

THE CITY COLLEGE OF NEW YORK

Report of the President's Council on Inclusion and Excellence

September 2012

This page intentionally left blank.



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Wille Administration Building, Room 300
160 Convent Avenue
New York, New York 10031

TEL: 212.650.7285
FAX: 212.650.7680
www.cuny.cuny.edu

September 17, 2012

Dear Faculty Colleagues,

To become a world-class academic institution, The City College of New York must continue to strengthen our world-class faculty – one that reflects the rich diversity of voices, viewpoints, and experiences, of *all* of our nation, and an increasingly global society. Talented and ambitious scholars can come from anywhere – and in a very real sense must come from everywhere. I am resolutely committed to diversity as central to excellence in research, scholarship, and in teaching. We must ensure that those who have the ability and ambition to succeed at City College can thrive at City College. We cannot do otherwise.

It is therefore my privilege to present the first **Report of the President's Council on Inclusion and Excellence** – the result of a year's study to develop a plan to enhance faculty diversity and to create an environment of inclusion throughout the College. As you read the Report and discuss its recommendations, I believe that you will agree with me that dedicated, concrete efforts to address the concerns outlined herein will be good for the entire faculty. Everyone will profit from wide-ranging, open searches to seek out the best talent. Everyone will benefit from greater clarity in the requirements for tenure and promotion. Everyone will gain from programs to mentor junior faculty, and to provide the management and leadership experience they need to advance into academic administration.

Using the tools of scholarship and data collection, however, the Report reveals that many faculty members experience City College in ways that are often distinctly and even painfully different from other faculty. We must, as a community, mitigate this difference, both because basic fairness demands it, and because we cannot become the institution we wish to be while this difference exists.

This is not to say that we have not come some distance. This year, for example, more than 60% of our faculty hires are minorities and/or women. Importantly, we have changed the College's governance to make the tenure voting process vastly more inclusive. In addition, we will introduce an Administrative Faculty Fellows program next Spring, designed to provide mid-level faculty with the management and administrative experience that will enhance their ability to move into academic leadership positions.



It is clear, however, we have further to go. We must put into place the systems and strategies that ensure inclusion and fairness at every juncture in the professional life of each faculty member at City College. These need to be built upon a culture of inclusion that values and embraces diversity in its broadest sense within our academic community. I ask every member of the faculty to think freshly about how we can build a vibrant and inclusive College, to the benefit of everyone.

I would like thank Professor Charles Watkins, as Chair of the Council, for giving us an excellent starting place – and for agreeing to continue to lead this important effort. Now it's up to all of us.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lisa S. Coico".

Lisa S. Coico
President

Acknowledgements

The President's Council for Inclusion and Excellence expresses its gratitude to President Lisa S. Coico for her strong moral leadership in creation of the Council and her unflinching support of its work.

We also express our appreciation to Deborah Hartnett, Senior Advisor to the President and Chief of Staff, for her tireless efforts in facilitating access to information and resources. We owe special thanks to the Council's staff members, Regina Pierce, Tamara Smalling, and Ian Matthew, for their dedicated service in support of the faculty and administrators on the Council. In addition, we thank Maxwell Yearwood, Ph.D. candidate in the Quantitative Methods in Educational and Psychological Research Concentration of the CUNY Doctoral Program in Educational Psychology, for his assistance with the statistical calculations of the Council's report. Finally, we recognize the work of former Assistant Vice President for Human Resources, Sabrina Ellis, in contributing to the formation of the Council and helping to shepherd it through its early stages.

This page intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

Council Membership	vii
---------------------------------	-----

PART I: EXECUTIVE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Report Purpose and Structure	1
B. Background	1
C. Vision, Mission, and Scope	2
D. Council’s First-Year Activities	3
E. Study Design and Theoretical Basis	5
F. Findings, Goals, and Strategies	6
References for Part I	15

PART II: RESEARCH REPORT

A. Introduction	16
B. Research Methodology	16
Interviews	16
Focus Groups.....	17
Faculty Survey.....	18
C. Findings	
Historical Dimension of Diversity Climate.....	23
Faculty Demographic Composition	25
Academic Administration Demographic Composition	34
Faculty Recruitment Practices and Policies	41
Faculty Retention Issues.....	46
Promotion and Tenure Issues	55
Psychological and Behavioral Issues	67
Organizational Leadership for Climate Change.....	80
D. Summary and Conclusions	82

References for Part II	84
Appendices	
Appendix A. -- Faculty Survey Instrument.....	85
Appendix B. – Tabulated Survey Results with Computed Percentages and IMs.....	95
Appendix C. – Results of Statistical Testing	116

President's Council on Inclusion and Excellence

Members

Carol W. Moore

Sophie Davis
Department of Microbiology
and Immunology

Juan Carlos Mercado

Center for Worker Education
Office of the Dean

Ramona Hernandez

Division of Social Sciences
Department of Sociology/Dominican Studies
Institute

Jeffrey F. Morris

Grove School of Engineering
Department of Chemical Engineering/Levich
Institute

I-Hsien Wu

Division of Humanities and the Arts
Department of Foreign Languages and Literature

Sheldon Weinbaum

Grove School of Engineering
Department of Biomedical Engineering

Karen Hubbard

Division of Science
Department of Biology

Carlos Aguasaco

Division of Interdisciplinary Studies
Center for Worker Education

V. Parameswaran Nair

Division of Science
Department of Physics

Christopher D. Yawn

School of Education
Department of Leadership and Special
Education

Arthur K. Spears

Division of Social Sciences
Department of Anthropology

Andrea Weiss

Division of Humanities and the Arts
Department of Media and Communication Arts
Film and Video Program

Ardie D. Walser

Office of Diversity and Compliance

Carlos Riobó

Division of Humanities and the Arts
Department of Foreign Languages and Literature

Deborah L. Vietze

Division of Social Sciences
Department of Psychology

Charles B. Watkins (Chair)

Grove School of Engineering
Department of Mechanical Engineering

Council Staff

Ian Matthew – Office of Human Resources Liaison

Tamara Smalling – Meeting Recorder

Regina Pierce – Administrative Support

This page intentionally left blank.

PART I: EXECUTIVE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Report Purpose and Structure

This report is the result of a one-year study to develop a plan to enhance faculty diversity and inclusion at The City College of New York. The study was carried out at the request of President Lisa S. Coico by The President's Council on Inclusion and Excellence, appointed by her. It presents the Council's findings on the climate for faculty diversity and inclusion with goals and strategies to improve the climate and increase the representation of minorities and women on the faculty.

The report is divided into two parts. Part I, the Executive Report and Recommendations, describes the Council's purpose and mission, gives an overview of its activities, summarizes its findings, and presents its recommendations in the form of goals and strategies. Part II, the Research Report, supports Part I with details of the analysis of the data and presentation of 34 major findings.

B. Background

Increasing the diversity of the professoriate has been a common theme in higher education for two decades. Initiatives to increase the numbers of minority and women faculty whether at the national level, focusing on pipeline problems, or at the institutional level, focusing on recruitment, retention, and career advancement, are commonplace. Among the most prominent private U.S. universities with significant faculty diversity initiatives are Harvard, Yale, Princeton, MIT, Stanford, NYU, and Columbia. Public universities with such initiatives include the campuses of the University of California, Penn State, and SUNY. However, until recently, the administration at The City College of New York (CCNY) had not focused on this issue with the development of a faculty diversity plan.

The lack of action at City College changed with the appointment of Dr. Lisa S. Coico as President in August 2010. In early September, she sent a letter to the campus community affirming her commitment to a culture of diversity.

That first fall of her tenure, President Coico convened a series of formal dialogue sessions with CCNY faculty and administrators about her vision for the College and the College's immediate opportunities and challenges. A number of faculty identified problems confronting minority and women faculty as being one of the major challenges. President Coico also participated in a City College Faculty Senate forum on the College's results from the Spring 2009 Faculty Experience Survey¹ conducted by the CUNY University Faculty Senate. One of the survey's findings was that CCNY ranked last among all CUNY colleges in faculty satisfaction with their college's commitment to faculty diversity.

In early 2011, CUNY Chancellor Matthew Goldstein appointed President Coico to an Ad-Hoc Committee on Strengthening Faculty Diversity, comprised of CUNY senior academic leaders.

The Chancellor charged the Committee with developing a comprehensive University faculty diversity action plan.

In the spring of 2011, President Coico initiated a parallel planning effort at City College by appointing the President's Council on Inclusion and Excellence to develop a comprehensive plan for inclusiveness and diversity specifically for CCNY, as an institution that in many ways is unique within CUNY. Charles Watkins, Professor of Mechanical Engineering and Chair of the Faculty Committee on Personnel Matters, was appointed to chair the Council.

The inaugural meeting of the Council was convened by the President in June 2011. At that meeting she charged the council to devote itself to a year-long task of study, analysis, and plan development with the full support of her office. The Council was to have the autonomy to examine sensitive data on both faculty and student diversity, free from censorship, and deliver a report to her with recommendations, irrespective of how challenging and difficult they might be.

The charge that President Coico gave to the Council was broader in context than developing a plan for compositional diversity alone. It embraced the principles of inclusive excellence by emphasizing that excellence and diversity, as core values of City College, are inextricably connected; one cannot be compromised for the other. President Coico's vision of inclusive excellence calls for a campus community with a culture that is committed to full participation, fair treatment, and academic or professional success of all, regardless of their socioeconomic status, ethnicity, race, gender, religion, or sexual orientation.

The concept of inclusive excellence, as articulated by President Coico, has a foundation in work supported by the Association of American Colleges and Universities. It is delineated in three papers^{2,3,4} commissioned by the Association in 2005. These papers lay out a comprehensive vision of inclusion and excellence permeating every aspect of the academic mission of an institution. It transcends traditional thinking of a commitment to diversity as simply a racial, ethnic, and gender compositional imperative.

C. Vision, Mission, and Scope

Over the summer after its inaugural meeting, the Council began to assemble and review the academic literature on diversity and inclusion, the plans and reports of other institutions related to diversity and inclusive excellence, and CCNY's own student and faculty demographic data and affirmative action reports.

One of the first tasks that the Council undertook in the fall was the writing of vision and mission statements to guide its work. The following statements were adopted by the Council after a period of extensive deliberation.

Vision

The vision of the President's Council for Inclusion and Excellence is a City College of New York where the administration, faculty, and staff engage cooperatively in striving toward excellence of achievement and fairness of treatment for every member of the college community. The Council further envisions a City College that celebrates the reflection among its students, faculty, and staff of the full array of diversity found in New York City and strives to be inclusive of this diversity in fulfilling the College's mission.

Mission

The President's Council on Inclusion and Excellence serves to enhance the City College of New York's ability to incorporate the full diversity of backgrounds, traditions, and experiences of faculty, staff, and students in realizing the goal of an inclusive community that values excellence in scholarship, creative arts, teaching and learning, and student development. To accomplish this, the Council analyzes current trends and concerns related to inclusion in all areas of the College and, based on these analyses, provides need-based recommendations to the President that promote inclusive excellence. These recommendations focus on encouraging inclusiveness in hiring; fairness in faculty retention, tenure, and promotion; and provision of equal opportunity for all faculty and staff to rise, on their merits, to leadership positions. The council also makes recommendations that promote an understanding of how inclusion and participation of the diverse groups within the College community fosters excellence. It further works to encourage a culturally rich and cohesive environment that nourishes student retention and academic success.

After fully considering the scope of its charge, the Council, in consultation with the President, decided that focusing its first-year activities on faculty would be more manageable and productive than addressing both faculty and student issues. Without minimizing the importance or urgency of student body issues in the context of inclusive excellence, student issues were deferred for later consideration by the Council. The Council further decided to restrict its consideration of faculty issues to those of the full-time faculty.

D. Council's First-Year Activities

The Presidents' Council on Inclusion and Excellence set for itself a schedule of bimonthly meetings for the 2011-12 academic year. The meetings commenced in the Fall Semester of 2011.

It became apparent early on that many faculty members were eager to share with the Council their perceptions and experiences at CCNY regarding inclusion. However, some were also reticent to divulge their identity or otherwise wanted their privacy to be protected. To obtain faculty input on inclusion in a confidential and systematic manner, the Council decided to conduct confidential focus groups and an anonymous faculty opinion survey. In addition, confidential interviews would be conducted with selected senior faculty and administrators.

A consultant firm, Cambridge Hill Partners, was engaged to assist with the focus groups, survey, and interview tasks. The firm was also asked to help in structuring the work of the Council, analyzing some of the internal and external data, and identifying best practices at other institutions.

An Institutional Review Board exemption was requested and granted for confidential focus groups and an anonymous web survey. The focus groups were conducted in February 2012 and were followed by the web survey, which was conducted in March 2012. Prior to the focus groups and survey, President Coico sent letters to full-time faculty members alerting them to these activities, emphasizing their importance, and requesting the participation of all eligible faculty.

The focus groups and survey were restricted to full-time, regular faculty members and participation was voluntary. The design of the survey and the focus group discussion protocol were similar to others that have been conducted at various institutions to assess the climate for diversity and inclusion. The following were the general areas of inquiry:

- satisfaction
- inclusion/community
- collegial interaction
- diversity
- fairness/consistency
- hiring process
- tenure
- promotion
- work-life

Over the course of the 2011-12 academic year, in addition to obtaining information from the interviews, focus groups, and survey, the Council received input at its meetings from a variety of other sources. A Council meeting was attended by Provost Martin Moskovits, who discussed with the Council his plans for raising the undergraduate entrance requirements to improve graduation rate and his personal analysis arguing minimal impact on student diversity. He also gave his reaction to some preliminary recommendations of the Council regarding affirmative action practices.

A Council meeting was attended by Acting Dean of the Division of Humanities and the Arts, Geraldine Murphy, and Dean of the Division of Social Sciences Dean, Marilyn Hoskin. The topic of discussion with the two deans was the role of ethnic and gender studies in promoting inclusion and excellence.

At another meeting, Assistant Vice President for Human Resources, Sabrina Ellis, who was also a Council member, presented her proposal for the creation of affinity groups at the College.

The Council devoted a portion of two meetings to review and discussion of the findings of the CUNY Diversity Study and the CUNY Faculty Diversity Action Plan.⁵ The Action Plan, which was released in April 2012, has been integrated into the Council's recommendations.

Council members participated in the CUNY Office of Recruitment and Diversity's site review of the College's Office of Affirmative Action, Compliance and Diversity (now the Office of Diversity and Compliance). Members also participated in the search process for a new Director of that office.

To gain further insight into best practices at another institution, the Council chair accompanied the consultants on a visit to MIT. An Associate Provost and an Associate Dean of Science were interviewed about the implementation of faculty diversity and equity initiatives at MIT. Council members also participated in a webinar entitled, *Diversity Inclusion: A New Systems-Based Institutional Transformation Framework*, sponsored by the Harvard Medical School, Office for Diversity Inclusion and Community Partnership and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

In a few instances, the Council or its members received unsolicited information containing allegations of practices that violated the principles of inclusion. If the nature of the complaint allowed it and if the complainant(s) consented, these allegations were referred to the proper office for resolution.

The Council partnered with the Faculty Committee on Personnel Matters (FCPM) in advocacy for the change in the City College Governance Plan to have all the tenured members of a department vote on faculty tenure as a fairer system than the previous procedure of having only the Executive Committee of a department vote on tenure. The Council and FCPM are also advocates for a requirement that all departments have department-level, written, specific criteria for tenure and promotion.

Another activity of the Council involved the Deans' searches that took place during the academic year. Council members met with the President to express their concerns about the lack of diversity in the candidate pools. The Council then developed a proposal for broadening the pool of College faculty with administrative experience and potential through a Faculty Administrative Fellows Program. The proposal was vetted by the FCPM and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and has been accepted by the President for implementation.

The Council's activities of the 2011-12 academic year concluded on May 24, 2012 with a half-day meeting attended by the President at which the faculty survey data were formally reviewed by the Council along with best practices adopted at other institutions. At the meeting a set of additional recommendations were formulated to supplement the recommendations already formulated over the course of the year.

E. Study Design and Theoretical Basis

There is a substantial body of higher education literature and research devoted to characterizing the elements of a campus diversity climate. Campus climate is the real and perceived culture of

an institution that surrounds interpersonal, academic, and professional interactions. It is the experience of individuals and groups on the campus. Fries-Britt et al.⁶ provide an excellent summary of the literature most relevant to the climate for faculty diversity.

The consensus of the literature, to date, is that a campus diversity climate has five internal dimensions that must all be addressed to create a culture and practice of inclusion;

- (a) historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion,
- (b) compositional diversity,
- (c) psychological climate,
- (d) behavioral climate, and
- (e) organizational/structural aspect of climate.

The research methods that were used to develop the findings of this report were aimed at investigating the five dimensions of climate. They consisted of a review of existing data and of data gathered in response to specific requests as well as the previously mentioned confidential interviews of key faculty and administrators, faculty focus groups, and anonymous on-line faculty survey, which were conducted by the consultants.

Further details on the research methods as well as the detailed findings resulting from the research are presented in Part II of this report.

F. Findings, Goals, and Strategies

The Council's recommendations are centered on the achievement of eight goals that address our main findings regarding the climate for faculty diversity, inclusion, and excellence at CCNY.

Goal 1: Improve the psychological and behavioral climate for inclusion at CCNY.

Goal 2: Reduce inequities and improve fairness in faculty personnel actions.

Goal 3: Improve the compositional diversity of the faculty.

Goal 4: Increase faculty retention.

Goal 5: Increase the compositional diversity of the Executive Compensation Plan-level academic administration.

Goal 6: Increase the compositional diversity of the departmental administrations.

Goal 7: Institutionalize a culture of inclusion.

Goal 8: Create an organizational structure across all levels of the organization to support and sustain the other goals.

These goals are presented as discrete but they are all interrelated in a mutually reinforcing continuum. In the following we summarize our findings, recommend goals to address them, and suggest strategies to achieve the goals. Several of these strategies overlap or reinforce strategies articulated in the CUNY Faculty Diversity Plan⁵ and are indicated as such with an asterisk.

Goal 1: Improve the psychological and behavioral climate for inclusion at CCNY

There is a historical context at CCNY that makes the conversation about faculty diversity and inclusion difficult and complex. However, our findings of feelings of unwelcomeness, exclusion, and discrimination among faculty, particularly of minorities and women, must be tackled as an urgent priority. It is important to acknowledge these feelings openly and publically to begin healing and to increase awareness and sensitivity. The special feelings of grievance of Black faculty should be acknowledged for their pervasiveness. There needs to be open communication of inclusion issues and concerns between affected and non-affected faculty groups and between affected groups and administration.

The strategies we recommend to begin to address Goal 1 are:

Strategy 1-1: Hold a series of forums for academic leaders and faculty governance bodies to present the Council's findings and recommendations and to solicit their participation in and support for implementing the recommendations.

Strategy 1-2: Release the Executive Report section of the Council's report through the College's website.

Strategy 1-3: Hold a series of workshops for faculty to sensitize them to the issues confronting minority and women faculty outlined in the Council's report.

Strategy 1-4: Create a New Faculty Orientation Program designed to produce faculty cohorts who have formed collegial relationships across departmental boundaries; are exposed to effective pedagogical techniques; appreciate the College's culture; and are savvy about negotiating the tenure process, grant writing, and publishing.

Strategy 1-5: Have group dinners in an informal setting once per semester where the President and the Provost, together or separately, meet with first and second-year faculty to demonstrate their commitment to the welcome and inclusion of this group and to determine if they have any individual or group concerns. The event would also serve as a networking opportunity for the faculty involved.

Strategy 1-6: Division/School Deans should host welcoming receptions for their new faculty and spotlight their research. Deans/departments should also recognize and celebrate faculty promotions.

Goal 2: Reduce inequities and improve fairness in faculty personnel actions and improve faculty retention.

There are a number of deficiencies in the promotions and tenure process that disproportionately affect minorities and women and require attention. One is that service and student mentoring are inadequately recognized. Another is that there is no college-wide formal faculty mentoring process. Informal mechanisms do not seem to address this deficiency and may especially disadvantage minorities and women. Lastly, criteria for tenure and promotions are perceived by many faculty as subjectively and inequitably applied and faculty are often unclear about them, especially the criteria for promotions.

Another personnel issue needing attention is the low representation of women and minorities among faculty appointed as Distinguished Professors and named chair professors.

We believe the appropriate strategies to achieve Goal 2 are:

Strategy 2-1: Provide increased released time for junior faculty taking on significant service burdens with realistic accounting for the time spent in committee assignments, program direction, or student mentoring. Give due consideration to service as a supplementary factor for tenure in accordance with CUNY Board of Trustees policy. Provide documentation of the quality of such service as part of the tenure package.

Strategy 2-2: Develop and implement a structured, formal mentoring program for untenured faculty at the divisional or school level based on models that have proven to be successful at other institutions.^{7*}

Strategy 2-3: Develop written departmental criteria for promotion and tenure to supplement Board criteria.

Strategy 2-4: Implement an automatic review of denial of tenure, promotion, or reappointment, prior to such recommendations reaching the President, by an equity panel empowered to review such denials for consistency in application of requirements. The panel would be advisory to and appointed by the President. Alternatively, revise the CCNY Governance Plan to add a non-voting equity advisor to the Review Committee. The additional member would be appointed by the President to monitor fairness and consistency in personnel actions.

Strategy 2-5: Make relevant materials widely available regarding CV preparation and the process for tenure and promotion to all untenured and junior faculty each year. In addition, a catalog of CV's should be compiled for all faculty who were awarded tenure or promotion to ensure more transparency in the process, to make the pathway more clear in terms of productivity and scholarly accomplishment, and to encourage inclusive

excellence. This should include appointments/promotions to Distinguished Professor and named chairs.

Strategy 2-6: Maintain statistical data on faculty reappointments, promotions, tenure, and retention overall and by protected class in such a way that academic units can be monitored for their performance in these areas and to create a sense of accountability, just as there should be in hiring.*

Strategy 2-7: Look strategically for opportunities to recruit minorities and women to CCNY as Distinguished Professors or named chair professors and also identify deserving internal candidates for nomination. Consider internal candidates who have made outstanding contributions in scholarship, external funding, and service for internally funded chair appointments as Presidential Professor, Presidential Service Professor, etc.

Goal 3: Improve the compositional diversity of the faculty.

There is a persistent deficit in the representation of minority and women faculty on the CCNY faculty with respect to underutilization data, other CUNY senior colleges, and the student body demographics. The compositional diversity of new hires under the current senior administration reflects substantial progress in recruitment and hiring of diverse faculty.

There is not yet evidence of accountability for compositional diversity at the division and school level at CCNY. Efforts to recruit minority and women candidates are often ad hoc and opportunistic; there is no clear and consistent commitment to devote resources for their recruitment and hiring. Faculty are largely unaware of the seriousness of the College's commitment to diversifying the faculty and of resources and mechanisms to facilitate it. Furthermore, the College lacks an aggressive, bottom-up approach to identifying outstanding minority and women faculty candidates. In addition, more oversight is needed to ensure determined outreach and fair treatment of applicants by search committees.

To achieve Goal 3, the strategies we recommend are:

Strategy 3-1 Require the Office of Diversity and Compliance to take a more proactive role in the facilitation of diversity in searches.*

We recommend this be implemented by the Office in the following specific ways:

- a. When a short list is composed for candidates to be interviewed, the Office should be familiar with the CV's of the individuals within the search. It should consult with appropriate parties, as necessary, to assist in its independent evaluation of CV's.
- b. If the Office considers candidates outside the list more qualified than the candidates being selected for interviews, the search committee chair should provide a justification as to why the apparently more qualified candidates have not been selected.

- c. Participate, at its discretion, as a silent observer in searches that take place within departments where there is persistent underutilization and lack of diversity in short-listed candidates.
- d. Require departments with underutilization to identify all of the qualifying criteria used for evaluating candidates and ensure that all such criteria have been appropriately cited in the job posting and are not overly restricted in specialization. If this is not satisfied, the search should cease and the job description and/or qualifications should be revised.

Strategy 3-2 Provide additional lines and other incentives for opportunity hires of exceptional minority and women faculty candidates, particularly in areas of underutilization. Also, travel funds should be provided for outreach, including networking and “upstream” recruiting, and for campus visits of potential candidates.*

Strategy 3-3 Require that the Office of Diversity and Compliance conduct workshops and disseminate materials concerning best practices for recruiting diverse candidates, such as contacting associations of underrepresented groups. At least one person in each department should be designated as a resource person for knowledge of best practices and for identification of potential candidates, including those among the department’s adjuncts.*

Strategy 3-4 Utilize knowledgeable and diverse faculty from outside a department on search committees rather than restricting committees to faculty from within one department (or institute), in order to ensure that faculty candidates from protected classes, and other diverse candidates are given adequate consideration.

Strategy 3-5 Require that the Provost work more closely with the Office of Diversity and Compliance and the Deans to ensure that searches are not overly restrictive and that diverse candidates are fairly considered for appointments in departments with underutilization.

Strategy 3-6 Have the Deans work aggressively with the Provost and the Department Chairs to ensure that if offers are made to minority and women candidates, these offers lead to acceptances. This includes engaging proactively in salary and start-up package negotiations, arranging subsequent campus visits and informal meetings with other minority or women faculty, and providing housing and child-care information.

Strategy 3-7 Recognize and acknowledge Deans publically and in performance reviews for successful efforts to diversify their faculties. Deans, in turn, should recognize their departments for successful efforts.

Goal 4: Increase Faculty Retention

CCNY must work to improve the climate and support mechanisms for all faculty, but particularly for minority and women faculty, to improve their retention. Retention of minority and women faculty at CCNY is important to increasing their representation.

The goal of improving the retention of minorities and women is obviously closely related to the goals of improving the psychological and behavioral climate for inclusion and improving fairness in personnel actions, Goals 1 and 2. In their survey responses, minorities and women were generally less satisfied with their experience at CCNY, including their career progression, than other faculty. Some of these issues are addressed by our strategies for Goals 1 and 2.

Most faculty survey respondents would again choose to work at CCNY but the proportion of Black faculty that would choose to remain is lower. Geographic location is the most important factor influencing faculty to stay while salary, benefits and research support were the two most important factors that would influence them to leave. Another factor that may be influencing retention is work-life balance. CCNY and CUNY lack the family friendly policies and programs to help faculty balance work and personal responsibilities that are found at some other institutions.

Strategy 4-1: Establish a supplemental faculty development fund targeted at reducing inequities and improving retention of minorities and women, as established for this purpose at MIT. Such funds could also be used as bridge funding for faculty who have gaps in their funding due to special circumstances and should not be restricted to STEM disciplines.

Strategy 4-2: Convene a committee of faculty and staff, chaired by the Assistant Vice President/ Director of Human Resources, to explore what can be done locally at CCNY to establish more family-friendly work-life programs, policies, and practices.*

Strategy 4-3: Increase the knowledge base about reasons for faculty leaving from data collected by routinely conducting exit interviews.

Goal 5: Improve the compositional diversity of the Executive Compensation Plan-level academic administration.

There is a deficit in Black and Asian academic administrators in Executive Compensation Plan (ECP) positions where it is expected that they have faculty credentials and underlying faculty titles. The absence of senior Black and Asian academic administrators is a glaring issue that undermines perceptions of the credibility of diversity efforts by the administration. Black faculty are especially sensitive to this issue. There is a need to monitor closely the Hispanic and female representations among ECP academic administrators to ensure they reflect the diversity of the institution and the faculty. The Council believes that there is a diverse and exceptional pool of internal candidates that are often overlooked for ECP academic administration.

The strategies we recommend for Goal 5 are:

Strategy 5-1: Ensure that in appointments of interim, acting, and permanent ECP academic administrators, including for academic positions in the Office of the Provost and President, persons appointed are from a diverse pool and have exhibited

demonstrable success in promoting inclusion and excellence in all areas under their previous jurisdiction.

Strategy 5-2: Follow an interview process prior to appointments of interim and acting administrators and make every effort to interview both minority and women candidates.

Strategy 5-3: Ensure that there is a diverse pool of candidates for the new Administrative Faculty Fellows Program to increase the diversity of internal ECP candidates with previous administrative experience and exposure.

Strategy 5-4: Make the external search process more effective for identifying diverse candidates by not depending solely on search firms but using the internet, professional networks, and professional organizations in searching for qualified candidates; requesting names of possible candidates from all qualified faculty and administrators; stopping or extending searches if necessary; and providing adequate time and other resources to those involved in searches tasked with identifying diverse candidates.

Goal 6: Increase the compositional diversity of the departmental administrations.

There is a need for more diversity among Department Chairs and Executive Committees and particularly for more women to be elected as Department Chairs and members of Department Executive Committees. This is largely outside the purview of the President or a Council appointed by her since Chairs and Executive Committees are elected. Nevertheless, the Council feels an obligation to address this issue with the following recommendations.

Strategy 6-1: Encourage departments to consider an inclusive pool of candidates for departmental administrative positions.

Strategy 6-2: Make available on the Office of Diversity and Compliance website, ethnic and gender breakdowns of each department's administration, along with its faculty ethnic and gender breakdown and underutilization.

Strategy 6-3: Convene a group of senior women to explore any barriers to their serving as chairs or on executive committees.

Strategy 6-4: Consider the diversity of a department's administration as one criterion in any consideration of an award to a department for its diversity efforts.

Strategy 6-5: Involve the Faculty Senate in mediating any issues between departmental administrations and their faculty members regarding inclusion since diversity and inclusion are a compelling college-wide interest and, therefore, under the purview of the Senate.

Goal 7: Institutionalize a culture of inclusion.

Beyond the steps outlined so far but related and overarching, we believe that there needs to be a new consciousness and cultural transformation at CCNY surrounding the climate for inclusion. Certainly one reason is because the inclusiveness of the culture of CCNY impacts its desirability as a place of employment to faculty and faculty candidates from all backgrounds and demographic groups. However, more importantly, it is because a culture of inclusive excellence is a natural fit with CCNY's mission, location, and legacy.

This connection between CCNY's internal culture and its mission, location, and legacy has been neglected or lost in some areas. The lack of attention to CCNY's ethnic and gender studies programs under previous administrations is one example.

Feelings of unwelcomeness and exclusion and/or discrimination due to age, sexual orientation, religion, and disabilities are present among many faculty and need to be addressed. They are each important in their own right and deserving of special attention. This report does not adequately address these issues and they should be topics for future study.

In terms of transforming the academic culture, religion and sexual orientation should be more prominent in the discussion of inclusion. In particular, potential new programs in Islamic studies and Queer studies should be part of the dialogue about culturally relevant academic programs.

