



MSU College of Natural Science 2019 Organizational Climate Survey

Conducted on Behalf of

Michigan State University College of Natural Science

By

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

November 2019

Daniel Thaler, PhD, Research Analyst
Linda Stork, Director

Rev. 05/04/2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
SECTION I. INTRODUCTION.....	8
Purpose of Study	8
Methodology	8
Table M-1. Response Rate, by Respondent Type	9
SECTION II. PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS	10
Table 1. Profile of Respondents by Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation, and Race / Ethnicity.....	11
Table 2. Profile of Respondents by U.S. Citizenship and Religious Background	12
Table 3. Profile of Respondents by Military Service and Disabilities	13
SECTION III. GENERAL ASSESSMENTS OF NATSCI	14
Satisfaction and Comfort	14
Table 4. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Respondent Type	14
Table 5. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity	15
Table 6. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Employee Role and Time in Position	16
Table 7. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Unit.....	17
Describing NatSci.....	18
Table 8. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Respondent Type	18
Table 9. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity	19
Table 10. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Employee Role and Time in Position	20
Table 11. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Employee Unit.....	21
Sense of Belonging	22
Table 12. Summary of Responses to Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items	22
Table 13. Mean Response to Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Respondent Type.....	23
Table 14. Mean Response to Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Race and Gender	24
Table 15. Mean Response to Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Employee Role and time in Position.....	24
Table 16. Mean Response to Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Unit	26
Table 17. Summary of Responses to Sense of Belonging Frequency Items	27
Table 18. Mean Response to Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Respondent Type	28
Table 19. Mean Response to Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Race and Gender	28
Table 20. Mean Response to Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Employee Role and Time in Position	29
Table 21. Mean Response to Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Employee Unit	30
Potential to Leave NatSci.....	31
Table 22. Percent of Employees who Reported Considering Leaving their Position	31
Table 23. Percent of Students Who Reported Considering Leaving MSU.....	33
SECTION IV. DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION.....	34
Diversity of Faculty	34
Table 24. Reported Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Respondent Type	35
Table 25. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity	36
Table 26. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Employee Role and Time in Position	37
Table 27. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Employee Unit	39
Diversity of Staff.....	40
Table 28. Reported Perceptions of Staff Diversity, by Respondent Type	40
Table 29. Perceptions of Staff Diversity, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity.....	41
Table 30. Perceptions of Staff Diversity, by Employee Role and Time in Position	42
Table 31. Perceptions of Staff Diversity, by Employee Unit.....	44
Diversity of Students.....	45
Table 32. Reported Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Respondent Type	45
Table 33. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity	46
Table 34. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Employee Role and Time in Position	47

Table 35. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Employee Unit	49
Fair Treatment	50
Table 36. Summary of Responses to Fair Treatment Items	50
Table 37. Mean Response to Fair Treatment Items, by Respondent Type.....	51
Table 38. Mean Response to Fair Treatment Items, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity	52
Table 39. Mean Response to Fair Treatment Items, by Employee Role and Time in Position.....	53
Table 40. Mean Response to Fair Treatment Items, by Employee Unit	54
Climate for Diverse Groups.....	55
Table 41. Summary of Responses to Climate for Diverse Groups Items.....	55
Table 42. Mean Response to Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Respondent Type	56
Table 43. Mean Response to Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity	57
Table 44. Mean Response to Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Employee Role and Time in Position	58
Table 45. Mean Response to Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Employee Unit	60
SECTION V. BIAS, HARASSMENT, AND UNCIVIL BEHAVIOR	61
Respectful Treatment.....	61
Table 46. Summary of Responses to Respectful Treatment Items.....	61
Table 47. Mean Response to Respectful Treatment Items, by Respondent Type.....	62
Table 48. Mean Response to Respectful Treatment Items, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity	63
Table 49. Mean Response to Respectful Treatment Items, by Employee Role and Time in Position..	63
Table 50. Mean Response to Respectful Treatment Items, by Employee Unit	65
Uncivil Behaviors	66
Table 51. Summary of Responses to Uncivil Behaviors Items	66
Table 52. Percent who Reported Experiencing Uncivil Behaviors, by Respondent Type.....	67
Table 53. Percent who Reported Experiencing Uncivil Behaviors, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity	68
Table 54. Percent who Reported Experiencing Uncivil Behaviors, by Employee Role and Time in Position	69
Table 55. Percent who Reported Experiencing Uncivil Behaviors, by Employee Unit.....	71
Sexual Harassment.....	72
Table 56. Summary of Responses to Sexual Harassment Items, by Respondent Type.....	72
Table 57. Response to Sexual Harassment Items, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity	73
Table 58. Response to Sexual Harassment Items, by Employee Role and Time in Position	74
Table 59. Response to Sexual Harassment Items, by Employee Unit.....	75
Bias Incidents.....	76
Table 60. Summary of Responses to Bias Incident Items	76
Table 61. Response to Bias Incident Items, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity.....	77
Table 62. Response to Bias Incident Items, by Employee Role and Time in Postition	78
Table 63. Response to Bias Incident Items, by Employee Unit.....	79
Table 64. Prevalence of Bias Incidents Experienced and Witnessed	80
Table 65. Prevalence of Bias Incidents, by Respondent Type.....	81
Table 66. Prevalence of Bias Incidents, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity	82
Table 67. Prevalence of Bias Incidents, by Employee Role and Time in Position.....	83
Table 68. Prevalence of Bias Incidents, by Employee Unit.....	84
Table 69. Percent of Respondents who Reported the Most Recent Bias Incident they Encountered..	85
Table 70. Type of Person Who Committed Act of Bias / Discrimination.....	86
Table 71. Type of Person Targeted by Act of Bias / Discrimination Witnessed by Respondent	86
SECTION VI. MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES.....	87
Table 72. Significant Predictors of Key Outcomes, among Employees	87
Table 73. Significant Predictors of Key Outcomes, among Students	88
APPENDIX A. ORDERED AND BINARY LOGISTIC REGRESSIONS	89

Table 74. Ordered Logistic Regression Analysis: Determinants of Self-Reported Satisfaction, among Employees	91
Table 75. Ordered Logistic Regression Analysis: Determinants of Self-Reported Comfort, among Employees	92
Table 76. Ordered Logistic Regression Analysis: Determinants of Considering Leaving Position, among Employees	93
Table 77. Ordered Logistic Regression Analysis: Determinants of Self-Reported Satisfaction, among Students	94
Table 78. Ordered Logistic Regression Analysis: Determinants of Self-Reported Comfort, among Students	95
Table 79. Ordered Logistic Regression Analysis: Determinants of Considering Leaving MSU, among Students	96
APPENDIX B. ADDITIONAL ANALYSES.....	97
Table 80. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status	97
Table 81. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity	97
Table 82. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Department (Undergraduate Students).....	98
Table 83. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Department (Graduate Students)	99
Table 84. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status.....	100
Table 85. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity.....	101
Table 86. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Department (Undergraduate Students).....	102
Table 87. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Department (Graduate Students)	103
Table 88. Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status	104
Table 89. Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity	104
Table 90. Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students) ...	105
Table 91. Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Department (Graduate Students).....	106
Table 92. Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status	107
Table 93. Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity	107
Table 94. Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students).....	108
Table 95. Sense of Belonging Items, by Department (Graduate Students)	109
Table 96. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status	110
Table 97. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity	111
Table 98. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Department (Undergraduate Students)	112
Table 99. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Department (Graduate Students).....	113
Table 100. Perceptions of Staff Diversity, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status	114
Table 101. Perceptions of Staff Diversity, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity	115
Table 102. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status	116
Table 103. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity	117
Table 104. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Department (Undergraduate Students).....	118
Table 105. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Department (Graduate Students)	119
Table 106. Fair Treatment Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status	120
Table 107. Fair Treatment Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity	121
Table 108. Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status.....	122
Table 109. Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity.....	123
Table 110. Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students).....	124
Table 111. Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Department (Graduate Students)	125
Table 112. Respectful Treatment Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status	126
Table 113. Respectful Treatment Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity	126
Table 114. Respectful Treatment Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students).....	127
Table 115. Respectful Treatment Items, by Department (Graduate Students)	128
Table 116. Uncivil Behaviors Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status	129
Table 117. Uncivil Behaviors Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity	130
Table 118. Uncivil Behaviors Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students)	131
Table 119. Uncivil Behaviors Items, by Department (Graduate Students)	132

Table 120. Sexual Harassment Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status	133
Table 121. Sexual Harassment Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity	134
Table 122. Sexual Harassment Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students)	135
Table 123. Sexual Harassment Items, by Department (Graduate Students).....	136
Table 124. Bias Incident Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status	137
Table 125. Bias Incident Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity	138
Table 126. Bias Incident Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students)	139
Table 127. Bias Incident Items, by Department (Graduate Students).....	140

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

The purpose of the NatSci Organizational Climate Survey was to assist the Michigan State University College of Natural Science in assessing the current climate and learning environment for employees and students in the college. The survey focused on such factors such as inclusion, diversity, fairness, and the prevalence of harmful, inappropriate, or uncivil behaviors. Electronic invitations were sent to a total of 13,682 members of the NatSci community, of whom 2,342 eligible participants completed the survey, for a response rate of 17.1 percent. Data were gathered from February 20, 2019 through March 22, 2019.

Basic Conclusions

On average, MSU College of Natural Science community members reflected positively on the climate and environment at the university. A majority of those who provided data expressed favorable opinions on nearly every item, although a nontrivial minority of respondents did express concerns on many items. In particular, 80 percent of those surveyed indicated that they are satisfied with their experience in the college. The college's greatest strengths, according to the views expressed are in creating a friendly environment and generally positive climate for diverse groups – especially for those of varying races, genders, and sexual orientations. Meanwhile, the areas identified as most *in need of improvement* were: (a) the level of diversity among community members, especially in terms of race and ethnicity; (b) the prevalence of uncivil behavior and bias incidents – especially those committed by faculty against other employees and graduate students, and those committed by undergraduate students against other undergraduates; and (c) valuing diversity-related contributions. Overall, 30 percent of employees and 15 percent of students indicated that the climate within NatSci had led them to consider leaving the college.

Although some consistent differences were observed between particular subgroups (especially by year in the program and disability status), these differences were generally small and most of the time all groups agreed which aspects of the environment were good or in need of improvement.

Diversity and Inclusion

Respondents gave generally favorable assessments of conditions within the college for particular minority subgroups. In particular, over 70 percent of respondents agreed that:

- The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty (70 percent) and recruiting diverse students (78 percent).
- Employees are given feedback and evaluated fairly (75 percent), assignments are given based on skills and abilities (77 percent), and employees are hired and promoted objectively (73 percent).
- The climate within the college is good for those who are white and people of color; males and females; people with physical disabilities; people in the military; Christians and non-Christians; people who are gay, lesbian, or bisexual; and those who are international or immigrants (70 percent to 88 percent, depending on the group being referenced).

However:

- Barely more than half indicated there is currently an acceptable level of diversity among faculty (59 percent) or staff (51 percent).
- Only 30 percent of employees feel their diversity-related contributions have been or will be valued for promotion or tenure.
- Over 20 percent of respondents rated the organizational climate as negative for people who are non-native English speakers (21 percent), have psychological or mental health issues (25 percent, or are fixed-term employees (38 percent).

Bias, Harassment, and Uncivil Behaviors

Respondents gave generally favorable assessments of how they are treated within the College of Natural Science. In particular, over 70 percent of respondents indicated that:

- They are always or very often treated with respect in general within NatSci (82 percent) and specifically by faculty, students, staff, advisors, and unit heads or chairs (84 to 90 percent, depending on the group being referenced).
- They trust their coworkers (79 percent).
- Sexual harassment is taken seriously within the college (79 percent).
- They can report bias incidents they encounter without fear of retaliation (70 percent).

However:

- Over two-thirds (68 percent) of respondents indicated that they had experienced at least some form of uncivil behavior committed by another member of the Natural Science community.
- 31 percent of respondents indicated that sexual harassment is a problem within the College, and 6 percent indicated they had personally experienced sexual harassment.
- About one-fourth (23 percent) of all respondents reported having experienced bias or discrimination within the college at least once in the previous year, while one-third (33 percent) indicated they had witnessed an incident directed at someone else.

Differences between Subgroups

For the most part, the responses of particular subgroups (by race or ethnicity, gender identity, employee role, time spent in current position, and employment unit) mirrored each other fairly closely, indicating that different cohorts largely agreed with one another about the college's strengths and needs. However, a few cohorts consistently stood out from the others. The following cohorts expressed consistently *less favorable* attitudes than other respondents:

- Black or African American and Hispanic or Latinx respondents, compared to whites and Asian or Pacific Islander respondents;
- Female-identifying respondents, compared to males;
- Tenure-stream faculty and graduate students;
- Employees who have spent between 4 and 20 years in their current position; and
- Employees within Chemistry, Mathematics, Plant Biology NATSCI, Microbiology / Molecular Genetics, and Integrative Biology.

Generally speaking, those who identified themselves as belonging to a particular minority group were more likely to evaluate the conditions for members of that group unfavorably. That is, for example, black respondents were less likely to indicate that the climate for people of color was good, females were less likely to indicate that the climate for females was good, and so on.

Determinants of Key Outcomes

Finally, a series of multivariate analyses were conducted to help identify which attitudes and traits are most important in determining who is most satisfied and comfortable within the college, and who has considered leaving due to the climate. The results suggest that employees prioritize an *equitable professional environment* (i.e., characterized by mutual respect, equal opportunities, and fair treatment) whereas students prioritize a *warm educational community* (i.e., where they feel safe, welcome, and a strong sense of belonging).

SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to assist the Michigan State University College of Natural Science (NATSCI) in assessing the current climate and learning environment for current employees and students in the college. In 2018, NatSci arranged to have MSU's Office for Survey Research (OSR) conduct a survey of current faculty, staff, specialists, post-docs, and students evaluating factors such as inclusion, diversity, fairness, and the prevalence of harmful, inappropriate, or uncivil behaviors.

The survey, conducted between February 20, 2019 and March 22, 2019, involved sending invitations to 632 faculty, 937 specialists, post-docs, and staff, 961 graduate students, 5535 undergraduates within NatSci, 956 undergraduates within Lyman Briggs with coordinate majors within NatSci, and a random sample of 4661 other undergraduates who had taken at least one Natural Science course within the past year. Of those invited, a total of 2342 completed enough of the questionnaire to be included in the data¹. The responses were summarized and then examined for differences across demographic groups such as role within the college, unit, gender, race, and the length of time spent in one's position of employment. This report presents the results of these analyses.

Methodology

The data collection instrument used was an online (computer-assisted web interviewing, or CAWI) questionnaire programmed and administered using Qualtrics Professional Edition software, and was designed jointly by OSR staff and administrative leaders at NatSci. The questionnaire covered the following areas, although not all types of respondents received all sets of items:

- Demographics
- General Assessments of NatSci
 - Satisfaction and Comfort
 - Descriptive Adjectives about NatSci
 - Sense of Belonging
 - Potential to Leave NatSci
- Diversity and Inclusion
 - Assessment of Diversity Levels
 - Diversity of Faculty
 - Diversity of Staff
 - Diversity of Students
 - Fair Treatment
 - Climate for Diverse Groups
- Bias, Harassment, and Uncivil Behavior
 - Respectful Treatment
 - Uncivil Behaviors
 - Sexual Harassment
 - Bias Incidents

¹ Completes were defined as respondents having progressed through at least the first section of substantive items about the college. 1897 respondents progressed through 100 percent of the questionnaire, while 434 respondents were included in the dataset as "partials."

Frame – The sampling frame for this study varied by respondent type: for faculty, staff, post-docs, and specialists, the College of Natural Science provided a list of employees and their contact information, with a goal that all employees would be invited to participate. The study can thus be considered a census of these populations with no random sampling error in the estimates (although other types of error, including nonresponse error, would still be present).

For students, the MSU Registrar’s Office provided a list of all current graduate and undergraduate students within the College of Natural Science, as well as those within the Lyman Briggs College with coordinate majors in Natural Science. Again, the study can be considered a census of these populations with no random sampling error because all members covered by this frame were invited to participate.

Finally, the Registrar’s Office provided a random sample of 4,661 other undergraduate students who were not within NatSci or Lyman Briggs, but had taken at least one Natural Science course in Spring or Fall of 2018. This sample intentionally oversampled students with minority ethnic codes according to the university’s official records, in order to obtain a sufficiently large sample of nonwhite respondents to assess differences of opinion by race and ethnicity.

Response – The response rate for each group is shown in the table below.

Table M-1. Response Rate, by Respondent Type

Group	Number Invited	Number Completed	Response Rate
Faculty	632	305	48.3%
Specialists and Staff	937	375	40.0%
Graduate Students	961	282	29.3%
NatSci Undergraduates	5535	835	15.1%
Other Undergraduates (includes Lyman Briggs)	5617	545	9.7%
TOTAL	13682	2342	17.1%
<i>"Completed" includes partials, defined as respondents having progressed through at least the first section of substantive items about the College of Natural Science.</i>			
<i>On all tables in this report, except where post-doc responses are listed separately, they are included with Staff / Specialist responses.</i>			

SECTION II. PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

This section provides a general breakdown of the demographic characteristics of the respondents who responded to the 2019 NatSci Organizational Climate Survey, based on their answers to demographic questions in the questionnaire.

In Table 1, respondents of each type are described in terms of the distribution of gender, sexual orientation, and race or ethnicity – each as self-identified by the respondents themselves. The table indicates that:

- About two-thirds (63 to 66 percent) of the staff, specialist, and undergraduate students who responded to the demographics section of the questionnaire identified themselves as female. By contrast, 47 percent of the graduate students and 65 percent of the faculty identified themselves as male.
- Over four-fifths (81 to 96 percent) of all respondent types identified themselves as heterosexual or straight. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual identities were reported most commonly (approximately 15 to 17 percent of those who identified their orientation) among the graduate and undergraduate student respondents.
- About three-fourths (73 percent) of respondents identified themselves as White or Caucasian, while another 17 percent indicated that they are Asian, Pacific Islander, or Native Hawaiian. Respondents identifying as Black or African American, or Hispanic or Latinx, comprised about seven percent of the full sample apiece.

Next, Table 2 summarizes each of the five respondent types in terms of the distribution of United States citizenship status and religious background – each as self-identified by the respondents. The table indicates that:

- About 80 percent of the full sample (including 85 to 88 percent of undergraduates) indicated that they are U.S. born citizens. Faculty were the most likely to answer that they are naturalized citizens or permanent residents, while graduate students were more likely than other groups to indicate they are on international visas.
- The most prevalent religious background reported by respondents was “Christian,” with about half of those who answered the question selecting this option. Another 22 percent reported being Agnostic, and 21 percent reported being Atheist.

Finally, Table 3 breaks down the sample in terms of military service and disabilities or other conditions – as reported by the respondents. The table indicates that:

- Very few (one percent) respondents reported having ever served in the U.S. Armed Forces, Military Reserves, or National Guard.
- About one third (33 percent) of respondents reported that at least one disability or condition impacts their learning, working, or living activities. The most prevalent conditions reported were mental health or psychological conditions (21 percent of respondents) and Attention Deficit / Hyperactivity Disorder (7 percent of respondents). These conditions were reported much more commonly by graduate and undergraduate students than by faculty or Staff.

Table 1. Profile of Respondents by Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation, and Race / Ethnicity

Demographics	Faculty		Staff / Specialists		Graduate Students		NatSci Undergrads		Other Undergrads		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Gender Identity												
Male	168	65%	116	37%	113	47%	209	33%	132	33%	738	40%
Female	91	35%	196	63%	120	50%	408	65%	267	66%	1082	59%
Another identity	1	<1%	1	<1%	6	3%	7	1%	7	2%	22	1%
<i>Decline / No answer</i>	45		62		43		211		139		500	
Sexual Orientation												
Heterosexual / Straight	247	96%	289	93%	189	81%	522	85%	339	85%	1586	87%
Bisexual	1	<1%	7	2%	25	11%	61	10%	27	7%	121	7%
Gay / Lesbian	5	2%	8	3%	10	4%	15	2%	14	3%	52	3%
Another orientation	4	2%	7	2%	8	3%	19	3%	21	5%	59	3%
<i>Decline / No answer</i>	48		64		50		218		144		524	523
Race / Ethnicity^a												
White / Caucasian	200	82%	246	79%	153	65%	465	75%	271	67%	1335	73%
Asian	30	12%	38	12%	55	23%	93	15%	88	22%	304	17%
Black / African American	4	2%	12	4%	12	5%	64	10%	35	9%	127	7%
Hispanic / Latinx	11	5%	25	8%	16	7%	38	6%	31	8%	121	7%
Middle Eastern / North African	4	2%	5	2%	4	2%	15	2%	4	1%	32	2%
American Indian / Alaska Native	1	<1%	0	0%	3	1%	12	2%	9	2%	25	1%
Another Identity	3	1%	4	1%	2	1%	5	1%	4	1%	18	1%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	0	0%	1	<1%	0	0%	5	1%	3	1%	9	1%
<i>Decline / No answer</i>	61		62		47		213		142		525	
<i>Multiple Races / Ethnicities</i>	37	15%	51	16%	63	27%	134	22%	115	29%	400	22%
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	305		375		282		835		545		2342	

^a Because respondents could select multiple categories, the percentages for racial and ethnic categories will not sum to 100.

Table 2. Profile of Respondents by U.S. Citizenship and Religious Background

Demographics	Faculty		Staff / Specialists		Graduate Students		NatSci Undergrads		Other Undergrads		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Citizenship												
U.S. Born Citizen	174	67%	239	75%	162	68%	554	88%	345	85%	1474	80%
Naturalized Citizen	39	15%	8	3%	5	2%	17	3%	18	4%	87	5%
Dual Citizenship	14	5%	5	2%	2	1%	5	1%	12	3%	38	2%
Permanent Resident	22	8%	14	4%	3	1%	14	2%	9	2%	62	3%
International visa	10	4%	54	17%	66	28%	37	6%	23	6%	190	10%
Decline / No answer	46		55		44		208		138		491	
Religious Background												
Christian	81	38%	136	50%	68	35%	293	56%	189	55%	767	50%
Agnostic	53	25%	51	19%	61	31%	106	20%	70	20%	341	22%
Atheist	68	32%	54	20%	58	30%	91	17%	48	14%	319	21%
Spiritual, non-religious	12	6%	29	11%	19	10%	43	8%	42	12%	145	9%
Buddhist	6	3%	10	4%	7	4%	12	2%	3	9%	44	3%
Hindu	2	1%	11	4%	8	4%	9	2%	13	4%	43	3%
Muslim	2	1%	3	1%	7	4%	17	3%	8	2%	37	2%
Jewish	11	5%	2	1%	4	2%	5	1%	11	3%	33	2%
Unitarian / Universalist	6	3%	6	2%	2	1%	5	1%	3	1%	22	1%
Humanist	4	2%	4	1%	6	3%	0	0%	6	2%	20	1%
Other	3	1%	6	2%	5	3%	25	5%	10	3%	49	3%
<i>Decline / No Answer</i>	<i>96</i>		<i>109</i>		<i>91</i>		<i>324</i>		<i>204</i>		<i>824</i>	
<i>Multiple Religious Backgrounds</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>13%</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>20%</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>14%</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>14%</i>	<i>219</i>	<i>14%</i>
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	303		365		282		836		545		2331	

^a Because respondents could select multiple categories, the percentages for racial and ethnic categories will not sum to 100.

Table 3. Profile of Respondents by Military Service and Disabilities

Demographics	Faculty		Staff / Specialists		Graduate Students		NatSci Undergrads		Other Undergrads		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Military Service												
Yes	2	1%	6	2%	1	<1%	4	1%	3	1%	16	1%
No	260	99%	309	98%	237	>99%	620	99%	401	99%	1827	99%
Decline / No answer	46		55		44		208		138		491	
Disabilities / Conditions												
Brain injury	2	1%	4	1%	0	0%	5	1%	4	1%	15	1%
ADHD	5	2%	17	6%	13	6%	47	8%	39	11%	121	7%
Asperger's / Autism	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%	6	1%	5	1%	15	1%
Low vision / blind	1	<1%	1	<1%	0	0%	16	3%	11	3%	29	2%
Hard hearing / deaf	3	1%	3	1%	0	0%	6	1%	7	2%	19	1%
Learning disability	3	1%	8	3%	1	<1%	13	2%	6	2%	31	2%
Medical condition	18	8%	20	7%	8	4%	25	4%	11	3%	82	5%
Mental / psychological	14	6%	29	11%	59	27%	150	27%	89	24%	341	21%
Physical / mobility (affects walking)	4	2%	8	3%	2	1%	6	1%	5	1%	25	2%
Physical / mobility (does not affect walking)	2	1%	4	1%	3	1%	3	1%	3	1%	15	1%
Speech / communication	1	<1%	1	<1%	1	<1%	8	1%	3	1%	14	1%
Other	7	3%	4	1%	6	3%	10	2%	7	2%	34	2%
None of the above	195	82%	201	73%	144	67%	343	61%	233	64%	1116	67%
<i>Decline / no answer</i>	<i>61</i>		<i>62</i>		<i>47</i>		<i>213</i>		<i>142</i>		<i>525</i>	
<i>At least one disability / condition</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>18%</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>27%</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>33%</i>	<i>220</i>	<i>39%</i>	<i>132</i>	<i>36%</i>	<i>542</i>	<i>33%</i>
<i>Multiple disabilities / conditions</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>6%</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>7%</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>8%</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>9%</i>
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	303		365		282		836		545		2331	

^a Because respondents could select multiple categories, the percentages for racial and ethnic categories will not sum to 100.

SECTION III. GENERAL ASSESSMENTS OF NATSCI

The survey instrument included four sets of items asking respondents to assess their general attitudes toward the College of Natural Science. These items covered the following topics:

- Satisfaction and Comfort,
- Describing NatSci,
- Sense of Belonging, and
- Potential to Leave NatSci.

The distribution of responses to each of these items are summarized in the following subsections.

Satisfaction and Comfort

To measure their feelings toward the College of Natural Science overall, respondents were asked:

- *How satisfied are you with your experiences as a(n) [employee / student] in the College of Natural Science?*
- *Overall, how comfortable are you with the climate in the College?*

The instrument also included a note that “by ‘climate’ we mean ‘current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of employees and students concerning the access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and potential.’ (from Rankin 2001).” Responses to these items could be registered on a seven-point scale ranging from “Very Dissatisfied / Uncomfortable” to “Very Satisfied / Comfortable.” Table 4 summarizes the results of these items by respondent type.

Table 4. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Respondent Type

Items	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads	Other Undergrads	Total
Satisfaction						
Total Satisfaction ^a	78%	79%	79%	85%	77%	80%
Total Dissatisfaction ^b	15%	11%	14%	7%	9%	10%
Mean Score ^c	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.10	3.95	4.00
Comfort						
Total Comfortable ^a	70%	80%	68%	79%	82%	77%
Total Uncomfortable ^b	20%	12%	21%	9%	7%	12%
Mean Score ^c	3.75	4.09	3.69	4.03	4.17	3.99
<i>Number of responses</i>	302	371	279	826	536	2314

^a Total Satisfaction and Total Comfortable refer to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER “Somewhat Satisfied / Comfortable” OR “Very Satisfied / Comfortable.” Higher percentages correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

^b Total Dissatisfaction and Total Uncomfortable refer to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER “Somewhat Dissatisfied / Uncomfortable” OR “Very Dissatisfied / Uncomfortable.” Higher percentages correspond to *less* favorable attitudes.

^c Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where 1 = “Very Dissatisfied / Uncomfortable” and 5 = “Very Satisfied / Comfortable.” Higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

Table 4 indicates generally favorable attitudes toward the college overall. Specifically:

- Four-fifths (80 percent) of respondents reported being satisfied with their experience in the College, and slightly fewer than that (77 percent) reported being comfortable with the organizational climate. Nevertheless, a nontrivial minority reported being dissatisfied (10 percent of respondents) and/or uncomfortable (12 percent).
- The most favorable responses were given by undergraduate students and staff or specialists, while faculty and graduate students were the most likely to report feeling uncomfortable with the organizational climate (20 and 21 percent of these groups, respectively).

Next, Table 5 summarizes the reported satisfaction and comfort level of respondents by their race or ethnicity, gender identity, and LGBT status. The results indicate that:

- Black or African American respondents reported the lowest level of satisfaction (74 percent) and comfort (67 percent).
- Female-identifying respondents reported slightly lower levels of satisfaction and comfort than did male-identifying respondents.
- LGBT respondents reported slightly lower levels of satisfaction and comfort than did non-LGBT respondents.

Table 5. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity

Items	Race / Ethnicity					Gender Identity		LGBT	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African American	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Satisfaction									
Total Satisfaction ^a	83%	79%	74%	75%	85%	83%	81%	81%	79%
Total Dissatisfaction ^b	9%	7%	15%	12%	12%	9%	11%	10%	12%
Mean Score ^c	4.07	4.02	3.81	3.93	4.00	4.10	3.98	4.01	3.95
Comfort									
Total Comfortable ^a	81%	78%	67%	73%	72%	81%	78%	78%	72%
Total Uncomfortable ^b	11%	9%	20%	18%	20%	10%	13%	12%	16%
Mean Score ^c	4.07	4.00	3.78	3.93	3.81	4.12	3.97	4.01	3.82
<i>Number of responses</i>	1325	305	122	120	74	730	1073	2082	232

^a Total Satisfaction and Total Comfortable refer to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Satisfied / Comfortable" OR "Very Satisfied / Comfortable." Higher percentages correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

^b Total Dissatisfaction and Total Uncomfortable refer to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Dissatisfied / Uncomfortable" OR "Very Dissatisfied / Uncomfortable." Higher percentages correspond to *less* favorable attitudes.

^c Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where 1 = "Very Dissatisfied / Uncomfortable" and 5 = "Very Satisfied / Comfortable." Higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

Table 6 summarizes the reported satisfaction and comfort level of faculty, staff, and specialist respondents by their employee role and time in current position. The results indicate that:

- Tenure-stream faculty were more likely than other employees to report being dissatisfied (15 percent) or uncomfortable with the organizational climate (22 percent).
- Employees who have been in their current position for over 20 years were the most likely to report being dissatisfied with their experience (17 percent), while those who have been in their position for 4-10 years were the most likely to report feeling uncomfortable with the climate (20 percent).
- Nevertheless, overall reported satisfaction and comfort were much more favorable than unfavorable among all employee groups.

Table 6. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Employee Role and Time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Current Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuing)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	> 20 Years
Satisfaction										
Total Satisfaction ^a	78%	81%	89%	80%	77%	81%	79%	80%	83%	75%
Total Dissatisfaction ^b	15%	12%	11%	12%	11%	8%	12%	11%	9%	17%
Mean Score ^c	3.89	4.04	4.09	3.96	4.02	4.07	4.02	3.97	4.10	3.92
Comfort										
Total Comfortable ^a	67%	76%	82%	80%	81%	81%	81%	74%	72%	75%
Total Uncomfortable ^b	22%	13%	13%	12%	11%	13%	11%	20%	16%	13%
Mean Score ^c	3.69	3.98	3.98	3.88	4.13	4.09	4.09	3.80	3.90	3.97
<i>Number of responses</i>	218	57	45	25	211	109	289	201	97	72

^a Total Satisfaction and Total Comfortable refer to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Satisfied / Comfortable" OR "Very Satisfied / Comfortable." Higher percentages correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

^b Total Dissatisfaction and Total Uncomfortable refer to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Dissatisfied / Uncomfortable" OR "Very Dissatisfied / Uncomfortable." Higher percentages correspond to *less* favorable attitudes.

^c Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where 1 = "Very Dissatisfied / Uncomfortable" and 5 = "Very Satisfied / Comfortable." Higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

Table 7 breaks down reported satisfaction and comfort by unit, among NatSci employees. The results indicate that although the responses within each unit were more favorable than unfavorable, reported satisfaction and comfort were *highest* within FRIB / NSCL and Computational Math / Science / Engineering and *lowest* within Neuroscience, Plant Biology NatSci, and Integrative Biology.

