



## **2018 ADVANCE Faculty Climate Survey Report**

Prepared by the leaders of the UD ADVANCE Program  
Dr. Pam Cook, PI, Unidel Professor of Mathematical Sciences & Associate Dean of Engineering  
Dr. Robin Andreasen, Co-PI, Associate Professor of Linguistics & Cognitive Science  
Dr. Heather Doty, Co-PI, Assistant Professor of Mechanical Engineering  
Dr. John Sawyer, Co-PI, Professor of Business Administration  
Dr. Shawna Vican, Director, UD ADVANCE Institute  
Dr. Yvette Jackson, UD ADVANCE Senior Researcher  
Dr. Ursula Anderson, Senior Research Analyst, IRE and UD ADVANCE

### **Introduction**

The UD ADVANCE Institute, funded by the NSF Grant No. HRD-1409472, operates with the broad goal of promoting faculty diversity. We seek to increase the representation, retention, and advancement of faculty in under-represented groups. In order to continue and sustain institutional change, our work aims to improve the climate for all faculty. For additional information about the UD ADVANCE Institute and our work on campus, please see [www.udel.edu/advance](http://www.udel.edu/advance).

UD ADVANCE conducts a faculty climate survey every two years. The survey is designed to provide much needed data on the climate for faculty at UD, inform UD ADVANCE programmatic activities, inform institutional change efforts by other faculty and administrative groups, and help us identify additional areas on which to focus. The survey results will also be used as part of our research agenda.

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of major themes and results from the 2018 Faculty Climate Survey. For the first time, we are able to provide results of longitudinal analysis for select questions, comparing results from 2016 and 2018. When interpreting these results, it is important to keep in mind that there has been substantial change in UD's upper administration in the period between the two surveys. When the 2016 survey was administered, Dr. Assanis had just been named president but had not yet taken office. When the 2018 survey was administered, the provost had recently resigned and the search for a new provost was underway. The change in administration and the resulting institutional uncertainty may have affected faculty perceptions on a number of survey questions.

Please direct questions to Shawn Vican, Director, UD ADVANCE Institute  
Institute: [svican@udel.edu](mailto:svican@udel.edu).

## **Section 1. Background and Methodology**

The 2018 faculty climate survey was administered from January 29 to March 31, 2018. The survey was sent to all full-time tenured or tenure-track (T/TT) faculty, continuing track (CT) faculty, department chairs, and center directors (N=1187). 433 respondents completed the survey, yielding 36.5% response rate. This response rate is slightly lower than the 2016 response rate of 37.5%, but the overall sample size is larger because in 2016 chairs and center directors did not receive the survey.

Results for T/TT faculty are found in Sections 2 through 6 of the report and results for CT faculty are found in Section 7. Much of the survey instrument mirrors the 2016 survey; results of longitudinal analysis are presented for questions with significant differences in overall means from 2016 to 2018. Full details on the survey methodology and a description of respondent characteristics can be found in Appendix 1. Tables of results can be found in Appendix 2.

## **Section 2. T/TT Faculty Satisfaction with Professional Life**

T/TT faculty were asked a series of questions about various aspects of their professional lives, including their teaching, research, and service loads, support for professional development, current salary, experience of community, and overall experience of being a faculty member at UD (see Table 2.1). Satisfaction was measured on a 7-point scale, from (1) very dissatisfied to (7) very satisfied. Overall results indicate moderate to above average satisfaction, with most mean responses being at or somewhat above a neutral value of four. When comparing survey responses from 2016 to 2018, faculty satisfaction with experience of community at UD has improved since 2016 ( $M=4.03$  vs.  $4.41$ ;  $p<.05$ ).

Gender effects were observed with respect to current salary and service load, with women expressing lower levels of satisfaction on average than men ( $p<.05$ ). Rank effects were observed in responses to nearly all questions. The overall pattern indicates that assistant professors tend to be more satisfied and associate professors tend to be less satisfied than faculty in one or both of the other ranks (see Table 2.1). A similar pattern is observed with respect to career advancement. The overall mean is above the midpoint ( $M=4.47$ ) but when disaggregated by rank, associate professors are significantly less satisfied ( $M=3.74$ ) than assistant or full professors (see Table 2.2).

These results may indicate that efforts to support assistant professors have been reasonably successful, but that more support is needed for associate professors. UD ADVANCE efforts to support associate professors include mini-grants for leadership training, P&T workshops for advancement to full professor, networking lunches, and leadership training events. UD ADVANCE will also continue to advocate for formalizing the importance of mentoring for associate professors and will support this effort with resources and training.

When asked about turnover intentions, approximately a third of faculty reported that they are likely or very likely to search for a new job within the next three years. Roughly one fifth indicated that they are likely or very likely to leave UD for a new job within the next three years (see Table 2.3). Comparing 2016 and 2018 results, we find no statistically significant differences in faculty intentions to leave the university, but do find differences in the reasons faculty consider leaving. In 2018 faculty are more likely to cite salary increases as an important factor ( $M=2.73$  vs.  $2.95$ ;  $p<.05$ ), but are less likely to cite finding a more supportive work environment ( $M=3.29$  vs.  $2.95$ ;  $p<.05$ ), or retirement ( $M=1.95$  vs.  $1.64$ ;  $p<.001$ ) as important factors.

### **Section 3. Promotion and Tenure Process for T/TT Faculty**

To examine faculty perceptions about the promotion and tenure process, T/TT faculty were asked a number of questions such as whether the standards are reasonable, flexible in terms of the weight given to teaching, research, and service, whether they have changed over time, and whether the process is free from bias. These items were measured on a 7-point scale from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree.

Results for these questions suggest that T/TT faculty have some apprehensions about the promotion and tenure process. Nearly 40% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement that the P&T process is free from bias and only about 15% agreed or strongly agreed with this statement (see Table 3.1). More than half of the faculty agreed or strongly agreed that the standards have changed over the last five years and faculty are divided on whether the system is flexible in terms of the weight given to teaching, research and service. Gender effects were observed in perceptions of whether the standards have changed, with women showing a higher mean response than men. Rank effects were observed with respect to whether the standards are reasonable and whether the system is flexible. The mean response from associate professors was below that of full professors in the former case and below that of assistant professors in the latter case. There was a decline in faculty perceptions of whether P&T standards are reasonable between 2016 and 2018 ( $M=5.26$  vs  $4.77$ ;  $p<.001$ ).

