# San José Police Department Data Analysis and Gender Action Plan

Created as part of the City of San José Intersectional Gender Analysis by the

Social Justice and Innovation Research Lab

Askew School of Public Administration and Policy

Florida State University

This page intentionally left blank.

Executive Summary	3
Letter of Transmittal	4
RECAP OF PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED DELIVERABLES	5
DATA COLLECTION METHODS	7
Data Analysis Overview	9
Introduction	9
San Jose Data Collection and Management Report	11
Analysis of SJPD Survey Results and Focus Groups	18
Positive Findings	18
Areas for Improvement	19
Policy Recommendations	33
References	34
Appendix	35
Complete Cross-Tabulation of SJPD Employee Survey Responses	35

# **Executive Summary**

A brief recap of previous deliverables is provided, along with an explanation of some challenges and shortcomings as tied to the origins of this study.

Beginning in August of 2021, the consultants contacted representatives from the San José Police Department (SJPD) to understand the data collection and management efforts of the department. During this time we also aggregated all publicly available data from SJPD. SJPD does make a great deal of data publicly available including the use of force events, departmental memos, and some departmental policies and procedures. These data are easy to find and manageable for the general public.

The workforce employment records were not as easily accessible or organized as the public-facing data. Many of the SJPD personnel records are not stored digitally, but rather in paper form. This makes continuous and careful monitoring and evaluation of the SJPD workforce incredibly challenging both for SJPD leadership and external stakeholders. SJPD should digitize all employment records as soon as feasible.

Due to workforce data limitations, we offered a series of recommendations that would allow SJPD to engage in strategic human resource management. If implemented, our recommendations would allow SJPD to accurately assess the intersectional gender equity across the department, identify goals to improve intersectional equity, monitor and evaluate progress towards those goals, and communicate the progress to the broader San José community. We based our recommendations on best practices from police departments from similarly sized metropolitan areas across the U.S.

Moving forward, SJPD should collect historical employment records that include pay information, reported employee gender identity, training and development obtained by the employee, and any disciplinary action faced by the employee. These data should then be de-identified and published to the general public in order to engender a greater sense of trust and accountability. These data should be combined with unit-level information about unfilled vacancies and employees exiting the unit. The employee records can be linked with the existing publicly available use of force data so the public can identify any systemic bias towards underrepresented intersectional gender groups. The department should also digitize any employment application data to understand if intersectional gender disparities within the workforce can be addressed through increased/targeted recruitment efforts.

This San José Police Department Data Analysis and Gender Action Plan is the comprehensive report and final deliverable of this Gender Equity Analysis Project of the City of San Jose Police Department. This report aggregates all quantitative survey data and qualitative focus group data collected to provide a comprehensive analysis for the San Jose City Council's use. Previous deliverables are summarized and policy recommendations are provided to implement specifically in the San Jose Police Department.

<sup>1</sup> This may require the Records Unit to remove specific information from the published records if the general public could use that information to identify individual SJPD employees in the database.



## **Letter of Transmittal**

Daniel Fay
Co-Director, Social Justice and Innovation Lab
Askew School of Public Administration and Policy
Florida State University
627 BEL
113 Collegiate Loop
Tallahassee, FL 32306

June 30, 2022

City of San José Office of the City Manager Attn: Sabrina Parra-Garcia 200 E. Santa Clara St, 17<sup>th</sup> Fl San José, CA 95113

Dear Sabrina:

As agreed in our contract, we are submitting the attached report entitled *San José Police Department Data Analysis and Gender Action Plan*.

This report aggregates all quantitative data and qualitative interview data collected across departments to provide a comprehensive analysis for the City Council's use. Previous deliverables are summarized and policy recommendations are provided to implement specifically in the San Jose Police Department.

We hope you find this final deliverable satisfactory.

Sincerely,

Daniel L. Fay

Daniel L. Fay

# **Recap of Previously Submitted Project Deliverables**

#### Deliverable 1

Deliverable 1 outlined the previous and contemporaneous employee data collection and management efforts of the San Jose Police Department. The data were structured by current individual employees and their job movements within the organization across their career. Due to the structure of these data, researchers are unable to identify any structural gender biases that occur over time and across units within SJPD. The consultants recommended restructuring the data collection efforts to include vacant positions, employees exiting the organization, and unit level demographics as outlined in deliverable 2.

## Deliverable 2

Deliverable 2 provided two templates for employee data collection: one for SJPD as a whole and the other for unit leaders within SJPD. Both data collection tools should be used annually to track employees across time and to identify any structural gender biases within the organization/unit that could be addressed with strategic human resource management and reorganization.

## Deliverable 3

Deliverable 3 resulted in the creation of the SJPD employee survey that was developed and distributed digitally through Qualtrics. SJPD leadership was consulted and was vital to the dissemination of the survey to employees department-wide.

## Deliverable 4

Deliverable 4 resulted in the creation of the San Jose resident survey that was developed and distributed digitally through Qualtrics. Twenty-one unique organizations that service a broad range of constituents through San Jose were contacted to assist in the distribution of the resident survey, along with City of San Jose government.

## Deliverable 5

Deliverable 5 involved following up with SJPD to send reminders to employees to complete the survey, which greatly increased the overall response rate.

For the resident survey, twenty-one unique organizations that service a broad range of constituents through San Jose were contacted multiple times via email and phone calls to assist in the distribution of the resident survey, in partnership with the City of San Jose government.

## Deliverable 6

Deliverable 6 provides an overview of the thematic findings of the two focus groups of SJPD employees that were conducted to allow for data collection, aggregation, and analysis regarding department activities, programming, policy, and budget. Participants held various job roles, both sworn officers and civilians, and represented a diverse background of racial and ethnic background, national origin, gender identity, sexual orientation, and years of experience at SJPD.

Unfortunately, no resident respondents were willing to participate in a focus group at the time of completion of this project.

## **Data Collection Methods**

San Jose Police Department Employee Survey

With the assistance of SJPD leadership, the consultants distributed the online survey instrument to all current SJPD employees (N=1657) through Qualtrics. The survey instrument (approved by the Florida State University Institutional Review Board (IRB)) asked a variety of questions about job functions, attitudes, experiences, and respondents' overall feelings towards SJPD and policing in general. The instrument allows SJPD employees to share their experiences with SJPD and identify any systemic or structural gender inequities without guiding or leading questions. At the completion of this report, a total of 263 employees completed the survey (response rate of ~16%). Although this response rate may seem low, it is well within the normal range of criminal justice survey response rates, but is very high compared to other online surveys conducted without incentives to participants (see Nix, Pickett, Baek & Alpert, 2019).

Additionally, two focus groups among SJPD employees were conducted to allow for qualitative data collection, aggregation, and analysis regarding department activities, programming, policy, and budget, among other issues. Participants held various job roles, both sworn officers and civilians, and represented a diverse background of racial and ethnic background, national origin, gender identity, sexual orientation, and years of experience at SJPD. Structuring both the SJPD employee survey and focus groups in this way allowed for consultants to then identify how positive and negative experiences and opinions correlate with various gender identities, resulting in a comprehensive, intersectional analysis. The identifying gender identity question in the employee survey is a validated question from the UCLA School of Law Williams Institute, and it is utilized so that the consultants can isolate the unique experiences of employees that identify as trans women, cisgender women, non-binary individuals, and others on the gender spectrum without imposing a gender dichotomy.

## San Jose Resident Survey

A separate resident survey was developed and distributed to residents of San Jose through Qualtrics in an effort to achieve an intersectional gender analysis that examines gender gaps that may disproportionately affect women of color, immigrant women, women with disabilities, trans women, etc within the community. Separate questions that ask gender identity, ethnicity, pronouns, national origin, etc. in order to conduct a comprehensive intersectional analysis. The identifying gender identity question used is a validated question from the UCLA School of Law Williams Institute, and it is utilized so that the consultants can isolate the unique experiences of trans women, cisgender women, non-binary individuals, and others on the gender spectrum without imposing a gender dichotomy.

Specific questions are asked about experiences with SJPD, which can then be cross-tabulate with the demographic information of respondents to identify and quantify gender gaps in experiences with SJPD among the various groups through an intersectional gender lens. Multiple opportunities are provided for respondents to discuss violence they may have experienced, providing them the agency to choose what, if any, specifics they would like to share.

The instrument allows residents to share their experiences with SJPD and identify any systemic or structural gender inequities without guiding or leading questions. There are various questions that ask specifically how their gender identity affects their interaction/experiences with SJPD, and whether they were themselves victims of a crime, along with their opinions of policing in general. Structuring the resident survey in this way allows for consultants to then identify how positive and negative experiences and opinions correlate with various gender identities.

Unfortunately, after outreach to more than twenty community organizations and in partnership with city government, at the time of completion of this report the response rate of the resident survey did not meet the threshold to allow for us to conduct a thorough analysis of respondents by the close of FY 2022. If the City of San Jose performs additional targeted outreach to residents to increase their completion rate of the resident survey by at least 200 additional respondents (as of June 2022), the consultants will revise this report to include relevant findings and adjust recommendations as may be needed. Consultants will also adjust the analysis of the employee survey if additional responses are collected during this period.

# **Data Analysis Overview**

#### Introduction

The data analysis for this project spanned two unique areas. The first was a look at the internal data collection and management of San Jose Police Department employees through the below San Jose Data Collection and Management Report. The workforce employment records were not as easily accessible or organized as the public-facing data. Many of the SJPD personnel records are not stored digitally, but rather in paper form. This makes continuous and careful monitoring and evaluation of the SJPD workforce incredibly challenging both for SJPD leadership and external stakeholders. SJPD should digitize all employment records as soon as feasible.

SJPD does store some limited electronic employment records, but these records only contain information for the current SJPD workforce. The goal of this first piece of the project was to assess the intersectional gender equity of the SJPD, but the existing records could not be used to perform such an analysis because the data only record the biological sex of current employees rather than the employees' own gender identity or expression. Additionally, the observations of the current database correspond to internal positions changes of current SJPD employees. The structure of these data, therefore, do not allow SJPD to identify critical gaps or under/over-representation of intersectional gender groups across units in the department. Workforce trends among these groups are also impossible to identify with the current structure of the data.

Due to these workforce data limitations, we offer a series of recommendations that would allow SJPD to engage in strategic human resource management. If implemented, our recommendations would allow SJPD to accurately assess the intersectional gender equity across the department, identify goals to improve intersectional equity, monitor and evaluate progress towards those goals, and communicate the progress to the broader San José community. We based our recommendations on best practices from police departments from similarly sized metropolitan areas across the U.S.

SJPD should collect historical employment records that include pay information, reported employee gender identity, training and development obtained by the employee, and any disciplinary action faced by the employee. These data should then be de-identified<sup>2</sup> and published to the general public in order to engender a greater sense of trust and accountability. These data should be combined with unit-level information about unfilled vacancies and employees exiting the unit. The employee records can be linked with the existing publicly available use of force data so the public can identify any systemic bias towards underrepresented intersectional gender groups. The department should also digitize any employment application data to understand if intersectional gender disparities within the workforce can be addressed through increased/targeted recruitment efforts.

<sup>2</sup> This may require the Records Unit to remove specific information from the published records if the general public could use that information to identify individual SJPD employees in the database.

The second piece of data analysis involves the analysis from the SJPD employee survey results as well as the analysis of the SJPD focus groups. Below you will find an overview of key findings in the data, illustrated through survey responses to questions which yielded statistical significance, and an illustration of excerpts from the focus groups which together informed the policy recommendations laid out at the conclusion of this report.

# San Jose Data Collection and Management Report

General Background Information

The Government Results and Performance Act of 1993 and the GPRA Modernization of 2010 required federal agencies to create strategic plans, establish performance goals, and submit annual reports to Congress documenting their actual performance compared to these goals, with the fundamental assumption that this data would be used to improve organizational accountability and improve policy results (Pandey, 2015). Similar reforms were widely adopted by state and local governments in the U.S. as well as many governments throughout the world (Krull, 2015). The City of San José Police Department (SJPD) does maintain and publicize a significant amount of performance data through a public facing section of its website (<a href="www.sjpd.org/records">www.sjpd.org/records</a>). The site also includes an interactive dashboard which allows the general public to search for use of force incidents as far back as 2015. These initiatives often focus on agency outputs rather than internal personnel information.

Many state and local government agencies do not collect, store, or analyze internal personnel information electronically thereby preventing the agency from strategically tracking and planning its workforce development efficiently and effectively. SJPD has limited electronic personnel records that are not publicly available. The consultant's initial conversation with Deputy Chief of Policy Heather Randol connected us with several other personnel in the SJPD Research and Development Unit and Fiscal Administration & Employee Services Division. From our understanding most personnel records are kept on-site in physical paper form, preventing strategic workforce planning that could be used to identify and ameliorate any gender disparities in the SJPD workforce, which may then translate into disproportionate outcomes for underrepresented gender groups in the San José community. We requested all available electronic employment records and received a historical record of all sworn officers and civilian employees. These data, while helpful, only contain limited information about individual employees' ethnicity, sex<sup>3</sup>, and job titles within the department. In these records female employees represent:

- 24.6% of the total SJPD workforce.
- 70.1% of the civilian workforce.
- 12.7% of the sworn officers in SJPD.
- Female civilian employees are most represented in the Records division (n=222)
- Female sworn officers are most represented in the Field Patrol division (n=297)

11

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> These data identify female employees, but do not identify gender or gender identity.

# Significance of Addressing the Data Management Problem in SJPD

Data collection and management are critical tasks for a transparent and accountable police department.

Strategic workforce planning consists of five main tasks that allow organizations to achieve their goals:

- Identify stakeholders in developing, communicating and implementing the workforce plan.
- Determine critical skills necessary for programmatic results.
- Develop strategies tailored to address gaps in number, deployment and alignment of human capital approaches for enabling and sustaining the contributions of all critical skills and competencies.
- Build the capability needed to address administrative, educational and other requirements important to support workforce planning strategies.
- Monitor and evaluate progress towards goals.

Each of these essential tasks can be accomplished more easily through robust electronic records because the goals and outcomes can be continually monitored to assess progress. Expanding and updating electronic records would allow SJPD leadership to contact and monitor women, transgender, and non-binary candidates and employees from recruitment to exiting the department. SJPD could then identify any internal or external conditions that may disproportionately affect women, trans, and non-binary employees and align management strategies to promote advancement within or prevent attrition from the SJPD. Expanding these electronic records could also allow SJPD to nimbly and quickly respond to external events that may affect the financial environment such as the COVID-19 pandemic. The state of South Carolina used electronic records and other human resource information technology to save \$61 million and lost less than one half of one percent of the workforce responding to the recession of 2008. A similar system would allow SJPD to nimbly react to any workforce shocks.

Indeed, scholars argue that a lack of government legitimacy induces dissatisfied groups of citizens to struggle against the perceived illegitimate government (Hegre et al., 2001), which may further exacerbate tensions between law enforcement agencies and the communities that they serve. Many jurisdictions have sought to expand the transparency of police operations to help the reputation and legitimacy of police officers, which police advocacy organizations such as the National Police Foundation support (Nir et al., 2021).

Traditional government transparency initiatives receive almost universal support to hold the government accountable, but the relationship between transparency, accountability, trust, and legitimacy is contextual and complex (Bromberg et al., 2018; Cucciniello et al., 2017). Social movements calling for increased transparency and accountability of law enforcement in recent years (Schmidt 2015) have gained significant public support since the murder of George Floyd. Police information, data, and documentation occupy a vexed position; on one side, the police need to be as transparent as possible to have the public's trust and be viewed as legitimate. However, law enforcement also needs to protect sensitive information that deals with intelligence and/or the privacy of their personnel and citizens (Chanin and Courts, 2017), supported by the

general public (Driscoll et al., 2000). Kimball (2003) indicates, "one of the greatest checks on government inefficiency or corruption may be citizen's access to government information." The public's ability to supervise the government already has barriers simply due to the time, resources, and expertise needed to request and understand relevant performance information. The lack of readily available information requires individuals to actively request information through interaction with the agency itself, thereby allowing the bureaucrat processing the request to exercise discretion.

A large portion of non-sworn employees in police departments across the U.S. are women and racial minorities. For example, McCarty and Skogan (2012) find that 61 percent of non-sworn police employees are women, which is in stark contrast to the 12 percent of women officers reported by the BLS in 2016. Civilian employees are more cost-effective for the positions mentioned above because they are paid less, cost less to train, and have fewer employee benefits than their sworn counterparts (McCarty and Skogan, 2012). However, low salaries and little room for career growth make long-term retention difficult (Alderden and Skogan, 2012).

Organizations typically report performance information for people to develop evaluation standards of "good" and "bad" performance (James, 2011; James & Moseley, 2014). Performance information can influence public perception and may be able to overcome anti-government bias in the citizenry (Noda, 2020). Experimental studies have found that positive performance information may improve people's evaluation of performance, resulting in higher levels of support for a particular elected official or public service provider (James, 2011; James & Moseley, 2014). On the contrary, when the performance information is negative, people may be less likely to support an incumbent elected official (James, 2011), but may not generate collective action from constituents (James & Mosely, 2014)

#### Problem Statement

The SJPD electronic personnel records contain 9,353 observations of both sworn and civilian employees. Each observation represents job position changes within the agency for the 1,651 current SJPD employees between June 6, 1999 and October 3, 2021. Current employees' tenure with SJPD range from 37 years to five employees that began their employment the day of data aggregation. Sworn officers changed positions on average 4.02 times during their tenure at SJPD and civilian employees changed positions on average 3.69 times during their tenure at SJPD. Female employees changed positions around 4.08 times and male employees changed positions around 3.90 times during their tenure. Male SJPD employees were employed in 105 different positions in 139 bureaus or units. Female employees were employed in 130 different positions in 184 bureaus or units. Male SJPD employees are most represented in the Field Patrol unit and female SJPD employees are most represented in the Communications Center. Over 90% of employees in the Field Patrol unit are sworn officers and over 90% of the employees in the Communications Center are civilian employees. Importantly these records do not identify employees' gender identity, pay schedule, training or development, and do not contain information about employees that have left SJPD.

While these records allow for broad descriptive statistics they do not allow SJPD to effectively engage in the five tasks of strategic human resource management, but also prevent effective communication of workforce plans and developments to the broader San José community. These data do not allow stakeholders to analyze workforce conditions that create the gender mix within SJPD described above. The records do not allow the SJPD to track the skills, knowledge, and abilities of individual employees nor do they allow SJPD to identify critical gender gaps in the units within SJPD by identifying barriers for women, nonbinary, and trans employees to be equally represented across units. By relying solely on individual employee employment data SJPD cannot keep an accurate historical record of gender representation across time and units.

Our workforce data recommendations described below will allow SJPD to: 1) identify any gender disparities in the workforce across units, 2) establish goals for improving gender equity across departmental units, 3) establish mechanisms to monitor and evaluate progress towards established goals, 4) create a more resilient workforce by documenting employee knowledge, skills, and abilities across units so that human resources can be reallocated during crises such as COVID-19 or financial instability, 5) identify structural conditions that may cause underrepresented intersectional gender minority employees to exit SJPD at higher or lower rates compared to gender majority employees.