Table 7. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Unit

Items	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics-Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
Satisfaction																
Total Satisfaction ^a	81%	94%	73%	91%	59%	91%	70%	81%	79%	86%	76%	69%	88%	85%	69%	73%
Total Dissatisfaction ^b	5%	6%	18%	0%	34%	4%	21%	6%	15%	9%	15%	31%	8%	15%	21%	20%
Mean Score ^c	4.15	4.31	3.73	4.36	3.45	4.43	3.63	4.11	3.87	4.07	3.82	3.38	4.27	4.00	3.81	3.80
Comfort																
Total Comfortable ^a	78%	81%	68%	90%	52%	92%	74%	88%	68%	86%	81%	54%	82%	73%	69%	67%
Total Uncomfortable ^b	8%	19%	25%	5%	28%	4%	21%	2%	22%	9%	9%	38%	9%	18%	29%	26%
Mean Score ^c	4.14	4.00	3.67	4.19	3.48	4.25	3.74	4.23	3.68	4.24	4.00	2.85	4.11	3.91	3.69	3.77
<i>Number of responses</i>	79	16	57	22	29	24	43	48	52	58	33	13	74	33	42	44
^a Total Satisfaction and Total Comfortable refer to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Satisfied / Comfortable" OR "Very Satisfied / Comfortable." Higher percentages correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes. ^b Total Dissatisfaction and Total Uncomfortable refer to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Dissatisfied / Uncomfortable" OR "Very Dissatisfied / Uncomfortable." Higher percentages correspond to <i>less</i> favorable attitudes. ^c Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where 1 = "Very Dissatisfied / Uncomfortable" and 5 = "Very Satisfied / Comfortable." Higher scores correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes. <i>Bold italicized text</i> indicates that mean scores are significantly different across groups, at the p < .05 level.																

Describing NatSci

In order to measure how they perceive the climate within the College of Natural Science, respondents were given a list (in an order randomized for each respondent) of adjective pairs and asked to select a number from 1 to 7 that represents how they would rate the climate based on their direct experiences. The list of adjectives is displayed in Table 8, along with the mean score given by each respondent type for each item. For example, for the “Hostile – Friendly” item, a value of 1 would represent “very hostile” and a value of 7 would represent “very friendly.” Each item is coded such that higher values correspond to more favorable attitudes, and the items are listed in the table in descending order from the most favorable mean score to the least favorable mean score.

The table indicates that:

- Overall, the mean scores given to the NatSci organizational climate were more favorable than unfavorable, with each being greater than 4.00 on the seven-point scale. However, these means mostly fell near the middle of the scale – ranging only between 4.43 and 5.76 – which likely indicates mixed feelings and room for improvement.
- Respondents gave the most favorable mean responses on items describing the NatSci climate as non-homophobic, non-racist, and friendly. The least favorable mean responses were on the “Collaborative – Individualistic” and “Cooperative – Competitive” and “Improving – Regressing” items. It should be noted, however, that “Collaborative” and “Cooperative” are not unambiguously more favorable conditions than “Individualistic” and “Competitive.”

Table 8. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Respondent Type

Items	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads	Other Undergrads	Total
Non-homophobic (7) – Homophobic (1)	5.39	5.76	5.38	5.87	5.99	5.76
Non-racist (7) – Racist (1)	5.25	5.63	4.94	5.77	5.92	5.62
Friendly (7) – Hostile (1)	5.07	5.61	5.38	5.57	5.56	5.49
Respectful (7) – Disrespectful (1)	4.99	5.49	5.24	5.57	5.65	5.46
Non-ageist (7) – Ageist (1)	4.87	5.30	5.07	5.49	5.81	5.40
Non-sexist (7) – Sexist (1)	4.73	5.17	4.64	5.63	5.77	5.36
Welcoming (7) – Unwelcoming (1)	5.08	5.52	5.25	5.37	5.32	5.33
Supportive (7) – Unsupportive (1)	4.85	5.31	4.97	5.28	5.24	5.18
Diverse (7) – Homogeneous (1)	4.00	4.77	4.15	5.11	5.01	4.77
Collaborative (7) – Individualistic (1)	4.46	5.02	4.70	4.60	4.56	4.65
Cooperative (7) – Competitive (1)	4.48	5.06	4.90	4.34	4.66	4.61
Improving (7) – Regressing (1)	4.51	4.30	4.40	4.49	4.38	4.43
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.81</i>	<i>5.26</i>	<i>4.92</i>	<i>5.25</i>	<i>5.32</i>	<i>5.17</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>302</i>	<i>371</i>	<i>279</i>	<i>826</i>	<i>536</i>	<i>2314</i>

Item scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes. In this table, the label defined as “favorable” for the purpose of calculating this score is listed first within each pair of adjectives.

Next, Table 9 summarizes the results of the NatSci Climate Descriptors items by the respondents' race or ethnicity, gender identity, and LGBT status. The table indicates that:

- Black or African American respondents gave the lowest mean scores on average (4.80 across all items), including rating the climate as more racist (mean score of 4.78) compared to other racial and ethnic groups.
- Female-identifying respondents gave slightly lower mean scores (5.13 average across all items) than did male-identifying respondents (5.32), including rating the climate as more sexist (5.18 score among females, compared to 5.64 among males).
- LGBT respondents gave slightly lower mean scores (4.99 average across all items) than did non-LGBT respondents (5.19), including rating the climate as more homophobic (5.50 score among LGBT respondents, compared to 5.79 among non-LGBT).

Table 9. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity

Items	Race / Ethnicity					Gender Identity		LGBT	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African American	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Non-homophobic (7) – Homophobic (1)	5.89	5.70	5.24	5.71	5.90	5.97	5.71	5.79	5.50
Non-racist (7) – Racist (1)	5.77	5.59	4.78	5.39	5.53	5.87	5.51	5.65	5.34
Friendly (7) – Hostile (1)	5.60	5.58	5.20	5.65	5.16	5.68	5.46	5.50	5.34
Respectful (7) – Disrespectful (1)	5.54	5.55	5.28	5.68	5.22	5.59	5.45	5.47	5.38
Non-ageist (7) – Ageist (1)	5.46	5.57	5.12	5.48	5.22	5.56	5.36	5.42	5.27
Non-sexist (7) – Sexist (1)	5.38	5.56	5.02	5.18	5.32	5.64	5.18	5.40	4.98
Welcoming (7) – Unwelcoming (1)	5.43	5.40	4.85	5.36	5.11	5.51	5.30	5.35	5.14
Supportive (7) – Unsupportive (1)	5.25	5.34	4.90	5.36	4.99	5.31	5.17	5.19	5.14
Diverse (7) – Homogeneous (1)	4.73	5.15	4.12	4.58	4.82	4.82	4.70	4.81	4.40
Collaborative (7) – Individualistic (1)	4.68	4.66	4.55	4.69	4.32	4.68	4.67	4.68	4.41
Cooperative (7) – Competitive (1)	4.63	4.82	4.34	4.78	4.48	4.81	4.55	4.63	4.42
Improving (7) – Regressing (1)	4.60	4.13	4.13	4.24	4.38	4.44	4.47	4.41	4.61
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.25</i>	<i>5.26</i>	<i>4.80</i>	<i>5.17</i>	<i>5.04</i>	<i>5.32</i>	<i>5.13</i>	<i>5.19</i>	<i>4.99</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>1325</i>	<i>305</i>	<i>122</i>	<i>120</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>730</i>	<i>1073</i>	<i>2082</i>	<i>232</i>

Item scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes. In this table, the label defined as "favorable" for the purpose of calculating this score is listed first within each pair of adjectives.

Table 10 summarizes the results of the NatSci Climate Descriptors items by the respondents' role and time in current position, among those who are NatSci employees. The table indicates that:

- Staff rated the climate with higher scores (5.33 on average across all items) than did other employee groups, while tenure-stream faculty and continuing specialists rated the climate with lower scores (4.75 and 4.74, respectively, on average).

- Employees who have been in their position for between 4 and 20 years rated the climate with lower scores (4.94 to 4.96 on average) compared to those who are newer in their role or have been in their position for over 20 years (5.20 and 5.18, respectively, on average).
- Nevertheless, mean scores on individual items ranged between 3.82 and 5.97 among all employment groups, which indicates mixed to moderately favorable perceptions in general.

Table 10. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Employee Role and Time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Current Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuing)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	> 20 Years
Non-homophobic (7) – Homophobic (1)	5.34	5.57	5.25	5.75	5.79	5.85	5.77	5.52	5.42	5.68
Non-racist (7) – Racist (1)	5.19	5.45	5.09	5.50	5.79	5.46	5.64	5.37	5.40	5.48
Friendly (7) – Hostile (1)	5.02	5.51	5.18	5.38	5.61	5.68	5.51	5.23	5.31	5.52
Respectful (7) – Disrespectful (1)	4.91	5.32	5.02	5.44	5.51	5.61	5.44	5.04	5.16	5.51
Non-ageist (7) – Ageist (1)	4.86	4.91	4.57	5.46	5.31	5.38	5.37	4.92	4.93	5.19
Non-sexist (7) – Sexist (1)	4.68	5.04	4.18	4.96	5.25	5.24	5.13	4.65	4.99	5.27
Welcoming (7) – Unwelcoming (1)	5.02	5.32	5.09	5.33	5.62	5.54	5.36	5.22	5.20	5.57
Supportive (7) – Unsupportive (1)	4.80	5.21	4.80	5.04	5.34	5.37	5.27	5.00	4.91	5.25
Diverse (7) – Homogeneous (1)	3.94	4.35	3.82	4.48	4.92	4.68	4.49	4.25	4.53	4.52
Collaborative (7) – Individualistic (1)	4.35	4.91	4.53	4.33	5.10	5.09	4.91	4.69	4.59	4.93
Cooperative (7) – Competitive (1)	4.35	4.81	4.76	4.92	5.10	5.08	4.96	4.72	4.59	4.91
Improving (7) – Regressing (1)	4.53	4.36	4.56	4.54	4.40	4.07	4.39	4.52	4.40	4.36
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.75</i>	<i>5.07</i>	<i>4.74</i>	<i>5.12</i>	<i>5.33</i>	<i>5.25</i>	<i>5.20</i>	<i>4.94</i>	<i>4.96</i>	<i>5.18</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>218</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>211</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>289</i>	<i>201</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>72</i>

Item scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes. In this table, the label defined as “favorable” for the purpose of calculating this score is listed first within each pair of adjectives.

Table 11, which breaks down the responses of NatSci employees by unit, indicates that:

- The highest scores were given by respondents in the Plant Research Lab (5.38 average across all items) and Biomedical Lab Diagnostics (5.21 on average).
- The lowest scores were given by respondents within Mathematics (4.65 average across all items) and Earth and Environmental Science (4.66 on average).
- Nevertheless, mean scores on individual items ranged between 3.57 and 5.95 among all units, which indicates mixed to moderately favorable perceptions in general.

Table 11. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Employee Unit

Items	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics-Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
Non-homophobic (7) – Homophobic (1)	5.57	5.75	5.38	5.52	5.41	5.70	5.73	5.72	5.14	5.62	5.47	5.15	5.63	5.26	5.50	5.95
Non-racist (7) – Racist (1)	5.60	5.38	5.23	5.50	5.41	5.71	5.38	5.43	5.22	5.43	5.30	5.23	5.56	5.63	5.05	5.74
Friendly (7) – Hostile (1)	5.53	5.50	4.89	5.41	5.03	5.58	5.19	5.51	4.69	5.61	5.60	4.62	5.56	5.38	5.05	5.61
Respectful (7) – Disrespectful (1)	5.43	5.50	4.73	5.55	4.86	5.75	5.07	5.53	4.60	5.45	5.23	4.23	5.59	5.19	5.12	5.55
Non-ageist (7) – Ageist (1)	5.21	5.00	5.02	5.48	4.83	5.21	4.63	5.22	4.63	5.25	5.13	4.62	5.31	5.10	4.82	5.40
Non-sexist (7) – Sexist (1)	5.06	4.81	4.79	5.24	5.10	5.29	4.59	5.04	4.53	4.77	4.47	4.38	5.18	5.16	4.58	5.40
Welcoming (7) – Unwelcoming (1)	5.43	5.50	4.98	5.27	4.62	5.46	5.17	5.43	4.82	5.51	5.42	4.85	5.52	5.63	4.93	5.73
Supportive (7) – Unsupportive (1)	5.23	5.13	4.40	5.55	4.34	5.21	4.71	5.26	4.84	5.33	5.27	4.46	5.14	5.45	5.10	5.32
Diverse (7) – Homogeneous (1)	4.44	4.75	4.32	4.62	4.00	4.33	3.57	3.89	4.53	4.72	4.77	4.46	4.11	4.38	4.24	5.36
Collaborative (7) – Individualistic (1)	5.11	4.94	4.64	4.76	3.83	4.70	4.50	4.55	4.00	5.04	4.63	4.62	4.81	4.78	4.83	5.25
Cooperative (7) – Competitive (1)	4.86	5.38	4.61	5.14	4.17	4.46	4.64	4.66	4.43	4.96	5.10	5.08	4.81	5.19	4.53	4.86
Improving (7) – Regressing (1)	4.37	4.93	3.78	4.47	4.26	4.74	4.79	4.87	4.42	4.44	4.66	4.31	4.50	4.48	4.33	4.40
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.16</i>	<i>5.21</i>	<i>4.74</i>	<i>5.27</i>	<i>4.66</i>	<i>5.17</i>	<i>4.83</i>	<i>5.09</i>	<i>4.65</i>	<i>5.18</i>	<i>5.09</i>	<i>4.67</i>	<i>5.14</i>	<i>5.15</i>	<i>4.87</i>	<i>5.38</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>44</i>

Item scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes. In this table, the label defined as “favorable” for the purpose of calculating this score is listed first within each pair of adjectives.

Sense of Belonging

In order to measure respondents' sense of belonging within the college, the instrument first presented them with a list (in an order randomized for each respondent) of statements and asked them to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement on a seven-point scale. Some statements were only applicable to certain types of respondents and therefore were only displayed to those types.

The statements in this battery of items were as follows:

- "There are enough faculty [/ staff] I identify with"
- "I have similar opportunities for success as other [faculty / students / employees]"
- "My personal identities are valued in the [work environment / classroom / research environment]"
- "Faculty are concerned about my welfare" (*displayed to students only*)
- "Advisors are concerned about my welfare" (*displayed to students only*)
- "Faculty negatively prejudice me" (*displayed to students only*)
- "I have faculty role models" (*displayed to students only*)

The results of these items are shown in Table 12. Each item is coded such that higher values correspond to more favorable attitudes, and the items are listed in the table in descending order from the most favorable mean score (on the seven-point scale) to the least favorable mean score.

Table 12. Summary of Responses to Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items

Items	Total Agreement	Total Disagreement	Mean Score
Advisors are concerned about my welfare	80%	14%	5.51
I have similar opportunities for success as other [people]	78%	15%	5.42
Faculty negatively prejudice me (<i>reverse coded</i>)	19%	69%	5.18
Faculty are concerned about my welfare	72%	17%	5.07
I have faculty role models	67%	18%	5.06
My personal identities are valued	66%	17%	5.01
There are enough faculty / staff I identify with	66%	25%	4.85
<i>AVERAGE</i>			<i>5.16</i>
^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded item ("Faculty negatively prejudice me"), 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.			

Overall, the table reflects generally favorable attitudes, as respondents gave more favorable than unfavorable responses to all seven items. In particular, about four-fifths (80 percent) of students agreed that advisors are concerned about their welfare, and 78 percent of respondents agreed that they have similar opportunities for success as other people. The least favorable responses were to the item, "there are enough faculty / staff I identify with," as one-fourth (25 percent) of respondents disagreed with that statement.

Table 13, which breaks down these results by employee type, indicates that:

- Graduate students agreed more strongly than undergraduates that advisors and faculty are concerned about their welfare, and that they have faculty role models. However, graduate students were also more likely to indicate that faculty negatively prejudice them and less likely to indicate that there are enough faculty they identify with.

- Faculty respondents agreed less than other groups that they have similar opportunities for success as other people like them, that their personal identities are valued within the college.

Table 13. Mean Response to Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Respondent Type

Items	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads	Other Undergrads
Advisors are concerned about my welfare	-	-	5.65	5.47	5.48
I have similar opportunities for success as other [people]	5.09	5.27	5.27	5.50	5.70
Faculty negatively prejudice me (<i>reverse coded</i>)	-	-	4.81	5.20	5.36
Faculty are concerned about my welfare	-	-	5.21	5.04	5.05
I have faculty role models	-	-	5.52	5.00	4.88
My personal identities are valued	4.81	5.20	5.00	4.96	5.07
There are enough faculty / staff I identify with	4.91	5.13	4.49	4.88	4.76
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.94</i>	<i>5.20</i>	<i>5.14</i>	<i>5.15</i>	<i>5.19</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>280</i>	<i>320</i>	<i>242</i>	<i>680</i>	<i>419</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded item ("Faculty negatively prejudice me"), 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 14 breaks down the results to these items by the respondents' race, gender identity, and LGBT status. The results indicate that:

- Black or African American respondents expressed the least favorable attitudes on this set of items (mean score of 4.42 on average across all items) while white respondents expressed the most favorable attitudes (mean score of 5.31).
- Male-identifying respondents gave more favorable answers than did female-identifying respondents both overall (mean score of 5.43 compared to 5.09) and on each of the seven individual items.
- Non-LGBT respondents gave more favorable answers than did LGBT-identifying respondents overall on average (mean score of 5.16 compared to 5.10), but less favorable answers on four of the seven individual items. The overall difference in mean scores was driven most heavily by LGBT respondents' much less favorable response to the item, "There are enough faculty / staff I identify with."

Table 14. Mean Response to Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Race and Gender

Items	Race / Ethnicity					Gender Identity		LGBT	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Advisors are concerned about my welfare	5.60	5.39	5.11	5.82	5.67	5.71	5.42	5.50	5.60
I have similar opportunities for success as others	5.59	5.41	4.73	5.02	5.11	5.59	5.35	5.41	5.49
Faculty negatively prejudge me (<i>reverse coded</i>)	5.38	5.02	4.78	4.81	5.23	5.30	5.16	5.17	5.23
Faculty are concerned about my welfare	5.12	5.11	4.63	5.09	5.27	5.28	4.95	5.08	5.06
I have faculty role models	5.22	5.02	4.30	5.11	5.15	5.13	5.07	5.03	5.21
My personal identities are valued	5.14	5.18	4.32	4.71	4.69	5.19	4.99	5.04	4.75
There are enough faculty / staff I identify with	5.12	4.77	3.04	4.19	4.20	5.80	4.71	4.92	4.36
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.31</i>	<i>5.13</i>	<i>4.42</i>	<i>4.96</i>	<i>5.05</i>	<i>5.43</i>	<i>5.09</i>	<i>5.16</i>	<i>5.10</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>1296</i>	<i>291</i>	<i>120</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>71</i>	<i>713</i>	<i>1044</i>	<i>1763</i>	<i>228</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded item ("Faculty negatively prejudge me"), 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Below, Table 15 summarizes the results of the three items that were asked to employee respondents, by the respondents' role and time in their current position.

Table 15. Mean Response to Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Employee Role and time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Current Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuing)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	>20 Years
I have similar opportunities for success as others	5.15	4.82	5.02	4.90	5.37	5.34	5.24	5.12	5.14	5.38
My personal identities are valued	4.70	5.36	4.58	5.21	5.35	5.19	5.07	4.98	5.10	5.19
There are enough faculty / staff I identify with	4.95	4.90	4.77	5.32	5.21	5.03	4.92	5.12	5.19	5.07
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.93</i>	<i>5.03</i>	<i>4.79</i>	<i>5.14</i>	<i>5.31</i>	<i>5.19</i>	<i>5.08</i>	<i>5.07</i>	<i>5.14</i>	<i>5.21</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>187</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>174</i>	<i>189</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>147</i>

Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree."

Table 15 indicates that:

- Staff and post-docs responded most favorably to these items, whereas continuing specialists and tenure-stream faculty gave the least favorable responses.
- The mean response to these items was more favorable among respondents who had spent more time in their current position compared to those who had spent less time in their position.
- Nevertheless, responses by all employee groups were more favorable than unfavorable, as the mean score for each individual item by each group was greater than 4.00 out of 7.00.

Below, Table 16 summarizes the mean response to these items by employee unit, for those respondents who are employed by NatSci. The table indicates that:

- The most favorable responses were given by respondents who work within Computational Math / Science / Engineering (mean score of 5.72), Kellogg Biological Station (mean score of 5.41), and FRIB / NSCL (mean score of 5.38).
- The least favorable responses were given by respondents in Neuroscience (mean score of 4.11), Chemistry (mean score of 4.63), Earth and Environmental Science (mean score of 4.74).

Next, the instrument included another set of items measuring sense of belonging, by asking respondents to indicate how often they feel:

- "Valued as an individual in the College of Natural Science"
- "Valued by other employees in the College of Natural Science" (*displayed to employees only*)
- "They belong in the College of Natural Science"
- "Others value their opinions in the College of Natural Science"
- "Safe within the College of Natural Science"
- "Valued by your faculty mentor [and committee members]" (*displayed to post-docs and graduate students only*)
- "Valued by advisors in the NatSci" (*displayed to students only*)
- "Valued by instructors in the classroom" (*displayed to students only*)
- "Valued by [other] students in the classroom"

The question about feeling valued by faculty mentors was displayed only to students, and only graduate students received the additional language about their committee members. Responses could be given on a five-point scale where 1 = "Never," 2 = "Rarely," 3 = "Sometimes," 4 = "Very Often," and 5 = "Always." Because all of the items asked about the frequency of feeling favorable attitudes, higher values on this five-point scale will correspond to greater favorability on these items.

Table 16. Mean Response to Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Unit

Items	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics-Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
I have similar opportunities for success as others	5.43	5.07	4.76	5.53	4.64	5.73	5.03	5.59	4.89	5.15	5.21	3.92	5.26	5.48	5.03	5.44
My personal identities are valued	5.24	5.25	4.51	5.69	4.75	5.27	5.05	5.28	4.66	5.15	5.00	3.91	5.04	4.87	4.81	5.24
There are enough faculty / staff I identify with	5.31	5.31	4.61	5.95	4.84	5.14	5.08	5.36	4.73	4.79	5.00	4.50	4.78	5.00	4.94	5.27
<i>AVERAGE</i>	5.33	5.21	4.63	5.72	4.74	5.38	5.05	5.41	4.76	5.03	5.07	4.11	5.03	5.12	4.93	5.32
Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree."																

Table 17 summarizes the responses to the second battery of belonging items, with the items listed in order from the most favorable mean score to the least favorable mean score.

Table 17. Summary of Responses to Sense of Belonging Frequency Items

Items	"Always" or "Very Often"	"Rarely" or "Never"	Mean Score ^a
Safe within the NatSci	83%	3%	4.29
Valued by your faculty mentor and committee members	72%	9%	3.97
You belong in NatSci	66%	10%	3.88
Valued by advisors in NatSci	62%	12%	3.82
Valued by other employees in NatSci	63%	7%	3.74
Valued by other students in the classroom	60%	9%	3.68
Valued by instructors in the classroom	57%	11%	3.66
Others value your opinions in NatSci	52%	12%	3.54
Valued as an individual in NatSci	52%	17%	3.51
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>63%</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>3.79</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1 = "Never" and 5 = "Always."

Table 17 indicates generally favorable attitudes, as a majority (52 percent or more) of respondents answered "always" or "very often" to all nine items. In particular:

- Fourth-fifths (83 percent) of respondents reported feeling safe within NatSci either always or very often, compared to just 3 percent who reported rarely or never feeling safe.
- The least favorable responses were to the items about feeling valued as an individual (mean score of 3.51 out of 5.00) and others valuing your opinion (mean score of 3.54).

Table 18, which breaks down the mean response to these items by respondent type, shows that, on average, staff and undergraduates expressed more favorable attitudes on these items than did faculty and graduate students.

In Table 19, these results are broken down by the race or ethnicity, gender identity, and LGBT status of the respondent. The table indicates that:

- The most favorable responses to these items were given by Asian or Pacific Islander (mean score of 3.93 out of 5.00) and white (mean score of 3.76) respondents.
- The least favorable responses were given by black or African American (mean score of 3.62) and Hispanic or Latinx (mean score of 3.70) respondents.
- Male-identifying respondents gave more favorable responses (mean score of 3.97) than did female-identifying respondents (mean score of 3.78).
- Non-LGBT respondents gave more favorable responses (mean score of 3.80) than did LGBT-identifying respondents (mean score of 3.65).
- Nevertheless, across all racial and gender groups the mean score overall and on each individual item was greater than 3.30 out of 5.00.

Table 18. Mean Response to Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Respondent Type

Items	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads	Other Undergrads
Safe within NatSci	4.21	4.31	3.98	4.31	4.45
Valued by your faculty mentor [and committee members]	-	4.13	3.91	-	-
You belong in NatSci	3.86	3.76	3.67	4.02	-
Valued by advisors in NatSci	-	-	-	3.82	3.79
Valued by other employees in NatSci	3.64	3.82	-	-	-
Valued by [other] students in the classroom	3.98	-	3.86	3.57	3.56
Valued by instructors in the classroom	-	-	3.71	3.59	3.75
Others value your opinions in NatSci	3.42	3.65	3.37	3.59	-
Valued as an individual in NatSci	3.47	3.67	3.35	3.52	-
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>3.76</i>	<i>3.86</i>	<i>3.70</i>	<i>3.81</i>	<i>4.01</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>281</i>	<i>327</i>	<i>246</i>	<i>683</i>	<i>416</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1= "Never" and 5 = "Always."

Table 19. Mean Response to Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Race and Gender

Items	Race / Ethnicity					Gender Identity		LGBT	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African American	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Safe within NatSci	4.33	4.30	4.01	4.17	4.18	4.45	4.20	4.31	4.10
Valued by your faculty mentor [and committee members]	4.04	3.98	3.83	4.21	3.20	4.03	3.95	3.95	4.08
You belong in NatSci	3.93	3.98	3.69	3.55	3.82	4.02	3.81	3.90	3.70
Valued by advisors in NatSci	3.83	3.90	3.66	4.00	4.12	3.95	3.78	3.82	3.79
Valued by other employees in NatSci	3.80	3.83	3.86	3.60	3.20	3.81	3.75	3.75	3.48
Valued by [other] students in the classroom	3.71	3.70	3.37	3.48	3.81	3.85	3.57	3.72	3.45
Valued by instructors in the classroom	3.63	3.80	3.52	3.76	3.78	3.81	3.56	3.68	3.56
Others value your opinions in NatSci	3.56	3.67	3.33	3.47	3.42	3.68	3.46	3.56	3.38
Valued as an individual in NatSci	3.54	3.68	3.41	3.41	3.29	3.67	3.44	3.54	3.32
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>3.88</i>	<i>3.93</i>	<i>3.62</i>	<i>3.70</i>	<i>3.81</i>	<i>3.97</i>	<i>3.78</i>	<i>3.80</i>	<i>3.65</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1= "Never" and 5 = "Always."

Table 20 summarizes the results of these items for respondents employed within NatSci, disaggregated by the employee’s role and time spent in their current position. The table shows that:

- On average, the most favorable responses to these items were given by staff and post-docs.
- Respondents who have spent more time in their current position gave more favorable responses, on average, than did those who are newer to their position.

Table 20. Mean Response to Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Employee Role and Time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Current Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuing)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	>20 Years
Safe within NatSci	4.22	4.24	4.09	4.00	4.34	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.28	4.44
Valued by your faculty mentor	-	-	-	-	-	4.12	4.00	3.54	4.67	4.43
You belong in NatSci	3.86	3.94	3.79	3.62	3.85	3.66	3.62	3.87	4.07	3.85
Valued by other employees in NatSci	3.60	3.61	3.80	4.00	3.88	3.77	3.74	3.72	3.76	3.81
Valued by students in the classroom	3.96	3.98	4.17	4.25	-	4.50	3.96	3.95	4.05	4.08
Others value your opinions in NatSci	3.41	3.44	3.45	3.67	3.66	3.74	3.51	3.50	3.57	3.69
Valued as an individual in NatSci	3.43	3.63	3.49	3.71	3.72	3.64	3.53	3.60	3.64	3.66
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>3.75</i>	<i>3.79</i>	<i>3.77</i>	<i>3.83</i>	<i>3.89</i>	<i>3.88</i>	<i>3.77</i>	<i>3.79</i>	<i>3.90</i>	<i>3.92</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>207</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>184</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>174</i>	<i>187</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>144</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1= “Never” and 5 = “Always.”

Table 21, which breaks down these items by employment unit, shows that:

- The most favorable answers, on average, were given by those in Computational Mathematics, Science, or Engineering (mean score of 4.08 out of 5.00) as well as those in Physics-Astronomy (mean score of 3.97).
- The least favorable answers, on average, were given by employees within Neuroscience (mean score of 3.52) and the Natural Science Dean’s Office (mean score of 3.63).

Table 21. Mean Response to Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Employee Unit

Items	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics-Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
Safe within NatSci	4.34	4.19	4.14	4.42	4.25	4.64	4.05	4.49	4.11	4.39	4.14	3.93	4.46	4.27	4.10	4.30
Valued by your faculty mentor	4.10	-	4.67	4.25	5.00	-	4.00	4.38	5.00	4.08	-	-	4.67	-	4.10	3.33
You belong in NatSci	3.82	3.73	3.66	4.11	3.79	4.18	3.67	3.90	3.83	3.94	3.88	3.50	4.06	3.81	3.73	3.61
Valued by other employees in NatSci	3.71	4.00	3.54	4.00	3.76	3.62	3.58	3.84	3.60	3.83	3.62	3.53	3.84	3.58	3.62	3.76
Valued by students in the classroom	4.00	4.00	4.17	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.95	4.13	4.18	3.88	3.60	3.90	3.91	4.05	3.83	3.86
Others value your opinions in NatSci	3.58	3.50	3.43	3.84	3.52	3.55	3.38	3.73	3.23	3.60	3.41	3.14	3.71	3.52	3.51	3.71
Valued as an individual in NatSci	3.60	3.69	3.33	4.00	3.48	3.68	3.34	3.72	3.24	3.80	3.45	3.07	3.78	3.53	3.46	3.57
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>3.83</i>	<i>3.86</i>	<i>3.71</i>	<i>4.08</i>	<i>3.79</i>	<i>3.95</i>	<i>3.67</i>	<i>3.92</i>	<i>3.71</i>	<i>3.92</i>	<i>3.63</i>	<i>3.52</i>	<i>3.97</i>	<i>3.78</i>	<i>3.74</i>	<i>3.76</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>44</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1= "Never" and 5 = "Always."

Potential to Leave NatSci

Respondents who are employees of the College were also asked, "Has the current climate within the College of Natural Science prompted you to consider leaving your position?" The responses to this item are summarized in Table 22.

Table 22. Percent of Employees who Reported Considering Leaving their Position

	Number Considered Leaving	Percent of Responses
All Employee Respondents	166	30%
Type		
Faculty	90	34%
Specialist / Staff	76	26%
Race / Ethnicity		
White	113	27%
Asian / Pacific Islander	11	19%
Black / African American	3	20%
Hispanic / Latinx	11	38%
Other Identities	9	56%
Gender		
Male	60	23%
Female	87	34%
Role		
Faculty (Tenure)	72	37%
Faculty (Fixed)	13	28%
Specialist (Continuing)	11	28%
Specialist (Fixed)	4	21%
Staff	45	26%
Post-Doc	17	21%
Time in Position		
< 4 Years	42	27%
4-10 Years	62	35%
11-20 Years	25	31%
> 20 Years	29	22%
Unit		
Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	16	25%
Chemistry	17	36%
Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	3	19%
Earth and Environ. Science	8	36%
FRIB / NSCL	5	23%
Integrative Biology	15	44%
Kellogg Biological Station	6	16%
Mathematics	17	43%
Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	13	25%
Natural Science Dean	10	37%
Physics-Astronomy	19	29%
Physiology	8	25%
Plant Biology	13	39%
Plant Research Lab	8	24%

Table 22 indicates that nearly one-third (30 percent) of employee respondents reported that they have considered leaving their position due to the current climate in the College of Natural Science. The proportion is even higher than that among the following groups:

- Faculty, especially tenure-stream (37 percent have considered leaving);
- Hispanic / Latinx employees (38 percent) as well as those who identified themselves as a race or ethnicity other than the four largest groups listed (56 percent);
- Female-identifying respondents (34 percent);
- Employees who have been in their current position for between 4 and 20 years (31 to 35 percent); and
- Those within the following units:
 - Integrative Biology (44 percent);
 - Mathematics (43 percent);
 - Plant Biology (39 percent);
 - Natural Science Dean (37 percent);
 - Chemistry (36 percent); and
 - Earth and Environmental Science (36 percent).