The culturally transformative measures we recommend are:

Strategy 7-1: Adopt an "Inclusion across the campus" approach and perspective on the educational and research programs at the College in analogy with the terminology of "writing across the curriculum" but perhaps closer in likeness to the "Broader Impacts" criterion for NSF proposals. In other words, inclusion should be a consideration in every programmatic decision made at the College. This would include authorization of new academic programs, authorization of new and replacement lines, and allocation of internal funds for research and scholarship. Internal proposals and budget requests should address this issue.

Strategy 7-2: Develop an assessment process for determining if all curricula and programs are consistent with diverse, multicultural, and global perspectives. While we recognize that curricula are a faculty responsibility, we call on the Provost to ensure that there is awareness of and accountability among Deans, Senior Advisors, and others for leadership in this area.

Strategy 7-3: Create a faculty development program to encourage faculty and provide them with the necessary tools to incorporate inclusive excellence into their courses and their curricular and co-curricular initiatives. Engaging faculty in developing multicultural competencies for their interactions with students in and outside the classroom should be part of this program.

Strategy 7-5: Begin the process of strengthening the various existing ethnic and gender studies programs that are in need of it. Convene under the leadership of the Provost, a diverse advisory committee to develop recommendations for the strengthening of these programs through allocation or reallocation of resources, administrative adjustments, award of appropriate academic recognition to the students enrolled in them, and other measures found necessary.

Strategy 7-6: Begin exploration of the feasibility of new culturally relevant academic programs, such as Islamic studies and Queer studies, through formation of exploratory committees.

Strategy 7-7: Initiate a program to recognize academic units and individuals for their achievements in diversity and inclusion. This would range from highlighting activities in a newsletter to major college awards presented at a reception celebrating diversity and inclusion.

Strategy 7-8: Provide, upon request, reasonable assistance to facilitate self-organization of faculty and/or staff affinity groups and publicize to the faculty/staff community that such assistance is available.

Goal 8: Create an organizational structure across all levels of the organization to support and sustain the other goals.

The present administrative structure for oversight and implementation of most of the Council's recommendations is thin. It consists of the PCIE itself, the Office of Diversity and Compliance, and the administrators in the Office of the Provost and the Academic Affairs Division. The PCIE and the Director of Diversity and Compliance report directly to the President but much of the task of implementation of the Council's recommendations falls under the jurisdiction of the Provost and of the divisions and schools.

Strategy 8-1: Assign the PCIE a continuing oversight role in the implementation of its recommendations. It should continue to report to the President. The PCIE or similar group is now mandated by the CUNY Faculty Diversity Plan.*

Strategy 8-2: Require each division and school to establish its own inclusion and excellence council with a representative from each of its departments. The divisional and school councils should be charged with fostering inclusion within their academic units and coordinating with college-wide efforts. A representative from each division and school council should serve on the PCIE.

Strategy 8-3: Designate a senior person, reporting to the President, as publically and visibly assigned to interface and coordinate with the PCIE, the Office of Diversity and Compliance, the Provost and the Provost's staff, the Office of Human Resources, and the Ombudsperson. The person should be seen as the ultimate go-to person on faculty diversity issues and provide the President with confidential advice and counsel.

Strategy 8-4: Ask the Provost to designate a senior staff person as accountable for the implementation and coordination of the recommendations of this report within the Academic Affairs Division.

Strategy 8-5: Have the PCIE create a diversity and inclusion assessment plan. The plan should establish metrics, benchmarks, and objectives for diversity and inclusion. It also should provide a schedule for periodic qualitative and quantitative assessments of progress.

References for Part I

1. Barker, K. *The Spring 2009 Faculty Experience Survey (FES:09): Report for full- and part-time faculty*. New York, NY: The University Faculty Senate of The City University of New York (2010).

<http://cunyufs.org/FES/2009Report.pdf>

2. Williams, D., Berger, J., and McClendon, S., *Towards a Model of Inclusive Excellence and Change in Higher Education*, Washington, D.C., Association of American Colleges and Universities (2005).

3. Milem, J. F., Chang, M. J, and Antonio, A. L., *Making Diversity Work on Campus: A Research-Based Perspective*, Washington, D.C., Association of American Colleges and Universities (2005).

4. Bauman, G., Bustillos, L. T., Bensimon, E., Brown, C., and Bartee, R., *Achieving Equitable Educational Outcomes with All Students: The Institution's Roles and Responsibilities*, Washington, D.C., Association of American Colleges and Universities (2005).

5. *Building on a Strong Foundation: A Strategy for Enhancing CUNY's Leadership in the Areas of Faculty Diversity and Inclusion, Diversity Action Plan*, The City University of New York Office of Human Resources Management, Office of Recruitment and Diversity, New York, NY (2012).

http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/ohrm/diversity/DiversityActionPlan/DiversityActionPlan_Revised.pdf

6. Fries-Britt, S. L., Rowan-Kenyon, H. T., Perna, L. W., Milem, J. F., Howard, D. G., Underrepresentation in the academy and the institutional climate for faculty diversity, *Journal of the Professoriate*, 5 (1), (2011).

http://jotp.icbche.org/2011/5-1_FriesBritt_p.1.pdf

7. Thomas, R., *Exemplary Junior Faculty Mentoring Programs*, Women Faculty Forum, Yale University, New Haven CT (2005).

<http://www.yale.edu/wff/pdf/ExemplaryJuniory%20Faculty%20MentoringPrograms.pdf>

PART II: RESEARCH REPORT

A. Introduction

Campus climate is the real and perceived culture of an institution that surrounds interpersonal, academic, and professional interactions. It has five internal dimensions that must all be addressed to create a culture and practice of inclusion favorable to faculty diversity;¹

- (a) historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion,
- (b) compositional diversity,
- (c) psychological climate,
- (d) behavioral climate, and
- (e) organizational/structural aspect of climate.

B. Research Methodology

The research methods that were used to develop the findings of this report were aimed at investigating the five dimensions of climate. They consisted of review and analysis of existing demographic data and of demographic data gathered in response to specific requests, confidential interviews of key faculty and administrators, faculty focus groups, and an anonymous on-line faculty survey. The interviews, focus groups, and on-line survey were conducted by the consultants, Cambridge Hill Partners.

Interviews

Interviews were conducted with the President, Provost, President's Cabinet members, selected Institute and Center Directors and Distinguished Professors, certain members of the Council, and some other faculty selected to broaden participation in the study from Asians and Hispanics. The interviews were designed to get their perspectives on the climate and culture at the College, including the climate for diversity and inclusion.

A typical interview script was as follows:

1. Background for project.
2. What adjectives would you use to describe the climate and/or culture of CCNY?
3. How have you experienced diversity and inclusion at CCNY?
 - a. What have you found most satisfying?
 - b. Most frustrating?

4. How do you see diversity issues playing out at CCNY?
 - a. With faculty? Students? Staff?
 - b. In departments?
 - c. In the classroom?
 - d. In the community?
5. What is your biggest personal concern about your experience of diversity and inclusion at CCNY?
6. To what extent are there policies or practices that need to be assessed, changed, or developed to support diversity moving forward, e.g., orientation, mentoring, professional development, retention, advancement, etc.?
7. What administrators, faculty, or staff have demonstrated diversity leadership at CCNY? What are specific examples of practices or initiatives that have been implemented and are making a difference?
8. Reflecting on CCNY's culture, to what degree do you believe faculty and administrators are currently engaged in diversity and inclusion efforts? What are those efforts and what has been their impact? How can faculty and staff be further engaged?
9. What do you think should be CCNY's diversity and inclusion priorities? Why? How do you see them fitting in with other CCNY priorities?
10. What might various members of CCNY's community resist related to diversity efforts? How will it be manifested (show up or get expressed)?
11. How might senior leadership most effectively hold department chairs and academic leaders accountable for maintaining a climate of respect and advancing diversity?
12. How do you see yourself contributing?

Focus Groups

Focus groups were conducted with faculty voluntarily segregated by diversity demographic category. The following groups were convened.

- Religion Restricted (faculty with needs for special religious accommodations or religious concerns)
- Disabled
- African American/Black
- Middle-Eastern (faculty with issues or concerns related to middle-eastern origin or ancestry)

- LGBTQ
- Engineering/ Sophie Davis /Science Department Chairs
- Architecture/ Social Science/ Education / Humanities and Arts/ CWE Department Chairs
- Senate, Councils, FCPM, and PSC Leaders
- Latino/Latina/Hispanic
- Italian American
- Asian
- White Male
- Junior Women (Assistant and Associate ranks)
- Early Career (first and second-year tenure or CCE track)
- Women
- Open Forum (three sessions)

The protocol at the focus group sessions was structured to address many of the issues touched on in the interview script. Attendance at some of the sessions was sparse. The Religion Restricted, Disabled, and Middle Eastern sessions were not held because no faculty attended.

Faculty Survey

The on-line survey consisted of 94 questions, including requested demographic data. A copy of the survey instrument is included as Appendix A. There were 186 survey respondents distributed as in Table 1. The race/ethnicity totals are more than 186 because multiple responses were allowed; therefore, the race/ethnicity categories are not mutually exclusive. CCNY faculty demographic data are taken from the Fall 2011 edition of *City Facts*.²

The survey response rates shown in Table 1 are typical of such surveys. The participation rate of Black faculty was unusually high, exceeding 50 percent.

Since the sampled faculty groups consisted essentially of volunteers, their responses are subject to voluntary sampling bias. The influence of such bias diminishes as the percentage of the population sampled increases.

If sampling is random, a maximum sampling error can be computed at a given confidence level from the size of the population and the size of the sample. The present sampling is not random. However, computing the maximum random sampling error gives some idea of the relative adequacy of the sampled group sizes. Random sampling error decreases significantly from the maximum when large proportions of the population from which the sample is drawn share similar views.

Table 1 Survey sample demographics.

Race/Ethnicity/Gender	Survey Sample	CCNY Faculty²	Sample Percentage of CCNY Faculty	Maximum Random Sampling Error (90% confidence level)
White	95	369	25.7%	7.3%
Black	30	52	57.7%	10%
Hispanic (Includes Puerto Ricans)	18	43	41.8%	15%
Asian	13	69	18.8%	21%
Italian American	9	24	37.5%	22%
Other	16			
Refused to say	18			
Men	95	328	28.9%	7.1%
Women	90	207	43.4%	6.5%
Transgender	1			
All Groups	186	535	34.7%	4.9%

The maximum random sampling errors computed in Table 1 raise questions about the adequacy of the survey sample sizes for Asians, Italian Americans and, to a lesser degree, Hispanics. This is also borne out by the statistical testing done on the observed intergroup group differences in the survey results. Asian, Black, and Hispanic responses were tested against white responses and female responses were tested against male responses.

The differences between the Asian and white groups survived the test criterion only for very large effect sizes, i.e., large differences between group results. The dual identification of most of the Italian-Americans respondents as whites precluded testing of their group responses.

The survey questions were mostly five-point Likert item questions. As an example of the method of analysis of these questions, consider the results from the first question on the survey as shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Faculty respondents’ satisfaction by demographic group.

The question asks if faculty agree that they are satisfied with their CCNY faculty experience. We analyzed responses to it by assigning a value from 1 to 5, for strongly disagree to strongly agree, from each individual response. We then computed and plotted the interpolated median (IM) of the responses from each racial/ethnic/gender group as in the figure. “Sample” in the figure represents the entire group of respondents.

The IM, as an indication of the 50th percentile of responses, is a more appropriate statistic than the mean for Likert item response data. This is because the response choices are ordinal and the distributions of responses are often skewed. The IM is computed as the median of the grouped data by assuming that all responses with a given value are uniformly distributed across an interval of width one about the midpoint of the value.

IM is also preferable to using combined strongly agree/agree or combined strongly disagree/agree response percentages as a basis for comparison, especially in intergroup response comparisons. This is because, as a measure of central tendency, it retains the information contained in all five-levels of choice. Furthermore, it is more meaningful for small samples.

In Figure 1, the only respondent group with a median satisfaction level below neutral is the Black group. At an IM value of 2.5, only 37% (n=11) agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied. Black response medians indicating most are dissatisfied or perceive bias are pervasive throughout the survey.

The IM of 3.8 for whites was reflective of a combined agree or strongly agree total of 66% (n=63). The IMs of Figure 1 also reflect that, among respondents, female satisfaction (53%; n=48) was less than male satisfaction (63%; n=60) and Hispanics (50%; n=9) were less satisfied than Asians (54%; n=7). Only 44% (n=4) of the small Italian-American group of respondents were satisfied. All ethnic and racial groups were less satisfied than whites.

It is useful to have a way to determine if a given survey IM result is acceptable. A reasonable, although somewhat arbitrary, goal is to have more than half of the survey respondents in each group agree or strongly agree with a proposition stating something positive. Therefore, an IM of 3.5 would be acceptable as an equivalent minimum passing score.

Using the criterion of 3.5 as a passing score, respondents as a whole (“Sample” in the figure) are sufficiently satisfied with their experience at CCNY since the IM of their responses is 3.7. Black and Italian-American respondents did not give their satisfaction a passing grade. Even though the 3.7 passing score of the entire sample corresponded to 58% (n=108) agreeing or strongly agreeing, a significant percentage, 29% (n=55), disagreed or strongly disagreed. Twelve percent (n=23) were neutral.

The nature of some questions may require a more stringent criterion with a higher IM than 3.5 if the proposition states something for which agreement is more essential than merely desirable. Another consideration in setting a passing score is that several of the survey questions involved a proposition stating something undesirable. In other words, respondents agreeing with the proposition would be agreeing that they had some negative experience identified in the question. On such questions, the goal would be the converse of an IM greater than or equal to 3.5. An equivalent passing score would be an IM of 2.5 or lower.

It should be understood that when this report makes a generalized statement about a group survey response, it is referring to only the interpolated median response. If it states that a group agrees with a positively posed proposition, it simply means that the IM is above the neutral level of 3.0, so there can still be many dissenters and neutrals.

Fisher’s exact test was used on the underlying response data to determine if the possibility of the observed differences between the Black, Hispanic, or Asian groups compared with whites being due to chance could be ruled out statistically. The differences between females and males were also statistically tested. To perform the test, the strongly agree and agree responses were aggregated and the strongly disagree and disagree responses were also aggregated to perform the test on three possible response outcomes instead of five, i.e., a 3x2 test.

The p values from the testing comparing Black, Hispanic, and Asian responses with white responses on the question in Figure 1 were 0.0078, 0.081 and 0.40, respectively. The p value for the test comparing female responses to male responses was 0.41. Therefore, using an alpha of 0.1, only the Black and Hispanic responses could be statistically differentiated from white responses since the p values for the comparisons were less than alpha. Female responses could not be statistically differentiated from male responses.

It is important to recognize that the absence of statistical validation on a single question does not mean that there are no substantiated differences in group perceptions among the various respondent groups. In fact, similar group response patterns on the various questions of the survey are a valid statistical indicator, especially when the questions are similar.

In general, male responses to positive propositions were higher than female responses. Among racial and ethnic groups, there is a persistent pattern of whites having more positive responses than any other group, followed, in turn, by Asians, Hispanics, and then Blacks.

The survey results discussed in this report are those most relevant to our assessment of the climate related to inclusion. The complete survey results for race, ethnicity, and gender with the computed IM values are included as Appendix B. The results of the statistical testing are included as Appendix C.

C. Findings

Historical Dimension of Diversity Climate

The historical dimension of campus climate at CCNY is important to an understanding of the institution's overall climate for inclusion. However, the legacy of inclusion or exclusion at CCNY is complex and controversial. It is not restricted to the campus alone but also has an external aspect in its relationship to external stakeholders. Its thorough examination would be beyond the scope of this report, but we attempt to describe its essence.

The legacy of inclusion and exclusion is rooted in the controversy over the open admissions policy instituted in 1969 but later abandoned, which had a dramatic impact on CCNY student demographics and CCNY's public image as the "Harvard of the Proletariat." A more recent controversy affecting climate involved divisive speech by CCNY faculty in the early 1990s. The principal manifestations of the historical legacy are ongoing debates and tensions over the mission of the institution and its evolving student demographics. One aspect is the perceived dichotomy between inclusion and excellence that the concept of inclusive excellence dispels.

At CCNY the issue of increased admissions standards and their impact on the institution's traditional mission of access is often framed in racial terms. Some of the comments made during the focus groups and interviews reflect the tension over the issue of changing racial demographics in the student population.

This college has so many minorities it is incredible. Because the definition includes AA/ Hispanic/ AND ASIANS. The Asians are inflating the numbers. IR data...every year I have to correct that for my reports... (African American)

The steady decline in proportion of so-called underrepresented minorities in STEM is very disturbing. (African American Faculty)

A subtext in the debate over changing racial demographics is part of a larger debate at CCNY. Namely, that there is a perceived shift in the mission toward emphasizing the STEM disciplines and on the value placed on research versus teaching. Some representative comments are below.

The college shifting its weight toward STEM is having an impact on both students and faculty...

There are huge tensions between the research and teaching agendas.

It seems to me that much more now tenure decisions are based on research rather than teaching. This is the schizophrenia of the college or maybe...we have two missions.

Lastly, the most recent historical legacy is the unwillingness of the previous CCNY permanent administration to engage the faculty on any topic, let alone the controversial one of inclusion or exclusion. This was manifested in the relatively low evaluation by CCNY faculty on topics related to college administrative engagement with faculty in the CUNY University Faculty Senate's 2009 Faculty Experience Survey.³ Relevant comments from the interviews and focus groups include:

There's definitely a pre & post President Lisa experience... The previous guard maintained a hierarchical wall – She has taken some hits off the bat with the changes she tried to implement – she's interested in creating a dynamic culture and receptive to change –There is a real resistance to change here.

The relationship between the previous administration and faculty was exceptionally poor. [Since the arrival of President Lisa,] it has improved—the culture is on the correct trajectory, but there is a mountain to overcome. (White Male Faculty)

During the decades of the 1970s and 1980s, previous CCNY Presidents Robert Marshak and Bernard Harleston demonstrated some personal commitments to diversity efforts. However, until President Coico created the present initiative, faculty diversity and inclusion had never been comprehensively addressed as an administrative priority at CCNY. The previous lack of acknowledgement and attention to the issue has created a present climate in which institutional inertia makes it even more difficult to address diversity and inclusion.

Our principal finding from this brief examination of the historical legacy of inclusion and exclusion at CCNY is:

Finding 1: There is a historical context of changing student demographics, mission shift, and inattention to faculty diversity at CCNY that makes the conversation about faculty diversity and inclusion difficult and complex.

Faculty Demographic Composition

The demographic breakdown of the current CCNY full-time faculty by race, ethnicity, and gender is given in the Fall 2011 edition of *City Facts*,² the annual compendium of data published by the College's Office of Institutional Research. It is reproduced here as Table 2.

Table 2. Full-time faculty by race, ethnicity and gender, Fall 2011

F/T Regular Faculty		Ethnicity					
		NTV AM	ASIAN	BLK	HISP	WHITE	ALL
F/T TENURE BEARING TITLES	Women		14	23	18	105	160
	Men	1	43	18	15	207	284
INSTRUCTOR	Women		1			2	3
LECTURER	Women		1	6	1	20	28
	Men		4	2	4	17	27
F/T MEDICAL SERIES TITLES	Women		2	2	2	10	16
	Men	1	4	1	3	8	17
ALL		2	69	52	43	369	535

Source: *City Facts, Fall 2011*²

Although not included in Table 2 as a category separate from white, Italian Americans are considered, within CUNY, to be a protected group for affirmative action purposes. The most recent summary for full-time, Italian-American faculty is given in Table 3.

Table 3. Italian American full-time faculty, Spring 2012

F/T REGULAR FACULTY	ITALIAN AMERICANS	
F/T TENURE BEARING TITLES	Women	8
	Men	12
INSTRUCTOR	Women	
LECTURER	Women	1
	Men	
F/T MEDICAL SERIES TITLES	Women	2
	Men	1
ALL		24

Source: CCNY Human Resources Office

The percentages of full-time and tenure track faculty by race, ethnicity and gender, including Italian Americans, computed from Tables 1 and 2 are shown in Figure 2. Medical series faculty members are included in the tenure-track faculty percentages.




Figure 2. Percentage distribution of faculty racial, ethnic, and gender demographics, 2011-12.

Table 4 shows the change in the ethnic and gender composition of full-time faculty over the most recent three-year period as reported in *City Facts*. The most significant change over the period is the decline in Black faculty. There is a small increase in women. A surge in the hiring of Black and Hispanic faculty hiring for 2012-2013 will increase their percentages over those shown for 2011.

Data on faculty demographics such as those in Tables 1, 2, and 3 and Figure 2 reveal little about diversity without context. One such context is the annual examination of faculty demographics performed by the City College Office of Diversity and Compliance for its Affirmative Action Plan (AAP).⁴ The AAP is a required document containing information and analyses of a federal contractor's workforce.

Table 4. Full-time faculty demographics over three-year period by race, ethnicity, and gender

Ethnicity	Academic Year		
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Native American	2	2	2
Hispanic	41	40	43
Black	57	54	52
Asian	70	72	69
White	374	362	369
Women	203	204	207
Men	332	326	328

Source: *City Facts 2011, 2010, and 2009*

A mandatory element of a federal affirmative action plan is an underutilization analysis to determine what protected group(s) are underutilized in a given job category. It is used to establish hiring goals for that category. The protected racial and ethnic groups are women, Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians. Although not required by federal law, a lawsuit settlement requires CUNY to treat Italian Americans as a protected class, and, therefore, their underutilizations are also determined. Faculty underutilizations, if any, are determined on a department-by-department basis by comparing an academic department's demographics to that of national Ph.D. production in the field of the department.

Table 5 shows faculty underutilization by department at the College for Fall 2010 and Fall 2011 as reported in the AAP. The highlighted entries are cases where there was an increase or decrease from 2010 to 2011. There is not a complete correspondence to actual departmental academic units. For example, the School of Architecture is treated as a department. The few departments with no underutilization were excluded from the table but there also appear to be erroneous omissions.

Table 5. Faculty underutilization by department for Fall 2010 and Fall 2011

Department	Female UU 2011	Female UU 2010	Blk UU 2011	Blk UU 2010	Hispanic UU 2011	Hispanic UU 2010	Asian UU 2011	Asian UU 2010
Architecture	4	4	2	1	1	0	4	5
Art	4	2	1	3	1	0	0	0
Biology	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Biomedical Engineering	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Chemical Engineering	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0
Chemistry	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civil Engineering	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Computer Science	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
Earth and Atmospheric Science	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economics	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	0
Electrical Engineering	2	6	2	0	0	1	0	0
English	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
Leadership	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Library	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Math	3	3	0	1	1	1	2	1
Mechanical Engineer	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
MCA	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Music	5	4	0	0	0	0	1	2
Philosophy	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	1
Physics	5	5	0	1	0	0	0	1
Political Science	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	1
Psychology	15	7	0	0	1	0	0	0
Secondary Education	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0
Sociology	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Theatre	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	1

Source: *City College, 2011 Affirmative Action Plan*⁴

Inconsistencies between the data in Table 5 and other data presented in the AAP prevent verifying the total overall number of underutilizations. However, Table 5 shows 87 for 2011, comprised of 53 women, 15 Blacks, 12 Asians, and 7 Hispanics. The 87 represents approximately 16% of the total number of faculty positions. The five-year underutilization data in the AAP show that there has been little change in this overall percentage over the five years, or in the pattern of underutilization among departments. In the Fall semester of 2010, 77.4% of academic units defined as departments for affirmative action reporting purposes had underutilization.

The persistent pattern of significant underutilization indicates that the College has lacked a vigorous effort to attack the problem through aggressive recruitment and strategic allocation of

faculty lines with other resources to reduce underutilization. In addition, there has been no effective communication with the departments involved of their underutilization numbers.

Underutilization should be aggressively attacked but should not be the only measure of achieving success in minority representation. In fact, its use as a measure of success can have negative consequences. If a department has no underutilization of a particular group and no efforts are made to recruit others from that group, underutilization can indeed become a “quota” in the restrictive sense of a ceiling. Furthermore, smaller departments where the national Ph.D. production of minorities or women is low can show no underutilization with only one member from a particular group. That lone minority or woman can feel isolated.




Figure 3. Full-time faculty diversity at CCNY in comparison with all CUNY Senior Colleges.

Another perspective on faculty diversity is gained by comparing the diversity of full-time faculty at CCNY with that of peer institutions. Figure 3 is a comparison with the total percentages from all CUNY senior colleges.⁵ In Figure 3 and in all subsequent demographic compositional data in this report, unless otherwise stated, Italian Americans are not included in the white category.

As indicated in the figure, CCNY has lower percentages of African American, Hispanic, Italian American, and female faculty. One explanation sometimes given for this is the mix of academic programs at CCNY leans toward fields with lower representation of minorities and women. However, the underutilization analysis of the AAP takes this into account and underutilization at the college is, as previously discussed, significant.

Figures 4 through 6 compare the percentages of Black, Hispanic, Asian, white, and women tenured and tenure-track faculty, respectively, with the percentages of these groups at a set of 16

peer institutions outside of CUNY. The percentages of these groups in the student population are also plotted in these figures. The data are from IPEDS for 2010.

Figure 4 shows that the percentage of Black faculty at CCNY, at 10%, is higher than at any peer institution but it is less than half of the percentage of Black students. However, there are higher ratios of Black students to Black faculty at Georgia State, Memphis, New Orleans, and Houston. Among the peer group, only Georgia State and Memphis have higher percentages of Black Students than CCNY.




Figure 4. Comparison of Black representation at peer group institutions.

CCNY, at 7%, also leads its peers in the percentage of Hispanic faculty as shown in Figure 5 but the percentage of Hispanic students is four times larger, which is the largest ratio to faculty of any institution in the peer group. CCNY also has the largest percentage of Hispanic students in the group.

As shown in Figure 6, CCNY, at 13%, has about half the Asian faculty percentage representation of the leader, the University of Memphis, and is below the approximately 16% level of Houston, Illinois at Chicago, and UCLA. However, the College’s percentage of Asian students at 22% is below only that of UCLA, which is 33 percent.

Figure 7 shows that CCNY, at 65%, has the lowest percentage of white faculty of any institution in its peer group but also the lowest percentage, by far, of white students, just over 20%.

Figure 8 shows that the percentage of women faculty at CCNY is at the upper middle of the range and the college ranks fourth of 17 institutions for female faculty percentage. The

percentage of women faculty is approximately 40% and the percentage of women students is about 51%, which is the lowest of any peer institution, except for the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, with its large percentage of STEM majors.




Figure 5. Comparison of Hispanic representation at peer group institutions.

Overall, Figures 4 through 8 show that, with the notable exception of Asian faculty, City College ranks high or highest among its peers in the percentages of minority and women faculty. However, the faculty percentages are all significantly lower than the corresponding percentages for minority and women students.




Figure 6. Comparison of Asian representation at peer group institutions.




Figure 7. Comparison of white representation at peer-group institutions.




Figure 8. Comparison of women’s representation at peer group institutions.

Some minority and women students respond more favorably toward minority and women faculty as mentors or role models. Similarly, some minority and women faculty feel a personal sense of responsibility to serve as mentors or advocates for students from their own groups. Thus, while it is not an affirmative action underutilization issue, CCNY should seek to increase its numbers of minority and women faculty because they are underrepresented compared with the highly diverse student population. This argument also puts CCNY in a better position to defend its faculty diversity efforts against legal challenges.⁶

Some views on how this impacts education were expressed during the interview and focus group sessions.

I have experienced feeling different – we talk about educational philosophy and talk about from a Western Cultural World view – I’m constantly feeling this conflict of the educational ethos where my colleagues have a more individualistic world view – and I come from a culture that is more collective not only as a faculty member but the students also come from collective community cultures and there is a tension with colleagues who present if you don’t think like they think you’re wrong – this comes up more around pedagogy than curriculum but indirectly it impacts curriculum... (Asian)

Faculty makeup does not reflect the student body—have a lot of minority and majority faculty who come, do classes, and go home—they really treat City College as a commuter school and do not engage with the community.

The second part of the last comment concedes that merely having more minority faculty is insufficient. Minority or majority, there is a need for faculty to be committed to the mission of the institution.

The Council sees the need to increase the representation of minorities and women on the CCNY faculty as urgent. Along with many faculty that we heard from during the interviews and focus groups, we applaud President Coico's recognition of this need and her initiatives to address it.

Like all academic institutions, CCNY is predominantly male dominated ... the initiatives the president put in place are about proactively increasing the representation of diversity for faculty and inclusion. (Asian Female Faculty)

When asking faculty about their experience, the only meaningful way to mark time is pre- and post-President Lisa. While there are still enormous problems to address, since she has arrived, there is now hope. (African American Faculty)

The first step in addressing the need for demographic change is to have it universally recognized as an urgent priority by all faculty and academic administrators. The Council observes that this recognition is largely absent below the President.

The Council summarizes the results of its examination of the CCNY faculty demographic composition with the following findings.

Finding 2: There is a persistent deficit in the representation of minority and women faculty on the CCNY faculty with respect to underutilization data, other CUNY senior colleges, and the student body demographics.

Finding 3: There is a lack of universal recognition of the extent of the underrepresentation and the urgent need to address it.

Academic Administration Demographic Composition

The Council believes that an investigation of the demographics of the academic administrators at the college is an important aspect of its study of faculty diversity. An inclusive administration is a symbolic indication that the institution practices inclusion at all levels. Such an administration is more likely to have a diverse perspective when making decisions that affect the lives of students, faculty, and staff from all backgrounds. Moreover, career advancement into academic administration is an opportunity that should not be restricted.

The 2011-12 demographic distribution of the College academic administrators in the CUNY Executive Compensation Plan (ECP) who had underlying faculty appointments and were in positions where faculty credentials are expected, including the President, is shown in Figure 9.

The racial and ethnic composition shown in the figure reflects an underrepresentation of Asians and Blacks, compared with their faculty representation. There was no Asian academic

administrator for the year of the data. (We note that an Asian faculty member has been appointed as an acting dean for the 2012-13 academic year.)The only Black ECP academic administrator was among those at the lowest level of the ECP administrators.




Figure 9. Demographics of ECP academic administrators with underlying faculty positions (July 2012).

Figure 9 also shows the gender breakdown of the academic administrators in question. Women are not underrepresented among these administrators relative to their representation among the faculty. There is essentially now parity; their percentages of academic administrators and of faculty, are both about 38%.