Faculty perceptions of fairness in how various groups apply P&T standards, however, were more positive (Table 3.2). A majority of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that chairs as well as departmental, college, and university P&T committees apply existing standards fairly. A little below 50% agreed or strongly agreed that the deans apply standards fairly and roughly 40% agreed or strongly agreed that the provost is fair in the application of P&T standards. When rank effects were observed, associate professor perceptions of fairness were lower than either assistant or full professors. Fairness in application of P&T standards showed an increase in perceptions of fairness of college P&T (from  $5.11$  to  $5.20$ ,  $p<.05$ ) and of the provost ( $4.09$  vs  $4.65$   $p<.001$ ) from 2016-2018.

When it comes to the resources used for understanding the P&T process, results suggest that most faculty rely on departmental colleagues, documents and the faculty handbook (see Table 3.3). Faculty also rely on chairs and P&T workshops for understanding the process, but not as often as they utilize the previously mentioned resources. Faculty were generally positive about the helpfulness of such resources. Comparing 2016 and 2018 survey results, there is a statistically significant increase in perceptions of the helpfulness of UD ADVANCE P&T workshops for understanding the P&T process ( $M=3.18$  vs.  $3.49$ ;  $p<.05$ ).

2-year, 4-year, and post-tenure reviews – and to a lesser extent, annual appraisals – can be also used to help faculty think about advancement through the ranks and into leaderships positions. The results for these questions are more difficult to interpret due to lower response rates relative to response rates to other questions in the survey. The general take-away is that annual appraisals and post-tenure reviews are perceived as less helpful than 2-year or 4-year reviews.

Many of the UD ADVANCE efforts to support faculty satisfaction are also designed to help faculty advance through the ranks. These include networking and leadership events, P&T workshops, and support for mentoring for both assistant and associate professors. UD ADVANCE has also participated in and continues to advocate for changes in the peer-review process to better align it with its mentoring function and with the P&T process.

#### **Section 4: Mentoring for T/TT Faculty**

Faculty were asked about the types of mentoring they receive both internal and external to UD (see Table 4.1). Overall, faculty report informal mentoring is more common than formal mentoring within their department. 20% of T/TT faculty receive formal mentoring within their departments, compared to 59% who receive informal mentoring within the department. Rates of mentoring are higher for T/TT assistant professors: 58% receive formal mentoring within their departments compared to 80% who receive informal mentoring. These findings are consistent with survey results from 2016. There are also differences in mentoring by gender: more women than men receive informal mentoring outside their department but within UD (47% vs. 24%) as well as outside UD (62% vs. 45%).

Faculty report generally high levels of satisfaction with mentor effectiveness (see Table 4.2). Roughly equal percentages of faculty (~60%) rate mentoring as above average or excellent both for formal mentoring and informal mentoring within the department. There are even higher levels of satisfaction for informal mentoring outside the department. The percentage of T/TT faculty who rate informal mentoring as above average or excellent are 69% for outside the department but within UD and 81% for outside UD.

UD ADVANCE advocates for formal mentoring within departments to supplement and complement informal mentoring that occurs inside and outside departments (for example,

through UD's Faculty Accountability Program). UD ADVANCE provides training and resources on formal mentoring for department chairs, faculty mentors, and faculty mentees.

### **Section 5: Work-Life Satisfaction for T/TT Faculty**

Faculty were asked about their dual-career experiences (see Table 5.1). Of those respondents who have spouses working in academia, many have spouses who work at UD (64% overall; 57% of men and 73% of women). Partner employment is more important in the decision to accept the job at UD for assistant professors than for associate or full professors (see Table 5.2). This suggests that dual-career accommodations may be an important aspect of faculty recruitment. Overall attitudes and experiences with dual career did not change significantly from 2016 to 2018.

Similar to 2016, faculty expressed low levels of satisfaction with communication of parental and family leave policies (see Table 5.3). Faculty find written policies (in faculty handbook, CBA, etc.) most clear: 50% of T/TT faculty find written policies moderately or extremely clear. Less clarity comes from the chairs: a third of T/TT faculty find policies moderately or extremely clear when communicated by the chair. There are gender effects in whether faculty are encouraged to take family leave, with women reporting higher levels of encouragement than men (see Table 5.4). While about half of women are moderately or extremely encouraged to take leave by their chair, less than 10% of men are so encouraged.

Faculty report relatively low levels of satisfaction with how clearly the stop the tenure clock policy is communicated (see Table 5.6). Only 36% of T/TT faculty think this policy is moderately or extremely well communicated by the department chair. More women than men are moderately or extremely encouraged by their chairs to take the extra year (57% vs. 15%,  $p < .05$ ). Overall, just over a third of faculty members who were eligible to stop the tenure clock took advantage of the extra year.

UD ADVANCE works with chairs on communication of family-friendly policies and has also been active in dual career policy development at UD.

### **Section 6: Climate for Diversity for T/TT Faculty**

Faculty were asked a series of questions about the climate for diversity within their department, as measured on a 7-point scale, from (1) very poor to (7) excellent. Faculty perceive the climate for diversity to be average to slightly above average (see Table 6.1). Comparing these results to the 2016 survey, there was a significant decline in perceptions of the departmental climate for women ( $M = 4.55$  vs.  $4.89$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and faculty of color ( $M = 4.05$  vs.  $4.38$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Perceptions of climate also differ by gender and race: women perceive the departmental climate as less positive than do men, while black faculty perceive the departmental climate as less positive than white faculty (see Table 6.3). When considering faculty perceptions of access to informal networks,

equity in workload and resources, experiences of discrimination and bias, and equity in the promotion process—factors that may shape overall perceptions of the climate for diversity—there are significant differences between men and women (Table 6.2) as well as black and white faculty (Table 6.4).

Faculty were asked about their perceptions of the climate for disability within their department. Faculty with disabilities (about 15% of respondents) perceive a less positive climate than their non-disabled peers (Table 6.5). Comparing overall means, there was a significant decline between 2016 and 2018 in perceptions of the departmental climate for faculty with disabilities ( $M=4.92$  vs.  $4.52$ ,  $p<.01$ ).

In addition to questions about the departmental climate for diversity, faculty were asked about their perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity (see Table 6.6). 22% of faculty agree or strongly agree that leaders at UD hold themselves accountable for progress on diversity, while 29% disagree or strongly disagree. 33% of faculty agree or strongly agree that UD offers adequate training to effectively manage diversity, while 17% disagree or strongly disagree. There are gender and race effects for the diversity training question, with women reporting lower levels of agreement than men ( $M=4.19$  vs.  $4.69$ ,  $p<.05$ ) and black faculty reporting lower levels of agreement than white faculty ( $M=3.11$  vs.  $4.56$ ,  $p<.05$ ). When asked if university-wide diversity goals and priorities are clearly defined, 27% of faculty agree or strongly agree. Fewer faculty agree or strongly agree (16%) that the university has a clear strategy for achieving its diversity goals.

