

UD Faculty Work-Life Survey: Summary Report

Prepared by John Sawyer, Office of Institutional Research

In collaboration with the leaders of the UD ADVANCE-IT initiative

This work was carried out with partial support of NSF HRD-1409472.

This report summarizes the results of the Faculty Work-Life Survey conducted in April 2014. The survey was distributed to all full-time CNTT and tenure/tenure-track (T/TT) faculty over a three week period. The survey was distributed electronically under the Provost's signature. Three follow-up messages were sent at approximately 5 day intervals.

Sample Characteristics

Over half of the faculty (53%) responded to at least a portion of the survey with 472 (39%) completing and submitting the survey. Among those who provided demographic data (N=449: 23 chose not to respond to the demographic items), the distribution of respondents closely approximated the University population with the following exceptions.

- The sample represented a larger proportion of women (48.3%) than in the population (39.7%)
- Whites were slightly over represented (83.2% vs. 79.7%)
- Asians were somewhat under represented (7.5% vs. 11.1%)
- Black males were slightly under represented (2.7% vs. 3.2%)
- Hispanic males were over represented (4.6% vs. 2.8%).
- Alfred Lerner College and the College of Engineering were somewhat under represented (8.1% vs. 10.8% and 10.1% vs. 12.4% respectively)
- The Social Sciences portfolio of Arts and Sciences is somewhat over represented (27.4% vs 22.1%).
- CNTT and T/TT faculty responded proportional to the population, with CNTT assistant professors somewhat over represented (50.8% vs. 45.7%) and CNTT instructors under represented (28.5% vs. 36.0%).
- Among T/TT faculty, assistant professors were slightly over represented (19.7% vs. 17.5%) and full professors were underrepresented (46.8% vs. 49.4%).

Because the proportions of respondents across demographics were in most cases close to the proportions within the faculty population, the results summarized here can be considered to reflect the population with some caution related to the specific subgroups identified above.

Analysis

The faculty responses were summarized by descriptive statistics as either mean for continuous scale questions or percentage for questions with ordinal or nominal scale. Multivariate analysis of variance was used to compare means of responses from faculty of different gender, race, rank, and tenure status and by college. For multivariate analyses, partial least squares were used to test each demographic factor while controlling for the effects of other factors. Least Squares Means (LSM) are reported where significant differences were found controlling for other demographic factors. Race was effect coded to compare Hispanic to all others, Black to all others, and Asian to all others. The sample sizes for other

ances were too small to test and reporting differences would reveal individuals. We did not test for race by sex interactions because the sample sizes for sex-by-race combinations were too small for statistical testing. Chi-Square test or Fisher exact test was used to determine the significance of the association when response variables were categorical. P-values less than 0.05 are considered as statistically significant and 0.10 as marginally significant.

Several scales were used which include multiple item indicators. In these cases, principle components analysis and internal consistency item reliabilities were reported to confirm subscale structures. Upon confirmation, subscale composite scores were analyzed and reported.

There were several qualitative (write-in) questions. Answers to these questions often pertained to different sections, thus qualitative analyses are summarized in the pertinent sections.

Promotion Processes and Fairness

Faculty groups were asked questions about the clarity of promotion policies, fairness in application of standards and satisfaction with the promotion process. Question sets presented to CNTT, versus T/TT assistant and recently promoted associate professors, versus associate approaching or recently promoted full professors differed only in details associated with those specific ranks and processes.

Overall, for both CNTT promotions and tenure-track promotion to associate professor with tenure, those who had been promoted reported significantly greater clarity of communication about the process and policies, and greater satisfaction and perceived fairness, than those who had not yet applied for promotion. Thus, significant clarity and satisfaction accrued from having successfully completed the process. There were notable differences between CNTT and tenure-track processes, as well as across sex and race for tenure-track faculty.

Career Advancement for CNTT Faculty

The clarity of communication about promotion criteria from the Faculty Handbook, Department P&T documents, the Department Chair and other faculty was rated on a 1-4 scale from “not clear” to “very clear.” Overall, CNTT faculty reported the criteria were “somewhat clearly communicated.” CNTT instructors and assistant professors on average reported that the criteria are only “somewhat clearly” communicated by all of the above sources, while CNTT associate and full professors reported criteria are communicated with “moderate clarity” by the Chair and in department documents. Associate professors reported only “somewhat clear” communication in the departmental promotion documents. Associate and full professors provided more positive ratings than assistant professors and instructors regarding communication of promotion criteria communicated by Faculty Handbook, Chair and other faculty in the department ($p < 0.01$). Associate and full professors also gave more positive ratings than assistant professors for criteria communicated by departmental promotion documents ($P < 0.05$).