The perceptions of faculty survey respondents about the opportunities available to minority and women faculty in academic administration are shown in Figures 10 and 11, respectively. Figure 10 shows that the percentage of Black faculty respondents with a positive perception on the question of developing minority faculty for leadership was extremely low. The lack of visible Black academic leadership could be one thing that is communicating an unintended message to Black faculty. In a separate survey question about the support of senior administration for diversity only 27% of Black respondents had a positive view. The interviews and focus groups also reflected some Black resentment about lack of representation and consideration. Typical comments were:

African Americans have been excluded from positions of power and influence within academic administration at CCNY. (African American Faculty)

Though there are lots of adjuncts and lecturers of color-- though still not enough--we seem to continue hiring older white men and women as administrators and faculty. (African American Faculty)




Figure 10. Respondents’ perceptions of effort made to develop minority faculty for leadership.

Hispanic and female faculty respondents were also below neutral on this question of leadership opportunities for minorities. Asians were neutral. Only whites and Italian Americans were very positive.

Results from the corresponding gender question are presented in Figure 11. Black and women respondents were below neutral. All other groups were generally positive, with men being very positive. One woman made the following observation.

The most outstanding women on the faculty do not have the opportunity to serve, to learn and to develop the skills and the relationships that are needed for leadership. Quite simply, it takes a village to change the culture of an institution that is still a bastion of concentrated male power. (Female Faculty)

The Council observes that the survey, interviews, and focus groups were conducted before the Provost appointed two women to leadership positions within his office.




Figure 11. Respondents’ perceptions of effort made to develop women faculty for leadership.

The polarization of faculty perceptions shown in the responses on this and other issues between affected groups and non-affected groups shows a need for an open and frank dialogue on topics of diversity with faculty, along with a need to educate whites and males regarding the problems and concerns of minorities and women.

It is important to consider the diversity of departmental administrations as well as higher academic unit and institutional administrations for some of the same reasons. Furthermore, departmental administrative positions can be a stepping stone to higher administration. Moreover, they play an important role in faculty appointments, reappointments, promotions, tenure, and teaching and service assignments.

Examination of the diversity of departmental chairs at all CUNY colleges was a part of the CUNY Faculty Diversity Study.⁷ The results for Department Chairs at CCNY are shown in Figure 12. The results for the ethnic, racial, and gender compositions of the College’s Executive committees are shown in Figure 13.

Figures 12 and 13 show that departmental administrations overall are not, in certain respects, reflective of the diversity of the faculty. This is a particular concern for some departments where there are entrenched departmental administrations. Faculty from a few such departments brought their concerns regarding departmental administration to the Council.




Figure 12. Demographics of CCNY Department Chairs (2011-12).

Figure 12 shows that Asians, Hispanics, and women are underrepresented among Department Chairs as of 2011-12. We note that a Hispanic has been elected as Department Chair for the term beginning in 2012.

Figure 13 shows that women are also underrepresented on Executive Committees. Since Department Chairs and Executive Committees are elected by the faculty, underrepresentation is not a problem that can be solved by the administration. It must first be recognized as an issue within departments so that it will be on the mind of every faculty member who nominates and votes in departmental elections.




Figure 13. Demographics of CCNY Executive Committees (2011-12).

We conclude this section dealing with academic leadership with a quote that expresses a persistent sentiment encountered during the dialogue with minority and women faculty.

Having a female president who cares deeply about diversity is critical. By itself, it is also insufficient because: the college continues to have the same handful of men in leadership position; the same handful of men continue to nominate each other and their friends for important college-wide work not on the basis of excellence, but of personal calculation; women and minorities who are hired, chosen, included, are chosen because they will help the old boys stay in power, while giving the appearance of inclusion, rather than for their recognized intellectual power and potential. (Female Faculty)

The Council summarizes its investigation of the demographics of the CCNY academic administration with findings as follow:

Finding 4: There is a deficit in Black and Asian ECP academic administrators in positions where it is expected that they have faculty credentials and underlying faculty titles. The absence of senior Black and Asian academic administrators is a glaring issue that undermines perceptions of the credibility of diversity efforts. Black faculty are particularly critical of the deficit. We believe that there is a diverse and exceptional pool of internal candidates who are often overlooked.

Finding 5: There is a need to monitor closely the Hispanic and female representations among ECP academic administrators to ensure they reflect the diversity of the institution and, especially, of the faculty.

Finding 6: There is a need for more diversity among Department Chairs and Executive Committees and particularly for more women to be elected as Department Chairs and members of Department Executive Committees.

Finding 7: There needs to be open communication of diversity issues and concerns between affected and non-affected groups.

Faculty Recruitment Practices and Policies

There have been a number of recent, laudable efforts by the current senior administration to encourage and support recruitment of minority and women faculty. Sixty-nine percent of Fall Semester 2012-2013 faculty hires are minorities or women. However, it remains to be seen if this commitment has permeated into the hiring initiatives of all the schools and divisions, if the division and school deans will be held accountable, and if adequate resources will be available to sustain it.

Efforts to recruit minority faculty are often ad hoc and opportunistic. The Council has not seen yet an aggressive across-the-board, bottom-up approach to identifying and recruiting minority and women faculty candidates. Many faculty are unaware of the College's commitment in this area or of the availability of resources to facilitate recruitment.

The Council's findings in area of recruitment and retention are informed and supported by faculty perceptions and concerns as determined from the results of the faculty survey and focus groups. A relevant comment was captured during the discussions with faculty.

The President and Provost are committed to making the faculty as diverse as possible. But when we approve searches, one candidate out of 20 will be minority. There are not enough proactive searches. A committee will spend endless ages going over CV's, but not in actually searching. (White Male Faculty)

Deans, Department Chairs, and search committees are unsure as to what resources are available for lines and outreach efforts to recruit minorities and women.

I don't know that the college spends the kinds of resources to go to places you would find the most diverse candidates. We have a very limited budget. Positions are posted on line and to a limited number of places. Our habits around recruitment are pretty routine.

I discovered a great candidate who wants to be here. I had to go to the President and Provost because no one has the money. It may go forward if she is still available or interested.

The faculty survey results most relevant to recruitment are shown in Figures 14 and 15. Figure 14 shows that Asian, Black, Hispanic, and female respondents generally did not believe that their departments actively recruited minority candidates, with Blacks again responding very negatively. Whites largely did not share this view.

Figure 15 shows that more Asian, Black, and female respondents believed that female candidates were actively recruited but the proportions of the believing respondents were slightly less than the acceptable level. Males had a more positive perception.




Figure 14. Respondents' perceptions of departmental minority recruitment efforts.




Figure 15. Respondents' perceptions of women departmental recruitment efforts.




Figure 16. Respondents’ perceptions of equity in consideration of minority applicants’ qualifications.




Figure 17. Respondents’ perceptions of equity in consideration of women applicants’ qualifications.

Another aspect of faculty recruitment, apart from outreach efforts, is the evaluation of candidates' qualifications. The Black and Hispanic survey respondents, as shown in Figure 16, generally believed that there is a higher standard for minority candidates.

Up until a year ago, I was the only Black faculty in my department. There was always an objection to every Black faculty who applies. (African American Faculty)

Sometimes the bias is subtle sometimes not subtle. It is almost as though.... that whole feeling... you have to over excel in order to be considered good. Every time I got someone in here.... every time ...there was always some objection. (African American Faculty)

Figure 17 shows that no group of respondents, except Blacks, had a majority believing that there is a higher standard for female candidates. But, more Hispanics and females agreed with the proposition than our maximum passing score of 2.5 allows.

Hispanic survey respondents generally held the same view of bias in recruitment as Black respondents but to a lesser degree.

Have served in two searches--I haven't noticed any bias or looking at people for certain race gender in the searches or given preferences (Hispanic Faculty)

The Council concludes that additional oversight is needed of search processes to ensure aggressive outreach and fair treatment of applicants. This could be accomplished in a number of ways.

The composition of search committees was a related issue that surfaced during the focus groups.

CCNY should not approve search committees that only meet minimum standards for "diversity" by appointing lecturers of color who do the bidding for the powerful whites in the department while tenured faculty of color willing to serve are barred from the search committees. (Female White)

In recruitment efforts, identification and selection is only part of the equation. Conversion of a highly sought-after selected candidate to a hire is a process that also needs attention and resources.

... my department interviewed three African American candidates—the first two candidates on the short list got better offers and CCNY could not compete—they had young families and had concerns about where they would live and affording it. This impacts recruitment as well as retention

Not all the participants in interviews and focus groups subscribed to targeted hiring.

"Hires of opportunity" create major disparities within departments and should be rethought. Making criteria significantly different for some groups is a bad model that leads to substandard scholarship and impacts students in a bad way. (Female White)

A final consideration in recruitment is programmatic. New program proposals are seemingly approved with no consideration to diversity in recruiting faculty or, for that matter, students. This state of affairs extends to hiring authorizations for expansion of existing programs.

A related programmatic issue is the status of the ethnic and gender studies programs at the College. These programs are fertile ground for recruitment of minority and women faculty. Moreover, they enhance the intellectual and cultural diversity of the College's education and research missions. Black Studies is clearly one such program but it is in disarray. Other such programs are in desperate need of strengthening. There is an urgent need to focus attention and resources on these programs, which were neglected under the previous administration.

Finding 8: While, there has been recent progress in the hiring of minority and women faculty, there is not yet evidence of accountability at the divisional and school level.

Finding 9: Efforts to recruit minority and women candidates are often ad hoc and opportunistic; there is no clear and consistent commitment to devote resources for their recruitment and hiring.

Finding 10: The College lacks an aggressive, bottom-up approach to identifying and recruiting minority and women faculty candidates.

Finding 11: Faculty are largely unaware of the seriousness of the College's commitment to diversifying the faculty and of resources and mechanisms to facilitate it.

Finding 12: Additional oversight is needed to ensure determined outreach and fair treatment of applicants by search committees.

Finding 13: Ethnic and gender studies programs are fertile ground for the recruitment of minority and women faculty but these programs are in urgent need of strengthening after neglect by the previous administration.

Faculty Retention Issues

Retention of minority and women faculty is nearly as important as recruitment in efforts designed to increase faculty compositional diversity. To increase the numbers at CCNY, obviously more new faculty must be hired than leave. Table 6 gives the demographic breakdown of tenured and tenure-track new hires and leavers over a three-year period. Leavers include deaths as well as retirements, resignations, non-reappointments, and intra-CUNY transfers.

Table 6. Hiring and attrition demographics of tenured and tenure-track faculty 2009-12

Ethnicity/ Race/ Gender	Academic Year							Net Gain (2010-12 hired minus 2009-11 left)	Pct. Change in No. of Faculty
	2009-10		2010-11*		2011-12		2012-13		
	Hired	Left	Hired	Left	Hired	Left	Hired**		
Native Am.	1								100%
Hispanic	2		3	1			5	7	17.9%
Black	1		3	4	3	2	6	6	10.7%
Asian	4	2	5	5	3	3	5	3	4.5%
Ital. Am.		1	4	2			2	3	No data
White	15	9	21	18	14	9	11	10	No data
White including Ital. Am.	15	10	25	20	14	9	13	13	3.6%
Women	13	0	16	11	9	6	12	20	10.6%
Men	12	12	20	19	11	8	17	9	2.7%
All	25	12	36	30	20	14	29	29	5.7%

*Early Retirement Incentive year; **Does not include Spring Semester 2013-start hires.

Table 6 shows a surge in minority hiring for the 2012-13 academic year, resulting in gains in the number of minority faculty over the period. Fifty-five percent of 2012-13 new hires in the table were minorities. The data in Table 6 also shows that the recent new hiring of minorities and women could have had a greater impact on their underrepresentation with a reduction in attrition due to non-reappointments, denials of tenure, early retirements, or defections to positions

elsewhere. Therefore, improved retention of minority and women faculty is an important objective.

The Table 6 data is over a limited time span and includes the anomalous 2010-11 year, which had an unusually large number of retirees due to the offering of an early retirement incentive program for that year. Nevertheless, some interesting patterns tentatively can be discerned. Except for Asians, it does not appear that the number of leavers of any group among the minority and women demographic was larger than its proportionate faculty share.

Looking at the net increase of the various demographic groups over the time span of the table, there were significant net gains made by most minorities and women in their proportionate share of an overall growing faculty. Asian faculty were the exception, with their percentage growth slightly less than the overall percentage growth. The strong 2012-13 fall hiring of other minorities had a substantial impact on their percentage growth.

For data consistency, Table 6 does not include offers accepted for a Spring Semester 2013 start date. These Spring starts include two Asian faculty hires. If they are included among the 2012-13 starts, the Asian percentage growth rises to 7.5%, also exceeding the overall faculty growth.

Improved retention of minority and women faculty along with improved recruitment has the potential to increase any gains made in their numbers. It is worthwhile, then, to examine the results of our research that are most relevant to the retention issue. These results include those from the faculty survey questions that relate to career satisfaction.

Related to the question on faculty satisfaction discussed in the section on Research Methodology is the one that followed it on the survey, asking whether faculty would again choose CCNY. The results from this question are shown in Figure 18.




Figure 18. Replies to question of would respondents' again choose CCNY.

Figure 18 shows a pattern of responses that differ from the responses shown in Figure 1 on the question of faculty satisfaction. The result for the entire sample was similar but there were differences in group responses. The Asian response dipped to slightly below the target IM level, while Black responses increased into positive territory. Hispanics, Italian Americans, and women registered higher scores, while men dropped slightly. Any increase in a group’s score from the earlier question may be due to positive factors associated with living in the New York metro area. This seems to be confirmed by the top four results from the question asking respondents for reasons for staying at CCNY, which are shown in Figure 19.

Figure 19 shows that for every group “geographic location” was their top choice of reasons for staying. Every group except Hispanics and Asians cited their top reasons as the ones shown in the figure. Hispanics cited “culture and climate” in a tie with “colleagues” (relationships with) and Asians cited “salary and benefits” after “my department.”




Figure 19. Factors influencing respondents to stay at CCNY, by demographic group.

A follow-up question asked respondents about factors that would influence them to consider leaving. The results from this question are shown in Figure 20. “Salary and benefits” and “research support” were at the top of every group’s list in first or second place. For minorities and women, “research support” was either first or tied for first with “salaries and benefits.”

Because of the small numbers involved, no firm conclusions can be drawn for intergroup differences in Figures 19 and 20, except perhaps the top two choices. Remarkably, research

support, one of the top two issues identified in the leaving question, is often overlooked as a retention tool. Targeted research support for minorities and women is a primary focus of efforts at MIT to reduce inequities and improve retention and tenure rates.




Figure 20. Factors influencing respondents to consider leaving CCNY, by demographic group.

The importance of support for research, including appropriate teaching loads, to retention at CCNY is underscored by comments heard from focus group and interview participants.

We have seen a train of minority engineering faculty come in and out of here—in many cases they are not given enough resources to be successful, not enough funding, not enough space, etc.

The retention issue revolves around teaching loads and it goes up after 5 years on reaching tenure. We have a crop of faculty who are competitive nationally and may not find reasons to stay once they begin to have families—I sense that group is at risk for leaving

Some participants believed that there has been disparate treatment of minorities and women in areas that impact their retention such as teaching and service loads, research support, and salary adjustment. A question on service load was included in the survey. The results are shown in Figures 21 and 22.

Figure 21 shows that Black, Hispanic, and women faculty respondents tended to feel that underrepresented faculty faced a greater service load. Likewise, in Figure 22, Black, Hispanic, and women faculty, but now joined by Italian-American faculty, felt that women faced a greater service role.




Figure 21. Respondents' perceptions of minority faculty service load.




Figure 22. Respondents' perceptions of women faculty service load.

The survey results in Figures 21 and 22 echoed the concerns over service load disparities expressed in the interviews and focus groups.

Overall my department is very diverse and women are well represented, but we have no African American faculty. We have to do the service work for a department and the division. I am hitting the Ivory ceiling...The service load is huge. One of our Latin American faculty is becoming a token because he is wanted on every committee; we are worried for his tenure.

In attempting to bring greater diversity to search committees we are overtaxing women and URM faculty. Committees may be being diluted with individuals who are not adding value to the process in order to have the appearance of inclusion.

The lone African American faculty member in one department is the go to guy for all black students; he provides a lot of service and mentors a number of students. He is not tenured.

I've seen many African American faculty come in and be part of 50,000 committees which leads to death by committee, need your department not necessarily for money but greasing the wheels and enabling you to remain on target which includes publishing and bringing in money—some of the new faculty need to realize that even if your recommended for committees this is the last thing they will look at when you're heading to tenure

There was also concern expressed within the focus groups about equity in teaching assignments. The following comment is a typical one.

Without transparency there are more arbitrary assignments. The less favorable assignments depend on where you are in the social structure of the organization. I think minorities are teaching more and definitely women suffer.

The context for concern over service and teaching load is the 21 contact-hour, base teaching load with very limited relief for scholarly activities in academic departments outside the STEM disciplines. This load is often unmanageable for faculty trying to balance the demands of quality teaching and scholarship with family life.

Many of the concerns expressed at the interviews and focus groups surrounding retention transcend diversity issues and are institutional issues, such as infrastructure and support services, that affect all faculty. The Council has conveyed these concerns to the administration, but believes that they are beyond the scope of the present report.

Satisfaction with career progression is obviously important to faculty retention and was addressed in a separate survey question, the results of which are shown in Figure 23. Overall, respondents were satisfied, reaching the target score. The levels of satisfaction for Asian, Hispanic, and women respondents were above neutral but below the target score. Continuing the

previous pattern, Black respondents were more negative. On this question, Black responses were below neutral.




Figure 23. Respondents’ satisfaction with career progress at CCNY.

Career progression for untenured and junior faculty is largely determined by progress toward tenure and promotion. We will examine issues connected to these milestones of a successful and satisfying faculty career in the next section.

Satisfaction with work-life issues is important to faculty retention. They can also affect demographic segments differently. A number of questions on the survey had to do with various aspects of these issues. They included dependent care, partner/spousal hiring, health accommodations, family responsibilities, and tenure-clock adjustment.

All but one of these work-life questions asked whether departments were supportive of these issues. This makes the results difficult to interpret because most of these areas are beyond the control of the department to deal with, except on an informal basis. In fact, some are beyond the control of CCNY and are CUNY issues. The results of the one work-life question about CCNY, asking about family friendly policies and programs, are shown in Figure 24.

While there are demographic differences, the views of the respondents were generally negative. Eighteen percent of survey respondents answered this question with a “not applicable.” Demographic differences in response to a question of this type would be expected because of cultural differences and traditional gender roles but the more negative Black response may be attributable to an overall negative feeling, as a group, about CCNY.




Figure 24. Respondents’ views on CCNY family-friendly policies and programs.

The topic of work-life balance was also covered during the interviews and focus groups. An interesting culturally specific comment was captured in a session.

The institution should be mother and father friendly – not just maternity leave but because of extensive family relationship in Asian families i.e. taking care of aging parents because the culture does not allow it – and it would be good if there was more support for that or some acknowledgement of that (Asian)

Work-life issues were also studied during the CUNY Faculty Diversity Study.⁷ Many of the issues involve personnel policies or faculty contractual provisions that are CUNY-wide.

Finding 14: Improved retention of minority and women faculty at CCNY is important to increasing their representation on the faculty. Retention of Asian faculty is an area of special concern.

Finding 15: Most faculty survey respondents would again choose to work at CCNY, but the proportion of Blacks that would choose to remain is lower.

Finding 16: Geographic location is the most important factor influencing faculty to stay at CCNY.

Finding 17: Salary and benefits and research support were the two most important factors that would influence faculty to leave CCNY.

Finding 18: The lack of formal and informal mentoring of junior faculty is likely a major contributing factor to attrition and/or career stagnation for minorities and women at CCNY.

Finding 19: Many women and minority faculty perceive that their service load is inequitably high within the context of the demands of a heavy base teaching load and scholarship expectations.

Finding 20: Minority and women survey respondents were less satisfied with their career progression than other faculty.

Finding 21: CCNY and CUNY lack family friendly policies and programs to help faculty balance work and personal responsibilities.

Promotion and Tenure Issues

Promotion and tenure practices and policies are part of an institution’s organizational/structural dimension of diversity climate. At CCNY there is no available data, at present, on promotion and tenure rates that would allow a meaningful comparison between racial/ethnic and gender groups. However, the CUNY Faculty Diversity Action Plan⁷ states that “The University Office of Institutional Research will work with the University Office of Recruitment and Diversity to develop metrics and design reports to show data on rates of tenure and promotion, time to tenure and promotion, and turnover.”

For now, we largely rely on results of the faculty survey and our own experience. The survey asked respondents to supply their faculty title or rank. Table 7 shows the demographics of the survey sample in percentages by title/rank. The distribution in the table indicates that it contains sufficient representation across all ranks to respond meaningfully to questions regarding issues of promotion, tenure, and CCE.

Table 7. Demographics of survey respondents by rank

Rank	Sample	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Italian American	White	Male	Female
Lecturer	10.2%		10%	16.7%	11.1%	11.6%	10.5%	10.0%
Distinguished Lecturer	0.5%		3.3%					1.1%
Instructor	3.2%		3.3%			3.2%	2.1%	4.4%
Assistant Professor	23.1%	7.7%	23.3%	50%	22.2%	18.9%	14.7%	32.2%
Associate Professor	27.4%	23.1%	26.7%	22%	44.4%	33.7%	23.2%	32.2%
Professor	31.2%	69.2%	33.3%	5.6%	11.1%	27.4%	45.3%	15.6%
Distinguished Professor	3.8%			5.6%	11.1%	4.2%	4.2%	3.3%
Substitute/ Visitor	0.5%					1.1%		1.1%

As noted, comparative rates of tenure and promotion of groups are not available. Even if they were, they would not represent a complete picture since decisions of personnel committees are overturned at higher levels and faculty leave in anticipation of a negative decision. However, the Council’s collective experience leads it to posit that minorities and women are overrepresented among faculty receiving negative decisions from personnel committees for reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

The survey questions were designed to solicit perspectives on tenure, separately from promotion, by demographic group. We first look at the issues of tenure and begin by examining the survey results.

More than half of respondents from all demographic groups felt that they did significant student mentoring or committee service that is not recognized by the tenure process. If minorities and women are, indeed, doing more in these areas, they are disproportionately affected by this lack of recognition.

Department chairs play a role in some committee assignments, are responsible for teaching assignments, and perform or oversee the annual evaluation of untenured faculty. Figure 25 shows the respondents’ assessment of whether they received helpful feedback from their chairs on their progress toward tenure and CCE.




Figure 25. Respondents’ assessment of feedback from department chairs for tenure progress.

Using our criterion of a minimum of 3.5 for an IM, Black and women respondents feel that their chairs are not fulfilling this role adequately. On the other hand, some chairs in the focus groups complained of being overwhelmed due to lack of support staff.

There is no college-wide formal faculty mentoring process that could help the chairs guide faculty toward tenure. Informal mechanisms do not seem to adequately address this deficiency. Informality may disadvantage women and minorities, especially if there is any degree of discomfort or exclusion in informal interactions with colleagues. The following comments from the focus groups and interviews are particularly relevant.

We have no mechanism for a senior faculty member to take a junior faculty member under their wing—this is about the institution being cognizant that it costs more money to hire someone and then fire them in a few years—you lose resources. It’s demoralizing to that person and the institution. (African American)

The concept of mentoring is just getting started. The structure and support network doesn’t work well here. This has more significantly impacted minority faculty.

I have received none prior to this year. Before my level of mentoring received has been none. I relied on my doctoral advisor from another institution. This year we hired a full professor well known; he has done a great job. If he had not been here, it would have been a continuation of the past ...total absence (African American)

There is no question that African American junior faculty do not attract the sponsorship of senior faculty. (African American)

The issue of lack of fairness in the application of tenure criteria on the basis of race was raised most prominently by Black respondents in the survey, as shown in Figure 26.




Figure 26. Respondents’ perceptions of department’s racial fairness in tenure/CCE decisions.




Figure 27. Respondents' perceptions of department's gender fairness in tenure/CCE decisions.




Figure 28. Respondents' perceptions of department's ethnicity fairness in tenure/CCE decisions.

The issue of fairness based on gender as shown in Figure 27 is also perceived by Black respondents as a problem. Even though the IM for women of 3.8 on this question exceeds our threshold, given the importance of gender equity, it should still be of concern.

The corresponding results for ethnicity fairness are shown in Figure 28. It shows that Black and Hispanic respondents had the lowest values of IM. Even though the Hispanic, women, and Asian groups had responses with IM values above 3.5, there were significant numbers in these groups that believed there is ethnicity inequity in the application of tenure requirements. This is cause for concern. All these groups had lower IM response values than white respondents.

The effective sample sizes for the race, ethnicity, and gender tenure fairness results were lowered and the results clouded by the on-average, approximately 20% of each group of respondents electing the “not applicable” choice on these questions.

Concerns of fairness, equity and the existence of double standards for awarding tenure were raised in the focus groups and interviews.

I have seen white males with one paper put up for tenure...The Dean will say “they are a good teacher, etc.” This would never happen for a man of color or woman. If that person is non-white the Dean will say, “We are not going to put our faculty standards at risk.”

I have been here for four years. In that time I have twice seen whites who were not qualified promoted and Blacks who were qualified denied tenure. It has gotten better since President Lisa arrived. But still I have myself witnessed this (double standard) two times. It is really discouraging.




Figure 29. Respondents’ judgment concerning their understanding of promotion criteria.

The survey results for the promotion process were generally more critical of the process than those for the tenure process. Some faculty respondents did not feel they understood the criteria for promotion (Figure 29) and more (Figure 30) indicated that they did not receive helpful feedback from the department chair on their progress toward promotion. The proportions claiming that they received helpful feedback were generally lower than in the corresponding question for progress toward tenure.

Figure 31 shows that most faculty respondents did not agree that the requirements for promotion are clearly articulated in their department. Taken together, the results shown in Figures 29 through 31 indicate that there is a need for more communication with faculty about tenure and promotions criteria and their progress toward meeting the criteria. It also validates the need for written departmental criteria.

The tenure and promotion process is not clear – we have guidelines, in the field there are general guidelines, but a lot of it is individual responsibility to figure out what it means - there is a mentoring system in my division- a lot of it depends on common sense. The mentoring system has been in place the last 2 -3 years which is better now than it was in the beginning – Most faculty in my division are good at the teaching part and have to be actively involved in service but we know that scholarship will make or break you – but no one will say it and this is the reality and you have to figure it out for yourself. (Asian)

Faculty are unsure or cynical about the balance between teaching and research in promotions and tenure criteria.

It seems to me that much more now tenure decisions are based on research rather than teaching.

We tell people about the three legged stool but only two legs count – service, publications and teaching – only two count and one is not listed. Publications and monies count but monies is not listed, particularly in engineering—In the social sciences it comes down to publications (it does not matter if the students complain about your teaching or the committees that you have served on does not matter)




Figure 30. Respondents' assessment of feedback from department chairs for promotion progress.




Figure 31. Respondents' opinion of articulation of their department's promotions requirements.

The results for respondents' perceptions of race, gender, and ethnicity fairness in promotion are shown in Figures 32 through 34.




Figure 32. Respondents' perceptions of department's racial fairness in promotions decisions.




Figure 33. Respondents' perceptions of department's gender fairness in promotions decisions.




Figure 34. Respondents’ perceptions of department’s ethnicity fairness in promotions decisions.

The survey results for race, gender, and ethnicity fairness in promotion mirror fairly closely the results for tenure, with Black, Hispanic, and women respondents feeling somewhat less positive about promotion fairness than about tenure fairness. There were significant proportions of these groups that felt that neither the requirements for tenure nor the requirements for promotion are uniformly applied regardless of race, gender, or ethnicity. However, like the tenure fairness results, the effective sample sizes were lowered and the results clouded by respondents electing the “not applicable” choice for these questions.

There was discussion about perceived inequities in tenure and promotion during the focus groups and interviews. One comment captured the sentiment expressed by some minority faculty.

I have seen two cases in the few years I have been here. We have wonderful minority faculty who were discontinued but now they are at excellent schools. You have to say, “What happened here?” It is problematic. The system is certainly unfair. Some people can get promoted when they do not have the qualifications that get promoted and vice versa. They are white. There are people who have publications and they are doing research but they don’t get promoted. (Asian)

Diversity in appointments to Distinguished Professorships and named chair professorships is not only a fairness in promotions issue but also a recruitment and retention issue. These types of appointments can be used as part of a competitive package to attract or retain faculty of high stature in their disciplines, including such faculty who happen to be women or minorities.




Figure 35. Demographics of CCNY Distinguished Professors (July 2012)

The demographics of current Distinguished Professors by gender and race/ethnicity are shown in Figure 35. From the figure it is obvious that women are underrepresented among faculty with Distinguished Professor (DP) appointments. They are 16% of DPs and 37% of tenure-track faculty. Except for Italian Americans, minorities are also underrepresented. Hispanics are 4% of DPs (one DP) and 8% of tenure-track faculty. Asians are 4% of DPs and 13% of tenure-track faculty. There are no Black DPs, but Blacks are 9% of tenure-track faculty.

Figure 36 shows the demographics of current named chair appointments. Women are underrepresented with 9.5 % of appointments, Hispanics with 5%, Asians with 9%, and Blacks with 5%. There are no Italian-American faculty with named chair appointments.

The underrepresentation of minorities and women in these high-status and highly visible positions reflects negatively on the perception of CCNY faculty as an inclusive community of scholars. It also raises questions of equity in the opportunity for faculty of all races, ethnicities, and genders to be considered for appointments as DPs or named chairs, whether they are internal or external candidates.




Figure 36. Demographics of CCNY named chair professors (July 2012).

The Council notes that there are and were a number of CCNY minority and women faculty who have made extraordinary and often singular contributions in research, external funding, and/or service but who have received no recognition from the College for their achievements. We note the example of one such minority faculty member who left the College, without fanfare or attention, for a named chair position at a prominent private institution.

From the foregoing, it is clear that there are a number of areas within the tenure and promotions process that need attention to ensure fairness and inclusion.

Finding 22: Service and student mentoring are inadequately recognized in the tenure and promotions process, which disproportionately disadvantages minorities and women.

Finding 23: There is no college-wide formal faculty mentoring process that could help the chairs guide faculty toward tenure and promotion. Informal mechanisms do not seem to adequately address this deficiency and may especially disadvantage minorities and women.

Finding 24: Some faculty participants in the survey and focus groups do not feel that requirements for tenure and promotion are uniformly applied regardless of race, ethnicity, or gender. This is particularly true of Black faculty.

Finding 25: Faculty are less clear in their understanding of promotion requirements than they are about tenure requirements. They generally do not feel that promotions requirements are clearly articulated at the departmental level. Black, Hispanic, and women faculty are even less likely to feel that the requirements are clearly articulated.

