

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-identified¹ 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.

¹ 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.



FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
ASKEW SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

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, 17th 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

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 SJPД, which can then be cross-tabulate with the demographic information of respondents to identify and quantify gender gaps in experiences with SJPД 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 SJPД 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 SJPД, 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-identified² 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.

² 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 (www.sjpd.org/records). 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, sex³, 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)

³ 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 & Moseley, 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.

Data Collection and Management Conclusions and Recommendations

(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 heteronormative ‘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 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 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 reinstating 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: [10.1080/10439463.2017.1394300](https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2017.1394300)
- 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, <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/>.

Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice

	Total	A Cisgender (non-trans) W	B Cisgender (non-trans) M	C Transgender Man	D Transgender Woman	E Agender	F Gender non-conforming	G Genderqueer	H Please specify another term you prefer here:
Strongly disagree	2.1%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
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%
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%
Average	3.6	3.4	3.6		4.0	2.8	3.7	3.3	3.7
Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	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%
Somewhat disagree	6.9%	8.6%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
Strongly disagree	6.2%	5.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	4.2%
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

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%
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%
Average	4.1	4.1	4.0		4.0	3.8	4.7	4.3	4.1
Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0

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%
Somewhat disagree	6.2%	8.6%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Strongly disagree	13.8%	14.3%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	75.0%	10.4%
Average	3.8	3.6	4.0		5.0	2.8	3.7	1.8	3.9
Median	4.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	2.0	5.0	1.0	4.0

Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice

Total	Cisgender (non-trans) A	Transgender (non-trans) B	Transgender Man C	Transgender Woman D	Agender E	Gender non-conforming F	Genderqueer G	Please specify another term you prefer here: H
-------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------	---------------------	-----------	-------------------------	---------------	--

	Median	2.0	3.0	2.0		2.0	1.0	2.0	1.5	2.5
--	--------	-----	-----	-----	--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Q21: Based on my observations in my work unit, differences in performance are recognized in a meaningful way.	Strongly agree	11.7%	14.3%	8.3%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	10.4%
	Somewhat agree	25.5%	25.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	18.8%
	Neither agree nor disagree	22.1%	25.7%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%
	Somewhat disagree	23.4%	28.6%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
	Strongly disagree	15.9%	5.7%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	18.8%
	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

Q22: Based on my observations in my work unit, awards and/or commendations are given depending on how well employees perform their jobs.	Strongly agree	16.6%	14.3%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	20.8%
	Somewhat agree	31.7%	25.7%	39.6%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	27.1%
	Neither agree nor disagree	18.6%	28.6%	22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
	Somewhat disagree	13.8%	14.3%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	20.8%
	Strongly disagree	17.9%	14.3%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	18.8%
	Average	3.2	3.1	3.2		4.0	3.4	3.3	2.8	3.1
	Median	3.0	3.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0

Q23: Based on my experiences in my work unit, employees share job knowledge with each other.	Strongly agree	40.0%	48.6%	47.9%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	31.3%
	Somewhat agree	41.4%	37.1%	31.3%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	75.0%	47.9%
	Neither agree nor disagree	4.8%	8.6%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
	Somewhat disagree	10.3%	5.7%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
	Strongly disagree	2.8%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Average	4.1	4.3	4.0		5.0	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

Q24: Based on my observations in my work unit, my unit's skill level has improved in the past year.	Strongly agree	29.7%	37.1%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	29.2%
	Somewhat agree	33.8%	37.1%	39.6%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	25.0%
	Neither agree nor disagree	21.4%	17.1%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
	Somewhat disagree	5.5%	5.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
	Strongly disagree	9.0%	2.9%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	6.3%
	Average	3.7	4.0	3.6		5.0	3.0	3.3	3.5	3.6
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

	Exceptional	40.0%	42.9%	45.8%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	33.3%
	Above Standard	26.9%	28.6%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	27.1%
	Meets Standard	26.9%	25.7%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	37.5%
	Needs Improvement	5.5%	2.9%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%

Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice

		Total	Cisgender (non-trans) A	Cisgender (non-trans) B	Transgender Man C	Transgender Woman D	Agender E	Gender non-conforming F	Genderqueer G	Please specify another term you prefer here: H	
Q25: How would you rate the overall quality of work done by your work unit?	Unsatisfactory	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	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	

Q26: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: The workforce has the job-relevant knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish organizational goals	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%
	Neither agree nor disagree	9.7%	8.6%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.8%
	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%
	Average	3.7	3.9	3.7		5.0	3.4	4.3	2.5	3.7
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	4.0	2.5	4.0

Q27: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Employees are recognized for providing high quality products and services.	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%
	Somewhat disagree	15.2%	20.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
	Strongly disagree	17.2%	8.6%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	22.9%
	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

Q28: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Creativity and innovation are rewarded	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%
	Somewhat disagree	23.4%	31.4%	22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	22.9%
	Strongly disagree	18.6%	11.4%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%
	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

Q29: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace (for example, recruiting minorities and women, training in awareness of diversity issues, mentoring).	Strongly agree	40.0%	40.0%	39.6%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	41.7%
	Somewhat agree	27.6%	25.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%
	Neither agree nor disagree	18.6%	20.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	25.0%
	Somewhat disagree	6.2%	5.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	6.3%
	Strongly disagree	6.9%	8.6%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Average	3.9	3.8	3.9		5.0	3.2	3.3	4.0	4.0
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0

Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice

	Total	Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice				Please specify another term you prefer here:				
		A Cisgender (non-trans) W	B Cisgender (non-trans) M	C Transgender Man	D Transgender Woman	E Agender	F Gender non-conforming	G Genderqueer	H	
Q30: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Employees are reasonably protected from health and safety hazards on the job	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%
	Neither agree nor disagree	15.2%	11.4%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	27.1%
	Somewhat disagree	17.9%	22.9%	27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	6.3%
	Strongly disagree	12.4%	5.7%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
	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	

Q31: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: My organization has prepared employees for potential security threats	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%
	Neither agree nor disagree	11.7%	8.6%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	16.7%
	Somewhat disagree	13.1%	22.9%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
	Strongly disagree	8.3%	5.7%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
	Average	3.6	3.5	3.5		5.0	3.4	4.3	2.8	3.8
Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	3.0	5.0	2.5	4.0	

Q32: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Arbitrary action, personal favoritism and coercion for partisan political purposes are not tolerated	Strongly agree	23.4%	20.0%	27.1%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	18.8%
	Somewhat agree	19.3%	34.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
	Neither agree nor disagree	17.2%	20.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	18.8%
	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%
	Average	3.1	3.4	3.1		5.0	2.8	4.3	1.8	2.8
Median	3.0	4.0	3.0		5.0	2.0	5.0	1.0	3.0	

Q33: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Prohibited Personnel Practices (for example, illegally discriminating for or against any employee/applicant, obstructing a person's right to compete for employment, knowingly violating veterans' preference requirements) are not tolerated.	Strongly agree	49.0%	51.4%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	33.3%	50.0%	45.8%
	Somewhat agree	20.7%	28.6%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
	Neither agree nor disagree	14.5%	11.4%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	22.9%
	Somewhat disagree	6.9%	2.9%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	8.3%
	Strongly disagree	8.3%	5.7%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	6.3%
	Average	4.0	4.2	4.0		5.0	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.9
Median	4.0	5.0	4.5		5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	

Q34: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: My agency is successful at accomplishing its mission.	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%
	Strongly disagree	4.8%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Average	3.8	4.0	3.7		5.0	3.4	3.3	4.0	3.9

Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice

Total	Cisgender (non-trans) A	Cisgender (non-trans) B	Transgender Man C	Transgender Woman D	Agender E	Gender non-conforming F	Genderqueer G	Please specify another term you prefer here: H
-------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	---------------------	-----------	-------------------------	---------------	--

Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
--------	-----	-----	-----	--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Q35: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: I recommend my organization as a good place to work	Strongly agree	31.0%	42.9%	27.1%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	29.2%
	Somewhat agree	32.4%	31.4%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	35.4%
	Neither agree nor disagree	16.6%	14.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	18.8%
	Somewhat disagree	11.7%	11.4%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	8.3%
	Strongly disagree	7.6%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
	Average	3.7	4.1	3.5		5.0	2.8	3.3	3.3	3.7
Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	2.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	