# Analysis of Alternative

In pursuit of building the most robust recommendations for data management, ten comparable police departments across the country were selected for comparison. The ten selected were either of a similar size or a department larger known for standard setting in other areas. The research team both reviewed and compiled information that was available online and reached out via phone and email to employees of these police departments to discover how other large police departments manage their employment data. The primary purpose of these inquiries was to find out if employee data is stored digitally or hard copy and what if any information is made publicly available. Many of the departments are utilizing a hybrid storage approach of personnel data, where some of it is digital and some is still in hard copy paper form. This project is a necessary effort to optimize operations moving forward, and digitizing personnel files should be prioritized moving forward in the City of San Jose Police Department.

The ten police departments identified included: Jacksonville, Dallas, New York City, Phoenix, Los Angeles (city), San Diego, Miami, Chicago, Houston, Philadelphia. After multiple attempts, three police departments were unreachable, and of the additional eight, many have partially migrated from paper personnel records to digital, or a mix of digital and hard copy form. Most police departments that we spoke to mentioned the importance of storing personnel files digitally, even for those who have not yet begun this process, like Philadelphia.

SJPD does make much of its police activity data available online, which is already on par with many comparable police departments. Chicago and Phoenix both list all statistics and map it out for residents on an accessible website, which is much more detailed than Los Angeles, which only posts data related to the use of force. Dallas makes readily available online all data regarding officer involved shootings, racial profiling, and response to resistance.

New York City will provide information only if a FOIA request is made to ask for specifics related to police activity. Jacksonville does not have an independent website, and upon further inquiry we were advised to instead look for data tracking information on the Sheriff's website for the area. Philadelphia is also resistant to including this information publicly on their website. In Miami, if someone from the public wants to access crime data, the department charges for it. Charges are issued per calendar year of request.

# (1) Begin Digitizing All Records

Best practice moving forward is to ensure that all personnel records are being digitized - backup paper records can be kept and are at most locations that have switched to digital or at minimum a hybrid option. This will enable the department to more easily account for how representative the department is to the community - what is the gender representation within the department and its units, how many ethnicities and at what percentages are currently employed, and how has the intersectional gender diversity changed over time? If the department would ever like to engage in targeted recruiting to ensure that they represent the communities they serve and are equitably hiring from diverse backgrounds, having digitized records immediately allows for quick analysis and identification of any shortcomings across units. It will also allow for more enriching data analysis across all data sets collected by the department. For example, in neighborhoods seeing increased crime, how many members of the department live in that community? The limitless possibilities to be open, transparent and accountable to the city and its residents by providing more detailed reports in this way will serve as a means to continue to meet the objectives of the city. SJPD should make some slight changes to the employee records that it currently stores electronically. These recommendations are as follows:

- To the extent possible, SJPD should collect workforce records retrospectively and organize these records by *year* rather than only storing information about current employees organized by employee positions across time. This will allow SJPD to establish long-term goals for intersectional gender workforce equity and the ability to monitor and evaluate progress towards those goals over time.
- SJPD should store information about current employees, unfilled positions, and employees exiting SJPD for all units. These data can be gathered annually. SJPD can use these data to understand any problematic cultures within units that could discourage intersectional gender minorities from seeking positions within those units.
- SJPD should allow employees to report their gender identity to be linked to their employment record so that SJPD can effectively track gender equity across the units of the department.
- Employment training and development should be connected with employment records so human resources can be reallocated during times of crisis (such as COVID-19) based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities of those human assets.
- Employment pay rate or salary should be connected with anonymous employment records so that the department can identify and correct any pay disparities across intersectional groups.

## (2) Optimize digital records' availability to the public

All data should be available to the general public to establish a better sense of accountability with the general public. The employment records that we received were de-identified and anonymous. Due to the low representation of women and ethnic minorities in certain positions and units within SJPD, it may be possible to link a known employee to their individual record. To prevent that we recommend redacting some of the most specific information reporting an employee's position and unit in the data available to the public.

Organized and available workforce data would allow SJPD to better track its own workforce across units within the department and across time. This would allow the department to understand a current snapshot of the intersectional gender equity of its workforce, make goals to improve the intersectional gender equity, and monitor and evaluate progress towards those goals. Improving the data collection, management, and dissemination will also engender a sense of trust and accountability with the general public. Underrepresented intersectional gender groups could use these updated data to understand how many SJPD employees share their identities, where these employees work within the department, and where to reach these employee

# **Analysis of SJPD Survey Results and Focus Groups**

# Positive Findings

Survey results reveal many positive findings for women in SJPD in addition to positive findings for other gender groups. Women and other gender minorities are human resource assets that SJPD leadership should cultivate and support to achieve the goals and mission of the organization. These employees, in general, are excellent organizational citizens and display higher aptitudes to understand the requirements of their positions, go above and beyond those requirements for the betterment of the organization, and feel valued by the organization. Men score lower than women on several key indicators of employee performance and motivation including:

- "I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things"
- "My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment"
- "I know what is expected of me on the job"
- "When needed I am willing to put in the extra effort to get a job done"
- "I am constantly looking for new ways to do my job better"
- "My talents are used well in the workplace"
- "I know how my work relates to the agency's goals and priorities"
- "I recommend my organization as a good place to work"
- "My supervisor supports my need to balance work and other life issues"
- "I have a high level of respect for my organization's senior leaders"

On average, women and men employees in SJPD have the same levels of job satisfaction. Women do report more pro-social/organizational behavior than their men counterparts including participation in neighborhood watch or other resident programs and reporting instances of gender or racial bias among other employees. Survey results showcase that women are more likely to put in more effort to get the job done and more likely to find innovative ways to do the job better.

Additionally, another conversation emerged from one of the focus groups highlighting the move towards gender neutral language in policies throughout the department, including revisions to duty manual policies, as well as the development of gender inclusive policies that did not exist until this more recent update. Standards for grooming no longer require SJPD to abide by traditional heternormative 'male' and 'female' standards for grooming in an effort to internally validate employees' identity. This extended to policies for interacting with San Jose residents as well, which now allots residents the agency and choice regarding the background of the SJPD officer that will be interacting with them, when resources are available.

# Areas for Improvement

Overall things are 'getting better,' and 'have been getting better', phrases that were a constant refrain during both focus groups. Sentiments were made very clear by employees who can acknowledge the strides being made by the department, and the improvements over time, while still acknowledging they (as a department) can always be continuously improving. However there are some structural differences between gender groups of SJPD employees. Non-male employees report that they do personally perceive a gender bias in the SJPD. Gender non-conforming employees are most likely to perceive a bias (33.3%) followed by cisgender women (25.7%), which is significantly higher than cisgender men (16.7%). This suggests that while the department has made strides in recent years to root out gender bias, gender bias does exist in the organization and it primarily affects women and other gender minorities.

Survey respondents expanded on their perceptions of gender bias in the organization through the following statements:

- "Although leadership has made efforts to improve, there are still many employees with sexist views of women."
- "Certain groups speak different about woman and them being in power and then you have woman that's of color you really going be left out of things and talked about."
- "I have been questioned about aspects of my gender affecting my work performance"
- "Officers are mostly male. Civilian staff are mostly female. In both cases it has an affect on how people are treated and perceived."
- "Some sworn staff still treat women differently than men. It's a lot better but still happens."
- "There are officers who believe women should not be in law enforcement, and express it vocally. Stereotypes about women abound. We are often pigeonholed into the jobs requiring more empathy (family, sex, schools) rather than groomed for special operations or tactical/physically demanding assignments."
- "This is law enforcement, this is male-dominated field. There are more males than females in commanding positions and males are given more slack when they make mistakes. Mistakes by some people are swept under the rug, whereas women's performance is under much more intensified scope. There needs to be better mentorship programs at this Department for minorities and women and new officers!"
- "Women are denied opportunity to excel. Recent training initiatives for women have been discontinued because male employees complained about "not being invited" despite SJPD's long history of excluding female employees from opportunity."
- "Women as a whole are judged based upon how they look and or are not taken seriously, overlooked next to male officers."
- "Following gender norms are expected due to the paramilitary nature of the organization"

• "Jobs within department generally divide between roles: men more likely to be officers, mechanics while women are more likely to be dispatchers, admins, data specialists, etc."

These quotes pulled from the survey free response windows describe perceived gender bias within the organization, and parallel the quantitative disparities between men and women/other gender minorities in the survey data. Women are less likely to report that they feel their workload is reasonable compared to men.

An interesting take away from the focus groups is that when asked at the onset directly about a present gender bias, only about a third of participants felt comfortable naming that directly. However, as their answers evolved later in the focus groups in other contexts, the presence of gender bias was amplified through their individual answers as describing how things operate, mirroring some of the key takeaways from the focus groups as well.

One focus group respondent had this to share:

"I've been on (the job) 23 years...so I've seen a lot of changes from when I started 'til now. You know, in regards to how people are being treated within the police department, and the changes we've made, and I think this department has done a lot. You know, since day one when I got hired. You know, definitely we could improve on a lot of things, but I think we're way ahead of the curve to what we're doing for our officers, but we could definitely do more."

"I think we do an okay job. Can we do better? We can always do better."

Particularly when it came to discussing leadership positions within SJPD, participants in the focus groups placed a greater emphasis on the need for leadership training and individuals promote within the department:

"...there should be an increase in leadership positions and leadership training...starting at the Sergeant's level on up, so that...we can all get on the same page as to what...the benefits and the expectations...of leadership is within the department, and provide that then to their...employees."

Another respondent followed up:

"...I think leadership training is super important, and as you promote you...are required to take it, but really, I think that our chiefs should be attending leadership training...not that our chiefs currently aren't good leaders, I just think that as you promote, that stuff falls by the wayside, and that's really when you need it the most. I feel like if you're going to be running a unit or a division or organization, you need to...know how to lead people in a

way that they'll respond (to) and that's what leadership training has helped with, and...I think we have bigger issues."

Another conversation from one of the focus groups centered on the topic of innovation at work. There was some robust discussion around the desire for new ideas and innovations to be welcomed and valued, including female focus group respondents expressing their desire to see a change in the department where this would be a more welcomed aspect of their work, sharing:

"if there's one thing culturally I'd like to see (done) different(ly) at PD, it would be more of an emphasis on allowing an environment where people are encouraged to think outside the box. Because we are very regimented from just the nature of a police community, and that trickles down through all of the rest of our departments, even for civilians. I've worked with leadership that was more of an attitude of 'stay in your lane, do as you're told, and that's the way we've always done it' attitude. And then I've had the opportunity to work on the other side of that, where opinions and thoughts and ideas were, were allowed and even encouraged, and unfortunately, I think that's rare. I'd like to see more, where you could be more comfortable, where we take advantage of everybody's talents, and that they feel safe in (that) aspect for, for being able to approach that."

Another respondent immediately agreed and added:

"I just have to say, 100% what [they] just said, and those are, unfortunately, culturally part of SJPD it's 'staying your lane' and 'this is the way we've always done it,' and I'm sure other departments have the same thing. But those are things we hear...either directly or we feel on on a regular basis within this department."

When asked about bias in promotions processes, answers in the focus group varied a bit based on perception through one self and by others. One female respondent had this to share in a focus group:

"... in regards to promotions or, you know, assignments, I've never experienced any sort of bias. I mean, I would say a lot of people in the department feel the flip side, that as a woman you're likely to get promoted more quickly or you know, maybe undeservingly...I'd like to think I got promoted on my merit. But there's other people in...the department that maybe where they (believe women) were promoted just because they're a female, or because they're of a certain ethnicity, and you know and, and that's. you know, that doesn't always sit well with some people..."

An LGBTQ indentifying male respondent in one of the focus groups shared his perspective:

"...I've experienced that in the past that people think that I got maybe preferential treatment because they wanted someone like me in this position. I don't believe that at all,

I believe that the process was very fair. I believe that they took into consideration my qualifications, and they chose to meet based on my merit. So...I have to say that as far as that goes, I feel like the process has been very fair here in San Jose for me."

Another respondent weighed in on the promotion process, offering their perspective:

"I've been given a fair shake and...people have been promoted, and...maybe some people get promoted on the basis of gender, or for sexuality but for the most part, I think the department does a good job on promoting the right people for the right jobs, and...my personal experience, I've never been discriminated (against), and I('ve) always been given a fair shot, and that I appreciate that of this department because my previous department wasn't that way."

One female focus group respondent brought up feeling her last round of interviews was conducted fairly with the presence of the interview panel she appeared in front of:

"I feel like in my last round of interviews, the interview panel was very diverse. (It) had different departments (present, it) wasn't just, you know, police department staff interviewing me, and then on top of that, you know the interviewers were diverse in background and culture. And so I felt like that made me feel like 'oh, well, I'm going into (an) unbiased interview.' I guess my takeaway is the interview panel should be not biased, and maybe just be more inclusive of not just maybe your friends that are in the interview panel."

In response, another female focus group respondent outlined her concerns with an 'archaic' and outdated method of holding interview panels for SJPD hiring and promotion panels, shining a light on the need to rethink how to orchestrate the interview process in the future:

"In regards to interview panels, I think San Jose really does it, we're pretty archaic, I think, in the way that we do it. I don't know that any police departments in the Bay area still do interview panels with internal members on them, and we still do in...some ways....But I think more so what happens is people on the panel are biased, and what, for whatever reason, against whoever might be coming in next, they might have had a pass running with them, or some sort of other negative experience, and I think as much as we'd like to pretend it doesn't happen, that influences the outcome of the interview, or the score that's given. And I just can't believe as a progressive as a department, as we, you know to be, that we still use interview panels with internal members. I just, that just completely blows my mind."

The survey results also reveal disparities in the performance review process between women and men. Women are less likely to feel their performance appraisal is a fair reflection of their performance. One focus group respondent flagged the fact that performance appraisals are not uniformly executed across units within the department:

"...we have very few supervisors (that) actually write appraisals. And so...you can require something to be done in time for an appraisal. But if no appraisals are being done in the first place, then you know, how do you enforce that? And that's you know, that's a systematic culture that we have in our department that needs to be emphasized from the top down, but that's a whole other issue..."

# The respondent continues:

"...appraisals are falling by the wayside here. I think that's a much bigger issue than just the apathy. I think that the whole system is, (it) just isn't very effective. Whether it be the, the format of our...appraisals, or...the weight that they carry for either...merit...or pay increase...or promotions, or whatever. They're just not taken into consideration to such an extent that people feel compelled to require them, or ask for them. I also think they're very poor, poorly worded and give very little ability for managers to interact with their employees in a meaningful way."

The survey responses and focus group excerpts highlight the need to revamp the performance appraisal process within SJPD. This includes ensuring it is executed routinely and consistently throughout the department. Ensuring a comprehensive annual performance review takes place for all department employees will allow SJPD to better track employee data as well, ensuring they have the ability to track position movements within the department. SJPD needs consistent, uniform performance evaluation across all units, enabling units to include unit-specific supplemental questions and performance indicators. With the implementation of the new data collection and management system proposed in Deliverable 2, unit-specific revisions can easily be incorporated and then continuously tracked over time.

A focus group respondent spoke to how training and evaluation procedures should be tied to future appraisal processes to encourage employees throughout the department to take them more seriously:

"...I believe that providing an incentive to, to furthering your education is always a good move, whether that be a requirement or an added bonus to promotions or, or, or regular appraisals to have it mentioned or commendations for taking training or recognition for taking training, especially if you're doing it on your own. I always think that that's a...positive, is rewarding people for, for making the effort to, to continue your education and make it worthwhile for them."

Continuing the conversation, another focus group respondent agreed, with broad consensus from participants, assuming that performance appraisals are conducted consistently and appropriately:

"...if it's incorporated into the annual appraisal process as to if we supposedly had these little modules or things that you had to go and and do, and at the appraisal point each year you have to have completed so many of these, it'd be an effective way to get stuff put through."

Other focus group participants weighed in on their desire to have trainings included in performance appraisals, including this specific thought:

"And the trainings should be tied to their performance evaluation, so they should get rewards for trainings, and their training should include the performance appraisals, like how they can use that training to increase their performance. It can't be, they talk about having a lot of training, online training, etc. I think that by tying it to the performance metrics and evaluations, the participants will get more out of it and feel like it's not just something you have to complete to check a box."

Moving forward, finding a way to link training and performance metrics will enhance the overall performance appraisal system within SJPD, and opens the door to further embed the goals of the trainings being offered to the shift change meetings or team meetings throughout normal work periods, further meeting the goal of offering the trainings to begin with. This will then allow for pinpointed areas for improvement and areas of success to highlight among units throughout SJPD, allowing the department to be targeted in their future strategic planning and the trajectory of the department.

Survey results found women are also less likely to feel like they can disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear or reprisal compared to men.

A male focus group respondent had this to share:

"So it's happened, it's come up once in the past, and it came out again recently where I've had a female officer, flat out say that they do not feel like they could report harassment by males in the workplace because they did not want to be seen as....yeah, which I thought was kind of sad. But that, yeah, that's been told to me a couple times."

A female focus group respondent directly responded:

"I've had women come to me about similar (things) that they have felt, maybe that their supervisor is mistreating them or belittling them because they were female....I had one woman who told me when she goes to the (shooting) range with her male partner, he's

given three boxes of ammunition, she's given one box of ammunition, and this is happening on a regular basis, up until recently, when there was a change in our staff there. But things like that have definitely come up over the years."

Moving forward a new process needs to be put in place to eradicate barriers to reporting incidents like this, and to create a welcoming, private environment for employees to feel comfortable coming forward.

Based on survey findings, 20 percent of cisgender women report having witnessed an instance of gender bias displayed by a colleague towards another colleague within SJPD, whereas only 4.2 percent of men report witnessing such an event. Focus group participants shared these sentiments in a similar breakdown, providing first or secondhand accounts and anecdotes to illustrate these experiences across both groups. Here is just one excerpt:

"I've certainly had male superiors who have treated me like garbage, and I'm, you know, they were very demeaning and just rude, and just handled themselves completely

Focus group participants in both groups shared similar sentiments when it came to gender bias displayed towards and amongst LGBTQ employees:

Shared from an LGBTQ male focus group respondent:

"...to present as gay and to be on patrol...it led to some issues early on which, which were not only surprising, but significant. They were something I didn't expect...I have to say that...originally I was shocked...and disappointed at the reception that I received being openly gay in what is traditionally a very macho (place) and an environment not necessarily very inviting to to gay people. So, so again things have improved. We've moved forward now 9 years later, I have to say I...like what I see. I still think there's room for improvement...

This female straight focus group respondent reflects on the disparity between gay and lesbian and transgender employees feeling comfortable and welcomed to be out at work:

"We don't have a lot of openly gay men on the department or transgender, and so I'm not sure that 'succeeding' is the right word, and I know you said the opposite, too, you know or not succeeding in your original question. So, but again, is that? And this is just a hypothetical question or rhetorical question. Really? Yeah, are we? Do we not have a lot of openly gay men, or lesbian women, or transgender? Are they not coming out because they just haven't got to...that point yet personally? Or is it because they don't feel supported, and in which case, if they don't feel supported, then we are not succeeding."

Another female focus group respondent shared an anecdote regarding the experience of a transgender female in department:

"I recall was the first transgender officer transition at the police department, and it was an outrage, and I mean it was. I couldn't believe it and you know, as I reflect on it, I just think that, really kudos to that officer for making that choice in such a when it was not open or welcomed, and like they must have felt so strongly about who they were and and their identity that, they knew, she knew she was gonna face an uphill battle, and she did it anyways."

