
Older age	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times
Younger age	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times
Gender expression and identity	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times
Sexual orientation	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times
Race/ethnicity	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times
Country of origin	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times
Religious background	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times
A psychological or mental health issue	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times
A physical disability or health issue	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times
Other (please specify)	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times	▼ Never ... 2 or More Times

Display This Question:

If EXPERIENCE/WITNESS BIAS INCIDENTS : Experienced [Once] (Count) >= 1

Or EXPERIENCE/WITNESS BIAS INCIDENTS : Experienced [2 or More Times] (Count) >= 1

Q20 XII. Bias Incidents

You indicated that you **personally experienced** an incident of bias/discrimination. Please indicate who was involved. **Please select all that apply**

- Academic Advisor(s)
- Campus visitor(s)
- Dean / Assoc Dean / Asst Dean
- Major/Program Director
- Faculty member(s)
- Graduate student(s) / Teaching assistant(s)
- Postdoctoral scholar(s)
- Staff member(s)
- Undergraduate student(s)
- Other (please specify)

Page Break

Q21 XII. Bias Incidents - 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
I know how to report bias incidents if they occurred within the College.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leaders will take appropriate actions to address them based on the claimant's desires.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am confident that college leaders maintain confidentiality when handling reports of bias, discrimination, or incivility.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Display This Question:

If EXPERIENCE/WITNESS BIAS INCIDENTS : Experienced [Once] (Count) >= 1

Or EXPERIENCE/WITNESS BIAS INCIDENTS : Experienced [2 or More Times] (Count) >= 1

Or EXPERIENCE/WITNESS BIAS INCIDENTS : Witnessed [Once] (Count) >= 1

Or EXPERIENCE/WITNESS BIAS INCIDENTS : Witnessed [2 or More Times] (Count) > 1

Q22 XII. Bias Incidents - Reporting

You indicated that you experienced or witnessed at least one incident of bias/discrimination. Thinking about the incident(s) of bias/discrimination you experienced or witnessed, did you report the incident(s)?

- Reported the incident or all incidents
- Reported some of the incidents
- Did not report the incident(s)

Display This Question:

If REPORT BIAS INCIDENT(S) = Reported some of the incidents

Or REPORT BIAS INCIDENT(S) = Did not report the incident(s)

Q23 XII. Bias Incidents - Reporting

What are the reasons why you decided not to report the incident(s)? **Please select all that apply**

- I feared retaliation.
- I did not think I would be believed.
- I did not think appropriate action would be taken.
- I was unsure if the incident violated university policies.
- Other reason(s) (please specify) _____

Display This Question:

If REPORT BIAS INCIDENT(S) = Reported the incident or all incidents

Or REPORT BIAS INCIDENT(S) = Reported some of the incidents

Q24 XII. Bias Incidents - Reporting

To which individual(s) or unit(s) did you report bias/discrimination incidents? **Please select all that apply**

- Office of Institutional Equity (OIE)
- Office for Civil Rights and Title IX Compliance (OCR)
- Ombudsperson Office
- Faculty Grievance and Dispute Resolution Office
- My major/program supervisor/chair/director
- Dean, associate dean, assistant dean
- NatSci DEI Office
- Graduate Program Director
- Undergraduate Program Director
- Supervisor
- Staff member
- Other (please specify) _____

End of Block: BIAS

Start of Block: STRATEGIC-2

Q25 XIII. Strategic Priority

Another strategic priority of the college is "demonstrate transparency, accountability, professionalism, and respectful communication in ways that contribute to the greater good of all."

What is the next thing your department/program leadership and college leadership should do to improve this?

- Major/Program Leadership: _____
- College of Natural Science Leadership: _____

End of Block: STRATEGIC-2

Start of Block: CURRENT CLIMATE

Q26 XIV. Assessment of Current Climate

Overall, how comfortable or uncomfortable are you with the climate in the College of Natural Science?

- Very uncomfortable
- Somewhat uncomfortable
- Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable
- Somewhat comfortable
- Very comfortable

Q27 XIV. Assessment of Current Climate

Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your experience as a student in the College of Natural Science?

- Very dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Very satisfied

Q28 XIV. Assessment of Current Climate

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about your experiences as a student in the College of Natural Science.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
I am proud to be part of NatSci.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have seriously considered leaving my program in NatSci because of negative experiences.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I intend to stay at NatSci until graduation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q29 XIV. Assessment of Current Climate

Think of what is possible, that is, how well are we reaching our greatest potential for climate and values, and where do we most need additional attention and commitment.

For each area covered in this survey, what is your assessment and recommendation to NatSci leaders?