Q36: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: I believe the results of this survey will be used to make my agency a better place to work	Strongly agree	13.1%	17.1%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	25.0%	8.3%
	Somewhat agree	18.6%	22.9%	22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
	Neither agree nor disagree	26.2%	25.7%	22.9%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	31.3%
	Somewhat disagree	13.1%	11.4%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
	Strongly disagree	28.3%	22.9%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	31.3%
	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	

Q37: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: My supervisor supports my need to balance work and other life issues	Strongly agree	53.8%	57.1%	54.2%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	50.0%	52.1%
	Somewhat agree	26.2%	31.4%	27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	22.9%
	Neither agree nor disagree	9.0%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	20.8%
	Somewhat disagree	5.5%	8.6%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
	Strongly disagree	4.8%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	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	

Q38: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: My supervisor provides me with opportunities to demonstrate my leadership skills	Strongly agree	44.1%	40.0%	52.1%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	41.7%
	Somewhat agree	32.4%	40.0%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	31.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	9.7%	14.3%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
	Somewhat disagree	4.8%	5.7%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
	Strongly disagree	7.6%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	4.2%
	Average	4.0	4.1	4.1		5.0	3.8	3.7	2.5	4.0
Median	4.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	2.5	4.0	

Q39: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: My supervisor provides me with opportunities to demonstrate my leadership skills	Strongly agree	44.8%	42.9%	47.9%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	47.9%
	Somewhat agree	30.3%	34.3%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%
	Neither agree nor disagree	11.0%	14.3%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	16.7%
	Somewhat disagree	4.1%	5.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%

Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice

	Total	Cisgender (non-trans) A	Transgender (non-trans) B	Transgender Man C	Transgender Woman D	Agender E	Gender non-conforming F	Genderqueer G	Please specify another term you prefer here: H	
Strongly disagree	8.3%		2.9%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	6.3%
Average	4.0		4.1	4.1		5.0	3.6	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	52.4%	57.1%	47.9%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	25.0%	54.2%
Somewhat agree	21.4%	28.6%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	17.9%	11.4%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	27.1%
Somewhat disagree	2.8%	2.9%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Strongly disagree	4.8%	0.0%	6.3%	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
Median	5.0	5.0	4.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	5.0

Strongly agree	42.1%	40.0%	45.8%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	45.8%
Somewhat agree	37.2%	48.6%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	33.3%	25.0%	33.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	9.0%	8.6%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
Somewhat disagree	3.4%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
Strongly disagree	6.9%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	4.2%
Average	4.1	4.3	4.1		5.0	3.6	3.3	2.3	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%
Neither agree nor disagree	12.4%	14.3%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
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
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%
Somewhat disagree	2.8%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
Strongly disagree	5.5%	2.9%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	2.1%
Average	4.3	4.4	4.2		5.0	4.2	3.7	3.3	4.3
Median	5.0	5.0	5.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	3.5	5.0

Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice

	Total	Cisgender (non-trans) W		Cisgender (non-trans) M		Transgender Man	Transgender Woman	Agender	Gender non-conforming		Genderqueer	Please specify another term you prefer here:
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H			
Q44: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: My supervisor treats me with respect	Strongly agree	71.0%	71.4%	75.0%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	66.7%	75.0%	66.7%	25.0%	66.7%
	Somewhat agree	19.3%	25.7%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
	Neither agree nor disagree	2.8%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
	Somewhat disagree	2.1%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	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%	0.0%	
	Average	4.5	4.6	4.5		5.0	4.8	3.7	4.0	4.6		
Median	5.0	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0			

Q45: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: In the last six months, my supervisor has talked with me about my performance.	Strongly agree	40.0%	37.1%	45.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	41.7%
	Somewhat agree	33.1%	31.4%	31.3%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	0.0%	75.0%	33.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	15.2%	20.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
	Somewhat disagree	4.1%	5.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	2.1%
	Strongly disagree	6.9%	5.7%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	0.0%	8.3%
	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	