Finding 26: Minority and women faculty are underrepresented among faculty holding Distinguished Professor and named chair appointments and existing minority and women faculty are often unrecognized for their achievements.

Psychological and Behavioral Issues

This section presents our findings for the psychological and behavioral dimensions of faculty diversity climate at CCNY. Based on the work of Hurtado et al.^{8,9} the psychological dimension of diversity climate consists of views about intergroup relations and institutional responses to diversity. It includes perceptions of discrimination or racial, ethnic, or gender conflict and feelings toward individuals from different backgrounds. The behavioral dimension of diversity climate consists of the status and nature of interactions between and among individuals from different backgrounds and the quality of intergroup relations.

One survey question covered the overall feeling of individual faculty about the campus psychological and behavioral climate as it relates to them. It was whether they feel a sense of inclusion and belonging. The response to this question by demographic group is shown in Figure 37.




Figure 37. Respondents' feelings of inclusion and belonging at CCNY.

The level of agreement for the entire sample of respondents is slightly below our target IM level of 3.5. Hispanic, Asian, and male respondents' agreements were at or slightly higher than the target level. Blacks, females, and Italian Americans were lower. Black respondents were neutral and Italian Americans were substantially below neutral. These data indicate that some work needs to be done to foster more of a sense of community across the campus at CCNY, especially among those groups with a lower median response level. The following relevant comments were expressed by faculty members.

I do not have a sense of community outside of the department. Outside of my department people do not know my name. I am one of two black males. People are constantly confusing our names, mistaking us for each other. They call us “the boys”. (African American).

Recognize and highlight the Asian community on campus – we’re all different there is no monolithic Asian from Japan to Afghanistan – encourage the formation of communities on campus – it needs to start somewhere then it will snow ball – needs to be initiated by someone – faculty will probably not start it on their own – The size of the school is somewhat of a deterrent about forming groups – some feel that the numbers are too few (Asian)




Figure 38. Respondents’ feelings of inclusion and belonging in their division/school.

The agreement with a feeling of inclusion and belonging is higher on the division/school level as shown in Figure 38, except for Asian and Black respondents where there is a slight decline.

Based on the IMs for Black, Italian and women respondents, Figure 38 suggests that inclusion efforts should also address issues within the various divisions and schools of the College.

Figure 39 shows that the agreement of respondents when the proposition focuses on the departmental level is higher for every group as well as overall. All group IMs meet or exceed the target level. The data also track very closely with responses (not shown) to the survey proposition, “I feel like my input at department meetings is valued.”




Figure 39. Respondents' feelings of inclusion and belonging in their departments.

Even though the IMs of all groups met or exceeded the IM threshold of acceptability for agreeing that they felt inclusion and belonging in their departments, IM=3.5, Blacks and women only minimally met it. There are nagging concerns about the 37 % of Black respondents and the 36% of women respondents who disagreed. This may be a question that requires a higher IM than 3.5 for acceptability of a group response. Some faculty expressed feelings of alienation at the division/ school and department level during the interviews and focus groups.

There are some departments that are experienced by the senior women as being not welcoming, and exclusive. Some senior women are making their homes at the Graduate Center because they feel unwelcomed in their own departments.

In some departments the dynamic is senior faculty against junior faculty. (jr. faculty)

Engineering is a wasteland for women. It is like an old men's club. I think the culture is very negative for women...we have one bright light in (white woman)

There is a widely held perception that black faculty have a more difficult time in some departments. I know some black faculty feel beleaguered. (jr. female faculty).

...are troubled departments. The women in the ... department sued(white woman)

A similar lower-to-higher IM pattern, as the level of the academic unit decreased, emerged from responses to questions concerning the strength of collegial relationships with other faculty. The agreement that relationships were strong increased as the question proceeded from the college-wide, to the division/school, and then to the departmental level. This is an expected result since collegial relationships would encompass professional as well as faculty-life interactions. Interaction with colleagues within a department would be more frequent and less incidental than

those with colleagues outside a department. However, having stronger collegial relationships throughout CCNY would foster an improved sense of community and encourage interdisciplinary scholarship.

Figure 40 shows that, except for Asian faculty, most respondents did not have strong collegial relationships across CCNY. Other, but minor, racial, ethnic, and gender differences are evident. The results (not shown) at the division/school level were somewhat better. One comment during the interviews and focus groups, perhaps, gives some insight.

Still see people clustered with their own...do not see a lot of cross-pollenization within the faculty. The university is a series of individual operators except for the people you directly come in contact with—the commuter school gets in the way of collegial interactions—for some who are involved in committee work there is more connection—the push for interdisciplinary work by the administrations has helped but it takes too much time away from things that are counted for tenure. . (jr. female faculty).




Figure 40. Respondents’ collegial relationships throughout CCNY




Figure 41. Respondents’ collegial relationships in their department.

The good and encouraging news regarding collegial relationships is at the departmental level, as shown in Figure 41. These relationships are more pertinent to our evaluation of climate. The figure shows that they all cross our 3.5 threshold of agreement. The agreement of Italian Americans respondents is unusually high, while the others are lower, with little disparity among them. Twenty percent of women disagreed or strongly disagreed, as did 27% of Blacks, 27% of Hispanics, and 21% of whites also disagreed or strongly disagreed.

The overall good news concerning departmental collegial relationships does not mean that there are no dysfunctional departments with regard to collegiality. This is indicated by the comments expressed during the interviews and focus groups that were cited in connection with the inclusion and belonging question.

A set of questions on the survey dealt explicitly with the most emotional but perhaps the most important issues regarding the climate for inclusion at CCNY. The responses are troubling to consider. It is no accident that we have left consideration of them to last in our presentation of findings on psychological and behavioral climate dimensions. Lamentably, they are overarching and sobering in their implications.

In the first of the set of questions, respondents were asked if they had felt unwelcomed or excluded at CCNY due to age, gender, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, disabilities, or national origin within the past five years. IM plots of the results for gender, race, ethnicity, and national origin are shown in Figures 42 through 44.

Figures 42 through 44 represent responses to a proposition that asserts an undesirable experience. Adopting the criterion discussed earlier of an IM below 2.5 as satisfactory, only 50% of

respondents would have to disagree or strongly disagree. This would discount the painful experiences of too many respondents. Therefore, we set a criterion of 2.0 as a realistic criterion; ideally, it would be even lower.




Figure 42. Respondents’ feelings of unwelcomeness or exclusion due to gender.

The results from the question on unwelcomeness or exclusion due to gender in Figure 42 show that an unacceptable (IM greater than 2.0) number of women respondents reported having such feelings. Thirty-eight percent, by responding agree or strongly agree, indicated that they felt unwelcomed or excluded because of their gender during the last five years. Fisher’s exact test produced a p of less than 0.0001, rejecting the null hypothesis, when comparing the responses of women against the responses of men. Therefore, the results cannot be discounted on statistical grounds.

As shown in Figure 43, an unacceptably high number of Black and Hispanic respondents reported feelings of unwelcomeness or exclusion due to race. The 57% majority of Black respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing drove the Black IM up to 3.7. Thirty-three percent of Hispanic respondents felt unwelcomeness or exclusion due to race but only one Asian respondent (8%) felt this way. Thirty-three percent of those who identified their race/ethnicity as “Refuse to say” reported feelings of unwelcomeness or exclusion. Thirteen percent of white respondents reported such feelings.




Figure 43. Respondents' feelings of unwelcomeness or exclusion due to race.




Figure 44. Respondents' feeling of unwelcomeness or exclusion due to ethnicity.




Figure 45. Respondents’ feeling of unwelcomeness or exclusion due to national origin.

Comparing Black and white responses with Fisher’s exact test on the race proposition, the null hypothesis was rejected with a p of less than 0.0001. For Hispanics, rejection in a comparison with whites was based on a p of 0.0026. Thus, even at small sample sizes, the statistical evidence for disparities between Black or Hispanic respondents and white respondents on the question of feelings of unwelcomeness and exclusion is convincingly overwhelming.

When the question turned to ethnicity, Figure 44 shows that the Hispanic respondents group’s feelings of unwelcomeness or exclusion rose. Thirty-nine percent felt unwelcomed or excluded, contributing to the unacceptably high IM. Of the Black respondents, who apparently considered themselves belonging to an ethnic group as well as a racial group, 43% reported feeling unwelcomed or excluded. Again, only one Asian respondent had such feelings. Interestingly, only one Italian American respondent (11%) reported feelings of unwelcomeness or exclusion. Eleven percent of the “Refuse to say” shared these feelings.

The null hypothesis on this question also was rejected in the comparisons of Blacks and Hispanics with whites. In both cases p was less than 0.0001, demonstrating a near impossibility of the disparity being a chance result.

Figure 45 shows that the IM for Hispanic respondents on the question of unwelcomeness or exclusion due to national origin is significantly above the acceptable level of 2.0. Thirty-three percent agreed or strongly agreed that they had such feelings. The Black respondents’ IM was somewhat above the threshold due to a large number reporting neutral feelings. None reported agreeing or strongly agreeing with the proposition. One Asian, one Italian American, and five white respondents reported feeling unwelcomed or excluded due to national origin. Overall, 9% of the sample felt unwelcomed or excluded due to national origin.

The Council believes that the numbers of respondents with feelings of unwelcomeness and exclusion due to their gender, race, ethnicity, or national origin is intolerably high. The numbers reflect appallingly high percentages of Black and Hispanic respondents feeling unwelcomed or excluded on the basis of race and ethnicity.

Members of underrepresented minority groups who have raised issues or challenged processes they believe impeded diversity have experienced being ostracized and isolated. (African America Faculty)

After many years of full time service to the college community and after having received my doctorate, I find myself unappreciated by colleagues and administration. I feel as if I need to make myself overly visible to merit recognition and acceptance....Throughout my undergraduate and graduate experiences I demonstrated excellence and had a sense of self-worth; however, within the CCNY environment, I did not reach such heights. (Hispanic Faculty)

In the other categories of unwelcomeness or exclusion feelings, out of the sample of 186 respondents, 35 reported unwelcomeness or exclusion feelings due to age, 12 due to sexual orientation, 10 due to disability, and 9 due to religion. The Council finds that these numbers are all significant and their causes need to be addressed and remediated.

The second set of difficult questions leads to responses with an even more profound significance and emotional impact. The questions asked respondents if they had ever felt discriminated (even subtly) against on campus and the reasons for it.

The questions are all-encompassing and not time-limited. Even though they are asked of faculty members, it can be taken to mean their interactions with students, staff, and administration, as well as with other faculty. It also can evoke a visceral reaction because of the history of use of the term “discrimination” in the law and in characterizing widespread practices of racial injustice. Nevertheless, we support the use of this question to ferret out exposure to injustices, major and minor, among segments of the College’s faculty.

The responses of survey participants to the question of discrimination are shown in Figure 46. Percentages responding yes or no are grouped by race/ethnicity and gender of the respondents.

The most striking result shown in Figure 46 is that 77 % of Black respondents and 76 % of Hispanic respondents experienced feelings of discrimination as did 59% of women, 56% of Italian Americans, 39% of whites, 38 % of males, and 31 % of Asians.

Fisher’s exact test produced a p value of 0.0052 for the gender comparison and p values of 0.7626, 0.0003 and 0.0037 for the Asian, Black, and Hispanic with white comparisons, respectively, with whites. Hence, only the Asian comparison did not survive statistical testing.




Figure 46. Respondents’ reporting feelings of discrimination.

The types of discrimination respondents reported experiencing allows some further analysis of the data in Figure 46. Figure 47 shows the types of discrimination respondents most frequently perceived. Multiple responses were permitted. The most frequently cited reasons are shown in Figure 47 as a percentage of discrimination complaints for each racial/ethnic/gender group.

Figure 47 shows that all of the Black respondents feeling discrimination attributed it to race, at least in part. Seventy-five percent of Asians claiming discrimination reported race was a factor as did 36% of Hispanics and 19% of whites.

Figure 47 also shows that 50% of Asian respondents claiming discrimination attributed their discrimination to ethnicity as did 50% of Hispanics, 35% of Blacks, and 11% of whites. Noteworthy is that no Italian American respondent attributed their discrimination to ethnicity.

Finally, the figure shows that 68% of women respondents reported gender as a factor in their discrimination experience.

In addition to the reasons plotted in the figure, 29% of those feeling discrimination cited age as reason, 17 % cited national origin, 13% cited sexual orientation, 8% cited religion, and 4% cited disabilities.




Figure 47. Most frequently cited reasons for respondents' discrimination experience.

Perhaps more interesting than Figure 47, which is restricted to respondents reporting discrimination, are the percentages obtained by considering all members of each group. Table 8 shows the percentage of respondents in each demographic group who reported discrimination for the given reasons.

Table 8 gives some idea of the prevalence of types of discrimination as reported by the various demographic groups of respondents. As discussed previously, there are a number of problems in using respondent data to project to the entire CCNY faculty population. However, the table can be used to compare the relative experience of the groups with discrimination for the most frequently reported reasons.

Table 8 shows that the 76.7% of Black respondents reporting racial discrimination was the most prevalent discrimination experience of any group, followed by the 40% of women respondents reporting gender discrimination, 38.8% of Hispanic respondents reporting national origin discrimination, and 23.1% of Asian respondents reporting racial discrimination.

As an indication of the relative prevalence of perceived discrimination, the table shows, for example, that the prevalence of perceived racial discrimination among Black faculty respondents was almost twice the prevalence of perceived discrimination of any other group for any reason.

Table 8. Experience of respondents with perceived discrimination by demographic group

Ethnicity/Gender	Discrimination Reason Given			
	Race	Ethnicity	National Origin	Gender
Asian	23.1%	15.4%	15.4%	0
Black	76.7%	26.7%	6.7%	26.7%
Hispanic	27.8%	33.3%	38.8%	33.3%
Italian American	0	0	0	44.4%
Whites	7.4%	4.2%	3.2%	23.1%
Men	20.0%	15.8%	9.5%	5.3%
Women	27.7%	11.1%	6.7%	40.0%

The Council believes that the data in Table 8 are not reflective of the percentage of Hispanic respondents who have felt discrimination due to their Hispanic backgrounds. The raw survey data reported by the consultants did not allow us to analyze perceptions of discrimination against Hispanic respondents by aggregating their national origin, ethnicity, and race reasons. The overall perception of discrimination by Hispanics based on their identity as Hispanics may be higher than any of the separate reasons given by them. Aggregating reasons could easily bring the total perceiving discrimination to include most of the respondents. A similar aggregation for Asians could increase their totals as well.

The discrimination reported by white respondents for race, ethnicity, and national origin may overlap the reported discrimination in other groups since multiple racial/ethnic identities were allowed. The most prevalent reason cited for discrimination by men respondents was race, but the only non-overlapping reason was gender, which was cited by 5.3% of men.

The unwelcomeness and exclusion question asked about experiences over the last five years. However, the discrimination question did not ask about a time period. Therefore, one could optimistically speculate that the reported occurrences of discrimination were long ago, that discrimination is now less likely, and that it can be relegated to history. We cannot dismiss this possibility directly. But, if it is true and if faculty rank is a proxy for longevity, the percentages of faculty reporting experience with discrimination should increase with rank. If the incidence or rate at which discrimination occurs is low but more or less constant over time, the cumulative exposure would still tend to cause the percentages to increase with rank.

Looking at the reported prevalence of discrimination by rank, the percentages reporting discrimination were 54%, 55%, and 41% for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors, respectively. Applying Fisher's exact test, to these results for each pair of ranks, there was no statistically defensible difference between any pair. Thus, we cannot conclude that discrimination is getting better or even an infrequent occurrence by looking at its prevalence by faculty rank.

Many participants made comments during the focus groups and interviews that relate to perceptions of discrimination either toward themselves or others. Among the most explicit were:

Like most faculty members here, I cherish our culture of diversity and delight in our marvelous student body. But it is not lost on me that being a white woman on our faculty is often disadvantageous. Race trumps gender continually--why?... I want to be part of a rich, vibrant, strongly diverse faculty community in which all individuals are valued, and all are equal. We have some marvelous strong women as leaders on our campus (like our president!), yet women can face subtle discrimination routinely nonetheless. (White Female Faculty)

The condescension from senior white male faculty members is nauseating. I am over 50 years old, a senior member of the faculty and am prominent on campus and the "good old boys" still try to give me orders. I give them an attitude when I can, but I am worried that by reacting, they will simply exclude me. My department is OK, but not so other departments in my unit. (White Female Faculty)

Disregard, disrespect, and exclusion of women is so deeply ingrained in the college's DNA that it will take a LOT of strong and accomplished women from outside the college in top administrative roles to begin to change the climate. Good intentioned men won't be able to do it, as the vast majority participates daily in many subtle forms of discrimination like unconsciously calling on their male colleagues and giving greater value to their input when women with greater knowledge/expertise are present. (White Female Faculty)

Older women and minorities are constantly marginalized via "democratic" and legal means. In other words racism and sexism are easily practiced under the authority of majority rule. (African American Female Faculty)

I think that in this environment...and I have seen this up close...the question of competency is a relevant question. An individual who is a white male in those organizations can get away with lower degrees of competency than non-white men. If you take two individuals, there will be a higher level of scrutiny for the non-white male. (African American Faculty)

There really is a prejudice if I make a mistake they say it is because my English is not good – One of the things that needs to happen – we like to take the initiative to say that we're going to do this – there needs to be reaching out to the Asian Faculty instead of waiting for people to come and say that we'll do it –Culturally you do not say what

you're good at – It is hard to say what we're good at – the onus is on the administration and chairs to realize the strengths the faculty has and approach people (Asian)

In spite of the distressing findings regarding some aspects of the psychological and behavioral dimensions of the climate for diversity and inclusion at CCNY, the Council believes that the present uncovering and documentation of these aspects is a giant step toward improving the climate. The next step must be to engage the administration, faculty, and staff in a dialogue about these findings.

Finding 27: Feelings of inclusion and belonging and of strong relations with colleagues were positive at the departmental level but, especially for some minorities and women, less so at the divisional or school level and at the College level.

Finding 28: Feelings of unwelcomeness and exclusion due to gender, race, ethnicity, and national origin are held by many faculty. Appallingly high percentages of Black and Hispanic survey respondents reported feeling excluded on the basis of race and ethnicity.

Finding 29: Feelings of unwelcomeness and exclusion and/or discrimination due to age, sexual orientation, religion, and disabilities are present among many faculty and need to be addressed.

Finding 30: Perceptions of racial discrimination are common, especially among Black faculty, at CCNY. A substantial majority of Black respondents to the faculty survey reported experiencing discrimination due to race at CCNY as did lesser but significant percentages of Hispanic and Asian respondents. The prevalence of experiences of perceived racial discrimination among Black faculty respondents was almost twice the prevalence of perceived discrimination for any other group for any reason.

Finding 31: Substantial percentages of Hispanic respondents reported experiencing discrimination due to ethnicity or national origin. The survey design and data reporting did not allow an overall assessment of perceptions of discrimination against Hispanics based on their Hispanic identity, which could be even more substantial.

Finding 32: A sizable minority of women survey respondents reported experiencing gender discrimination. Given the number of women faculty at CCNY, gender discrimination is a major problem.

Finding 33: The psychological and behavioral dimensions of the CCNY climate for diversity and inclusion are problematic but largely invisible to those who are unaffected by it.

Organizational Leadership for Climate Change

Organizational leadership is an important element of the organizational/structural diversity climate. President Coico is committed to improving the climate for diversity and inclusion at CCNY but she cannot do it alone. It will take sustained effort by a new partnership among informed administrators, faculty, and staff. It will also require an administrative and

organizational structure to support these efforts and to impart organizational leadership at every level, from the senior administration down to the departments. Beyond the creation of our Council, these elements are not now in place.

The Office of Diversity and Compliance historically and organizationally plays a limited role in the academic life of the College. It is not positioned to assume a larger role in faculty diversity issues other than oversight of recruiting and hiring. The permanent directors have not been respected by either faculty or senior administrators as academic peers and have lacked the credentials to exercise independent judgments about searches.

Finding 34: The College lacks an administrative and organizational structure to support diversity and inclusion efforts and to impart leadership across every level of the organization.

D. Summary and Conclusions

Our research study was carried out within the framework of the five dimensions of campus climate using multiple methods. It reveals a mixed picture of the climate for faculty inclusive excellence at CCNY.

On the positive side, the focus of the present senior administration on this difficult and complex issue is unprecedented and there have been tangible results in the hiring of Black, Hispanic, and female faculty. The President's creation of the Council itself and sponsorship of its work heralds a new beginning for diversity and excellence at the College.

On the other hand, our study shows that there is considerable work to be done to achieve inclusive excellence. We found distinct polarities of perception about equity within the faculty experience at CCNY. Black faculty are at one extreme, while white male faculty are at the other. Women, Hispanic, and Asian faculty are in between. This extends to almost every area of inquiry of the study, ranging over issues related to faculty recruitment, retention, promotion, tenure, and behavioral relations.

Although the voluntary nature of faculty participation in the study makes it difficult to generalize to the entire faculty population, it is clear that, perhaps most, Black faculty at some time have felt excluded, unwelcomed, or treated inequitably because of their race. A large proportion of women share similar perceptions about their treatment due to gender.

The study results for Hispanic faculty and, to a lesser extent, Asian faculty indicate that many of them also have had these perceptions of exclusion, unwelcomeness, and inequitable treatment due to their national origin, ethnicity, and/or race. The level of uncertainty about proportions is greater than with Black and women faculty because of smaller sample sizes and ambiguities in the survey questions and data. The negative perceptions held by Hispanic faculty could well extend to most of them.

On the other hand, whites and males generally were much more positive and generally did not perceive any inequities in areas such as hiring, promotion, tenure, or advancement into administration. Data on the makeup of the faculty and the academic administration point to the compositional and structural deficits of minorities and women that some of them feel are a reflection of inequities.

The study did not find any indication of malicious intent to deny equitable treatment to minority or women faculty. Nor did it find that minority and women faculty were looking for special privilege or interested in inclusion at the expense of excellence. In fact, they generally felt that excellence was being compromised by a lack of inclusion.

Apart from issues of race, ethnicity, and gender, faculty also had concerns over inclusiveness related to their sexual orientation, religion and disabilities that need to be addressed.

The specific findings of our research in each one of the climate areas led to the goals and strategies we put forward in Part I. Many are race, ethnicity, and gender neutral. The fact that they are derived from research-based findings gives us confidence that if our recommendations are implemented, the climate will be improved to the benefit of the institution and all of its faculty and students. We look forward to a dialogue with all faculty and administration about our findings and recommendations and to their participation in making the changes necessary to ensure that inclusion and excellence are simultaneously enhanced at CCNY.

References for Part II

1. Fries-Britt, S. L., Rowan-Kenyon, H. T., Perna, L. W., Milem, J. F., Howard, D. G., Underrepresentation in the academy and the institutional climate for faculty diversity, *Journal of the Professorsiate*, 5 (1), (2011).
(http://jotp.icbche.org/2011/5-1_FriesBritt_p.1.pdf)
2. *City Facts, Fall 2011*, The City College of New York Office of Institutional Research, New York, NY (2011).
(http://www1.cuny.cuny.edu/facultystaff/ir/upload/City_Facts_Fall_2011_06132012.pdf),
3. Barker, K. *The Spring 2009 Faculty Experience Survey (FES:09): Report for full- and part-time faculty*. New York, NY: The University Faculty Senate of The City University of New York (2010).
<http://cunyufs.org/FES/2009Report.pdf>
4. *Executive Order 1246 Affirmative Action Plan (AAP) The City College of New York Affirmative Action Program September 1, 2011 – August 31, 2012*, The City College of New York Office of Affirmative Action, Compliance and Diversity, New York, NY (2012).
(<http://www1.cuny.cuny.edu/facultystaff/aao/upload/2011-CCNY-AAP-Final.pdf>)
5. *Affirmative Action Summary Data By College, Ethnicity And Gender, Fall 2010*, The City University of New York, Office of Human Resources Management, New York, NY (2011).
(<http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/ohrm/reports-forms/FinalFall2010AASD.pdf>)
6. Alger, J. R., *As The Workplace Turns: Affirmative Action In Employment*, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ (2005).
(http://generalcounsel.rutgers.edu/documents/facultydiversity.outline.oct2005_001.doc)
7. *Building on a Strong Foundation: A Strategy for Enhancing CUNY's Leadership in the Areas of Faculty Diversity and Inclusion, Diversity Action Plan*, The City University of New York Office of Human Resources Management, Office of Recruitment and Diversity, New York, NY (2012).
(http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/ohrm/diversity/DiversityActionPlan/DiversityActionPlan_Revised.pdf)
8. Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F.; & Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice, *Review of Higher Education*, 21, 279-302 (1998).
9. Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A R., & Allen, W. R., *.Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports Series No. 26-8). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass. (1999).

Web Page 1 Intro:



CCNY's Council on Excellence and Inclusion on behalf of the President and in conjunction with the consulting firm, Cambridge Hill Partners, is conducting a survey to assess attitudes and experiences related to diversity and inclusion at the City College of New York.

We value your frank and candid feedback as your opinions are very valuable to CCNY. Please be assured that anonymity will be maintained and all information you provide will only be used in combination with responses from other survey participants.

Please keep the following definitions in mind when you complete the survey below.

Diversity is defined as individual differences in experiences, values, and perceptions that include--but extend beyond--differences in race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, disability, and sexual orientation.

Inclusion is defined as involving, respecting, and valuing each individual's differences, so that each member feels a sense of belonging and can fully participate and contribute to the campus.

Underrepresented is defined as federally underrepresented minority groups such as African Americans, Hispanics/Latinos/Chicanos (including Puerto Ricans), Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders and Native Americans/Alaskan Natives.


Discrimination is defined as the prejudicial treatment of an individual based on attributes of their personal identity.

Disability is defined as a physical or mental impairment that materially limits a major life activity such as walking, seeing or learning. Examples of disabilities are epilepsy, blindness, and dyslexia.

Sexual orientation is defined as including heterosexual or straight, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or queer.

Start

Web Page 2 Survey:

Completed 


Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I am satisfied with my experience as a faculty member at CCNY.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If I had the opportunity to choose again, I would choose to work at CCNY.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am satisfied with the way my career has progressed at CCNY.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I feel a sense of inclusion and belonging...						
At CCNY	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In my department	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In my division/school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<< Back
Finish Later
Next >>

Web Page 3:

Completed 

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I have strong collegial relationships with other faculty members...						
In my department	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In my division/school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Throughout CCNY	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Within the past five years, I have felt unwelcomed or excluded at CCNY because of my...						
Age	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gender	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Race	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ethnicity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Religion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sexual orientation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disabilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
National origin	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<< Back
Finish Later
Next >>

Completed 

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Within the past five years, due to fear of negative consequences, I have avoided disclosing to colleagues my...						
Age	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gender	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Race	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ethnicity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Religion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sexual orientation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disabilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
National origin	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I am satisfied with the access I have to senior leadership of CCNY.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am satisfied with the opportunities I have to offer input on important decisions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[<< Back](#) [Finish Later](#) [Next >>](#)

Completed 


Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I am treated with respect by...						
My colleagues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My department chair	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My dean	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
My area of research is valued by my colleagues in...						
My department	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My school or division	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I feel like my input at department meetings is valued.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am satisfied with the campus environment regarding diversity.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cultural differences are valued at CCNY.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior leadership at CCNY fosters respect and support for diversity.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior leadership at CCNY has made an effort to develop minority faculty for leadership positions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior leadership at CCNY has made an effort to develop women faculty for leadership positions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>


Web Page 6:

Completed 

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Expectations for my performance are clearly communicated by...						
My department chair	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My dean or division head	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think I do a significant amount of student mentoring that is not formally recognized by the tenure/CCE and promotion processes.						
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think I do a significant amount of service on committees that is not formally recognized by the tenure/CCE and promotion processes.						
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe underrepresented faculty face a greater service load than do non-minority faculty.						
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe female faculty face a greater service load than do male faculty.						
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Web Page 7:

Completed 

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I am satisfied with the efforts search committees in my department have made to develop racially and ethnically diverse applicant pools.						
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am satisfied with the efforts search committees in my department have made to develop gender diverse applicant pools.						
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe my department actively recruits faculty of color.						
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe my department actively recruits female faculty.						
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe that underrepresented minorities have to meet higher standards for hiring than non-minority applicants.						
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe that female applicants have to meet higher standards for hiring than male applicants.						
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I understand/understood the criteria for achieving tenure or CCE.						
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I receive/received helpful feedback from my chair on my progress toward tenure or CCE.						
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Completed 


Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
In my department, the requirements for tenure or CCE are uniformly applied regardless of a faculty member's...						
Age	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gender	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Race	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ethnicity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Religion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sexual orientation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disabilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
National origin	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I think I have to/had to meet a higher standard for tenure or CCE than do/did other colleagues in my department.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I understand/understood the criteria for achieving promotion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I receive/received helpful feedback from my chair on my progress toward promotion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The requirements for promotion are clearly articulated in my department.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[<< Back](#) [Finish Later](#) [Next >>](#)


Web Page 9:

Completed 

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know																					
In my department, the requirements for promotion are uniformly applied regardless of a faculty member's...																											
Age	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																					
Gender	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																					
Race	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																					
Ethnicity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																					
Religion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																					
Sexual orientation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																					
Disabilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																					
National origin	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																					
<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 70%;"></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Strongly Agree</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Agree</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Neutral</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Disagree</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Strongly Disagree</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Don't Know</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="7" style="background-color: #f0e6ff; padding: 5px;">I think I have to/had to meet a higher standard for promotion than do/did other colleagues in my department.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCNY does a good job helping faculty balance work and personal responsibilities via family friendly policies and programs.</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>								Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	I think I have to/had to meet a higher standard for promotion than do/did other colleagues in my department.							CCNY does a good job helping faculty balance work and personal responsibilities via family friendly policies and programs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know																					
I think I have to/had to meet a higher standard for promotion than do/did other colleagues in my department.																											
CCNY does a good job helping faculty balance work and personal responsibilities via family friendly policies and programs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																					
<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px 10px;"><< Back</td> <td style="padding: 2px 10px;">Finish Later</td> <td style="padding: 2px 10px;">Next >></td> </tr> </table>							<< Back	Finish Later	Next >>																		
<< Back	Finish Later	Next >>																									


Web Page 10:

Completed 

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know			
In my experience, my department is supportive of the following work-life issues...									
Family leave	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>			
Dependant care (e.g. children or elders)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>			
Partner/spousal hiring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>			
Tenure clock adjustment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>			
Health accommodations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>			
Flexibility regarding family responsibilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>			
<p>Have you ever felt discriminated (even subtly) against on campus?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p> <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px 10px;"><< Back</td> <td style="padding: 2px 10px;">Finish Later</td> <td style="padding: 2px 10px;">Next >></td> </tr> </table>							<< Back	Finish Later	Next >>
<< Back	Finish Later	Next >>							

Web Page 11 Discrimination:

Completed 


I felt this discrimination was due to my (Check all that apply)

- Age
- Race
- Religion
- Disabilities
- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Sexual orientation
- National origin
- Other (Please specify):

Did you report the discrimination to college officials (e.g. chair, dean, AAO, provost)?