There were several positive changes in perceptions of the UD administration's diversity efforts in 2018 as compared to 2016. The mean response increased for whether respondents feel leaders at UD hold themselves and other accountable for progress on diversity ( $M=3.53$  vs.  $3.90$ ,  $p<.05$ ), UD offers sufficient diversity training ( $M=3.72$  vs.  $4.44$ ,  $p<.001$ ), and university-wide diversity priorities are clearly defined ( $M=3.73$  vs.  $4.23$ ,  $p<.01$ ).

A topic of particular interest to UD ADVANCE is faculty search committees. UD ADVANCE Faculty Fellows offer workshops annually on best practices for faculty search committees. In the 2018 survey respondents were asked a series of questions about their perceptions of faculty search committee attitudes and behaviors surrounding diversity (Table 6.8). 35% of faculty agree or strongly agree that faculty search committees in their department believe that recruiting diverse candidates to UD is difficult. Almost 50% of faculty disagree or strongly disagree that faculty search committees do not take adequate steps to recruit diverse candidates. There are gender effects for a number of the questions. Women more than men agree that search committees are concerned that focusing on diversity is at the expense of excellence ( $M=3.99$  vs.  $3.46$ ,  $p<.05$ ), talk differently about male and female candidates ( $M=3.81$  vs.  $2.57$ ,  $p<.001$ ), and talk about a candidate's personal characteristics ( $M=3.4$  vs.  $2.51$ ,  $p<.01$ ).

## Section 7: CT Faculty

When asked about their satisfaction with various aspects their professional life (see Table 7.1), CT faculty are most satisfied with their overall experience as faculty member (71%) and least satisfied with their salary (44%). Among CT faculty, women report higher levels of satisfaction with the experience of community at UD than do their male peers ( $M=5.57$  vs.  $4.72$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Comparing 2016 and 2018 survey results, CT faculty report significantly higher satisfaction with teaching load ( $M=4.94$  vs.  $5.49$ ,  $p<.05$ ) and career progression ( $M=4.35$  vs.  $5.11$ ,  $p<.01$ ). CT faculty report neutral to slightly positive attitudes about their career advancement (see Table 7.2). CT faculty perceive their departments as somewhat inclusive and collegial (see Table 7.3), with a higher score for inclusiveness ( $5.54$ ) than collegiality ( $4.93$ ).

Compared to 2016, there is increased agreement among CT faculty that promotion standards are reasonable (increased from an average of “neutral” to “somewhat agree”) and the promotion process is free from bias (increased from an average of “somewhat disagree” to “neutral”). 60% of CT faculty perceive that promotion standards have changed over the last five years. About a third of CT faculty agree or strongly agree that the promotion system is flexible in terms of weight given to teaching, research, and service. There are gender effects for perceptions of the flexibility of the promotion system, with men having more positive views ( $M=4.96$  vs.  $4.14$ ,  $p<.05$ ).

At least half of CT faculty agree or strongly agree that promotion standards are applied fairly by department P&T committees, department chairs, college P&T committees, and university P&T committee. 46% agree that their dean applies standards fairly, an improvement compared to 2016 results ( $M=4.33$  vs.  $5.11$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Only about a quarter agree that the provost applies standards fairly. However, the mean response for the provost is neutral to “somewhat agree,” which is a statistically significant increase compared to 2016. When asked about the resources CT faculty use to understand the promotion process, department chair and colleagues are considered “extremely helpful.”

32% of CT faculty receive formal mentoring within their department, compared to 19% in 2016. Informal mentoring within the department remains the most common form of mentoring, while informal mentoring outside UD receives the highest ratings in terms of efficacy.

## APPENDIX 1

### Methodology

The majority of survey questions were 5- or 7-point items measuring faculty attitudes or perceptions of UD policies and climate. For these continuous scale questions, we conducted two-way analysis of variance to compare faculty mean responses by gender and rank. We include gender *and* rank in all models unless otherwise specified. When gender and/or rank showed a statistically significant effect, we ran post-hoc analysis to determine where the significant differences occurred between categories of respondents. Thus, a significant effect for gender can be interpreted as a difference in the mean response of men and women, after controlling for rank. For questions with categorical response variables, such as whether respondents had stopped the tenure clock, we use chi-square tests (or Fisher's exact tests, when applicable) to determine whether there are significant differences in responses by gender and, separately, by race.

For ease of interpretation, tables include both frequencies for a subset of response categories, as well as estimated marginal means (least squares means) for categories of respondents (i.e., categories of rank and gender), making note of significant differences between these groups. Matching symbols denote statistically significant differences.

Several scales were constructed using multiple survey items. We report scale reliability (Cronbach's alpha) and composite scores for these scales. We chose a minimum  $\alpha$  coefficient of 0.8 for scales.

Throughout the report, main analyses are conducted on tenured and tenure-track (T/TT) respondents, including chairs and center directors as applicable. The report includes a separate section with results for continuing track (CT) faculty (see Section 7, "Experiences of CT Faculty"). We report results for CT faculty only for questions pertinent to their job and when their response rate was high enough to allow for meaningful analysis.

Due to low numbers, this report does not disaggregate by race in main models. For results related to race/ethnicity, see Section 6, "Climate for Diversity, Faculty of Color." In this section, we model the effects of race/ethnicity on a number of climate variables. Due to the low sample size for faculty of color, we do not control for gender or rank in these models.

## Sample Characteristics

We note several differences between survey respondents and the UD faculty population.

- *Rank, Tenure Status*: As compared to the UD faculty population, CT faculty are underrepresented. (see Table 1.1).
- *Sex/Gender Identity*: Across T/TT faculty and Chairs/Center Directors, survey respondents skew more female than the overall UD population (see Table 1.2).
- *Race/Ethnicity*: Asian faculty are underrepresented among respondents as compared to the UD faculty population (5.5% vs. 13.4%); black faculty are slightly underrepresented (3.4% vs. 4.7%), Latino(a) faculty are overrepresented (4.0% vs. 2.3%); and white faculty are overrepresented (82.1% vs. 77.6%).
- *LGBTQ*: Among respondents who chose to identify, 85.0% are “straight or heterosexual,” 4.6% are “LGBT,” and 10.4% are “other or unknown.” UD lacks institutional data on sexual orientation, so it is unclear whether this distribution is similar to that of the UD faculty population.
- *Disability*: 6.8% of respondents indicated they have a disability and have requested accommodation, 8.1% have a disability and have not requested accommodation, and 85.1% do not have a disability that qualifies for accommodation. UD lacks institutional data on faculty disability, so it is unclear whether this distribution approximates rates of disability in the UD faculty population.
- *Colleges and Portfolios*: Among those respondents who identified their college or portfolio, respondents approximate the makeup of the UD colleges and portfolios with a few exceptions (see Table 1.3). Respondents in the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS) Social Sciences portfolio are overrepresented (12.9% vs. 7.5%), while faculty in the CAS Miscellaneous portfolio are underrepresented (1.2% vs. 5.6%).