Q46: Overall, how good a job do you feel your immediate supervisor is doing?	Exceptional	43.4%	34.3%	45.8%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	47.9%
	Above Standard	30.3%	37.1%	31.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	29.2%
	Meets Standard	17.2%	22.9%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%
	Needs Improvement	5.5%	2.9%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
	Unsatisfactory	2.8%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	0.0%

Q47: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: In my organization, senior leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.	Strongly Agree	15.2%	11.4%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	14.6%
	Somewhat agree	28.3%	25.7%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	33.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	16.6%	25.7%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	12.5%
	Somewhat disagree	20.0%	22.9%	22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	18.8%
	Strongly disagree	19.3%	14.3%	22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	20.8%
	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	

Q48: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: My organization's senior leaders maintain high standards of honesty and integrity	Strongly agree	33.8%	28.6%	35.4%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	27.1%
	Somewhat agree	26.2%	34.3%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	22.9%
	Neither agree nor disagree	15.2%	17.1%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.9%
	Somewhat disagree	13.1%	17.1%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
	Strongly disagree	11.0%	2.9%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	14.6%
	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	55.9%	37.1%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	50.0%	60.4%
----------------	-------	-------	-------	------	--------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice

	Total	Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice								Please specify another term you prefer here:
		A Cisgender (non-trans) W	B Cisgender (non-trans) M	C Transgender Man	D Transgender Woman	E Agender	F Gender non-conforming	G Genderqueer	H	
Q49: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Supervisors work well with employees of different backgrounds	Somewhat agree	25.5%	40.0%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	22.9%
	Neither agree nor disagree	10.3%	17.1%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
	Somewhat disagree	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
	Strongly disagree	2.8%	2.9%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Average	4.3	4.1	4.4		5.0	3.8	4.7	3.8	4.4
	Median	5.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0

Q50: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Managers communicate the goals and priorities of the organization.	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%
	Strongly disagree	8.3%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	10.4%
	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	

Q51: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives	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%
	Neither agree nor disagree	26.2%	25.7%	27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	27.1%
	Somewhat disagree	11.7%	14.3%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%
	Strongly disagree	9.0%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%
	Average	3.5	3.8	3.5		4.0	3.4	4.3	2.5	3.3
Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	5.0	2.5	3.0	

Q52: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Managers support collaboration across work units to accomplish work objectives	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%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20.0%	25.7%	12.5%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%
	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
Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	

Q53: Overall, how good a job do you feel the manager directly above your immediate supervisor is doing?	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%
	Meets Standard	28.3%	31.4%	27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	29.2%
	Needs Improvement	9.0%	2.9%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%	12.5%
	Unsatisfactory	6.2%	5.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
	Average	2.4	2.3	2.2		1.0	2.2	2.0	3.8	2.6

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) W	Transgender Man	Transgender Woman	Agender	Gender non-conforming	Genderqueer	Please specify another term you prefer here:	
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	

Q54: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: I have a high level of respect for my organization's senior leaders	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%
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
		H								
Median		4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0	5.0	3.5	4.0

Q55: Senior leaders demonstrate support for work/life programs. How satisfied are you with your involvement in decisions that affect your work?	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%
Somewhat dissatisfied		16.6%	20.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	14.6%
Extremely dissatisfied		10.3%	8.6%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%
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

Q56: How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?	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%
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%
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

Q57: How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?	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%
Very dissatisfied		14.5%	11.4%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	18.8%
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

Q58: How satisfied are you with the policies and practices of your organization?	Very satisfied	15.9%	17.1%	10.4%	0.0%	100.0%	16.7%	66.7%	0.0%	16.7%
Somewhat satisfied		29.0%	28.6%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	29.2%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied		20.0%	20.0%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	18.8%
Somewhat dissatisfied		21.4%	31.4%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	18.8%
Very dissatisfied		13.1%	2.9%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	16.7%

Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice

the policies and practices of your senior leaders?	Total	Cisgender (non-trans) W	Cisgender (non-trans) M	Transgender Man	Transgender Woman	Agender	Gender non-conforming	Genderqueer	Please specify another term you prefer here:	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		
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	