Yes No


Web Page 12 Not Report:

Completed 

Why did you choose NOT to report the incident? (Check all that apply)

- I feared I would not get tenure or CCE
- I feared I would not be promoted
- I feared I would not be taken seriously
- I feared I would be labeled a complainer
- I feared no one would believe me
- I feared I would be seen as having a "chip on my shoulder"
- I feared I would be ostracized
- I felt intimidated by the situation
- I did not know how to file a complaint
- Other (Please specify):


Web Page 13 Response:

Completed 

Were you satisfied with the college's response?

Yes No


Web Page 14 Result:

Completed 

Why were you not satisfied with the college's response? *(Check all that apply)*

- I was not taken seriously
- My experience of discrimination was discounted as a "misunderstanding" or as my being "overly sensitive"
- Nothing happened after the complaint; there was no consequence for the person(s) who discriminated against me
- I felt like I was blamed for the situation
- The person to whom I reported the incident didn't seem to understand my concern
- Other (Please specify):

Web Page 15 Demographics:

Completed 

What are the three most important factors that are influencing you to stay at CCNY? *(Check up to 3 responses)*

- My department
- Geographic location
- Spousal employment
- Community resources & opportunities
- Quality of students
- Support for research
- College climate and culture
- Salary and benefits
- Relationships with colleagues
- Other (Please specify):

What are the three most important factors that would influence you to consider leaving CCNY? *(Check up to 3 responses)*

- My department
- Geographic location
- Spousal employment
- Community resources & opportunities
- Quality of students
- Support for research
- College climate and culture
- Salary and benefits
- Relationships with colleagues
- Other (Please specify):

What is your current title/rank?

- Lecturer
- Distinguished Lecturer
- Instructor
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor
- Distinguished Professor
- Substitute or Visiting Faculty

Have you served on a search committee for new faculty?

- Yes
- No

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Transgender

Do you identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or queer (LGBTQ)?

- Yes
- No
- Refuse to Say

Do you identify as having a disability?

- Yes
- No
- Refuse to Say

How do you define your race and or ethnicity? *(Check all that apply)*

- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Puerto Rican
- Italian American
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Other
- Refuse to say

Please include any comments below.

<< Back

Finish Later

Send Answers



Thank you for completing the survey. Please be assured that anonymity will be maintained and all information you provide will only be used in combination with responses from other survey participants.

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	
1				Race (Note that when further analysis was completed, some groups were combined to create mutually exclusive, independent categories)									
2			Overall 186	Asn 13 6.4%	Blk 30 14.9%	Hispr 18 8.9%	Ital 9 4.5%	Wht 95 47.0%	Other 16 7.9%	Refuse ID 18 8.9%	Male 95 51.1%	Female 90 48.4%	
3	Q1	I am satisfied with my experience as a faculty member at CCNY.											
4		Strongly Agree	15.1%; 28	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	17.9%; 17	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	16.8%; 16	13.3%; 12	
5		Agree	43.0%; 80	46.2%; 6	30.0%; 9	38.9%; 7	22.2%; 2	48.4%; 46	50.0%; 8	38.9%; 7	46.3%; 44	40.0%; 36	
6		Neutral	12.4%; 23	7.7%; 1	13.3%; 4	22.2%; 4	33.3%; 3	11.6%; 11	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	10.5%; 10	13.3%; 12	
7		Disagree	16.7%; 31	23.1%; 3	26.7%; 8	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	12.6%; 12	18.8%; 3	22.2%; 4	13.7%; 13	20.0%; 18	
8		Strongly Disagree	12.9%; 24	15.4%; 2	23.3%; 7	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	9.5%; 9	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	12.6%; 12	13.3%; 12	
9		Not Applicable	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	
10		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90	
11		Interpolated Median	3.7	3.6	2.5	3.5	3.3	3.8			3.8	3.6	
12													
13	Q2	If I had the opportunity to choose again, I would choose to work at CCNY.											
14		Strongly Agree	22.6%; 42	7.7%; 1	13.3%; 4	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	27.4%; 26	18.8%; 3	22.2%; 4	23.2%; 22	22.2%; 20	
15		Agree	32.3%; 60	38.5%; 5	26.7%; 8	22.2%; 4	33.3%; 3	28.4%; 27	31.3%; 5	50.0%; 9	31.6%; 30	32.2%; 29	
16		Neutral	19.9%; 37	46.2%; 6	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	20.0%; 19	18.8%; 3	5.6%; 1	21.1%; 20	18.9%; 17	
17		Disagree	11.3%; 21	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 5	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	11.6%; 11	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	10.5%; 10	12.2%; 11	
18		Strongly Disagree	10.2%; 19	7.7%; 1	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	7.4%; 7	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	11.6%; 11	8.9%; 8	
19		Not Applicable	3.8%; 7	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	5.3%; 5	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	5.6%; 5	
20		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90	
21		Interpolated Median	3.7	3.4	3.1	3.8	3.8	3.8			3.7	3.7	
22													
23	Q3	I am satisfied with the way my career has progressed at CCNY.											
24		Strongly Agree	16.1%; 30	15.4%; 2	3.3%; 1	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	20.0%; 19	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	21.1%; 20	11.1%; 10	
25		Agree	32.8%; 61	23.1%; 3	26.7%; 8	27.8%; 5	33.3%; 3	34.7%; 33	37.5%; 6	33.3%; 6	34.7%; 33	30.0%; 27	
26		Neutral	24.7%; 46	30.8%; 4	30.0%; 9	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	25.3%; 24	18.8%; 3	22.2%; 4	17.9%; 17	32.2%; 29	
27		Disagree	14.5%; 27	23.1%; 3	13.3%; 4	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	13.7%; 13	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	13.7%; 13	15.6%; 14	
28		Strongly Disagree	11.8%; 22	7.7%; 1	26.7%; 8	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	6.3%; 6	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	12.6%; 12	11.1%; 10	
29		Not Applicable	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	
30		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90	
31		Interpolated Median	3.5	3.1	2.8	3.3	3.7	3.6			3.7	3.2	
32													
33	Q4	I feel a sense of inclusion and belonging...											
34		At CCNY											
35		Strongly Agree	16.1%; 30	15.4%; 2	13.3%; 4	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	15.8%; 15	18.8%; 3	22.2%; 4	22.1%; 21	10.0%; 9	
36		Agree	31.7%; 59	38.5%; 5	20.0%; 6	44.4%; 8	0.0%; 0	31.6%; 30	31.3%; 5	33.3%; 6	31.6%; 30	32.2%; 29	
37		Neutral	23.7%; 44	23.1%; 3	33.3%; 10	22.2%; 4	33.3%; 3	26.3%; 25	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	23.2%; 22	23.3%; 21	
38		Disagree	17.7%; 33	15.4%; 2	23.3%; 7	16.7%; 3	33.3%; 3	16.8%; 16	18.8%; 3	22.2%; 4	12.6%; 12	23.3%; 21	
39		Strongly Disagree	10.2%; 19	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	9.5%; 9	18.8%; 3	5.6%; 1	9.5%; 9	11.1%; 10	
40		Not Applicable	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.1%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	
41		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90	
42		Interpolated Median	3.4	3.6	3.0	3.5	2.3	3.4			3.6	3.2	
43	Q5	In my department											
44		Strongly Agree	29.0%; 54	15.4%; 2	16.7%; 5	33.3%; 6	33.3%; 3	35.8%; 34	31.3%; 5	16.7%; 3	31.6%; 30	26.7%; 24	
45		Agree	29.6%; 55	38.5%; 5	33.3%; 10	22.2%; 4	33.3%; 3	25.3%; 24	43.8%; 7	33.3%; 6	33.7%; 32	24.4%; 22	
46		Neutral	10.8%; 20	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 4	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	11.6%; 11	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 3	8.4%; 8	13.3%; 12	
47		Disagree	15.6%; 29	30.8%; 4	13.3%; 4	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	17.9%; 17	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	13.7%; 13	17.8%; 16	
48		Strongly Disagree	14.5%; 27	15.4%; 2	23.3%; 7	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	9.5%; 9	25.0%; 4	16.7%; 3	11.6%; 11	17.8%; 16	

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
49		Not Applicable	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
50		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
51		Interpolated Median	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.8	4.0	3.9			4.0	3.5
52	Q6	In my division/school										
53		Strongly Agree	17.7%; 33	15.4%; 2	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	22.1%; 21	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	24.2%; 23	11.1%; 10
54		Agree	32.8%; 61	30.8%; 4	26.7%; 8	38.9%; 7	11.1%; 1	34.7%; 33	25.0%; 4	27.8%; 5	33.7%; 32	31.1%; 28
55		Neutral	21.0%; 39	30.8%; 4	26.7%; 8	16.7%; 3	33.3%; 3	22.1%; 21	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	16.8%; 16	25.6%; 23
56		Disagree	14.5%; 27	7.7%; 1	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	12.6%; 12	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	11.6%; 11	17.8%; 16
57		Strongly Disagree	12.4%; 23	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	8.4%; 8	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	12.6%; 12	12.2%; 11
58		Not Applicable	1.6%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	1.1%; 1	2.2%; 2
59		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
60		Interpolated Median	3.5	3.4	2.9	3.5	2.7	3.7			3.8	3.2
61												
62	Q7	I have strong collegial relationships with other faculty members...										
63		In my department										
64		Strongly Agree	30.1%; 56	15.4%; 2	26.7%; 8	38.9%; 7	55.6%; 5	34.7%; 33	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	31.6%; 30	28.9%; 26
65		Agree	34.9%; 65	38.5%; 5	33.3%; 10	16.7%; 3	33.3%; 3	36.8%; 35	56.3%; 9	27.8%; 5	31.6%; 30	37.8%; 34
66		Neutral	16.7%; 31	23.1%; 3	13.3%; 4	22.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	13.7%; 13	0.0%; 0	38.9%; 7	20.0%; 19	13.3%; 12
67		Disagree	12.9%; 24	23.1%; 3	16.7%; 5	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	9.5%; 9	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	12.6%; 12	13.3%; 12
68		Strongly Disagree	5.4%; 10	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	6.7%; 6
69		Not Applicable	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0
70		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
71		Interpolated Median	3.9	3.6	3.8	3.8	4.6	4.1			3.9	3.9
72	Q8	In my division/school										
73		Strongly Agree	12.9%; 24	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	14.7%; 14	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	16.8%; 16	8.9%; 8
74		Agree	34.9%; 65	53.8%; 7	23.3%; 7	33.3%; 6	22.2%; 2	38.9%; 37	25.0%; 4	22.2%; 4	33.7%; 32	35.6%; 32
75		Neutral	26.9%; 50	23.1%; 3	30.0%; 9	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	23.2%; 22	18.8%; 3	50.0%; 9	27.4%; 26	26.7%; 24
76		Disagree	15.6%; 29	23.1%; 3	20.0%; 6	5.6%; 1	33.3%; 3	16.8%; 16	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	14.7%; 14	16.7%; 15
77		Strongly Disagree	7.5%; 14	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 5	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	18.8%; 3	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 6	8.9%; 8
78		Not Applicable	2.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	3.3%; 3
79		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
80		Interpolated Median	3.5	3.6	2.9	3.7	3.3	3.6			3.5	3.4
81	Q9	Throughout CCNY										
82		Strongly Agree	6.5%; 12	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	4.2%; 4	18.8%; 3	5.6%; 1	9.5%; 9	3.3%; 3
83		Agree	25.8%; 48	53.8%; 7	23.3%; 7	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	22.1%; 21	25.0%; 4	33.3%; 6	29.5%; 28	22.2%; 20
84		Neutral	28.0%; 52	15.4%; 2	26.7%; 8	33.3%; 6	11.1%; 1	28.4%; 27	6.3%; 1	38.9%; 7	23.2%; 22	33.3%; 30
85		Disagree	26.9%; 50	23.1%; 3	23.3%; 7	16.7%; 3	33.3%; 3	33.7%; 32	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	25.3%; 24	27.8%; 25
86		Strongly Disagree	11.3%; 21	7.7%; 1	20.0%; 6	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	9.5%; 9	25.0%; 4	5.6%; 1	10.5%; 10	12.2%; 11
87		Not Applicable	1.6%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	1.1%; 1
88		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
89		Interpolated Median	2.9	3.6	2.8	3.0	2.3	2.7			3.1	2.8
90												
91	Q10	Within the past 5 years, I have felt unwelcomed or excluded at CCNY because of my...										
92		Age										
93		Strongly Agree	4.3%; 8	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	22.2%; 2	4.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	5.6%; 5
94		Agree	14.5%; 27	15.4%; 2	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	33.3%; 3	16.8%; 16	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	7.4%; 7	22.2%; 20
95		Neutral	16.7%; 31	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	27.8%; 5	11.1%; 1	13.7%; 13	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	15.8%; 15	16.7%; 15
96		Disagree	21.0%; 39	15.4%; 2	36.7%; 11	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	20.0%; 19	31.3%; 5	16.7%; 3	13.7%; 13	28.9%; 26

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
97		Strongly Disagree	41.4%; 77	53.8%; 7	20.0%; 6	33.3%; 6	22.2%; 2	44.2%; 42	43.8%; 7	50.0%; 9	58.9%; 56	23.3%; 21
98		Not Applicable	2.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	3.3%; 3
99		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
100		Interpolated Median	1.9	1.4	2.2	2.5	3.7	1.8			1.3	2.4
101	Q11	Gender										
102		Strongly Agree	5.4%; 10	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 6	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	1.1%; 1	10.0%; 9
103		Agree	15.6%; 29	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 5	16.7%; 3	44.4%; 4	20.0%; 19	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	27.8%; 25
104		Neutral	14.0%; 26	30.8%; 4	16.7%; 5	33.3%; 6	0.0%; 0	9.5%; 9	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	15.8%; 15	11.1%; 10
105		Disagree	19.9%; 37	15.4%; 2	36.7%; 11	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	16.8%; 16	18.8%; 3	22.2%; 4	14.7%; 14	25.6%; 23
106		Strongly Disagree	43.0%; 80	53.8%; 7	16.7%; 5	27.8%; 5	55.6%; 5	45.3%; 43	56.3%; 9	55.6%; 10	61.1%; 58	24.4%; 22
107		Not Applicable	2.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	1.1%; 1
108		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
109		Interpolated Median	1.8	1.4	2.4	2.7	1.4	1.7			1.3	2.5
110	Q12	Race										
111		Strongly Agree	6.5%; 12	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	4.2%; 4	8.9%; 8
112		Agree	15.1%; 28	0.0%; 0	46.7%; 14	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	9.5%; 9	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	12.6%; 12	17.8%; 16
113		Neutral	11.3%; 21	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	9.5%; 9	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	11.6%; 11	10.0%; 9
114		Disagree	24.7%; 46	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	30.5%; 29	25.0%; 4	22.2%; 4	12.6%; 12	37.8%; 34
115		Strongly Disagree	40.3%; 75	46.2%; 6	10.0%; 3	22.2%; 4	44.4%; 4	45.3%; 43	56.3%; 9	50.0%; 9	55.8%; 53	24.4%; 22
116		Not Applicable	2.2%; 4	7.7%; 1	3.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	2.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	1.1%; 1
117		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
118		Interpolated Median	1.8	1.5	3.7	2.7	1.5	1.6			1.4	2.2
119	Q13	Ethnicity										
120		Strongly Agree	4.8%; 9	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	5.6%; 5
121		Agree	11.8%; 22	0.0%; 0	36.7%; 11	27.8%; 5	11.1%; 1	4.2%; 4	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	11.6%; 11	12.2%; 11
122		Neutral	17.2%; 32	23.1%; 3	16.7%; 5	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	18.9%; 18	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	17.9%; 17	15.6%; 14
123		Disagree	22.0%; 41	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	27.4%; 26	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	7.4%; 7	37.8%; 34
124		Strongly Disagree	39.8%; 74	46.2%; 6	13.3%; 4	16.7%; 3	55.6%; 5	44.2%; 42	50.0%; 8	50.0%; 9	53.7%; 51	25.6%; 23
125		Not Applicable	4.3%; 8	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	3.2%; 3	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	5.3%; 5	3.3%; 3
126		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
127		Interpolated Median	1.9	1.5	3.3	3.2	1.3	1.7			1.4	2.1
128	Q14	Religion										
129		Strongly Agree	1.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	1.1%; 1
130		Agree	3.8%; 7	7.7%; 1	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	3.3%; 3
131		Neutral	18.3%; 34	23.1%; 3	23.3%; 7	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	14.7%; 14	6.3%; 1	27.8%; 5	17.9%; 17	17.8%; 16
132		Disagree	24.2%; 45	15.4%; 2	36.7%; 11	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	28.4%; 27	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	11.6%; 11	37.8%; 34
133		Strongly Disagree	46.8%; 87	53.8%; 7	16.7%; 5	50.0%; 9	55.6%; 5	50.5%; 48	56.3%; 9	50.0%; 9	61.1%; 58	32.2%; 29
134		Not Applicable	5.9%; 11	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 5	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	2.1%; 2	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	4.2%; 4	7.8%; 7
135		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
136		Interpolated Median	1.5	1.4	2.2	1.4	1.3	1.5			1.3	1.9
137	Q15	Sexual orientation										
138		Strongly Agree	3.2%; 6	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	3.2%; 3	3.3%; 3
139		Agree	3.2%; 6	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	3.3%; 3
140		Neutral	15.6%; 29	30.8%; 4	26.7%; 8	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	10.5%; 10	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	16.8%; 16	13.3%; 12
141		Disagree	25.8%; 48	15.4%; 2	36.7%; 11	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	30.5%; 29	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	14.7%; 14	37.8%; 34
142		Strongly Disagree	48.4%; 90	53.8%; 7	16.7%; 5	50.0%; 9	55.6%; 5	49.5%; 47	68.8%; 11	66.7%; 12	60.0%; 57	36.7%; 33
143		Not Applicable	3.8%; 7	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 4	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	2.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	5.6%; 5
144		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
145		Interpolated Median	1.5	1.4	2.2	1.4	1.3	1.5			1.3	1.8
146	Q16	Disabilities										
147		Strongly Agree	3.2%; 6	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	2.2%; 2
148		Agree	2.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	3.3%; 3
149		Neutral	17.2%; 32	30.8%; 4	20.0%; 6	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	14.7%; 14	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	16.8%; 16	16.7%; 15
150		Disagree	24.2%; 45	15.4%; 2	36.7%; 11	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	27.4%; 26	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	12.6%; 12	36.7%; 33
151		Strongly Disagree	45.2%; 84	38.5%; 5	16.7%; 5	50.0%; 9	55.6%; 5	47.4%; 45	68.8%; 11	61.1%; 11	56.8%; 54	33.3%; 30
152		Not Applicable	8.1%; 15	15.4%; 2	16.7%; 5	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	5.3%; 5	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	8.4%; 8	7.8%; 7
153		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
154		Interpolated Median	1.5	1.8	2.2	1.4	1.3	1.5			1.3	1.8
155	Q17	National origin										
156		Strongly Agree	3.2%; 6	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	18.8%; 3	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	2.2%; 2
157		Agree	5.4%; 10	7.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	4.2%; 4	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	5.6%; 5
158		Neutral	17.2%; 32	30.8%; 4	36.7%; 11	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	13.7%; 13	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	15.8%; 15	17.8%; 16
159		Disagree	24.2%; 45	15.4%; 2	33.3%; 10	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	27.4%; 26	18.8%; 3	22.2%; 4	12.6%; 12	36.7%; 33
160		Strongly Disagree	45.2%; 84	46.2%; 6	16.7%; 5	33.3%; 6	66.7%; 6	50.5%; 48	56.3%; 9	55.6%; 10	57.9%; 55	32.2%; 29
161		Not Applicable	4.8%; 9	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 4	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	3.2%; 3	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	4.2%; 4	5.6%; 5
162		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
163		Interpolated Median	1.6	1.8	2.3	2.7	1.2	1.5			1.3	1.9
164												
165	Q18	Within the past 5 years, due to fear of negative consequences, I have avoided disclosing to my colleagues my...										
166		Age										
167		Strongly Agree	1.6%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	3.2%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	2.2%; 2
168		Agree	10.8%; 20	15.4%; 2	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	11.6%; 11	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	7.4%; 7	14.4%; 13
169		Neutral	12.9%; 24	15.4%; 2	13.3%; 4	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	9.5%; 9	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	12.6%; 12	12.2%; 11
170		Disagree	19.9%; 37	7.7%; 1	40.0%; 12	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	17.9%; 17	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	14.7%; 14	25.6%; 23
171		Strongly Disagree	51.1%; 95	61.5%; 8	33.3%; 10	44.4%; 8	55.6%; 5	54.7%; 52	56.3%; 9	50.0%; 9	61.1%; 58	41.1%; 37
172		Not Applicable	3.8%; 7	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	3.2%; 3	4.4%; 4
173		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
174		Interpolated Median	1.4	1.3	1.8	1.5	1.4	1.4			1.3	1.8
175	Q19	Gender										
176		Strongly Agree	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
177		Agree	1.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	1.1%; 1	1.1%; 1
178		Neutral	15.6%; 29	23.1%; 3	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	12.6%; 12	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	14.7%; 14	15.6%; 14
179		Disagree	23.1%; 43	7.7%; 1	36.7%; 11	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	22.1%; 21	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	14.7%; 14	32.2%; 29
180		Strongly Disagree	55.4%; 103	69.2%; 9	33.3%; 10	50.0%; 9	55.6%; 5	61.1%; 58	62.5%; 10	50.0%; 9	65.3%; 62	45.6%; 41
181		Not Applicable	4.3%; 8	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	4.4%; 4
182		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
183		Interpolated Median	1.4	1.2	1.8	1.4	1.4	1.3			2.2	2.5
184	Q20	Race										
185		Strongly Agree	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
186		Agree	1.6%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	1.1%; 1	2.2%; 2
187		Neutral	17.2%; 32	23.1%; 3	20.0%; 6	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	13.7%; 13	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	14.7%; 14	18.9%; 17
188		Disagree	21.0%; 39	7.7%; 1	40.0%; 12	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	18.9%; 18	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	12.6%; 12	30.0%; 27
189		Strongly Disagree	55.4%; 103	69.2%; 9	30.0%; 9	44.4%; 8	66.7%; 6	62.1%; 59	62.5%; 10	50.0%; 9	65.3%; 62	45.6%; 41
190		Not Applicable	4.3%; 8	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	5.3%; 5	3.3%; 3
191		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
192		Interpolated Median	1.4	1.2	1.9	1.7	1.3	1.3			1.2	1.6

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
193	Q21	Ethnicity										
194		Strongly Agree	1.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	0.0%; 0
195		Agree	2.7%; 5	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	2.2%; 2
196		Neutral	16.1%; 30	15.4%; 2	13.3%; 4	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	15.8%; 15	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	15.8%; 15	16.7%; 15
197		Disagree	21.5%; 40	7.7%; 1	40.0%; 12	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	20.0%; 19	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	10.5%; 10	33.3%; 30
198		Strongly Disagree	53.8%; 100	69.2%; 9	30.0%; 9	44.4%; 8	66.7%; 6	58.9%; 56	62.5%; 10	50.0%; 9	64.2%; 61	43.3%; 39
199		Not Applicable	4.8%; 9	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 3	5.3%; 5	4.4%; 4
200		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
201		Interpolated Median	1.4	1.2	1.9	1.7	1.3	1.3			1.2	1.6
202	Q22	Religion										
203		Strongly Agree	1.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	1.1%; 1
204		Agree	4.3%; 8	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	5.3%; 5	2.2%; 2
205		Neutral	15.1%; 28	15.4%; 2	13.3%; 4	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	14.7%; 14	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	14.7%; 14	15.6%; 14
206		Disagree	21.5%; 40	7.7%; 1	40.0%; 12	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	21.1%; 20	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	12.6%; 12	31.1%; 28
207		Strongly Disagree	52.7%; 98	69.2%; 9	23.3%; 7	55.6%; 10	66.7%; 6	57.9%; 55	62.5%; 10	44.4%; 8	61.1%; 58	44.4%; 40
208		Not Applicable	5.4%; 10	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 4	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 3	5.3%; 5	5.6%; 5
209		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
210		Interpolated Median	1.4	1.2	2.0	1.4	1.3	1.3			1.3	1.6
211	Q23	Sexual orientation										
212		Strongly Agree	2.7%; 5	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	3.2%; 3	2.2%; 2
213		Agree	2.7%; 5	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	2.2%; 2
214		Neutral	15.6%; 29	30.8%; 4	20.0%; 6	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	12.6%; 12	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	14.7%; 14	15.6%; 14
215		Disagree	22.6%; 42	7.7%; 1	40.0%; 12	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	20.0%; 19	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	13.7%; 13	32.2%; 29
216		Strongly Disagree	52.2%; 97	61.5%; 8	26.7%; 8	38.9%; 7	66.7%; 6	58.9%; 56	62.5%; 10	50.0%; 9	61.1%; 58	43.3%; 39
217		Not Applicable	4.3%; 8	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	4.4%; 4
218		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
219		Interpolated Median	1.4	1.3	2.0	1.8	1.3	1.3			1.3	1.6
220	Q24	Disabilities										
221		Strongly Agree	2.7%; 5	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	2.2%; 2
222		Agree	3.8%; 7	7.7%; 1	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	12.5%; 2	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	4.4%; 4
223		Neutral	14.5%; 27	23.1%; 3	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	11.6%; 11	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	15.8%; 15	13.3%; 12
224		Disagree	20.4%; 38	7.7%; 1	33.3%; 10	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	18.9%; 18	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	10.5%; 10	31.1%; 28
225		Strongly Disagree	51.1%; 95	61.5%; 8	26.7%; 8	50.0%; 9	66.7%; 6	55.8%; 53	62.5%; 10	50.0%; 9	60.0%; 57	42.2%; 38
226		Not Applicable	7.5%; 14	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 4	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	8.4%; 8	6.7%; 6
227		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
228		Interpolated Median	1.4	1.3	2.0	1.4	1.3	1.3			1.3	1.6
229	Q25	National origin										
230		Strongly Agree	1.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	0.0%; 0
231		Agree	1.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	1.1%; 1
232		Neutral	14.5%; 27	23.1%; 3	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	12.6%; 12	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	12.6%; 12	15.6%; 14
233		Disagree	23.7%; 44	15.4%; 2	36.7%; 11	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	23.2%; 22	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	12.6%; 12	35.6%; 32
234		Strongly Disagree	53.8%; 100	61.5%; 8	33.3%; 10	44.4%; 8	66.7%; 6	58.9%; 56	62.5%; 10	50.0%; 9	65.3%; 62	42.2%; 38
235		Not Applicable	5.9%; 11	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	6.3%; 1	16.7%; 3	6.3%; 6	5.6%; 5
236		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
237		Interpolated Median	1.4	1.3	1.8	1.5	1.3	1.3			1.2	1.6
238												
239	Q26	I am satisfied with the access I have to senior leadership of CCNY.										
240		Strongly Agree	10.8%; 20	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	12.6%; 12	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	15.8%; 15	5.6%; 5

Appendix E

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
241		Agree	32.8%; 61	61.5%; 8	23.3%; 7	33.3%; 6	11.1%; 1	30.5%; 29	31.3%; 5	33.3%; 6	34.7%; 33	31.1%; 28
242		Neutral	21.0%; 39	23.1%; 3	16.7%; 5	22.2%; 4	33.3%; 3	26.3%; 25	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	21.1%; 20	20.0%; 18
243		Disagree	16.1%; 30	7.7%; 1	23.3%; 7	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	13.7%; 13	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	11.6%; 11	21.1%; 19
244		Strongly Disagree	16.7%; 31	7.7%; 1	30.0%; 9	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	12.6%; 12	12.5%; 2	27.8%; 5	13.7%; 13	20.0%; 18
245		Not Applicable	2.7%; 5	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	2.2%; 2
246		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
247		Interpolated Median	3.3	3.7	2.4	2.9	2.7	3.3			3.6	2.9
248												
249	Q27	I am satisfied with the opportunities I have to offer input on important decisions.										
250		Strongly Agree	9.1%; 17	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	11.6%; 11	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	14.7%; 14	3.3%; 3
251		Agree	28.0%; 52	53.8%; 7	20.0%; 6	33.3%; 6	0.0%; 0	25.3%; 24	18.8%; 3	38.9%; 7	32.6%; 31	23.3%; 21
252		Neutral	18.8%; 35	15.4%; 2	13.3%; 4	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	24.2%; 23	31.3%; 5	5.6%; 1	13.7%; 13	23.3%; 21
253		Disagree	21.5%; 40	7.7%; 1	33.3%; 10	27.8%; 5	33.3%; 3	18.9%; 18	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	17.9%; 17	25.6%; 23
254		Strongly Disagree	22.0%; 41	23.1%; 3	30.0%; 9	22.2%; 4	33.3%; 3	18.9%; 18	18.8%; 3	27.8%; 5	21.1%; 20	23.3%; 21
255		Not Applicable	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
256		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
257		Interpolated Median	2.8	3.6	2.1	2.5	2.0	3.0			3.3	2.5
258												
259	Q28	I am treated with respect by my...										
260		My colleagues										
261		Strongly Agree	32.8%; 61	7.7%; 1	20.0%; 6	38.9%; 7	44.4%; 4	41.1%; 39	37.5%; 6	11.1%; 2	40.0%; 38	25.6%; 23
262		Agree	36.6%; 68	53.8%; 7	40.0%; 12	33.3%; 6	44.4%; 4	33.7%; 32	37.5%; 6	38.9%; 7	35.8%; 34	36.7%; 33
263		Neutral	16.1%; 30	23.1%; 3	23.3%; 7	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	11.6%; 11	12.5%; 2	27.8%; 5	14.7%; 14	17.8%; 16
264		Disagree	9.7%; 18	7.7%; 1	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	10.5%; 10	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	5.3%; 5	14.4%; 13
265		Strongly Disagree	4.3%; 8	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	3.2%; 3	5.6%; 5
266		Not Applicable	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
267		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
268		Interpolated Median	4.0	3.7	3.8	4.2	4.4	4.2			4.2	3.8
269	Q29	My department chair										
270		Strongly Agree	33.3%; 62	23.1%; 3	16.7%; 5	38.9%; 7	22.2%; 2	37.9%; 36	37.5%; 6	33.3%; 6	37.9%; 36	28.9%; 26
271		Agree	29.0%; 54	30.8%; 4	36.7%; 11	16.7%; 3	33.3%; 3	30.5%; 29	31.3%; 5	16.7%; 3	26.3%; 25	31.1%; 28
272		Neutral	12.9%; 24	7.7%; 1	23.3%; 7	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	8.4%; 8	6.3%; 1	27.8%; 5	11.6%; 11	14.4%; 13
273		Disagree	10.2%; 19	30.8%; 4	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	8.4%; 8	6.3%; 1	16.7%; 3	12.6%; 12	7.8%; 7
274		Strongly Disagree	12.9%; 24	7.7%; 1	13.3%; 4	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	14.7%; 14	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	10.5%; 10	15.6%; 14
275		Not Applicable	1.6%; 3	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	2.2%; 2
276		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
277		Interpolated Median	4.0	3.6	3.7	4.0	3.7	4.1			4.1	3.9
278	Q30	My dean										
279		Strongly Agree	31.2%; 58	23.1%; 3	16.7%; 5	38.9%; 7	22.2%; 2	37.9%; 36	37.5%; 6	16.7%; 3	41.1%; 39	21.1%; 19
280		Agree	31.2%; 58	30.8%; 4	26.7%; 8	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	33.7%; 32	25.0%; 4	38.9%; 7	23.2%; 22	38.9%; 35
281		Neutral	19.9%; 37	30.8%; 4	33.3%; 10	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	13.7%; 13	18.8%; 3	33.3%; 6	20.0%; 19	20.0%; 18
282		Disagree	4.3%; 8	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	2.1%; 2	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	3.3%; 3
283		Strongly Disagree	9.1%; 17	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	9.5%; 9	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	8.4%; 8	10.0%; 9
284		Not Applicable	4.3%; 8	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	3.2%; 3	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	6.7%; 6
285		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
286		Interpolated Median	4.0	3.6	3.5	4.4	3.5	4.2			4.2	3.8
287												
288	Q31	My area of research is valued by my colleagues in...										