**Table 1.1: Respondents by Rank & Tenure Status**

	Faculty, Chairs & Center Directors		Tenure-Track & Tenured		Continuing Track		Chair & Center Director	
	Respondents	Population <sup>1</sup>	Respondents	Population	Respondents	Population	Respondents	Population
Assistant	25.2%	25.9%	14.4%	15.3%	10.6%	10.3%	0.2%	0.3%
Associate	30.7%	30.5%	26.6%	25.7%	2.6%	3.9%	1.4%	0.9%
Professor	39.8%	35.8%	30.7%	30.9%	1.9%	1.3%	7.2%	3.7%
Instructor	4.3%	7.7%	0.2%	0.3%	4.1%	7.1%	0.0%	0.3%
<b>All Ranks</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>71.9%</b>	<b>72.2%</b>	<b>19.2%</b>	<b>22.5%</b>	<b>8.9%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Source: UD IRE

**Table 1.2: Respondents by Rank, Tenure Status, Sex**

	Faculty, Chairs & Center Directors			Tenure-Track & Tenured			Continuing Track			Chair & Center Director		
	Respondents		Population <sup>1</sup>	Respondents		Population	Respondents		Population	Respondents		Population
	Count	% Female	% Female	Count	% Female	% Female	Count	% Female	% Female	Count	% Female	% Female
Assistant	109	61.5%	56.0%	60	60.0%	53.0%	44	63.6%	62.0%	1	0.0%	50.0%
Associate	130	47.7%	44.0%	111	46.8%	45.0%	11	63.6%	46.0%	6	16.7%	27.3%
Professor	166	33.7%	27.0%	128	28.9%	27.0%	8	62.5%	47.0%	30	46.7%	27.3%
Instructor	22	59.1%	74.0%	1	100.0%	75.0%	17	47.1%	73.0%	1	0.0%	100.0%
<b>All Ranks</b>	<b>427</b>	<b>46.6%</b>	<b>43.7%</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>42.0%</b>	<b>38.9%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>60.0%</b>	<b>61.9%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>39.5%</b>	<b>32.3%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Source: UD IRE

**Table 1.3: Respondents by College & Portfolio**

	Respondents	Population
Agriculture & Natural Resources	8.9%	6.1%
CAS Art	5.4%	4.9%
CAS Humanities	13.1%	12.9%
CAS Natural Sciences	15.7%	16.2%
CAS Social Sciences	12.9%	7.5%
CAS Miscellaneous	1.2%	5.6%
Earth, Ocean, & Environment	7.5%	4.5%
Education & Human Development	7.5%	6.7%
Engineering	10.0%	12.6%
Health Sciences	9.8%	11.2%
Lerner College of Business & Economics	8.2%	11.9%

## APPENDIX 2

**Table 2.1: Satisfaction with Professional Life, T/TT Faculty, 2018**

	Very Dissatisfied/ Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied/ Satisfied	Mean Response		Mean Response		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Professor
Professional Life:							
...Experience as faculty member	19.4%	50.8%	4.79	4.83	4.95	4.51	4.96
...Experience of community at UD	19.6%	35.6%	4.56	4.49	4.98 <sup>a1,a2</sup>	4.27 <sup>a1</sup>	4.31 <sup>a2</sup>
...Career progression	17.3%	45.4%	4.77	4.71	5.18 <sup>c1</sup>	4.01 <sup>c1,c2</sup>	5.03 <sup>c2</sup>
...Support for professional development	31.6%	21.7%	3.79	3.81	4.30 <sup>a</sup>	3.41 <sup>b</sup>	3.68 <sup>a</sup>
...Support for grants	23.9%	30.1%	4.31	4.01	4.65 <sup>a1,a2</sup>	3.82 <sup>a1</sup>	4.02 <sup>a2</sup>
...Current salary	25.7%	32.4%	4.39 <sup>a</sup>	3.87 <sup>a</sup>	4.49 <sup>a</sup>	3.37 <sup>a</sup>	4.17
...Teaching load	7.1%	51.6%	5.18	5.08	5.21	4.85 <sup>a</sup>	5.33 <sup>a</sup>
...Research load	3.9%	55.3%	5.38	5.26	5.55 <sup>a1</sup>	5.01 <sup>a1,a2</sup>	5.40 <sup>a2</sup>
...Service load	15.6%	32.8%	4.62 <sup>a</sup>	4.17 <sup>a</sup>	4.71 <sup>a</sup>	3.87 <sup>a,b</sup>	4.61 <sup>b</sup>
...Adjustments to workload	23.5%	24.5%	4.13	3.82	4.21	3.74	3.98
<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001							

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001

7-point scale from (1) Very Dissatisfied to (7) Very Satisfied

**Table 2.2: Career Advancement Scale, 2018**

	T/TT Faculty	Mean Response		Mean Response		
		Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Professor
Career advancement scale ( $\alpha=.94$ )	4.47	4.57	4.39	4.84 <sup>c1</sup>	3.74 <sup>c1,c2</sup>	4.86 <sup>c2</sup>

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001

7-point scale from (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree

### 2.3. T/TT Faculty Intentions to Leave, 2018

	Very Unlikely/ Unlikely	Likely/ Very Likely	Mean Response		Mean Response		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Professor
How likely are you to search for a new job:							
In the next three years	38.5%	32.2%	2.92	2.99	3.21 <sup>b1</sup>	3.12 <sup>b2</sup>	2.54 <sup>b1,b2</sup>
In the next year	62.6%	18.2%	2.45	2.19	2.49	2.36	2.11
How likely are you to leave UD for a new job:							
In the next three years	42.2%	20.6%	2.70	2.72	2.88 <sup>a1</sup>	2.82 <sup>a2</sup>	2.43 <sup>a1,a2</sup>
In the next year	73.1%	6.4%	2.07 <sup>a</sup>	1.78 <sup>a</sup>	2.06	1.89	1.84
<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001							