Being a welcoming, safe, and supportive community.	▼ Needs Significant Improvement ... Is Exemplary, Best Possible
Being a diverse community.	▼ Needs Significant Improvement ... Is Exemplary, Best Possible
Being inclusive and promoting belonging.	▼ Needs Significant Improvement ... Is Exemplary, Best Possible
Empowering the best outcomes for all regardless of role, identity, or ability status.	▼ Needs Significant Improvement ... Is Exemplary, Best Possible
Being open to perspectives and ideas.	▼ Needs Significant Improvement ... Is Exemplary, Best Possible
Creating an environment of trust where ideas are freely shared and discussed.	▼ Needs Significant Improvement ... Is Exemplary, Best Possible
Being innovative.	▼ Needs Significant Improvement ... Is Exemplary, Best Possible
Demonstrating transparency and openness.	▼ Needs Significant Improvement ... Is Exemplary, Best Possible
Demonstrating accountability and integrity.	▼ Needs Significant Improvement ... Is Exemplary, Best Possible
Demonstrating professionalism and high ethical standards.	▼ Needs Significant Improvement ... Is Exemplary, Best Possible
Demonstrating respectful communication.	▼ Needs Significant Improvement ... Is Exemplary, Best Possible
Contributing to the greater good of all.	▼ Needs Significant Improvement ... Is Exemplary, Best Possible

End of Block: CURRENT CLIMATE

Start of Block: OPEN-ENDS

Q30 XIV. Assessment of Current Climate

Thank you for all of your ratings. Please add some thoughts in your own words to help us better understand your experience as a member of the NatSci community and your ideas for strengthening and improving NatSci climate and values. For the greatest positive impact, include specific actionable ideas.

. What are the factors that most influence your experience as a NatSci undergraduate student?

End of Block: OPEN-ENDS

Start of Block: DEMOGRAPHICS

Q31 XV. Demographics

Please complete this section so that we may better understand the perspectives of respondent groups. These data will be held confidential by the Office of Survey Research (OSR) and will not be reported in ways that would link any individual respondents with their answers. In each case you have the option to decline to answer, but the more information you provide the more complete our analyses of the climate will be.

What is primary major?

▼ Biochemistry and Molecular Biology ... Prefer not to answer

Q33 XV. Demographics

What year did you start taking classes at Michigan State University?

▼ 2022 ... Prefer not to answer

Q34 When do you expect to complete your current degree program?

▼ 2022 ... Prefer not to answer

Q35 XV. Demographics

In what year were you born?

▼ 2004 ... Prefer not to answer

Q36 XV. Demographics

What is your gender identity? **Please select all that apply**

- Agender
- Cisgender Man
- Cisgender Woman
- Gender non-conforming
- Genderqueer
- Non-binary
- Transgender Man
- Transgender Woman
- Two-spirit
- In another way, please specify if you wish:

Prefer not to answer

Q37 XV. Demographics

What is your sexual orientation/identity?

- Asexual
- Bisexual
- Demisexual
- Gay
- Lesbian
- Pansexual
- Queer
- Questioning or unsure
- Same-gender loving
- Straight
- Another identity not listed (please specify if you wish):

- Prefer not to answer

Q38 XV. Demographics

What is your race and/or ethnicity? **Please select all that apply**

- African, African American, or Black
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian or Asian American
- Hispanic or Latina, Latino, Latinx
- Middle Eastern or North African
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White or Caucasian
- Another identity not listed (please specify):

- Prefer not to answer

Q39 XV. Demographics

Are you an international student

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

Q40 XV. Demographics

Which of the following best describes the educational experience of your parents/guardians?

- At least one parent or guardian completed a 4-year college degree or higher
- Neither parent or guardian completed a 4-year college degree or higher
- Unsure
- Prefer not to answer


Q41 XV. Demographics

With which of the following religious background(s), if any, do you identify? **Please select all that apply**

- Agnostic
- Atheist
- Buddhist
- Christian
- Hindu
- Humanist
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Spiritual, non-religious
- Unitarian / Universalist
- None
- Other (please specify): _____
- Prefer not to answer

Q42 XV. Demographics

Which (if any) of the disabilities / conditions listed below have you been diagnosed with that impact your learning, working, or living activities? **Please select all that apply**

- Acquired / traumatic brain injury
 - Attention Deficit / Hyperactivity Disorder
 - Autism Spectrum
 - Low vision or blind
 - Hard of Hearing or deaf
 - Learning disability
 - Medical condition
 - Mental health / psychological condition
 - Physical / mobility condition that affects walking
 - Physical / mobility condition that does not affect walking
 - Speech / communication
 - Other (please specify): _____
 - I have none of the listed conditions
 -  Prefer not to answer
-

Q43 XV. Demographics

Have you ever served, or are you currently serving, in the U.S. Armed Forces, Military Reserves, or National Guard?

- Yes
 - No
-

Q45 Do you have primary caregiving responsibilities? This may include childcare, eldercare, or disability care.

- Yes
- No

End of Block: DEMOGRAPHICS

Start of Block: END

Q43 XI. Final Thoughts

As you leave this survey, is there anything else you hope NatSci leaders are thinking about?

End of Block: END