Q59: How satisfied are you with your opportunity to obtain a better job in your organization?	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%
	Extremely dissatisfied	15.2%	8.6%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	12.5%
	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

Q60: How satisfied are you with the training you receive for your present job?	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%
	Average	3.4	3.3	3.6		5.0	2.6	4.3	2.8	3.4
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	2.0	4.0	2.5	3.0

Q61: Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job?	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%
	Extremely dissatisfied	6.9%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	6.3%
	Average	3.7	3.7	3.7		5.0	2.8	4.7	2.5	3.8
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	2.0	5.0	2.5	4.0

Q62: Considered everything, how satisfied are you with your pay?	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%
	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
	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%
----------------	-------	-------	-------	------	--------	-------	-------	------	-------

		Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice									
		Total	Cisgender (non-trans) A	Cisgender (non-trans) B	Transgender Man C	Transgender Woman D	Agender E	Gender non-conforming F	Genderqueer G	Please specify another term you prefer here: H	
Median		2.0	1.0	1.0			1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	3.0
Q72: Do you currently live within the San Jose city limits?	Yes	49.0%	54.3%	56.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	75.0%	39.6%	
	No	50.3%	45.7%	43.8%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	25.0%	60.4%	
Q73: How safe do you feel when alone outside in San Jose at night?	Very Safe	6.9%	8.6%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	
	Somewhat safe	15.9%	14.3%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	10.4%	
	Somewhat unsafe	15.2%	14.3%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	16.7%	
	Very unsafe	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%	
Q74: In your opinion, what are the most serious crime problems in San Jose? (You can select more than one) - Selected Choice	Auto theft	17.9%	17.1%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	16.7%	
	Property crime not including auto theft (burglary, theft, shoplifting, etc)	31.7%	28.6%	39.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	27.1%	
	Violent crime (assault, robbery, domestic violence, sexual assault, homicide)	31.0%	31.4%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	25.0%	
	Drug crime (dealing, use of drugs on the street, in parks, schools, etc)	23.4%	25.7%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	20.8%	
	Social disorder (public drinking, loitering, panhandling, graffiti, youth curfew)	33.1%	31.4%	39.6%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	27.1%	
	Some other problem	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.6%	
Q74_6_TEXT: Some other problem - Text	Any misdemeanor 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 CAN 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%	
	Everything 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%	
	Homelessness	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	Homelessness!!!!	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
	I'd reword this.	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	Mental Health	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
	Unhoused, mental health needs support, a solution	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	Violence and guns	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
	charging for the broken window theory	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
	identity theft	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	
	juvenile crime that isnt deemed serious.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	prostitution	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
Q75: In your opinion, how big a problem is gang activity in your neighborhood?	Major problem	8.3%	8.6%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	25.0%	4.2%	
	Minor problem	22.1%	11.4%	31.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	22.9%	
	Not a 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%	
Q76: In your opinion, in the last two years would you say the overall level of crime in your neighborhood has...	Increased	33.1%	28.6%	41.7%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	75.0%	27.1%	
	Decreased	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	Stayed about the same?	15.2%	25.7%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	12.5%	
Q77: This next set of questions is about your experiences with City of San Jose residents as an employee of the Police Department. Please indicate how familiar you believe residents are with the City of San Jose Police Department:	Not familiar at all	10.3%	14.3%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	
	Slightly familiar	33.8%	42.9%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	75.0%	29.2%	
	Moderately familiar	33.8%	34.3%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	25.0%	31.3%	
	Very familiar	15.2%	5.7%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	22.9%	
	Extremely familiar	6.2%	2.9%	4.2%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	8.3%	
	Average	3.3	3.6	3.3		1.0	3.4	2.3	3.8	3.1	

Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice

	Total	Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice								Please specify another term you prefer here:
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
Often, women are more comfortable opening up to a female law enforcement officer than a male officer.	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	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 outcome of my case.	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	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%	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%	0.0%	2.1%
absolutely	0.0%	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%	0.0%
n/a	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	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%	0.0%	2.1%
no	12.4%	8.6%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	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%	0.0%
no idea	0.7%	0.0%	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%	0.0%	2.1%
positive	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
unsure	0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	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%	0.0%