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001

5-point scale from (1) Very Unlikely to (5) Very Likely

## 2.4. Reasons T/TT Faculty Consider Leaving UD, 2018

	Never/ Rarely	Very Often/ All The Time	Mean Response		Mean Response		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Professor
More supportive work environment	35.8%	40.6%	2.92	3.08	2.79	3.23	2.98
Increase time for research	47.7%	26.7%	2.48	2.69	2.29 <sup>a</sup>	2.83 <sup>a</sup>	2.63
Increase salary	34.6%	34.3%	2.8	3.05	2.77	3.09	2.9
Retirement	78.3%	5.1%	1.51	1.59	1.20 <sup>c</sup>	1.50 <sup>b</sup>	1.94 <sup>b,c</sup>
Employment of spouse	70.0%	11.8%	2.05	1.94	2.24 <sup>a</sup>	1.99	1.75 <sup>a</sup>
Child or family issues	79.1%	7.1%	1.73	1.64	1.75	1.7	1.6
Improve P&T prospects	72.2%	13.4%	2.06	2.09	2.21 <sup>c1,c2</sup>	2.50 <sup>c1</sup>	1.50 <sup>c2</sup>
Non-academic job	77.5%	5.3%	1.75	1.77	1.74	1.89	1.66

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001

5-point scale from (1) Never to (5) All the Time

**Table 3.1. Standards for Promotion and Tenure, 2018**

	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Agree/ Strongly Agree	Mean Response		Mean Response		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Full
P&T standards are reasonable	10.0%	41.8%	4.62	4.96	4.98	4.47 <sup>a</sup>	4.92 <sup>a</sup>
P&T system is flexible in terms of weight given to teaching, research, service	28.7%	23.2%	3.9	3.98	4.30 <sup>a</sup>	3.55 <sup>a</sup>	3.97
P&T standards have changed over the last 5 years	8.9%	52.6%	5.00 <sup>b</sup>	5.53 <sup>b</sup>	5.12	5.3	5.37
The P&T process is free from bias	37.9%	15.5%	3.53	3.25	3.66	3.06	3.45

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001

7-point scale from (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree.

**Table 3.2: Perceptions of Fairness in Application of P&T Standards, 2018**

	Disagree/ Strongly	Agree/ Strongly	Mean		Mean		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Full
P&T standards have been applied fairly by:							
...department P&T committee	7.7%	60.6%	5.30	5.38	5.36	5.01 <sup>b</sup>	5.65 <sup>b</sup>
...department chair	13.2%	60.6%	5.28	5.08	5.4	4.77 <sup>a</sup>	5.41 <sup>a</sup>
...college P&T committee	8.6%	55.6%	5.22	5.22	5.50 <sup>a</sup>	4.90 <sup>a</sup>	5.27
...dean	17.7%	48.2%	4.79	4.64	4.93	4.6	4.62
...university P&T committee	4.7%	56.7%	5.18	5.31	5.08	5.23	5.41
...provost	12.8%	39.6%	4.69	4.60	4.87	4.37	4.7

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001

7-point scale from (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree.

**Table 3.3: Resources to Understand P&T Process, 2018**

	Used Resource to Understand <b>P&amp;T Process</b>	Not/Slightly Helpful	Extremely/ Moderately Helpful	Mean Response		Mean Response		
				Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Full
Colleagues in your department	83.2%	7.9%	65.7%	3.98	3.93	3.97	3.72 <sup>b</sup>	4.18 <sup>b</sup>
Departmental documents	87.1%	11.0%	66.7%	3.81	3.70	3.59 <sup>b</sup>	3.57 <sup>c</sup>	4.12 <sup>b,c</sup>
Faculty Handbook	86.2%	12.2%	58.2%	3.67	3.58	3.55	3.58	3.74
Department chair	68.4%	8.4%	64.4%	3.93	3.77	3.77	3.69 <sup>a</sup>	4.08 <sup>a</sup>
P&T Workshop	50.5%	19.7%	55.6%	3.40	3.54	3.47	3.52	3.42

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001

5-point scale from (1) Not Helpful to (5) Extremely Helpful

**Table 3.4 Annual Appraisal & Peer Evaluations, 2018**

	Have Completed or Attended	Not/Slightly Helpful	Extremely/ Moderately Helpful
Annual Appraisals	96.20%	41.70%	36.20%
2-Year Peer	71.9%	25.1%	53.5%
4-Year Peer	58.6%	27.2%	53.9%
Post-Tenure Review	53.5%	47.1%	37.1%

5-point scale from (1) Not Helpful to (5) Extremely Helpful

### 3.5. Perceived Support in Advancement to Associate Professor w/ Tenure 2018

	Not At All/ Slightly Supported	Extremely/ Moderately Supported	Mean Response		Mean Response		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Full
Department Chair	11.2%	76.4%	4.19	4.19	4.36	4.17	4.05
Colleagues in Department	12.1%	77.4%	4.22	4.06	4.27	4.17	3.99

5-point scale from (1) Not at all Supported to (5) Extremely Supported

### 3.6. Perceived Support in Advancement to Full Professor, 2018

	Not At All Supported	Extremely Supported	Mean Response		Mean Response	
			Men	Women	Associate	Full
Department Chair	27.4%	59.7%	3.27	3.36	2.69 <sup>c</sup>	3.94 <sup>c</sup>
Colleagues in Department	23.0%	60.7%	3.46	3.41	2.85 <sup>c</sup>	4.03 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> P<.01 <sup>c</sup> P<.001

5-point scale from (1) Not at all Supported to (5) Extremely Supported

**Table 4.1: Percentage of Faculty who Receive Mentoring, by mentoring type**

	T/TT Faculty	Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Professor
<b>Formal Mentoring:</b>						
within your department	20.2%	18.5%	22.2%	58.2% <sup>a</sup>	15.5% <sup>a</sup>	8.2%
<b>Informal Mentoring:</b>						
within your department	59.2%	57.3%	61.5%	80.0% <sup>a</sup>	61.8% <sup>a</sup>	48.9%
outside department but within UD	34.7%	24.2%	47.0% <sup>a</sup>	54.5% <sup>a</sup>	33.3% <sup>a</sup>	27.6%
outside of UD	52.4%	44.6%	61.7% <sup>a</sup>	78.2% <sup>a</sup>	44.0% <sup>a</sup>	48.1%

<sup>a</sup> p<.05

**Table 4.2: Effectiveness of Mentors**

	Very Poor/ Below Avg.	Above Avg./ Excellent	Mean Response		Mean Response		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Professor
<b>Formal mentoring:</b>							
within your department	21.0%	61.3%	3.486	3.833	3.782	3.063 <sup>a</sup>	4.179 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Informal mentoring:</b>							
within your department	8.9%	59.5%	3.662	3.907	4.065 <sup>c</sup>	3.431 <sup>c,a</sup>	3.857 <sup>a</sup>
outside dept but within UD	4.1%	69.1%	3.714	4.037	3.952	3.586 <sup>a</sup>	4.088 <sup>a</sup>
outside of UD	2.1%	80.7%	4.003	4.175	4.140	3.912 <sup>a</sup>	4.216 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> p<.05   <sup>b</sup> P<.01   <sup>c</sup> P<.001