Graduate and undergraduate students within the College were also asked a similar question, which asked, "Has the current climate within the College of Natural Science prompted you to consider leaving Michigan State University before completing your current degree program?"

Table 23, which summarizes the results of the responses to this item, shows that over one-seventh (15 percent) of student respondents reported having considered leaving the university, and that proportion was even higher among:

- Graduate students (28 percent);
- Black or African American students (29 percent); and
- Female-identifying students (16 percent).

Table 23. Percent of Students Who Reported Considering Leaving MSU

	Number Considered Leaving	Percent of Responses
<i>All Student Respondents</i>	<i>122</i>	<i>15%</i>
Type		
Graduate	63	28%
Undergraduate	59	10%
Race / Ethnicity		
White	77	13%
Asian / Pacific Islander	19	15%
Black / African American	20	29%
Hispanic / Latinx	7	14%
Other Identities	5	15%
Gender		
Male	35	12%
Female	80	16%
Level		
Graduate – Doctorate	56	29%
Graduate – Master’s	5	21%
Undergraduate – Y4	17	11%
Undergraduate – Y3	16	10%
Undergraduate – Y2	13	8%
Undergraduate – Y1	13	10%
LGBT Status		
Non-LGBT	102	15%
LGBT	20	16%

SECTION IV. DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Next, the survey instrument contained a battery of items about respondents' perception of diversity and inclusion for various members of the NatSci community. These items covered the following topics:

- Diversity of Faculty,
- Diversity of Staff,
- Diversity of Students,
- Fair Treatment, and
- Climate for Diverse Groups.

The results of these items are summarized in the following subsections.

Diversity of Faculty

To measure their opinions about the level of diversity among faculty in the college, respondents were asked to indicate on a seven-point scale the extent to which they agree or disagree with the following two statements:

- "The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty"
- "Within the college there is an acceptable amount of faculty diversity."

Respondents who answered that they disagreed with the second statement also received a follow-up question asking in which areas (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation), if any, they believe there is not enough faculty diversity.

Table 24, which summarizes the results of these items overall and by respondent type, indicates that:

- Most respondents agreed that the college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty (70 percent) and that there is an acceptable amount of diversity among faculty (59 percent).
- Among those who indicated that faculty diversity is insufficient, the most common areas noted were race or ethnicity (93 percent of those who indicated diversity levels are unacceptable), followed by gender (61 percent) and people with disabilities (56 percent).
- Undergraduate students were the most likely to agree with both statements, while faculty and graduate students were the most likely to disagree.
- Different types of respondents generally identified the same areas as lacking diversity, except that undergraduate students were less likely to indicate that there is an unacceptable level of gender diversity among faculty.

Table 24. Reported Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Respondent Type

Items	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads	Total
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty					
Total Agreement ^a	69%	67%	58%	76%	70%
Total Disagreement ^b	21%	15%	34%	13%	18%
Mean Score ^c	4.86	4.98	4.40	5.38	5.04
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of faculty diversity					
Total Agreement ^a	34%	56%	47%	75%	59%
Total Disagreement ^b	55%	31%	45%	17%	31%
Mean Score ^c	3.63	4.46	3.93	5.30	4.61
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)					
Race / Ethnicity	93%	93%	95%	90%	93%
Gender	71%	61%	63%	46%	61%
People with Disabilities	49%	58%	63%	58%	56%
Sexual Orientation	37%	37%	52%	50%	44%
Nationality	21%	31%	34%	48%	33%
Religion	12%	13%	23%	30%	19%
Age	7%	16%	23%	24%	17%
<i>Number of responses</i>	286	324	258	724	1,592
^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree", "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes. ^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>less</i> favorable attitudes. ^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes.					

Table 25, below, summarizes the results of these items by the race or ethnicity, gender identity, and LGBT status of the respondent.

Table 25. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity

Items	Race / Ethnicity					Gender Identity		LGBT	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African American	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non-LGBT	LGBT
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty									
Total Agreement ^a	71%	78%	49%	60%	69%	76%	66%	72%	52%
Total Disagreement ^b	18%	11%	44%	23%	27%	13%	23%	17%	35%
Mean Score ^c	5.05	5.43	4.17	4.75	4.90	5.26	4.88	5.11	4.41
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of faculty diversity									
Total Agreement ^a	56%	74%	44%	55%	61%	61%	56%	61%	47%
Total Disagreement ^b	35%	17%	47%	35%	35%	28%	35%	30%	44%
Mean Score ^c	4.49	5.15	3.78	4.29	4.65	4.70	4.44	4.68	3.98
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)									
Race / Ethnicity	93%	94%	100%	97%	95%	94%	93%	92%	96%
Gender	67%	62%	41%	45%	74%	59%	64%	61%	63%
People with Disabilities	60%	59%	43%	62%	53%	42%	66%	54%	71%
Sexual Orientation	46%	44%	35%	55%	37%	30%	50%	41%	63%
Nationality	29%	53%	27%	52%	53%	22%	38%	32%	37%
Religion	18%	29%	24%	21%	37%	14%	22%	18%	25%
Age	15%	32%	19%	21%	11%	11%	18%	16%	25%
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>933</i>	<i>177</i>	<i>82</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>536</i>	<i>695</i>	<i>2105</i>	<i>237</i>

^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree", "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to *less* favorable attitudes.

^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

The results indicate that:

- Asian or Pacific Islander respondents were the most likely to agree with both statements, whereas less than half of the black or African American respondents agreed with either statement.
- Different racial groups generally identified the same areas as lacking diversity, except that black or African American and Hispanic or Latinx respondents were less likely to indicate that there is not enough gender diversity among faculty.
- Female-identifying respondents were somewhat less likely to agree with each statement compared to male-identifying respondents, and especially more likely to identify disabilities, sexual orientation, and nationality as areas lacking diversity.

- LGBT respondents were much less likely to agree with each statement compared to non-LGBT respondents, and especially more likely to identify disabilities and sexual orientation as areas lacking diversity.

Table 26 summarizes the reported perceptions among employees of faculty diversity, broken down by role and time spent in current position.

Table 26. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Employee Role and Time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Current Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuing)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	> 20 Years
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty										
Total Agreement ^a	69%	76%	50%	70%	76%	55%	68%	66%	75%	70%
Total Disagreement ^b	22%	14%	37%	15%	9%	25%	17%	21%	14%	17%
Mean Score ^c	4.83	5.14	4.26	5.05	5.24	4.59	4.93	4.79	5.17	5.04
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of faculty diversity										
Total Agreement ^a	35%	37%	19%	47%	62%	50%	50%	40%	43%	50%
Total Disagreement ^b	55%	45%	72%	37%	22%	40%	36%	48%	45%	40%
Mean Score ^c	3.59	3.92	2.98	4.21	4.74	4.23	4.25	3.83	3.97	4.26
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)										
Race / Ethnicity	95%	91%	94%	86%	90%	92%	90%	95%	93%	93%
Gender	76%	48%	71%	57%	62%	54%	65%	73%	55%	65%
People with Disabilities	46%	61%	65%	86%	56%	51%	49%	63%	48%	44%
Sexual Orientation	38%	30%	45%	29%	28%	38%	44%	43%	23%	28%
Nationality	15%	30%	39%	43%	21%	38%	25%	25%	20%	26%
Religion	9%	22%	16%	14%	13%	10%	10%	14%	15%	9%
Age	6%	9%	13%	14%	7%	28%	13%	10%	5%	16%
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>210</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>172</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>163</i>	<i>186</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>142</i>

^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree", "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to *less* favorable attitudes.

^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

Table 26 indicates that:

- Most tenure-stream faculty (55 percent) and continuing academic specialists (72 percent) *disagreed* that there is an acceptable amount of diversity among faculty.

- Respondents who have worked in their current position for between 4 and 20 years gave less favorable responses than those who are newer to their position or have worked there for more than 20 years.
- Employees of all types generally identified similar areas as lacking diversity, although fixed-term academic specialists were especially likely to indicate that there is not enough diversity in terms of disabilities or nationality.

Table 27 summarizes the results of these items by employment unit. The results indicate that:

- The employees who were most likely to agree that the college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty work in Biochemistry / Molecular Biology (84 percent agreement) and FRIB / NSCL (83 percent).
- The employees who were most likely to *disagree* that the college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty work in Earth and Environmental Science (30 percent disagreement) and Plant Biology (30 percent).
- The employees who were most likely to indicate that there is an acceptable amount of faculty diversity work in Plant Research Lab (73 percent agreement) and Biochemistry / Molecular Biology (54 percent).
- The employees who were most likely to indicate that there is *not* an acceptable amount of diversity work in Integrative Biology (68 percent disagreement) and FRIB / NSCL (55 percent).

Table 27. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Employee Unit

Items	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics-Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty																
Total Agreement ^a	84%	86%	69%	81%	56%	83%	45%	62%	67%	66%	74%	57%	74%	71%	62%	72%
Total Disagreement ^b	11%	7%	23%	10%	30%	4%	29%	21%	20%	19%	17%	21%	17%	14%	30%	10%
Mean Score ^c	5.18	5.29	4.90	5.48	4.41	5.63	4.26	4.74	4.93	4.91	4.78	4.36	5.07	5.00	4.65	5.18
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of faculty diversity																
Total Agreement ^a	54%	56%	38%	45%	46%	23%	20%	38%	42%	43%	35%	29%	38%	50%	44%	73%
Total Disagreement ^b	37%	31%	52%	50%	46%	55%	68%	48%	44%	43%	52%	50%	49%	37%	49%	20%
Mean Score ^c	4.32	4.38	3.79	4.00	4.14	3.68	3.13	3.64	4.16	3.89	3.57	3.36	3.83	4.23	3.90	5.17
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)																
Race / Ethnicity	93%	100%	93%	100%	92%	92%	96%	95%	80%	92%	100%	86%	94%	91%	100%	75%
Gender	68%	80%	85%	90%	77%	67%	44%	15%	75%	83%	75%	71%	82%	45%	53%	88%
People with Disabilities	46%	60%	48%	60%	62%	17%	56%	65%	45%	54%	58%	43%	38%	73%	58%	38%
Sexual Orientation	29%	40%	41%	70%	38%	17%	33%	5%	55%	29%	25%	29%	41%	36%	37%	25%
Nationality	14%	20%	19%	10%	31%	8%	26%	20%	40%	21%	33%	43%	21%	0%	26%	25%
Religion	18%	40%	4%	20%	7%	0%	4%	10%	25%	4%	8%	29%	9%	9%	11%	13%
Age	11%	0%	26%	10%	7%	8%	0%	15%	10%	17%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	50%
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>44</i>
^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree," "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes. ^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree," "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>less</i> favorable attitudes. ^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes.																

Diversity of Staff

The same set of items was then repeated, except that this time it asked about the diversity of *staff* within NatSci. These items were asked only to employees, based on an assumption that few students would have had enough regular interaction with college staff to make a reasonable assessment.

The results of these items are summarized below, in Table 28.

Table 28. Reported Perceptions of Staff Diversity, by Respondent Type

Items	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Total
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse staff			
Total Agreement ^a	59%	65%	62%
Total Disagreement ^b	17%	6%	11%
Mean Score ^c	4.84	5.10	2.79
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of staff diversity			
Total Agreement ^a	42%	58%	51%
Total Disagreement ^b	31%	11%	20%
Mean Score ^c	4.27	4.88	4.60
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)			
Race / Ethnicity	90%	97%	94%
Gender	55%	68%	60%
People with Disabilities	54%	74%	62%
Sexual Orientation	36%	51%	42%
Nationality	25%	64%	40%
Religion	13%	35%	21%
Age	13%	38%	22%
<i>Number of responses</i>	247	298	545
^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree", "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes. ^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>less</i> favorable attitudes. ^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes.			

The table shows that:

- A majority (62 percent) of respondents agreed that the college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse staff, and about half (51 percent) agreed that there is an acceptable amount of diversity among staff.
- Among those who indicated that staff diversity is insufficient, the most common areas noted were race or ethnicity (94 percent of those who indicated diversity levels are unacceptable), followed by people with disabilities (62 percent) and gender (60 percent).

- Staff and specialists were more likely than faculty to agree with both statements.
- Among those who reported that the diversity level is unacceptable, staff and specialists selected many more areas as having not enough diversity. In particular, over half of these respondents indicated there is not enough diversity in terms of nationality and sexual orientation.

Table 29 presents the results of these items, broken down by the race or ethnicity, gender identity, and LGBT status of the respondent.

Table 29. Perceptions of Staff Diversity, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity

Items	Race / Ethnicity					Gender Identity		LGBT	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African American	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non-LGBT	LGBT
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse staff faculty									
Total Agreement ^a	64%	71%	38%	58%	27%	69%	56%	63%	43%
Total Disagreement ^b	9%	7%	38%	13%	33%	9%	12%	10%	25%
Mean Score ^c	5.03	5.31	4.15	4.74	4.00	5.16	4.83	5.02	4.25
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of staff diversity									
Total Agreement ^a	49%	64%	36%	56%	25%	53%	48%	51%	48%
Total Disagreement ^b	22%	8%	43%	24%	44%	20%	21%	20%	35%
Mean Score ^c	4.52	5.19	4.07	4.62	3.81	4.69	4.51	4.64	3.97
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)									
Race / Ethnicity	94%	88%	100%	90%	100%	90%	96%	94%	93%
Gender	66%	71%	0%	44%	38%	54%	65%	61%	50%
People with Disabilities	59%	29%	67%	73%	75%	47%	74%	62%	69%
Sexual Orientation	40%	29%	17%	56%	38%	31%	45%	38%	69%
Nationality	34%	50%	43%	56%	75%	30%	46%	39%	50%
Religion	18%	17%	17%	25%	43%	19%	19%	21%	17%
Age	19%	17%	17%	30%	29%	20%	20%	20%	38%
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>398</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>237</i>	<i>234</i>	<i>2105</i>	<i>237</i>

^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree," "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree," "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to *less* favorable attitudes.

^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

The results in Table 29 indicate that:

- Asian or Pacific Islander respondents were the most likely to agree with both statements, whereas less than 40 percent of the black or African American respondents agreed with either statement.

- Respondents from all groups identified race and ethnicity as the main area where there is not enough diversity.
- Female-identifying respondents were somewhat less likely to agree with each statement compared to male-identifying respondents, and especially more likely to identify disabilities, sexual orientation, and nationality as areas lacking diversity.
- LGBT-identifying respondents were less likely to agree with each statement compared to non-LGBT respondents, and especially more likely to identify sexual orientation, age, and nationality as areas lacking diversity.

Table 30 summarizes these results by employee role and time spent in current position.

Table 30. Perceptions of Staff Diversity, by Employee Role and Time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Current Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuing)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	>20 Years
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse staff										
Total Agreement ^a	56%	70%	60%	60%	69%	58%	63%	60%	68%	62%
Total Disagreement ^b	17%	11%	26%	5%	5%	6%	12%	12%	10%	8%
Mean Score ^c	4.76	5.15	4.77	5.10	5.19	4.94	4.97	4.97	5.05	5.03
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of staff diversity										
Total Agreement ^a	41%	47%	47%	52%	62%	51%	56%	48%	48%	52%
Total Disagreement ^b	34%	17%	30%	14%	10%	12%	17%	22%	26%	16%
Mean Score ^c	4.19	4.51	4.40	4.81	4.93	4.80	4.73	4.52	4.49	4.69
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)										
Race / Ethnicity	93%	88%	88%	100%	97%	96%	94%	96%	81%	97%
Gender	60%	38%	50%	75%	70%	65%	66%	72%	40%	50%
People with Disabilities	54%	50%	63%	100%	75%	72%	55%	68%	58%	62%
Sexual Orientation	40%	13%	43%	25%	50%	53%	45%	54%	22%	31%
Nationality	25%	25%	43%	33%	62%	73%	53%	42%	17%	41%
Religion	13%	13%	29%	0%	41%	25%	20%	28%	9%	17%
Age	7%	38%	23%	33%	42%	44%	25%	20%	17%	32%
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>181</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>172</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>167</i>	<i>188</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>139</i>

^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree", "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to *less* favorable attitudes.

^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

Table 30 indicates that:

- Tenure-stream faculty and continuing academic specialists were the most likely groups to disagree with both statements.
- Agreement with the two statements was similar across cohorts that had been in their current position for different lengths of time.
- Respondents from all groups identified race and ethnicity as the main area where there is not enough diversity.

Table 31 summarizes the results of these items by employment unit. The results indicate that:

- The employees who were most likely to agree that the college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse staff work in the Natural Science Dean's office (75 percent agreement) and FRIB / NSCL (75 percent).
- The employees who were most likely to *disagree* that the college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse staff work in Plant Biology (24 percent) and Computational Math, Science, or Engineering (21 percent disagreement).
- The employees who were most likely to indicate that there is an acceptable amount of staff diversity work in the Natural Science Dean's Office (64 percent agreement) and Mathematics (60 percent).
- The employees who were most likely to indicate that there is *not* an acceptable amount of diversity work in Integrative Biology (39 percent disagreement), Physics-Astronomy (33 percent), and Plant Biology (33 percent).

Table 31. Perceptions of Staff Diversity, by Employee Unit

Items	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics-Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse staff																
Total Agreement ^a	72%	67%	57%	63%	56%	75%	39%	46%	65%	68%	75%	57%	55%	70%	45%	71%
Total Disagreement ^b	9%	13%	6%	21%	24%	5%	15%	8%	8%	6%	8%	7%	23%	7%	24%	3%
Mean Score ^c	5.00	5.00	4.98	4.89	4.84	5.35	4.36	4.73	5.28	5.12	5.08	4.79	4.73	5.19	4.59	5.34
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of staff diversity																
Total Agreement ^a	54%	56%	49%	40%	48%	26%	26%	30%	60%	58%	64%	57%	37%	62%	42%	66%
Total Disagreement ^b	20%	19%	24%	25%	30%	26%	39%	20%	21%	13%	14%	7%	33%	7%	33%	7%
Mean Score ^c	4.59	4.63	4.55	4.30	4.56	4.13	3.84	4.13	4.90	4.83	4.82	4.71	4.30	4.93	4.12	5.24
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)																
Race / Ethnicity	88%	100%	100%	100%	60%	100%	100%	100%	78%	91%	100%	100%	96%	100%	100%	100%
Gender	59%	33%	58%	67%	78%	50%	47%	44%	44%	82%	40%	0%	63%	75%	77%	75%
People with Disabilities	65%	67%	62%	83%	56%	17%	60%	75%	67%	73%	80%	100%	45%	100%	57%	25%
Sexual Orientation	38%	67%	33%	100%	38%	0%	33%	30%	11%	56%	50%	0%	36%	67%	42%	50%
Nationality	14%	33%	31%	60%	50%	0%	33%	58%	33%	33%	50%	0%	29%	67%	50%	75%
Religion	7%	33%	17%	40%	100%	0%	0%	30%	44%	0%	50%	0%	13%	67%	18%	25%
Age	20%	67%	31%	20%	33%	17%	0%	45%	22%	25%	20%	0%	5%	50%	8%	50%
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>44</i>
^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree", "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes.																
^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>less</i> favorable attitudes.																
^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes.																

Diversity of Students

The instrument then repeated the same type of items again, but asked about the diversity of *students* within NatSci. The results of these items are summarized below, in Table 32.

Table 32. Reported Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Respondent Type

Items	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads	Total
The college has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting diverse students					
Total Agreement ^a	74%	79%	69%	82%	78%
Total Disagreement ^b	6%	9%	13%	3%	6%
Mean Score ^c	5.42	5.41	5.09	5.72	5.50
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of student diversity					
Total Agreement ^a	53%	70%	56%	83%	71%
Total Disagreement ^b	14%	17%	19%	5%	11%
Mean Score ^c	4.82	5.06	4.73	5.69	5.26
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)					
Race / Ethnicity	100%	90%	100%	94%	97%
Gender	60%	33%	63%	49%	53%
People with Disabilities	75%	57%	78%	61%	69%
Sexual Orientation	46%	39%	60%	42%	48%
Nationality	45%	41%	75%	68%	59%
Religion	27%	27%	38%	44%	34%
Age	34%	27%	43%	40%	36%
<i>Number of responses</i>	270	297	254	703	1524
^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree", "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes. ^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>less</i> favorable attitudes. ^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes.					

The table shows that:

- A majority (78 percent) of respondents agreed that the college has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting diverse students, and that there is an acceptable amount of diversity among students (71 percent).
- Of those who indicated that staff diversity is insufficient, the most common areas noted were race or ethnicity (97 percent of those who indicated diversity levels are unacceptable), followed by people with disabilities (69 percent) and nationality (59 percent).
- Undergraduates were the most likely group to agree with both statements, while graduate students were the most likely to disagree.

Table 33 presents the results of these items, broken down by the race or ethnicity, gender identity, and LGBT status of the respondent.

Table 33. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity

Items	Race / Ethnicity					Gender Identity		LGBT	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African American	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non-LGBT	LGBT
The college has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting diverse students									
Total Agreement ^a	78%	85%	64%	68%	81%	81%	76%	79%	70%
Total Disagreement ^b	6%	3%	15%	11%	15%	4%	8%	6%	11%
Mean Score ^c	5.49	5.81	4.99	5.25	5.37	5.62	5.39	5.54	5.13
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of student diversity									
Total Agreement ^a	68%	83%	57%	59%	75%	69%	70%	72%	61%
Total Disagreement ^b	12%	3%	24%	17%	22%	10%	13%	10%	16%
Mean Score ^c	5.17	5.71	4.58	4.83	5.24	5.27	5.17	5.31	4.88
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)									
Race / Ethnicity	98%	88%	96%	96%	100%	96%	99%	97%	100%
Gender	59%	43%	35%	24%	42%	55%	46%	51%	63%
People with Disabilities	72%	88%	43%	74%	77%	58%	75%	66%	84%
Sexual Orientation	54%	29%	18%	53%	54%	38%	52%	43%	74%
Nationality	55%	81%	43%	81%	77%	46%	64%	57%	71%
Religion	33%	44%	27%	20%	58%	20%	39%	34%	37%
Age	39%	67%	5%	44%	8%	27%	38%	34%	52%
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>928</i>	<i>210</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>539</i>	<i>716</i>	<i>2105</i>	<i>237</i>

^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree", "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to *less* favorable attitudes.

^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

The results in Table 33 indicate that:

- Asian or Pacific Islander respondents were the most likely to agree with both statements, while black or African American respondents agreed the least.
- Respondents from all groups identified race and ethnicity as the main area where there is not enough diversity.
- Agreement with each statement was similar across both female and male-identifying respondents.
- LGBT respondents were somewhat less likely than non-LGBT respondents to agree with each statement, and also more likely to identify disabilities, sexual orientation, and nationality as areas lacking diversity.

Next, Table 34 summarizes these results by employee role and time spent in current position, for those who are employees of NatSci.

Table 34. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Employee Role and Time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Current Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuing)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	> 20 Years
The college has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting diverse students										
Total Agreement ^a	72%	78%	66%	86%	82%	75%	76%	72%	80%	82%
Total Disagreement ^b	7%	6%	17%	9%	4%	15%	8%	9%	2%	9%
Mean Score ^c	5.36	5.59	5.00	5.45	5.61	5.17	5.41	5.31	5.63	5.48
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of student diversity										
Total Agreement ^a	54%	49%	50%	57%	75%	67%	65%	55%	64%	68%
Total Disagreement ^b	15%	12%	24%	24%	9%	26%	15%	18%	12%	15%
Mean Score ^c	4.77	4.94	4.40	4.86	5.29	4.84	5.00	4.80	5.00	5.05
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)										
Race / Ethnicity	100%	92%	100%	100%	87%	92%	94%	96%	100%	97%
Gender	60%	67%	30%	20%	40%	38%	52%	43%	54%	44%
People with Disabilities	76%	67%	58%	60%	67%	54%	61%	67%	67%	72%
Sexual Orientation	48%	38%	50%	20%	40%	42%	50%	46%	25%	36%
Nationality	44%	43%	64%	20%	27%	50%	48%	41%	46%	38%
Religion	25%	29%	30%	20%	33%	29%	29%	31%	10%	24%
Age	30%	38%	45%	20%	27%	25%	32%	39%	18%	19%
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>197</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>160</i>	<i>89</i>	<i>158</i>	<i>181</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>136</i>

^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree", "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to *less* favorable attitudes.

^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

Table 34 indicates that:

- Tenure-stream faculty and continuing academic specialists were the most likely groups to disagree with both statements.
- Agreement with the two statements was similar across cohorts that had been in their current position for different lengths of time.
- Respondents from all groups identified race and ethnicity as the main area where there is not enough diversity.

Table 35 summarizes the results of these items by employment unit. The results indicate that:

- The employees who were most likely to agree that the college has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting diverse students work in FRIB / NSCL (95 percent agreement) and Plant Research Lab (89 percent).
- The employees who were most likely to *disagree* that the college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse staff work in Plant Biology (19 percent) and Kellogg Biological Station (14 percent disagreement).
- The employees who were most likely to indicate that there is an acceptable amount of staff diversity work in the Plant Research Lab (84 percent agreement), and Chemistry (76 percent).
- The employees who were most likely to indicate that there is *not* an acceptable amount of diversity work in Kellogg Biological Station (33 percent disagreement), and Plant Biology (28 percent).

Table 35. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Employee Unit

Items	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics-Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
The college has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting diverse students																
Total Agreement ^a	84%	87%	80%	65%	69%	95%	60%	73%	68%	80%	85%	67%	71%	70%	65%	89%
Total Disagreement ^b	9%	13%	4%	10%	8%	5%	9%	14%	5%	2%	10%	7%	12%	3%	19%	3%
Mean Score ^c	5.53	5.80	5.61	5.20	5.54	5.91	4.94	5.24	5.23	5.63	5.55	5.20	5.35	5.23	4.84	5.72
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of student diversity																
Total Agreement ^a	62%	53%	76%	60%	62%	48%	29%	50%	67%	75%	70%	53%	51%	55%	50%	84%
Total Disagreement ^b	16%	13%	11%	15%	15%	5%	26%	33%	11%	9%	15%	20%	16%	14%	28%	5%
Mean Score ^c	4.95	4.93	5.35	4.95	5.35	4.81	4.03	4.42	5.07	5.18	4.80	4.67	4.79	4.66	4.44	5.66
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)																
Race / Ethnicity	94%	100%	100%	100%	86%	100%	100%	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%	96%	100%	100%	67%
Gender	50%	0%	43%	75%	67%	100%	50%	8%	83%	40%	0%	0%	82%	0%	60%	67%
People with Disabilities	64%	50%	75%	80%	60%	67%	79%	71%	71%	60%	67%	33%	71%	40%	69%	0%
Sexual Orientation	31%	0%	57%	100%	40%	50%	5%	17%	40%	40%	67%	0%	53%	0%	50%	0%
Nationality	36%	50%	67%	50%	40%	50%	64%	17%	33%	60%	67%	67%	50%	0%	45%	50%
Religion	21%	0%	33%	75%	20%	0%	33%	17%	60%	20%	33%	33%	29%	0%	30%	0%
Age	33%	50%	33%	33%	25%	0%	30%	8%	33%	40%	33%	0%	27%	20%	50%	0%
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>36</i>		
^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree", "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes. ^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>less</i> favorable attitudes. ^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes.																

Fair Treatment

In order to measure employees' perceptions of fairness or unfairness within the college, the survey instrument presented them with a list (in an order randomized for each respondent) of statements and asked them to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement on a seven-point scale.

The statements in this battery of items are shown in Table 36, along with the summary of responses. Each item is coded such that higher values correspond to more favorable attitudes, and the items are listed in the table in descending order from the most favorable mean score (on the seven-point scale) to the least favorable mean score.

Table 36. Summary of Responses to Fair Treatment Items

Items	Number of Responses	Total Agreement	Total Disagreement	Mean Score ^a
Employees in my unit are given feedback and evaluated fairly	592	75%	14%	5.45
Assignments are given based on a person's skills and abilities	580	77%	16%	5.34
My unit has a track record of hiring and promoting employees objectively	557	73%	16%	5.28
I have been treated fairly in the tenure / promotion process	543	67%	17%	5.16
I feel I have been treated differently in my unit <i>(reverse coded)</i>	627	26%	65%	5.05
I have been treated fairly with respect to decisions about merit raises	540	58%	23%	4.81
I am burdened by university service responsibilities beyond those of my colleagues <i>(reverse coded)</i>	584	24%	53%	4.64
I feel that my diversity-related contributions have been / will be valued for promotion or tenure	470	30%	26%	4.09
I perform more work to help students and colleagues than my colleagues <i>(reverse coded)</i>	574	42%	26%	3.67
<i>AVERAGE</i>				4.49
^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.				

Overall, the table reflects generally favorable attitudes, as respondents gave more favorable than unfavorable responses to all nine items. In particular, about three-fourths (73 to 77 percent) of employees agreed that:

- Employees in their unit are given feedback and evaluated fairly,
- Assignments are given based on skills and abilities, and
- Their unit has a track record of hiring and promoting employees objectively.

The least favorable responses were to the item, "I perform more work to help students and colleagues than my colleagues," as one-fourth (26 percent) of respondents agreed with that statement.

Table 37, which breaks down the Fair Treatment results by employee type, indicates that on average, staff and specialists gave more favorable responses than did faculty to eight of the nine items.

Table 37. Mean Response to Fair Treatment Items, by Respondent Type

Items	Faculty	Staff / Specialists
Employees in my unit are given feedback and evaluated fairly	5.33	5.55
Assignments are given based on a person's skills and abilities	5.24	5.43
My unit has a track record of hiring and promoting employees objectively	5.24	5.32
I have been treated fairly in the tenure / promotion process	5.39	4.95
I feel I have been treated differently in my unit (<i>reverse coded</i>)	4.83	5.24
I have been treated fairly with respect to decisions about merit raises	4.65	4.97
I am burdened by university service responsibilities beyond those of my colleagues (<i>reverse coded</i>)	4.16	5.05
I feel that my diversity-related contributions have been / will be valued for promotion or tenure	3.89	4.27
I perform more work to help students and colleagues than my colleagues (<i>reverse coded</i>)	3.17	4.10
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.67</i>	<i>4.99</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>286</i>
^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.		

Below, Table 38 breaks down the responses to these items by race or ethnicity, gender identity, and LGBT status. The table indicates that:

- Black or African American employees gave the most favorable answers on average, whereas Hispanic or Latinx respondents and those in racial or ethnic groups other than the four largest gave the least favorable responses.
- Male-identifying respondents gave more favorable responses than did female-identifying responses on eight of the nine items.
- LGBT respondents gave less favorable answers on average compared to non-LGBT respondents, overall and on six of the nine individual items.

Table 38. Mean Response to Fair Treatment Items, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity

Items	Race / Ethnicity					Gender Identity		LGBT	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African American	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Employees in my unit are given feedback and evaluated fairly	5.54	5.68	5.57	4.90	4.73	5.68	5.33	5.50	4.52
Assignments are given based on a person's skills and abilities	5.40	5.52	5.50	4.74	5.13	5.58	5.17	5.34	5.24
My unit has a track record of hiring and promoting employees objectively	5.35	5.67	5.08	4.74	5.00	5.63	5.02	5.30	4.96
I have been treated fairly in the tenure / promotion process	5.25	5.43	5.30	4.56	4.88	5.42	5.05	5.16	5.17
I feel I have been treated differently in my unit (<i>reverse coded</i>)	5.22	5.25	5.46	4.51	3.77	5.51	4.78	5.08	4.67
I have been treated fairly with respect to decisions about merit raises	4.96	5.24	4.75	4.63	3.71	4.96	4.88	4.81	4.82
Burdened by university service responsibilities beyond those of my colleagues (<i>reverse coded</i>)	4.68	4.50	4.92	4.32	4.73	4.63	4.68	4.65	4.45
My diversity-related contributions have been / will be valued for promotion or tenure	4.10	4.18	4.57	3.89	3.33	4.15	4.03	4.08	4.26
I perform more work to help students and colleagues than my colleagues (<i>reverse coded</i>)	3.77	3.41	4.14	3.52	3.13	3.72	3.68	3.68	3.48
AVERAGE	4.92	4.99	5.03	4.42	4.27	5.03	4.74	4.84	4.62
Number of Responses	404	63	14	31	15	262	257	563	29

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 39, which breaks down the mean response to this battery of items by employee role and time spent in current position, shows that staff and fixed term academic specialists responded most favorably to these items, whereas continuing specialists and tenure-stream faculty gave the least favorable responses.