Similarly, focus group respondents shared much about the 'dominant male culture' and the role that plays, intentional or not, in slowing the overall advancement of the department when it comes to gender and sexual orientation-based variations throughout the department, sharing:

"It surprised me, actually, and it hasn't gone unnoticed by me, and probably anyone else that, you know, when you look at the statistics we have, you know, 90% of our department, probably maybe a little less than that now, are men, but very, very few are openly gay, and I think that has only been in the last few years that we've had more than one person who has been (an) openly gay male (at work)...and I'm sure there are other folks at the department who are still closeted because they don't feel comfortable.

I don't know that that has to do with our leadership as much as it has to do with being in a predominantly male culture, and I also think that sometimes it's a fear that's internal that may not come to fruition, right, like if, if, say those folks who are concerned about coming out did come out, they might find that really they're accepted a lot more than they thought they would be. So...it just seems really complicated to me. but I think that as a department we're really trying, but as a society, and a microcosm of society, we still have a lot of work to do definitely."

A heterosexual male respondent later chimed in on the disparity of treatment and openness among varying LGBTQ identities:

"I kind of agree with...when (someone else) said that it's okay, if you're a female, and you're...lesbian or bisexual. I think they got no issues, but, but dudes on the other hand, they probably (have a harder time)..."

As mentioned above, the survey finds that women are more likely to report instances of racial or gender bias, despite a higher fear of reprisal, but are less satisfied than men employees with how the department handles the complaint. Women are also less satisfied with the trainings that are offered and the number of trainings available in the department that cover gender bias or other cultural competency compared to employees that are men.

When discussing trainings in both of the focus groups, overwhelmingly all respondents felt that more trainings are needed, and robust discussions ensued regarding the need for additional funding and resources to ensure trainings can be properly staffed, prioritized, and attended. One focus group respondent shared the following on their need for additional training:

"I think more training is needed. It's not just a one-and-done. I do feel a little bit like It's a one and done like we had a...LGBTQ training, I personally learned a lot. I think all the coworkers I know that went too agree that it was a great training. Everyone learned a lot but It's like I don't think that's the end. I think more...Maybe you don't accept it at first, and maybe after a few more trainings they'll kind of sink in a little bit or so on, so I do imagine that the training can continue. But that was it."

Another respondent on the positive impacts of training:

"I hope (continued training) does (continue)...that implicit bias class that they had...4 or 5 years ago, that was my first exposure to things, and I went, 'oh, that's that's me' when they were talking about certain things, and again I never had the opportunity to get educated and and other than just what's in the news and that's so flagrantly overdone. So yeah, more training and...not just a one-and-done. It needs to continue."

When reflecting on the varying need for trainings based on age and lived experience diversity within the department, one focus group participant shared this:

"...people that are at the twilight of their career, they've grown up and have wait in a completely different society, or upbringing where these things weren't talked about 20 years ago or 30 years ago...valid point about education, cause that's, that's the only way people are gonna change if they do change at all, is by education and by training, and so I think it you know is really important."

Discussing the long lasting effect of trainings continually pushing the department in the right direction, another focus group respondent shared:

"Training creates that conversation, even for people that are not paying attention, then at least, it's in their mind, and then what walking around the department...they know...it's an aspect of our lives here now, and it's it's here, and it's gonna stay here. So eventually (all employees) get indoctrinated...into that...People pay attention eventually, because they get bombarded with classes and training, classes and training, and that's where we're going. We need more training, more classes, but it's (been) a step in the right direction."

On the need for consistent prioritization and funding from the city, one focus group respondent shared:

"...I see this pattern of where there's high priority...to come up with a training plan for these issues, and then we do. And then, by the time we come up with the training plan it's less of a priority, or it's kind of fallen to the to the wayside, or some other priority has come up, and by the time a decision has to be made on implementing the training that

we've come up with they're like, 'well, okay, sure. Just knock it out in a couple of hours, you know. Make it work,' and we'll move on to the next thing..."

One focus group participant shares their perspective about recent LGBTQ trainings, noting that they feel any inequities at work are not 'unique' to their department:

"I mean, when I was in college I hadn't even heard of LGBTQ. You know I didn't even know what those terms meant and it's an education process. You know you've got to take...your adult staff who, this is all new to us. If you didn't grow up with that, if you didn't have it in your family or your community, you had no experience with it. So you -you've -we've got to keep going with the classes and the training, and get people more exposed and understanding to expect change. But that's, that's the society that's just not something that's a problem for PD. That's a problem for everywhere."

Mentioning the need to prioritize and compensate for trainings, so as not to undermine people's openness to embrace the training before entering the space, a focus group respondent shared this thought:

"...for folks like...our dispatchers that are already working mandatory massive amounts of overtime. You tell them they have to go to training and spend more hours, that's the last thing they want to do. So you've already defeated your purpose and with you know, they're not coming with positive attitudes when you're making those demands of them already."

For trainings to be successful, they need to be led by individuals who are credible and passionate about what they are presenting, and the excitement and importance needs to be levied at all levels of the department for the best results. Both focus groups shared very similar accounts of a bias training that took place a few years back now, and their overwhelming consensus from both groups was what a terrible training it was because the person in charge had no credibility. From their vantage point, within the first five minutes of the training, they all had the impression they were there just to 'check a box' and say they went to this training, because it was very poorly done, and the trainer had a 'we just have to get through this for a few hours' attitude. This was contrasted with the highly touted LGBTQ+ Awareness training currently being provided, and focus group respondents illuminated the vast differences in the two, because current training has a solid curriculum, a trainer that has credibility and passion for the topic, and that makes a vast difference to participants.

These focus group excerpts illuminate the passion that employees have for wanting more trainings and understanding the importance of them, but also struggling to achieve what is needed operating within the financial confines currently in place. When it comes to training, best practice is to ensure continuous trainings, with each completed training informing the needs of participants to plan for a future training that meets their revised needs.

Overall the earlier mentioned gender disparities within the department extend to SJPD interactions with San Jose residents. Women and gender minority employee respondents are less likely to agree with the following statements compared to men SJPD employees:

- "SJPD is helpful to people who have been victims of a crime"
- "Overall, the police do a good job of honoring the gender identities of residents they interact with"
- "In your opinion, SJPD officers treat all residents equally regardless of gender identity"
- "In your opinion, SJPD officers treat all residents equally regardless of race or ethnicity"
- "In your opinion, SJPD officers treat all residents equally regardless of national origin"
- "In your opinion, SJPD officers treat all residents equally regardless of socioeconomic status"
- "City of San Jose police officers are likely to treat male-identifying people, female-identifying and gender non-conforming people equally."
- "Based on your experience, you believe the City of San Jose police officer/s treat residents professionally and respectfully."

The focus groups highlighted a great sense of pride among SJPD employees for the work they do to build trust in the community, particularly when compared to other departments in the area. Focus group participants highlighted programs that are run, or used to be run before COVID, such as Coffee with a Cop, Boba with a Cop, Shop with a Cop, Ice Cream with a Cop, Citizen's Academy, Reading with a Cop, Camping with a Cop, ride alongs, and a host of other school-based and community-based programs. It was noted during focus groups that the funding for programs such as Coffee with a Cop are primarily grant-funded, not through normal budget allocations made to the department, which means they are not regularly scheduled, recurring events, but take place on a more ad-hoc basis.

A few excerpts on this topic from focus group participants:

"How does our department fare when you compare it to other departments. Well, I can tell you that our department has a ton of programs when it comes to engaging the community. We have Shop with a Cop, Ice Cream with a Cop, Camping with a Cop, Reading with a Cop, every elementary school in San Jose, prior to COVID, had an officer in there reading with them, elementary school kids. We have an ice cream truck that we purchased a couple of years ago to honor one of our fallen officers who loved ice cream. We routinely use that at community events, and of course...the Coffee with a Cop program is all over the country where officers get to meet the community, and then get to chat about what's going on and answer any questions that we have. The...camping program it's been in place as well, although we haven't done it in a couple of years because of COVID. We used to have a Citizens Academy, we don't have that anymore. I don't know what happened to that.

I think that's a great way to get citizens involved and let them know, and give them a realistic approach of, almost, without getting hurt, about what we do about, so with...that in place, I think we do a pretty good job."

"...(you need a) combination of the police department doing it right along with the community, because it takes both, right, to have a safe place. You have to have a strong, good police department, and you have to have the community that supports that department."

Speaking to the shortcomings of achieving additional programming without the funding for additional staffing and having to work within limited constraints, a focus group respondent had this to share:

"...we keep making new units without getting additional staffing. We keep adding in more training without getting additional money. So, of course I mean, the city of course, they're no they're no dummies. They're gonna say, 'Well, you made it work do it again.' And so it's like you almost can't blame the city for saying that right? Because why would they offer anything else up when we've been able to make it work? But...we're barely hanging on. I mean we are barely keeping our head above water when it comes to staffing..."

Another focus group respondent repeatedly brought up the short staffing issues within SJPD:

"...we're very thinly staff, for a city of our size. They actually want the people in the training academy to go out and answer calls on their days off. I mean it's, it's crazy how we have to like superglue everything together here compared to well-staffed departments which do exist in this country, (but) not San Jose."

Also during the focus groups, the topic of mental health was brought up and emphasized as something that needs to be further prioritized and woven into the fabric of everything the department does. Currently the department does have mental health services available, but it has limited capacity with only a few staffers, and the location of the mental health services office should be reconsidered. Focus group participants uplifted the issue of employees being averse to utilizing the resources available due to the office location being in such close proximity to the Chief's office. This pronounced, high traffic location is not conducive to employees being comfortable taking advantage of the services they need.

The mental health services offered within the department should physically be relocated, ideally to an offsite location that employees can access, to protect their anonymity. Leadership throughout the department should encourage all employees to embrace their mental health needs and take advantage of what is available to them, and the department's funding in this area should be a top priority.

Additionally, one finding that became clear after analyzing the focus groups, while funding is always a constraint that governments at every level grapple with, the ways in which changes to the budget are allocated can actually address more than one issue at a time. For example, the costs of putting together trainings and hiring on the trainers, and buying out the

time for department participants to engage in the trainings is clearly an ongoing issue. However, if increases in funding to civilian employment within SJPD are made, that can further create the core team of individuals not only in training, but in other key areas of the department, where civilian employees can alleviate some of the burdens of sworn officers, and thereby sworn officers will also benefit in the long term from this additional infrastructure and support from within the department structure.

One focus group participant summed up the benefits and potential impact of a move like this:

"...the cost effectiveness of continued civilianization of areas within the department that can safely and effectively been be done by civilian employees, which are a low cost solution to and a lower liability solution than using sworn officers, and I love the fact that that kind of can fit in kind of like a puzzle piece to increasing funding for programs that are more important to sworn officers is of putting more off on civilians that can do the job effectively at a lower cost, and that could free up funds so that officers would have a little bit more latitude, too, for the important training and, and other necessities that they require for their jobs."

One final set of observations worth mentioning from the focus groups involves the need for cultural change within the department. Again, strong themes throughout both focus groups highlighted that SJPD employees overall have seen the progress being made, but know there is still room for improvement in all of the above mentioned areas as they seek gender parity in all aspects of the department.

A noteworthy piece of information shared in both focus groups, is that employees believe that currently 65% of the department has been on the job with five years of experience or less, indicating that the time to lean into shifts in cultural norms and departmental culture change is now.

One focus group respondent described it in this way:

"It's a new generation. I think we're under-experienced with officers right now. I think the department is 65% on 5 years of experience, so it's a new... generation (that's) taken over so...that's a big improvement."

When speaking about the speed of culture shift in the context of an unsavory incident from years ago, another focus group respondent had this to share:

"I think that our department,...the management of our department, the command staff of our department, are doing a pretty good job in this area [speaking about gender equity overall], but I think that it's a cultural shift that is just slow to happen. I feel like in the history of the 30 years that I've been there, the lesbian officers have been pretty comfortable being openly gay, and there hasn't been, from an outsider looking in, it seems like everybody's kind of comfortable in their skin in the women's locker room. When we

had the male officer that transitioned to female who came into the women's locker room, I was pretty taken aback at how she was treated."

Additionally, currently 13% of the SJPD workforce is female, and while this is a long way from gender parity, it is an improvement to a few years ago when the department was at 9%. Focus group participants had the following to share, expressing the increasing number of females in the department and in leadership roles gives them hope:

".. There's a lot more women getting hired..."

"...you definitely can feel it in the lockers, we're running out of lockers for women in the locker room, you know, and so that, to me, that makes me feel good because it's, I feel like that issue is getting addressed. Like there's not this low number anymore it's trying to create, you know, that...equity right like, hey, we want more females, we want visibility, right. At least that's...how I'm seeing it, you know, and I can only speak to how I'm interpreting it. There's also more females as far as the chain of command...which...when I see that, you know, I know there's a lot of women that are working hard and that deserve to be in those positions, it's not something that is just handed (to them), and so to see officers getting recognized for their hard work, and actually getting promotions, for me, it's a possibility that...I can be potentially in their shoes, and it's not gonna be overlooked just because I'm a woman...They're looking at everybody."

A clear priority for the department moving forward is to continue targeted efforts to reach gender parity within the department, which will lend itself to broader cultural change throughout the department, and will have a direct impact on each of these areas of improvement moving forward.

## **Policy Recommendations**

Based on our analysis of the survey and focus group data, we summarize the following policy recommendations to directly target the most impactful reforms that SJPD can pursue to alleviate gender bias throughout departmental operations.

- Revamp and codify improved annual performance appraisal process, ensuring unit-specific metrics are added that the process happens uniformly throughout the department
- Increase training opportunities and tie participation to performance appraisals
- Primary trainers and educators should come from within the department when possible
- Discipline employees for gender bias/hostile environment through established disciplinary procedures
- Implement a zero tolerance policy for retaliation for reports and actually follow through on disciplining employees for retaliation
- Create a mentorship program for women and gender minorities so they can continue to rise in leadership.
- Relocate the department's current mental health office (ideally offsite) and further invest in its staffing and resources
- Increase recruitment and selection efforts of men civilian employees
- Increase recruitment and selection efforts of women sworn officers to strive for gender parity among sworn officers
- Increase resident engagement by reinstituting programs like Citizen's Academy, school-based partnership programs and youth camping programs, among others
- Institutionalize and fund resident engagement programs such as Coffee with a Cop, Boba with a Cop, and others so they are consistently executed and not dependent on grant funding

#### References

- Alderden, M., & G. Skogan, W. (2014). The place of civilians in policing. Policing: an international journal of police strategies & management, *37*(2), 259-284.
- Bromberg, D. E., Charbonneau, É., & Smith, A. (2018). Body-Worn Cameras and Policing: A List Experiment of Citizen Overt and True Support. *Public Administration Review*, 78(6), 883-891. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12924
- Chanin, J., & Courts, J. (2017). Examining the determinants of police department online transparency. *Criminology, Crim. Just. L & Soc'y*, 18, 52.
- Cucciniello, M., Porumbescu, G. A., & Grimmelikhuijsen, S. (2017). 25 years of transparency research: Evidence and future directions. *Public Administration Review*, 77(1), 32-44.
- Driscoll, P. D., Splichal, S. L., Salwen, M. B., & Garrison, B. (2000). Public support for access to government records: A national survey. Access denied: Freedom of information in the information age, 23-36.
- Hegre, Havard, Tanja Ellingsen, Scott Gates, Nils Peter. Gleditsch. 2001. 'Toward a Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War, 1816-1992.' American Political Science Review 95: 33-48.
- James, O. (2011). Performance measures and democracy: Information effects on citizens in field and laboratory experiments. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(3), 399-418.
- James, O. & Moseley, A. (2014). Does performance information about public services affect citizens' perceptions, satisfaction, and voice behaviour? Field experiments with absolute and relative performance information. *Public Administration*, *92*(2), 493-511.
- Kimball, M. B.(2003). Law enforcement records custodians' decision-making behaviors in response to Florida's public records law. *Communication Law and Policy*, 8(3), 313-360.
- McCarty, W. P. & Skogan, W. G. (2012). Job-Related Burnout Among Civilian and Sworn Police Personnel, *Police Quarterly 16*(1): 66-84.
- Nir, Bromwich, J. E., & Weiser, B. (2021). Police Killings: Of 43 Inquiries, No Convictions. The New York Times, A1–.
- Nix, J. Pickett, J. T., Baek, H. & Alpert, G. P. (2019) Police research, officer surveys, and response rates, Policing and Society, 29:5, 530-550, DOI: <u>10.1080/10439463.2017.1394300</u>
- Schmidt, M. S. (2015, January 15). A call to better track police use of guns. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/16/us/politics/holder-urges-better-data-for-shootings-involving-police.html
- UCLA School of Law Williams Institute, <a href="https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/">https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/</a>.