Appendix E

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
289		My department										
290		Strongly Agree	22.0%; 41	15.4%; 2	13.3%; 4	33.3%; 6	22.2%; 2	25.3%; 24	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	24.2%; 23	20.0%; 18
291		Agree	37.1%; 69	46.2%; 6	43.3%; 13	22.2%; 4	44.4%; 4	35.8%; 34	37.5%; 6	33.3%; 6	38.9%; 37	34.4%; 31
292		Neutral	16.1%; 30	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	17.9%; 17	18.8%; 3	27.8%; 5	14.7%; 14	17.8%; 16
293		Disagree	12.4%; 23	23.1%; 3	23.3%; 7	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	8.4%; 8	6.3%; 1	16.7%; 3	10.5%; 10	14.4%; 13
294		Strongly Disagree	8.1%; 15	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	7.4%; 7	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	7.4%; 7	8.9%; 8
295		Not Applicable	4.3%; 8	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	4.4%; 4
296		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
297		Interpolated Median	3.8	3.8	3.7	4.0	3.9	3.9			3.9	3.7
298	Q32	My school or division										
299		Strongly Agree	13.4%; 25	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	14.7%; 14	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	15.8%; 15	11.1%; 10
300		Agree	32.8%; 61	69.2%; 9	16.7%; 5	27.8%; 5	11.1%; 1	32.6%; 31	31.3%; 5	33.3%; 6	36.8%; 35	28.9%; 26
301		Neutral	24.7%; 46	15.4%; 2	23.3%; 7	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	25.3%; 24	12.5%; 2	38.9%; 7	21.1%; 20	28.9%; 26
302		Disagree	9.7%; 18	15.4%; 2	13.3%; 4	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	10.5%; 10	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	10.5%; 10	7.8%; 7
303		Strongly Disagree	10.2%; 19	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 5	11.1%; 2	33.3%; 3	7.4%; 7	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	9.5%; 9	11.1%; 10
304		Not Applicable	9.1%; 17	0.0%; 0	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	9.5%; 9	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 6	12.2%; 11
305		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
306		Interpolated Median	3.5	3.8	2.9	3.4	2.8	3.6			3.7	3.4
307												
308	Q33	I feel like my input at department meetings is valued.										
309		Strongly Agree	25.3%; 47	15.4%; 2	16.7%; 5	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	31.6%; 30	31.3%; 5	16.7%; 3	32.6%; 31	17.8%; 16
310		Agree	37.6%; 70	38.5%; 5	30.0%; 9	38.9%; 7	33.3%; 3	37.9%; 36	25.0%; 4	55.6%; 10	36.8%; 35	38.9%; 35
311		Neutral	15.1%; 28	15.4%; 2	26.7%; 8	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	11.6%; 11	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	8.4%; 8	21.1%; 19
312		Disagree	10.8%; 20	23.1%; 3	6.7%; 2	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	11.6%; 11	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	10.5%; 10	11.1%; 10
313		Strongly Disagree	9.1%; 17	7.7%; 1	16.7%; 5	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	7.4%; 7	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	9.5%; 9	8.9%; 8
314		Not Applicable	2.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	2.2%; 2
315		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
316		Interpolated Median	3.9	3.6	3.4	3.9	3.8	4.0			4.1	3.7
317												
318	Q34	I am satisfied with the campus environment regarding diversity.										
319		Strongly Agree	21.0%; 39	15.4%; 2	6.7%; 2	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	26.3%; 25	31.3%; 5	22.2%; 4	32.6%; 31	8.9%; 8
320		Agree	34.4%; 64	38.5%; 5	23.3%; 7	44.4%; 8	55.6%; 5	34.7%; 33	37.5%; 6	38.9%; 7	29.5%; 28	40.0%; 36
321		Neutral	17.2%; 32	15.4%; 2	16.7%; 5	27.8%; 5	11.1%; 1	18.9%; 18	6.3%; 1	16.7%; 3	14.7%; 14	18.9%; 17
322		Disagree	12.4%; 23	23.1%; 3	23.3%; 7	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	7.4%; 7	6.3%; 1	16.7%; 3	12.6%; 12	12.2%; 11
323		Strongly Disagree	12.4%; 23	7.7%; 1	30.0%; 9	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	7.4%; 7	18.8%; 3	5.6%; 1	8.4%; 8	16.7%; 15
324		Not Applicable	2.7%; 5	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	3.3%; 3
325		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
326		Interpolated Median	3.7	3.6	2.4	3.4	3.8	3.9			3.9	3.5
327												
328	Q35	Cultural differences are valued at CCNY.										
329		Strongly Agree	27.4%; 51	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	5.6%; 1	22.2%; 2	33.7%; 32	31.3%; 5	33.3%; 6	37.9%; 36	16.7%; 15
330		Agree	35.5%; 66	30.8%; 4	23.3%; 7	55.6%; 10	66.7%; 6	36.8%; 35	43.8%; 7	33.3%; 6	30.5%; 29	41.1%; 37
331		Neutral	17.2%; 32	23.1%; 3	23.3%; 7	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	13.7%; 13	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	14.7%; 14	18.9%; 17
332		Disagree	7.5%; 14	23.1%; 3	16.7%; 5	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	8.4%; 8	6.7%; 6
333		Strongly Disagree	7.5%; 14	0.0%; 0	20.0%; 6	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	6.3%; 6	8.9%; 8
334		Not Applicable	4.8%; 9	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	7.4%; 7	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	7.8%; 7
335		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
336		Interpolated Median	3.9	3.6	2.9	3.8	4.1	4.2			4.1	3.8

Appendix E

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
337												
338	Q36	Senior leadership at CCNY fosters respect and support for diversity.										
339		Strongly Agree	22.0%; 41	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	27.4%; 26	25.0%; 4	22.2%; 4	27.4%; 26	16.7%; 15
340		Agree	30.1%; 56	38.5%; 5	16.7%; 5	33.3%; 6	33.3%; 3	34.7%; 33	25.0%; 4	27.8%; 5	30.5%; 29	30.0%; 27
341		Neutral	19.4%; 36	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	15.8%; 15	18.8%; 3	27.8%; 5	14.7%; 14	24.4%; 22
342		Disagree	11.8%; 22	38.5%; 5	20.0%; 6	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	7.4%; 7	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	10.5%; 10	12.2%; 11
343		Strongly Disagree	10.2%; 19	0.0%; 0	26.7%; 8	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	10.5%; 10	10.0%; 9
344		Not Applicable	6.5%; 12	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	0.0%; 0	22.2%; 2	9.5%; 9	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	6.3%; 6	6.7%; 6
345		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
346		Interpolated Median	3.7	3.3	2.5	3.3	4.0	4.0			3.9	3.5
347												
348	Q37	Senior leadership at CCNY has made an effort to develop minority faculty for leadership positions.										
349		Strongly Agree	17.7%; 33	15.4%; 2	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	22.1%; 21	12.5%; 2	27.8%; 5	18.9%; 18	16.7%; 15
350		Agree	19.9%; 37	23.1%; 3	13.3%; 4	5.6%; 1	33.3%; 3	23.2%; 22	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	21.1%; 20	17.8%; 16
351		Neutral	15.6%; 29	15.4%; 2	10.0%; 3	27.8%; 5	0.0%; 0	17.9%; 17	0.0%; 0	22.2%; 4	17.9%; 17	13.3%; 12
352		Disagree	13.4%; 25	23.1%; 3	13.3%; 4	33.3%; 6	11.1%; 1	10.5%; 10	25.0%; 4	5.6%; 1	7.4%; 7	20.0%; 18
353		Strongly Disagree	17.7%; 33	15.4%; 2	56.7%; 17	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	5.3%; 5	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	16.8%; 16	18.9%; 17
354		Not Applicable	15.6%; 29	7.7%; 1	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	33.3%; 3	21.1%; 20	31.3%; 5	5.6%; 1	17.9%; 17	13.3%; 12
355		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
356		Interpolated Median	3.2	3.0	1.4	2.5	3.8	3.8			3.4	2.8
357												
358	Q38	Senior leadership at CCNY has made an effort to develop women faculty for leadership positions.										
359		Strongly Agree	18.3%; 34	23.1%; 3	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	18.9%; 18	25.0%; 4	33.3%; 6	25.3%; 24	11.1%; 10
360		Agree	23.7%; 44	30.8%; 4	26.7%; 8	33.3%; 6	22.2%; 2	21.1%; 20	12.5%; 2	27.8%; 5	27.4%; 26	20.0%; 18
361		Neutral	20.4%; 38	15.4%; 2	16.7%; 5	27.8%; 5	11.1%; 1	26.3%; 25	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	18.9%; 18	21.1%; 19
362		Disagree	12.9%; 24	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	11.6%; 11	25.0%; 4	5.6%; 1	7.4%; 7	18.9%; 17
363		Strongly Disagree	11.3%; 21	7.7%; 1	26.7%; 8	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	5.3%; 5	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	6.3%; 6	16.7%; 15
364		Not Applicable	13.4%; 25	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	33.3%; 3	16.8%; 16	25.0%; 4	5.6%; 1	14.7%; 14	12.2%; 11
365		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
366		Interpolated Median	3.4	3.8	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.4			3.9	2.9
367												
368	Q39	Expectations for my performance are clearly communicated by...										
369		My department chair										
370		Strongly Agree	22.6%; 42	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	33.3%; 6	11.1%; 1	24.2%; 23	25.0%; 4	33.3%; 6	26.3%; 25	18.9%; 17
371		Agree	29.0%; 54	53.8%; 7	20.0%; 6	11.1%; 2	55.6%; 5	30.5%; 29	31.3%; 5	16.7%; 3	27.4%; 26	30.0%; 27
372		Neutral	17.7%; 33	0.0%; 0	30.0%; 9	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	16.8%; 16	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	15.8%; 15	20.0%; 18
373		Disagree	15.6%; 29	30.8%; 4	23.3%; 7	27.8%; 5	11.1%; 1	12.6%; 12	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	14.7%; 14	16.7%; 15
374		Strongly Disagree	12.9%; 24	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 5	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	13.7%; 13	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	13.7%; 13	12.2%; 11
375		Not Applicable	2.2%; 4	7.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	2.2%; 2
376		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
377		Interpolated Median	3.6	3.8	2.8	3.3	3.8	3.7			3.7	3.5
378	Q40	My dean or division head										
379		Strongly Agree	15.1%; 28	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	20.0%; 19	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	18.9%; 18	11.1%; 10
380		Agree	29.0%; 54	46.2%; 6	23.3%; 7	33.3%; 6	22.2%; 2	27.4%; 26	31.3%; 5	27.8%; 5	31.6%; 30	25.6%; 23
381		Neutral	25.3%; 47	23.1%; 3	40.0%; 12	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	22.1%; 21	25.0%; 4	33.3%; 6	21.1%; 20	30.0%; 27
382		Disagree	15.1%; 28	23.1%; 3	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	14.7%; 14	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	13.7%; 13	16.7%; 15
383		Strongly Disagree	10.8%; 20	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 4	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	10.5%; 10	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	9.5%; 9	12.2%; 11
384		Not Applicable	4.8%; 9	7.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	5.3%; 5	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	4.4%; 4

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
385		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
386		Interpolated Median	3.4	3.5	2.9	3.7	2.5	3.5			3.6	3.1
387												
388	Q41	I think I do a significant amount of student mentoring that is not formally recognized by the tenu										
389		Strongly Agree	38.7%; 72	15.4%; 2	40.0%; 12	38.9%; 7	66.7%; 6	43.2%; 41	43.8%; 7	33.3%; 6	30.5%; 29	47.8%; 43
390		Agree	29.0%; 54	46.2%; 6	30.0%; 9	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	26.3%; 25	25.0%; 4	33.3%; 6	31.6%; 30	26.7%; 24
391		Neutral	17.7%; 33	23.1%; 3	20.0%; 6	27.8%; 5	11.1%; 1	13.7%; 13	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	18.9%; 18	15.6%; 14
392		Disagree	8.1%; 15	15.4%; 2	3.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	9.5%; 9	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	11.6%; 11	4.4%; 4
393		Strongly Disagree	2.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	2.2%; 2
394		Not Applicable	4.3%; 8	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	5.3%; 5	3.3%; 3
395		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
396		Interpolated Median	4.2	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.8	4.3			4.0	4.5
397												
398	Q42	I think I do a significant amount of service on committees that is not formally recognized by the										
399		Strongly Agree	31.7%; 59	23.1%; 3	40.0%; 12	44.4%; 8	55.6%; 5	28.4%; 27	37.5%; 6	38.9%; 7	27.4%; 26	36.7%; 33
400		Agree	22.6%; 42	30.8%; 4	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	23.2%; 22	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	23.2%; 22	22.2%; 20
401		Neutral	23.7%; 44	38.5%; 5	23.3%; 7	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	20.0%; 19	12.5%; 2	38.9%; 7	26.3%; 25	20.0%; 18
402		Disagree	12.9%; 24	7.7%; 1	3.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	18.9%; 18	18.8%; 3	0.0%; 0	13.7%; 13	12.2%; 11
403		Strongly Disagree	3.2%; 6	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	4.4%; 4
404		Not Applicable	5.9%; 11	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	5.3%; 5	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	7.4%; 7	4.4%; 4
405		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
406		Interpolated Median	3.8	3.6	4.1	4.6	4.7	3.7			3.7	4.0
407												
408	Q43	I believe underrepresented faculty face a greater service load than do non-minority faculty.										
409		Strongly Agree	16.1%; 30	7.7%; 1	20.0%; 6	38.9%; 7	11.1%; 1	7.4%; 7	12.5%; 2	38.9%; 7	10.5%; 10	22.2%; 20
410		Agree	11.8%; 22	0.0%; 0	36.7%; 11	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	8.4%; 8	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	8.4%; 8	15.6%; 14
411		Neutral	16.7%; 31	38.5%; 5	20.0%; 6	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	13.7%; 13	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	16.8%; 16	15.6%; 14
412		Disagree	15.6%; 29	30.8%; 4	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	17.9%; 17	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	15.8%; 15	15.6%; 14
413		Strongly Disagree	18.8%; 35	15.4%; 2	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	33.3%; 3	25.3%; 24	6.3%; 1	27.8%; 5	30.5%; 29	6.7%; 6
414		Not Applicable	21.0%; 39	7.7%; 1	13.3%; 4	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	27.4%; 26	31.3%; 5	11.1%; 2	17.9%; 17	24.4%; 22
415		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
416		Interpolated Median	2.8	2.5	3.9	4.5	2.0	2.1			2.2	3.5
417												
418	Q44	I believe female faculty face a greater service load than do male faculty.										
419		Strongly Agree	17.2%; 32	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	22.2%; 4	44.4%; 4	17.9%; 17	12.5%; 2	27.8%; 5	5.3%; 5	30.0%; 27
420		Agree	15.1%; 28	7.7%; 1	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	15.8%; 15	18.8%; 3	0.0%; 0	9.5%; 9	21.1%; 19
421		Neutral	17.7%; 33	30.8%; 4	36.7%; 11	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	11.6%; 11	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	17.9%; 17	16.7%; 15
422		Disagree	13.4%; 25	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	12.6%; 12	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	16.8%; 16	10.0%; 9
423		Strongly Disagree	19.4%; 36	30.8%; 4	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	22.1%; 21	6.3%; 1	33.3%; 6	34.7%; 33	3.3%; 3
424		Not Applicable	17.2%; 32	7.7%; 1	16.7%; 5	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	20.0%; 19	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	15.8%; 15	18.9%; 17
425		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
426		Interpolated Median	3.0	2.2	3.2	3.5	4.5	3.0			1.9	4.0
427												
428	Q45	I am satisfied with the efforts search committees in my department have made to develop racially a										
429		Strongly Agree	22.0%; 41	15.4%; 2	13.3%; 4	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	28.4%; 27	12.5%; 2	33.3%; 6	27.4%; 26	16.7%; 15
430		Agree	25.3%; 47	23.1%; 3	6.7%; 2	16.7%; 3	44.4%; 4	31.6%; 30	31.3%; 5	22.2%; 4	28.4%; 27	22.2%; 20
431		Neutral	12.4%; 23	15.4%; 2	13.3%; 4	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	10.5%; 10	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	10.5%; 10	14.4%; 13
432		Disagree	16.1%; 30	23.1%; 3	16.7%; 5	38.9%; 7	22.2%; 2	9.5%; 9	25.0%; 4	16.7%; 3	12.6%; 12	18.9%; 17

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
433		Strongly Disagree	18.8%; 35	23.1%; 3	50.0%; 15	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	11.6%; 11	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	16.8%; 16	21.1%; 19
434		Not Applicable	5.4%; 10	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	8.4%; 8	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	6.7%; 6
435		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
436		Interpolated Median	3.5	2.8	1.5	2.4	3.6	4.0			3.8	3.0
437												
438	Q46	I am satisfied with the efforts search committees in my department have made to develop gender div										
439		Strongly Agree	22.0%; 41	15.4%; 2	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	30.5%; 29	18.8%; 3	27.8%; 5	28.4%; 27	15.6%; 14
440		Agree	26.9%; 50	23.1%; 3	20.0%; 6	33.3%; 6	33.3%; 3	25.3%; 24	37.5%; 6	33.3%; 6	28.4%; 27	25.6%; 23
441		Neutral	20.4%; 38	23.1%; 3	33.3%; 10	33.3%; 6	11.1%; 1	16.8%; 16	18.8%; 3	5.6%; 1	18.9%; 18	22.2%; 20
442		Disagree	12.4%; 23	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	11.6%; 11	6.3%; 1	27.8%; 5	10.5%; 10	13.3%; 12
443		Strongly Disagree	11.3%; 21	15.4%; 2	23.3%; 7	5.6%; 1	22.2%; 2	6.3%; 6	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	9.5%; 9	13.3%; 12
444		Not Applicable	7.0%; 13	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	9.5%; 9	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	10.0%; 9
445		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
446		Interpolated Median	3.6	3.0	2.9	3.6	3.5	3.9			3.8	3.3
447												
448	Q47	I believe my department actively recruits faculty of color.										
449		Strongly Agree	24.7%; 46	15.4%; 2	10.0%; 3	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	32.6%; 31	12.5%; 2	33.3%; 6	28.4%; 27	21.1%; 19
450		Agree	19.9%; 37	23.1%; 3	13.3%; 4	16.7%; 3	44.4%; 4	22.1%; 21	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	24.2%; 23	15.6%; 14
451		Neutral	11.3%; 21	7.7%; 1	3.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	12.6%; 12	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	9.5%; 9	13.3%; 12
452		Disagree	18.8%; 35	46.2%; 6	20.0%; 6	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	13.7%; 13	25.0%; 4	16.7%; 3	13.7%; 13	23.3%; 21
453		Strongly Disagree	18.3%; 34	7.7%; 1	53.3%; 16	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	7.4%; 7	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	18.9%; 18	17.8%; 16
454		Not Applicable	7.0%; 13	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	11.6%; 11	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	8.9%; 8
455		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
456		Interpolated Median	3.3	2.4	1.4	2.4	3.8	4.0			3.7	2.8
457												
458	Q48	I believe my department actively recruits female faculty.										
459		Strongly Agree	24.7%; 46	15.4%; 2	10.0%; 3	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	29.5%; 28	25.0%; 4	38.9%; 7	31.6%; 30	17.8%; 16
460		Agree	26.3%; 49	30.8%; 4	33.3%; 10	27.8%; 5	33.3%; 3	24.2%; 23	25.0%; 4	22.2%; 4	32.6%; 31	20.0%; 18
461		Neutral	18.3%; 34	38.5%; 5	16.7%; 5	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	16.8%; 16	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	14.7%; 14	21.1%; 19
462		Disagree	12.4%; 23	7.7%; 1	13.3%; 4	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	12.6%; 12	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	9.5%; 9	15.6%; 14
463		Strongly Disagree	10.2%; 19	7.7%; 1	20.0%; 6	0.0%; 0	22.2%; 2	6.3%; 6	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	7.4%; 7	13.3%; 12
464		Not Applicable	8.1%; 15	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	10.5%; 10	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	12.2%; 11
465		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
466		Interpolated Median	3.7	3.4	3.3	3.9	3.5	3.9			4.0	3.2
467												
468	Q49	I believe that underrepresented minorities have to meet higher standards for hiring than non-minor										
469		Strongly Agree	7.5%; 14	0.0%; 0	30.0%; 9	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	10.0%; 9
470		Agree	15.1%; 28	15.4%; 2	33.3%; 10	38.9%; 7	11.1%; 1	5.3%; 5	25.0%; 4	5.6%; 1	13.7%; 13	16.7%; 15
471		Neutral	15.6%; 29	30.8%; 4	10.0%; 3	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	12.6%; 12	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	13.7%; 13	17.8%; 16
472		Disagree	22.6%; 42	15.4%; 2	13.3%; 4	5.6%; 1	44.4%; 4	29.5%; 28	31.3%; 5	16.7%; 3	21.1%; 20	24.4%; 22
473		Strongly Disagree	32.8%; 61	38.5%; 5	13.3%; 4	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	40.0%; 38	18.8%; 3	50.0%; 9	45.3%; 43	20.0%; 18
474		Not Applicable	6.5%; 12	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	9.5%; 9	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	11.1%; 10
475		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
476		Interpolated Median	2.1	2.3	3.9	3.5	2.0	1.7			1.7	2.5
477												
478	Q50	I believe that female applicants have to meet higher standards for hiring than male applicants.										
479		Strongly Agree	4.8%; 9	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 4	5.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	1.1%; 1	8.9%; 8
480		Agree	12.9%; 24	0.0%; 0	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	10.5%; 10	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	9.5%; 9	16.7%; 15

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
481		Neutral	19.9%; 37	46.2%; 6	30.0%; 9	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	13.7%; 13	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	17.9%; 17	21.1%; 19
482		Disagree	24.2%; 45	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	33.3%; 3	28.4%; 27	25.0%; 4	16.7%; 3	24.2%; 23	24.4%; 22
483		Strongly Disagree	30.6%; 57	38.5%; 5	10.0%; 3	22.2%; 4	33.3%; 3	34.7%; 33	18.8%; 3	55.6%; 10	45.3%; 43	15.6%; 14
484		Not Applicable	7.5%; 14	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	8.4%; 8	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	13.3%; 12
485		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
486		Interpolated Median	2.1	2.3	3.1	2.6	1.8	1.9			1.7	2.7
487												
488	Q51	I understand/understood the criteria for achieving tenure or CCE.										
489		Strongly Agree	17.7%; 33	7.7%; 1	16.7%; 5	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	21.1%; 20	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	21.1%; 20	14.4%; 13
490		Agree	41.9%; 78	53.8%; 7	40.0%; 12	27.8%; 5	33.3%; 3	43.2%; 41	43.8%; 7	38.9%; 7	41.1%; 39	43.3%; 39
491		Neutral	14.5%; 27	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	11.6%; 11	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	14.7%; 14	14.4%; 13
492		Disagree	10.8%; 20	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	10.5%; 10	12.5%; 2	0.0%; 0	9.5%; 9	11.1%; 10
493		Strongly Disagree	9.1%; 17	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	8.4%; 8	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	8.4%; 8	10.0%; 9
494		Not Applicable	5.9%; 11	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	5.3%; 5	12.5%; 2	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	6.7%; 6
495		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
496		Interpolated Median	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.9			3.9	3.8
497												
498	Q52	I receive/received helpful feedback from my chair on my progress toward tenure or CCE.										
499		Strongly Agree	17.2%; 32	15.4%; 2	10.0%; 3	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	20.0%; 19	25.0%; 4	16.7%; 3	17.9%; 17	16.7%; 15
500		Agree	30.1%; 56	30.8%; 4	16.7%; 5	33.3%; 6	33.3%; 3	30.5%; 29	37.5%; 6	27.8%; 5	32.6%; 31	27.8%; 25
501		Neutral	21.0%; 39	15.4%; 2	36.7%; 11	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	16.8%; 16	18.8%; 3	22.2%; 4	20.0%; 19	21.1%; 19
502		Disagree	9.1%; 17	15.4%; 2	10.0%; 3	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	9.5%; 9	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	6.3%; 6	12.2%; 11
503		Strongly Disagree	13.4%; 25	15.4%; 2	16.7%; 5	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	14.7%; 14	6.3%; 1	16.7%; 3	13.7%; 13	13.3%; 12
504		Not Applicable	9.1%; 17	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	8.4%; 8	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	9.5%; 9	8.9%; 8
505		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
506		Interpolated Median	3.6	3.5	3.0	3.7	3.8	3.7			3.7	3.4
507												
508	Q53	In my department, the requirements for tenure or CCE are uniformly applied regardless of a faculty member's...										
509		Age										
510		Strongly Agree	26.9%; 50	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	27.8%; 5	33.3%; 3	33.7%; 32	31.3%; 5	27.8%; 5	30.5%; 29	23.3%; 21
511		Agree	30.1%; 56	38.5%; 5	26.7%; 8	22.2%; 4	33.3%; 3	27.4%; 26	25.0%; 4	38.9%; 7	33.7%; 32	26.7%; 24
512		Neutral	16.7%; 31	7.7%; 1	33.3%; 10	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	14.7%; 14	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 3	12.6%; 12	20.0%; 18
513		Disagree	3.8%; 7	7.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	3.3%; 3
514		Strongly Disagree	4.3%; 8	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	4.4%; 4
515		Not Applicable	18.3%; 34	15.4%; 2	23.3%; 7	33.3%; 6	11.1%; 1	17.9%; 17	25.0%; 4	5.6%; 1	14.7%; 14	22.2%; 20
516		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
517		Interpolated Median	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.3	4.2	4.2			4.1	3.9
518	Q54	Gender										
519		Strongly Agree	28.0%; 52	23.1%; 3	13.3%; 4	27.8%; 5	55.6%; 5	33.7%; 32	31.3%; 5	27.8%; 5	32.6%; 31	23.3%; 21
520		Agree	28.0%; 52	46.2%; 6	23.3%; 7	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	26.3%; 25	18.8%; 3	33.3%; 6	30.5%; 29	25.6%; 23
521		Neutral	10.2%; 19	0.0%; 0	20.0%; 6	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	9.5%; 9	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	8.4%; 8	11.1%; 10
522		Disagree	11.3%; 21	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	11.6%; 11	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	7.4%; 7	15.6%; 14
523		Strongly Disagree	7.0%; 13	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	5.3%; 5	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	7.4%; 7	6.7%; 6
524		Not Applicable	15.6%; 29	15.4%; 2	23.3%; 7	27.8%; 5	0.0%; 0	13.7%; 13	25.0%; 4	5.6%; 1	13.7%; 13	17.8%; 16
525		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
526		Interpolated Median	4.0	4.1	3.4	4.0	4.6	4.1			4.2	3.8
527	Q55	Race										
528		Strongly Agree	28.0%; 52	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	22.2%; 4	44.4%; 4	35.8%; 34	25.0%; 4	27.8%; 5	32.6%; 31	23.3%; 21