Table 39. Mean Response to Fair Treatment Items, by Employee Role and Time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Current Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuing)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	> 20 Years
Employees in my unit are given feedback and evaluated fairly	5.19	5.63	5.50	6.05	5.65	5.39	5.49	5.30	5.48	5.68
Assignments are given based on a person's skills and abilities	5.14	5.63	5.30	5.40	5.54	5.27	5.39	5.21	5.31	5.55
My unit has a track record of hiring and promoting employees objectively	5.11	5.62	5.21	5.61	5.46	5.12	5.26	5.18	5.40	5.50
I have been treated fairly in the tenure / promotion process	5.43	5.15	5.00	5.32	4.96	5.04	5.19	5.12	5.28	5.27
I feel I have been treated differently in my unit (<i>reverse coded</i>)	4.60	5.69	4.86	5.23	5.37	5.31	5.41	4.85	4.65	5.33
I have been treated fairly with respect to decisions about merit raises	4.51	4.84	5.71	5.00	4.97	4.82	5.01	4.91	4.90	4.53
I am burdened by university service responsibilities beyond those of my colleagues (<i>reverse coded</i>)	3.99	4.73	4.41	4.90	5.13	5.17	4.73	4.39	4.61	4.94
I feel that my diversity-related contributions have been / will be valued for promotion or tenure	3.78	4.24	4.17	4.60	4.32	4.10	4.10	4.04	4.05	4.28
I perform more work to help students and colleagues than my colleagues (<i>reverse coded</i>)	3.23	3.37	2.87	3.68	4.30	3.88	3.75	3.45	3.47	4.04
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.55</i>	<i>4.99</i>	<i>4.78</i>	<i>5.09</i>	<i>5.08</i>	<i>4.90</i>	<i>4.93</i>	<i>4.72</i>	<i>4.79</i>	<i>5.01</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>206</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>186</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>172</i>	<i>181</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>135</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 40, which summarizes the mean response to these items by employee unit, indicates that the most favorable responses were given by respondents who work within FRIB / NSCL (mean score of 5.08), Physiology (mean score of 5.01), and Plant Research Lab (mean score of 5.00). The least favorable responses were given by respondents in Earth and Environmental Science (mean score of 4.47) and Neuroscience (mean score of 4.49).

Table 40. Mean Response to Fair Treatment Items, by Employee Unit

Items	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics-Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
Employees in my unit are given feedback and evaluated fairly	5.41	5.75	5.18	5.50	4.50	6.10	4.97	5.60	5.34	5.47	5.46	4.79	5.65	5.97	5.53	5.50
Assignments are given based on a person's skills and abilities	5.26	5.69	5.34	5.68	4.73	5.64	4.94	5.77	5.28	5.25	5.50	5.00	5.64	5.48	5.06	5.08
My unit has a track record of hiring and promoting employees objectively	5.33	5.69	5.17	5.77	4.83	5.80	4.88	5.29	4.93	5.10	5.43	5.42	5.31	5.62	5.52	5.72
I have been treated fairly in the tenure / promotion process	5.36	5.33	5.31	5.28	4.71	5.45	4.67	5.13	4.89	5.40	4.50	5.43	5.43	5.42	5.24	5.21
I feel I have been treated differently in my unit (<i>reverse coded</i>)	5.20	5.12	4.80	5.41	4.88	5.45	4.63	4.98	4.66	4.79	5.24	4.53	5.21	5.07	4.72	5.51
I have been treated fairly with respect to decisions about merit raises	5.01	5.33	4.52	4.94	4.38	5.19	4.16	4.59	4.36	5.10	4.59	4.64	5.25	5.03	4.27	4.91
I am burdened by university service responsibilities beyond those of my colleagues (<i>reverse coded</i>)	4.11	5.07	4.39	3.95	4.61	3.95	4.86	4.95	4.31	4.52	4.43	4.75	4.44	4.90	4.23	5.06
I feel that my diversity-related contributions have been / will be valued for promotion or tenure	3.88	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.92	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.68	4.38	3.96	4.00	3.94	4.22	3.88	4.08
I perform more work to help students and colleagues than my colleagues (<i>reverse coded</i>)	3.44	4.20	3.70	3.17	3.64	3.90	3.68	4.43	3.02	3.34	3.78	3.36	3.52	3.41	3.88	3.94
AVERAGE	4.78	4.61	4.70	4.86	4.47	5.08	4.54	4.99	4.50	4.82	4.77	4.49	4.93	5.01	4.70	5.00
Number of responses	71	16	49	20	24	20	36	45	47	53	26	14	66	29	36	36

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Climate for Diverse Groups

To measure how NatSci community members perceive the organizational climate to be for various types of people in the college, the survey instrument presented each respondent a list (in a randomized order) of groups and asked them to rate on a seven-point scale how positive or negative the climate is for each group. The list of groups, along with the summary of responses, are shown in Table 41.

Table 41. Summary of Responses to Climate for Diverse Groups Items

Groups	Total Positive	Total Negative	Mean Score
White	88%	3%	6.09
Male	88%	3%	6.06
Tenure-stream <i>(asked of faculty only)</i>	85%	4%	5.80
Served / serving in the military	77%	4%	5.65
Female	81%	11%	5.55
Physical disability	75%	11%	5.44
Gay, lesbian, or bisexual	76%	7%	5.49
From Christian religious affiliations	72%	9%	5.44
International	76%	12%	5.39
Immigrants	74%	11%	5.38
People of Color	75%	13%	5.37
From religious affiliations other than Christian	70%	8%	5.36
Providing care for adults who are disabled and / or elderly	68%	10%	5.32
Parents / guardians of dependent children	70%	15%	5.21
Learning disabilities	67%	16%	5.18
Transgender	62%	15%	5.07
Non-native English speakers	65%	21%	4.97
Psychological or mental health issues	60%	25%	4.81
Fixed-term <i>(asked of faculty only)</i>	45%	38%	4.26
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>72%</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>5.36</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1= "Very Negative" and 7 = "Very Positive."

The results indicate that:

- The groups for whom the NatSci climate was rated as most positive, on average, were whites (mean score of 6.09 out of 7.00), males (mean score of 6.06), and tenure-stream employees (mean score of 5.80)
- The groups for whom the climate was rated as most negative, on average, were non-native English speakers (mean score of 4.97), people with psychological or mental health issues (mean score of 4.81), and fixed-term employees (mean score of 4.26).

Table 42 summarizes the responses to these items by respondent type. It indicates that undergraduate students assessed the climate for these groups more favorably, on average, than did other types of respondents, while graduate students and faculty assessed the climate most negatively.

Table 42. Mean Response to Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Respondent Type

Groups	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads	Other Undergrads
White	5.89	5.99	6.31	6.13	6.11
Male	5.83	5.97	6.21	6.09	6.15
Tenure-stream	5.80	-	-	-	-
Served / serving in the military	5.24	5.22	5.26	5.89	5.88
Female	4.85	5.23	5.19	5.88	5.85
Physical disability	5.13	5.08	4.97	5.67	5.66
Gay, lesbian, or bisexual	5.12	5.39	5.20	5.67	5.63
From Christian religious affiliations	5.08	5.26	5.23	5.63	5.56
International	5.20	5.41	5.08	5.57	5.38
Immigrants	5.18	5.33	4.95	5.54	5.54
People of Color	4.78	5.08	4.80	5.69	5.70
From religious affiliations other than Christian	4.90	5.11	5.04	5.59	5.54
Providing care for adults who are disabled and / or elderly	4.83	5.17	4.66	5.61	5.55
Parents / guardians of dependent children	5.02	5.36	4.42	5.44	5.44
Learning disabilities	4.75	4.80	4.50	5.46	5.41
Transgender	4.59	4.79	4.36	5.38	5.37
Non-native English speakers	4.68	5.04	4.56	5.20	5.02
Psychological or mental health issues	4.37	4.52	3.99	5.14	5.17
Fixed-term	4.26	-	-	-	-
<i>AVERAGE (17 common items)</i>	<i>5.03</i>	<i>5.22</i>	<i>4.98</i>	<i>5.62</i>	<i>4.59</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>270</i>	<i>304</i>	<i>241</i>	<i>704</i>	<i>446</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1= "Very Negative" and 7 = "Very Positive."

Below, Table 43 shows that:

- Asian or Pacific Islander respondents assessed the climate for diverse groups the most favorably, while Hispanic or Latinx respondents assessed it the least favorably.
- On average, male-identifying respondents rated the climate for diverse groups as being more positive than did female-identifying respondents.
- On average, non-LGBT respondents rated the climate for diverse groups as being more positive than did LGBT-identifying respondents.

Table 43. Mean Response to Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender

Items	Race / Ethnicity						Gender Identity		LGBT	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African American	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non-LGBT	LGBT	
White	6.13	6.10	6.16	6.22	5.94	5.90	6.25	6.06	6.31	
Male	6.16	6.04	6.12	5.97	5.60	5.86	6.25	6.04	6.27	
Tenure-stream	5.97	5.56	6.67	5.70	5.17	5.80	5.94	5.78	6.36	
Served / serving in the military	5.63	5.73	5.75	5.56	6.00	5.62	5.66	5.66	5.57	
Female	5.50	5.69	5.52	5.42	5.54	5.66	5.44	5.57	5.37	
Physical disability	5.39	5.60	5.41	5.20	5.75	5.60	5.34	5.49	5.05	
Gay, lesbian, or bisexual	5.58	5.31	5.07	5.27	5.41	5.60	5.46	5.53	5.21	
From Christian religious affiliations	5.47	5.48	5.50	5.32	5.00	5.33	5.51	5.44	5.45	
International	5.44	5.27	5.24	5.35	4.98	5.51	5.30	5.42	5.10	
Immigrants	5.47	5.29	5.00	4.98	5.06	5.52	5.28	5.41	5.15	
People of Color	5.42	5.49	4.78	4.93	5.48	5.49	5.29	5.40	5.13	
From religious affiliations other than Christian	5.41	5.30	5.16	5.01	4.96	5.41	5.31	5.37	5.25	
Providing care for adults who are disabled and / or elderly	5.24	5.54	5.40	4.94	5.61	5.47	5.21	5.36	4.93	
Parents / guardians of dependent children	5.19	5.26	5.22	4.74	5.19	5.29	5.15	5.26	4.76	
Learning disabilities	5.06	5.40	5.31	4.93	5.49	5.27	5.09	5.25	4.66	
Transgender	5.10	5.03	4.65	4.62	5.17	5.26	4.97	5.17	4.42	
Non-native English speakers	5.00	4.97	4.87	4.66	4.61	5.13	4.86	5.03	4.55	
Psychological or mental health issues	4.74	5.08	4.97	4.93	5.07	4.97	4.74	4.88	4.39	
Fixed-term	4.15	4.64	3.50	3.50	3.86	4.45	3.82	4.25	4.40	
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.37</i>	<i>5.41</i>	<i>5.28</i>	<i>5.12</i>	<i>5.26</i>	<i>5.43</i>	<i>5.31</i>	<i>5.39</i>	<i>5.18</i>	
<i>Number of Responses</i>	<i>1245</i>	<i>276</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>653</i>	<i>1021</i>	<i>2105</i>	<i>217</i>	

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Identity

Table 44 summarizes the reported perceptions among employees of the climate for diverse groups, broken down by role and time spent in current position.

Table 44. Mean Response to Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Employee Role and Time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Current Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuing)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	> 20 Years
White	5.83	6.10	6.23	6.38	5.91	6.13	5.90	6.06	6.06	5.84
Male	5.74	6.10	6.29	5.94	5.91	6.13	5.85	6.02	5.96	5.82
Tenure-stream	5.70	6.20	6.06	6.00	-	-	6.04	5.78	5.83	5.63
Served / serving in the military	5.01	5.96	5.33	5.40	5.22	5.45	5.00	5.29	5.36	5.49
Female	4.76	5.19	4.55	4.88	5.35	5.21	5.12	4.93	5.02	5.18
Physical disability	4.98	5.72	5.00	5.36	5.17	4.87	4.97	5.15	5.36	5.11
Gay, lesbian, or bisexual	4.99	5.55	4.93	5.22	5.57	5.23	5.33	5.19	5.36	5.26
From Christian religious affiliations	4.94	5.75	5.00	5.50	5.17	5.61	5.26	5.13	5.05	5.29
International	5.13	5.47	4.82	5.29	5.49	5.47	5.39	5.28	5.22	5.30
Immigrants	5.09	5.51	4.70	5.50	5.44	5.27	5.33	5.23	5.20	5.28
People of Color	4.62	5.40	4.17	4.69	5.29	5.04	5.06	4.88	4.99	4.86
From religious affiliations other than Christian	4.74	5.41	4.61	5.38	5.18	5.07	5.11	5.03	5.02	4.88
Providing care for adults who are disabled and / or elderly	4.62	5.55	4.86	5.22	5.31	4.97	4.99	4.86	5.48	4.90
Parents / guardians of dependent children	4.90	5.55	4.97	5.13	5.43	5.45	5.15	5.13	5.15	5.41
Learning disabilities	4.55	5.09	4.43	4.57	5.04	4.82	4.71	4.76	4.98	4.82
Transgender	4.39	4.96	4.27	4.50	5.04	4.52	4.74	4.53	5.02	4.65
Non-native English speakers	4.58	5.20	3.97	5.21	5.21	4.95	4.91	4.79	4.73	4.98
Psychological or mental health issues	4.11	5.13	4.35	4.00	4.83	4.18	4.47	4.43	4.62	4.46
Fixed-term	4.14	4.71	4.06	4.71	-	-	4.37	4.09	4.44	4.35
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.89</i>	<i>5.50</i>	<i>4.87</i>	<i>5.20</i>	<i>5.33</i>	<i>5.20</i>	<i>5.14</i>	<i>5.08</i>	<i>5.20</i>	<i>5.13</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>199</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>174</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>160</i>	<i>180</i>	<i>86</i>	<i>137</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

The results in Table 44 indicate that:

- Staff and fixed term academic specialists responded most favorably to these items, whereas continuing specialists and tenure-stream faculty gave the least favorable responses.

- The climate for diverse groups was assessed most favorably by employees who had been in their current position for 11 to 20 years.

Finally, Table 45 disaggregates the results of these items by employee unit. It shows that:

- The most favorable responses were given by respondents who work within the Plant Research Lab (mean score of 5.40), and the Natural Science Dean's Office (mean score of 5.39).
- The least favorable responses were given by respondents in Biomedical Lab Diagnostics (mean score of 4.59) and Neuroscience (mean score of 4.77).

Table 45. Mean Response to Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Employee Unit

Items	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics- Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
White	5.84	4.60	5.64	5.76	5.48	6.05	6.11	5.86	6.11	5.92	6.23	4.87	6.01	5.96	5.89	5.70
Male	5.84	4.13	5.65	5.76	5.61	6.04	6.13	5.88	5.88	5.88	6.12	5.31	6.00	5.81	5.97	5.69
Tenure-stream	5.96	6.25	5.36	6.00	5.29	6.00	5.80	6.14	5.59	5.88	6.20	5.60	6.13	5.79	5.47	5.25
Served / serving in the military	4.94	6.13	4.65	4.67	4.81	5.27	5.21	5.07	5.44	5.55	5.60	5.14	5.38	5.59	4.58	5.57
Female	4.93	3.73	4.78	4.75	4.92	5.48	4.86	5.32	4.90	5.04	4.83	4.07	5.17	5.11	5.03	5.54
Physical disability	5.00	5.79	5.08	4.92	5.06	5.21	4.77	4.31	5.27	5.53	5.41	4.78	5.09	4.95	4.27	5.38
Gay, lesbian, or bisexual	5.04	3.93	5.00	4.75	5.24	5.56	5.40	5.44	5.29	5.09	5.43	4.25	5.19	5.12	5.37	5.82
From Christian religious affiliations	5.02	4.29	5.18	4.73	5.11	5.71	5.20	5.00	5.07	5.03	5.61	5.00	5.17	5.25	5.38	5.20
International	5.33	3.36	5.07	5.35	5.35	5.60	5.24	5.20	5.27	5.11	5.36	4.92	5.43	5.15	5.29	5.72
Immigrants	5.20	3.54	4.95	5.29	5.48	5.40	5.04	5.00	5.19	5.19	5.55	5.22	5.42	5.27	5.52	5.82
People of Color	4.87	3.73	4.82	4.71	4.95	5.42	4.61	4.58	4.56	5.00	5.19	4.55	4.95	4.92	5.04	5.68
From religious affiliations other than Christian	4.85	4.00	4.82	4.36	5.28	5.15	4.79	4.82	4.70	5.29	5.47	4.50	5.03	4.77	5.18	5.56
Providing care for adults who are disabled and / or elderly	5.00	5.60	4.55	4.40	4.67	5.36	4.38	4.78	5.00	5.26	5.47	4.33	5.34	4.70	4.13	5.59
Parents / guardians of children	5.05	5.19	4.51	5.38	5.05	5.37	5.58	5.55	5.26	4.73	5.64	4.73	5.20	5.32	5.14	5.63
Learning disabilities	4.75	5.80	4.68	4.77	4.50	4.90	4.20	4.54	4.77	4.96	5.07	4.33	4.94	4.73	4.36	4.94
Transgender	4.49	4.23	4.29	3.60	5.00	5.42	4.47	4.48	5.22	4.77	5.06	5.50	4.79	4.82	4.42	5.20
Non-native English speakers	4.49	3.20	4.60	4.50	5.13	5.50	4.57	4.92	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.70	4.98	4.80	5.19	5.35
Psychological or mental health issues	4.39	5.38	3.88	4.10	4.06	4.64	3.60	4.28	4.17	4.69	4.94	4.78	4.75	4.84	4.00	4.84
Fixed-term	4.69	4.38	4.48	3.63	3.58	4.33	4.05	4.00	3.63	4.52	4.50	4.00	4.32	4.94	3.86	4.14
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.04</i>	<i>4.59</i>	<i>4.84</i>	<i>4.81</i>	<i>4.98</i>	<i>5.39</i>	<i>4.95</i>	<i>5.01</i>	<i>5.05</i>	<i>5.17</i>	<i>5.39</i>	<i>4.77</i>	<i>5.23</i>	<i>5.15</i>	<i>4.98</i>	<i>5.40</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>39</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

SECTION V. BIAS, HARASSMENT, AND UNCIVIL BEHAVIOR

Next, the survey instrument contained items about the ways people are treated by other members of the NatSci community – especially the prevalence of both friendly and hostile interactions. These items covered the following topics:

- Respectful Treatment,
- Uncivil Behaviors
- Sexual Harassment
- Fair Treatment, and
- Bias Incidents.

The results of these items are summarized in the following subsections.

Respectful Treatment

To measure the extent to which respondents feel respected and cared for in the College of Natural Science, the survey instrument presented them with a list of items (in an order randomized for each respondent) asking to indicate on a five-point scale how often they feel a particular way. The items are listed in Table 46, along with the overall summary of responses. As noted in the table, some items were only displayed to certain types of respondents.

Table 46. Summary of Responses to Respectful Treatment Items

Items	Number of Responses	"Always" or "Very Often"	"Rarely" or "Never"	Mean Score ^a
You are treated with respect by advisors <i>(asked to students only)</i>	844	90%	2%	4.51
You are treated with respect by staff	866	89%	2%	4.39
You are treated with respect by your unit head or chair <i>(asked to employees only)</i>	816	81%	5%	4.28
You are treated with respect by faculty	1966	82%	3%	4.21
You are treated with respect by students	1940	84%	2%	4.19
You are treated with respect within NatSci	1501	82%	3%	4.16
You trust your coworkers <i>(asked to employees only)</i>	613	79%	3%	4.10
Your contributions to your unit are recognized and valued <i>(asked to employees only)</i>	607	61%	10%	3.73
People in your unit care about your general satisfaction <i>(asked to employees only)</i>	590	60%	15%	3.65
<i>AVERAGE</i>				<i>4.21</i>
^a Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1= "Never" and 5 = "Always."				

Table 46 reflects quite favorable attitudes overall, as over 80 percent of respondents reported feeling they are always or very often treated with respect. A small but nontrivial minority, however, reported that they rarely or never feel their contributions to their unit are recognized and valued (10 percent) or that people in their unit care about their general satisfaction (15 percent).

Table 47, which breaks down the mean response (on the five-point scale) by respondent type, shows that faculty generally expressed less favorable attitudes, on average, than others did.

Table 47. Mean Response to Respectful Treatment Items, by Respondent Type

Items	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads	Other Undergrads
You are treated with respect by advisors	-	-	-	4.52	4.48
You are treated with respect by staff	3.99	4.19	4.52	4.48	-
You are treated with respect by your unit head or chair	4.22	4.40	4.18	-	-
You are treated with respect by faculty	4.01	4.12	4.07	4.31	4.34
You are treated with respect by students	4.14	4.38	4.24	4.14	4.16
You are treated with respect within NatSci	3.86	4.18	4.05	4.31	-
You trust your coworkers	3.99	4.19	-	-	-
Your contributions to your unit are recognized and valued	3.64	3.81	-	-	-
People in your unit care about your general satisfaction	3.41	3.85	-	-	-
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>3.91</i>	<i>4.14</i>	<i>4.21</i>	<i>4.35</i>	<i>4.33</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>283</i>	<i>325</i>	<i>251</i>	<i>684</i>	<i>423</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1 = "Never" and 5 = "Always."

Table 48 summarizes the results of these items by race or ethnicity, gender identity, and LGBT status. It indicates that:

- Asian or Pacific Islander respondents expressed the most favorable attitudes on this set of items (mean score of 4.31 on these items), followed closely by black or African American respondents (mean score of 4.28).
- Respondents from racial or ethnic groups other than the four largest expressed the least favorable attitudes (mean score of 3.98 across all items), followed by Hispanic or Latinx respondents (mean score of 4.13).
- Male-identifying respondents expressed slightly more favorable attitudes than female-identifying respondents on all nine items.
- Non-LGBT respondents expressed slightly more favorable attitudes than LGBT-identifying respondents on six of the nine items.

Table 48. Mean Response to Respectful Treatment Items, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity

Items	Race / Ethnicity					Gender Identity		LGBT	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Treated with respect by advisors	4.53	4.51	4.34	4.66	4.68	4.57	4.50	4.50	4.57
Treated with respect by staff	4.43	4.45	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.44
Treated with respect by your unit head or chair	4.34	4.32	4.64	4.27	3.96	4.36	4.27	4.30	4.09
Treated with respect by faculty	4.20	4.38	4.19	4.23	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.22	4.16
Treated with respect by students	4.22	4.24	4.02	4.16	4.16	4.26	4.17	4.21	4.07
Treated with respect within NatSci	4.18	4.30	4.22	4.23	4.02	4.22	4.15	4.15	4.19
You trust your coworkers	4.13	4.39	4.40	4.06	4.06	4.26	4.05	4.10	4.09
Your contributions to your unit are recognized and valued	3.76	4.08	4.31	3.62	3.18	3.89	3.67	3.74	3.67
People in your unit care about your general satisfaction	3.71	4.09	4.07	3.64	3.25	3.76	3.68	3.66	3.50
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.17</i>	<i>4.31</i>	<i>4.28</i>	<i>4.13</i>	<i>3.98</i>	<i>4.24</i>	<i>4.11</i>	<i>4.14</i>	<i>4.09</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1= "Never" and 5 = "Always."

Table 49. Mean Response to Respectful Treatment Items, by Employee Role and Time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Current Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuin)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	> 20 Years
You are treated with respect by staff	4.41	4.33	4.40	4.38	4.31	4.44	4.36	4.30	4.37	4.50
You are treated with respect by your unit head or chair	4.15	4.38	4.54	4.48	4.41	4.42	4.38	4.34	4.14	4.40
You are treated with respect by faculty	4.03	3.94	3.83	3.90	4.12	4.29	4.14	3.87	4.10	4.26
You are treated with respect by students	4.13	4.21	4.24	4.24	4.38	4.45	4.34	4.11	4.32	4.38
You are treated with respect within NatSci	3.83	4.04	3.90	3.85	4.21	4.25	4.12	3.99	4.00	4.08
You trust your coworkers	3.94	4.12	4.05	4.19	4.16	4.34	4.14	3.99	4.09	4.25
Your contributions are recognized and valued	3.56	3.83	3.80	3.75	3.80	3.90	3.81	3.68	3.71	3.81
People in unit care about your satisfaction	3.32	3.79	3.66	3.75	3.90	3.85	3.79	3.63	3.51	3.72
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>3.92</i>	<i>4.08</i>	<i>4.05</i>	<i>4.07</i>	<i>4.16</i>	<i>4.24</i>	<i>4.14</i>	<i>3.99</i>	<i>4.03</i>	<i>4.18</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1= "Never" and 5 = "Always."

Table 49 reports the results of the Respectful Treatment items for employees only, broken down by role and time spent in current position. The table shows that:

- Post-docs and staff gave the most favorable responses to these items, on average (mean score of 4.24 and 4.16, respectfully), while tenure-stream faculty gave the least favorable responses (mean score of 3.92).
- Respondents who had been in their position for between 4 and 20 years expressed less favorable attitudes, on average, compared to those who were either newer to their position or had been in the same position for over 20 years.

Below, Table 50 shows the results of these items by employee unit. It indicates that:

- The most favorable responses on these items were given by respondents who work in Computational Math, Science, or Engineering (mean score of 4.28) or in Microbiology / Molecular Genetics (mean score of 4.25).
- The least favorable responses were given by those in Mathematics (mean score of 3.66) and Neuroscience (mean score of 3.82).

Table 50. Mean Response to Respectful Treatment Items, by Employee Unit

Items	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics-Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
You are treated with respect by staff	4.39	4.50	4.20	4.53	4.16	4.50	4.50	4.41	4.20	4.49	4.11	4.13	4.39	4.42	4.39	4.46
You are treated with respect by your unit head or chair	4.39	4.31	4.18	4.63	3.79	4.45	3.97	4.18	4.00	4.54	4.19	4.20	4.46	4.52	4.08	4.44
You are treated with respect by faculty	4.25	4.25	3.98	4.16	4.04	4.00	3.82	4.14	3.57	4.25	3.65	3.60	4.16	4.10	4.21	4.29
You are treated with respect by students	4.30	4.38	4.17	4.42	4.52	4.27	4.11	4.36	4.15	4.26	4.04	3.93	4.26	4.17	4.26	4.29
You are treated with respect within NatSci	4.09	4.19	3.69	4.21	3.80	4.20	3.83	4.17	3.59	4.41	3.86	3.73	4.13	4.10	3.92	4.24
You trust your coworkers	4.19	4.27	3.90	4.32	4.21	4.14	4.03	4.27	3.62	4.23	3.72	3.80	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.20
Your contributions to your unit are recognized and valued	3.82	3.94	3.49	4.00	3.88	3.73	3.74	3.69	3.20	3.98	3.48	3.73	3.80	3.67	3.66	3.95
People in your unit care about your general satisfaction	3.79	3.67	3.38	3.95	3.56	3.50	3.46	3.60	2.93	3.86	3.68	3.40	3.60	3.67	3.76	3.78
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.15</i>	<i>4.19</i>	<i>3.87</i>	<i>4.28</i>	<i>4.00</i>	<i>4.10</i>	<i>3.93</i>	<i>4.10</i>	<i>3.66</i>	<i>4.25</i>	<i>3.84</i>	<i>3.82</i>	<i>4.12</i>	<i>4.09</i>	<i>4.03</i>	<i>4.21</i>
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>70</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>41</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1= "Never" and 5 = "Always."

Uncivil Behaviors

The survey instrument also contained a set of items asking respondents how often (if at all) they had experienced four types of uncivil behaviors within the College of Natural Science. Respondents answered separately based on whether these behaviors were committed by faculty, staff, graduate students, or undergraduates. The results of these items are summarized below in Table 51, which shows that:

- Overall, respondents indicated that uncivil behaviors are *prevalent* within the college (in the sense that most – 68 percent – had experienced at least one uncivil behavior from at least one type of NatSci community member), but not necessarily *frequent*. The mean frequency with which respondents reported experiencing these behaviors consistently fell between 1.00 and 2.00 out of 5.00, which corresponds to a frequency of less than once per semester.
- The most common form of uncivil behavior respondents indicated they had experienced was others doubting or devaluing their work or expertise, while the least prevalent uncivil behavior (among those listed) was making false statements or circulating negative rumors.

Table 51. Summary of Responses to Uncivil Behaviors Items

Items	% Ever Experienced	Mean Frequency
Treatment from Faculty		
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	36%	1.58
Put down or was condescending	34%	1.53
Distrusted description of own experiences	23%	1.35
Made false statements or circulated rumors	14%	1.21
Treatment from Staff		
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	16%	1.24
Put down or was condescending	15%	1.21
Distrusted description of own experiences	12%	1.18
Made false statements or circulated rumors	9%	1.12
Treatment from Graduate Students		
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	32%	1.48
Put down or was condescending	25%	1.38
Distrusted description of own experiences	19%	1.27
Made false statements or circulated rumors	11%	1.14
Treatment from Undergraduates		
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	32%	1.52
Put down or was condescending	26%	1.40
Distrusted description of own experiences	17%	1.26
Made false statements or circulated rumors	14%	1.20
<i>% Experienced <u>at least one</u> of these Behaviors:</i>		
<i>Committed by Faculty</i>	46%	
<i>Committed by Staff</i>	23%	
<i>Committed by Graduate Students</i>	40%	
<i>Committed by Undergraduates</i>	41%	
<i>Committed by anyone</i>	68%	
<i>Means were calculated on a five-point scale where 1 = "Never" and 5 = "Daily"</i>		

- According to these results, uncivil behaviors were less likely to be committed by staff than other groups, but otherwise were committed at fairly similar rates by faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates.

Table 52, which summarizes the percent of respondents who reported ever experiencing uncivil behaviors by respondent type, indicates that:

- Each type of respondent was more likely than other groups to report experiencing uncivil behaviors committed by people like them (e.g., graduate students were the most likely group to experience uncivil behaviors from graduate students, staff were the most likely to experience uncivil behaviors from staff, etc.)

Table 52. Percent who Reported Experiencing Uncivil Behaviors, by Respondent Type

Items	Type of Respondent			
	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads
Treatment from Faculty				
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	50%	42%	46%	23%
Put down or was condescending	51%	31%	47%	22%
Distrusted description of own experiences	32%	24%	35%	14%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	29%	14%	19%	6%
Treatment from Staff				
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	20%	28%	12%	11%
Put down or was condescending	21%	25%	14%	8%
Distrusted description of own experiences	16%	18%	12%	8%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	15%	16%	8%	3%
Treatment from Graduate Students				
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	36%	24%	43%	29%
Put down or was condescending	26%	16%	38%	25%
Distrusted description of own experiences	18%	15%	31%	16%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	22%	8%	18%	5%
Treatment from Undergraduates				
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	39%	18%	31%	37%
Put down or was condescending	36%	12%	21%	30%
Distrusted description of own experiences	20%	6%	15%	21%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	29%	7%	12%	13%
<i>% Experienced <u>at least one</u> of these Behaviors:</i>				
<i>Committed by Faculty</i>	61%	49%	63%	30%
<i>Committed by Staff</i>	30%	36%	22%	14%
<i>Committed by Graduate Students</i>	45%	30%	53%	39%
<i>Committed by Undergraduates</i>	52%	21%	36%	48%
<i>Committed by anyone</i>	80%	67%	76%	61%

- According to their survey responses, the most common instances of uncivil behaviors were committed by faculty members, and targeted other faculty members or graduate students. In particular about half (46 to 51 percent) of respondents in these groups indicated that a faculty member in the college had doubted or devalued their work or expertise, or put them down or spoke condescendingly to them.

Next, Table 53 summarizes the responses to these items by race or ethnicity, gender, and LGBT status.