ew Crosstab											
		<b>Total</b> Cisgende	Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice  Total Cisgender (non-trans) V Cisgender (non-trans) m Transgender Man Transgender Woman Agender Gender non-conforming Genderqueer Please specify another te								
		A Cisgenia	B	C C	D D	ender Woman Agende E	F Gender	G G	H H	specify another to	
	Street Acres	20.0%	34.3%	25.00/	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	22.20/	25.00/	29.2%	
	Strongly Agree	29.0%		25.0%	0.0%		16.7%	33.3% 33.3%	25.0% 25.0%	29.2%	
	Somewhat agree	33.1%	45.7%	31.3%		0.0%				I	
	Neither agree nor disagree	11.0%	5.7%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%	
Q2: I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things.	Somewhat disagree	12.4%	8.6%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	
	Strongly disagree	13.8%	5.7%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	16.7%	
	Average	3.5	3.9	3.4		5.0	2.8	3.3	3.3	3.4	
		В									
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	2.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	
	Strongly Agree	44.8%	42.9%	45.8%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	100.0%	25.0%	45.8%	
	Somewhat agree	29.7%	40.0%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	25.0%	22.9%	
	Neither agree nor disagree	9.7%	8.6%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	
	Somewhat disagree	9.7%	8.6%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	10.4%	
My work gives me a feeling	=	5.5%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%	
f personal accomplishment		4.0	4.2	4.0		5.0	3.8	5.0	3.0	3.9	
	Average	4.0	4.2	4.0		5.0	3.8	5.0	3.0	3.9	
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	
	Strongly agree	56.6%	62.9%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	50.0%	60.4%	
	Somewhat agree	31.0%	34.3%	31.3%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	25.0%	29.2%	
	Neither agree nor disagree	6.9%	2.9%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	6.3%	
	Somewhat disagree	3.4%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	4.2%	
	Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
know what is expected of me on the job	Average	4.4	4.6	4.2		5.0	4.4	4.0	4.3	4.5	
	Average	В В	4.0	4.2		5.0	4.4	4.0	4.5	4.5	
	Adv. div.		5.0	45		5.0	10	5.0	4.5	5.0	
	Median	5.0	5.0	4.5		5.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	
	r										
	Strongly Agree	77.2%	80.0%	70.8%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	81.3%	
	Somewhat agree	17.9%	17.1%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%	
	Neither agree nor disagree	2.1%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
To what extent do you agree	Somewhat disagree	1.4%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
th the following statement: In needed I am willing to put	Strongly disagree	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
in the extra effort to get a job done.	Average	4.7	4.8	4.6		5.0	4.4	5.0	5.0	4.8	
						5.0		5.0	5.0	4.0	
	Median	5.0	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	
	median	5.0	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	
Q6: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: I am constantly looking for ways	Strongly Agree	57.2%	68.6%	41.7%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	66.7%	50.0%	68.8%	
	Somewhat agree	33.1%	25.7%	45.8%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	33.3%	50.0%	22.9%	
	Neither agree nor disagree	4.8%	2.9%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	
	Somewhat disagree	2.1%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	Strongly disagree	2.1%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
to do my job better.	Average	4.4	4.6	4.2		5.0	3.8	4.7	4.5	4.6	

w Crosstab										
		Takal	Cianandar (nan trops) M Cian	Q142: When describing your g					Diago angifu	
			Lisgender (non-trans) v Cisg A B	ender (non-trans) n Transgender Man C	D	nder Woman Agender E	F	non-conforminį Genderqueer G	Please specify a H	mother term y
	Median	5.0	5.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
	Strongly agree	11.0%	5.7%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	16.7%
	Somewhat agree	31.7%	37.1%	31.3%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	27.1%
	Neither agree nor disagree	7.6%	8.6%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
To what extent do you agree	Somewhat disagree	19.3%	22.9%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%		22.9%
h the following statement: I	Strongly disagree	29.7%	25.7%		0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%		25.0%
ve sufficient resources (for cample, people, materials,										
udget) to get my job done.	Average	2.8	2.7	2.6		4.0	2.2	3.3	2.5	2.9
	Median	3.0	3.0	2.5		4.0	1.0	4.0	2.0	3.0
						-	-			
	Strongly agree	21.4%	14.3%	16.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	31.3%
	Somewhat agree	24.8%	22.9%	31.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	20.8%
	Neither agree nor disagree	13.1%	17.1%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
	Somewhat disagree	20.0%	25.7%	22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
To what extent do you agree	Strongly disagree	20.0%	20.0%		0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	33.3%		18.8%
th the following statement:  Ny workload is reasonable.										
iy workload is reasonable.	Average	3.1	2.9	3.1		5.0	1.8	3.7	2.8	3.3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0		5.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	4.0
	Strongly agree	29.7%	34.3%		0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%		29.2%
	Somewhat agree	31.7%	28.6%		0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%		33.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	11.0%	17.1%		0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
To what extent do you agree		13.8%	14.3%		0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%		14.6%
th the following statement:	Strongly disagree	13.1%	5.7%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	12.5%
talents are used well in the workplace.										
workplace.	Average	3.5	3.7	3.5		4.0	2.6	3.3	2.5	3.5
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	2.0	4.0	2.5	4.0
	_									
	Strongly agree	47.6%	51.4%	43.8%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%
	Somewhat agree	33.8%	40.0%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	50.0%	27.1%
	Neither agree nor disagree	7.6%	5.7%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
	Somewhat disagree	4.8%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
									0.0%	2.1%
	Strongly disagree	5.5%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1/0
agree with the following ement: I know how my work	-		0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.176
agree with the following ement: I know how my work	-		0.0%	4.0	0.0%	5.0	33.3%	4.3	4.5	4.1
agree with the following ement: I know how my work tes to the agency's goals and	Strongly disagree	5.5%			0.0%					
agree with the following ement: I know how my work tes to the agency's goals and	Strongly disagree	5.5%			0.0%					
agree with the following ement: I know how my work es to the agency's goals and	Strongly disagree  Average	5.5%	4.4	4.0	0.0%	5.0	3.2	4.3	4.5	4.1
agree with the following ement: I know how my work tes to the agency's goals and	Strongly disagree  Average	5.5%	4.4	4.0	0.0%	5.0	3.2	4.3	4.5	4.1
agree with the following tement: I know how my work ates to the agency's goals and	Strongly disagree  Average  Median	5.5% 4.1 4.0	5.0	4.0		5.0	3.2 4.0	4.3	4.5	4.1
Q10: To what extent do you agree with the following stement: I know how my work ates to the agency's goals and priorities	Strongly disagree  Average  Median  Strongly agree	5.5% 4.1 4.0 70.3%	5.0	4.0 4.0 75.0% 18.8%	0.0%	5.0	3.2 4.0 50.0%	4.3 4.0 66.7%	4.5	4.1

w Crosstab				0442 What day this				Calanta d Chaire		
		Total Cisgend	ler (non-trans) W Cisgen	der (non-trans) m Transgender Ma		se select the term(s) with which sgender Woman Agender		- Selected Choice er non-conforming Genderqueer	P	lease specify another teri
		A A	B	C	D	E	F	G G		
agree with the following	Strongly disagree	2.1%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
statement: The work I do is	5,									
important.	Average	4.5	4.7	4.6		5.0	4.4	4.7	5.0	4.3
	Median	5.0	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Strongly agree	29.0%	37.1%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	31.3%
	Somewhat agree	33.8%	17.1%	41.7%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	33.3%	25.0%	35.4%
	Neither agree nor disagree	9.7%	11.4%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
atement: Physical conditions	Somewhat disagree	17.2%	20.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	18.8%
	Strongly disagree	9.7%	14.3%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	6.3%
eanliness in the workplace)	Average	3.6	3.4	3.6		4.0	2.8	3.7	3.3	3.7
	Avelage	3.0	3.4	3.0		4.0	2.8	3./	3.3	3.7
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0
		7.0	7.0			7.0			5.5	4.0
	Strongly agree	31.7%	25.7%	39.6%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	31.3%
	Somewhat agree	33.8%	42.9%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	33.3%	50.0%	33.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20.7%	17.1%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	20.8%
Q13: To what extent do you	Somewhat disagree	6.9%	8.6%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
agree with the following	Strongly disagree	6.2%	5.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	4.2%
tatement: My performance opraisal is a fair reflection of										
my performance.	Average	3.8	3.7	3.9		5.0	3.6	4.0	3.0	3.8
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0
	0			0= 44/				00 804		
	Strongly agree	42.8%	40.0%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	25.0%	54.2%
	Somewhat agree	34.5%	42.9%	41.7%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	75.0%	18.8%
	Neither agree nor disagree	11.7%	5.7%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
Q14: To what extent do you	Somewhat disagree	6.9%	8.6%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
	Strongly disagree	3.4%	2.9%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
ountable for achieving result	Average	4.1	4.1	4.0		4.0	3.8	4.7	4.3	4.1
	Average	4.1	4.1	4.0		4.0	5.0	4.7	4.5	4.1
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
				***						3.0
	Strongly agree	41.4%	28.6%	52.1%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	41.7%
	Somewhat agree	26.9%	40.0%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	29.2%
	Neither agree nor disagree	11.0%	8.6%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
5: I can disclose a suspected		6.2%	8.6%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
iolation of any law, rule or	Strongly disagree	13.8%	14.3%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	75.0%	10.4%
egulation without fear or	-									
reprisal	Average	3.8	3.6	4.0		5.0	2.8	3.7	1.8	3.9
	Median	4.0	4.0	5.0			2.0	5.0	1.0	4.0

ew Crosstab										
		<b>Total</b> Cisgend	( t) \ Ci			select the term(s) with which			Diagon	:£
		A Cisgena	er (non-trans) v cisgent	der (non-trans) n Transger C	D D	ender Woman Agender	Gender	non-conforminį Genderqueer G	H	specify another term
	Strongly agree	44.1%	45.7%	35.4%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	25.0%	52.1%
	Somewhat agree	20.7%	22.9%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	10.4%
	_	22.1%	20.0%	27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	22.9%
	Neither agree nor disagree									I
	Somewhat disagree	4.8%	2.9%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
be rated at different	Strongly disagree	7.6%	8.6%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	6.3%
rformance levels (Exception, Above Standard, Meets										
ndard, Needs Improvement,	Average	3.9	3.9	3.9		5.0	3.8	4.3	2.8	3.9
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	2.5	5.0
										<u>.</u>
	Strongly agree	37.9%	31.4%	45.8%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	100.0%	33.3%
	Somewhat agree	41.4%	40.0%	39.6%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	66.7%	0.0%	45.8%
	Neither agree nor disagree	7.6%	8.6%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
17: To what extent do you	Somewhat disagree	10.3%	17.1%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
agree with the following	_									I
tement: The people I work	Strongly disagree	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
th cooperate to get the job	A		2.0	4.3		F 0	2.4	4.2	F.0	4.0
done.	Average	4.1	3.9	4.2		5.0	3.4	4.3	5.0	4.0
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0
	Strongly agree	18.6%	20.0%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	16.7%
		20.7%	11.4%	29.2%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	20.8%
	Somewhat agree									I
18: To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree	18.6%	28.6%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.1%
agree with the following	Somewhat disagree	20.0%	28.6%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	16.7%
	Strongly disagree	21.4%	11.4%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	25.0%	18.8%
	Average	3.0	3.0	3.0		4.0	1.8	2.7	3.0	3.0
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0		4.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
	Strongly agree	11.0%	22.9%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	8.3%
	Somewhat agree	21.4%	25.7%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	16.7%
	Neither agree nor disagree	17.9%	14.3%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	22.9%
19: To what extent do you	Somewhat disagree	24.8%	28.6%	22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.3%
gree with the following	Strongly disagree	24.1%	8.6%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	66.7%	50.0%	20.8%
tement: Promotions in my										
ork unit are based on merit.	Average	2.7 B, H	3.3	2.5		4.0	1.8	2.3	2.3	2.6
	Median	3.0	3.0	2.0		4.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0
	Strongly agree	9.7%	5.7%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	10.4%
	Somewhat agree	22.8%	25.7%	22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.1%
	Neither agree nor disagree	13.1%	20.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%
	Somewhat disagree	29.7%	31.4%	41.7%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	66.7%	25.0%	14.6%
y work unit, steps are taken		24.1%	17.1%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	35.4%
	Average	2.6	2.7	2.7		2.0	2.0	3.0	1.8	2.6

ew Crosstab									
				Q142: When describing your ge					
		=		er (non-trans) n Transgender Man	Transgender Woman	Agender Gen	der non-conforminį Genderqu		e specify another term
		Α	В	С	D	E F	G	Н	
	Median	2.0	3.0	2.0		.0 1.0	2.0	1.5	2.5
	Median	2.0		2.0		1.0			
	Strongly agree	11.7%	14.3%	8.3%	.0% 100.0	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	10.4%
	Somewhat agree	25.5%	25.7%	33.3%	.0% 0.0	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	18.8%
	Neither agree nor disagree	22.1%	25.7%	20.8%	.0% 0.0	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%
21: Based on my observations	Somewhat disagree	23.4%	28.6%	20.8%	.0% 0.0	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
my work unit, differences in		15.9%	5.7%	16.7%	.0% 0.0	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	18.8%
formance are recognized in a	3								
meaningful way.	Average	2.9	3.1	3.0	5	.0 2.8	3.0	2.5	2.8
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	5	.0 2.0	3.0	2.5	3.0
	Strongly agree	16.6%	14.3%		.0% 0.0		33.3%	0.0%	20.8%
	Somewhat agree	31.7%	25.7%		.0% 100.0		33.3%	50.0%	27.1%
	Neither agree nor disagree	18.6%	28.6%		.0% 0.0		0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
	Domewhat alsagree	13.8%	14.3%		.0% 0.0		0.0%	25.0%	20.8%
	Strongly disagree	17.9%	14.3%	18.8%	.0% 0.0	9% 16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	18.8%
	A	3.2	3.1	3.2		.0 3.4	3.3	2.8	3.1
	Average	3.2	3.1	3.2	4	3.4	3.3	2.8	3.1
	Median	3.0	3.0	4.0		.0 4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
	Wedan			4.0		.0 4.0	4.0	3.0	5.0
	Strongly agree	40.0%	48.6%	47.9%	.0% 100.0	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	31.3%
	Somewhat agree	41.4%	37.1%	31.3%	.0% 0.0	50.0%	100.0%	75.0%	47.9%
	Neither agree nor disagree	4.8%	8.6%	2.1%	.0% 0.0	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
23: Based on my experiences	Somewhat disagree	10.3%	5.7%	12.5%	.0% 0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
n my work unit, employees	Strongly disagree	2.8%	0.0%	6.3%	.0% 0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
are job knowledge with each									
other.	Average								
	Average	4.1	4.3	4.0	5	.0 4.0	4.0	4.3	3.9
	Average	4.1	4.3	4.0	5	.0 4.0	4.0	4.3	3.9
	Median	4.1	4.3	4.0		.0 4.0	4.0	4.3	3.9
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0	5	.0 4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Median Strongly agree	4.0	4.0	4.0	.0% 100.0	.0 4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Median  Strongly agree Somewhat agree	4.0 29.7% 33.8%	4.0 37.1% 37.1%	4.0 25.0% (0 39.6% (0	.0% 100.0 .0% 0.0	.0 4.0 16.7% 19% 33.3%	4.0 33.3% 33.3%	4.0 25.0% 50.0%	4.0 29.2% 25.0%
	Median  Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree	29.7% 33.8% 21.4%	4.0 37.1% 37.1% 17.1%	4.0 25.0% ( 39.6% ( 18.8% (	.0% 100.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0	.0 4.0 16.7% 19% 33.3% 19% 0.0%	4.0 33.3% 33.3% 0.0%	4.0 25.0% 50.0% 0.0%	29.2% 25.0% 33.3%
	Median  Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat disagree	29.7% 33.8% 21.4% 5.5%	4.0 37.1% 37.1% 17.1% 5.7%	4.0 25.0% (0 39.6% (0 18.8% (0 6.3% (0	.0% 100.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0	.0 4.0 % 16.7% % 33.3% 1% 0.0% 1% 0.0%	4.0 33.3% 33.3% 0.0% 0.0%	25.0% 50.0% 0.0%	29.2% 25.0% 33.3% 6.3%
	Median  Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree	29.7% 33.8% 21.4%	4.0 37.1% 37.1% 17.1%	4.0 25.0% (0 39.6% (0 18.8% (0 6.3% (0	.0% 100.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0	.0 4.0 % 16.7% % 33.3% 1% 0.0% 1% 0.0%	4.0 33.3% 33.3% 0.0%	4.0 25.0% 50.0% 0.0%	29.2% 25.0% 33.3%
	Median  Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat disagree Strongly disagree	4.0 29.7% 33.8% 21.4% 5.5% 9.0%	4.0 37.1% 37.1% 17.1% 5.7% 2.9%	4.0 25.0% ( 39.6% ( 18.8% ( 6.3% ( 10.4% (	5.0% 100.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0	.0 4.0 16.7% % 33.3% 16.7% % 0.0% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7%	4.0 33.3% 33.3% 0.0% 0.0% 33.3%	4.0 25.0% 50.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0%	29.2% 25.0% 33.3% 6.3% 6.3%
	Median  Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat disagree	29.7% 33.8% 21.4% 5.5%	4.0 37.1% 37.1% 17.1% 5.7%	4.0 25.0% (0 39.6% (0 18.8% (0 6.3% (0	5.0% 100.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0	.0 4.0 % 16.7% % 33.3% 1% 0.0% 1% 0.0%	4.0 33.3% 33.3% 0.0% 0.0%	25.0% 50.0% 0.0%	29.2% 25.0% 33.3% 6.3%
	Median  Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat disagree Strongly disagree	4.0 29.7% 33.8% 21.4% 5.5% 9.0%	4.0 37.1% 37.1% 17.1% 5.7% 2.9%	4.0 25.0% ( 39.6% ( 18.8% ( 6.3% ( 10.4% (	5.0% 100.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0	.0 4.0 16.7% % 33.3% 16.7% % 0.0% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7%	4.0 33.3% 33.3% 0.0% 0.0% 33.3%	4.0 25.0% 50.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0%	29.2% 25.0% 33.3% 6.3% 6.3%
	Median  Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat disagree Strongly disagree  Average	29.7% 33.8% 21.4% 5.5% 9.0%	4.0 37.1% 37.1% 17.1% 5.7% 2.9%	4.0  25.0% ( 39.6% ( 18.8% ( 6.3% ( 10.4% (  3.6	.0% 100.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0	.0 4.0  % 16.7% % 33.3% % 0.0% % 0.0% % 33.3% .0 3.0	4.0 33.3% 33.3% 0.0% 0.0% 33.3% 3.3%	4.0 25.0% 50.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0%	29.2% 25.0% 33.3% 6.3% 6.3%
	Median  Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat disagree Strongly disagree	4.0 29.7% 33.8% 21.4% 5.5% 9.0%	4.0 37.1% 37.1% 17.1% 5.7% 2.9%	4.0 25.0% ( 39.6% ( 18.8% ( 6.3% ( 10.4% (	.0% 100.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0	.0 4.0 16.7% % 33.3% 16.7% % 0.0% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7% 16.7%	4.0 33.3% 33.3% 0.0% 0.0% 33.3%	4.0 25.0% 50.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0%	29.2% 25.0% 33.3% 6.3% 6.3%
	Median  Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat disagree Strongly disagree  Average	29.7% 33.8% 21.4% 5.5% 9.0%	4.0 37.1% 37.1% 17.1% 5.7% 2.9%	4.0  25.0% ( 39.6% ( 18.8% ( 6.3% ( 10.4% (  3.6	.0% 100.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0 .0% 0.0	.0 4.0  % 16.7% % 33.3% % 0.0% % 0.0% % 33.3% .0 3.0	4.0 33.3% 33.3% 0.0% 0.0% 33.3% 3.3%	4.0 25.0% 50.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0%	29.2% 25.0% 33.3% 6.3% 6.3%
	Median  Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat disagree Strongly disagree  Average  Median	4.0 29.7% 33.8% 21.4% 5.5% 9.0% 3.7	4.0 37.1% 37.1% 17.1% 5.7% 2.9% 4.0	4.0  25.0% ( 39.6% ( 18.8% ( 6.3% ( 10.4% (  3.6	5.0% 100.0 1.0% 0.0 1.0% 0.0 1.0% 0.0 1.0% 0.0 5	.0 4.0  16.7% 18. 33.3% 19. 0.0% 19. 0.0% 19. 33.3% 10. 33.3% 10. 3.0	4.0 33.3% 33.3% 0.0% 0.0% 33.3% 3.3	4.0 25.0% 50.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0% 3.5	29.2% 25.0% 33.3% 6.3% 6.3%
	Median  Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat disagree Strongly disagree  Average  Median  Exceptional	4.0  29.7% 33.8% 21.4% 5.5% 9.0%  3.7	4.0 37.1% 37.1% 17.1% 5.7% 2.9% 4.0	4.0  25.0% ( 39.6% ( 18.8% ( 6.3% ( 10.4% (  3.6  4.0	5.0% 100.0 1.0% 0.0 1.0% 0.0 1.0% 0.0 5 5	.0 4.0  16.7% 16.7% 19% 33.3% 19% 0.0% 19% 33.3% 10.0 3.0  10.0 4.0	4.0 33.3% 33.3% 0.0% 0.0% 33.3% 3.3	4.0 25.0% 50.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0% 3.5 4.0	29.2% 25.0% 33.3% 6.3% 6.3% 3.6
124: Based on my observations n my work unit, my unit's skill evel has improved in the past year,	Median  Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat disagree Strongly disagree  Average  Median	4.0 29.7% 33.8% 21.4% 5.5% 9.0% 3.7	4.0 37.1% 37.1% 17.1% 5.7% 2.9% 4.0	4.0  25.0% ( 39.6% ( 18.8% ( 6.3% ( 10.4% (  3.6  4.0	5.0% 100.0 1.0% 0.0 1.0% 0.0 1.0% 0.0 1.0% 0.0 5	.0 4.0  16.7% 19% 16.7% 19% 33.3% 19% 0.0% 19% 33.3% 1.0 3.0  1.0 4.0  19% 16.7% 19% 33.3%	4.0 33.3% 33.3% 0.0% 0.0% 33.3% 3.3	4.0 25.0% 50.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0% 3.5	29.2% 25.0% 33.3% 6.3% 6.3%