5-point scale from (1) Very Poor to (5) Excellent

**Table 5.1a: Spouse/Partner Employment**

	T/TT Faculty	Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Professor
<b>Spouse/Partner is employed:</b>						
Full-Time	59.5%	53.0%	69.4%	71.7%	68.8%	47.7%
Part-Time	11.1%	12.5%	9.0%	11.3%	9.4%	12.3%
Spouse/Partner works in academia	32.9%	30.7%	36.0%	41.5%	33.7%	28.6%
Spouse/Partner works at UD	64.1%	56.9%	73.2%	72.7%	58.8%	63.9%

**Table 5.1b: Partner Position in Academia**

Partner's position in academia:	T/TT Faculty	Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Professor
Tenure-track or tenured	46.2%	40.0%	53.7%	40.9%	60.6%	36.1%
Non-tenure track,	18.7%	28.0%	7.3%	22.7%	6.1%	27.8%
Post-doc	2.2%	2.0%	2.4%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Administrator/Staff/Other	32.9%	30.0%	36.5%	27.3%	33.3%	36.2%

**Table 5.2: Spouse/Partner Employment & UD**

	Not At All/Slightly	Moderately /Extremely	Mean Response		Mean Response		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Full
Was spouse/partner's employment important in your decision to accept a job at UD?	40.1%	45.5%	3.23	3.19	3.62 <sup>a1, a2</sup>	2.91 <sup>a1</sup>	3.04 <sup>a2</sup>

<sup>a</sup> p < 0.5   <sup>b</sup> P < 0.1   <sup>c</sup> P < .001

5-point scale from (1) Not At All to (5) Extremely

**Table 5.3: Communication of Family Leave Policy, T/TT Faculty**

	Not/Slightly Clearly	Moderately /Extremely Clearly	Mean Response		Mean Response		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Full
How clearly is parental/family leave policy communicated?							
... in writing (faculty handbook, CBA, etc.)	27.1%	49.8%	3.18	3.22	3.14	3.09	3.39
... by department chair	46.8%	33.0%	2.70	2.64	2.92 <sup>a1</sup>	2.33 <sup>a1, a2</sup>	2.76 <sup>a2</sup>
... by other faculty in your department	52.1%	25.7%	2.60	2.48	2.93 <sup>a1</sup>	2.14 <sup>a1, a2</sup>	2.56 <sup>a2</sup>
... by other sources within UD	49.7%	30.7%	2.47	2.77	2.86	2.39	2.6

<sup>a</sup> p < 0.5   <sup>b</sup> P < 0.1   <sup>c</sup> P < .001

**Table 5.4: Encouragement to take Family Leave, T/TT Faculty**

	Not At All		Moderately/Extremely		Mean Response		Mean Response		
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Full
How encouraged to take parental or family leave?									
... by dept chair	87.7%	41.7%	8.8%	52.1%	1.45 <sup>a</sup>	3.18 <sup>a</sup>	2.60	2.19	2.15
... by faculty colleagues	73.2%	33.3%	16.1%	50.0%	2.20 <sup>a</sup>	3.43 <sup>a</sup>	3.55 <sup>a1, a2</sup>	2.53 <sup>a1</sup>	2.37 <sup>a2</sup>

<sup>a</sup> p < 0.5   <sup>b</sup> P < 0.1   <sup>c</sup> P < .001

5-point scale from (1) Not At All to (5) Extremely

**Table 5.5: Satisfaction with Parental Leave Policies**

	Extremely Dissatisfied/Dissatisfied		Extremely Satisfied/Satisfied		Mean Response		Mean Response		
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Full
For those faculty with children:									
How satisfied with elder/sick care policies	10.10%	22.4%	18.2%	11.8%	4.11	3.78	4.15	3.69	3.99
How satisfied with parental leave policies	12.2%	11.6%	27.7%	27.9%	4.27	4.36	4.48	4.12	4.34
How satisfied with how parental leave policies implemented within department	16.7%	15.9%	27.2%	27.3%	4.22	4.23	4.4	3.93	4.34

7-point scale from (1) Extremely Dissatisfied to (7) Extremely Satisfied

**Table 5.6: Communication of Stop the Tenure Clock Policy**

	Not/Slightly Clearly	Moderately/ Extremely Clearly	Mean Response		Mean Response		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Full
How clearly is stop the tenure clock policy communicated?							
in writing (faculty handbook, CBA, etc.)	23.2%	54.4%	3.32	3.41	3.29	3.28	3.53
by department chair	42.0%	35.8%	2.78	2.84	2.95	2.47 <sup>a</sup>	3.01 <sup>a</sup>
by other faculty in your department	45.5%	31.0%	2.71	2.67	3.00 <sup>a1</sup>	2.29 <sup>a1, a2</sup>	2.77 <sup>a2</sup>
by other sources within UD	45.6%	32.3%	2.46	2.74	2.67	2.43	2.71
<sup>a</sup> p < 0.5 <sup>b</sup> P < 0.1 <sup>c</sup> P < .001							

<sup>a</sup> p < 0.5   <sup>b</sup> P < 0.1   <sup>c</sup> P < .001

5-point scale from (1) Not Clearly to (5) Extremely Clearly

**Table 5.7a: Encouragement to Stop the Tenure Clock**

	Not At All		Moderately/Extremely		Mean Response		Mean Response		
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Professor
How encouraged to stop the clock?									
... by dept chair	77.5%	40.0%	15.0%	57.1%	1.86	3.18	3.36 <sup>a1, a2</sup>	2.41 <sup>a1</sup>	1.78 <sup>a2</sup>
... by faculty colleagues	70.3%	35.3%	18.9%	55.9%	2.21	3.31	3.64 <sup>a1</sup>	2.74 <sup>a2</sup>	1.89 <sup>a1, a2</sup>

<sup>a</sup> p < 0.5   <sup>b</sup> P < 0.1   <sup>c</sup> P < .001

5-point scale from (1) Not At All to (7) Extremely

**Table 5.7b: Stop the Clock in Career Advancement**

	Definitely/Probably Not		Definitely/Probably Yes		Mean Response		Mean Response		
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Professor
Did taking the extra year negatively impact your career advancement?									
	77.8%	61.1%	22.2%	22.2%	2.61	2.33	2.00	1.92	3.50