Table 53. Percent who Reported Experiencing Uncivil Behaviors, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity

Items	Race / Ethnicity					Gender Identity		LGBT	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African American	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Treatment from Faculty									
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	39%	23%	33%	29%	41%	33%	39%	36%	37%
Put down or was condescending	37%	20%	26%	29%	30%	29%	36%	34%	33%
Distrusted description of own experiences	25%	16%	20%	20%	29%	20%	25%	22%	28%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	13%	15%	10%	10%	16%	15%	13%	15%	10%
Treatment from Staff									
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	18%	10%	13%	12%	13%	11%	20%	17%	12%
Put down or was condescending	16%	11%	5%	16%	14%	10%	18%	16%	13%
Distrusted description of own experiences	13%	7%	12%	11%	14%	9%	14%	13%	11%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	9%	7%	4%	7%	9%	8%	9%	9%	6%
Treatment from Graduate Students									
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	34%	24%	33%	34%	34%	26%	37%	31%	37%
Put down or was condescending	26%	19%	30%	30%	23%	21%	28%	25%	27%
Distrusted description of own experiences	19%	14%	24%	22%	16%	17%	20%	17%	30%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	11%	10%	7%	10%	11%	12%	10%	11%	14%
Treatment from Undergraduates									
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	33%	30%	29%	29%	30%	27%	36%	32%	35%
Put down or was condescending	26%	23%	30%	22%	21%	23%	28%	26%	28%
Distrusted description of own experiences	16%	17%	22%	13%	14%	15%	17%	16%	26%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	13%	15%	13%	8%	13%	16%	12%	14%	14%
% Experienced <u>at least one</u> of these Behaviors:									
Committed by Faculty	49%	28%	37%	42%	46%	43%	48%	45%	47%
Committed by Staff	25%	15%	15%	19%	23%	17%	27%	24%	19%
Committed by Graduate Students	43%	30%	43%	44%	45%	35%	45%	40%	47%
Committed by Undergraduates	41%	37%	22%	39%	39%	36%	44%	40%	47%
Committed by anyone	71%	56%	68%	67%	71%	63%	73%	68%	69%

Table 53 shows only small differences across racial or ethnic groups and gender identities. Most noticeably:

- Asian or Pacific Islander respondents were the least likely to report experiencing uncivil behaviors.
- Female-identifying respondents were more likely to report experiencing uncivil behaviors than were male-identifying respondents.

Table 54, which summarizes these items for those employed within the college by employee role and time in current position, indicates that:

- Post-docs were less likely than other groups to report having experienced uncivil behaviors.
- Employees who had served in their current position for 4 to 20 years were more likely to report experiencing uncivil behaviors than those who were newer to their position or had worked in their current position for over 20 years.

Table 54. Percent who Reported Experiencing Uncivil Behaviors, by Employee Role and Time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuing)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	> 20 Years
Treatment from Faculty										
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	52%	44%	53%	52%	43%	32%	38%	56%	52%	37%
Put down or was condescending	53%	42%	40%	43%	32%	24%	30%	52%	42%	32%
Distrusted description of own experiences	33%	33%	33%	24%	27%	16%	23%	34%	37%	21%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	33%	21%	19%	14%	14%	11%	15%	26%	27%	17%
Treatment from Staff										
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	19%	25%	26%	19%	37%	9%	24%	27%	27%	19%
Put down or was condescending	20%	29%	19%	19%	31%	12%	21%	27%	27%	17%
Distrusted description of own experiences	17%	17%	14%	14%	23%	9%	18%	17%	22%	15%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	15%	19%	14%	10%	20%	5%	15%	16%	23%	11%
Treatment from Graduate Students										
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	37%	31%	28%	33%	24%	26%	24%	39%	30%	23%
Put down or was condescending	27%	21%	14%	19%	16%	15%	17%	25%	27%	13%
Distrusted description of own experiences	20%	19%	14%	10%	12%	19%	15%	24%	13%	11%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	25%	15%	9%	5%	6%	11%	14%	16%	14%	13%
Treatment from Undergraduates										
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	37%	44%	47%	52%	17%	6%	25%	39%	27%	14%
Put down or was condescending	34%	48%	26%	38%	13%	4%	18%	29%	28%	17%
Distrusted description of own experiences	19%	27%	21%	24%	4%	2%	9%	17%	18%	7%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	27%	42%	19%	24%	6%	2%	12%	17%	21%	18%
% Experienced at least one of these Behaviors:										
Committed by Faculty	64%	52%	60%	62%	53%	38%	44%	67%	62%	46%
Committed by Staff	30%	29%	35%	24%	45%	17%	31%	38%	39%	24%
Committed by Graduate Students	48%	35%	37%	33%	29%	32%	31%	45%	40%	32%
Committed by Undergraduates	51%	58%	53%	57%	20%	7%	28%	45%	39%	28%
Committed by anyone	79%	75%	81%	90%	70%	55%	68%	83%	77%	62%

Finally, Table 55 shows the percent of employee respondents within each unit who reported experiencing uncivil behaviors from each type of NatSci community member. The table indicates that:

- Uncivil behaviors were reported most prevalently by respondents in the Natural Science Dean's Office (93 percent of respondents) and in Integrative Biology (89 percent).
- The units least likely to report experiencing uncivil behaviors were Plant Research Lab (61 percent of respondents) and FRIB / NSCL (64 percent).
- Respondents in the Natural Science Dean's Office were especially likely to report experiencing uncivil behaviors from staff (66 percent of respondents).

Table 55. Percent who Reported Experiencing Uncivil Behaviors, by Employee Unit

Items	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics-Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
Treatment from Faculty																
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	41%	56%	39%	35%	60%	41%	42%	49%	60%	43%	55%	67%	43%	44%	54%	32%
Put down or was condescending	36%	56%	43%	40%	60%	41%	50%	38%	51%	39%	55%	73%	41%	31%	46%	27%
Distrusted description of own experiences	26%	25%	27%	15%	32%	32%	37%	29%	36%	24%	28%	47%	31%	19%	27%	34%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	16%	25%	25%	10%	32%	36%	24%	11%	34%	19%	31%	47%	23%	25%	16%	20%
Treatment from Staff																
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	16%	31%	22%	15%	40%	27%	26%	29%	28%	17%	41%	40%	23%	19%	30%	12%
Put down or was condescending	11%	31%	20%	15%	40%	23%	29%	31%	19%	20%	48%	27%	23%	19%	24%	17%
Distrusted description of own experiences	11%	13%	20%	5%	32%	32%	13%	20%	19%	9%	24%	13%	20%	16%	22%	17%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	8%	19%	27%	5%	24%	23%	11%	11%	19%	11%	21%	20%	13%	16%	16%	10%
Treatment from Graduate Students																
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	36%	19%	33%	25%	40%	27%	32%	33%	36%	31%	17%	20%	30%	31%	35%	32%
Put down or was condescending	23%	13%	22%	5%	16%	23%	18%	18%	26%	28%	7%	20%	33%	19%	24%	27%
Distrusted description of own experiences	21%	19%	20%	15%	16%	18%	3%	16%	19%	19%	3%	13%	23%	25%	19%	24%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	11%	19%	22%	10%	12%	18%	16%	7%	17%	19%	3%	7%	21%	13%	16%	24%
Treatment from Undergraduates																
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	29%	44%	22%	30%	28%	32%	45%	11%	38%	20%	48%	53%	34%	34%	19%	15%
Put down or was condescending	25%	44%	27%	15%	16%	27%	26%	2%	34%	22%	34%	40%	23%	28%	19%	12%
Distrusted description of own experiences	12%	31%	12%	20%	12%	18%	13%	4%	26%	7%	14%	7%	20%	16%	5%	10%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	12%	50%	18%	20%	12%	23%	18%	4%	28%	19%	24%	27%	20%	22%	5%	5%
% Experienced <u>at least one</u> of these Behaviors:																
Committed by Faculty	53%	69%	53%	50%	68%	50%	61%	58%	66%	52%	69%	87%	47%	56%	59%	41%
Committed by Staff	25%	38%	33%	20%	44%	32%	39%	40%	30%	26%	66%	47%	31%	19%	41%	24%
Committed by Graduate Students	44%	19%	45%	30%	40%	32%	39%	40%	47%	43%	17%	20%	39%	34%	49%	39%
Committed by Undergraduates	37%	63%	35%	30%	28%	41%	50%	16%	47%	37%	48%	53%	37%	47%	27%	20%
Committed by anyone	66%	88%	73%	65%	80%	64%	89%	69%	85%	67%	93%	87%	66%	75%	76%	61%

Sexual Harassment

Next, the survey instrument contained a set of four items asking respondents to indicate on a seven-point scale the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with four statements about sexual harassment within the College of Natural Science – including whether they had ever experienced it themselves. The statements themselves are listed, along with a summary of responses to each item, below in Table 56.

Table 56. Summary of Responses to Sexual Harassment Items, by Respondent Type

Items	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads	Other Undergrads	Total
Sexual harassment is a problem within the College (reverse coded)						
Total Agreement	38%	26%	45%	29%	22%	31%
Total Disagreement	45%	55%	41%	54%	59%	52%
Mean Score ^a	4.26	4.77	4.01	4.70	4.91	4.60
I know the steps to take if a person comes to me with a problem						
Total Agreement	98%	90%	88%	86%	84%	88%
Total Disagreement	1%	7%	9%	10%	11%	9%
Mean Score ^a	6.21	5.80	5.70	5.68	5.54	5.76
Sexual harassment is taken seriously within the College						
Total Agreement	82%	77%	68%	81%	83%	79%
Total Disagreement	11%	13%	24%	10%	7%	12%
Mean Score ^a	5.63	5.52	4.99	5.73	5.82	5.60
I have experienced sexual harassment within the College (reverse coded)						
Total Agreement	7%	5%	11%	5%	5%	6%
Total Disagreement	89%	92%	87%	93%	91%	91%
Mean Score ^a	6.22	6.31	6.15	6.47	6.42	6.35
<i>Number of responses</i>	281	324	237	614	402	1858
^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.						

The table shows that:

- About one-third (31 percent) of respondents indicated that sexual harassment is a problem within the College of Natural Science, and over one-tenth (12 percent) disagreed that it is taken seriously there.
- At least five percent of each respondent type answered that they have experienced sexual harassment within the College of Natural Science.
- Graduate students were the group that gave the least favorable answers, on average – 45 percent agreed that sexual harassment is a problem in the college, 24 percent disagreed that it is taken seriously, and over one-tenth (11 percent) indicated that they have experienced it.

Table 57, which breaks down the sexual harassment items by race or ethnicity, gender identity, and LGBT status, indicates that:

- Answers to these items were largely similar across racial and ethnic groups, although black or African American respondents gave somewhat less favorable responses.
- Female-identifying respondents were over twice as likely as males to indicate they had experienced sexual harassment and that it is not taken seriously within the college.
- LGBT-identifying respondents were approximately twice as likely as non-LGBT respondents to indicate they had experienced sexual harassment and that it is not taken seriously within the college.

Table 57. Response to Sexual Harassment Items, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity

Items	<u>Race / Ethnicity</u>					<u>Gender Identity</u>		<u>LGBT</u>	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African American	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non- LGBT	LGBT
Sexual harassment is a problem within the College (reverse coded)									
Total Agreement	30%	34%	28%	30%	29%	28%	32%	30%	38%
Total Disagreement	54%	46%	47%	50%	52%	55%	51%	53%	44%
Mean Score ^a	4.65	4.33	4.60	4.56	4.67	4.72	4.54	4.65	4.21
I know the steps to take if a person comes to me with a problem									
Total Agreement	88%	89%	90%	85%	90%	91%	86%	89%	82%
Total Disagreement	10%	5%	8%	9%	7%	5%	11%	7%	16%
Mean Score ^a	5.72	5.78	6.10	5.60	5.86	5.89	5.67	5.80	5.46
Sexual harassment is taken seriously within the College									
Total Agreement	79%	82%	77%	71%	75%	87%	75%	81%	70%
Total Disagreement	13%	11%	14%	15%	13%	6%	16%	11%	20%
Mean Score ^a	5.55	5.72	5.68	5.33	5.68	5.90	5.42	5.66	5.14
I have experienced sexual harassment within the College (reverse coded)									
Total Agreement	6%	6%	8%	6%	7%	3%	8%	5%	11%
Total Disagreement	92%	90%	91%	89%	92%	95%	89%	92%	86%
Mean Score ^a	6.37	6.32	6.30	6.25	6.32	6.60	6.22	6.40	6.03
<i>Number of responses</i>	1302	305	120	119	72	715	1048	2105	237

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Below, Table 58 breaks down the results of these items by employee role and time in current position. The table shows that:

- Tenure-stream faculty and post-docs were the most likely to agree that sexual harassment is a problem within the college, while fixed-term specialists were the most likely to indicate they had experienced sexual harassment (though the latter is on the basis of only 17 responses).
- Respondents who had been in their current position for 10 or fewer years expressed less favorable attitudes than did those who had been in their position for longer than 10 years.

Table 58. Response to Sexual Harassment Items, by Employee Role and Time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Current Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuing)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	> 20 Years
Sexual harassment is a problem within the College (reverse coded)										
Total Agreement	42%	29%	23%	35%	19%	42%	37%	34%	22%	28%
Total Disagreement	39%	58%	52%	47%	63%	42%	51%	50%	58%	44%
Mean Score ^a	4.11	4.55	4.65	4.47	5.12	4.17	4.46	4.54	4.80	4.48
I know the steps to take if a person comes to me with a problem										
Total Agreement	98%	92%	98%	86%	91%	89%	90%	95%	100%	91%
Total Disagreement	1%	4%	2%	14%	6%	8%	9%	3%	0%	5%
Mean Score ^a	6.13	6.10	6.37	6.05	5.82	5.75	5.74	6.16	6.20	5.93
Sexual harassment is taken seriously within the College										
Total Agreement	80%	87%	82%	72%	80%	75%	77%	77%	85%	84%
Total Disagreement	12%	11%	9%	22%	9%	19%	18%	13%	5%	6%
Mean Score ^a	5.51	5.83	5.76	5.39	5.64	5.33	5.38	5.51	5.86	5.74
I have experienced sexual harassment within the College (reverse coded)										
Total Agreement	7%	8%	3%	14%	6%	3%	6%	7%	3%	5%
Total Disagreement	89%	84%	98%	86%	90%	96%	93%	89%	92%	90%
Mean Score ^a	6.21	6.20	6.47	5.86	6.27	6.43	6.41	6.12	6.34	6.33
<i>Number of responses</i>	152	38	31	17	136	65	166	188	91	149

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 59, which summarizes these items by unit, indicates that the most favorable responses were given by those in Microbiology / Molecular Genetics or the Plant Research Lab, while the least favorable responses came from Earth and Environmental Science or Integrative Biology.

Table 59. Response to Sexual Harassment Items, by Employee Unit

Items	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics-Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
Sexual harassment is a problem within the College (reverse coded)																
Total Agreement	41%	23%	36%	31%	38%	41%	55%	45%	30%	18%	35%	27%	33%	29%	40%	26%
Total Disagreement	43%	38%	36%	54%	48%	53%	34%	31%	52%	63%	52%	45%	61%	43%	44%	61%
Mean Score ^a	4.16	4.46	4.31	4.92	4.57	4.29	3.90	3.69	4.48	5.05	4.61	4.45	4.75	4.25	4.24	4.77
I know the steps to take if a person comes to me with a problem																
Total Agreement	96%	94%	96%	100%	92%	95%	95%	84%	91%	94%	93%	93%	91%	100%	95%	97%
Total Disagreement	0%	6%	4%	0%	8%	5%	3%	11%	5%	4%	4%	7%	7%	0%	5%	3%
Mean Score ^a	6.01	6.19	6.00	5.95	6.08	6.27	6.03	5.69	5.82	6.21	6.07	6.00	5.88	6.10	5.89	6.11
Sexual harassment is taken seriously within the College																
Total Agreement	78%	86%	74%	88%	67%	89%	73%	74%	80%	83%	87%	79%	87%	85%	69%	79%
Total Disagreement	11%	14%	12%	6%	25%	5%	21%	13%	11%	13%	9%	7%	8%	4%	19%	9%
Mean Score ^a	5.42	5.79	5.57	5.76	5.08	6.00	5.09	5.36	5.69	5.59	6.00	5.57	5.95	5.41	5.06	5.62
I have experienced sexual harassment within the College (reverse coded)																
Total Agreement	5%	6%	6%	5%	21%	5%	13%	7%	5%	2%	0%	0%	3%	10%	11%	3%
Total Disagreement	90%	88%	89%	89%	75%	95%	84%	86%	91%	94%	100%	93%	97%	81%	89%	95%
Mean Score ^a	6.18	6.06	6.17	6.37	5.58	6.45	5.89	6.14	6.36	6.48	6.56	6.47	6.56	5.87	6.30	6.47
<i>Number of responses</i>	49	16	57	22	29	24	43	48	52	58	33	15	74	33	42	44
^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.																

Bias Incidents

The next section of the survey pertained to bias incidents within the college, where “bias incident” referred to “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.” The instrument provided this definition to each respondent, along with links to the MSU Anti-Discrimination Policy and Anti-Harassment Statement for further information.

Respondents were asked to indicate on a seven-point scale the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with three statements about bias incidents within the College of Natural Science. The list of statements is shown in Table 60, along with a summary of responses broken down by respondent type.

Table 60. Summary of Responses to Bias Incident Items

Items	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads	Other Undergrads	Total
I know how to report bias incidents if they occurred within the college						
Total Agreement	78%	70%	50%	56%	56%	61%
Total Disagreement	18%	25%	42%	38%	35%	33%
Mean Score ^a	5.32	4.88	4.17	4.37	4.41	4.59
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation						
Total Agreement	70%	70%	56%	75%	69%	70%
Total Disagreement	21%	20%	31%	14%	18%	19%
Mean Score ^a	5.13	5.11	4.47	5.37	5.07	5.11
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leadership will take appropriate actions to address them						
Total Agreement	64%	68%	53%	75%	74%	69%
Total Disagreement	27%	18%	36%	17%	17%	21%
Mean Score ^a	4.74	5.01	4.23	5.21	5.12	4.96
<i>Number of responses</i>	244	290	208	560	369	1671
^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = “Strongly Disagree” and 7 = “Strongly Agree.” However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = “Strongly Agree” and 7 = “Strongly Disagree” because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.						

The results indicate attitudes that are more favorable than unfavorable, but with a nontrivial minority of respondents perceiving issues within the college. In particular:

- Most (61 to 70 percent) respondents indicated they know how to report bias incidents and can do so without fear of retaliation. However, among graduate students specifically, the responses were much more divided (50 percent and 56 percent, respectively).
- Most (69 percent) respondents agreed that leadership will take appropriate action to address bias incidents that are reported. However, among graduate students only about half (53 percent) agreed while 36 percent disagreed.

Table 61, which breaks down these results by race or ethnicity, gender, and LGBT status, shows that:

- Asian or Pacific Islander respondents generally expressed the most favorable attitudes on these items, while Hispanic or Latinx respondents gave the least favorable responses.
- Male-identifying respondents consistently gave more favorable answers to these items than did female-identifying respondents.
- Non-LGBT respondents consistently gave more favorable answers to these items than did LGBT-identifying respondents.

Table 61. Response to Bias Incident Items, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity

Items	Race / Ethnicity					Gender Identity		LGBT	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African American	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non-LGBT	LGBT
I know how to report bias incidents if they occurred within the college									
Total Agreement	58%	72%	68%	58%	66%	68%	57%	63%	46%
Total Disagreement	36%	22%	29%	39%	22%	25%	37%	31%	47%
Mean Score ^a	4.46	4.99	4.79	4.46	4.90	4.87	4.41	4.67	3.99
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation									
Total Agreement	71%	69%	76%	63%	62%	79%	66%	71%	61%
Total Disagreement	18%	17%	18%	21%	31%	13%	22%	19%	24%
Mean Score ^a	5.16	5.14	5.30	4.98	4.75	5.50	4.94	5.16	4.75
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leadership will take appropriate actions to address them									
Total Agreement	69%	79%	62%	57%	68%	75%	67%	71%	57%
Total Disagreement	22%	13%	26%	7%	25%	16%	23%	19%	35%
Mean Score ^a	4.93	5.39	4.81	4.69	4.78	5.21	4.86	5.05	4.40
<i>Number of responses</i>	1239	265	112	109	68	642	955	2105	237

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Below, Table 62 summarizes the responses to these items by employee role and time in current position, for those who are employed by the college. The table shows that:

- Tenure-stream faculty and continuing specialists were the most likely to agree that they know how to report bias incidents, but fixed-term faculty were more likely to agree that they can report incidents without fear of retaliation and that leadership will take appropriate action to deal with such incidents if they are reported.
- In terms of time in current position, the most favorable answers were given by those who had worked in theirs for 11 to 20 years.

Table 62. Response to Bias Incident Items, by Employee Role and Time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Current Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuing)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	> 20 Years
I know how to report bias incidents if they occurred within the college										
Total Agreement	80%	67%	82%	65%	71%	69%	71%	73%	87%	70%
Total Disagreement	16%	27%	15%	35%	23%	29%	25%	23%	10%	24%
Mean Score ^a	5.32	5.13	5.51	4.64	4.93	4.82	4.88	5.16	5.54	4.98
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation										
Total Agreement	68%	78%	72%	59%	71%	69%	70%	69%	81%	67%
Total Disagreement	21%	17%	26%	29%	16%	27%	20%	23%	14%	21%
Mean Score ^a	5.07	5.46	5.03	4.71	5.23	4.94	5.10	5.09	5.39	5.12
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leadership will take appropriate actions to address them										
Total Agreement	62%	71%	68%	63%	69%	67%	63%	64%	77%	67%
Total Disagreement	28%	20%	21%	32%	17%	21%	23%	26%	15%	20%
Mean Score ^a	4.66	5.13	4.97	4.74	5.08	4.89	4.79	4.89	5.05	5.01
<i>Number of responses</i>	178	45	38	19	167	81	145	170	81	128

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 63, below, summarizes these items by employee unit. It shows that in most units, the responses were more favorable than unfavorable. More specifically:

- The most favorable responses were given by those employed within FRIB / NSCL and the Natural Science Dean's Office.
- On the other hand, fewer than half of the respondents in Earth and Environmental Science agreed that they can report bias incidents without fear of retaliation and that leadership will take action to address such incidents if they are reported (42 and 46 percent, respectively).

Table 63. Response to Bias Incident Items, by Employee Unit

Items	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics-Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
I know how to report bias incidents if they occurred within the college																
Total Agreement	76%	88%	77%	68%	67%	95%	78%	71%	75%	73%	85%	71%	74%	75%	77%	78%
Total Disagreement	21%	13%	23%	16%	21%	5%	19%	29%	15%	22%	7%	29%	25%	18%	23%	19%
Mean Score ^a	5.11	5.69	5.13	4.95	5.04	6.21	5.25	4.90	5.35	5.02	5.70	4.71	5.08	5.07	5.11	5.19
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation																
Total Agreement	77%	71%	63%	84%	42%	90%	62%	73%	59%	79%	84%	64%	84%	63%	63%	60%
Total Disagreement	11%	14%	28%	5%	38%	5%	32%	23%	29%	17%	4%	29%	13%	17%	29%	23%
Mean Score ^a	5.40	5.29	4.91	5.74	4.38	6.10	4.56	5.30	4.71	5.29	5.80	4.36	5.69	4.83	4.74	4.97
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leadership will take appropriate actions to address them																
Total Agreement	68%	73%	59%	67%	46%	84%	54%	60%	61%	73%	80%	57%	77%	65%	55%	78%
Total Disagreement	23%	20%	28%	17%	46%	5%	40%	19%	18%	20%	8%	43%	14%	27%	28%	13%
Mean Score ^a	4.92	5.40	4.72	5.11	4.21	5.47	4.03	4.67	3.89	5.17	5.32	4.07	5.22	4.58	4.31	5.44
<i>Number of responses</i>	62	15	46	19	24	19	35	43	38	41	25	14	64	26	29	32
^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.																

Respondents were also asked how often, within the past year, they had personally experienced or witnessed bias or discrimination within the College of Natural Science. If they answered yes to either, they were then given a follow-up question asking them to indicate what the bias or discrimination was based on (e.g., racial discrimination, age discrimination, etc.).

Table 64 lists the forms of discrimination that were shown on the survey instrument, along with the percentage of respondents who reported having experienced and witnessed at least one incident of each type within the past year. The bottom of the table contains summary statistics including the percentage of respondents who ever experienced or witnessed at least one bias incident of any type. The table indicates that:

- About one-fourth (23 percent) of all respondents reported having experienced bias or discrimination within the college at least once in the previous year, while one-third (33 percent) indicated they had witnessed an incident directed at someone else.
- The most common forms of bias or discrimination respondents indicated they had personally experienced were based on race or ethnicity (8 percent of respondents) and gender identity (7 percent of respondents).
- At least 10 percent of respondents indicated they had witnessed at least one incident of bias or discrimination based on race or ethnicity (15 percent), gender identity (11 percent), or country of origin (10 percent).

Table 64. Prevalence of Bias Incidents Experienced and Witnessed

Items	% Ever Experienced	% Ever Witnessed
Race / ethnicity	8%	15%
Gender identity	7%	11%
Psychological or mental health issue	4%	7%
Age	4%	6%
Country of origin	4%	10%
Socioeconomic status	4%	5%
Gender expression	3%	5%
Religious background	3%	5%
Sexual orientation	3%	6%
Physical health issue	2%	3%
Physical disability	1%	2%
<i>% Experienced / witnessed at least one bias incident in the last year:</i>	<i>23%</i>	<i>33%</i>
<i>At least 1 or 2 times per semester in the last year:</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>19%</i>
<i>At least weekly in the last year:</i>	<i>1%</i>	<i>2%</i>

Table 65 summarizes the responses to these items by respondent type.

Table 65. Prevalence of Bias Incidents, by Respondent Type

Items	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads	Other Undergrads
% Experienced					
Race / ethnicity	9%	5%	14%	8%	7%
Gender identity	11%	6%	12%	5%	5%
Psychological or mental health issue	2%	2%	13%	4%	4%
Age	8%	5%	4%	4%	3%
Country of origin	5%	2%	10%	2%	4%
Socioeconomic status	2%	4%	5%	4%	3%
Gender expression	6%	2%	6%	2%	3%
Religious background	3%	2%	4%	3%	3%
Sexual orientation	2%	2%	4%	2%	3%
Physical health issue	2%	2%	3%	1%	2%
Physical disability	1%	2%	<1%	1%	1%
% Witnessed					
Race / ethnicity	15%	10%	28%	14%	13%
Gender identity	20%	8%	18%	7%	8%
Psychological or mental health issue	5%	5%	21%	4%	6%
Age	10%	7%	9%	4%	4%
Country of origin	11%	7%	22%	8%	8%
Socioeconomic status	2%	6%	9%	5%	4%
Gender expression	8%	4%	8%	5%	4%
Religious background	6%	4%	7%	4%	4%
Sexual orientation	6%	3%	9%	7%	4%
Physical health issue	1%	4%	6%	2%	3%
Physical disability	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%
<i>% Experienced at least one bias incident:</i>					
	32%	19%	34%	18%	22%
<i>% Witnessed at least one bias incident:</i>					
	42%	27%	51%	27%	32%

The table shows that:

- About one-third of graduate students and faculty (34 and 32 percent, respectively) indicated they had personally experienced at least one bias incident within the college in the past year. These were also the groups most likely to indicate that they witnessed bias or discrimination directed at someone else (51 and 42 percent, respectively).

- The specific forms of discrimination indicated most prevalently were similar across all respondent types, although graduate students in particular were more likely than other groups to indicate incidents related to psychological or mental health issues and country of origin.

Table 66. Prevalence of Bias Incidents, by Race or Ethnicity and Gender Identity

Items	Race / Ethnicity					Gender Identity		LGBT	
	White	Asian / Paci. Island	Black / African American	Hispanic / Latinx	Other Identities	Male	Female	Non-LGBT	LGBT
% Experienced									
Race / ethnicity	4%	13%	31%	21%	24%	9%	8%	8%	6%
Gender identity	7%	4%	11%	4%	8%	1%	10%	6%	13%
Psych. / mental health issue	5%	5%	5%	5%	3%	2%	6%	3%	13%
Age	4%	5%	5%	5%	3%	4%	5%	4%	5%
Country of origin	2%	9%	7%	8%	11%	5%	4%	4%	2%
Socioeconomic status	3%	3%	5%	8%	3%	2%	4%	3%	6%
Gender expression	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	1%	4%	2%	8%
Religious background	2%	4%	3%	6%	10%	2%	3%	3%	4%
Sexual orientation	2%	2%	3%	2%	0%	2%	3%	2%	8%
Physical health issue	2%	2%	3%	4%	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%
Physical disability	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	<1%	1%	1%	1%
% Witnessed									
Race / ethnicity	13%	18%	23%	15%	27%	13%	16%	14%	22%
Gender identity	12%	5%	12%	7%	17%	8%	12%	10%	18%
Psych. / mental health issue	8%	7%	6%	7%	8%	5%	8%	6%	15%
Age	6%	4%	5%	6%	8%	6%	6%	5%	9%
Country of origin	9%	15%	9%	8%	12%	10%	10%	9%	13%
Socioeconomic status	5%	5%	6%	6%	7%	4%	5%	5%	7%
Gender expression	6%	3%	10%	5%	2%	4%	6%	5%	10%
Religious background	4%	5%	6%	6%	7%	4%	5%	4%	9%
Sexual orientation	6%	4%	6%	9%	5%	4%	7%	5%	11%
Physical health issue	3%	2%	3%	4%	2%	2%	4%	2%	7%
Physical disability	3%	2%	3%	5%	0%	2%	3%	2%	5%
<i>% Experienced ≥ one incident:</i>	20%	22%	36%	30%	37%	17%	26%	22%	29%
<i>% Witnessed ≥ one incident:</i>	32%	30%	34%	31%	39%	28%	36%	32%	41%

Table 67 breaks down the results of the bias incident items by employee role and time in current position, among those employed by NatSci. It shows that staff and post-docs were the least likely to indicate they had experienced or witnessed bias incidents, while tenure-stream and fixed-term faculty were the most likely.

Table 67. Prevalence of Bias Incidents, by Employee Role and Time in Position

Items	Employee Role						Time in Current Position			
	Faculty (Tenure)	Faculty (Fixed)	Specialist (Continuing)	Specialist (Fixed)	Staff	Post-Doc	< 4 Years	4 – 10 Years	11-20 Years	> 20 Years
% Experienced										
Race / ethnicity	10%	5%	14%	0%	3%	6%	6%	8%	8%	6%
Gender identity	12%	11%	8%	11%	4%	7%	9%	9%	9%	5%
Psych. / mental health issue	3%	2%	0%	5%	1%	2%	1%	2%	4%	2%
Age	7%	11%	3%	5%	5%	2%	8%	8%	4%	3%
Country of origin	4%	5%	14%	0%	0%	5%	3%	5%	1%	4%
Socioeconomic status	2%	0%	11%	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	1%
Gender expression	6%	7%	0%	0%	1%	4%	3%	5%	5%	1%
Religious background	3%	2%	5%	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%	4%	2%
Sexual orientation	2%	7%	0%	0%	2%	2%	3%	2%	0%	4%
Physical health issue	3%	2%	0%	0%	2%	2%	1%	3%	4%	2%
Physical disability	0%	2%	5%	0%	1%	1%	0%	4%	0%	1%
% Witnessed										
Race / ethnicity	18%	7%	22%	25%	6%	7%	13%	16%	8%	9%
Gender identity	20%	23%	11%	25%	6%	10%	13%	20%	8%	8%
Psych. / mental health issue	5%	9%	8%	6%	3%	5%	6%	6%	4%	2%
Age	10%	9%	6%	6%	7%	6%	10%	11%	5%	5%
Country of origin	12%	7%	11%	13%	4%	7%	11%	11%	3%	7%
Socioeconomic status	2%	0%	3%	13%	6%	4%	8%	4%	0%	2%
Gender expression	9%	5%	6%	0%	4%	2%	8%	6%	5%	3%
Religious background	5%	7%	3%	6%	1%	7%	4%	5%	4%	5%
Sexual orientation	7%	9%	3%	0%	3%	1%	6%	6%	0%	3%
Physical health issue	1%	5%	8%	0%	4%	1%	4%	3%	0%	2%
Physical disability	2%	5%	8%	6%	3%	1%	4%	4%	1%	1%
<i>% Experienced at least one incident:</i>	34%	30%	32%	26%	16%	15%	26%	29%	22%	20%
<i>% Witnessed at least one incident:</i>	45%	39%	44%	44%	22%	23%	37%	43%	24%	23%

The number of respondents within most units was too small to break down the full set of items by unit, but Table 68 indicates that bias incidents were experienced and witnessed most prevalently within Integrative Biology, Neuroscience, and Plant Biology.