						e select the term(s) with wi				
			ler (non-trans) V Cisgend	er (non-trans) n Transgend		gender Woman Agender	Gender	non-conforming Genderqueer		se specify another term you p
Q25: How would you rate the		A	В	С	D	E	F	G	н	1
rerall quality of work done by	Unsatisfactory	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
your work unit?										
	Average	2.0	1.9	1.9		1.0	2.4	2.0	1.8	2.1
	Median	2.0	2.0	2.0		1.0	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.0
			-				-			
	Strongly agree	26.9%	37.1%	20.8%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%
	Somewhat agree	44.1%	37.1%	56.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	50.0%	39.6%
		9.7%	8.6%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.8%
Q26: To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree									
agree with the following	Somewhat disagree	13.1%	17.1%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
	Strongly disagree	5.5%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	4.2%
e job-relevant knowledge and										
	Average	3.7	3.9	3.7		5.0	3.4	4.3	2.5	3.7
organizational godis										
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	4.0	2.5	4.0
	Strongly agree	15.2%	8.6%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	18.8%
	Somewhat agree	35.2%	37.1%	37.5%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	31.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	16.6%	25.7%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	10.4%
Q27: To what extent do you	Somewhat disagree	15.2%	20.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
agree with the following	-									
statement: Employees are	Strongly disagree	17.2%	8.6%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	22.9%
ecognized for providing high										
uality products and services.	Average	3.2	3.2	3.2		4.0	3.2	3.0	3.5	3.1
	Median	4.0	3.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.5
	Strongly agree	10.3%	11.4%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	10.4%
	Somewhat agree	24.1%	20.0%	22.9%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	27.1%
	Neither agree nor disagree	22.1%	25.7%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	20.8%
Q28: To what extent do you	Somewhat disagree	23.4%	31.4%	22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	22.9%
agree with the following	Strongly disagree	18.6%	11.4%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%
statement: Creativity and	Strongly disagree	10.070	11.470	20.070	0.070	0.070	33.370	33.370	30.070	10.770
	A.:ama-a	2.8	2.9	2.8		4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.9
	Average	2.8	2.9	2.8		4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.9
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0		4.0	4.0	3.0	1.5	3.0
	Strongly agree	40.0%	40.0%	39.6%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	41.7%
220: To what outent do	Somewhat agree	27.6%	25.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%
Q29: To what extent do you agree with the following	Neither agree nor disagree	18.6%	20.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	25.0%
statement: Policies and	Somewhat disagree	6.2%	5.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	6.3%
ograms promote diversity in	Strongly disagree	6.9%	8.6%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
ne workplace (for example,	3,1110		- 0070		. •					
recruiting minorities and	Average	3.9	3.8	3.9		5.0	3.2	3.3	4.0	4.0
men, training in awareness of	Aveluge	3.3	3.0	3.3		5.0	3.2	J.J	4.0	4.0
diversity issues, mentoring).										
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0

Crosstab										
		Total Ciccond	or (non-trans) M Cisgons			select the term(s) with w			. Di	laasa spasify apathor t
		Total Cisgend A	er (non-trans) v cisgent B	ler (non-trans) n Transgen C	der ivian - Transge D	ender Woman Agender F	Gender F	non-conforminį Genderquee G	er Pi	lease specify another to
	Strongly agree	22.1%	22.9%	16.7%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	25.0%
	Somewhat agree	31.7%	37.1%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	27.1%
: To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree	15.2%	11.4%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	27.1%
ee with the following	Somewhat disagree	17.9%	22.9%	27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	6.3%
ment: Employees are	Strongly disagree	12.4%	5.7%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
nd safety hazards on the	Average	3.3	3.5	3.2		5.0	2.0	3.7	3.3	3.4
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	1.0	4.0	3.5	4.0
	ivieulaii	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	1.0	4.0	3.3	4.0]
										1
	Strongly agree	23.4%	20.0%	27.1%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	66.7%	25.0%	18.8%
	Somewhat agree	42.8%	42.9%	39.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	54.2%
To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree	11.7%	8.6%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	16.7%
e with the following	Somewhat disagree	13.1%	22.9%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
ent: My organization has	Strongly disagree	8.3%	5.7%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
pared employees for ential security threats	Average	3.6	3.5	3.5		5.0	3.4	4.3	2.8	3.8
	ů									
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	3.0	5.0	2.5	4.0
	THE GRANT					3.0	3.0	5.0	2.3	
	Strongly agree	23.4%	20.0%	27.1%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	18.8%
			34.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
	Somewhat agree	19.3%								
	Neither agree nor disagree	17.2%	20.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	18.8%
e with the following	Somewhat disagree	19.3%	17.1%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
	Strongly disagree	20.0%	8.6%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	75.0%	22.9%
tisan political purposes	Average	3.1	3.4	3.1		5.0	2.8	4.3	1.8	2.8
	Aveluge	5,1	5.4	5.1		5.0	2.0	4.5	1.0	2.0
	Median	3.0	4.0	3.0		5.0	2.0	5.0	1.0	3.0
	ivieulati	5.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	2.0	3.0	1.0	5.0]
	Strongly agree	49.0%	51.4%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	33.3%	50.0%	45.8%
what extent do you	Somewhat agree	20.7%	28.6%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
with the following	NI-Minara and Parama									
t: Prohibited Personne		14.5%	11.4%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	22.9%
(for example, illegally		6.9%	2.9%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	8.3%
ating for or against any /applicant, obstructing		8.3%	5.7%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	6.3%
n's right to compete for		4.0	4.2	4.0		5.0	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.9
ployment, knowingly	Aveluge	4.0	4.4	4.0		5.0	3.0	3.3	3.3	3.9
ig veterans' preference nents) are not tolerated	1.									
nems, are not tolerated	Median	4.0	5.0	4.5		5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
	Strongly agree	27.6%	25.7%	27.1%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	31.3%
	Somewhat agree	45.5%	54.3%	43.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	100.0%	41.7%
	Neither agree nor disagree	13.8%	14.3%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	16.7%
	Somewhat disagree	7.6%	5.7%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	8.3%
with the following ment: My agency is	Strongly disagree	4.8%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
ful at accomplishing its mission.	Average	3.8	4.0	3.7		5.0	3.4	3.3	4.0	3.9

w Crosstab										
						please select the term(s) with				
		Total		isgender (non-trans) n Trans		Fransgender Woman Agen		r non-conforminį Genderquee		Please specify another term you pr
			A B	С	l	D E	F	G		Н
	Median	4.	0 4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
	iviedian	4.	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
	Strongly agree	31.09	6 42.9%	27.1%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	29.2%
	Somewhat agree	32.49	6 31.4%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	35.4%
	Neither agree nor disagree	16.69	6 14.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	18.8%
5: To what extent do you	Somewhat disagree	11.79		10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	8.3%
gree with the following	Strongly disagree	7.69		12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
ement: I recommend my nization as a good place to										
work	Average	3.	7 4.1	3.5		5.0	2.8	3.3	3.3	3.7
			В							
	Median	4.	0 4.0	4.0		5.0	2.0	3.0	3.5	4.0
	Strongly agree	13.19	6 17.1%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	25.0%	8.3%
	Somewhat agree	18.69		22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
	=									
	Neither agree nor disagree	26.29		22.9%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	31.3%
	Somewhat disagree	13.19		14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
ment: I believe the results his survey will be used to	Strongly disagree	28.39	6 22.9%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	31.3%
	A	2.	0 20	2.7		2.0	2.4	4.2	2.0	2.5
	Average	2.	8 3.0	2.7		3.0	2.4	4.3	2.8	2.5
	Median	3.	0 3.0	3.0		3.0	2.0	5.0	2.5	3.0
	Strongly agree	53.89		54.2%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	50.0%	52.1%
	Somewhat agree	26.29		27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	22.9%
7: To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree	9.09		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	20.8%
gree with the following	Somewhat disagree	5.59		6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
atement: My supervisor	Strongly disagree	4.89	6 0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
ports my need to balance										
ork and other life issues	Average	4.	2 4.4	4.1		5.0	3.8	3.7	4.3	4.2
	Median	5.	0 5.0	5.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
		-	-							
	a									
	Strongly agree	44.19		52.1%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	41.7%
	Somewhat agree	32.49		29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	31.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	9.79		6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
gree with the following	Somewhat disagree	4.89		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
	Strongly disagree	7.69	6 0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	4.2%
			_							
skills	Average	4.	0 4.1	4.1		5.0	3.8	3.7	2.5	4.0
		4.	0 4.0	5.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	2.5	4.0
	Median		· 4.0	5.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	2.3	4.0
	Median	4.								
	Median									
	Median Strongly agree	44.89	6 42.9%	47.9%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	47.9%
				47.9% 33.3%	0.0% 0.0%	100.0% 0.0%	16.7% 50.0%	33.3% 33.3%	25.0% 0.0%	47.9% 25.0%
39: To what extent do you	Strongly agree	44.89	6 34.3%							

ew Crosstab										
						please select the term(s) with wh				
		<b>Total</b> Cisgend A	der (non-trans) v Cisgeni B	der (non-trans) n Transgende C	er Man	Transgender Woman Agender D F	Gender	r non-conforminį Genderqueer G	Ple H	ease specify another term you
agree with the following	Strongly disagree	8.3%	2.9%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	6.3%
atement: Discussions with my	Strongly disagree	0.570	2.370	0.570	0.070	0.070	10.770	33.370	30.070	0.570
supervisor about my performance are worthwhile	Average	4.0	4.1	4.1		5.0	3.6	3.3	2.5	4.1
	, and the second									
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	4.0
	Strongly agree	52.4%	57.1%	47.9% 25.0%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0% 16.7%	66.7%	25.0%	54.2%
	Somewhat agree	21.4% 17.9%	28.6% 11.4%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 25.0%	16.7% 27.1%
Q40: To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree	2.8%	2.9%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.1%
agree with the following	Somewhat disagree	4.8%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%		33.3%	50.0%	I
	Strongly disagree	4.8%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	0.0%
	Average	4.1	4.4	4.0		5.0	4.0	3.7	2.5	4.2
	, we tage	4.1	4.4	٠.٠		3.0	4.0	5.7	2.3	4.2
	Median	5.0	5.0	4.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	5.0
	Ctrongly agree	42.1%	40.0%	45.8%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	45.8%
	Strongly agree	42.1% 37.2%	48.6%	45.8% 33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	33.3%	25.0%	33.3%
	Somewhat agree									
Q41: To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree	9.0%	8.6%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
agree with the following	Somewhat disagree	3.4%	2.9% 0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 50.0%	6.3%
statement: My supervisor rovides me with constructive	Strongly disagree	6.9%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	4.2%
uggestions to improve my job	Average	4.1	4.3	4.1		5.0	3.6	3.3	2.3	4.1
performance	Average	4.1	4.3	4.1		5.0	3.0	3.3	2.5	4.1
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	4.0
	Strongly agree	46.2%	42.9%	47.9%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	25.0%	47.9%
	Somewhat agree	29.0%	37.1%	31.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Q42: To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree	12.4%	14.3%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
agree with the following	Somewhat disagree	4.8%	5.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
	Strongly disagree	6.9%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	6.3%
	Average	4.0	4.2	4.1		5.0	3.8	3.7	2.5	4.0
	Average	4.0	4.2	4.1		5.0	3.8	5./	2.5	4.0
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	2.0	4.0
	Strongly agree	53.1%	54.3%	54.2%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	25.0%	54.2%
	Somewhat agree	32.4%	40.0%	31.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	31.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	5.5%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
		2.8%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
Q43: To what extent do you agree with the following	Somewhat disagree	2.8% 5.5%	2.9%	4.2% 8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	2.1%
agree with the following	Strongly disagree	5.5%	2.9%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	2.1%
tement: My supervisor listens		4.3	4.4	4.2		5.0	4.2	3.7	3.3	4.3
atement: My supervisor listens to what I have to say	Average					J.U	7.4	5.7	3.3	4.5
	Average	4.3	7.7							
atement: My supervisor listens to what I have to say	Average	4.3	7.7							

ew Crosstab										
						, please select the term(s) with w				
		Total		gender (non-trans) n Transg	ender Man	Transgender Woman Agende		r non-conforminį Genderqueer		Please specify another term you
	Characteristic	74.00/	A B	C	0.000	D E	F	G		H
	Strongly agree	71.0%		75.0%	0.0%		66.7%	66.7%	75.0%	66.7%
	Somewhat agree	19.3%		12.5%	0.0%		16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
	Neither agree nor disagree	2.8%		2.1%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
Q44: To what extent do you	Somewhat disagree	2.1%		4.2%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Strongly disagree	4.1%	2.9%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	0.0%
atement: My supervisor treats										
	Average	4.5	4.6	4.5		5.0	4.8	3.7	4.0	4.6
										1
	Median	5.0	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Strongly agree	40.0%	37.1%	45.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	41.7%
	Somewhat agree	33.1%		31.3%	0.0%		33.3%	0.0%	75.0%	33.3%
	-	15.2%		16.7%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
45: To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree			4.2%				0.0%	25.0%	
agree with the following	Somewhat disagree	4.1%			0.0%		0.0%			2.1%
statement: In the last six	Strongly disagree	6.9%	5.7%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	0.0%	8.3%
months, my supervisor has talked with me about my	•							2.2		
performance.	Average	4.0	3.9	4.1		4.0	3.8	2.3	3.5	4.0
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	4.0
	Exceptional	43.4%	34.3%	45.8%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	47.9%
6: Overall, how good a job do		30.3%		31.3%	0.0%		0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	29.2%
you feel your immediate	Meets Standard	17.2%		16.7%	0.0%		16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
supervisor is doing?	Needs Improvement	5.5%		4.2%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
	Unsatisfactory	2.8%		2.1%	0.0%		0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	0.0%
	onsatisfactory	2.070	2.370	2.170	0.070	0.070	0.070	55.570	23.070	0.070
	0									
	Strongly Agree	15.2%		14.6%	0.0%		33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	14.6%
	Somewhat agree	28.3%		25.0%	0.0%		16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	33.3%
Q47: To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree	16.6%		14.6%	0.0%		16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	12.5%
agree with the following	Somewhat disagree	20.0%		22.9%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	18.8%
atement: In my organization,	Strongly disagree	19.3%	14.3%	22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	20.8%
enior leaders generate high										
levels of motivation and ommitment in the workforce.	Average	3.0	3.0	2.9		4.0	3.6	4.3	2.8	3.0
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0		4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.0
	Strongly agree	33.8%	28.6%	35.4%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	27.1%
	Somewhat agree	26.2%		29.2%	0.0%		16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	22.9%
		15.2%		10.4%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.9%
	Neither agree nor disagree									
	Somewhat disagree	13.1%		14.6%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
atement: My organization's enior leaders maintain high	Strongly disagree	11.0%	2.9%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	14.6%
enior leaders maintain high standards of honesty and										
integrity	Average	3.6	3.7	3.6		5.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.4
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.5
	Strongly agree	EF 00/	27.40/	CC 70/	0.000	100.00/	22.20/	66.79/	E0 00/	CO 40/
	Strongly agree	55.9%	37.1%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	50.0%	60.4%

ew Crosstab										_
						select the term(s) with wh				
		<b>Total</b> Cisgend	ler (non-trans) V Cisgend B	ler (non-trans) n Transgen	nder Man Transge D	ender Woman Agender	Gender r	non-conforminį Genderqueer		ease specify another term yo
	Somewhat agree	25.5%	40.0%	C 20.8%	0.0%	E 0.0%	16.7%	G 33.3%	0.0%	22.9%
	Neither agree nor disagree	10.3%	40.0% 17.1%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
Q49: To what extent do you	Somewhat disagree	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
agree with the following	Strongly disagree	2.8%	2.9%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
tatement: Supervisors work		2.070	2.570	0.570	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070
ell with employees of different backgrounds	Average	4.3	4.1	4.4		5.0	3.8	4.7	3.8	4.4
backgrounds	, we tage	5				5.0	5.0		5.0	
	Median	5.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
	Strongly agree	33.1%	40.0%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	25.0%	31.3%
	Somewhat agree	35.9%	28.6%	47.9%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	12.4%	20.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
	Somewhat disagree	9.7%	11.4%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
agree with the following	Strongly disagree	8.3%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	10.4%
statement: Managers communicate the goals and										
priorities of the organization.	Average	3.8	4.0	3.8		4.0	3.6	4.7	2.5	3.6
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	5.0	2.0	4.0
	Strongly agree	25.5%	31.4%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	0.0%	22.9%
	Somewhat agree	26.9%	28.6%	27.1%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Q51: To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree	26.2%	25.7%	27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	27.1%
agree with the following	Somewhat disagree	11.7%	14.3%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%
tatement: Managers review	Strongly disagree	9.0%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%
d evaluate the organization's										
progress toward meeting its goals and objectives	Average	3.5	3.8	3.5		4.0	3.4	4.3	2.5	3.3
godis dila objectives										
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	5.0	2.5	3.0
	Strongly agree	30.3%	28.6%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	27.1%
	Somewhat agree	26.2%	28.6%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%
Q52: To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree	20.0%	25.7%	12.5%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%
agree with the following	Somewhat disagree	10.3%	11.4%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	10.4%
	Strongly disagree	12.4%	5.7%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%
	Average	3.5	3.6	3.7		3.0	2.8	3.3	2.8	3.4
	Average	3.5	<b>3.</b> b	3./		3.0	2.8	3.3	2.8	3.4
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
	Wedian	4.0	4.0	4.0		3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
	Exceptional	26.2%	25.7%	31.3%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	18.8%
	Above Standard	28.3%	34.3%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	29.2%
		28.3%			0.0%	0.0%			0.0%	29.2%
	Meets Standard	28.3% 9.0%	31.4% 2.9%	27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0% 33.3%	50.0%	29.2% 12.5%
3: Overall, how good a job do				6.3%			0.0%			
ou feel the manager directly above your immediate	Unsatisfactory	6.2%	5.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
supervisor is doing?	Average	2.4	2.3	2.2		1.0	2.2	2.0	3.8	2.6