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
529		Agree	24.2%; 45	46.2%; 6	16.7%; 5	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	24.2%; 23	18.8%; 3	27.8%; 5	26.3%; 25	22.2%; 20
530		Neutral	12.4%; 23	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 5	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	11.6%; 11	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	10.5%; 10	13.3%; 12
531		Disagree	7.0%; 13	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	6.3%; 6	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	5.3%; 5	8.9%; 8
532		Strongly Disagree	10.8%; 20	7.7%; 1	26.7%; 8	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	5.3%; 5	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	11.6%; 11	10.0%; 9
533		Not Applicable	17.7%; 33	15.4%; 2	23.3%; 7	33.3%; 6	0.0%; 0	16.8%; 16	31.3%; 5	5.6%; 1	13.7%; 13	22.2%; 20
534		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
535		Interpolated Median	4.0	4.1	2.8	3.8	4.0	4.3			4.1	3.8
536	Q56	Ethnicity										
537		Strongly Agree	28.0%; 52	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	22.2%; 4	44.4%; 4	35.8%; 34	31.3%; 5	27.8%; 5	32.6%; 31	23.3%; 21
538		Agree	25.3%; 47	46.2%; 6	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	23.2%; 22	18.8%; 3	33.3%; 6	28.4%; 27	22.2%; 20
539		Neutral	15.1%; 28	0.0%; 0	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	13.7%; 13	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	11.6%; 11	17.8%; 16
540		Disagree	3.8%; 7	7.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	3.3%; 3
541		Strongly Disagree	9.1%; 17	7.7%; 1	26.7%; 8	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	3.2%; 3	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	9.5%; 9	8.9%; 8
542		Not Applicable	18.8%; 35	15.4%; 2	23.3%; 7	27.8%; 5	0.0%; 0	18.9%; 18	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	13.7%; 13	24.4%; 22
543		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
544		Interpolated Median	4.0	4.1	3.1	3.7	4.3	4.3			4.1	3.9
545	Q57	Religion										
546		Strongly Agree	30.1%; 56	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	27.8%; 5	55.6%; 5	37.9%; 36	37.5%; 6	27.8%; 5	34.7%; 33	25.6%; 23
547		Agree	25.8%; 48	46.2%; 6	23.3%; 7	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	22.1%; 21	18.8%; 3	38.9%; 7	26.3%; 25	25.6%; 23
548		Neutral	16.7%; 31	7.7%; 1	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	16.8%; 16	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	13.7%; 13	18.9%; 17
549		Disagree	2.2%; 4	7.7%; 1	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	1.1%; 1
550		Strongly Disagree	2.7%; 5	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	3.2%; 3	2.2%; 2
551		Not Applicable	22.6%; 42	15.4%; 2	33.3%; 10	38.9%; 7	11.1%; 1	21.1%; 20	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	18.9%; 18	26.7%; 24
552		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
553		Interpolated Median	4.2	4.1	3.5	4.3	4.7	4.4			4.3	4.1
554	Q58	Sexual orientation										
555		Strongly Agree	29.6%; 55	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	27.8%; 5	55.6%; 5	37.9%; 36	37.5%; 6	27.8%; 5	33.7%; 32	25.6%; 23
556		Agree	26.3%; 49	46.2%; 6	23.3%; 7	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	23.2%; 22	18.8%; 3	38.9%; 7	27.4%; 26	25.6%; 23
557		Neutral	14.5%; 27	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	12.6%; 12	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	12.6%; 12	15.6%; 14
558		Disagree	2.7%; 5	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	3.3%; 3
559		Strongly Disagree	4.3%; 8	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 4	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	5.3%; 5	3.3%; 3
560		Not Applicable	22.6%; 42	15.4%; 2	33.3%; 10	38.9%; 7	11.1%; 1	21.1%; 20	25.0%; 4	5.6%; 1	18.9%; 18	26.7%; 24
561		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
562		Interpolated Median	4.2	4.1	3.5	4.3	4.7	4.4			4.3	4.1
563	Q59	Disabilities										
564		Strongly Agree	28.5%; 53	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	27.8%; 5	55.6%; 5	35.8%; 34	31.3%; 5	27.8%; 5	31.6%; 30	25.6%; 23
565		Agree	25.3%; 47	46.2%; 6	23.3%; 7	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	21.1%; 20	18.8%; 3	38.9%; 7	25.3%; 24	25.6%; 23
566		Neutral	14.5%; 27	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	11.6%; 11	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	14.7%; 14	13.3%; 12
567		Disagree	3.2%; 6	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	4.4%; 4
568		Strongly Disagree	4.3%; 8	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 4	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	4.4%; 4
569		Not Applicable	24.2%; 45	15.4%; 2	33.3%; 10	38.9%; 7	11.1%; 1	24.2%; 23	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	22.1%; 21	26.7%; 24
570		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
571		Interpolated Median	4.1	4.1	3.5	4.3	4.7	4.4			4.2	4.1
572	Q60	National origin										
573		Strongly Agree	27.4%; 51	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	22.2%; 4	44.4%; 4	35.8%; 34	25.0%; 4	27.8%; 5	33.7%; 32	21.1%; 19
574		Agree	26.9%; 50	46.2%; 6	20.0%; 6	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	24.2%; 23	18.8%; 3	38.9%; 7	28.4%; 27	25.6%; 23
575		Neutral	16.7%; 31	0.0%; 0	26.7%; 8	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	16.8%; 16	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	10.5%; 10	22.2%; 20
576		Disagree	4.3%; 8	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 6	2.2%; 2

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
577		Strongly Disagree	5.4%; 10	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	2.1%; 2	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	6.3%; 6	4.4%; 4
578		Not Applicable	19.4%; 36	15.4%; 2	23.3%; 7	33.3%; 6	0.0%; 0	18.9%; 18	31.3%; 5	11.1%; 2	14.7%; 14	24.4%; 22
579		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
580		Interpolated Median	4.0	4.1	3.2	4.0	4.3	4.3			4.2	3.8
581												
582	Q61	I think I have to/had to meet a higher standard for tenure or CCE than do/did other colleagues in										
583		Strongly Agree	14.0%; 26	7.7%; 1	23.3%; 7	33.3%; 6	22.2%; 2	7.4%; 7	18.8%; 3	27.8%; 5	13.7%; 13	14.4%; 13
584		Agree	15.6%; 29	23.1%; 3	20.0%; 6	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	14.7%; 14	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	16.8%; 16	14.4%; 13
585		Neutral	14.0%; 26	23.1%; 3	16.7%; 5	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	13.7%; 13	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	11.6%; 11	15.6%; 14
586		Disagree	25.3%; 47	23.1%; 3	13.3%; 4	22.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	27.4%; 26	31.3%; 5	33.3%; 6	22.1%; 21	28.9%; 26
587		Strongly Disagree	16.1%; 30	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	22.2%; 2	22.1%; 21	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	24.2%; 23	7.8%; 7
588		Not Applicable	15.1%; 28	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	11.1%; 2	33.3%; 3	14.7%; 14	18.8%; 3	5.6%; 1	11.6%; 11	18.9%; 17
589		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
590		Interpolated Median	2.6	3.0	3.7	3.5	3.5	2.3			2.4	2.8
591												
592	Q62	I understand/understood the criteria for achieving promotion.										
593		Strongly Agree	15.6%; 29	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	5.6%; 1	22.2%; 2	16.8%; 16	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	22.1%; 21	8.9%; 8
594		Agree	40.9%; 76	53.8%; 7	23.3%; 7	50.0%; 9	22.2%; 2	42.1%; 40	43.8%; 7	38.9%; 7	37.9%; 36	44.4%; 40
595		Neutral	14.0%; 26	7.7%; 1	16.7%; 5	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	11.6%; 11	6.3%; 1	27.8%; 5	14.7%; 14	13.3%; 12
596		Disagree	12.9%; 24	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	33.3%; 3	10.5%; 10	18.8%; 3	5.6%; 1	8.4%; 8	16.7%; 15
597		Strongly Disagree	9.7%; 18	7.7%; 1	16.7%; 5	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	8.4%; 8	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	11.6%; 11	7.8%; 7
598		Not Applicable	7.0%; 13	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	10.5%; 10	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	8.9%; 8
599		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
600		Interpolated Median	3.7	3.9	3.2	3.6	3.0	3.8			3.8	3.7
601												
602	Q63	I receive/received helpful feedback from my chair on my progress toward promotion.										
603		Strongly Agree	13.4%; 25	15.4%; 2	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	15.8%; 15	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	16.8%; 16	10.0%; 9
604		Agree	25.3%; 47	30.8%; 4	20.0%; 6	27.8%; 5	11.1%; 1	26.3%; 25	31.3%; 5	16.7%; 3	28.4%; 27	22.2%; 20
605		Neutral	22.6%; 42	7.7%; 1	30.0%; 9	16.7%; 3	33.3%; 3	20.0%; 19	12.5%; 2	33.3%; 6	22.1%; 21	23.3%; 21
606		Disagree	11.8%; 22	23.1%; 3	13.3%; 4	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	10.5%; 10	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	7.4%; 7	15.6%; 14
607		Strongly Disagree	16.1%; 30	15.4%; 2	23.3%; 7	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	16.8%; 16	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	15.8%; 15	16.7%; 15
608		Not Applicable	10.8%; 20	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	10.5%; 10	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	9.5%; 9	12.2%; 11
609		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
610		Interpolated Median	3.2	3.5	2.8	3.2	2.8	3.4			3.5	3.0
611												
612	Q64	The requirements for promotion are clearly articulated in my department.										
613		Strongly Agree	10.8%; 20	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	14.7%; 14	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	16.8%; 16	4.4%; 4
614		Agree	26.9%; 50	53.8%; 7	16.7%; 5	33.3%; 6	11.1%; 1	25.3%; 24	37.5%; 6	22.2%; 4	24.2%; 23	30.0%; 27
615		Neutral	16.1%; 30	0.0%; 0	23.3%; 7	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	15.8%; 15	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	17.9%; 17	14.4%; 13
616		Disagree	21.0%; 39	23.1%; 3	20.0%; 6	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	18.9%; 18	12.5%; 2	27.8%; 5	17.9%; 17	23.3%; 21
617		Strongly Disagree	19.4%; 36	23.1%; 3	33.3%; 10	22.2%; 4	33.3%; 3	17.9%; 17	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	18.9%; 18	20.0%; 18
618		Not Applicable	5.9%; 11	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	7.4%; 7	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	7.8%; 7
619		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
620		Interpolated Median	2.9	3.6	2.3	2.4	2.0	3.1			3.1	2.7
621												
622	Q65	In my department, the requirements for promotion are uniformly applied regardless of a faculty member's...										
623		Age										
624		Strongly Agree	25.8%; 48	23.1%; 3	6.7%; 2	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	31.6%; 30	37.5%; 6	27.8%; 5	30.5%; 29	21.1%; 19

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
625		Agree	23.7%; 44	38.5%; 5	23.3%; 7	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	21.1%; 20	12.5%; 2	27.8%; 5	27.4%; 26	20.0%; 18
626		Neutral	14.5%; 27	7.7%; 1	26.7%; 8	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	11.6%; 11	6.3%; 1	16.7%; 3	13.7%; 13	14.4%; 13
627		Disagree	5.4%; 10	7.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	7.4%; 7	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	6.7%; 6
628		Strongly Disagree	4.3%; 8	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	5.6%; 5
629		Not Applicable	26.3%; 49	15.4%; 2	33.3%; 10	33.3%; 6	33.3%; 3	26.3%; 25	31.3%; 5	22.2%; 4	21.1%; 20	32.2%; 29
630		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
631		Interpolated Median	4.0	4.0	3.4	4.2	4.0	4.3			4.2	3.9
632		Q66 Gender										
633		Strongly Agree	26.3%; 49	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	30.5%; 29	43.8%; 7	27.8%; 5	33.7%; 32	18.9%; 17
634		Agree	22.6%; 42	46.2%; 6	16.7%; 5	5.6%; 1	22.2%; 2	21.1%; 20	18.8%; 3	27.8%; 5	26.3%; 25	18.9%; 17
635		Neutral	11.3%; 21	7.7%; 1	16.7%; 5	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	12.6%; 12	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	10.5%; 10	11.1%; 10
636		Disagree	10.2%; 19	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	11.6%; 11	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	7.4%; 7	13.3%; 12
637		Strongly Disagree	7.0%; 13	7.7%; 1	16.7%; 5	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	3.2%; 3	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	6.3%; 6	7.8%; 7
638		Not Applicable	22.6%; 42	15.4%; 2	33.3%; 10	38.9%; 7	22.2%; 2	21.1%; 20	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	15.8%; 15	30.0%; 27
639		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
640		Interpolated Median	4.0	4.1	3.1	4.0	3.8	4.1			4.2	3.6
641		Q67 Race										
642		Strongly Agree	27.4%; 51	23.1%; 3	6.7%; 2	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	33.7%; 32	43.8%; 7	27.8%; 5	33.7%; 32	21.1%; 19
643		Agree	18.8%; 35	46.2%; 6	13.3%; 4	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	18.9%; 18	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	22.1%; 21	15.6%; 14
644		Neutral	12.9%; 24	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 5	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	13.7%; 13	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	9.5%; 9	15.6%; 14
645		Disagree	6.5%; 12	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	4.2%; 4	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	5.3%; 5	7.8%; 7
646		Strongly Disagree	11.3%; 21	7.7%; 1	26.7%; 8	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	6.3%; 6	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	11.6%; 11	11.1%; 10
647		Not Applicable	23.1%; 43	15.4%; 2	30.0%; 9	33.3%; 6	22.2%; 2	23.2%; 22	25.0%; 4	16.7%; 3	17.9%; 17	28.9%; 26
648		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
649		Interpolated Median	3.9	4.1	2.6	3.5	3.3	4.3			4.2	3.6
650		Q68 Ethnicity										
651		Strongly Agree	26.9%; 50	23.1%; 3	6.7%; 2	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	33.7%; 32	43.8%; 7	27.8%; 5	33.7%; 32	20.0%; 18
652		Agree	19.4%; 36	46.2%; 6	13.3%; 4	5.6%; 1	22.2%; 2	17.9%; 17	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	23.2%; 22	15.6%; 14
653		Neutral	15.1%; 28	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 5	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	16.8%; 16	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	11.6%; 11	17.8%; 16
654		Disagree	4.8%; 9	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	5.3%; 5	4.4%; 4
655		Strongly Disagree	8.6%; 16	7.7%; 1	23.3%; 7	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	4.2%; 4	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	8.4%; 8	8.9%; 8
656		Not Applicable	25.3%; 47	15.4%; 2	33.3%; 10	33.3%; 6	22.2%; 2	25.3%; 24	25.0%; 4	22.2%; 4	17.9%; 17	33.3%; 30
657		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
658		Interpolated Median	4.0	4.1	2.7	3.3	3.8	4.3			4.2	3.6
659		Q69 Religion										
660		Strongly Agree	28.0%; 52	23.1%; 3	6.7%; 2	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	34.7%; 33	43.8%; 7	27.8%; 5	34.7%; 33	21.1%; 19
661		Agree	19.9%; 37	46.2%; 6	16.7%; 5	5.6%; 1	22.2%; 2	17.9%; 17	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	22.1%; 21	17.8%; 16
662		Neutral	16.7%; 31	7.7%; 1	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	16.8%; 16	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	13.7%; 13	18.9%; 17
663		Disagree	1.6%; 3	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	1.1%; 1
664		Strongly Disagree	4.3%; 8	7.7%; 1	13.3%; 4	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	4.4%; 4
665		Not Applicable	29.6%; 55	15.4%; 2	40.0%; 12	50.0%; 9	33.3%; 3	27.4%; 26	25.0%; 4	27.8%; 5	23.2%; 22	36.7%; 33
666		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
667		Interpolated Median	4.1	4.1	3.2	4.6	4.0	4.4			4.3	3.9
668		Q70 Sexual orientation										
669		Strongly Agree	26.9%; 50	23.1%; 3	6.7%; 2	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	33.7%; 32	43.8%; 7	27.8%; 5	32.6%; 31	21.1%; 19
670		Agree	21.0%; 39	46.2%; 6	16.7%; 5	5.6%; 1	22.2%; 2	20.0%; 19	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	24.2%; 23	17.8%; 16
671		Neutral	16.7%; 31	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	14.7%; 14	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	15.8%; 15	16.7%; 15
672		Disagree	1.6%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	2.2%; 2

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
673		Strongly Disagree	4.8%; 9	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 4	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	4.2%; 4	5.6%; 5
674		Not Applicable	29.0%; 54	15.4%; 2	43.3%; 13	44.4%; 8	33.3%; 3	27.4%; 26	25.0%; 4	16.7%; 3	22.1%; 21	36.7%; 33
675		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
676		Interpolated Median	4.1	4.1	3.3	3.5	4.0	4.4			4.2	3.9
677	Q71	Disabilities										
678		Strongly Agree	26.9%; 50	23.1%; 3	6.7%; 2	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	32.6%; 31	43.8%; 7	27.8%; 5	32.6%; 31	21.1%; 19
679		Agree	18.8%; 35	46.2%; 6	16.7%; 5	5.6%; 1	22.2%; 2	16.8%; 16	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	21.1%; 20	16.7%; 15
680		Neutral	17.2%; 32	15.4%; 2	23.3%; 7	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	14.7%; 14	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	16.8%; 16	16.7%; 15
681		Disagree	2.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	1.1%; 1	3.3%; 3
682		Strongly Disagree	3.8%; 7	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	4.4%; 4
683		Not Applicable	31.2%; 58	15.4%; 2	43.3%; 13	44.4%; 8	33.3%; 3	30.5%; 29	25.0%; 4	27.8%; 5	25.3%; 24	37.8%; 34
684		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
685		Interpolated Median	4.1	4.1	3.3	4.5	4.0	4.4			4.3	3.9
686	Q72	National origin										
687		Strongly Agree	26.9%; 50	23.1%; 3	6.7%; 2	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	33.7%; 32	37.5%; 6	27.8%; 5	33.7%; 32	20.0%; 18
688		Agree	19.9%; 37	46.2%; 6	16.7%; 5	5.6%; 1	22.2%; 2	18.9%; 18	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	23.2%; 22	16.7%; 15
689		Neutral	15.1%; 28	0.0%; 0	20.0%; 6	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	15.8%; 15	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	11.6%; 11	17.8%; 16
690		Disagree	4.3%; 8	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	4.4%; 4
691		Strongly Disagree	6.5%; 12	7.7%; 1	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	3.2%; 3	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	5.3%; 5	7.8%; 7
692		Not Applicable	27.4%; 51	15.4%; 2	40.0%; 12	33.3%; 6	22.2%; 2	26.3%; 25	25.0%; 4	27.8%; 5	22.1%; 21	33.3%; 30
693		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
694		Interpolated Median	4.0	4.1	3.2	3.3	3.8	4.3			4.3	3.7
695												
696	Q73	I think I have to/had to meet a higher standard for promotion than do/did other colleagues in my d										
697		Strongly Agree	16.1%; 30	7.7%; 1	30.0%; 9	16.7%; 3	33.3%; 3	11.6%; 11	18.8%; 3	22.2%; 4	14.7%; 14	17.8%; 16
698		Agree	16.1%; 30	23.1%; 3	13.3%; 4	33.3%; 6	11.1%; 1	15.8%; 15	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	14.7%; 14	17.8%; 16
699		Neutral	11.8%; 22	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	9.5%; 9	0.0%; 0	22.2%; 4	12.6%; 12	10.0%; 9
700		Disagree	22.6%; 42	30.8%; 4	10.0%; 3	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	23.2%; 22	31.3%; 5	33.3%; 6	23.2%; 22	22.2%; 20
701		Strongly Disagree	12.4%; 23	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	17.9%; 17	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	17.9%; 17	6.7%; 6
702		Not Applicable	21.0%; 39	15.4%; 2	30.0%; 9	22.2%; 4	44.4%; 4	22.1%; 21	31.3%; 5	5.6%; 1	16.8%; 16	25.6%; 23
703		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
704		Interpolated Median	2.9	3.0	4.1	3.8	4.7	2.4			2.5	3.3
705												
706	Q74	CCNY does a good job helping faculty balance work and personal responsibilities via family friendl										
707		Strongly Agree	2.7%; 5	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	2.1%; 2	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	3.3%; 3
708		Agree	15.1%; 28	15.4%; 2	10.0%; 3	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	15.8%; 15	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	15.8%; 15	14.4%; 13
709		Neutral	17.7%; 33	15.4%; 2	10.0%; 3	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	20.0%; 19	6.3%; 1	44.4%; 8	24.2%; 23	11.1%; 10
710		Disagree	23.1%; 43	46.2%; 6	23.3%; 7	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	22.1%; 21	18.8%; 3	5.6%; 1	21.1%; 20	25.6%; 23
711		Strongly Disagree	23.1%; 43	15.4%; 2	33.3%; 10	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	23.2%; 22	18.8%; 3	22.2%; 4	20.0%; 19	26.7%; 24
712		Not Applicable	18.3%; 34	7.7%; 1	20.0%; 6	27.8%; 5	11.1%; 1	16.8%; 16	37.5%; 6	11.1%; 2	16.8%; 16	18.9%; 17
713		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
714		Interpolated Median	2.3	2.2	1.8	2.0	2.5	2.3			2.5	2.0
715												
716	Q75	In my experience, my department is supportive of the following work-life issues...										
717		Family leave										
718		Strongly Agree	11.3%; 21	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	44.4%; 4	13.7%; 13	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	12.6%; 12	10.0%; 9
719		Agree	29.6%; 55	38.5%; 5	33.3%; 10	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	29.5%; 28	18.8%; 3	33.3%; 6	24.2%; 23	34.4%; 31
720		Neutral	16.7%; 31	7.7%; 1	13.3%; 4	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	18.9%; 18	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	20.0%; 19	13.3%; 12

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
721		Disagree	8.1%; 15	30.8%; 4	3.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	5.3%; 5	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	9.5%; 9	6.7%; 6
722		Strongly Disagree	5.4%; 10	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	7.4%; 7	12.5%; 2	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 6	4.4%; 4
723		Not Applicable	29.0%; 54	23.1%; 3	40.0%; 12	44.4%; 8	22.2%; 2	25.3%; 24	37.5%; 6	33.3%; 6	27.4%; 26	31.1%; 28
724		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
725		Interpolated Median	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.5	4.6	3.7			3.5	3.8
726	Q76	Dependant care (e.g. children or elders)										
727		Strongly Agree	7.5%; 14	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	33.3%; 3	8.4%; 8	12.5%; 2	0.0%; 0	8.4%; 8	6.7%; 6
728		Agree	24.7%; 46	30.8%; 4	26.7%; 8	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	29.5%; 28	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	21.1%; 20	28.9%; 26
729		Neutral	16.7%; 31	23.1%; 3	16.7%; 5	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	15.8%; 15	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	22.1%; 21	11.1%; 10
730		Disagree	11.3%; 21	15.4%; 2	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	13.7%; 13	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	12.6%; 12	10.0%; 9
731		Strongly Disagree	6.5%; 12	7.7%; 1	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	6.3%; 6	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	7.4%; 7	5.6%; 5
732		Not Applicable	33.3%; 62	23.1%; 3	43.3%; 13	50.0%; 9	33.3%; 3	26.3%; 25	43.8%; 7	44.4%; 8	28.4%; 27	37.8%; 34
733		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
734		Interpolated Median	3.4	3.2	3.6	3.7	4.5	3.5			3.2	3.7
735	Q77	Partner/spousal hiring										
736		Strongly Agree	3.8%; 7	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	3.2%; 3	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	2.2%; 2
737		Agree	8.6%; 16	15.4%; 2	13.3%; 4	11.1%; 2	11.1%; 1	6.3%; 6	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	9.5%; 9	7.8%; 7
738		Neutral	18.3%; 34	23.1%; 3	13.3%; 4	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	21.1%; 20	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	22.1%; 21	14.4%; 13
739		Disagree	11.3%; 21	23.1%; 3	3.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	12.6%; 12	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	14.7%; 14	7.8%; 7
740		Strongly Disagree	9.7%; 18	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	5.6%; 1	22.2%; 2	12.6%; 12	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	11.6%; 11	7.8%; 7
741		Not Applicable	48.4%; 90	38.5%; 5	60.0%; 18	44.4%; 8	22.2%; 2	44.2%; 42	43.8%; 7	66.7%; 12	36.8%; 35	60.0%; 54
742		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
743		Interpolated Median	2.8	2.8	3.3	3.0	2.3	2.6			2.7	2.8
744	Q78	Tenure clock adjustment										
745		Strongly Agree	5.9%; 11	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	7.4%; 7	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	6.3%; 6	5.6%; 5
746		Agree	18.8%; 35	7.7%; 1	13.3%; 4	11.1%; 2	33.3%; 3	22.1%; 21	18.8%; 3	11.1%; 2	21.1%; 20	16.7%; 15
747		Neutral	18.3%; 34	23.1%; 3	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	15.8%; 15	12.5%; 2	27.8%; 5	27.4%; 26	8.9%; 8
748		Disagree	12.4%; 23	23.1%; 3	10.0%; 3	11.1%; 2	22.2%; 2	11.6%; 11	12.5%; 2	16.7%; 3	12.6%; 12	12.2%; 11
749		Strongly Disagree	4.8%; 9	7.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	7.4%; 7	2.2%; 2
750		Not Applicable	39.8%; 74	38.5%; 5	53.3%; 16	44.4%; 8	33.3%; 3	37.9%; 36	37.5%; 6	33.3%; 6	25.3%; 24	54.4%; 49
751		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
752		Interpolated Median	3.2	2.5	3.2	2.8	3.8	3.4			3.1	3.4
753	Q79	Health accommodations										
754		Strongly Agree	9.7%; 18	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	16.7%; 3	22.2%; 2	9.5%; 9	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	12.6%; 12	6.7%; 6
755		Agree	33.3%; 62	23.1%; 3	40.0%; 12	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	37.9%; 36	18.8%; 3	22.2%; 4	27.4%; 26	38.9%; 35
756		Neutral	17.7%; 33	46.2%; 6	10.0%; 3	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	17.9%; 17	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	25.3%; 24	10.0%; 9
757		Disagree	7.0%; 13	15.4%; 2	6.7%; 2	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	4.2%; 4	12.5%; 2	11.1%; 2	7.4%; 7	6.7%; 6
758		Strongly Disagree	5.9%; 11	7.7%; 1	3.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	8.4%; 8	12.5%; 2	0.0%; 0	7.4%; 7	4.4%; 4
759		Not Applicable	26.3%; 49	7.7%; 1	33.3%; 10	44.4%; 8	33.3%; 3	22.1%; 21	37.5%; 6	33.3%; 6	20.0%; 19	33.3%; 30
760		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
761		Interpolated Median	3.7	3.0	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.7			3.5	3.8
762	Q80	Flexibility regarding family responsibilities										
763		Strongly Agree	9.7%; 18	0.0%; 0	6.7%; 2	11.1%; 2	44.4%; 4	10.5%; 10	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	9.5%; 9	10.0%; 9
764		Agree	22.6%; 42	15.4%; 2	26.7%; 8	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	24.2%; 23	12.5%; 2	27.8%; 5	23.2%; 22	22.2%; 20
765		Neutral	22.6%; 42	38.5%; 5	23.3%; 7	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	24.2%; 23	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	26.3%; 25	18.9%; 17
766		Disagree	11.8%; 22	23.1%; 3	6.7%; 2	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	13.7%; 13	6.3%; 1	11.1%; 2	9.5%; 9	14.4%; 13
767		Strongly Disagree	7.0%; 13	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	16.8%; 3	0.0%; 0	7.4%; 7	12.5%; 2	0.0%; 0	7.4%; 7	6.7%; 6
768		Not Applicable	26.3%; 49	23.1%; 3	26.7%; 8	38.9%; 7	33.3%; 3	20.0%; 19	43.8%; 7	33.3%; 6	24.2%; 23	27.8%; 25