Table 68. Prevalence of Bias Incidents, by Employee Unit

	Biochemistry / Molecular Biology	Biomedical Lab Diagnostics	Chemistry	Computational Math / Sci. / Eng.	Earth and Environ. Science	FRIB / NSCL	Integrative Biology	Kellogg Biological Station	Mathematics	Microbiology / Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Dean	Neuroscience	Physics-Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Plant Research Lab
Experienced at least one incident	18%	31%	21%	12%	36%	23%	41%	25%	28%	24%	29%	43%	28%	28%	43%	9%
At least 1 or 2 times per semester	3%	19%	7%	0%	23%	5%	26%	10%	8%	12%	13%	21%	13%	16%	31%	9%
At least weekly	0%	6%	0%	0%	5%	0%	3%	0%	3%	2%	0%	0%	2%	4%	0%	0%
Witnessed at least one incident	23%	40%	24%	31%	55%	36%	50%	41%	43%	24%	48%	62%	40%	44%	36%	29%
At least 1 or 2 times per semester	8%	27%	14%	13%	27%	18%	34%	21%	24%	12%	17%	38%	22%	28%	24%	18%
At least weekly	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	4%	0%	0%	2%	4%	3%	0%
<i>Number of responses</i>	62	16	42	16	22	22	32	39	37	49	23	14	65	25	33	34

Respondents who indicated that they had either experienced or witnessed an act of bias or discrimination were then asked if they had reported the most recent incident and, if so, to whom. The results of these items are summarized in Table 69, which indicates that:

- Just 11 percent of those who experienced or witnessed an act of bias or discrimination actually reported it to anyone.
- Of those who did report an incident of bias / discrimination, the most common person to whom they reported it was their department or unit chair, followed by a faculty member or the OIE.

The number of respondents who answered that they reported the most recent incident to someone was too small to analyze across different groups.

Table 69. Percent of Respondents who Reported the Most Recent Bias Incident they Encountered

Incident reported to whom	Number	% of Responses
Department / unit chair	23	4%
Faculty member	18	3%
Office of Institutional Equity (OIE)	14	3%
Dean / associate dean / assistant dean	9	2%
Staff member	3	<1%
Title IX Office	3	<1%
Faculty Grievance Office	2	<1%
Prefer not to say	4	1%
Other	11	2%
<i>Did not report incident</i>	<i>475</i>	<i>89%</i>
<i>Percentages are calculated out of the number of respondents who indicated they had experienced or witnessed a bias incident</i>		

Finally, respondents who had experienced or witnessed any act(s) of bias or discrimination were asked if at least one incident was committed by or directed at various types of NatSci community members. The results indicate that the nature of these incidents varied depending on the respondent's role. In particular:

- Faculty members were most likely to indicate encountering incidents committed by (79 percent) and directed at other faculty members (61 percent).
- Staff members were most likely to indicate encountering incidents committed by faculty (69 percent), targeted at staff members (38 percent).
- Graduate students were most likely to indicate encountering incidents committed by faculty (75 percent) and targeting graduate students (70 percent).
- Undergraduate students were most likely to indicate encountering incidents committed by (81 percent of responses from NatSci undergraduates) and targeted at (74 percent of responses from NatSci undergraduates) other undergraduate students.

Table 70. Type of Person Who Committed Act of Bias / Discrimination

Items	Respondent Type					Total
	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads	Other Undergrads	
% of Incidents Committed By						
Faculty member(s)	79%	69%	75%	53%	47%	64%
Undergraduate student(s)	27%	13%	30%	81%	65%	49%
Graduate student(s) / Teaching assistant(s)	27%	23%	52%	38%	31%	35%
Staff member(s)	29%	44%	30%	12%	19%	25%
Department / unit head	41%	23%	27%	7%	10%	21%
Faculty advisor(s) / mentor(s)	8%	29%	40%	13%	10%	19%
Academic Advisor(s)	5%	11%	35%	19%	18%	18%
Campus visitor(s)	5%	9%	20%	15%	14%	13%
Dean / Assoc Dean / Asst Dean	29%	20%	7%	5%	0%	11%
Postdoctoral scholar(s)	10%	26%	15%	3%	5%	10%
<i>Number of respondents</i>						
	90	55	77	128	94	444

Table 71. Type of Person Targeted by Act of Bias / Discrimination Witnessed by Respondent

Items	Respondent Type					Total
	Faculty	Staff / Specialists	Graduate Students	NatSci Undergrads	Other Undergrads	
% of Incidents Directed at						
Undergraduate student(s)	23%	27%	30%	74%	66%	47%
Graduate student(s) / Teaching assistant(s)	43%	27%	70%	12%	15%	32%
Faculty member(s)	61%	12%	14%	12%	11%	22%
Staff member(s)	20%	38%	11%	4%	5%	14%
Postdoctoral scholar(s)	18%	23%	20%	3%	2%	12%
Campus visitor(s)	4%	3%	10%	6%	7%	6%
Academic Advisor(s)	5%	9%	6%	4%	4%	5%
Faculty advisor(s) / mentor(s)	3%	3%	7%	4%	1%	3%
Department / unit head	5%	4%	3%	3%	0%	3%
Dean / Assoc Dean / Asst Dean	2%	1%	1%	2%	0%	1%
<i>Number of respondents</i>						
	104	74	103	142	119	533

SECTION VI. MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

While respondents' direct answers can be instructive, some attitudes measured by the survey could be more important than others in terms of influencing NatSci community members' overall level of satisfaction, comfort, and intention to stay or leave the college. For that reason, it is useful to also test a statistical model of the determinants of these key dependent variables. If a variable is highly correlated with satisfaction, comfort, or intent to leave after controlling for other factors, it may be an area worth particular attention when strategizing how to improve the climate in the future.

To that end, a series of ordered and binary logistic regression analyses (method to estimate the effect of many variables on a dependent variable that is measured with a small number of discrete categories) were conducted to help identify which attitudes and traits are most important in determining who is most satisfied and comfortable within the college, and who has considered leaving due to the climate. The technical details of this analysis can be found in Appendix A, but the findings are summarized in Table 72 for employees and Table 73 for NatSci students.

The tables contain lists of only those variables that were found to have statistically significant relationships with each dependent variable, even after controlling for the other variables in the model. While causal influence cannot be assumed, the results can help us understand what makes people say they are more or less happy with the organizational climate. The tables also contains a measure of how strong the relationship is between each predictor variable and each dependent variable. Specifically, the numbers can be interpreted as the predicted *change* in the probability of saying that one is "Very Satisfied," is "Very Comfortable," or has considered leaving the college due to the climate that would be associated with increasing each predictor variable by a comparable amount (one standard deviation) while holding all other variables at their respective means.

Table 72. Significant Predictors of Key Outcomes, among Employees

DV: Satisfaction (Ordered Logit)		DV: Comfort (Ordered Logit)		DV: Considered Leaving (Logistic Regression)	
Significant Predictors	Typical Effect ^a	Significant Predictors	Typical Effect ^a	Significant Predictors	Typical Effect ^a
NatSci is supportive	+20.5%	NatSci is respectful	+15.8%	NatSci is respectful	-23.2%
Belong in NatSci	+15.4%	Personal identities are valued	+11.0%	Similar opportunities for success	-7.8%
NatSci is respectful	+9.6%	NatSci is welcoming	+8.2%		
Treated fairly with merit raise decisions	+7.8%	NatSci is non-sexist	+6.7%		

Table 72 suggests that the most important factors for keeping employees satisfied, comfortable, and willing to remain in their position include:

- Believing that NatSci is supportive, respectful, welcoming, and non-sexist;
- Feeling that one belongs in NatSci, that one's personal identities are valued, and that one has similar opportunities for success as other people; and
- Believing that one has been treated fairly with respect to merit raise decisions.

Table 73. Significant Predictors of Key Outcomes, among Students

DV: Satisfaction (Ordered Logit)		DV: Comfort (Ordered Logit)		DV: Considered Leaving (Logistic Regression)	
Significant Predictors	Typical Effect ^a	Significant Predictors	Typical Effect ^a	Significant Predictors	Typical Effect ^a
Belong in NatSci	+10.9%	Safe within NatSci	+9.3%	NatSci is welcoming	-3.5%
NatSci is supportive	+9.4%	NatSci is non-racist	+6.0%	Safe within NatSci	-2.1%
NatSci is improving	+5.5%	NatSci is supportive	+5.5%	Personal identities valued	-2.0%
Treated with respect by faculty	+4.8%	NatSci is welcoming	+5.2%	Witnessed bias incident	+3.8%
Similar opportunities for success	+4.4%	NatSci is respectful	+5.1%		
Experienced bias incident	-4.3%	NatSci is improving	+4.8%		
		Similar opportunities for success	+4.5%		
		NatSci is non-homophobic	-6.0%		

Table 73 indicates that the most important factors for keeping students satisfied, comfortable, and willing to remain at Michigan State University include:

- Feeling safe and a sense of belonging within NatSci;
- Believing that NatSci is supportive, improving, non-racist, welcoming, and respectful; and
- Minimizing the extent to which they experience or witness incidents of bias or discrimination.

Although this combination of factors could be subjectively interpreted many ways, one way to generalize the results would be to generalize employees as prioritizing an *equitable professional environment* (i.e., characterized by mutual respect, equal opportunities, and fair treatment) and students as prioritizing a *warm educational community* (i.e., where they feel safe, welcome, and a strong sense of belonging).

APPENDIX A. ORDERED AND BINARY LOGISTIC REGRESSIONS

We are interested in predicting or explaining respondents' self-assessed levels of comfort and satisfaction, which have been measured at the ordinal level – that is, there is a clear ordering of the categories the variable can take on, yet we cannot say that the spacing between adjacent values is the same across all levels of the variable. An ordered logistic regression, or ordered logit model, is the appropriate statistical method for modeling this type of dependent variable.

We are also interested in predicting or explaining whether or not a respondent has considered leaving the college due to its organizational climate, which is a dichotomous variable in that it can take on only two values: yes (1) or no (0). A binary logistic regression, or logit model, is the appropriate statistical method for modeling this type of dependent variable.

Each method estimates a regression equation to predict or explain variation in the dependent variable (in this case: satisfaction, comfort, and considering leaving the college) using the observed values of a set of predictor variables and a statistically-derived set of variable coefficients, expressed in these results as odds ratios. An odds ratio that is statistically significantly different from one (1.00) provides evidence of a causal effect, while the direction (i.e., whether or not the ratio is greater than or equal to 1.00) indicates whether the predicted effect is to increase or decrease the dependent variable.

Tables 74 through displays the results of the ordered and binary logit analyses predicting each dependent variable based on respondents' answers to other questions on the survey related to how they describe NatSci, how they are treated, their sense of belonging, and exposure to bias incidents. The columns in the table are as follows:

- **Independent Variables:** This column lists the variables that were used to predict the dependent variable. The effect of each independent variable after controlling for of the other variables, was estimated statistically, and a summary of those estimated effects are listed in the other columns in the same row for each independent variable.
- **Coefficient Estimates:** This column lists the odds ratio for each independent variable, as derived through the ordered or binary logit analysis. Stars are used to indicate when this effect is statistically significant (i.e., distinguishable from no effect whatsoever).
- **Standard Error:** This column lists the standard error of each regression coefficient. In other words, it measures how precisely the model estimates the true effect of each independent variable. Generally speaking, a lower standard error indicates a more precise estimate, though it is also sensitive to the units in which the independent and dependent variables are measured (thus, it is not appropriate to compare the standard errors of two different variables which are measured in different units). The standard error is used in the calculation of statistical significance.

The final two columns estimate the substantive *magnitude* of each independent variable's effect on self-reported likelihood to donate:

- **Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (Min → Max):** This column shows a projection of how the probability of answering "Very Satisfied," "Very Comfortable," or "Yes" on each dependent variable would *change* if each independent variable increased from its minimum value to its maximum value, while holding all the other independent variables constant. For instance, the "+55.5%" in the third row of Table 1 indicates that if a hypothetical respondent who considers the College of Natural Science to be "Very Unsupportive" changed her mind to consider it "Very Supportive" instead, the respondent's probability of reporting that she is Very Satisfied would increase by nearly 56 percentage points. This represents a maximum or ceiling estimate of the

effect, since it predicts the result of moving up through the entire observed range of the independent variable.

- **Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (+/- *sd*/2):** Whereas the previous column estimated the result of changing each independent variable from its minimum to its maximum, the final column in the table shows a projection of how the probability of being "Very Satisfied," "Very Comfortable," or having considered leaving the college would change if each independent variable increased by one standard deviation – specifically, from half a standard deviation below its mean to half a standard deviation above its mean. In contrast to the previous column, which estimated the maximum effect of the variable, this represents a more realistic or typical effect of the variable, in that it only requires moving up through a commonplace range of the variable rather than its entire observed range.

The results indicate that respect, equal opportunities, and fair treatment are most correlated with employees' general happiness within NatSci, whereas the most important priority for students is an environment where they feel safe, welcome, and a strong sense of belonging.

Table 74. Ordered Logistic Regression Analysis: Determinants of Self-Reported Satisfaction, among Employees

DV: Self-Reported Level of Satisfaction within NatSci (five-point ordinal scale)

Independent Variables	Odds Ratio	Standard Error	Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (Min → Max) †	Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (+/- <i>sd</i> /2) ‡
NatSci is improving	1.09	(0.10)	9.6%	2.4%
NatSci is non-ageist	1.05	(0.11)	5.1%	1.4%
NatSci is supportive	2.07 **	(0.32)	55.5%	20.5%
NatSci is non-homophobic	1.07	(0.14)	7.4%	1.7%
NatSci is cooperative	0.96	(0.11)	-4.5%	-1.2%
NatSci is collaborative	1.02	(0.11)	2.5%	0.7%
NatSci is sexist	1.01	(0.12)	1.4%	0.4%
NatSci is welcoming	0.82	(0.13)	-25.1%	-5.3%
NatSci is respectful	1.41 **	(0.22)	30.6%	9.6%
NatSci is diverse	1.12	(0.10)	12.7%	3.6%
NatSci is friendly	1.41	(0.25)	29.8%	9.0%
Treated fairly in tenure / promotion process	1.16	(0.10)	15.4%	4.7%
Treated fairly in merit raise decision process	1.28 **	(0.12)	24.3%	7.8%
Similar opportunities for success	1.10	(0.11)	9.7%	2.9%
Personal identities are valued	0.89	(0.09)	-14.0%	-3.6%
Belong in NatSci	2.17 **	(0.34)	41.1%	15.4%
Others value opinions	0.93	(0.16)	-5.2%	-1.2%
Safe within NatSci	1.33	(0.22)	17.7%	4.7%
Experienced bias incident	1.00	(0.08)	0.4%	0.1%
Witnessed bias incident	0.90	(0.06)	-10.7%	-3.9%
<i>n</i>	391			

** Statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, two-tailed.

† Percentages in this column indicate the change in the predicted probability of answering "Very Satisfied" when each variable changes from its minimum observed value to its maximum observed value, while holding all other independent variables at their respective means.

‡ Percentages in this column indicate the change in the predicted probability of answering "Very Satisfied" when each variable changes from half a standard deviation below its mean to half a standard deviation above its mean, while holding all other independent variables at their respective means.

Table 75. Ordered Logistic Regression Analysis: Determinants of Self-Reported Comfort, among Employees

DV: Self-Reported Level of Comfort within NatSci (five-point ordinal scale)

Independent Variables	Odds Ratio	Standard Error	Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (Min → Max) †	Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (+/- <i>sd</i> /2) ‡
NatSci is improving	0.94	(0.08)	-6.3%	-1.5%
NatSci is non-ageist	0.87	(0.09)	-14.5%	-3.5%
NatSci is supportive	1.11	(0.16)	9.8%	2.7%
NatSci is non-homophobic	0.98	(0.13)	-2.3%	-0.5%
NatSci is cooperative	1.06	(0.11)	5.4%	1.5%
NatSci is collaborative	0.98	(0.10)	-1.8%	-0.5%
NatSci is sexist	1.26 **	(0.14)	20.4%	6.7%
NatSci is welcoming	1.42 **	(0.22)	26.8%	8.2%
NatSci is respectful	1.88 **	(0.29)	43.0%	15.8%
NatSci is diverse	0.98	(0.09)	-1.7%	-0.5%
NatSci is non-racist	0.81	(0.11)	-24.8%	-5.2%
NatSci is friendly	1.28	(0.21)	20.1%	5.8%
Treated fairly in tenure / promotion process	1.13	(0.10)	11.4%	3.5%
Treated fairly in merit raise decision process	0.99	(0.09)	-0.8%	-0.2%
Similar opportunities for success	1.17	(0.11)	13.7%	4.3%
Personal identities are valued	1.51 **	(0.16)	32.9%	11.0%
Belong in NatSci	1.11	(0.16)	6.7%	1.9%
Others value opinions	1.04	(0.18)	2.7%	0.6%
Safe within NatSci	1.29	(0.22)	14.2%	3.7%
Experienced bias incident	0.91	(0.07)	-8.4%	-2.7%
Witnessed bias incident	1.01	(0.07)	1.3%	0.4%

n

391

** Statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, two-tailed.

† Percentages in this column indicate the change in the predicted probability of answering "Very Comfortable" when each variable changes from its minimum observed value to its maximum observed value, while holding all other independent variables at their respective means.

‡ Percentages in this column indicate the change in the predicted probability of answering "Very Comfortable" when each variable changes from half a standard deviation below its mean to half a standard deviation above its mean, while holding all other independent variables at their respective means.

Table 76. Ordered Logistic Regression Analysis: Determinants of Considering Leaving Position, among Employees

DV: Considered Leaving Position due to NatSci Climate (1 = Yes, 0 = No)

Independent Variables	Odds Ratio	Standard Error	Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (Min → Max) †	Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (+/- <i>sd</i> /2) ‡
NatSci is improving	1.07	(0.16)	6.0%	1.5%
NatSci is non-ageist	1.17	(0.2)	13.1%	3.8%
NatSci is supportive	1.03	(0.24)	2.9%	0.8%
NatSci is non-homophobic	1.11	(0.23)	8.3%	2.0%
NatSci is cooperative	1.12	(0.21)	10.1%	2.9%
NatSci is collaborative	0.96	(0.16)	-3.7%	-1.0%
NatSci is sexist	1.00	(0.17)	0.1%	0.0%
NatSci is welcoming	0.91	(0.22)	-9.8%	-2.2%
NatSci is respectful	0.37 **	(0.09)	-90.3%	-23.2%
NatSci is diverse	0.96	(0.14)	-4.2%	-1.1%
NatSci is non-racist	1.04	(0.22)	3.4%	0.9%
NatSci is friendly	0.70	(0.18)	-41.6%	-8.1%
Treated fairly in tenure / promotion process	0.92	(0.12)	-8.7%	-2.2%
Treated fairly in merit raise decision process	0.88	(0.13)	-13.2%	-3.4%
Similar opportunities for success	0.74 **	(0.1)	-33.7%	-7.8%
Personal identities are valued	0.95	(0.15)	-5.1%	-1.3%
Belong in NatSci	0.94	(0.22)	-3.9%	-1.0%
Others value opinions	0.73	(0.21)	-20.9%	-4.5%
Safe within NatSci	0.96	(0.25)	-2.3%	-0.5%
Experienced bias incident	1.04	(0.13)	3.8%	1.0%
Witnessed bias incident	0.98	(0.11)	-2.0%	-0.7%
<i>n</i>	391			

** Statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, two-tailed.

† Percentages in this column indicate the change in the predicted probability of answering "Yes" when each variable changes from its minimum observed value to its maximum observed value, while holding all other independent variables at their respective means.

‡ Percentages in this column indicate the change in the predicted probability of answering "Yes" when each variable changes from half a standard deviation below its mean to half a standard deviation above its mean, while holding all other independent variables at their respective means.

Table 77. Ordered Logistic Regression Analysis: Determinants of Self-Reported Satisfaction, among Students

DV: Self-Reported Level of Satisfaction within NatSci (five-point ordinal scale)

Independent Variables	Odds Ratio	Standard Error	Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (Min → Max) †	Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (+/- <i>sd</i> /2) ‡
NatSci is improving	1.22 **	(0.07)	20.3%	5.5%
NatSci is non-ageist	1.08	(0.08)	7.4%	2.0%
NatSci is supportive	1.44 **	(0.13)	30.5%	9.4%
NatSci is non-homophobic	0.84	(0.08)	-22.1%	-4.5%
NatSci is cooperative	0.95	(0.06)	-5.3%	-1.4%
NatSci is collaborative	1.02	(0.07)	1.6%	0.4%
NatSci is sexist	0.97	(0.08)	-3.8%	-1.0%
NatSci is welcoming	1.10	(0.11)	9.7%	2.5%
NatSci is respectful	1.17	(0.12)	14.4%	3.7%
NatSci is diverse	1.02	(0.06)	2.6%	0.7%
NatSci is non-racist	0.94	(0.09)	-7.4%	-1.8%
NatSci is friendly	1.08	(0.12)	7.5%	1.8%
Treated with respect by other students	0.81	(0.1)	-17.4%	-3.0%
Treated with respect by faculty	1.39 **	(0.18)	18.6%	4.8%
Similar opportunities for success	1.17 **	(0.08)	14.9%	4.4%
Personal identities are valued	1.09	(0.07)	8.5%	2.4%
Belong in NatSci	1.83 **	(0.21)	31.8%	10.9%
Others value opinions	1.25	(0.15)	15.2%	4.0%
Safe within NatSci	1.08	(0.13)	5.5%	1.3%
Experienced bias incident	0.91 **	(0.04)	-27.4%	-4.3%
Witnessed bias incident	1.05	(0.03)	11.7%	2.6%

n

684

** Statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, two-tailed.

† Percentages in this column indicate the change in the predicted probability of answering "Very Satisfied" when each variable changes from its minimum observed value to its maximum observed value, while holding all other independent variables at their respective means.

‡ Percentages in this column indicate the change in the predicted probability of answering "Very Satisfied" when each variable changes from half a standard deviation below its mean to half a standard deviation above its mean, while holding all other independent variables at their respective means.

Table 78. Ordered Logistic Regression Analysis: Determinants of Self-Reported Comfort, among Students

DV: Self-Reported Level of Comfort within NatSci (five-point ordinal scale)

Independent Variables	Odds Ratio	Standard Error	Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (Min → Max) †	Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (+/- <i>sd</i> /2) ‡
NatSci is improving	1.20 **	(0.07)	17.8%	4.8%
NatSci is non-ageist	0.97	(0.07)	-2.7%	-0.7%
NatSci is supportive	1.25 **	(0.11)	19.5%	5.5%
NatSci is non-homophobic	0.78 **	(0.07)	-31.4%	-6.0%
NatSci is cooperative	1.12	(0.07)	11.2%	3.2%
NatSci is collaborative	1.11	(0.07)	10.6%	2.8%
NatSci is sexist	1.12	(0.09)	10.6%	3.2%
NatSci is welcoming	1.24 **	(0.11)	18.4%	5.2%
NatSci is respectful	1.24 **	(0.12)	18.4%	5.1%
NatSci is diverse	1.10	(0.07)	9.0%	2.6%
NatSci is non-racist	1.25 **	(0.12)	18.5%	6.0%
NatSci is friendly	0.93	(0.10)	-8.2%	-1.7%
Treated with respect by other students	0.94	(0.11)	-4.4%	-0.8%
Treated with respect by faculty	1.07	(0.14)	4.4%	0.9%
Similar opportunities for success	1.18 **	(0.07)	14.9%	4.5%
Personal identities are valued	1.09	(0.07)	8.2%	2.3%
Belong in NatSci	1.16	(0.13)	9.5%	2.6%
Others value opinions	1.14	(0.13)	8.7%	2.2%
Safe within NatSci	1.87 **	(0.22)	27.6%	9.3%
Experienced bias incident	0.99	(0.04)	-3.3%	-0.6%
Witnessed bias incident	0.98	(0.03)	-4.7%	-1.0%
<i>n</i>	684			

** Statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, two-tailed.

† Percentages in this column indicate the change in the predicted probability of answering "Very Comfortable" when each variable changes from its minimum observed value to its maximum observed value, while holding all other independent variables at their respective means.

‡ Percentages in this column indicate the change in the predicted probability of answering "Very Comfortable" when each variable changes from half a standard deviation below its mean to half a standard deviation above its mean, while holding all other independent variables at their respective means.

Table 79. Ordered Logistic Regression Analysis: Determinants of Considering Leaving MSU, among Students

DV: Considered Leaving MSU due to NatSci Climate (1 = Yes, 0 = No)

Independent Variables	Odds Ratio	Standard Error	Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (Min → Max) †	Discrete Change, Prob("Very Likely") (+/- sd/2) ‡
NatSci is improving	0.91	(0.11)	-3.5%	-0.9%
NatSci is non-ageist	1.00	(0.11)	0.2%	0.0%
NatSci is supportive	0.85	(0.11)	-7.1%	-1.4%
NatSci is non-homophobic	0.97	(0.14)	-1.3%	-0.3%
NatSci is cooperative	0.87	(0.10)	-5.2%	-1.3%
NatSci is collaborative	1.01	(0.12)	0.5%	0.1%
NatSci is sexist	0.90	(0.12)	-4.2%	-1.0%
NatSci is welcoming	0.67 **	(0.09)	-25.4%	-3.5%
NatSci is respectful	1.01	(0.16)	0.3%	0.1%
NatSci is diverse	0.90	(0.09)	-3.9%	-1.0%
NatSci is non-racist	1.03	(0.15)	1.0%	0.3%
NatSci is friendly	0.99	(0.15)	-0.2%	-0.1%
Treated fairly in tenure / promotion process	1.17	(0.24)	3.2%	0.7%
Treated fairly in merit raise decision process	0.68	(0.15)	-14.3%	-1.8%
Similar opportunities for success	1.00	(0.10)	-0.1%	0.0%
Personal identities are valued	0.81 **	(0.08)	-9.1%	-2.0%
Belong in NatSci	0.89	(0.16)	-3.1%	-0.7%
Others value opinions	1.13	(0.22)	2.7%	0.7%
Safe within NatSci	0.67 **	(0.13)	-15.1%	-2.1%
Experienced bias incident	0.87	(0.07)	-17.2%	-2.0%
Witnessed bias incident	1.23 **	(0.09)	18.2%	3.8%
n	638			

** Statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, two-tailed.

† Percentages in this column indicate the change in the predicted probability of answering "Yes" when each variable changes from its minimum observed value to its maximum observed value, while holding all other independent variables at their respective means.

‡ Percentages in this column indicate the change in the predicted probability of answering "Yes" when each variable changes from half a standard deviation below its mean to half a standard deviation above its mean, while holding all other independent variables at their respective means.

APPENDIX B. ADDITIONAL ANALYSES

Table 80. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status

Items	<u>Employees</u>		<u>Grad Students</u>		<u>Undergrad Students</u>	
	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Satisfaction						
Total Satisfaction ^a	79%	76%	79%	80%	82%	80%
Total Dissatisfaction ^b	12%	18%	14%	16%	8%	10%
Mean Score ^c	3.98	3.82	3.87	3.89	4.05	3.99
Comfort						
Total Comfortable ^a	76%	66%	71%	55%	81%	78%
Total Uncomfortable ^b	15%	28%	18%	34%	9%	8%
Mean Score ^c	3.95	3.63	3.77	3.30	4.09	4.01
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>647</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>1220</i>	<i>160</i>

Table 81. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity

Items	<u>Employees</u>			<u>Grad Students</u>			<u>Undergrad Students</u>		
	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority
Satisfaction									
Total Satisfaction ^a	82%	81%	78%	84%	74%	68%	84%	80%	79%
Total Dissatisfaction ^b	11%	8%	15%	12%	9%	26%	8%	5%	10%
Mean Score ^c	4.09	4.13	3.85	4.01	3.83	3.55	4.08	4.05	3.97
Comfort									
Total Comfortable ^a	80%	84%	72%	68%	73%	57%	86%	78%	74%
Total Uncomfortable ^b	13%	11%	22%	22%	15%	27%	6%	5%	16%
Mean Score ^c	4.04	4.19	3.77	3.70	3.88	3.30	4.20	3.98	3.97
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>649</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>228</i>

Table 82. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Department (Undergraduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Human Biology	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Microbiology and Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Interdepartmental	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
Satisfaction														
Total Satisfaction ^a	88%	93%	90%	83%	85%	84%	76%	84%	88%	79%	85%	91%	89%	76%
Total Dissatisfaction ^b	2%	6%	7%	17%	8%	9%	6%	4%	0%	12%	6%	3%	5%	8%
Mean Score ^c	4.15	4.30	4.14	3.96	4.10	4.07	4.01	4.02	4.13	3.92	4.22	4.24	4.26	3.84
Comfort														
Total Comfortable ^a	80%	81%	76%	83%	81%	83%	71%	69%	75%	73%	78%	91%	84%	79%
Total Uncomfortable ^b	3%	9%	10%	17%	8%	12%	9%	13%	25%	13%	13%	3%	0%	4%
Mean Score ^c	4.15	4.11	3.97	3.92	4.10	4.10	3.91	3.73	3.63	3.83	4.02	4.27	4.21	4.00
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>25</i>

Table 83. Satisfaction and Comfort Level, by Department (Graduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	CMB / MMG / Genetics / Physiology	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
Satisfaction											
Total Satisfaction ^a	67%	88%	86%	76%	72%	70%	81%	80%	84%	90%	58%
Total Dissatisfaction ^b	25%	13%	11%	18%	17%	24%	6%	20%	8%	5%	25%
Mean Score ^c	3.50	4.50	4.00	3.76	3.44	3.67	3.81	4.00	4.16	4.00	3.42
Comfort											
Total Comfortable ^a	67%	100%	69%	63%	67%	56%	75%	80%	76%	75%	50%
Total Uncomfortable ^b	25%	0%	22%	21%	28%	26%	19%	10%	20%	10%	33%
Mean Score ^c	3.42	4.71	3.58	3.70	3.39	3.35	3.81	3.90	3.96	3.80	3.33
<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>12</i>

Table 84. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status

Items	Employees		Grad Students		Undergrad Students	
	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Non-homophobic (7) – Homophobic (1)	5.60	5.42	5.49	4.82	5.95	5.70
Non-racist (7) – Racist (1)	5.48	5.03	5.07	4.27	5.85	5.70
Friendly (7) – Hostile (1)	5.38	5.00	5.41	5.20	5.58	5.45
Respectful (7) – Disrespectful (1)	5.28	5.03	5.31	4.84	5.61	5.60
Non-ageist (7) – Ageist (1)	5.12	4.79	5.12	4.81	5.63	5.49
Non-sexist (7) – Sexist (1)	5.00	4.42	4.77	3.91	5.73	5.39
Welcoming (7) – Unwelcoming (1)	5.35	4.70	5.28	5.09	5.37	5.24
Supportive (7) – Unsupportive (1)	5.11	4.97	4.98	4.91	5.27	5.25
Diverse (7) – Homogeneous (1)	4.45	3.91	4.33	3.18	5.10	4.85
Collaborative (7) – Individualistic (1)	4.77	4.64	4.73	4.53	4.62	4.32
Cooperative (7) – Competitive (1)	4.80	4.73	4.89	4.93	4.50	4.22
Improving (7) – Regressing (1)	4.38	4.65	4.40	4.39	4.42	4.66
<i>AVERAGE</i>	5.06	4.77	4.98	4.57	5.30	5.16
<i>Number of respondents</i>	647	33	238	44	1220	160