w Crosstab				0.1.0						
		Total Circuit	er (non-trans) M Cisco				which you most identify - S	Selected Choice non-conforming Gendero	ueer Dloss	specify another to
		<b>Total</b> Cisgendo A	er (non-trans) v Cisgeni B	der (non-trans) n Transger C	nder Man Transge D	ender Woman Agende F	er Genderi F	non-conforming Genderd	queer Please H	specify another term
	Median	2.0	2.0	2.0		1.0	3.0	1.0	4.0	3.0
	Strongly agree	29.7%	31.4%	27.1%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	66.7%	25.0%	29.2%
	Somewhat agree	35.9%	51.4%	39.6%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%
	Neither agree nor disagree	15.2%	8.6%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	20.8%
4: To what extent do you										
	Somewhat disagree	6.9%	5.7%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
	Strongly disagree	11.7%	2.9%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	16.7%
	Average	3.7	4.0	3.6		5.0	3.4	4.3	3.3	3.4
		Н								
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	3.5	4.0
										,
	Very satisfied	19.3%	11.4%	22.9%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%
	Somewhat satisfied	26.9%	25.7%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	33.3%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	26.2%	34.3%	22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	27.1%
Q55: Senior leaders	Somewhat dissatisfied	16.6%	20.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	14.6%
emonstrate support for										
ork/life programs. How isfied are you with your	Extremely dissatisfied	10.3%	8.6%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
olvement in decisions that affect your work?	Average	3.3	3.1	3.3		5.0	3.0	3.3	3.8	3.4
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0		5.0	3.0	3.0	4.5	3.5
	Very Satisfied	19.3%	17.1%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	18.8%
	Somewhat satisfied	21.4%	25.7%	16.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.1%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	20.0%	28.6%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	0.0%	16.7%
										I
	Somewhat dissatisfied	17.9%	20.0%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
	Very dissatisfied	20.7%	8.6%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	22.9%
n management on what's g on in your organization?										
ig on in your organizations	Average	3.0	3.2	2.9		4.0	2.4	3.7	2.3	3.0
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0		4.0	2.0	3.0	1.5	3.0
	Very satisfied	19.3%	8.6%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	20.8%
	Somewhat satisfied	24.8%	31.4%	18.8%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	28.3%	37.1%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	12.4%	11.4%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	10.4%
How satisfied are you with	Very dissatisfied	14.5%	11.4%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	18.8%
ecognition you receive for doing a good job?										
	Average	3.2	3.1	3.3		4.0	3.8	3.0	2.8	3.2
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0		4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	IVICUIAII	3.0	3.0	3.0		4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0]
	Very satisfied	15.9%	17.1%	10.4%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	66.7%	0.0%	16.7%
	*						16.7%		25.0%	
	Somewhat satisfied	29.0%	28.6%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%		29.2%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	20.0%	20.0%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	18.8%
8: How satisfied are you with	Somewaht dissatisfied  Very dissatisfied	21.4% 13.1%	31.4% 2.9%	18.8% 16.7%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0%	16.7% 16.7%	0.0% 0.0%	25.0% 25.0%	18.8% 16.7%

						e select the term(s) with w				
			ender (non-trans) V Cisgend			gender Woman Agende		non-conforming Genderqueer		specify another term yo
e policies and practices or your		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	
	Average	3.1	3.3	3.0		5.0	3.0	4.3	2.5	3.1
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0		5.0	3.0	5.0	2.5	3.0
	Very satisfied	20.7%	28.6%	18.8%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	16.7%
	Somewhat satisfied	28.3%	25.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	27.1%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	20.0%	5.7%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	29.2%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	15.2%	31.4%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
59: How satisfied are you with	Extremely dissatisfied	15.2%	8.6%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	12.5%
our opportunity to obtain a	Extremely dissatisfied	15.2/6	0.076	10.776	0.076	0.076	33.376	33.376	30.076	12.576
etter job in your organization?										
	Average	3.2	3.3	3.3		5.0	2.6	3.0	2.5	3.2
	Median	3.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	3.0
	Very satisfied	24.8%	22.9%	20.8%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	29.2%
	Somewhat satisfied	32.4%	31.4%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	25.0%	16.7%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	11.0%	8.6%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.9%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	21.4%	31.4%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
	Extremely dissatisfied	9.7%	5.7%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	6.3%
e training you receive for your	Extremely dissuished	3.770	5.770	10.470	0.070	0.070	33.370	0.070	30.070	0.570
	A	3.4	3.3	2.0		F.0	2.6	4.2	2.8	3.4
	Average	3.4	3.3	3.6		5.0	2.0	4.3	2.8	3.4
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	2.0	4.0	2.5	3.0
	Very satisfied	29.0%	17.1%	33.3%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%
	Somewhat satisfied	37.9%	54.3%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	31.3%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	12.4%	11.4%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.8%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	13.1%	17.1%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
Q61: Considering everything,	Extremely dissatisfied	6.9%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	6.3%
ow satisfied are you with your		*****	*****	0.07.2		4.47.				
job?	Average	3.7	3.7	3.7		5.0	2.8	4.7	2.5	3.8
	Average	3.7	3.7	3.7		5.0	2.0	4.7	2.5	3.6
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	2.0	5.0	2.5	4.0
										1
	Very satisfied	12.4%	8.6%	12.5%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	12.5%
	Somewhat satisfied	31.0%	22.9%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	39.6%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	9.0%	11.4%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	21.4%	22.9%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	14.6%
Q62: Considered everything,	Extremely dissatisfied	25.5%	34.3%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	25.0%
	·									
	Average	2.8	2.5	3.0		5.0	2.2	2.7	2.5	3.0
	c.age	2.0	2.3	3.0		5.0	۷.۷	4.7	ر.2	3.0
	Median	3.0	2.0	3.0		5.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	4.0
	Very satisfied	19.3%	17.1%	14.6%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%

				the state of the s						
		Total Circuit	or (non trans) M Cisasa da			select the term(s) with w			or Dian	so specify another to
		<b>Total</b> Cisgende A	er (non-trans) V Cisgende B	er (non-trans) n Transgen C	der Man Transge D	ender Woman Agende E	r Gender F	non-conforminį Genderquee G	er Plea H	se specify another term
	Somewhat satisfied	42.1%	48.6%	47.9%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	35.4%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	13.1%	14.3%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	16.7%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	14.5%	17.1%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
Q63: Considering everything, www.satisfied are you with your	Extremely dissatisfied	10.3%	2.9%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	8.3%
organization?	Average	3.5	3.6	3.4		5.0	2.6	4.0	2.5	3.5
	, and the second									
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	2.0	4.0	2.5	4.0
	Extremely dissatisfied	12.4%	11.4%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	0.0%	12.5%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	11.7%	8.6%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	51.7%	51.4%	56.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	54.2%
4: How satisfied are you with	Somewhat satisfied	11.7%	22.9%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
following work/life programs	Extremely satisfied	11.7%	5.7%	12.5%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
	Average	3.0	3.0	3.0		1.0	2.8	4.3	3.0	3.0
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0		1.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0
	Extremely dissatisfied	9.7%	5.7%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	10.4%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	7.6%	11.4%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	4.2%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	53.8%	45.7%	58.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	62.5%
	Somewhat satisfied	17.2%	25.7%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	10.4%
Q65: Alternative Work	Extremely satisfied	11.0%	11.4%	10.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
Schedules (AWS)	Average	2.9	2.7	2.9		1.0	3.4	3.3	2.8	2.9
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0		1.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0
	Extremely dissatisfied	10.3%	5.7%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	12.5%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	10.3%	5.7%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	12.5%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	46.2%	48.6%	47.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	56.3%
	Somewhat satisfied	14.5%	22.9%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	6.3%
Q66: Employee Assistance Program (EAP)	Extremely satisfied	17.9%	17.1%	20.8%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
	Average	2.8	2.6	2.8		1.0	1.4	4.0	3.0	3.1
		E	E						E	
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0		1.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	3.0
	Strongly Disagree	20.0%	17.1%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	31.3%
	Somewhat disagree	9.0%	14.3%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	9.0%	5.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
Q67: To what extent do you	Somewhat agree	12.4%	11.4%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	6.3%
agree with the following atement: In my work unit, all	Strongly agree	49.0%	51.4%	58.3%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	25.0%	37.5%
ployees' gender identities are										_
respected	Average	2.4	2.3	2.0		1.0	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.9

Crosstab				O142: When describ	ing your gender, please	coloct the term(s) with w	hich you most identify - S	alacted Choice		
		Total Cis	gender (non-trans) V Cisgender			ender Woman Agender		non-conforming Genderqueer	Pl	ease specify another teri
		A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	
Media	1	2.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	3.0
o you currently live within Yes		49.0%	54.3%	56.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	75.0%	39.6%
ne San Jose city limits?		50.3%	45.7%	43.8%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	25.0%	60.4%
										557.772
Very Sa	rfe .	6.9%	8.6%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
	hat safe	15.9%	14.3%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	10.4%
-1-643	hat unsafe	15.2%	14.3%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	16.7%
night? Very ur		6.9%	11.4%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	2.1%
I don't	go out at night	3.4%	5.7%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
Auto th	peft	17.9%	17.1%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	16.7%
And the second section of the second section is	ty crime not including auto theft (burglary, theft, shoplifting, p		28.6%	39.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	27.1%
ost serious crime problems	crime (assault, robbery, domestic violence, sexual assault, ho		31.4%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	25.0%
san Jose? (You can select	rime (dealing, use of drugs on the street, in parks, schools, etc		25.7%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	20.8%
	disorder (public drinking, loitering, panhandling, graffiti, youth		31.4%	39.6%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	27.1%
	other problem	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
					****					
Any mi	sdemeanor crime that becomes accepted such as drug abuse	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
CITY CA	AN RESOLVE MOST PROBLEMS IF THEY TOOK HOMELESSNESS	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Everyth	ning is an issue, officers can make as many arrests as they can	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Homel	essness	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Homel	essness!!!!!	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
1'd rew	ord this.	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
problem - Text Menta	Health	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Unhou	sed, mental health needs support, a solution	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	ce and guns	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	ng for the broken window theory	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
identity		0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
	e crime that isnt deemed serious.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
prostiti	ution	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Major	problem	8.3%	8.6%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	4.2%
: In your opinion, how big a	problem	22.1%	11.4%	31.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	22.9%
iem is gang activity in your	problem	15.2%	25.7%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	10.4%
Unsure		2.8%	5.7%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
In your opinion, in the last										
In your opinion, in the last preason years would you say the		33.1%	28.6%	41.7%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	75.0%	27.1%
erall level of crime in your		0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	about the same?	15.2%	25.7%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	12.5%
Not far	niliar at all	10.3%	14.3%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
Slightly	r familiar	33.8%	42.9%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	75.0%	29.2%
his next set of questions is	ately familiar	33.8%	34.3%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	25.0%	31.3%
our experiences with City an Jose residents as an Very fa	•	15.2%	5.7%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	22.9%
mployee of the Police Extrem	ely familiar	6.2%	2.9%	4.2%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	8.3%
ow familiar you believe Average	e	3.3	3.6	3.3		1.0	3.4	2.3	3.8	3.1
idents are with the City of		н								

New Crosstab										
				Q142: When descril	bing your gender	r, please select the term(s) with whi	ich you most identify -	Selected Choice		
		Total	Cisgender (non-trans) V Cis	gender (non-trans) n Transg	ender Man	Transgender Woman Agender	Gender	non-conforming Genderqueer	Please	e specify another term you prefer here:
San Jose Police Department.			A B	С		D E	F	G	Н	
	Median	3.0	4.0	3.0		1.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0
interaction with a City of San	Yes	90.3%	88.6%	95.8%	0.0%		83.3%	66.7%	75.0%	89.6%
Jose resident during the past	No	9.0%	11.4%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	10.4%
		42.40/	27.40/	42.00/	0.000	2.00/	66.70/	22.20/	75.00/	42.00/
	I responded to a call from a resident who wanted to report a crime of	43.4% 0.0%	37.1% 0.0%	43.8% 0.0%	0.0%		66.7% 0.0%	33.3% 0.0%	75.0% 0.0%	43.8% 0.0%
Q79: If Yes, what was the nature of the most recent interaction	I stopped a resident for a traffic violation I responded to a call from a resident regarding a traffic accident	1.4%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
you had with a resident? -	I was interviewing a witness to a crime	5.5%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
Selected Choice	I was attending a community meeting	8.3%	5.7%	4.2%	0.0%		0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	12.5%
	Other	30.3%	42.9%	33.3%	0.0%		16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
	Other	30.376	42.376	33.376	0.076	0.076	10.776	0.076	0.076	25.0%
	Acquaintances that know what I do	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	All of the above	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Assisted in person and via phone with report requests, vehicle releas		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Co-worker	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Community event (SF Pride)	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Corresponded with a resident related to a request	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Detective work	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Each and every day we contact persons in the community	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	F/U on a case	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Follow up with victim of a crime for investigation	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Friends that live in san jose	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Had a friendly conversation.	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Hanging out with friends.	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Helping them at the window and on the phone	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	I assist citizens in the office	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	I assist many citizens in our main lobby; 290 registrants and citizens in	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	I have friends in San Jose.	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	I regularly take 911 and police non-emergency calls for service from	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	In the workplace	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Incoming phone call	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Interacting with the community while walking around a park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Q79_6_TEXT: Other - Text	Interview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Interviewing witnesses, suspects and victims to crimes	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Investigated cases where residents of SJ were the victims/suspects in		0.0%	2.1%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Issuing vehicle releases to the public	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Just walking on the street	0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 2.9%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0%		0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0%	2.1% 0.0%
	Presented at a community meeting	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Public place Responded to a call from a resident requesting police records	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
			0.0%	2.1%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Responding to a resident's complaint about SJPD making too much n Speaking to a resident while walking through the park to pass out sti		0.0%	2.1%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Stopped by a member of the public while walking into work. Answer		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Walked by a resident and resident approached me for help	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	any sports gathering	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	citizen contact	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	consensual contacts	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	fundraiser	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	i stopped a pedestrian on a bike with a felony warrant and took him	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	i stopped a resident for a traffic violation and found a loaded firearm		0.0%	2.1%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	interview of witness for investigation	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	or withest for investigation	0.776	0.078	2.1/0	5.076	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.073	0.070

ew Crosstab										
		Total Cisg	ender (non-trans) V Cisgender			select the term(s) with whi nder Woman Agender		selected Choice non-conforming Genderqueer	DI	ease specify another term you
		A A	B	(non-trains) ir fransge	D D	E E	F	G G	Н	case specify another term you
met	t my neighbor	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	merous social encounters	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
spea	aking to residents at window or on phone in records department	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
talk	ring to victims over the phone about their cases	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
: Do you personally perceive										
ender bias in the City of San		22.8%	25.7%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	100.0%	20.8%
lose Police Department? No		75.9%	71.4%	83.3%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	66.7%	0.0%	79.2%
	hough leadership has made efforts to improve, there are still mar		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
	tain genders will more likely to get promoted or a position	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	tain groups speak different about woman and them being in pow		0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	nale officers are offered specialized positions and opportunities f		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	believe that the culture tends to be male dominated with little r		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	on't believe everyone is treated equally from my observation	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	ave been questioned about aspects of my gender affecting my wo		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	now of at least one structure who was actively campaigning to be	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	ink gender bias is everywhere, gender bias is a societal problem v		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	BTQ+	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	k of representation	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	le dominated job	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Comment	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
The second secon	icers are mostly male. Civilian staff are mostly female. In both ca		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	sumptions based on race and sex and uniform	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	ems like the LGBT community is exercising their rights too much w		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	ne sworn staff still treat women differently than men. It's a lot be		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	ere are officers who believe women should not be in law enforcer		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	s is law enforcement, this is male-dominated field. There are mor		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	men are denied opportunity to excel. Recent training initiatives		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	men are promoted because of their sex, not their qualifications.		0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	men as a whole are judged based upon how they look and or are		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
	ering standards to achieve equity	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	nale officers underperfoming is always met with excuses and not		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	owing gender norms are expected due to the paramilitary nature		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
	s within department generally divide between roles: men more li		0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	ders being chosen based on gender and not qualifications is very	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
wor	men are not given the same respect as men, generally speaking.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
: Do you personally perceive thnic bias in City of San Jose		13.8%	20.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	8.3%
Police Department? No		84.8%	77.1%	87.5%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	50.0%	91.7%
_	ain, it is in the numbers. I may be harder to recruit in certain com		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	ck officers are not subject to discipline for egregious violations.	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	ryone has implicit bias about ethnicity.	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	now some races feel biased and have voiced it to myself	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
l've	seen officers treated differently than others in disciplinary cases	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
l've	seen where other races are afforded more opportunities and tra	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mai	ny officers utilize slurs when discussing people of color. Some PC	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pro	moting for the wrong reasons, ethnicity instead of ability	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
SON	ME MALE OFFICERS WHO ARE MORE QUALIFIED FOR A SPECIAL U	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Please expand upon your The	e more languages you speak, the better chances of promotion.	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
'Yes' response: The	ere is a small but vocal group of officers that regularly express rac	i 0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
	= : :	0.7%						0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

						select the term(s) with which				
		Total (	Cisgender (non-trans) V Cisgeno A R	der (non-trans) ir Transger C	nder Man Transg D	gender Woman Agender F	Gender	non-conforming Genderqueer G	Pleas H	e specify another term you pre
	Too long an explanation	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	We have seen a division between black and white officers in recent y	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	White and Hispanic officers are immediately determined to be guilty		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Yes, based on my recent experience I feel as though the department	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	differing standards to achieve equity	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	minority officers are given alot of leway in returns to work appearant	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	underrepresentation of ethnic minorities at each organizational level	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	we don't have a strong representation of African American employee	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
Q84: Do you perceive a national										
origin bias in the City of San Jose	Yes	5.5%	8.6%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	2.1%
Police Department?	No	92.4%	88.6%	93.8%	0.0%	100.0%	83.3%	100.0%	75.0%	95.8%
	Again, a small group of officers that hold xenophobic views.	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
	I am not sure about this actually; is it a requirement to be a US citize		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	In indexing subjects in law enforcement database, there is a question		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Q85: Please expand upon your	Many officers openly express negative biases about citizen and office	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
'Yes' response:	See previous answer regarding promotions.	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	There are not many minority supervisors in the department	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Too long an explanation	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	differing standards to achieve equity	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Voc	75.9%	82.9%	87.5%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	33.3%	50.0%	66.7%
you believe share your gender	Yes No	3.4%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	4.2%
,	140	3.470	2.376				10.770		23.076	4.270
										•
	Always does because they feel more comfortable and like they can g	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Always does because they feel more comfortable and like they can g Consent	0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Consent	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Consent Good	0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 2.1%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0%
	Consent Good Great!	0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 2.1% 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% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1%
	Consent Good Great! I dont know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 2.1% 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% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0%
	Consent Good Great! I dont know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 2.1% 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% 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%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic. It was a positive interaction	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9%	0.0% 2.1% 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% 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% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.13 0.0% 0.0%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic. It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9%	0.0% 2.1% 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%	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% 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% 25.0% 25.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic. It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9% 2.9%	0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1%	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% 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% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the perso I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic. It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9%	0.0% 2.1% 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% 0.0%	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% 0.0% 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% 25.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME.	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9%	0.0% 2.1% 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% 0.0%	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% 0.0% 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% 25.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME. NOPE	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 0.0%	0.0% 2.1% 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% 0.0%	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% 0.0% 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% 25.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME. NOPE No	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 1.9%	0.0% 2.1% 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% 0.0%	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% 0.0% 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% 0.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 1.5%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic. It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME. NOPE No No	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 1.4% 1.4% 0.7% 1.5.9% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 20.8% 2.1%	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% 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% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the perso I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic. It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME. NOPE No No	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 2.1% 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% 0.0%	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% 0.0% 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% 25.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 12.5% 0.0% 2.1%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME. NOPE No No No because it doesn't matter and has nothing to do with helping the No it did not	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 2.1% 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% 0.0%	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% 0.0% 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% 25.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME. NOPE No No No because it doesn't matter and has nothing to do with helping the No it did not No, I still treat all people with respect and dignity.	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 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% 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%	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% 25.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME. NOPE No No No because it doesn't matter and has nothing to do with helping the No it did not No, I still treat all people with respect and dignity. No, being influenced by gender identity is juvenile.	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0	0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1f 0.0% 2.1f 20.8% 2.19 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% 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% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME. NOPE No No No because it doesn't matter and has nothing to do with helping the No it did not No, I still treat all people with respect and dignity. No, being influenced by gender identity is juvenile.	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 5.7%	0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.18 20.8% 2.19 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% 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%	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% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.11% 0.0% 2.11% 0.0% 2.11% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0%
the outcome of your	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the perso I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic. It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME. NOPE No No No No because it doesn't matter and has nothing to do with helping the No it did not No, I still treat all people with respect and dignity. No, being influenced by gender identity is juvenile. No. No. My gender didn't mean anything, as it shouldn't.	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0	0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 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% 0.0%	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% 0.0% 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% 25.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1%
	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME. NOPE No No No because it doesn't matter and has nothing to do with helping the No it did not No, I still treat all people with respect and dignity. No, being influenced by gender identity is juvenile. No. No. My gender didn't mean anything, as it shouldn't. No. Our shared gender did not influence how I handled the interaction	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 5.7% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 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% 0.0%	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% 0.0% 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% 25.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0%
the outcome of your	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME. NOPE No No because it doesn't matter and has nothing to do with helping the No it did not No, I still treat all people with respect and dignity. No, being influenced by gender identity is juvenile. No. No. My gender didn't mean anything, as it shouldn't. No. Our shared gender did not influence how I handled the interaction.	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 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% 0.0%	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% 0.0% 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% 25.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0%
the outcome of your	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME. NOPE No No No because it doesn't matter and has nothing to do with helping the No it did not No, I still treat all people with respect and dignity. No, being influenced by gender identity is juvenile. No. No. My gender didn't mean anything, as it shouldn't. No. Our shared gender did not influence how I handled the interaction. Treat all people fair and equal. No. we got along just fine	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.11% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 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% 0.0%	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% 0.0% 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% 0.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0
Q87: If Yes, did that influence the outcome of your interaction? In what way?	Consent Good Great! I don't know - most people hold thier opinions and seem to be skepti I don't know what this question is asking me I knew that there was an immediate connection that made the persc I work really hard to combat the negative stigma by being authentic It was a positive interaction Many women that I interact with are trusting of me because I am als N/A NO NO, I DO MY BEST TO TREAT EVERYONE THE SAME. NOPE No No because it doesn't matter and has nothing to do with helping the No it did not No, I still treat all people with respect and dignity. No, being influenced by gender identity is juvenile. No. No. My gender didn't mean anything, as it shouldn't. No. Our shared gender did not influence how I handled the interaction.	0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7%	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 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% 0.0%	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% 0.0% 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% 25.0% 25.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0% 2.1% 0.0% 0.0%