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
769		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
770		Interpolated Median	3.3	2.9	3.4	3.3	4.8	3.3			3.5	3.8
771												
772	Q81	Have you ever felt discriminated (even subtly) against on campus?										
773		Yes	48.4%; 90	30.8%; 4	76.7%; 23	77.8%; 14	55.6%; 5	38.9%; 37	50.0%; 8	38.9%; 7	37.9%; 36	58.9%; 53
774		No	51.6%; 96	69.2%; 9	23.3%; 7	22.2%; 4	44.4%; 4	61.1%; 58	50.0%; 8	61.1%; 11	62.1%; 59	41.1%; 37
775		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
776												
777	Q82	I felt this discrimination was due to my (Check all that apply)										
778		Age	28.9%; 26	25.0%; 1	30.4%; 7	21.4%; 3	40.0%; 2	32.4%; 12	25.0%; 2	14.3%; 1	22.2%; 8	34.0%; 18
779		Race	50.0%; 45	75.0%; 3	100.0%; 23	35.7%; 5	0.0%; 0	18.9%; 7	50.0%; 4	57.1%; 4	52.8%; 19	47.2%; 25
780		Religion	7.8%; 7	25.0%; 1	4.3%; 1	14.3%; 2	0.0%; 0	2.7%; 1	37.5%; 3	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 4	5.7%; 3
781		Disabilities	4.4%; 4	0.0%; 0	4.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	8.1%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 2	3.8%; 2
782		Gender	46.7%; 42	0.0%; 0	34.8%; 8	42.9%; 6	80.0%; 4	59.5%; 22	37.5%; 3	57.1%; 4	13.9%; 5	67.9%; 36
783		Ethnicity	27.8%; 25	50.0%; 2	34.8%; 8	50.0%; 7	0.0%; 0	10.8%; 4	37.5%; 3	42.9%; 3	41.7%; 15	18.9%; 10
784		Sexual orientation	13.3%; 12	0.0%; 0	13.0%; 3	14.3%; 2	0.0%; 0	13.5%; 5	12.5%; 1	28.6%; 2	22.2%; 8	7.5%; 4
785		National origin	16.7%; 15	50.0%; 2	8.7%; 2	28.6%; 4	0.0%; 0	8.1%; 3	50.0%; 4	14.3%; 1	25.0%; 9	11.3%; 6
786		Accent	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	7.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
787		Atheism	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	7.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
788		Because of my stance on academic issues	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	14.3%; 1	2.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
789		Being an adjunct instructor	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	20.0%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.9%; 1
790		Bullying by a colleague in the department perhaps due to my non-CCE status	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.9%; 1
791		childcare responsibilities	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
792		Division I am in	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.9%; 1
793		English accent	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	7.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.9%; 1
794		na	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
795		political views	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.9%; 1
796		standards	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	4.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
797		Other	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0
798		Totals	*, *	*, *	*, *		*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *
799												
800	Q83	Did you report the discrimination to college officials (e.g. chair, dean, AAO, provost)?										
801		Yes	21.1%; 19	50.0%; 2	26.1%; 6	14.3%; 2	20.0%; 1	13.5%; 5	25.0%; 2	14.3%; 1	27.8%; 10	17.0%; 9
802		No	78.9%; 71	50.0%; 2	73.9%; 17	85.6%; 12	80.0%; 4	86.5%; 32	75.0%; 6	85.7%; 6	72.2%; 26	83.0%; 44
803		Totals	100.0%; 90	100.0%; 4	100.0%; 23	100.0%; 14	100.0%; 5	100.0%; 37	100.0%; 8	100.0%; 7	100.0%; 36	100.0%; 53
804												
805	Q84	Why did you choose NOT to report the incident? (Check all that apply)										
806		I feared I would not get tenure or CCE	32.4%; 23	0.0%; 0	29.4%; 5	33.3%; 4	50.0%; 2	37.5%; 12	33.3%; 2	50.0%; 3	30.8%; 8	34.1%; 15
807		I feared I would not be promoted	21.1%; 15	0.0%; 0	29.4%; 5	8.8%; 1	50.0%; 2	21.9%; 7	0.0%; 0	50.0%; 3	11.5%; 3	27.3%; 12
808		I feared I would not be taken seriously	49.3%; 35	50.0%; 1	58.8%; 10	50.0%; 6	50.0%; 2	43.8%; 14	50.0%; 3	66.7%; 4	50.0%; 13	47.7%; 21
809		I feared I would be labeled a complainer	57.7%; 41	50.0%; 1	52.9%; 9	50.0%; 6	50.0%; 2	65.6%; 21	66.7%; 4	83.3%; 5	46.2%; 12	63.6%; 28
810		I feared no one would believe me	19.7%; 14	0.0%; 0	17.6%; 3	33.3%; 4	0.0%; 0	21.9%; 7	33.3%; 2	16.7%; 1	7.7%; 2	27.3%; 12
811		I feared I would be seen as having a "chip on my shoulder"	53.5%; 38	50.0%; 1	76.5%; 13	41.7%; 5	50.0%; 2	50.0%; 16	50.0%; 3	66.7%; 4	46.2%; 12	56.8%; 25
812		I feared I would be ostracized	26.8%; 19	50.0%; 1	35.3%; 6	16.7%; 2	0.0%; 0	25.0%; 8	16.7%; 1	50.0%; 3	34.6%; 9	20.5%; 9
813		I felt intimidated by the situation	28.2%; 20	50.0%; 1	35.3%; 6	8.3%; 1	25.0%; 1	28.1%; 9	16.7%; 1	33.3%; 2	26.9%; 7	27.3%; 12
814		I did not know how to file a complaint	16.9%; 12	50.0%; 1	29.4%; 5	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	9.4%; 3	0.0%; 0	50.0%; 3	23.1%; 6	13.6%; 6
815		I did not care	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.9%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
816		I fear I will be fired and I need my job	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	25.0%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
817		I want to be specific that this is only ONE colleague in my department being mean	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
818		I was discriminated by students on race issues	1.4%; 1	50.0%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
819		I'm used to it in other settings so have developed ways around it.	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
820		I've already learned through a faculty member that I have a reputation as a malcont	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
821		intangible discrimination is difficult to demonstrate or even explain	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	8.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
822		involved not being listened to seriously	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
823		It happens with some higher ranking administrators at the College and it is so subtle	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	8.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
824		It was a minor incident that does not reflect my overall experience at this school.	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	8.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
825		It was easier to ignore the situation	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
826		It was too subtle to report	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.9%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
827		it wasn't bad enough	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.9%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
828		It's just not my style.	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
829		just the way of the world and little that can be done, though I might be wrong about	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
830		My colleagues knew and didn't say anything.	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
831		na	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
832		not serious enough to warrant reporting	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
833		Not significant enough/subtle	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
834		One is encouraged to go along with the system and not make waves	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.9%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
835		Subtle (as well as not so subtle) discrimination happens on a daily basis. It is part of	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
836		The discrimination came from some of those offices.	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
837		too subtle to lay a finger on it	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 1	3.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
838		What would be the point?	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	5.9%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.3%; 1
839		Other	1.4%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.8%; 1	0.0%; 0
840		Totals	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *
841												
842	Q85	Were you satisfied with the college's response?										
843		Yes	10.5%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	40.0%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 1	11.1%; 1
844		No	89.5%; 17	100.0%; 2	100.0%; 6	100.0%; 2	100.0%; 1	60.0%; 3	100.0%; 2	100.0%; 1	90.0%; 9	88.9%; 8
845		Totals	100.0%; 19	100.0%; 2	100.0%; 6	100.0%; 2	100.0%; 1	100.0%; 5	100.0%; 2	100.0%; 1	100.0%; 10	100.0%; 9
846												
847	Q86	Why were you not satisfied with the college's response? (Check all thay apply)										
848		I was not taken seriously	52.9%; 9	50.0%; 1	66.7%; 4	100.0%; 2	0.0%; 0	33.3%; 1	50.0%; 1	0.0%; 0	66.7%; 6	37.5%; 3
849		My experience of discrimination was discounted as a "misunderstanding" or as my b	29.4%; 5	0.0%; 0	33.3%; 2	100.0%; 2	0.0%; 0	66.7%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	33.3%; 3	25.0%; 2
850		Nothing happened after the complaint; there was no consequence for the person(s)	70.6%; 12	0.0%; 0	83.3%; 5	100.0%; 2	100.0%; 1	66.7%; 2	100.0%; 2	0.0%; 0	66.7%; 6	75.0%; 6
851		I felt like I was blamed for the situation	23.5%; 4	0.0%; 0	33.3%; 2	100.0%; 2	0.0%; 0	33.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	44.4%; 4	0.0%; 0
852		The person to whom I reported the incident didn't seem to understand my concern	41.2%; 7	0.0%; 0	50.0%; 3	100.0%; 2	100.0%; 1	33.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	100.0%; 1	55.6%; 5	25.0%; 2
853		college solutions are ad hoc and variable at best	5.9%; 1	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	12.5%; 1
854		I have always just worked things out myself	5.9%; 1	0.0%; 0	16.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	12.5%; 1
855		issue related to the chair and I fekt tenure was held over me if I said anything	5.9%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	33.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	12.5%; 1
856		Staff remained zt the college.	5.9%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	50.0%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	12.5%; 1
857		The dean/chair/Executice ganged up against me & I had to take CCNY to court to see	5.9%; 1	50.0%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
858		Other	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0
859		Totals	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *
860												
861	Q87	What are the three most important factors that are influencing you to stay at CCNY? (Check up to 3 responses)										
862		My department	33.9%; 63	46.2%; 6	23.3%; 7	33.3%; 6	33.3%; 3	33.7%; 32	43.8%; 7	38.9%; 7	38.9%; 37	28.9%; 26
863		Geographic location	57.5%; 107	69.2%; 9	60.0%; 18	44.4%; 8	55.6%; 5	61.1%; 58	50.0%; 8	50.0%; 9	53.7%; 51	61.1%; 55
864		Spousal employment	10.2%; 19	15.4%; 2	3.3%; 1	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	11.6%; 11	6.3%; 1	16.7%; 3	10.5%; 10	10.0%; 9

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
865		Community resources & opportunities	11.8%; 22	0.0%; 0	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	0.0%; 0	10.5%; 10	25.0%; 4	0.0%; 0	9.5%; 9	14.4%; 13
866		Quality of students	40.3%; 75	7.7%; 1	50.0%; 15	33.3%; 6	33.3%; 3	43.2%; 41	31.3%; 5	38.9%; 7	34.7%; 33	45.6%; 41
867		Support for research	10.8%; 20	15.4%; 2	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	10.5%; 10	12.5%; 2	22.2%; 4	17.9%; 17	3.3%; 3
868		College climate and culture	18.8%; 35	15.4%; 2	13.3%; 4	33.3%; 6	0.0%; 0	20.0%; 19	31.3%; 5	5.6%; 1	16.8%; 16	21.1%; 19
869		Salary and benefits	24.7%; 46	30.8%; 4	30.0%; 9	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	20.0%; 19	25.0%; 4	27.8%; 5	29.5%; 28	18.9%; 17
870		Relationships with colleagues	29.0%; 54	30.8%; 4	26.7%; 8	22.2%; 4	33.3%; 3	35.8%; 34	25.0%; 4	11.1%; 2	26.3%; 25	32.2%; 29
871		answering the question as:...would influence you to stay at CCNY	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
872		Assigned to CCNY	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
873		At can't get another job.	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
874		Being able to teach in my discipline and such jobs are rare to come by in NYC	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
875		CCNY serves students that otherwise would not easily get education	0.5%; 1	7.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
876		children	0.5%; 1	7.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
877		Commitment to students	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
878		Commitment with the Dominican Studies Institute	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
879		contribution I can make to students and department	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
880		dedication to the students and mission	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
881		Demographics of students	0.5%; 1	7.7%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
882		Diversity of Students	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
883		diversity of the student body	1.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	2.2%; 2
884		family connections	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
885		Giving talented students from diverse economic backgrounds the chance of earning	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
886		Have bought a home	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
887		Helping students of color.	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
888		Historic tradition of open access for working class families	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
889		I am trying very hard to leave, but the job market has been bad for few years. As soc	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
890		inertia	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
891		loyalty to the college and strong belief in its mission	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
892		nature of students	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
893		New York City	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
894		None	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
895		Only this one reason applies	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
896		Opportunities to develop and teach different courses and other gatherings	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
897		opportunity to do outstanding teaching / research	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
898		Personal issue	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
899		Political standpoint of supporting public universities	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
900		relationship with a very few other like-minded colleagues whose friendship and supp	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
901		Relationships with certain colleagues	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
902		relative research freedom	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
903		resourses that was given to me	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
904		student body	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
905		Student diversity	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
906		tenure	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
907		the ability of my partner to pay more than 50% of our living costs (this will soon char	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
908		The Graduate Center	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
909		The mission of the college	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
910		The President, who has brought a new sense of energy, hope, and enthusiasm for th	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
911		the students	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
912		the uniqueness of our students, and the satisfaction I get from working with them	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
913		Other	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0
914		Totals	*, *	*, *	*, *		*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *
915												
916	Q88	What are the three most important factors that would influence you to consider leaving CCNY? (Check up to 3 responses)										
917		My department	28.5%; 53	46.2%; 6	36.7%; 11	27.8%; 5	22.2%; 2	24.2%; 23	18.8%; 3	38.9%; 7	25.3%; 24	32.2%; 29
918		Geographic location	13.4%; 25	7.7%; 1	13.3%; 4	11.1%; 2	33.3%; 3	10.5%; 10	31.3%; 5	11.1%; 2	14.7%; 14	11.1%; 10
919		Spousal employment	14.0%; 26	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	16.7%; 3	33.3%; 3	18.9%; 18	6.3%; 1	22.2%; 4	13.7%; 13	14.4%; 13
920		Community resources & opportunities	7.0%; 13	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 4	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 6	12.5%; 2	5.6%; 1	5.3%; 5	8.9%; 8
921		Quality of students	18.8%; 35	15.4%; 2	20.0%; 6	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	18.9%; 18	12.5%; 2	27.8%; 5	25.3%; 24	11.1%; 10
922		Support for research	52.2%; 97	76.9%; 10	53.3%; 16	61.1%; 11	77.8%; 7	45.3%; 43	56.3%; 9	50.0%; 9	51.6%; 49	53.3%; 48
923		College climate and culture	30.1%; 56	30.8%; 4	26.7%; 8	22.2%; 4	22.2%; 2	32.6%; 31	31.3%; 5	27.8%; 5	30.5%; 29	30.0%; 27
924		Salary and benefits	55.4%; 103	61.5%; 8	46.7%; 14	50.0%; 9	77.8%; 7	54.7%; 52	68.8%; 11	50.0%; 9	60.0%; 57	51.1%; 46
925		Relationships with colleagues	24.7%; 46	23.1%; 3	30.0%; 9	22.2%; 4	11.1%; 1	27.4%; 26	18.8%; 3	16.7%; 3	23.2%; 22	25.6%; 23
926		any changes in how instruction is assessed, how curricular revisions are made	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
927		better, more efficient, more respectful service culture / leaving behind deadbeat or	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
928		Bureaucratic Inconsistency, poor maintenance of physical plant	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
929		Challenging Environment/Opportunity to build new program (s)	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
930		change in mission	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
931		Course load is too high, classes are too big	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
932		desire for camp town environment	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
933		desire for change	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
934		difficult bureaucracy	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
935		Dismal support services	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
936		Frustration at lack of racial diversity in department	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
937		I regard my work as akin to charity due to the poor pay and long hours. I stay b/c stu	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
938		Inability to move forward the Dominican Studies Institute	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
939		Lack of money in the college to make improvements	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
940		Lack of respect to academic process	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
941		more opportunities for the kind of work I want to do	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
942		negative political environment in department or division	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
943		New and interesting opportunities for advancement	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
944		No real infrastructure for effective functioning!!!	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
945		overwhelming amount of administrative work	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
946		Present Administration	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
947		Privatization of CCNY programs and mission	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
948		Promotion	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
949		Real estate	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
950		Reputation of the hiring university	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
951		Respect and support for non traditional students	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
952		taking away money and staff to support my research	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	11.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
953		The stance my colleagues take with respect to academic issues	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0
954		unsustainable workload/lack of admin support	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
955		work load	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
956		Other	1.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	1.1%; 1
957		Totals	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *
958												
959	Q89	What is your current title/rank?										
960		Lecturer	10.2%; 19	0.0%; 0	10.0%; 3	16.7%; 3	11.1%; 1	11.6%; 11	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	10.5%; 10	10.0%; 9

Appendix B

	A	B	C	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
961		Distinguished Lecturer	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
962		Instructor	3.2%; 6	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	6.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	2.1%; 2	4.4%; 4
963		Assistant Professor	23.1%; 43	7.7%; 1	23.3%; 7	50.0%; 9	22.2%; 2	18.9%; 18	18.8%; 3	38.9%; 7	14.7%; 14	32.2%; 29
964		Associate Professor	27.4%; 51	23.1%; 3	26.7%; 8	22.2%; 4	44.4%; 4	33.7%; 32	37.5%; 6	5.6%; 1	23.2%; 22	32.2%; 29
965		Professor	31.2%; 58	69.2%; 9	33.3%; 10	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	27.4%; 26	31.3%; 5	38.9%; 7	45.3%; 43	15.6%; 14
966		Distinguished Professor	3.8%; 7	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	11.1%; 1	4.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	5.6%; 1	4.2%; 4	3.3%; 3
967		Substitute or Visiting Faculty	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1
968		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
969												
970	Q90	Have you served on a search committee for new faculty?										
971		Yes	74.7%; 139	84.6%; 11	90.0%; 27	55.6%; 10	77.8%; 7	72.6%; 69	56.3%; 9	77.8%; 14	77.9%; 74	71.1%; 64
972		No	25.3%; 47	15.4%; 2	10.0%; 3	44.4%; 8	22.2%; 2	27.4%; 26	43.8%; 7	22.2%; 4	22.1%; 21	28.9%; 26
973		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
974												
975	Q91	What is your gender?										
976		Male	51.1%; 95	76.9%; 10	36.7%; 11	33.3%; 6	33.3%; 3	50.5%; 48	62.5%; 10	66.7%; 12	100.0%; 95	0.0%; 0
977		Female	48.4%; 90	23.1%; 3	60.0%; 18	66.7%; 12	66.7%; 6	49.5%; 47	37.5%; 6	33.3%; 6	0.0%; 0	100.0%; 90
978		Transgender	0.5%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0
979		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
980												
981	Q92	Do you identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or queer (LGBTQ)?										
982		Yes	9.1%; 17	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 4	11.1%; 2	0.0%; 0	11.6%; 11	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	11.6%; 11	6.7%; 6
983		No	82.8%; 154	92.3%; 12	83.3%; 25	83.3%; 15	100.0%; 9	85.3%; 81	93.8%; 15	50.0%; 9	76.8%; 73	90.0%; 81
984		Refuse to Say	8.1%; 15	7.7%; 1	3.3%; 1	5.6%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	0.0%; 0	50.0%; 9	11.6%; 11	3.3%; 3
985		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
986												
987	Q93	Do you identify as having a disability?										
988		Yes	5.9%; 11	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 4	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 6	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 6	5.6%; 5
989		No	86.0%; 160	100.0%; 13	83.3%; 25	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	89.5%; 85	93.8%; 15	44.4%; 8	86.3%; 82	86.7%; 78
990		Refuse to Say	8.1%; 15	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	4.2%; 4	0.0%; 0	55.6%; 10	7.4%; 7	7.8%; 7
991		Totals	100.0%; 186	100.0%; 13	100.0%; 30	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 9	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 16	100.0%; 18	100.0%; 95	100.0%; 90
992												
993	Q94	How do you define your race and or ethnicity? (Check all that apply)										
994		American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0
995		Asian	7.0%; 13	100.0%; 13	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	10.5%; 10	3.3%; 3
996		Black or African American	16.1%; 30	0.0%; 0	100.0%; 30	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	1.1%; 1	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	11.6%; 11	20.0%; 18
997		Hispanic or Latino	8.1%; 15	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	100.0%; 15	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	12.5%; 2	0.0%; 0	5.3%; 5	11.1%; 10
998		Puerto Rican	3.2%; 6	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	20.0%; 3	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	2.1%; 2	4.4%; 4
999		Italian American	4.8%; 9	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	100.0%; 9	5.3%; 5	6.3%; 1	0.0%; 0	3.2%; 3	6.7%; 6
1000		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0
1001		White	51.1%; 95	0.0%; 0	3.3%; 1	20.0%; 3	55.6%; 5	100.0%; 95	12.5%; 2	0.0%; 0	50.5%; 48	52.2%; 47
1002		Other	8.6%; 16	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	13.3%; 2	11.1%; 1	2.1%; 2	100.0%; 16	0.0%; 0	10.5%; 10	6.7%; 6
1003		Refuse to say	9.7%; 18	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	0.0%; 0	100.0%; 18	12.6%; 12	6.7%; 6
1004		Totals	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *	*, *

Appendix C

P-values Computed from Fisher's Exact Test

Questions	Gender	Race/Ethnicity			Title/Rank		
	Male vs. Female	Asian vs. White	Black vs. White	Hispanic vs. White	Assistant vs. Associate	Assistant vs. Full Professor	Associate vs. Full Professor
Q1 I am satisfied with my experience as a faculty member at CCNY.	0.4065	0.3970	0.0078*	0.0815*	0.2554	0.7665	0.1994
Q2 If I had the opportunity to choose again, I would choose to work at CCNY.	0.9785	0.1626	0.1306	0.6843	0.4082	0.5507	0.7917
Q3 I am satisfied with the way my career has progressed at CCNY.	0.0511*	0.4574	0.0350*	0.2050	0.4383	0.6065	0.2852
Q4 I feel a sense of inclusion and belonging...							
At CCNY	0.1546	>0.9999	0.3953	>0.9999	0.4417	0.8366	0.3287
Q5 In my department	0.1286	0.2873	0.4910	0.5763	0.2195	0.5048	0.4020
Q6 In my division/school	0.1034	0.6708	0.0535*	0.5750	0.6933	0.4066	0.3977
Q7 I have strong collegial relationships with other faculty members...							
In my department	0.4626	0.3757	0.2892	0.0916*	0.3647	0.3543	0.2014
Q8 In my division/school	0.6765	0.9227	0.0744	0.6932	0.1962	0.0490*	0.1350
Q9 Throughout CCNY	0.1116	0.1703	0.9291	0.5943	0.3305	0.2141	0.3772
Q10 Within the past 5 years, I have felt unwelcomed or excluded at CCNY because of my...							
Age	0.0051*	0.9129	0.5738	0.1714	0.9567	0.5929	0.7602
Q11 Gender	<0.0001*	0.0176*	0.4636	0.0034*	0.1526	0.2846	0.0951*
Q12 Race	0.2937	0.2721	<0.0001*	0.0026*	>0.9999	0.7147	0.6252
Q13 Ethnicity	0.9049	0.6533	<0.0001*	<0.0001*	0.8612	0.7286	0.8212
Q14 Religion	>0.9999	0.3854	0.1499	0.1562	0.2181	0.0383*	0.2075
Q15 Sexual orientation	0.8871	0.1284	0.0395*	0.3305	0.0717*	0.1855	0.0235*
Q16 Disabilities	>0.9999	0.2776	0.2223	0.4560	0.1962	0.7573	0.3183
Q17 National origin	0.8775	0.2137	0.0058*	0.0010*	0.6469	0.4931	0.9053
Q18 Within the past 5 years, due to fear of negative consequences, I have avoided disclosing to my colleagues my...							
Age	0.2528	0.7830	0.5339	0.6840	0.4930	0.6107	0.2773
Q19 Gender	0.8179	0.4703	0.5043	0.7584	0.5716	0.5745	>0.9999
Q20 Race	0.8310	0.5560	0.5440	0.1412	>0.999	0.6798	0.4931
Q21 Ethnicity	0.8165	0.4796	0.4041	0.2167	0.4257	0.6689	0.8545
Q22 Religion	0.7026	0.5403	0.2240	0.1260	0.6409	0.6689	0.8108
Q23 Sexual orientation	0.9191	0.3012	0.5231	0.2437	0.2287	0.5745	0.0551
Q24 Disabilities	0.8493	0.4343	0.4174	0.4422	0.3845	0.8465	0.1358
Q25 National origin	0.5282	0.4735	0.5064	0.3105	0.7724	0.6742	0.2739
Q26 I am satisfied with the access I have to senior leadership of CCNY.	0.0626*	0.5583	0.0390*	0.3839	0.8968	0.0106*	0.0240*
Q27 I am satisfied with the opportunities I have to offer input on important decisions.	0.0121*	0.5965	0.0717*	0.5566	0.5123	0.0638*	0.1378
Q28 I am treated with respect by my...							
My colleagues	0.0552*	0.4433	0.2373	0.7258	0.7646	0.6294	0.5010

Questions	Gender	Race/Ethnicity			Title/Rank		
	Male vs. Female	Asian vs. White	Black vs. White	Hispanic vs. White	Assistant vs. Associate	Assistant vs. Full Professor	Associate vs. Full Professor
Q29 My department chair	0.8220	0.4550	0.0846*	0.7121	0.5169	0.3522	0.0666*
Q30 My dean	>0.9999	0.1967	0.0194*	0.7679	0.3193	0.4975	0.9185
Q31 My area of research is valued by my colleagues in...							
My department	0.5009	0.3845	0.0743*	>0.9999	0.0175*	0.6123	0.0222*
Q32 My school or division	0.2835	0.5709	0.1590	0.8311	0.0060*	0.0065*	0.5099
Q33 I feel like my input at department meetings is valued.	0.0457*	0.4419	0.0528*	0.8480	>0.9999	0.4456	0.4958
Q34 I am satisfied with the campus environment regarding diversity.	0.2119	0.3896	0.0002*	0.6355	0.4844	0.8820	0.6571
Q35 Cultural differences are valued at CCNY.	0.5470	0.1190	<0.0001*	0.4502	0.1035	0.2011	0.8429
Q36 Senior leadership at CCNY fosters respect and support for diversity.	0.1840	0.0973*	0.0002*	0.0861*	0.0931*	0.0373*	0.6654
Q37 Senior leadership at CCNY has made an effort to develop minority faculty for leadership positions.	0.1298	0.2767	<0.0001*	0.0031*	0.7087	0.0833*	0.1800
Q38 Senior leadership at CCNY has made an effort to develop women faculty for leadership positions.	0.0302*	0.6581	0.0169*	>0.9999	0.2287	0.0906*	0.0229*
Q39 Expectations for my performance are clearly communicated by...							
My department chair	0.7181	0.3519	0.0340*	0.4918	0.7789	0.2791	0.0852*
Q40 My dean or division head	0.1322	>0.9999	0.0591*	0.5325	0.6453	0.7771	0.2251
Q41 I think I do a significant amount of student mentoring that is not formally recognized by the tenure...	0.1771	0.5698	0.5107	0.1452	0.0861*	0.0588*	0.0001*
Q42 I think I do a significant amount of service on committees that is not formally recognized by the	0.5253	0.2482	0.4784	0.2277	0.0832	0.1706	0.0001*
Q43 I believe underrepresented faculty face a greater service load than do non-minority faculty.	0.0012*	0.2106	<0.0001*	0.0277*	0.9531	0.2471	0.5538
Q44 I believe female faculty face a greater service load than do male faculty.	<0.0001*	0.0246*	0.0084*	0.7013	>0.9999	0.2463	0.1599
Q45 I am satisfied with the efforts search committees in my department have made to develop racially a	0,0945	0.1207	<0.0001*	0.0017*	0.2122	0.5660	0.6537
Q46 I am satisfied with the efforts search committees in my department have made to develop gender diversity...	0.1984	0.2187	0.0097*	0.0214*	0.2772	0.3368	0.9048
Q47 I believe my department actively recruits faculty of color.	0.1287	0.0692*	<0.0001*	0.0329*	0.8991	0.6794	0.6463
Q48 I believe my department actively recruits female faculty.	0.0064*	0.2889	0.2740	0.7069	0.9539	0.9204	0.7798
Q49 I believe that underrepresented minorities have to meet higher standards for hiring than non-minority	0.0558*	0.1298	<0.0001*	<0.0001*	0.6985	0.1550	0.1470
Q50 I believe that female applicants have to meet higher standards for hiring than male applicants.	0.0018*	0.0164*	0.0025*	0.1164	0.6765	0.4880	0.2186
Q51 I understand/understood the criteria for achieving tenure or CCE.	0.7964	0.6006	0.6415	0.1898	0.5069	0.1545	0.2140
Q52 I receive/received helpful feedback from my chair on my progress toward tenure or CCE.	0.5936	0.9143	0.0290*	0.9380	0.3030	0.2317	0.3129

Questions	Gender	Race/Ethnicity			Title/Rank			
	Male vs. Female	Asian vs. White	Black vs. White	Hispanic vs. White	Assistant vs. Associate	Assistant vs. Full Professor	Associate vs. Full Professor	
Q53	In my department, the requirements for tenure or CCE are uniformly applied regardless of a faculty member's...							
	Age	0.2351	0.4040	0.0388*	>0.9999	0.8706	0.8576	0.3755
Q54	Gender	0.1914	0.6781	0.0968*	>0.9999	0.7553	0.4630	0.3326
Q55	Race	0.4661	0.5753	0.0025*	0.6634	0.2839	0.4438	0.9138
Q56	Ethnicity	0.2657	0.2647	0.0058*	0.4486	0.2210	0.7164	0.3449
Q57	Religion	0.1402	0.3922	0.0118*	0.7999	0.5608	>0.9999	0.8784
Q58	Sexual orientation	0.6435	>0.9999	0.0425*	>0.9999	0.2510	>0.9999	0.1904
Q59	Disabilities	0.7923	0.7356	0.0754	>0.9999	0.1680	>0.9999	0.2702
Q60	National origin	0.0287*	0.0742*	0.0030*	0.8834	0.8796	0.8879	>0.9999
Q61	I think I have to/had to meet a higher standard for tenure or CCE than do/did other colleagues in	0.5452	0.3744	0.0112*	0.1584	0.4472	0.8078	0.4557
Q62	I understand/understood the criteria for achieving promotion.	0.7071	>0.9999	0.1101	0.7173	0.3008	0.0503	0.0249
Q63	I receive/received helpful feedback from my chair on my progress toward promotion.	0.1839	0.6117	0.1384	0.9449	0.4310	0.0943*	0.0030*
Q64	The requirements for promotion are clearly articulated in my department.	0.5204	0.3110	0.0863*	0.5599	0.8442	0.0290*	0.0036*
Q65	In my department, the requirements for promotion are uniformly applied regardless of a faculty member's...							
	Age	0.2069	0.7693	0.0458*	0.7334	0.4381	0.3064	0.0209*
Q66	Gender	0.0745*	0.7007	0.1088	0.2058	>0.9999	0.5113	0.1766
Q67	Race	0.1111	0.3716	0.0010*	0.2352	0.5501	>0.9999	0.4749
Q68	Ethnicity	0.1143	0.1577	0.0004*	0.1123	0.6465	0.8848	0.3732
Q69	Religion	0.2562	0.3874	0.0048*	0.5348	0.7070	0.8501	0.5971
Q70	Sexual orientation	0.3190	>0.9999	0.0170*	0.1131	0.7097	0.6151	0.2573
Q71	Disabilities	0.7262	>0.9999	0.0438*	0.5112	0.6197	0.3203	0.0515*
Q72	National origin	0.0884*	0.1089	0.0161*	0.0679*	>0.9999	0.8150	0.9537
Q73	I think I have to/had to meet a higher standard for promotion than do/did other colleagues in my...	0.3330	0.3002	0.0434*	0.0865*	0.2896	0.9484	0.2182
Q74	CCNY does a good job helping faculty balance work and personal responsibilities via family friendly...	0.0645*	0.7683	0.8603	0.3738	0.1701	0.2235	0.0553*
Q75	In my experience, my department is supportive of the following work-life issues...							
	Family leave	0.3017	0.2400	0.8112	0.6750	0.5693	0.8855	0.6802
Q76	Dependent care (e.g. children or elders)	0.1587	0.7481	0.6758	0.2893	0.1809	0.3560	0.8743
Q77	Partner/spousal hiring	>0.9999	0.8839	0.1709	0.4657	0.7534	0.7755	>0.9999
Q78	Tenure clock adjustment	0.1658	0.1694	0.4762	0.4894	0.2071	0.7547	0.3875
Q79	Health accommodations	0.0592*	0.0491*	0.8207	0.8245	0.9363	0.9337	0.6922
Q80	Flexibility regarding family responsibilities	0.4747	0.2695	0.9534	0.9258	0.6449	0.4864	0.9622
Q81	Have you ever felt discriminated (even subtly) against on campus?	0.0052*	0.7626	0.0003*	0.0037*	>0.9999	0.3132	0.1818

Questions	Gender	Race/Ethnicity			Title/Rank		
	Male vs. Female	Asian vs. White	Black vs. White	Hispanic vs. White	Assistant vs. Associate	Assistant vs. Full Professor	Associate vs. Full Professor
Q82	I felt this discrimination was due to my (Check all that apply)						
Q83	Did you report the discrimination to college officials (e.g. chair, dean, AAO, provost)?	0.3060	0.1284	0.3062	>0.9999	>0.9999	0.1930 0.1304
Q84	Why did you choose NOT to report the incident? (Check all that apply)						
Q85	Were you satisfied with the college's response?	>0.9999	0.5238	0.1818	0.5238	>0.9999	0.3077 0.3571
Q86	Why were you not satisfied with the college's response? (Check all that apply)						
Q87	What are the three most important factors that are influencing you to stay at CCNY? (Check up to 3 responses)						
Q88	What are the three most important factors that would influence you to consider leaving CCNY? (Check up to 3 responses)						
Q89	What is your current title/rank?						
Q90	Have you served on a search committee for new faculty?	0.3143	0.3152	0.0801*	0.1674	<0.0001*	<0.0001* >0.9999
Q91	What is your gender?	<0.0001*	0.0843*	0.1148	0.2071	0.3946	<0.0001* 0.0005*
Q92	Do you identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or queer (LGBTQ)?	0.0363*	0.2071	0.8948	0.8469	0.0246*	0.2189 0.0040*
Q93	Do you identify as having a disability?	>0.9999	>0.9999	0.4178	0.7956	0.1916	0.4774 0.2288
Q94	How do you define your race and or ethnicity? (Check all that apply)						

* p < α = 0.1