Table 85. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity

Items	Employees			Grad Students			Undergrad Students		
	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority
Non-homophobic (7) – Homophobic (1)	5.65	5.90	5.34	5.41	5.77	5.19	6.17	5.56	5.72
Non-racist (7) – Racist (1)	5.57	5.92	4.82	4.91	5.58	4.34	6.13	5.47	5.46
Friendly (7) – Hostile (1)	5.49	5.76	5.12	5.45	5.72	4.89	5.70	5.45	5.53
Respectful (7) – Disrespectful (1)	5.39	5.62	4.88	5.18	5.60	4.89	5.71	5.50	5.63
Non-ageist (7) – Ageist (1)	5.13	5.62	4.90	5.03	5.80	4.81	5.75	5.45	5.51
Non-sexist (7) – Sexist (1)	4.97	5.79	4.32	4.38	5.53	4.32	5.85	5.50	5.55
Welcoming (7) – Unwelcoming (1)	5.43	5.67	5.09	5.33	5.51	4.76	5.47	5.26	5.19
Supportive (7) – Unsupportive (1)	5.23	5.68	4.61	5.06	5.08	4.84	5.30	5.29	5.29
Diverse (7) – Homogeneous (1)	4.32	5.27	3.87	3.74	5.43	3.53	5.19	5.14	4.78
Collaborative (7) – Individualistic (1)	4.91	5.10	4.45	4.78	4.83	4.32	4.55	4.51	4.51
Cooperative (7) – Competitive (1)	4.88	5.43	4.72	4.95	5.17	4.62	4.41	4.53	4.49
Improving (7) – Regressing (1)	4.60	3.84	4.13	4.57	3.94	4.32	4.65	4.21	4.25
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.13</i>	<i>5.47</i>	<i>4.69</i>	<i>4.90</i>	<i>5.33</i>	<i>4.57</i>	<i>5.41</i>	<i>5.16</i>	<i>5.16</i>
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>649</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>228</i>

Table 86. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Department (Undergraduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Human Biology	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Microbiology and Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Interdepartmental	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
Non-homophobic (7) – Homophobic (1)	5.91	6.06	5.52	5.96	5.97	6.05	5.44	5.50	5.50	5.81	5.94	6.03	5.89	6.04
Non-racist (7) – Racist (1)	5.97	5.86	5.38	6.13	5.80	5.93	5.48	5.57	5.75	5.61	5.72	6.13	5.74	5.80
Friendly (7) – Hostile (1)	5.58	5.81	5.34	5.63	5.64	5.61	5.27	5.38	4.88	5.38	5.65	5.66	6.05	5.60
Respectful (7) – Disrespectful (1)	5.85	5.89	5.24	5.75	5.61	5.75	5.13	5.51	4.75	5.29	5.62	5.69	5.74	5.28
Non-ageist (7) – Ageist (1)	5.73	5.66	5.00	5.54	5.65	5.63	5.10	4.95	4.75	5.51	5.44	5.66	5.42	5.40
Non-sexist (7) – Sexist (1)	6.00	5.90	5.45	5.79	5.75	5.59	5.06	5.23	5.63	5.56	5.35	5.88	5.79	5.84
Welcoming (7) – Unwelcoming (1)	5.58	5.59	5.14	5.25	5.41	5.29	5.18	5.21	4.75	5.12	5.57	5.69	5.21	5.68
Supportive (7) – Unsupportive (1)	5.45	5.71	5.10	5.13	5.24	5.41	4.91	4.95	4.75	5.13	5.52	5.56	5.63	5.04
Diverse (7) – Homogeneous (1)	5.48	5.30	4.93	5.50	5.41	4.76	4.81	4.82	4.63	5.01	4.53	5.25	5.00	5.04
Collaborative (7) – Individualistic (1)	4.58	4.53	4.97	5.04	4.73	4.87	4.15	4.39	4.25	4.62	4.52	4.25	4.32	4.63
Cooperative (7) – Competitive (1)	4.41	4.27	4.17	4.92	4.28	4.55	4.52	3.88	4.50	4.34	4.54	3.97	4.47	4.28
Improving (7) – Regressing (1)	4.54	4.41	4.68	4.42	4.45	4.53	4.16	4.71	4.13	4.31	4.85	4.88	4.74	4.32
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>25</i>

Table 87. NatSci Climate Descriptors, by Department (Graduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	CMB / MMG / Genetics / Physiology	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
Non-homophobic (7) – Homophobic (1)	4.92	6.71	5.22	5.38	5.50	5.50	5.60	5.00	5.42	5.60	5.25
Non-racist (7) – Racist (1)	4.75	6.86	4.53	5.05	4.89	4.97	5.31	5.20	4.82	4.90	5.25
Friendly (7) – Hostile (1)	5.08	6.71	5.26	5.23	5.22	5.44	5.69	5.10	5.57	5.75	5.08
Respectful (7) – Disrespectful (1)	4.83	6.57	5.03	5.05	4.94	5.35	5.75	4.80	5.52	5.50	4.75
Non-ageist (7) – Ageist (1)	4.67	6.71	5.17	4.80	4.47	4.82	5.50	5.40	5.32	5.20	5.50
Non-sexist (7) – Sexist (1)	4.33	6.57	4.39	4.48	4.22	4.56	5.44	4.40	4.73	4.60	5.58
Welcoming (7) – Unwelcoming (1)	5.25	6.71	4.97	5.27	5.06	5.15	5.38	5.00	5.50	5.60	4.58
Supportive (7) – Unsupportive (1)	4.92	6.29	4.94	4.86	4.56	4.76	5.31	4.70	5.44	5.05	4.08
Diverse (7) – Homogeneous (1)	4.33	6.14	4.00	4.96	3.72	3.12	4.63	3.60	3.88	3.50	5.33
Collaborative (7) – Individualistic (1)	5.00	6.43	4.97	4.73	4.28	4.32	4.69	4.80	5.04	4.35	4.00
Cooperative (7) – Competitive (1)	4.92	6.29	4.39	4.88	4.47	4.65	5.00	5.20	5.27	5.30	4.83
Improving (7) – Regressing (1)	4.83	4.57	4.53	3.84	3.76	4.97	4.50	4.30	4.84	4.35	3.42
<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>12</i>

Table 88. Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status

Items	Employees		Grad Students		Undergrad Students	
	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Advisors are concerned about my welfare	-	-	5.61	5.88	5.47	5.50
I have similar opportunities for success as other [people]	5.19	5.06	5.25	5.40	5.57	5.60
Faculty negatively prejudice me (<i>reverse coded</i>)	-	-	4.82	4.73	5.24	5.35
Faculty are concerned about my welfare	-	-	5.21	5.19	5.05	5.03
I have faculty role models	-	-	5.54	5.42	4.92	5.15
My personal identities are valued	5.03	4.90	5.05	4.79	5.05	4.71
There are enough faculty / staff I identify with	5.06	4.42	4.63	3.86	4.89	4.48
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.09</i>	<i>4.79</i>	<i>5.16</i>	<i>5.04</i>	<i>5.17</i>	<i>5.12</i>
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>647</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>1220</i>	<i>160</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded item ("Faculty negatively prejudice me"), 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 89. Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity

Items	Employees			Grad Students			Undergrad Students		
	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority
Advisors are concerned about my welfare	-	-	-	5.88	5.50	5.28	5.53	5.40	5.42
I have similar opportunities for success as other [people]	5.41	5.47	4.50	5.59	5.02	4.74	5.75	5.47	5.11
Faculty negatively prejudice me (<i>reverse coded</i>)	-	-	-	2.95	3.19	3.80	2.54	3.04	2.97
Faculty are concerned about my welfare	-	-	-	5.31	5.27	4.69	5.08	5.07	4.87
I have faculty role models	-	-	-	5.66	5.54	5.08	5.10	4.77	4.77
My personal identities are valued	5.26	5.38	4.36	5.14	5.08	4.46	5.13	5.20	4.62
There are enough faculty / staff I identify with	5.38	5.18	3.64	4.62	4.81	3.29	5.19	4.71	3.88
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.35</i>	<i>5.34</i>	<i>4.17</i>	<i>5.02</i>	<i>4.92</i>	<i>4.48</i>	<i>4.90</i>	<i>4.81</i>	<i>4.52</i>
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>649</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>228</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded item ("Faculty negatively prejudice me"), 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 90. Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Human Biology	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Microbiology and Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Interdepartmental	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
Advisors are concerned about my welfare	6.00	5.68	4.83	5.64	5.34	5.48	5.18	5.31	6.13	5.13	5.78	5.86	5.95	4.90
I have similar opportunities for success as other students	5.70	5.59	4.92	5.70	5.64	5.56	5.39	5.27	5.25	4.97	5.55	5.62	5.84	5.52
Faculty negatively prejudge me (<i>reverse coded</i>)	5.32	5.12	5.17	5.15	5.23	5.35	4.96	5.24	4.71	5.26	5.33	5.22	5.26	4.61
Faculty are concerned about my welfare	4.93	5.47	5.17	5.48	5.08	4.78	5.00	4.77	4.63	4.74	5.06	4.82	5.47	5.32
I have faculty role models	5.00	5.80	4.87	5.45	4.80	4.88	4.76	4.78	5.25	4.83	5.28	5.14	5.21	4.64
My personal identities are valued	5.04	5.37	4.17	5.52	5.12	4.83	5.02	4.47	5.14	4.84	4.83	4.59	5.42	4.74
There are enough faculty / staff I identify with	5.05	5.35	4.73	4.70	4.94	4.87	4.82	4.29	5.25	4.39	4.90	5.24	5.72	4.48
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>25</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded item ("Faculty negatively prejudge me"), 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 91. Agree-Disagree Sense of Belonging Items, by Department (Graduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	CMB / MMG / Genetics / Physiology	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
Advisors are concerned about my welfare	5.08	6.00	5.43	5.25	5.28	5.63	5.86	5.78	5.94	6.28	6.00
I have similar opportunities for success as other students	5.58	6.57	5.13	5.10	4.76	5.39	4.77	5.11	5.35	5.50	5.70
Faculty negatively prejudge me (<i>reverse coded</i>)	5.18	5.57	4.65	4.40	4.56	4.89	4.50	5.00	5.24	5.18	4.38
Faculty are concerned about my welfare	5.17	6.50	4.97	5.13	5.06	4.97	4.93	5.75	5.39	5.78	5.13
I have faculty role models	5.17	6.00	5.87	5.31	5.22	5.48	5.58	5.38	5.45	6.33	5.63
My personal identities are valued	4.92	6.20	4.90	4.96	4.88	4.87	4.92	5.00	4.91	5.12	5.38
There are enough faculty / staff I identify with	4.67	5.67	4.40	4.19	4.00	4.80	4.00	4.63	4.64	4.78	4.44
<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>12</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded item ("Faculty negatively prejudge me"), 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 92. Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status

Items	Employees		Grad Students		Undergrad Students	
	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Safe within NatSci	4.28	3.91	4.02	3.81	4.39	4.22
Valued by your faculty mentor [and committee members]	4.12	4.14	3.88	4.07	-	-
You belong in NatSci	3.83	3.42	3.69	3.56	4.05	3.87
Valued by advisors in NatSci	-	-	-	-	3.82	3.79
Valued by other employees in NatSci	3.75	3.48	-	-	-	-
Valued by [other] students in the classroom	4.00	3.55	3.89	3.69	3.60	3.38
Valued by instructors in the classroom	-	-	3.74	3.57	3.66	3.55
Others value your opinions in NatSci	3.56	3.32	3.41	3.15	3.60	3.51
Valued as an individual in NatSci	3.58	3.46	3.40	3.14	3.54	3.37
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>3.87</i>	<i>3.61</i>	<i>3.72</i>	<i>3.57</i>	<i>3.81</i>	<i>3.67</i>
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>647</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>1220</i>	<i>160</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded item ("Faculty negatively prejudice me"), 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 93. Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity

Items	Employees			Grad Students			Undergrad Students		
	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority
Safe within NatSci	4.35	4.38	4.04	4.06	4.04	3.76	4.40	4.36	4.19
Valued by your faculty mentor [and committee members]	4.22	3.92	4.35	4.00	4.04	3.61	-	-	-
You belong in NatSci	3.90	4.16	3.32	3.74	3.67	3.39	4.04	4.02	3.91
Valued by advisors in NatSci	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.83	3.93	3.83
Valued by other employees in NatSci	3.81	3.89	3.55	-	-	-	-	-	-
Valued by [other] students in the classroom	3.99	4.00	4.14	3.91	3.80	3.66	3.59	3.65	3.37
Valued by instructors in the classroom	4.00	3.65	3.96	3.61	3.62	3.78	3.60	3.70	3.43
Others value your opinions in NatSci	3.63	3.80	3.35	3.40	3.50	3.12	3.57	3.78	3.44
Valued as an individual in NatSci	3.67	3.89	3.32	3.39	3.49	3.09	3.49	3.70	3.43
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>3.95</i>	<i>3.96</i>	<i>3.75</i>	<i>3.73</i>	<i>3.74</i>	<i>3.49</i>	<i>3.79</i>	<i>3.88</i>	<i>3.66</i>

Table 94. Sense of Belonging Frequency Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Human Biology	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Microbiology and Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Interdepartmental	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
Safe within NatSci	4.19	4.27	4.40	4.24	4.41	4.32	4.16	4.28	4.13	4.13	4.40	4.59	4.26	4.52
You belong in NatSci	4.02	4.12	4.00	4.10	4.04	4.10	3.80	3.93	3.38	4.05	4.04	4.23	3.78	4.05
Valued by advisors in NatSci	4.36	3.89	3.83	4.14	3.75	3.89	3.68	3.43	4.00	3.68	3.86	4.00	3.84	3.38
Valued by [other] students in the classroom	3.68	3.57	3.60	4.29	3.53	3.41	3.59	3.24	3.75	3.54	3.55	3.89	3.63	3.68
Valued by instructors in the classroom	3.48	3.69	3.83	3.91	3.63	3.48	3.62	3.24	3.38	3.69	3.59	3.48	3.58	3.55
Others value your opinions in the NatSci	3.70	3.64	3.61	3.86	3.61	3.52	3.59	3.39	3.71	3.44	3.52	3.80	3.63	3.67
Valued as an individual in the NatSci	3.36	3.74	3.48	4.00	3.65	3.47	3.40	3.07	3.00	3.54	3.49	3.48	3.79	3.11
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>25</i>

Table 95. Sense of Belonging Items, by Department (Graduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	CMB / MMG / Genetics / Physiology	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
Safe within NatSci	3.83	4.60	3.74	4.11	3.89	3.90	4.07	4.29	4.02	3.94	4.11
Valued by your faculty mentor [and committee members]	3.42	4.00	4.07	3.87	3.61	3.84	4.14	3.71	3.98	4.18	3.63
You belong in NatSci	3.58	4.80	3.38	3.84	3.24	3.57	3.69	3.50	4.00	3.53	3.22
Valued by [other] students in the classroom	3.83	4.50	3.48	4.00	3.71	3.90	4.15	3.71	3.96	3.72	3.60
Valued by instructors in the classroom	3.36	4.50	3.50	3.94	3.44	3.71	3.92	3.71	3.52	3.89	4.00
Others value your opinions in NatSci	3.45	3.80	3.36	3.46	3.22	3.10	3.42	3.00	3.44	3.50	3.33
Valued as an individual in NatSci	3.36	4.67	3.17	3.38	3.22	3.13	3.50	3.00	3.49	3.50	3.22
<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>12</i>

Table 96. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status

Items	Employees		Grad Students		Undergrad Students	
	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty						
Total Agreement ^a	69%	46%	64%	26%	77%	68%
Total Disagreement ^b	17%	39%	29%	62%	12%	19%
Mean Score ^c	4.98	3.93	4.63	3.29	5.40	5.19
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of faculty diversity						
Total Agreement ^a	46%	37%	53%	21%	77%	64%
Total Disagreement ^b	41%	53%	40%	65%	15%	29%
Mean Score ^c	4.12	3.23	4.14	2.88	5.36	4.82
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)						
Race / Ethnicity	93%	100%	94%	96%	90%	92%
Gender	67%	69%	64%	61%	42%	63%
People with Disabilities	51%	75%	59%	75%	57%	63%
Sexual Orientation	36%	44%	47%	68%	45%	71%
Nationality	25%	25%	31%	43%	51%	38%
Religion	12%	13%	21%	32%	31%	25%
Age	11%	13%	21%	32%	24%	25%
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>647</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>1220</i>	<i>160</i>

^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree", "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to *less* favorable attitudes.

^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

Table 97. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity

Items	<u>Employees</u>			<u>Grad Students</u>			<u>Undergrad Students</u>		
	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty									
Total Agreement ^a	71%	82%	51%	54%	83%	44%	80%	78%	64%
Total Disagreement ^b	18%	8%	32%	40%	10%	50%	9%	7%	27%
Mean Score ^c	4.97	5.58	4.25	4.22	5.34	3.85	5.50	5.58	4.93
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of faculty diversity									
Total Agreement ^a	42%	68%	34%	33%	74%	44%	78%	83%	64%
Total Disagreement ^b	46%	16%	55%	57%	17%	53%	14%	11%	28%
Mean Score ^c	3.92	5.09	3.50	3.49	4.96	3.44	5.46	5.56	4.75
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)									
Race / Ethnicity	94%	89%	94%	94%	100%	100%	88%	86%	100%
Gender	72%	44%	62%	67%	63%	58%	52%	57%	41%
People with Disabilities	54%	33%	53%	71%	50%	53%	64%	86%	47%
Sexual Orientation	36%	22%	38%	56%	25%	42%	54%	71%	47%
Nationality	20%	33%	38%	28%	50%	42%	48%	86%	44%
Religion	9%	11%	24%	24%	38%	26%	28%	71%	26%
Age	9%	22%	12%	21%	50%	26%	24%	29%	24%
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>649</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>228</i>

Table 98. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Department (Undergraduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Human Biology	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Microbiology and Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Interdepartmental	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty														
Total Agreement ^a	79%	88%	76%	61%	80%	62%	76%	73%	80%	70%	65%	83%	81%	86%
Total Disagreement ^b	8%	6%	12%	22%	12%	23%	4%	16%	0%	24%	17%	14%	6%	14%
Mean Score ^c	5.62	5.72	5.40	5.00	5.54	4.87	5.36	5.34	5.40	5.11	4.96	5.52	5.75	5.64
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of faculty diversity														
Total Agreement ^a	82%	85%	64%	59%	83%	55%	83%	63%	83%	70%	71%	81%	89%	76%
Total Disagreement ^b	13%	8%	28%	27%	10%	30%	6%	33%	0%	23%	22%	13%	11%	16%
Mean Score ^c	5.62	5.63	4.64	4.95	5.59	4.57	5.63	4.86	5.50	5.06	4.94	5.58	5.84	5.28
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)														
Race / Ethnicity	71%	83%	100%	100%	89%	95%	67%	94%	-	88%	91%	100%	100%	75%
Gender	71%	67%	57%	50%	39%	29%	100%	56%	-	25%	64%	25%	50%	50%
People with Disabilities	14%	33%	71%	50%	50%	67%	33%	69%	-	75%	55%	100%	50%	25%
Sexual Orientation	29%	50%	71%	33%	33%	62%	0%	69%	-	50%	64%	75%	50%	0%
Nationality	14%	67%	57%	33%	56%	62%	0%	50%	-	44%	36%	75%	0%	50%
Religion	29%	33%	29%	33%	33%	29%	0%	44%	-	19%	18%	25%	50%	50%
Age	29%	50%	29%	17%	17%	14%	33%	31%	-	31%	27%	25%	0%	0%
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>25</i>

Table 99. Perceptions of Faculty Diversity, by Department (Graduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	CMB / MMG / Genetics / Physiology	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse faculty											
Total Agreement ^a	58%	100%	48%	59%	53%	43%	67%	56%	64%	58%	73%
Total Disagreement ^b	33%	0%	48%	27%	35%	57%	17%	33%	24%	42%	27%
Mean Score ^c	4.50	6.67	3.86	4.61	4.00	3.87	4.92	4.22	4.52	4.47	5.00
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of faculty diversity											
Total Agreement ^a	45%	100%	34%	56%	39%	22%	53%	44%	57%	35%	75%
Total Disagreement ^b	55%	0%	63%	38%	44%	69%	40%	56%	35%	47%	8%
Mean Score ^c	3.73	6.40	3.34	4.38	3.50	3.06	4.27	3.67	4.09	3.65	5.00
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)											
Race / Ethnicity	100%	-	95%	90%	100%	86%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Gender	67%	-	65%	90%	63%	32%	83%	40%	81%	38%	100%
People with Disabilities	33%	-	65%	40%	50%	68%	67%	80%	75%	88%	100%
Sexual Orientation	17%	-	50%	45%	50%	50%	67%	60%	56%	63%	100%
Nationality	17%	-	40%	25%	38%	45%	17%	40%	19%	50%	100%
Religion	17%	-	15%	30%	25%	23%	33%	40%	19%	25%	0%
Age	17%	-	20%	50%	25%	5%	0%	0%	25%	13%	100%
<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>12</i>

Table 100. Perceptions of Staff Diversity, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status

Items	Employees		Grad Students		Undergrad Students	
	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse staff						
Total Agreement ^a	63%	43%	-	-	-	-
Total Disagreement ^b	10%	25%	-	-	-	-
Mean Score ^c	5.02	4.25	-	-	-	-
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of staff diversity						
Total Agreement ^a	51%	48%	-	-	-	-
Total Disagreement ^b	20%	35%	-	-	-	-
Mean Score ^c	4.64	3.97	-	-	-	-
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)						
Race / Ethnicity	94%	93%	-	-	-	-
Gender	61%	50%	-	-	-	-
People with Disabilities	62%	69%	-	-	-	-
Sexual Orientation	38%	69%	-	-	-	-
Nationality	39%	50%	-	-	-	-
Religion	21%	17%	-	-	-	-
Age	20%	38%	-	-	-	-
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>647</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>1220</i>	<i>160</i>

^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree", "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to *less* favorable attitudes.

^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to *more* favorable attitudes.

Table 101. Perceptions of Staff Diversity, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity

Items	Employees			Grad Students			Undergrad Students		
	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority
The college has demonstrated a commitment to hiring diverse staff									
Total Agreement ^a	65%	75%	44%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Disagreement ^b	9%	8%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean Score ^c	5.06	5.37	4.42	-	-	-	-	-	-
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of staff diversity									
Total Agreement ^a	49%	67%	43%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Disagreement ^b	21%	7%	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean Score ^c	4.55	5.25	4.30	-	-	-	-	-	-
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)									
Race / Ethnicity	93%	83%	96%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender	66%	60%	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-
People with Disabilities	59%	20%	71%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sexual Orientation	39%	20%	36%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nationality	32%	40%	61%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Religion	15%	20%	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Age	20%	20%	27%	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>649</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>228</i>

Table 102. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status

Items	Employees		Grad Students		Undergrad Students	
	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT
The college has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting diverse students						
Total Agreement ^a	78%	50%	72%	56%	82%	83%
Total Disagreement ^b	7%	21%	11%	23%	3%	2%
Mean Score ^c	5.46	4.64	5.20	4.49	5.74	5.58
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of student diversity						
Total Agreement ^a	63%	52%	59%	39%	84%	75%
Total Disagreement ^b	15%	26%	17%	30%	5%	7%
Mean Score ^c	4.97	4.45	4.86	4.11	5.73	5.40
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)						
Race / Ethnicity	96%	100%	100%	100%	93%	100%
Gender	46%	67%	65%	56%	43%	70%
People with Disabilities	66%	78%	73%	94%	58%	73%
Sexual Orientation	41%	56%	56%	71%	28%	100%
Nationality	44%	33%	73%	83%	65%	82%
Religion	28%	13%	39%	36%	40%	63%
Age	30%	38%	38%	56%	37%	56%
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>647</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>1220</i>	<i>160</i>
^a Total Agreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Agree", "Agree," OR "Strongly Agree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes. ^b Total Disagreement refers to the percentage of respondents who answered EITHER "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree," OR "Strongly Disagree." Higher percentages correspond to <i>less</i> favorable attitudes. ^c Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Higher scores correspond to <i>more</i> favorable attitudes.						

Table 103. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity

Items	Employees			Grad Students			Undergrad Students		
	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority
The college has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting diverse students									
Total Agreement ^a	76%	91%	67%	67%	80%	56%	85%	87%	74%
Total Disagreement ^b	8%	2%	16%	14%	6%	25%	1%	0%	8%
Mean Score ^c	5.40	5.84	5.02	4.98	5.61	4.58	5.80	5.96	5.44
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of student diversity									
Total Agreement ^a	57%	79%	58%	48%	83%	36%	85%	89%	72%
Total Disagreement ^b	18%	2%	23%	22%	4%	44%	3%	0%	12%
Mean Score ^c	4.81	5.56	4.58	4.50	5.62	3.92	5.78	5.99	5.27
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)									
Race / Ethnicity	97%	67%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	96%
Gender	50%	0%	27%	73%	33%	42%	72%	-	29%
People with Disabilities	64%	75%	73%	82%	100%	65%	73%	-	57%
Sexual Orientation	39%	0%	53%	70%	0%	41%	73%	-	26%
Nationality	32%	50%	80%	72%	100%	68%	78%	-	59%
Religion	22%	0%	40%	38%	75%	25%	65%	-	29%
Age	31%	0%	27%	46%	100%	25%	56%	-	11%
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>649</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>228</i>

Table 104. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Department (Undergraduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Human Biology	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Microbiology and Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Interdepartmental	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
The college has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting diverse students														
Total Agreement ^a	86%	86%	63%	68%	87%	74%	86%	83%	83%	78%	85%	83%	63%	91%
Total Disagreement ^b	2%	6%	13%	0%	2%	3%	0%	2%	0%	3%	0%	0%	6%	4%
Mean Score ^c	5.88	5.84	5.17	5.50	5.90	5.54	5.66	5.61	5.83	5.72	5.66	5.76	5.44	5.57
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of student diversity														
Total Agreement ^a	88%	87%	65%	78%	88%	81%	77%	78%	86%	79%	79%	84%	83%	84%
Total Disagreement ^b	2%	7%	19%	9%	2%	7%	4%	8%	0%	7%	4%	6%	6%	4%
Mean Score ^c	5.98	5.85	5.04	5.57	5.90	5.58	5.61	5.49	5.86	5.59	5.40	5.75	5.67	5.48
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)														
Race / Ethnicity	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%	80%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	50%	100%
Gender	50%	20%	60%	0%	25%	57%	100%	0%	-	50%	100%	50%	0%	100%
People with Disabilities	100%	38%	33%	100%	63%	78%	0%	57%	-	86%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Sexual Orientation	50%	20%	20%	50%	40%	40%	50%	60%	-	33%	100%	50%	0%	100%
Nationality	67%	50%	33%	50%	67%	88%	75%	71%	-	78%	67%	100%	50%	100%
Religion	67%	50%	20%	50%	50%	75%	0%	20%	-	50%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Age	67%	0%	33%	50%	40%	50%	0%	20%	-	50%	50%	50%	100%	100%
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>25</i>

Table 105. Perceptions of Student Diversity, by Department (Graduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	CMB / MMG / Genetics / Physiology	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
The college has demonstrated a commitment to recruiting diverse students											
Total Agreement ^a	64%	86%	53%	81%	47%	66%	60%	63%	81%	61%	73%
Total Disagreement ^b	18%	0%	15%	6%	24%	17%	20%	25%	10%	11%	0%
Mean Score ^c	4.91	6.00	4.62	5.60	4.53	4.76	4.87	5.00	5.25	4.94	5.45
Within the college there is an acceptable amount of student diversity											
Total Agreement ^a	67%	100%	26%	84%	61%	39%	60%	56%	49%	44%	67%
Total Disagreement ^b	33%	0%	29%	6%	28%	21%	20%	22%	22%	17%	8%
Mean Score ^c	4.83	6.17	4.09	5.70	4.39	4.27	4.87	4.56	4.43	4.39	5.25
Areas of Insufficient Diversity (% out of respondents who rated diversity unacceptable)											
Race / Ethnicity	100%		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Gender	50%		42%	75%	60%	33%	60%	100%	90%	25%	100%
People with Disabilities	25%		76%	50%	80%	100%	80%	67%	73%	100%	100%
Sexual Orientation	25%		50%	33%	20%	80%	60%	100%	67%	50%	100%
Nationality	25%		72%	75%	80%	92%	75%	50%	67%	100%	100%
Religion	25%		33%	25%	20%	38%	67%	50%	50%	67%	0%
Age	50%		46%	33%	20%	44%	0%	50%	46%	67%	0%
<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>12</i>

Table 106. Fair Treatment Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status

Items	Employees		Grad Students		Undergrad Students	
	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Employees in my unit are given feedback and evaluated fairly	5.50	4.52	-	-	-	-
Assignments are given based on a person's skills and abilities	5.34	5.24	-	-	-	-
My unit has a track record of hiring and promoting employees objectively	5.30	4.96	-	-	-	-
I have been treated fairly in the tenure / promotion process	5.16	5.17	-	-	-	-
I feel I have been treated differently in my unit (<i>reverse coded</i>)	5.08	4.67	-	-	-	-
I have been treated fairly with respect to decisions about merit raises	4.81	4.82	-	-	-	-
I am burdened by university service responsibilities beyond those of my colleagues (<i>reverse coded</i>)	4.65	4.45	-	-	-	-
I feel that my diversity-related contributions have been / will be valued for promotion or tenure	4.08	4.26	-	-	-	-
I perform more work to help students and colleagues than my colleagues (<i>reverse coded</i>)	3.68	3.48	-	-	-	-
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.49</i>	<i>4.40</i>				
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>647</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>1220</i>	<i>160</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded item ("Faculty negatively prejudge me"), 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 107. Fair Treatment Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity

Items	Employees			Grad Students			Undergrad Students		
	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority
Employees in my unit are given feedback and evaluated fairly	5.59	5.78	4.95	-	-	-	-	-	-
Assignments are given based on a person's skills and abilities	5.44	5.61	4.92	-	-	-	-	-	-
My unit has a track record of hiring and promoting employees objectively	5.38	5.73	4.85	-	-	-	-	-	-
I have been treated fairly in the tenure / promotion process	5.27	5.53	4.75	-	-	-	-	-	-
I feel I have been treated differently in my unit <i>(reverse coded)</i>	5.28	5.31	4.47	-	-	-	-	-	-
I have been treated fairly with respect to decisions about merit raises	4.99	5.27	4.37	-	-	-	-	-	-
I am burdened by university service responsibilities beyond those of my colleagues <i>(reverse coded)</i>	4.72	4.51	4.60	-	-	-	-	-	-
I feel that my diversity-related contributions have been / will be valued for promotion or tenure	4.16	4.30	3.81	-	-	-	-	-	-
I perform more work to help students and colleagues than my colleagues <i>(reverse coded)</i>	3.79	3.35	3.61	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.50</i>	<i>4.75</i>	<i>4.37</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>649</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>228</i>

Table 108. Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status

Items	Employees		Grad Students		Undergrad Students	
	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT
White	5.93	6.22	6.26	6.57	6.10	6.25
Male	5.89	6.09	6.14	6.55	6.09	6.23
Tenure-stream	5.78	6.36				
Served / serving in the military	5.21	5.67	5.33	4.88	5.91	5.72
Female	5.07	4.73	5.32	4.56	5.89	5.72
Physical disability	5.13	4.68	5.24	3.69	5.70	5.44
Gay, lesbian, or bisexual	5.27	5.24	5.36	4.61	5.70	5.39
From Christian religious affiliations	5.17	5.35	5.23	5.21	5.61	5.52
International	5.31	5.41	5.18	4.59	5.54	5.18
Immigrants	5.27	5.20	5.14	4.00	5.55	5.49
People of Color	4.97	4.48	4.94	4.06	5.71	5.56
From religious affiliations other than Christian	5.02	4.80	5.16	4.50	5.57	5.54
Providing care for adults who are disabled and / or elderly	4.99	5.19	4.98	3.26	5.61	5.38
Parents / guardians of dependent children	5.17	5.52	4.64	3.60	5.49	5.09
Learning disabilities	4.83	3.94	4.78	3.18	5.50	5.07
Transgender	4.76	3.95	4.64	3.34	5.45	4.88
Non-native English speakers	4.89	4.48	4.74	3.61	5.17	4.86
Psychological or mental health issues	4.47	4.09	4.15	3.32	5.22	4.75
Fixed-term	4.25	4.40	-	-	-	-
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.14</i>	<i>5.00</i>	<i>5.13</i>	<i>4.33</i>	<i>5.64</i>	<i>5.42</i>
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>647</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>1220</i>	<i>160</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1= "Very Negative" and 7 = "Very Positive."