Crosstab			O142: When describ	in a constant and along the	lease select the term(s) with which		Calcated Chains		
	Total C	Cisgender (non-trans) V Cisgende			ransgender Woman Agender		er non-conforming Genderqueer	Ple	ase specify another term y
	A	В	С	D	) E	F	G	н	
Often, women are more comfortable opening up to a female law en	f 0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
The sex or gender of the individuals I contact does not effect the ou	t 0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Trying to make them feel more comfortable.	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Yes, I was more comfortable interacting with that person.	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
absolutely	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
generally positive, they were left feeling for comfortable with case p	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
n/a	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
na	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
no	12.4%	8.6%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	8.3%
no - makes no difference	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
no idea	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
not at all	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
positive									
unsure	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
"Female" victims need support from women	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
City of San Jose Police Yes	87.6%	88.6%	97.9%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	50.0%	81.3%
artment leadership that you No	10.3%	8.6%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	16.7%
lieve share vour gender	10.570	0.070	2.170	0.070	0.070	10.770	0.070	30.070	10.770
Lity of San Jose Police Yes	89.7%	80.0%	95.8%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	91.7%
rtment leadership that you lelieve share your racial No	8.3%	17.1%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
y of San Jose residents that Ves u believe share your ethnic No	77.2% 5.5%	82.9% 5.7%	89.6% 2.1%	0.0% 0.0%	100.0% 0.0%	66.7% 16.7%	33.3% 0.0%	75.0% 0.0%	64.6% 8.3%
City of San Jose Police Intment leadership that you	90.3%	94.3%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	50.0%	83.3%
elieve share your gender No	7.6%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	14.6%
stions, please refer only to Strongly Agree	48.3%	45.7%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	25.0%	47.9%
thoughts and experiences Somewhat agree	33.1%	40.0%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	33.3%
the City of San Jose Police Neither agree nor disagree	8.3%	8.6%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%
tment, NOT experiences or ressions from any other Somewhat disagree	7.6%	2.9%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
county, state, or other law Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ement agency. For each of	·								
Illowing statements, please ct if you: Strongly Agree,	4.2	4.3	4.1		5.0	4.2	4.7	4.0	4.2
ree, Disagree, or Strongly gree You have confidence the City of San Jose Police Median	4.0	4.0	4.5		5.0	E 0	F.C.	4.0	4.0
the City of San Jose Police Median	4.0	4.0	4.5		5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Strongly agree	43.4%	48.6%	37.5%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	47.9%
Somewhat agree	29.0%	28.6%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	75.0%	20.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	7.6%	8.6%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
ou trust the leaders of the Somewhat disagree	12.4%	11.4%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
City of San Jose Police Strongly disagree	5.5%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
rtment to make decisions		*****			,,,,,,				
are in the public's best interest. Average	3.9	4.2	3.8		5.0	3.4	4.3	4.3	4.0
Median	4.0	4.5	4.0		5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
ivieulati	4.0	4.5	4.0		5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

						select the term(s) with wh				
			ler (non-trans) V Cisgend B	er (non-trans) n Transgend C	er Man Transg D	ender Woman Agender	Gender F	non-conforminį Genderqueer		specify another term y
		A	В	C	D	E	F	G	Н	
	Strongly agree	60.7%	42.9%	62.5%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	25.0%	70.8%
	Somewhat agree	28.3%	42.9%	27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	22.9%
	Neither agree nor disagree	3.4%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	4.2%
	Somewhat disagree	4.1%	8.6%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Strongly disagree	2.1%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	5,7									
	Average	4.4	4.2	4.4		5.0	4.2	5.0	4.0	4.6
	Average	7.7	7.2	7.7		5.0	7.2	5.0	Α	4.0
									A	
	Median	5.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
		***		***				***		2.2
	Strongly agree	26.2%	25.7%	27.1%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	66.7%	0.0%	25.0%
	Somewhat agree	36.6%	31.4%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	47.9%
	Neither agree nor disagree	16.6%	22.9%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	14.6%
5: To what extent do you										
gree with the following	Somewhat disagree	13.8%	11.4%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
statement:The police	Strongly disagree	5.5%	5.7%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
rtment does a good job of preventing crime.	Average	3.7	3.6	3.5		5.0	3.0	4.7	3.0	3.8
							E, G			
							·			
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	4.0
	Strongly agree	34.5%	31.4%	27.1%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	25.0%	37.5%
	Somewhat agree	31.0%	25.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	37.5%
	Neither agree nor disagree	13.1%	14.3%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	14.6%
6: To what extent do you gree with the following	Somewhat disagree	12.4%	20.0%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
ement:The police promptly	Strongly disagree	7.6%	5.7%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
and to non-emergency calls	Strongly disagree	7.070	5.770	111070	0.070	0.070	10.770	0.070	0.070	2.170
	Average	3.7	3.6	3.4		5.0	4.0	5.0	3.8	4.0
	. The large	3.,	3.0	3		5.0		3.0	В	
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	3.5	4.0
	Strongly agree	72.4%	74.3%	79.2%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	75.0%	66.7%
	Somewhat agree	17.2%	11.4%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	25.0%
7: To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree	5.5%	8.6%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
ree with the following	Somewhat disagree	2.8%	2.9%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ment: The police promptly	Strongly disagree	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ond to Emergency calls for										
stance when resources are	Average	4.6	4.6	4.6		5.0	4.2	4.7	4.8	4.6
available.										
	Median	5.0	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
										<u>'</u>
	Strongly agree	53.1%	34.3%	52.1%	0.0%	100.0%	83.3%	100.0%	25.0%	62.5%
	Somewhat agree	33.1%	45.7%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	6.2%	5.7%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%	6.3%
			11.4%			0.0%		0.0%		
	Somewhat disagree	5.5%		8.3%	0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	0.0%
	Strongly disagree	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ful to people who have been	Average	4.3	4.1	4.3		5.0				4.6
victims of crime							5.0	5.0	3.5	

w Crosstab									
		Tatal	day (non trops) M C	Q142: When describing your gend				Diecon	ifth !
		<b>Total</b> Cisgen A	der (non-trans) V Cisgen B	der (non-trans) n Transgender Man C	Transgender Woman Age D E	ender Gende F	r non-conforminį Genderqueer G	Please s H	specify another term
		A	В	C	D E	r	G	A	
	Median	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0
		***		***	***				
	Strongly agree	34.5%	31.4%	27.1% 0.0	0% 100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	43.8%
	Somewhat agree	37.9%	37.1%	43.8% 0.0		50.0%	33.3%	50.0%	31.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	11.0%	8.6%	8.3% 0.0		0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	14.6%
Q99: To what extent do you agree with the following	Somewhat disagree	10.3%	17.1%	12.5% 0.0		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
atement: Overall, the police	_	4.1%	2.9%	6.3% 0.0		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
e effective in dealing with the									
problems that concern residents.	Average	3.9	3.8	3.7	5.0	4.4	4.7	3.5	4.0
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	3.5	4.0
	Wedian	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	3.5	4.0
	Strongly agree	54.5%	28.6%	56.3% 0.0	0% 100.0%	83.3%	100.0%	25.0%	66.7%
	Somewhat agree	30.3%	42.9%	33.3% 0.0		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.1%
100: To what extent do you		5.5%	8.6%	2.1%		0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	4.2%
agree with the following	Somewhat disagree	6.2%	14.3%	4.2%		0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	2.1%
	Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.0%	4.2% 0.1		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	on one, a dagree	1.7/0	0.070	7.270	0.076	0.070	0.070	3.070	0.070
are doing a good job dealing with residents in a fair and	Average	4.3	3.9	4.3	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.3	4.6
courteous manner.			5.5	***	5.0	5.0		A A	
	Median	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0
			***						
	Strongly agree	59.3%	34.3%	68.8% 0.4	9% 100.0%	83.3%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%
	Somewhat agree	24.1%	42.9%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	20.8%
101: To what extent do you	Neither agree nor disagree	9.7%	8.6%	6.3% 0.0		0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	12.5%
agree with the following	Somewhat disagree	5.5%	11.4%	6.3% 0.0		0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
statement based on your ersonal experiences: Overall,	Strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
the police do a good job of									
onoring the gender identities		4.4	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.5
residents they interact with.			A, G					A, G	
	Median	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0
	Strongly 20100	25.00/	24.20/	21.29/	100.00	22.20/	22.29/	0.0%	A2 00/
	Strongly agree	35.9%	34.3%	31.3% 0.0		33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	43.8%
0102: To what extent do you	Somewhat agree	40.7%	42.9%	41.7% 0.0		16.7%	66.7%	75.0% 0.0%	37.5%
(102: To what extent do you agree with the following	_	12.4% 6.9%	11.4% 8.6%	14.6% 0.0 6.3% 0.0		16.7%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 25.0%	12.5%
statement based on your	Somewhat disagree					16.7%			4.2%
	Strongly disagree	2.8%	0.0%	6.3% 0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Average	4.0	4.1	3.0	F.0	3.8	4.3	2.5	4.2
gether with residents to solve local problems	Average	4.0	4.1	3.9	5.0	3.8	4.3	3.5	4.2
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Strongly agree	9.7%	8.6%	6.3% 0.0	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	25.0%	10.4%
Q103: To what extent do you	Somewhat agree	15.2% 22.8%	34.3% 14.3%	10.4% 0.0 16.7% 0.0		16.7% 16.7%	0.0% 0.0%	50.0% 0.0%	4.2% 39.6%

w Crosstab											
							er, please select the term(s)				
			-	der (non-trans) V Cisgende		ler Man	_	-	nder non-conformin{ Genderqueer		Please specify another ter
agree with the following			Α	В	C		D E	F	G	F	
statement based on your	Somewhat disagree		11.0%	20.0%	12.5%	0.09		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
rsonal experiences: Gender s a role in the interactions or	Strongly disagree		40.7%	20.0%	54.2%	0.09	6 100.0%	66.7%	33.3%	25.0%	39.6%
mployees of the City of San											
se Police Department and its	Average		2.4	2.9	2.0		1.0	1.8	3.7	3.5	2.4
residents			В								
	Median		2.0	3.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	5.0	4.0	3.0
	Strongly agree		11.0%	8.6%	10.4%	0.09		0.0%	66.7%	25.0%	10.4%
.04: To what extent do you	Somewhat agree		15.9%	31.4%	12.5%	0.09		16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	6.3%
agree with the following	Neither agree nor disagree		17.9%	14.3%	12.5%	0.09		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.3%
	Somewhat disagree		13.1%	14.3%	20.8%	0.09		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
	Strongly disagree		41.4%	28.6%	43.8%	0.09	6 100.0%	83.3%	33.3%	25.0%	43.8%
role in the interactions of aployees of the City of San											
Police Department and its	Average		2.4	2.8	2.3		1.0	1.5	3.7	3.5	2.3
Police Department and its residents											
	Median		2.0	3.0	2.0		1.0	1.0	5.0	4.0	2.0
	Strongly agree		8.3%	5.7%	6.3%	0.09		0.0%	66.7%	25.0%	8.3%
.05: To what extent do you	Somewhat agree		11.7%	25.7%	8.3%	0.09		16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	4.2%
agree with the following	Neither agree nor disagree		23.4%	20.0%	16.7%	0.09		0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	37.5%
tatement based on your	Somewhat disagree		13.8%	17.1%	18.8%	0.09	6 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
sonal experiences: National	Strongly disagree		42.1%	28.6%	50.0%	0.09	6 100.0%	83.3%	33.3%	25.0%	39.6%
origin plays a role in the											
ractions of employees of the City of San Jose Police	Average		2.3	2.6	2.0		1.0	1.5	3.7	3.3	2.3
partment and its residents			В								
	Median		2.0	3.0	1.5		1.0	1.0	5.0	3.5	2.5
an Jose Police Department											
ght behave toward residents.	A Major Problem		31.7%	28.6%	35.4%	0.09		33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	29.2%
our opinion, stopping people	A Minor Problem		11.7%	20.0%	10.4%	0.09		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
ars or on the street without	Not a Problem		54.5%	48.6%	50.0%	0.09	6 100.0%	66.7%	66.7%	50.0%	60.4%
.08: In your opinion, police			31.0%	28.6%	35.4%	0.09		33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	27.1%
gaging in racial profiling is			9.0%	22.9%	2.1%	0.09		0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	6.3%
<del></del> .	Not a Problem		58.6%	48.6%	58.3%	0.09	6 100.0%	66.7%	33.3%	50.0%	66.7%
	A A A a Company to the Company to th		26.007	22.00/	22.22		,		22.24	25.007	
	A Major Problem		26.9%	22.9%	33.3%	0.09		16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	25.0%
xample, being verbally or	A Minor Problem		20.0%	28.6%	14.6%	0.09		33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	14.6%
physically abusive is	Not a Problem		51.7%	48.6%	47.9%	0.09	6 100.0%	50.0%	33.3%	25.0%	60.4%
, ou. opo., poc	A A A a Company Company		20 ==/	22.00/	20.00		,		22.04	25.007	100:1
hanging their personal	A Major Problem		20.7%	22.9%	20.8%	0.09		16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	18.8%
	A Minor Problem		16.6%	22.9%	18.8%	0.09		16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	6.3%
eanor based on the gender					56.3%	0.09	6 100.0%	66.7%	33.3%	25.0%	70.8%
eanor based on the gender	Not a Problem		60.0%	54.3%							
eanor based on the gender	Not a Problem		60.0%	54.3%							
eanor based on the gender	Not a Problem										
neanor based on the gender	Not a Problem	Strongly agree	65.5%	40.0%	72.9%	0.09		100.0%	66.7%	25.0%	75.0%
neanor based on the gender esidents they are interacting	Not a Problem  Gender Identity	Strongly agree Somewhat agree Neither agree nor disagree				0.05 0.05 0.05	6 0.0%	100.0% 0.0% 0.0%	66.7% 33.3% 0.0%	25.0% 25.0% 0.0%	75.0% 16.7% 8.3%

/ Crosstab					O142: When describi	ing your gond	or places calact the terr	n/s) with which you mos	identify - Selected Choice		
			Total C	isgender (non-trans) V Cisgende			Transgender Woman		Gender non-conforming Ge	nderqueer F	Please specify another ter
	1		Α	В	С		D	E	F G	H	,
		Somewhat disagree	4.1%	5.7%	6.3%	0.0				25.0%	0.0%
		Strongly disagree	2.1%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
		Strongly agree	67.6%	37.1%	79.2%	0.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 66.7%	25.0%	77.1%
		Somewhat agree	17.9%	34.3%	12.5%	0.0				0.0%	14.6%
	Race or Ethnicity	Neither agree nor disagree	6.2%	11.4%	2.1%	0.0				25.0%	6.3%
		Somewhat disagree	5.5%	14.3%	2.1%	0.0	% 0.0			25.0%	2.1%
		Strongly disagree	2.8%	2.9%	4.2%	0.0				25.0%	0.0%
		Strongly agree	69.7%	42.9%	79.2%	0.0				25.0%	79.2%
	National Octob	Somewhat agree	16.6%	34.3%	10.4%	0.0				0.0%	12.5%
	National Origin	Neither agree nor disagree	8.3%	14.3%	4.2%	0.0				50.0%	6.3%
		Somewhat disagree	3.4%	5.7%	4.2%	0.0				0.0%	2.1%
: In your opinion, City of		Strongly disagree	2.1%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
se police officers treat all		Strongly agree	57.2%	31.4%	60.4%	0.0	% 100.0	% 83.3	% 66.7%	25.0%	70.8%
		Somewhat agree	24.1%	34.3%	22.9%	0.0				0.0%	20.8%
	Socioeconomic status	Neither agree nor disagree	6.2%	11.4%	2.1%	0.0				25.0%	6.3%
		Somewhat disagree	8.3%	14.3%	8.3%	0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0%	50.0%	2.1%
		Strongly disagree	3.4%	8.6%	4.2%	0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
				4.0							
	Average (Gender Identity)		4.4	4.0 A	4.5		5	.0 5	0 4.7	3.0	4.7
	Average (Race or Ethnicity)		4.4	3.9	4.6		5	.0 5	0 4.7	2.8	4.7
				A						F	1
	Average (National Origin)		4.5	4.1	4.6		5	.0 5	0 4.7	3.0	4.7
				A						F	•
	Average (Socioeconomic status)		4.2	3.7 A	4.3		5	.0 4	8 4.7	3.0	4.6
				A				А, В		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
	Median (Gender Identity)		5.0	4.0	5.0		5	.0 5	0 5.0	3.0	5.0
	Median (Race or Ethnicity)		5.0	4.0	5.0		5	.0 5	0 5.0	2.5	5.0
	Median (National Origin)		5.0	4.0	5.0		5	.0 5	0 5.0	3.0	5.0
	Median (Socioeconomic status)		5.0	4.0	5.0		5	.0 5	0 5.0	2.5	5.0
	Strongly agree		60.7%	31.4%	70.8%	0.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 66.7%	25.0%	68.8%
. To subat outant de se	Somewhat agree		17.2%	17.1%	18.8%	0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0	% 33.3%	0.0%	18.8%
: To what extent do you ree with the following	Neither agree nor disagree		12.4%	31.4%	4.2%	0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
ement based on your	Somewhat disagree		5.5%	11.4%	4.2%	0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
al experiences: City of San	Strongly disagree		3.4%	5.7%	2.1%	0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0%	25.0%	2.1%
olice officers are likely to male-identifying people,											
le-identifying and gender	Average		4.3	3.6	4.5		5	.0 5	0 4.7	2.5	4.5
onforming people equally.				A						A	
	Median		5.0	3.5	5.0		5	.0 5	0 5.0	2.0	5.0
	Chanaliana		F F6′	0.0%	10.49/		2/ 22		22.22	0.007	4.20/
	Strongly agree		5.5%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0				0.0%	4.2%
3: To what extent do you	Somewhat agree		9.7%	14.3%	8.3%	0.0				0.0%	8.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree		22.8%	42.9%	8.3%	0.0				25.0%	22.9%
al experiences: City of San	Somewhat disagree		12.4%	11.4%	18.8%	0.0				50.0%	6.3%
	Strongly disagree		49.0%	28.6%	54.2%	0.0	% 100.0	% 66.7	% 33.3%	25.0%	58.3%
to treat female-identifying cople better than male-	Average		2.1	2.4	2.0		1	.0 1	7 3.3	2.0	1.9
Apple Detter thall Illaie-	,agc		2.1	4.4	2.0		1	1		2.0	1.3