**Table 6.1: Departmental Climate for Diversity, Overall**

	Very Poor/ Poor	Very Good/ Excellent	Mean Response		Mean Response		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Professor
The climate within your dept:							
For women	14.8%	35.4%	5.06 <sup>c</sup>	4.00 <sup>c</sup>	4.65	4.28	4.66
For faculty of color	23.9%	22.2%	4.31 <sup>b</sup>	3.68 <sup>b</sup>	4.03	3.71 <sup>a</sup>	4.23 <sup>a</sup>
For LGBTQ faculty	11.4%	35.3%	4.96 <sup>b</sup>	4.32 <sup>b</sup>	4.59	4.50	4.82
For faculty with disabilities	11.3%	27.0%	4.83 <sup>b</sup>	4.21 <sup>b</sup>	4.79 <sup>a1</sup>	4.15 <sup>a1,a2</sup>	4.63 <sup>a2</sup>
For overall diversity	17.4%	24.0%	4.58 <sup>c</sup>	3.82 <sup>c</sup>	4.22	4.01	4.36

<sup>a</sup> p<.05   <sup>b</sup> p<.01   <sup>c</sup> p<.001

7-point scale, from (1) Very Poor to (7) Excellent

**Table 6.2: Departmental Climate for Women**

	Disagree/ Strongly	Agree/ Strongly	Mean		Mean		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Full
<b>Informal Networks:</b>							
Men are more likely than women to receive helpful career advice from colleagues	38.5%	19.1%	2.63 <sup>c</sup>	4.59 <sup>c</sup>	3.34	3.92	3.57
Informal networks frequently exclude individuals on the basis of gender	45.8%	17.8%	2.65 <sup>c</sup>	4.07 <sup>c</sup>	3.14	3.76 <sup>a</sup>	3.18 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Workload &amp; Resources:</b>							
Male colleagues are more likely to be sought for collaborative research than female, given comparable expertise	47.6%	15.5%	2.34 <sup>c</sup>	4.24 <sup>c</sup>	3.22	3.55 <sup>a</sup>	3.10 <sup>a</sup>
Women are asked to serve on more committees than their male colleagues	30.5%	34.4%	3.34 <sup>c</sup>	5.26 <sup>c</sup>	4.09	4.66 <sup>a</sup>	4.15 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Discrimination &amp; Bias:</b>							
Female faculty in my department have to work harder than male faculty to be perceived as valued	35.6%	22.1%	2.92 <sup>c</sup>	4.76 <sup>c</sup>	3.88	3.98	3.66
Sex discrimination is a problem in my department	49.2%	13.7%	2.48 <sup>c</sup>	3.94 <sup>c</sup>	3.22	3.54 <sup>b</sup>	2.87 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Promotion:</b>							
Men receive preferential treatment in the areas of recruitment and promotion	43.6%	21.3%	2.56 <sup>c</sup>	4.58 <sup>c</sup>	3.48	3.88 <sup>a</sup>	3.36 <sup>a</sup>
<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001							

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001

7-point scale, from (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree

**Table 6.3: Climate for Faculty of Color**

	Mean Response			
	White	Black	Latino(a)	Asian
Climate for diversity in department	4.39 <sup>a</sup>	3.11 <sup>a</sup>	3.83	4.13
Climate for faculty of color in department	4.21 <sup>a</sup>	2.67 <sup>a</sup>	3.45	3.71
Scale of inclusive department	5.05	4.69	4.7	5.01
Scale of collegial department	4.51	4.81	4.42	4.67

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> P<.01 <sup>c</sup> P<.001

Note: 7-point scale

**Table 6.4: Departmental Climate for URM Faculty**

	Mean Response			
	White	Black	Latino(a)	Asian
<b>Informal Networks:</b>				
URM faculty are less likely than white faculty to get helpful career advice from colleagues	3.16 <sup>a,b</sup>	5.11 <sup>b</sup>	4.50 <sup>a</sup>	3.92
Informal networks frequently exclude individuals on the basis of race and ethnicity	3.09	4.22	3.55	3.09
<b>Workload &amp; Resources:</b>				
There is equal access for both white and non-white faculty to research space and resources				
White colleagues are more likely to be sought out for collaborative research than non-white, given comparable expertise	2.89 <sup>a,b</sup>	4.67 <sup>b</sup>	4.25 <sup>a</sup>	3.55
URM faculty are asked to serve on more committees than their white colleagues	3.91 <sup>a</sup>	5.56 <sup>a</sup>	4.45	4.00
<b>Discrimination &amp; Bias:</b>				
URM faculty have to work harder than white colleagues to be perceived as valued colleagues	3.28 <sup>b</sup>	5.11 <sup>b</sup>	4.18	4.08
I have observed situations in which faculty members have been denigrated based on race and ethnicity				
Racial and ethnic discrimination is a problem in my department	2.88	4.11	3.08	3.08
<b>Promotion:</b>				
White faculty receive preferential treatment in the areas of recruitment and promotion	3.06 <sup>a</sup>	4.44 <sup>a</sup>	3.92	3.92

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> P<.01 <sup>c</sup> P<.001

7-point scale, from (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree

**Table 6.5: Climate for Faculty with Disabilities**

	Mean Response	
	Has disability that requires accommodation	Does not have disability that required
UD as a whole is accessible for faculty with disabilities	2.59 <sup>a</sup>	3.31 <sup>a</sup>
My department chair is supportive of faculty with disabilities	3.53 <sup>b</sup>	3.97 <sup>b</sup>
Faculty in my dept are supportive of faculty with disabilities	3.31 <sup>c</sup>	3.98 <sup>c</sup>
UD policies are clearly stated and sufficient for faculty with disabilities	2.52 <sup>b</sup>	3.27 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> P<.01 <sup>c</sup> P<.001

5-point scale from (1) Not at all to (5) Extremely

**Table 6.6: Perceptions of Institutional Commitment to Diversity**

	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Agree/ Strongly Agree	Mean Response		Mean Response		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Full
Leaders at UD hold themselves and others accountable for progress on diversity	29.1%	22.3%	3.99	3.95	4.31	3.73	3.86
UD offers adequate training to effectively manage diversity	16.8%	32.5%	4.69 <sup>a</sup>	4.19 <sup>a</sup>	4.46	4.47	4.39
University wide goals and priorities are clearly defined	19.5%	27.4%	4.33	4.13	4.35	4.23	4.11
The university has a clear strategy for achieving its diversity goals	32.1%	15.5%	3.77	3.50	3.91	3.49	3.50