Table 109. Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity

Items	Employees			Grad Students			Undergrad Students		
	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority
White	6.02	5.77	6.05	6.35	6.34	6.46	6.13	6.06	6.13
Male	6.07	5.57	5.89	6.35	6.22	6.19	6.17	6.03	5.98
Tenure-stream	5.98	5.62	5.58	-	-	-	-	-	-
Served / serving in the military	5.27	5.40	5.50	4.98	6.31	4.93	5.90	5.75	5.86
Female	5.06	5.40	4.67	4.90	5.62	5.42	5.91	5.83	5.73
Physical disability	5.10	5.33	4.97	4.52	6.13	5.05	5.72	5.69	5.49
Gay, lesbian, or bisexual	5.39	4.94	4.97	5.15	5.44	4.82	5.84	5.43	5.33
From Christian religious affiliations	5.30	4.97	4.58	5.10	5.61	5.45	5.64	5.53	5.51
International	5.38	5.48	4.89	4.98	5.38	4.75	5.64	5.25	5.31
Immigrants	5.40	5.31	4.61	4.83	5.34	4.62	5.75	5.33	5.15
People of Color	4.97	5.32	4.51	4.55	5.43	4.48	5.91	5.62	5.22
From religious affiliations other than Christian	5.14	5.23	4.25	4.88	5.50	4.60	5.73	5.29	5.31
Providing care for adults who are disabled and / or elderly	5.00	5.48	4.67	3.91	6.19	4.57	5.63	5.55	5.48
Parents / guardians of dependent children	5.28	5.18	4.86	4.09	5.45	4.47	5.50	5.39	5.22
Learning disabilities	4.78	5.07	4.65	3.91	5.65	4.67	5.38	5.55	5.36
Transgender	4.74	5.00	4.23	4.16	5.05	3.94	5.56	5.19	4.94
Non-native English speakers	4.90	5.16	4.45	4.36	5.02	4.17	5.27	4.98	4.87
Psychological or mental health issues	4.47	4.81	4.66	3.67	4.89	4.40	5.15	5.27	5.07
Fixed-term	4.19	4.71	3.68	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.19</i>	<i>5.26</i>	<i>4.85</i>	<i>4.75</i>	<i>5.62</i>	<i>4.88</i>	<i>5.70</i>	<i>5.51</i>	<i>5.41</i>
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>649</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>228</i>

² Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1= "Very Negative" and 7 = "Very Positive."

Table 110. Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Human Biology	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Microbiology and Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Interdepartmental	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
White	6.28	6.01	6.04	6.05	6.11	6.43	5.88	6.46	5.50	6.10	6.00	5.97	5.79	6.23
Male	6.25	6.06	6.04	6.10	6.02	6.24	5.98	6.29	5.71	6.07	6.06	6.00	5.68	6.41
Served / serving in the military	6.07	5.95	5.80	6.00	5.92	6.14	5.75	5.92	5.40	5.72	5.70	5.67	5.64	5.92
Female	5.91	6.13	5.72	5.86	6.05	6.01	5.54	5.84	5.25	5.77	5.57	5.94	5.74	5.50
Physical disability	5.84	5.98	5.77	5.63	5.72	5.56	5.72	5.27	5.50	5.67	5.72	5.30	5.46	5.67
Gay, lesbian, or bisexual	5.65	5.83	5.14	5.82	5.85	5.78	5.57	5.32	6.20	5.44	5.70	5.57	5.78	5.63
From Christian religious affiliations	5.82	5.63	5.24	5.61	5.73	5.82	5.52	5.61	4.86	5.62	5.76	5.42	5.35	5.25
International	5.68	5.65	5.45	5.50	5.62	5.73	5.56	5.32	5.00	5.25	5.62	5.63	5.59	5.85
Immigrants	5.53	5.57	5.10	5.67	5.72	5.52	5.57	5.35	5.20	5.00	5.56	5.74	5.63	5.94
People of Color	5.76	5.78	4.86	5.95	5.87	5.73	5.67	5.39	5.83	5.49	5.73	5.67	5.74	5.59
From religious affiliations other than Christian	5.48	5.69	4.94	5.65	5.68	5.55	5.76	5.36	5.00	5.64	5.86	5.27	5.71	5.44
Providing care for adults who are disabled and / or elderly	5.48	5.81	5.55	5.77	5.85	5.61	5.67	5.20	5.25	5.17	5.45	5.18	5.58	5.78
Parents / guardians of dependent children	5.30	5.74	5.40	5.21	5.77	5.17	5.57	4.95	5.25	5.17	5.04	5.18	5.50	5.50
Learning disabilities	5.41	5.77	5.69	5.67	5.60	5.33	5.47	5.00	5.33	5.52	5.10	5.26	5.07	5.53
Transgender	5.43	5.52	4.50	5.56	5.67	5.32	5.49	4.85	5.60	4.76	5.50	5.28	5.64	5.33
Non-native English speakers	5.30	5.45	4.88	5.11	5.26	5.26	5.40	4.67	5.00	4.65	5.17	5.27	5.69	5.84
Psychological or mental health issues	5.34	5.46	4.53	4.78	5.50	4.87	5.32	4.57	5.33	5.00	4.74	4.95	4.93	5.12
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>25</i>

Table 111. Climate for Diverse Groups Items, by Department (Graduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	CMB / MMG / Genetics / Physiology	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
White	6.33	6.00	6.55	6.35	6.72	6.00	6.54	6.50	6.23	6.71	5.40
Male	6.25	6.33	6.33	6.28	6.22	5.90	6.17	6.63	6.24	6.50	5.70
Served / serving in the military	4.83	5.75	5.75	5.68	4.60	4.88	6.33	6.50	4.88	4.80	5.25
Female	5.27	6.33	4.87	5.30	4.89	5.21	5.54	5.25	5.13	4.81	5.80
Physical disability	4.13	5.75	5.45	5.63	4.13	4.33	5.75	4.50	4.79	4.45	5.20
Gay, lesbian, or bisexual	5.10	6.25	5.00	5.33	5.27	5.54	5.40	5.14	5.09	4.79	5.33
From Christian religious affiliations	5.11	6.33	5.24	5.20	5.38	4.56	5.55	5.83	5.15	5.31	5.50
International	5.18	6.00	4.67	5.38	4.71	4.93	5.23	5.38	4.95	4.88	5.55
Immigrants	5.09	6.00	4.48	5.17	4.54	4.81	5.20	4.17	5.03	4.92	5.60
People of Color	5.09	5.80	4.42	5.04	4.57	4.52	5.25	4.50	4.71	4.38	5.89
From religious affiliations other than Christian	5.29	6.60	4.50	5.45	4.57	4.95	5.50	4.63	4.87	4.77	5.43
Providing care for adults who are disabled and / or elderly	3.86	5.75	4.44	5.68	3.58	3.92	6.75	3.67	4.47	4.40	5.50
Parents / guardians of dependent children	4.09	5.80	4.21	4.87	3.94	3.89	4.14	3.33	4.73	3.85	6.33
Learning disabilities	4.00	6.00	4.07	4.93	3.50	4.73	5.14	4.00	4.52	3.71	5.25
Transgender	4.29	5.00	3.38	4.96	4.82	4.16	4.00	4.00	4.30	3.82	5.20
Non-native English speakers	4.91	6.20	4.46	4.71	4.25	4.08	4.69	4.38	4.70	4.13	4.82
Psychological or mental health issues	3.40	5.75	3.54	4.25	3.12	3.56	3.78	4.14	4.74	3.63	5.67
<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>12</i>

Table 112. Respectful Treatment Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status

Items	Employees		Grad Students		Undergrad Students	
	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT
You are treated with respect by advisors	-	-	-	-	4.50	4.57
You are treated with respect by staff	4.36	4.47	4.45	4.42	-	-
You are treated with respect by your unit head or chair	4.32	4.23	4.23	3.97	-	-
You are treated with respect by faculty	4.08	3.87	4.11	3.91	4.33	4.29
You are treated with respect by students	4.28	4.10	4.27	4.07	4.16	4.07
You are treated with respect within NatSci	4.03	4.04	4.07	3.98	4.30	4.33
You trust your coworkers	4.10	4.09	-	-	-	-
Your contributions to your unit are recognized and valued	3.74	3.67	-	-	-	-
People in your unit care about your general satisfaction	3.66	3.50	-	-	-	-
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.07</i>	<i>4.00</i>	<i>4.23</i>	<i>4.07</i>	<i>4.32</i>	<i>4.32</i>
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>647</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>1220</i>	<i>160</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1= "Never" and 5 = "Always."

Table 113. Respectful Treatment Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity

Items	Employees			Grad Students			Undergrad Students		
	White Only	Asian / Pacific	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific	Other Minority
You are treated with respect by advisors	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.53	4.51	4.49
You are treated with respect by staff	4.41	4.46	4.30	4.50	4.47	4.29	-	-	-
You are treated with respect by your unit head or chair	4.38	4.42	4.29	4.21	4.16	4.31	-	-	-
You are treated with respect by faculty	4.10	4.34	3.94	4.03	4.38	3.97	4.31	4.41	4.30
You are treated with respect by students	4.26	4.28	4.38	4.30	4.32	4.13	4.18	4.19	4.01
You are treated with respect within NatSci	4.09	4.30	3.92	4.05	4.24	3.84	4.30	4.37	4.33
You trust your coworkers	4.13	4.40	4.14	-	-	-	-	-	-
Your contributions to your unit are recognized and valued	3.78	4.14	3.61	-	-	-	-	-	-
People in your unit care about your general satisfaction	3.72	4.13	3.59	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.11</i>	<i>4.31</i>	<i>4.02</i>	<i>4.22</i>	<i>4.31</i>	<i>4.11</i>	<i>4.33</i>	<i>4.37</i>	<i>4.28</i>
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>649</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>228</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a five-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. Specifically, 1= "Never" and 5 = "Always."

Table 114. Respectful Treatment Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Human Biology	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Microbiology and Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Interdepartmental	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
You are treated with respect by advisors	4.71	4.61	4.57	4.40	4.48	4.41	4.25	4.55	4.75	4.56	4.67	4.63	4.63	4.19
You are treated with respect by faculty	4.33	4.38	4.20	4.24	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.30	3.75	4.30	4.33	4.19	4.37	4.38
You are treated with respect by students	4.24	4.10	4.20	4.43	4.15	4.11	4.20	4.00	3.63	4.05	4.04	4.30	4.16	4.19
You are treated with respect within NatSci	4.40	4.30	4.08	4.38	4.42	4.24	4.25	4.13	3.63	4.25	4.30	4.41	4.47	4.37
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>25</i>

Table 115. Respectful Treatment Items, by Department (Graduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	CMB / MMG / Genetics / Physiology	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
You are treated with respect by staff	4.58	5.00	4.30	4.46	4.33	4.61	4.27	4.00	4.48	4.44	4.67
You are treated with respect by your unit head or chair	4.50	4.83	4.41	3.83	3.71	4.28	4.14	4.14	4.61	3.65	4.00
You are treated with respect by faculty	3.92	4.83	3.90	3.92	4.06	3.90	4.27	4.13	4.17	4.22	4.75
You are treated with respect by students	4.17	4.83	4.10	4.19	4.22	4.29	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.12	4.22
You are treated with respect within NatSci	4.10	4.83	4.00	4.02	3.89	4.10	4.07	4.00	4.02	4.11	4.00
<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>12</i>

Table 116. Uncivil Behaviors Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status

Items	Employees		Grad Students		Undergrad Students	
	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Treatment from Faculty						
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	45%	45%	44%	55%	23%	26%
Put down or was condescending	40%	36%	46%	48%	22%	25%
Distrusted description of own experiences	27%	39%	33%	45%	13%	17%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	21%	18%	21%	14%	6%	5%
Treatment from Staff						
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	25%	18%	11%	14%	11%	9%
Put down or was condescending	23%	21%	14%	16%	8%	8%
Distrusted description of own experiences	18%	12%	11%	14%	8%	9%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	16%	12%	8%	7%	3%	4%
Treatment from Graduate Students						
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	29%	39%	42%	50%	29%	29%
Put down or was condescending	20%	21%	37%	43%	25%	21%
Distrusted description of own experiences	16%	21%	27%	48%	15%	24%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	14%	24%	18%	18%	4%	8%
Treatment from Undergraduates						
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	27%	36%	30%	36%	38%	35%
Put down or was condescending	23%	24%	20%	25%	30%	31%
Distrusted description of own experiences	12%	21%	14%	18%	20%	31%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	17%	21%	12%	11%	13%	13%
<i>% Experienced <u>at least one</u> of these Behaviors:</i>						
<i>Committed by Faculty</i>	55%	55%	62%	66%	30%	35%
<i>Committed by Staff</i>	33%	30%	22%	20%	14%	15%
<i>Committed by Graduate Students</i>	36%	52%	51%	61%	39%	38%
<i>Committed by Undergraduates</i>	35%	39%	35%	43%	47%	51%
<i>Committed by anyone</i>	73%	70%	75%	77%	61%	65%
<i>Number of respondents</i>	647	33	238	44	1220	160

Table 117. Uncivil Behaviors Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity

Items	Employees			Grad Students			Undergrad Students		
	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority
Treatment from Faculty									
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	50%	25%	39%	51%	21%	55%	23%	21%	25%
Put down or was condescending	44%	16%	33%	53%	23%	55%	24%	21%	21%
Distrusted description of own experiences	30%	10%	28%	38%	19%	45%	14%	17%	13%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	21%	14%	16%	18%	15%	26%	4%	15%	7%
Treatment from Staff									
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	27%	8%	22%	13%	8%	16%	11%	11%	10%
Put down or was condescending	25%	8%	20%	15%	9%	18%	8%	13%	7%
Distrusted description of own experiences	17%	5%	20%	12%	4%	21%	8%	7%	8%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	17%	5%	10%	6%	6%	13%	1%	7%	5%
Treatment from Graduate Students									
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	33%	14%	29%	49%	26%	47%	29%	28%	32%
Put down or was condescending	21%	13%	20%	40%	28%	42%	25%	19%	29%
Distrusted description of own experiences	17%	10%	19%	35%	13%	37%	15%	17%	18%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	16%	5%	10%	17%	13%	26%	4%	14%	4%
Treatment from Undergraduates									
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	30%	21%	17%	32%	28%	24%	37%	40%	38%
Put down or was condescending	24%	24%	13%	20%	25%	18%	31%	21%	36%
Distrusted description of own experiences	13%	13%	6%	15%	17%	11%	19%	21%	26%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	16%	13%	10%	10%	15%	5%	12%	15%	15%
<i>% Experienced at least one of these Behaviors:</i>									
<i>Committed by Faculty</i>	60%	27%	51%	71%	36%	68%	32%	22%	31%
<i>Committed by Staff</i>	36%	11%	30%	22%	17%	26%	15%	14%	14%
<i>Committed by Graduate Students</i>	40%	16%	36%	58%	34%	58%	39%	35%	44%
<i>Committed by Undergraduates</i>	36%	32%	30%	40%	32%	24%	47%	43%	55%
<i>Committed by anyone</i>	78%	48%	68%	82%	58%	76%	61%	57%	68%
<i>Number of respondents</i>	425	63	69	144	53	38	649	148	228

Table 118. Uncivil Behaviors Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Human Biology	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Microbiology and Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Interdepartmental	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
Treatment from Faculty														
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	32%	29%	19%	26%	14%	25%	19%	29%	50%	25%	29%	20%	28%	15%
Put down or was condescending	34%	24%	27%	26%	15%	24%	23%	29%	50%	18%	31%	8%	22%	15%
Distrusted description of own experiences	20%	12%	8%	16%	7%	17%	17%	18%	25%	17%	15%	12%	22%	15%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	4%	9%	4%	11%	5%	3%	9%	4%	13%	8%	4%	4%	6%	10%
Treatment from Staff														
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	6%	16%	12%	5%	10%	13%	17%	16%	0%	8%	2%	8%	0%	20%
Put down or was condescending	8%	7%	12%	0%	8%	10%	15%	9%	0%	8%	4%	4%	6%	15%
Distrusted description of own experiences	8%	9%	8%	5%	8%	10%	13%	7%	0%	5%	6%	8%	0%	15%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	4%	3%	4%	0%	3%	0%	6%	0%	0%	5%	2%	4%	6%	5%
Treatment from Graduate Students														
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	42%	26%	27%	21%	24%	23%	23%	53%	50%	33%	19%	36%	28%	30%
Put down or was condescending	24%	35%	31%	11%	23%	21%	19%	33%	38%	23%	29%	20%	22%	5%
Distrusted description of own experiences	16%	16%	12%	21%	13%	11%	21%	27%	38%	18%	10%	20%	28%	5%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	4%	3%	4%	11%	5%	3%	13%	4%	25%	3%	2%	8%	6%	5%
Treatment from Undergraduates														
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	46%	43%	46%	32%	28%	23%	32%	56%	63%	47%	38%	56%	17%	40%
Put down or was condescending	34%	37%	35%	26%	22%	27%	28%	42%	63%	33%	31%	32%	33%	15%
Distrusted description of own experiences	24%	25%	15%	21%	17%	13%	21%	24%	50%	30%	25%	28%	17%	15%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	14%	12%	15%	26%	12%	4%	11%	11%	25%	17%	19%	28%	0%	5%
% Experienced at least one of these Behaviors:														
Committed by Faculty	42%	38%	31%	32%	19%	34%	23%	40%	50%	28%	42%	24%	28%	20%
Committed by Staff	10%	18%	12%	5%	13%	20%	21%	18%	0%	15%	8%	12%	6%	25%
Committed by Graduate Students	46%	44%	38%	26%	34%	31%	32%	56%	63%	42%	33%	44%	50%	30%
Committed by Undergraduates	52%	53%	58%	42%	39%	37%	38%	62%	75%	60%	48%	68%	39%	40%
Committed by anyone	60%	66%	61%	58%	56%	54%	57%	80%	88%	67%	65%	76%	56%	45%
Number of respondents	65	81	29	24	212	83	67	56	8	78	55	33	19	25

Table 119. Uncivil Behaviors Items, by Department (Graduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	CMB / MMG / Genetics / Physiology	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
Treatment from Faculty											
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	36%	0%	48%	52%	59%	55%	21%	44%	52%	33%	20%
Put down or was condescending	45%	14%	52%	54%	71%	55%	36%	56%	41%	28%	20%
Distrusted description of own experiences	27%	0%	39%	44%	41%	38%	21%	56%	30%	33%	20%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	9%	0%	23%	29%	18%	21%	14%	33%	17%	6%	30%
Treatment from Staff											
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	18%	0%	13%	10%	18%	3%	14%	33%	15%	0%	10%
Put down or was condescending	18%	0%	23%	10%	24%	7%	21%	56%	11%	6%	0%
Distrusted description of own experiences	9%	0%	16%	13%	18%	7%	14%	33%	11%	0%	0%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	9%	0%	10%	8%	18%	3%	7%	22%	7%	0%	10%
Treatment from Graduate Students											
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	36%	0%	48%	50%	47%	48%	43%	22%	50%	33%	20%
Put down or was condescending	36%	0%	58%	40%	47%	38%	29%	22%	41%	28%	30%
Distrusted description of own experiences	45%	0%	29%	35%	24%	31%	36%	22%	37%	22%	10%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	27%	0%	13%	29%	18%	21%	14%	22%	15%	0%	20%
Treatment from Undergraduates											
Doubted or devalued work or expertise	27%	0%	29%	46%	18%	34%	36%	11%	28%	28%	20%
Put down or was condescending	18%	0%	26%	31%	6%	31%	29%	11%	13%	11%	20%
Distrusted description of own experiences	9%	0%	16%	25%	0%	14%	21%	0%	15%	6%	10%
Made false statements or circulated rumors	0%	0%	10%	21%	6%	10%	7%	0%	13%	11%	20%
% Experienced at least one of these Behaviors:											
Committed by Faculty	55%	14%	65%	69%	76%	69%	43%	78%	65%	56%	50%
Committed by Staff	18%	0%	23%	23%	35%	10%	29%	67%	22%	6%	20%
Committed by Graduate Students	55%	0%	65%	60%	59%	59%	50%	33%	54%	39%	30%
Committed by Undergraduates	36%	0%	35%	52%	24%	52%	36%	11%	30%	33%	20%
Committed by anyone	73%	14%	84%	81%	88%	83%	64%	89%	78%	67%	50%
Number of respondents	65	81	29	24	212	83	67	56	8	78	55

Table 120. Sexual Harassment Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status

Items	Employees		Grad Students		Undergrad Students	
	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT
Sexual harassment is a problem within the College (<i>reverse coded</i>)						
Total Agreement	31%	57%	44%	50%	26%	30%
Total Disagreement	51%	35%	42%	34%	57%	49%
Mean Score ^a	4.57	3.78	4.09	3.66	4.84	4.47
I know the steps to take if a person comes to me with a problem						
Total Agreement	94%	84%	91%	73%	85%	84%
Total Disagreement	4%	16%	5%	27%	10%	13%
Mean Score ^a	6.01	5.59	5.85	5.02	5.64	5.56
Sexual harassment is taken seriously within the College						
Total Agreement	80%	73%	73%	50%	83%	77%
Total Disagreement	12%	19%	19%	45%	9%	11%
Mean Score ^a	5.58	5.31	5.18	4.21	5.82	5.43
I have experienced sexual harassment within the College (<i>reverse coded</i>)						
Total Agreement	6%	9%	9%	19%	4%	9%
Total Disagreement	90%	88%	89%	79%	93%	87%
Mean Score ^a	6.28	6.00	6.26	5.64	6.51	6.14
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.61</i>	<i>5.17</i>	<i>5.35</i>	<i>4.63</i>	<i>5.70</i>	<i>5.40</i>
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>647</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>1220</i>	<i>160</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 121. Sexual Harassment Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity

Items	Employees			Grad Students			Undergrad Students		
	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority
Sexual harassment is a problem within the College (reverse coded)									
Total Agreement	32%	26%	27%	47%	36%	44%	24%	38%	28%
Total Disagreement	50%	65%	42%	36%	53%	44%	61%	35%	55%
Mean Score ^a	4.51	4.84	4.58	3.85	4.44	4.16	4.98	4.03	4.67
I know the steps to take if a person comes to me with a problem									
Total Agreement	95%	95%	86%	85%	94%	86%	84%	87%	87%
Total Disagreement	4%	3%	10%	13%	0%	8%	13%	5%	9%
Mean Score ^a	6.03	5.93	5.72	5.54	6.08	5.76	5.56	5.62	5.81
Sexual harassment is taken seriously within the College									
Total Agreement	83%	85%	67%	66%	81%	66%	82%	85%	77%
Total Disagreement	10%	9%	23%	27%	17%	20%	9%	6%	12%
Mean Score ^a	5.65	5.76	5.23	4.84	5.57	4.97	5.72	5.97	5.66
I have experienced sexual harassment within the College (reverse coded)									
Total Agreement	6%	2%	4%	12%	6%	11%	4%	6%	7%
Total Disagreement	90%	98%	91%	86%	92%	86%	94%	89%	89%
Mean Score ^a	6.28	6.44	6.31	6.11	6.41	6.00	6.54	6.34	6.29
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.62</i>	<i>5.74</i>	<i>5.46</i>	<i>5.09</i>	<i>5.63</i>	<i>5.22</i>	<i>5.70</i>	<i>5.49</i>	<i>5.61</i>
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>649</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>228</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 122. Sexual Harassment Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Human Biology	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Microbiology and Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Interdepartmental	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
Sexual harassment is a problem within the College (reverse coded)														
Total Agreement	26%	35%	35%	36%	21%	20%	27%	42%	50%	42%	22%	33%	42%	14%
Total Disagreement	50%	51%	65%	57%	57%	59%	55%	39%	50%	44%	56%	67%	50%	79%
Mean Score ^a	4.61	4.49	5.06	4.43	4.90	4.98	4.91	4.15	4.50	4.16	4.91	4.89	4.33	5.36
I know the steps to take if a person comes to me with a problem														
Total Agreement	80%	90%	80%	89%	91%	81%	89%	79%	100%	80%	88%	96%	76%	81%
Total Disagreement	10%	8%	20%	6%	8%	16%	2%	16%	0%	18%	9%	0%	12%	19%
Mean Score ^a	5.55	5.89	5.05	5.94	5.83	5.50	5.91	5.44	6.00	5.64	5.65	5.96	5.35	5.25
Sexual harassment is taken seriously within the College														
Total Agreement	82%	79%	58%	87%	86%	81%	85%	74%	100%	78%	81%	86%	87%	71%
Total Disagreement	9%	9%	16%	7%	8%	10%	10%	17%	0%	16%	11%	9%	7%	14%
Mean Score ^a	5.70	5.84	5.05	5.80	6.05	5.73	5.72	5.29	6.00	5.43	5.81	5.77	5.93	5.00
I have experienced sexual harassment within the College (reverse coded)														
Total Agreement	2%	6%	0%	0%	5%	3%	7%	5%	0%	9%	5%	0%	18%	0%
Total Disagreement	92%	92%	95%	100%	94%	95%	86%	95%	100%	91%	95%	96%	76%	100%
Mean Score ^a	6.43	6.32	6.68	6.84	6.54	6.65	6.19	6.50	6.63	6.30	6.56	6.75	5.53	6.58
<i>Number of respondents</i>	65	81	29	24	212	83	67	56	8	78	55	33	19	25

Table 123. Sexual Harassment Items, by Department (Graduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	CMB / MMG / Genetics / Physiology	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
Sexual harassment is a problem within the College (reverse coded)											
Total Agreement	38%	50%	35%	50%	50%	48%	50%	57%	40%	47%	14%
Total Disagreement	38%	25%	42%	32%	33%	52%	38%	43%	50%	27%	86%
Mean Score ^a	4.00	3.50	4.23	3.97	3.58	4.29	3.63	3.43	4.17	3.73	5.14
I know the steps to take if a person comes to me with a problem											
Total Agreement	73%	100%	84%	94%	76%	83%	100%	89%	86%	88%	100%
Total Disagreement	9%	0%	10%	4%	18%	17%	0%	11%	11%	6%	0%
Mean Score ^a	5.64	6.83	5.42	6.15	5.18	5.48	5.79	5.56	5.43	5.71	6.56
Sexual harassment is taken seriously within the College											
Total Agreement	78%	100%	74%	64%	47%	62%	83%	63%	74%	69%	63%
Total Disagreement	22%	0%	22%	31%	40%	27%	17%	25%	16%	19%	38%
Mean Score ^a	4.89	6.50	5.00	4.83	4.13	4.62	5.75	4.88	5.29	5.25	4.63
I have experienced sexual harassment within the College (reverse coded)											
Total Agreement	9%	0%	16%	13%	12%	7%	0%	22%	10%	19%	0%
Total Disagreement	91%	100%	84%	85%	76%	90%	100%	78%	90%	81%	100%
Mean Score ^a	6.18	6.86	5.84	6.17	5.82	6.41	6.71	5.78	6.10	6.00	6.60
<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>12</i>

Table 124. Bias Incident Items, by Respondent Type and LGBT Status

Items	Employees		Grad Students		Undergrad Students	
	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT	Non-LGBT	LGBT
I know how to report bias incidents if they occurred within the college						
Total Agreement	74%	60%	54%	36%	58%	46%
Total Disagreement	21%	37%	39%	57%	35%	45%
Mean Score ^a	5.11	4.57	4.32	3.52	4.45	4.00
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation						
Total Agreement	70%	64%	62%	31%	73%	70%
Total Disagreement	20%	28%	27%	51%	15%	16%
Mean Score ^a	5.15	4.56	4.65	3.69	5.28	5.08
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leadership will take appropriate actions to address them						
Total Agreement	67%	54%	59%	31%	76%	65%
Total Disagreement	21%	42%	28%	67%	16%	25%
Mean Score ^a	4.93	4.12	4.45	3.36	5.25	4.76
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.06</i>	<i>4.42</i>	<i>4.47</i>	<i>3.52</i>	<i>4.99</i>	<i>4.61</i>
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>647</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>1220</i>	<i>160</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 125. Bias Incident Items, by Respondent Type and Race / Ethnicity

Items	Employees			Grad Students			Undergrad Students		
	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority	White Only	Asian / Pacific Islander	Other Minority
I know how to report bias incidents if they occurred within the college									
Total Agreement	73%	89%	61%	40%	75%	57%	51%	72%	62%
Total Disagreement	22%	9%	36%	53%	18%	34%	42%	21%	32%
Mean Score ^a	5.07	5.55	4.66	3.74	5.16	4.34	4.19	4.99	4.62
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation									
Total Agreement	73%	80%	54%	54%	73%	45%	74%	64%	75%
Total Disagreement	17%	13%	34%	32%	20%	42%	15%	17%	16%
Mean Score ^a	5.26	5.47	4.63	4.40	5.09	4.00	5.30	5.06	5.30
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leadership will take appropriate actions to address them									
Total Agreement	69%	85%	44%	47%	79%	47%	75%	80%	70%
Total Disagreement	21%	6%	31%	42%	14%	41%	17%	11%	22%
Mean Score ^a	4.93	5.93	4.27	3.98	5.26	4.00	5.18	5.39	5.03
<i>AVERAGE</i>	<i>5.09</i>	<i>5.65</i>	<i>4.52</i>	<i>4.04</i>	<i>5.17</i>	<i>4.11</i>	<i>4.89</i>	<i>5.15</i>	<i>4.98</i>
<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>649</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>228</i>

^a Mean scores are calculated on a seven-point scale where higher scores correspond to more favorable attitudes. For most items, 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 7 = "Strongly Agree." However, for the reverse coded items, 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 7 = "Strongly Disagree" because the statement expresses an unfavorable view.

Table 126. Bias Incident Items, by Department (Undergraduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Human Biology	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Microbiology and Molecular Genetics	Natural Science Interdepartmental	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Physiology	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
I know how to report bias incidents if they occurred within the college														
Total Agreement	53%	73%	64%	44%	63%	39%	65%	36%	75%	50%	52%	65%	65%	50%
Total Disagreement	31%	23%	32%	50%	31%	57%	28%	50%	25%	50%	40%	30%	35%	50%
Mean Score ^a	4.40	5.02	4.68	3.94	4.70	3.59	4.80	3.81	4.88	3.94	4.12	4.57	4.41	4.19
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation														
Total Agreement	88%	75%	68%	71%	73%	80%	75%	63%	67%	66%	80%	96%	76%	68%
Total Disagreement	5%	9%	18%	18%	17%	15%	3%	23%	17%	20%	10%	4%	18%	16%
Mean Score ^a	5.76	5.63	5.32	5.18	5.31	5.36	5.43	4.93	5.50	4.88	5.43	6.00	5.29	5.58
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leadership will take appropriate actions to address them														
Total Agreement	77%	90%	67%	68%	79%	76%	76%	66%	100%	60%	60%	71%	81%	72%
Total Disagreement	14%	5%	19%	26%	16%	16%	8%	27%	0%	31%	23%	25%	6%	22%
Mean Score ^a	5.39	5.83	5.14	5.00	5.27	5.27	5.37	4.93	6.17	4.51	4.83	5.17	5.56	4.72
<i>Number of respondents</i>	65	81	29	24	212	83	67	56	8	78	55	33	19	25

Table 127. Bias Incident Items, by Department (Graduate Students)

Items	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics	CMB / MMG / Genetics / Physiology	Chemistry	Geological Sciences	Integrative Biology	Mathematics	Neuroscience	Physics and Astronomy	Plant Biology	Statistics and Probability
I know how to report bias incidents if they occurred within the college											
Total Agreement	67%	86%	46%	44%	41%	33%	71%	14%	57%	56%	63%
Total Disagreement	11%	14%	46%	49%	53%	63%	14%	86%	39%	44%	13%
Mean Score ^a	5.00	5.86	3.96	4.15	3.47	3.37	5.14	2.71	4.27	3.94	5.38
I can report bias incidents I encounter without fear of retaliation											
Total Agreement	60%	100%	36%	52%	41%	35%	75%	43%	68%	67%	89%
Total Disagreement	30%	0%	52%	38%	53%	30%	17%	29%	24%	20%	11%
Mean Score ^a	4.80	6.50	3.72	4.29	3.82	3.78	5.08	4.29	4.82	4.73	5.89
If bias incidents are reported, I believe leadership will take appropriate actions to address them											
Total Agreement	88%	100%	42%	56%	43%	35%	83%	38%	56%	44%	75%
Total Disagreement	13%	0%	54%	33%	50%	46%	17%	50%	29%	44%	0%
Mean Score ^a	5.38	6.50	3.67	4.36	3.50	3.54	5.17	3.88	4.22	4.13	5.50
<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>12</i>