w Crosstad									
	Total Cisge	- d ( d ) ) ( d			please select the term(s) with which			DI	
	iotai Cisgei A	nder (non-trans) v Cisgende B	er (non-trans) n Transgender C	ivian	Fransgender Woman Agender	Gende	r non-conforminį Genderqueer G	Pleas H	se specify another term you
non-conforming people	А	В				- г	<u> </u>	П	
Median	2.0	3.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	4.0	2.0	1.0
Median	2.0	5.0	2.0		1.0	1.0		2.0	110
resident seeking help for a	10.3%	11.4%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	8.3%
nder-related crime or a crime No	89.0%	85.7%	89.6%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	75.0%	91.7%
D, have you ever responded Yes	44.1%	28.6%	52.1%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	41.7%
to a crime involving gender No	52.4%	68.6%	45.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	54.2%
ve you ever been contacted Yes ut neighborhood concerns or No	81.4%	65.7%	95.8%	0.0%	100.0%	83.3%	100.0%	75.0%	77.1%
No No	16.6%	31.4%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	18.8%
ghborhood watch or other Yes	52.4%	37.1%	58.3%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	66.7%	50.0%	54.2%
i-crime programs WITH City No	46.2%	60.0%	41.7%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	43.8%
Responded to a reported crime to police	57.2%	37.1%	70.8%	0.0%	100.0%	83.3%	66.7%	50.0%	54.2%
18: Of your contact with the Reponded to a reported other non-crime emergencies	1.4%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
of San Jose residents, which	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
the following describes your serious contact in the last were contacted about neighborhood concerns	10.3%	11.4%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
months? - Selected Choice Participated in block watch	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	20.7%	31.4%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	16.7%
19: Regarding THAT contact	63.4%	45.7%	70.8%	0.0%	100.0%	83.3%	66.7%	50.0%	CC 704
Yes th resident(s), were they a victim of a crime? No	28.3%	45.7% 37.1%	27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	66.7% 22.9%
victim of a crime?	20.5%	37.170	27.170	0.070	0.070	10.770	33.370	30.070	22.570
Strongly Agree D: Please read another series Somewhat agree	60.0%	31.4%	64.6%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	25.0%	75.0%
atements and express your	28.3%	42.9%	31.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	16.7%
on on how much you agree Neither agree nor disagree	6.9%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	4.2%
sagree with each statement Somewhat disagree	3.4%	2.9%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	2.1%
pased on your personal periences. Based on your Strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
erience, you believe the City	4.5	4.1	4.6		5.0	4.7	5.0	3.5	4.7
an Jose police officer/s treat sidents professionally and		A			A			А	
respectfully.									
Median	5.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	3.5	5.0
Strongly agree	53.1%	37.1%	56.3%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	62.5%
Somewhat agree	32.4%	37.1%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	25.0%	29.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	10.3%	22.9%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	6.3%
1: Based on your personal Somewhat disagree	2.1%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
rience, the City of San Jose Strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
lice clearly explains the				-					
Average	4.4	4.1	4.4		5.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	4.6
		G			G			A, G	
Madian	5.0	4.0	F.C.			4.5	F.C.	2.0	5.0
Median	5.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	5.0

Crosstab			04.42 \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\		and and the state of the state of the state of		Caladad Chaire		
	Total Cisgend	ler (non-trans) W Cisgond	er (non-trans) n Transger		select the term(s) with which ender Woman Agender		non-conforming Genderqueer	Please	specify another term y
	A A	R	er (non-trans) ir fransger	D D	F Agender	F	G G	H	specify another term y
Strongly agree	60.0%	42.9%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	25.0%	62.5%
Somewhat agree	27.6%	28.6%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	31.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	9.0%	22.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	4.2%
0 1 1 1	1.4%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
22: Based on your personal Somewhat disagree Strongly disagree	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
te always has a valid reason	0.776	0.076	2.1/0	0.076	0.076	0.076	0.076	0.076	0.076
for stopping a resident.  Average	4.5	4.1	4.6		5.0	5.0	4.7	3.3	4.6
Average	4.5	4.1	4.0		5.0	5.0	4.7	3.3 A	4.0
		A						Α	
Median	5.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0
Wedian	3.0	4.0	5.0		3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
No force of our bind in ourse and	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
No force of any kind is ever used									
perience, if San Jose police The amount of force is always appropriate	56.6%	40.0%	60.4%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	33.3%	25.0%	62.5%
the amount of force is somewhat appropriate interaction with residents,	24.1%	31.4%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	18.8%
would you say:	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
The amount of force is very inappropriate	2.1%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	0.0%
ormal complaint against a						0.007	0.00/		2 24
low member of the police Yes	2.8%	5.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
artment because of alleged No	95.9%	91.4%	95.8%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	97.9%
						0.00	0.004	2.21	
ver been filed against you Yes	3.4%	5.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
cause of alleged gender or No	86.9%	91.4%	85.4%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	83.3%
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
4 hour mandatory class	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
4 hours of LGBTQ+ training (mandatory) in the last 6 months		0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4hr, adequate	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5 hours worth of training recently, more in the past 12 mont		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
A lot of training	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Absolutely and yes	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Acad, on-going discussions, outside personal research	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Academy and follow up	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Academy training and concurrent trainings. They are shallow	w and ne 0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Adequate	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Annual training	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bias base Police training, LGBTQ+ training	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
СРТ	1.4%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
СРТ	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
CPT. adequate	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
CPT/ POST UPDATES	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Continued Police Training, yes.	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Cultural diversity, the most recent race based training	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Department has provided numerous training opportunities in		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Diversity training 36hrs I believe. It was an incredible class at	• •	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
Harassment and equality training, does not feel adequate be		0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
l attended a class session and found it adequate because of		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
I can't recall any gender bias training	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
I don't remember if i received gender bias training or not.	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
I found it adequate. Police are required to do a lot of training		0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
I have received adequate training throughout my law enforce		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
I have received bias based police training but not specifically	y gender 0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
I have recieved periodic on-line video training through the	city and 0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

					ibing your gender, p			y - Selected Choice		
		Total	Cisgender (non-trans) V C	Cisgender (non-trans) n Trans	gender Man T	ransgender Woman Age	ender Geno	der non-conforminį Genderqueer	Ple	ease specify another term you prefer I
			A B	C C	D		F	G	Н	1
	I received bias-base police training. Many officers don't seem to app			2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	I recently received a LGBTQ+ training class, and it was informative.	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	I've had over 50 hours of bias training. I dont need to be trained to l			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	I've received sexual harassment training once every other year, it was		0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Implicit Bias and LGBTQ+ training classes. Both were very good prog	g 0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	In CPT training. I found it adequate. It was informative and I learned	0.79	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	It was mandated and it was not based in fact or truth	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	It was, but the way it was done could have been better. Presentation	n 0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	LGBQT+ training. Was a good start. Most if not all the proctors of th	i: 0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	LGBTQ + training. It was good training. It assisted in understanding	t 0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	LGBTQ Training, Adequate	0.79	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	LGBTQ awareness - pretty good for what it was	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	LGBTQ training, yes it identified terms used	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	LGBTQ+ & CPT. Yes, it was thorough and unexpectedly well presente	0.79	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	LGBTQ+ training recently and in the past, and sexual harassment tra	i 0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	LGTBQIA+ training, gender identity training, bias based policing train	n 0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Q126: What if any training have	Lots and lots and lots - it is all common sense and treating others wi		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
you received on gender bias? Did you find it adequate? Please	No, not adequate. Recently we did have an LGBTQIA+ Awareness cla		2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
describe why or why not.	No, not specifically gender biasbut we have recently received train	i 0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Nobody paid any attention, it was just something we had to sit thro	υ 0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	None	1.49	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Not gender bias just gender awareness training	0.79	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Not sure	0.79	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Nothing on gender bias specifically. I have been given training on ev	ra 0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	ONLINE TRAIING. NO. ONLINE TRAINING DOESN'T HAVE ANY BACK	A 0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	ONLINE TRAINING THROUGH THE CITY WHICH WAS ADEQUATE.	0.79	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	On line training	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Post classes on gender bias. Yes it was adequate. It covered the app	r 0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Several	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Significant training	0.79	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Standard post training. Yes	0.79	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	TOO much	0.79	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	The Department has provided training on gender bias, racial profilin	ış 0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	The training was fine.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Too much looks like it's searching for a bias or making one up where	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Too much training, I don't care how people identify. I will treat them	n 0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Training from the city and from the academy. Not useful because it's			2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	We have received very little gender bias training.	0.79	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Х	0.79	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	YES	0.79		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Yes	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Yes / training was adequate	0.79		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Yes good training	0.09		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Yes our training had been very diverse and helpful.	0.79		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Yes they train the officers but everyone not going respect it or still to			2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Yes, City training and Department training. Feels like virtue signaling			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Yes, It was tedious and pandering	0.7%		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Yes, and it wss adequate adding with the other anti bias trainings ar			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Yes. It was to long.	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	anti harassment and gender indentity training. both were informative			2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	department mandated training	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	gender based training, adequate	0.09		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	gender/racial equality training	0.7%		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	lots of training in academy, CPT, in breifing. Extremley adequate bed			2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	no opinion	0.79		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	none	0.79	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

		Takal C'				select the term(s) with w			DI	and the second second
		Total Cis	sgender (non-trans) V Cisgende B	r (non-trans) n Transge C	ender Man Transge D	ender Woman Agende	r Gender F	non-conforming Genderqueer G	Pleas H	e specify another term y
	police bias	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	recently completed online training. Yes, it was adequate.	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	several hours worth over the last few years and it was adequate	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	will be attending a 4 hour in-person training this month	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	ves	4.1%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	2.1%
	yes regular annual or bi-annual - seems adequate - kind of common		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
		0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	yes. it was more than adequate. it was over the top. There has been	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	yes human beings commit crime	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Very Satisfied	34.5%	22.9%	39.6%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	25.0%	33.3%
9: Overall, how satisfied are	Somewhat Satisfied	27.6%	25.7%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	27.1%
with how the department	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	26.2%	34.3%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	27.1%
ndles complaints. Are you:	Somewhat Dissatisfied	5.5%	11.4%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
	Very Dissatisfied	4.8%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	6.3%
	very bissatisfied	4.070	2.370	2.170	0.070	0.070	0.078	0.070	30.070	0.570
0: Have you ever witnessed	Yes	10.3%	20.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	4.2%
n instance of gender bias	No	82.1%	68.6%	87.5%	0.0%	100.0%	83.3%	66.7%	25.0%	91.7%
ayed by a colleague towards		4.1%	5.7%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
other colleague within SJPD?	Prefer not to say	2.1%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	2.1%
								2 2.		
2: Have you ever witnessed	Yes	2.1%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
	No	91.7%	82.9%	91.7%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	97.9%
layed by a colleague towards a a resident of San Jose?	Maybe	3.4%	5.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
a a resident of San Joser	Prefer not to say	1.4%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
.34: Reflecting honestly on	Yes	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ur general interactions with	No	91.7%	82.9%	95.8%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	93.8%
San Jose residents, do you pond differently to residents	Sometimes	2.8%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
sed on their gender identity?	I'm not sure	3.4%	11.4%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ed on their gender identity.					*****			3.0,1		2.27.2
	Strongly Agree	42.1%	22.9%	43.8%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	66.7%	25.0%	50.0%
	Somewhat agree	40.0%	42.9%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	43.8%
Q135: In answering the	Neither agree nor disagree	5.5%	8.6%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Somewhat disagree	9.7%	22.9%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	2.1%
lly to your thoughts about sing IN GENERAL across the	Strongly disagree	2.1%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
United States. You have nfidence the police can do	Average	4.1	3.7	4.1		5.0	4.7	4.7	3.3	4.4
their job well.						A			A	
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.5
										,
	Strongly Agree	29.0%	20.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	25.0%	29.2%
	Somewhat agree	40.0%	42.9%	37.5%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	43.8%
	Neither agree nor disagree	10.3%	17.1%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
6: You trust the leaders of	Somewhat disagree	13.8%	11.4%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	10.4%
lice departments to make	Strongly disagree	6.2%	5.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
isions that are in the public's best interest.										

Crosstab										
		_				please select the term(s) with whi				
				nder (non-trans) n Transgend C		Transgender Woman Agender	Gender F	r non-conforminį Genderqueer	Ple H	ease specify another ter
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		D E 4.0	3.0	G	3.0	4.0
'	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	4.0
	Strongly Agree	43.4%	20.0%	45.8%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	25.0%	52.1%
	Somewhat agree	40.0%	48.6%	39.6%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	39.6%
	Neither agree nor disagree	6.9%	8.6%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
	Somewhat disagree	6.2%	14.3%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	2.1%
	Strongly disagree	2.8%	5.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Average	4.2	3.6	4.2		5.0	4.7	5.0	3.3	4.4
			А			Α			Α	
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0
	Strongly Agree	39.3%	17.1%	43.8%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	25.0%	47.9%
	Somewhat agree	36.6%	40.0%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	39.6%
	Neither agree nor disagree	10.3%	8.6%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
	Somewhat disagree	7.6%	20.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	2.1%
38: Police officers treat	Strongly disagree	5.5%	11.4%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
ividuals equally regardless of their race or ethnicity.										
	Average	4.0	3.3	4.1		5.0	4.3	4.7	2.3	4.3
			Α			Α	A		A	
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.5	5.0	1.5	4.0
	Strongly agree	33.8%	17.1%	39.6%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	25.0%	37.5%
	Somewhat agree	40.0%	28.6%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	52.1%
	Neither agree nor disagree	6.9%	11.4%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
	Somewhat disagree	11.7%	28.6%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	2.1%
	_	6.9%	11.4%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
	Strongly disagree	0.5%	11.476	0.376	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%	0.0%
	Average	3.8	3.1	3.9		5.0	4.3	4.7	2.3	4.3
	Average	3.0	Α	3.5		3.0 A	4.5 A	3.7	2.5 A	4.5
	Median	4.0	3.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	1.5	4.0
	Strongly agree	37.2%	14.3%	43.8%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	25.0%	43.8%
	Somewhat agree	42.1%	42.9%	39.6%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	33.3%	0.0%	47.9%
	Neither agree nor disagree	8.3%	11.4%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	6.3%
	Somewhat disagree	7.6%	20.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
L40: Police officers treat	Strongly disagree	4.1%	8.6%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
duals equally regardless of their gender identity.										1
men gender identity.	Average	4.0	3.4	4.2		5.0	4.5	4.7	2.5	4.3
			A			A	А		А	
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.5	5.0	2.0	4.0
	···cuai	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	7.3	3.0	2.0	4.0]
	01/2023	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	01/2023		0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%				
	10 years			4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	10 years	0.7%						0.00/	0.007	المداد
	2 years	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
								0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 25.0% 0.0%	2.1% 2.1% 0.0%

Q153: Do you have an leave the departme when?

			O142: When descri	oing your gender, please	select the term(s) with whi	ch vou most identify -	Selected Choice				
	Total	Cisgender (non-trans) V Cisgender			ender Woman Agender		Gender non-conforming Genderqueer		e specify another term you prefe		
		A B	С	D	E	F	G	Н			
2028	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
2035	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
3.5 years	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
4 years	1.4%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
5 years	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
ASAP	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
As soon as I can retire	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
As soon as a better job comes around	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
As soon as possible	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
By 2026	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Considering it	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
I do when there is better opportunities outside this agency	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
ldk, a large group of us are looking at departments like Palo Alto tha			2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
If I make enough money through investments, yes. The sooner the			2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
January 2023	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%		
May 2023	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
Maybe	0.7%		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Maybe, if opportunity presents itself	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
N/A	0.7%		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
NO NO	1.4%		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
No	14.5%		18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	14.6%		
No, City vaccine policy may change that	0.7%		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
No. When i retire	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Not at this time	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
November 2022	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
Possibly, not sure when another higher paying opportunity may aris			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Retire	0.7%		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Retirement.	0.7%		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Soon as I can	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%		
Undecided	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Within 1 -2 years	0.7%		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
X	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
YES, IN THE PROCESS NOW	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
YES, NEXT YEAR OR TWO	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
YES, WITHIN THE NEXT 6 MONTHS.	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
ans to Yes	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
f so, Yes - At normal retirement age.	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
Yes if I can find a higher paying job	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Yes in 2-4 years	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Yes in 5 years	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
Yes, 2023	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Yes, as soon as I can save enough money for the move, and secure a	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Yes, in 6 years when I retire.	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Yes, retirement in 23 months	0.7%		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Yes, soon	2.1%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%		
Yes, when I retire in 5 years.	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Yes. Within 3 years	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Yes. End of July hopefully.	0.7%		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Yes. In a few months.	0.7%		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%		
Yesif I become bored or find my job meaningless. If I get a signification											
as soon as I can retire	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
in the next couple of years	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
just retirement	0.7%		2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
less than one year	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
maybe , within the next year	0.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%		
no	11.7%	14.3%	14.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%		

	Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice									
	Total Cisgender (non-trans) V Cisgender (non-trans) m Transgender Man			Transgender Woman Agender		Gender non-conforming Genderqueer		Please specify another term you prefe		
		A B	С		D	E	F G	F	1	
no as long as I can help	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09	6 0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
nope	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09	6 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
not at present	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09	6 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
not specifically, but I am open to other job opportunities	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09	6 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
not until retirement	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09	6 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
possibly 2023	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
possibly, working past 50 years old is too old for this job and not get	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
soon	2.8%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09	6 0.0%	25.0%	4.2%	
unknown	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09	6 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
unsure	1.4%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09	6 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
when i reitre	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09	6 0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
when i retire	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09	6 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
yes	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
yes - retirement in 3-5 years	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09	6 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
yes 4 yeas	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
yes ASAP	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
yes within 4 years	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
yes, 1 yr	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09	6 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
yes, medically retiring out in May 2023	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
yeswithin 5 yrs	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
yes. soon.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
yes. 1-2 years	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	