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001

7-point scale, from (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree

**Table 6.7: Institutional Commitment to Diversity, Perceptions by Race/Ethnicity**

	Mean Response			
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Leaders at UD hold themselves and others accountable for progress on diversity	3.96	3.22	3.33	4.31
UD offers adequate training to effectively manage diversity	4.56 <sup>a</sup>	3.11 <sup>a</sup>	3.67	4.33
University wide goals and priorities are clearly defined	4.31 <sup>a</sup>	3.00 <sup>a</sup>	3.92	4.40
The university has a clear strategy for achieving its diversity goals	3.64	2.56	3.17	3.80

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001

7-point scale, from (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree

**Table 6.8: Diversity and Faculty Search Committees**

	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Agree/ Strongly Agree	Mean Response		Mean Response		
			Men	Women	Assistant	Associate	Full
Faculty search committees in my department:							
Are concerned that focusing on diversity is at the expense of excellence	34.0%	24.7%	3.46 <sup>a</sup>	3.99 <sup>a</sup>	3.07 <sup>b1,b2</sup>	4.05 <sup>b1</sup>	4.05 <sup>b2</sup>
Do not take adequate steps to recruit diverse	48.1%	17.7%	3.13	3.27	2.91	3.47	3.23
Believe it is difficult to find qualified female applicants in our field	64.3%	11.3%	2.36	2.79	2.13 <sup>a</sup>	2.89 <sup>a</sup>	2.7
Believe it is difficult to find qualified ethnic/racial minorities in our field	28.2%	35.1%	4.01	4.1	3.31 <sup>b1,b2</sup>	4.31 <sup>b1</sup>	4.53 <sup>b2</sup>
Talk different about male and female candidates	52.2%	15.0%	2.57 <sup>c</sup>	3.81 <sup>c</sup>	3.19	3.35	3.02
Talk about a candidate's personal characteristics (race, sex, martial status, children, religion)	56.6%	13.2%	2.51 <sup>c</sup>	3.4 <sup>c</sup>	2.79	3.39 <sup>b</sup>	2.69 <sup>b</sup>
Believe that recruiting diverse candidates to UD is difficult	20.8%	34.9%	4.3	4.53	4.02	4.59	4.62

<sup>a</sup> p<.05 <sup>b</sup> p<.01 <sup>c</sup> p<.001

7-point scale, from (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree

**Table 6.9: Diversity and Faculty Search Committees, Perceptions by Race/Ethnicity**

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
<b>Faculty search committees in my department:</b>				
Are concerned that focusing on diversity is at the expense of excellence	3.72	4.11	4.00	3.80
Do not take adequate steps to recruit diverse candidates	3.07 <sup>a</sup>	4.67 <sup>a</sup>	3.75	3.67
Believe it is difficult to find qualified female applicants in our field	2.55	2.78	2.92	3.00
Believe it is difficult to find qualified ethnic/racial minorities in our field	4.24	4.33	3.58	4.15
Talk different about male and female candidates	3.00	3.22	3.50	3.20
Talk about a candidate's personal characteristics (race, sex, marital status, children, religion) during discussions	2.76	3.00	3.42	3.07
Believe that recruiting diverse candidates to UD is difficult	4.53	4.89	3.64	4.20

<sup>a</sup> p<.05   <sup>b</sup> p<.01   <sup>c</sup> p<.001

7-point scale, from (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree

**Table 7.1: Satisfaction with Professional Life, CT Faculty**

	Very Dissatisfied/ Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied/ Satisfied	Mean Response	
			Men	Women
Professional Life:				
...Experience as faculty member	12.8%	70.5%	5.33	5.77
...Experience of community at UD	10.5%	55.3%	4.72 <sup>a</sup>	5.57 <sup>a</sup>
...Teaching load	6.5%	62.3%	5.27	5.64
...Service load	14.9%	50.0%	4.83	4.89
...Research load	10.8%	47.7%	5.23	4.67
...Career progression	8.0%	49.3%	4.90	5.24
...Current salary	17.9%	43.6%	4.37	4.83
<sup>a</sup> p<.05				

7-point scale from (1) Very Dissatisfied to (7) Very Satisfied

**Table 7.2: Career Advancement Scale, CT Faculty**

	CT Faculty	Mean Response	
		Men	Women
Career advancement scale ( $\alpha=.94$ )	4.65	4.54	4.73

**Table 7.3: Departmental Climate, CT Faculty**

	CT Faculty	Mean Response	
		Men	Women
Inclusive department scale ( $\alpha=0.83$ )	5.54	5.74	5.42
Collegial department scale ( $\alpha=0.95$ )	4.93	4.91	4.94

**Table 7.4: Views on Promotion Standards, CT Faculty**

	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Agree/ Strongly Agree	Mean Response	
			Men	Women
P&T standards are reasonable	5.9%	41.2%	5.29	4.84
P&T system is flexible in terms of weight given to teaching, research, service	18.8%	33.3%	4.96 <sup>a</sup>	4.14 <sup>a</sup>
P&T standards have changed over the last 5 years	4.4%	60.3%	5.46	5.55
The P&T process is free from bias	28.4%	14.9%	4.39	3.55

<sup>a</sup> p<.05

7-point scale from (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree

**Table 7.5: Perceptions of Fairness in Application of Promotion Standards, CT Faculty**

	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Agree/ Strongly Agree	Mean Response	
			Men	Women
Promotion standards have been applied fairly by:				
...department P&T committee	10.4%	61.2%	5.56	5.21
...department chair	3.0%	62.1%	5.75	5.43
...college P&T committee	6.3%	50.0%	5.52	5.02
...dean	7.7%	46.2%	5.35	4.98
...university P&T committee	4.7%	50.0%	5.09	5.12
...provost	9.2%	26.2%	4.26	4.60

7-point scale from (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree

**Table 7.6: Resources to Understand the Promotion Process, CT Faculty**

	Used This Resource	Not Helpful	Extremely Helpful	Mean Response	
				Men	Women
Colleagues in your department	75.7%	1.8%	41.8%	3.55	4.17
Departmental documents	77.0%	3.7%	25.9%	3.79	3.63
Faculty Handbook	86.5%	1.7%	16.7%	3.64	3.50
Department chair	67.1%	2.0%	44.9%	3.90	3.90
Colleagues outside your department	60.8%	0.0%	25.0%	3.58	3.75
Dean or associate dean	28.2%	5.3%	21.1%	3.33	3.69
P&T workshop	58.9%	4.8%	31.0%	3.50	3.93

**Table 7.7: Mentoring, CT Faculty**

	Receive this type of mentoring	Quality of Mentoring	
		Very Poor/ Below Avg.	Above Avg./ Excellent
Formal Mentoring:			
within your department	31.5%	29.2%	45.8%
Informal Mentoring:			
within your department	64.4%	6.5%	63.0%
outside dept but within UD	37.0%	3.6%	67.9%
outside UD	26.0%	0.0%	76.5%