City of San Jose Police Department leadership that you believe share your gender	Yes	87.6%	88.6%	97.9%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	50.0%	81.3%
No	10.3%	8.6%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	16.7%	

City of San Jose Police Department leadership that you believe share your racial	Yes	89.7%	80.0%	95.8%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	91.7%
No	8.3%	17.1%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	

City of San Jose residents that you believe share your ethnic	Yes	77.2%	82.9%	89.6%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	33.3%	75.0%	64.6%
No	5.5%	5.7%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	

City of San Jose Police Department leadership that you believe share your gender	Yes	90.3%	94.3%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	50.0%	83.3%
No	7.6%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	14.6%	

questions, please refer only to your thoughts and experiences within the City of San Jose Police Department, NOT experiences or impressions from any other local, county, state, or other law enforcement agency. For each of the following statements, please select if you: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree You have confidence that the City of San Jose Police	Strongly Agree	48.3%	45.7%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	25.0%	47.9%
	Somewhat agree	33.1%	40.0%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	33.3%
	Neither agree nor disagree	8.3%	8.6%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%
	Somewhat disagree	7.6%	2.9%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
	Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Average	4.2	4.3	4.1		5.0	4.2	4.7	4.0	4.2
Median	4.0	4.0	4.5		5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	

Q93: You trust the leaders of the City of San Jose Police Department to make decisions that are in the public's best interest.	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%
	Somewhat disagree	12.4%	11.4%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
	Strongly disagree	5.5%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
	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	

Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice									
Total	Cisgender (non-trans) A	Cisgender (non-trans) B	Transgender Man C	Transgender Woman D	Agender E	Gender non-conforming F	Genderqueer G	Please specify another term you prefer here: H A	

Median	5.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0
--------	-----	-----	-----	--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Q99: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Overall, the police are effective in dealing with the problems that concern residents.	Strongly agree	34.5%	31.4%	27.1%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	43.8%
	Somewhat agree	37.9%	37.1%	43.8%	0.0%	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%	0.0%	50.0%	14.6%
	Somewhat disagree	10.3%	17.1%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
	Strongly disagree	4.1%	2.9%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
	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	

Q100: To what extent do you agree with the following statement based on your experiences: Overall, the police are doing a good job dealing with residents in a fair and courteous manner.	Strongly agree	54.5%	28.6%	56.3%	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%	0.0%	27.1%
	Neither agree nor disagree	5.5%	8.6%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	4.2%
	Somewhat disagree	6.2%	14.3%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	2.1%
	Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Average	4.3	3.9	4.3		5.0	5.0	5.0	3.3	4.6
Median	5.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	

Q101: To what extent do you agree with the following statement based on your personal experiences: Overall, the police do a good job of honoring the gender identities of residents they interact with.	Strongly agree	59.3%	34.3%	68.8%	0.0%	100.0%	83.3%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%
	Somewhat agree	24.1%	42.9%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	20.8%
	Neither agree nor disagree	9.7%	8.6%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	12.5%
	Somewhat disagree	5.5%	11.4%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
	Strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Average	4.4	4.0	4.5		5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.5
Median	5.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	

Q102: To what extent do you agree with the following statement based on your personal experiences: The police are doing a good job working together with residents to solve local problems	Strongly agree	35.9%	34.3%	31.3%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	43.8%
	Somewhat agree	40.7%	42.9%	41.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	75.0%	37.5%
	Neither agree nor disagree	12.4%	11.4%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
	Somewhat disagree	6.9%	8.6%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	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	3.9		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	

Q103: To what extent do you agree with the following	Strongly agree	9.7%	8.6%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	25.0%	10.4%
	Somewhat agree	15.2%	34.3%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	4.2%
	Neither agree nor disagree	22.8%	14.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	39.6%

		Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice									
		Total	Cisgender (non-trans) W	Cisgender (non-trans) M	Transgender Man	Transgender Woman	Agender	Gender non-conforming	Genderqueer	Please specify another term you prefer here:	
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		
Q111: In your opinion, City of San Jose police officers treat all residents equally regardless of:	Somewhat disagree	4.1%	5.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	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%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	14.6%	
	Neither agree nor disagree	6.2%	11.4%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	6.3%	
	Somewhat disagree	5.5%	14.3%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	2.1%	
	Strongly disagree	2.8%	2.9%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	
	Strongly agree	69.7%	42.9%	79.2%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	25.0%	79.2%	
	Somewhat agree	16.6%	34.3%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	12.5%	
	Neither agree nor disagree	8.3%	14.3%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	6.3%	
	Somewhat disagree	3.4%	5.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
	Strongly disagree	2.1%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	
	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%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	20.8%	
	Neither agree nor disagree	6.2%	11.4%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	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%	
	Average (Gender Identity)	4.4	4.0	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	
	Average (National Origin)	4.5	4.1	4.6		5.0	5.0	4.7	3.0	4.7	
Average (Socioeconomic status)	4.2	3.7	4.3		5.0	4.8	4.7	3.0	4.6		
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		
Q112: To what extent do you agree with the following statement based on your personal experiences: City of San Jose police officers are likely to treat male-identifying people, female-identifying and gender non-conforming people equally.	Strongly agree	60.7%	31.4%	70.8%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	25.0%	68.8%	
	Somewhat agree	17.2%	17.1%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	18.8%	
	Neither agree nor disagree	12.4%	31.4%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%	
	Somewhat disagree	5.5%	11.4%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	
	Strongly disagree	3.4%	5.7%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	2.1%	
	Average	4.3	3.6	4.5		5.0	5.0	4.7	2.5	4.5	
Median	5.0	3.5	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	5.0		
Q113: To what extent do you agree with the following statement based on your personal experiences: City of San Jose police officers are more likely to treat female-identifying people better than male-identifying people and gender	Strongly agree	5.5%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	4.2%	
	Somewhat agree	9.7%	14.3%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	8.3%	
	Neither agree nor disagree	22.8%	42.9%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	22.9%	
	Somewhat disagree	12.4%	11.4%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	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%	
	Average	2.1	2.4	2.0		1.0	1.7	3.3	2.0	1.9	

New Crosstab

		Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice								
		Total	Cisgender (non-trans) A	Cisgender (non-trans) B	Transgender Man C	Transgender Woman D	Agender E	Gender non-conforming F	Genderqueer G	Please specify another term you prefer here: H
non-conforming people	Median	2.0	3.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	4.0	2.0	1.0
have you been approached by a resident seeking help for a gender-related crime or a crime	Yes	10.3%	11.4%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	25.0%	8.3%
	No	89.0%	85.7%	89.6%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	75.0%	91.7%
SJPD, have you ever responded to a crime involving gender	Yes	44.1%	28.6%	52.1%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	41.7%
	No	52.4%	68.6%	45.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	54.2%
have you ever been contacted about neighborhood concerns or	Yes	81.4%	65.7%	95.8%	0.0%	100.0%	83.3%	100.0%	75.0%	77.1%
	No	16.6%	31.4%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	18.8%
neighborhood watch or other anti-crime programs WITH City	Yes	52.4%	37.1%	58.3%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	66.7%	50.0%	54.2%
	No	46.2%	60.0%	41.7%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	43.8%
Q118: Of your contact with the City of San Jose residents, which of the following describes your most serious contact in the last 12 months? - Selected Choice	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%
	Responded 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%
	Responded to a reported suspicious person or noises	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Were contacted about neighborhood concerns	10.3%	11.4%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
	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%
Q119: Regarding THAT contact with resident(s), were they a victim of a crime?	Yes	63.4%	45.7%	70.8%	0.0%	100.0%	83.3%	66.7%	50.0%	66.7%
	No	28.3%	37.1%	27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	22.9%
Q120: Please read another series of statements and express your opinion on how much you agree or disagree with each statement based on your personal experiences. Based on your experience, you believe the City of San Jose police officer/s treat residents professionally and respectfully.	Strongly Agree	60.0%	31.4%	64.6%	0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	25.0%	75.0%
	Somewhat agree	28.3%	42.9%	31.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	16.7%
	Neither agree nor disagree	6.9%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	4.2%
	Somewhat disagree	3.4%	2.9%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	2.1%
	Strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Average	4.5	4.1	4.6		5.0	4.7	5.0	3.5	4.7
			A			A			A	
Median	5.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	3.5	5.0	
Q121: Based on your personal experience, the City of San Jose police clearly explains the reason a resident is stopped.	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%
	Somewhat disagree	2.1%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
	Strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Average	4.4	4.1	4.4		5.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	4.6
			G			G			A, G	
Median	5.0	4.0	5.0		5.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	5.0	

Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice

	Total	Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice								Please specify another term you prefer here:
		A Cisgender (non-trans)	B Cisgender (non-trans) W	C Cisgender (non-trans) r	D Transgender Man	E Transgender Woman	F Agender	G Gender non-conforming	H Genderqueer	
police bias	0.7%	0.0%	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%	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%	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%	0.0%
yes	4.1%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
yes regular annual or bi-annual - seems adequate - kind of common	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
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%	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%	0.0%	2.1%

Q129: Overall, how satisfied are you with how the department handles complaints. Are you:	Very Satisfied	34.5%	22.9%	39.6%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	25.0%	33.3%
	Somewhat Satisfied	27.6%	25.7%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	27.1%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	26.2%	34.3%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	25.0%	27.1%
	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%

Q130: Have you ever witnessed an instance of gender bias displayed by a colleague towards another colleague within SJPD?	Yes	10.3%	20.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	4.2%
	No	82.1%	68.6%	87.5%	0.0%	100.0%	83.3%	66.7%	25.0%	91.7%
	Maybe	4.1%	5.7%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Prefer not to say	2.1%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	2.1%

Q132: Have you ever witnessed an instance gender bias displayed by a colleague towards a resident of San Jose?	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%
	Maybe	3.4%	5.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Prefer not to say	1.4%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Q134: Reflecting honestly on your general interactions with San Jose residents, do you respond differently to residents based on their gender identity?	Yes	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	91.7%	82.9%	95.8%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	93.8%
	Sometimes	2.8%	2.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
	I'm not sure	3.4%	11.4%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Q135: In answering the following questions, please refer only to your thoughts about policing IN GENERAL across the United States. You have confidence the police can do their job well.	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%
	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%
	Strongly disagree	2.1%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
	Average	4.1	3.7	4.1		5.0	4.7	4.7	3.3	4.4
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.5

Q136: You trust the leaders of police departments to make decisions that are in the public's best interest.	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%
	Somewhat disagree	13.8%	11.4%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	10.4%
	Strongly disagree	6.2%	5.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
	Average	3.7	3.6	3.8		4.0	3.0	4.7	3.3	3.8

		Q142: When describing your gender, please select the term(s) with which you most identify - Selected Choice									
Total		Cisgender (non-trans)	W Cisgender (non-trans)	Transgender Man	Transgender Woman	Agender	Gender non-conforming	Genderqueer	Please specify another term you prefer here:		
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		
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%	
Idk, a large group of us are looking at departments like Palo Alto that		0.7%	0.0%	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 b		0.7%	0.0%	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%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	
May 2023		0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
Maybe		0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Maybe, if opportunity presents itself		0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	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%	
NO		1.4%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
No		14.5%	5.7%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	14.6%	
No, City vaccine policy may change that		0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
No. When i retire		0.7%	2.9%	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%	0.0%	2.1%	
November 2022		0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	
Possibly, not sure when another higher paying opportunity may arise		0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Retire		0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Retirement.		0.7%	0.0%	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%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	
Undecided		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Within 1 -2 years		0.7%	0.0%	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%	
Yes		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
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%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Yes, retirement in 23 months		0.7%	0.0%	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%	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%	0.0%	
Yes. Within 3 years		0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Yes. End of July hopefully.		0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Yes. In a few months.		0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Yes...if I become bored or find my job meaningless. If I get a signfica		0.7%	2.9%	0.0%	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%	
in the next couple of years		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
just retirement		0.7%	0.0%	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%	0.0%	2.1%	
maybe , within the next year		0.7%	0.0%	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%	

Q153: Do you have any plans to leave the department? If so, when?