CNTT faculty were asked how satisfied they are with the overall promotion process (1-5 very dissatisfied – very satisfied), how supported they felt in seeking advancement (1-5, significant opposition – strong support), and how consistent promotion criteria were with responsibilities of their position (1-5, very inconsistent – very consistent). While responses on all three items varied across the whole scale, on average satisfaction is below neutral ($M = 2.68$), support for advancement was rated neither supported

nor opposed ($M=3.09$) and criteria were reported as being “somewhat inconsistent” to “neither consistent nor inconsistent” with responsibilities ($M=2.50$). Full and associate professors were significantly more satisfied than assistant professors and instructors. A similar pattern, although not statistically significant, was found with respect to support for advancement.

Differences for consistency with responsibilities were not statistically reliable. After controlling for rank, there was no difference for sex or race on responses regarding satisfaction or support, except Asian CNTT faculty

were significantly more satisfied than non-Asians ($LSM=4.21$ vs 2.42 respectively). After controlling for rank, Hispanic CNTT faculty reported greater consistency of criteria with responsibilities ($LSM=5.42$ vs 3.14 respectively). A significant interaction on the consistency question of rank by sex was found such that male instructors reported lower consistency ($LSM=3.78$) and female associate professors reported greater consistency ($LSM=5.41$) than others in their rank.

Satisfaction with promotion and perceived support for Promotion by rank, CNTT faculty.

| Rank | Satisfaction | Support | Consistency |
|---------------------|--------------|---------|-------------|
| Full Professor | 3.67 | 4.33 | 3.50 |
| Associate Professor | 3.17 | 3.39 | 2.87 |
| Assistant Professor | 2.51 | 3.11 | 2.41 |
| Instructor | 2.54 | 2.66 | 2.31 |

Conclusions: career advancement for CNTT faculty

There was significant lack of clarity in promotional policies, low satisfaction and perceptions of support for advancement, particularly among instructors and assistant professors. Overall, promotion requirements are not seen as consistent with the responsibilities of the CNTT position, although there were some differences by race and sex. Whereas many departments apply the same policies for promotion and workload to CNTT faculty as they do for tenure-track faculty, these results indicate the need to consider a different set of policies designed specifically for CNTT faculty.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Tenure track faculty (assistant professors and associate professors promoted in 2010 or later) were asked questions regarding clarity of promotion criteria (1=not at all clear to 4=very clear), consistency with which criteria were applied (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree), and satisfaction (1=very dissatisfied to 5= very satisfied) and fairness (1=very arbitrary to 5=very fair) of the process of promotion to associate professor with tenure.

On average, T/TT faculty reported that criteria are communicated with “moderate clarity” by the Faculty Handbook, chair, and other faculty in the department. The criteria communicated by UD faculty outside the department, and other sources (other administrators or documents, caucuses, etc.) were rated as only “somewhat clear.” There was no difference between assistant professors and recently promoted associates in clarity of tenure policies except that associate professors reported greater clarity from the other sources outside their department than did assistants. This may be because early assistant professors may not have attended promotion-related workshops provided by caucuses or engaged yet in promotion preparation. Finally, women perceived the promotion criteria as presented in the Faculty Handbook as more clear than did men ($M=2.95$ vs 2.66 respectively). This significant gender difference persisted even after controlling for the race.

Associate professors reported greater satisfaction with the overall tenure process ($M=3.29$) than did assistant professors ($M=2.63$) ($P<.01$). However, the question was assessed on a 5 point scale with 3 being neutral. Thus, on average associate professors were “neutral” to “satisfied” while assistants were “neutral” to “dissatisfied.” There were no significant effects for sex, race or the interaction of sex with race. Most associate professors reported a “great extent” (46%) or “moderate” (24%) support for advancement, while for assistant professors the modal response was “moderate” support (46%) with more reporting “some” support (28%) than “great” support (21%).

To better understand the lack of satisfaction with the tenure process we asked if tenure standards are consistent with responsibilities, applied consistently across the department and college, and if the tenure process is free from bias and based on accurate information. Responses were made on a 5 point scale, 3 being neutral and 5 being best. Overall, tenure track faculty felt neutral or agreed about the consistency in applying the standard for tenure, but when asked about whether the process is free from bias, their opinions tended to be either “neutral” to “agree,” with a mean response of 3.29. No significant differences were found for faculty with different rank, gender or race/ethnicity. Conversely, faculty members “disagree” with the statement “decisions are based on accurate information ($M= 2.53$). There was a significant effect for race, with Asian faculty responding more positively than others ($M=3.22$ vs 2.46 respectively).

Tenure track faculty rated the fairness of Department P&T Committee, Department Chair, College P&T Committee and Dean on a scale from 1=“very arbitrary” to 5=“very fair. Average ratings were 4.08, 4.20, 4.40 and 4.33 respectively. Associate professors gave significantly higher ratings than assistant professors for the College P&T Committee ($M=4.76$ vs 4.07) and for the Dean ($M=4.76$ vs 3.95), and after controlling for rank, the mean response regarding the Department Chair by males was higher than females (marginally significant at $p=.06$) ($LSM=4.37$ vs 4.07). There were no race or interaction effects.

Faculty were asked to what extent their 2 and 4 year reviews were helpful in preparing them for tenure (1=not at all useful – 4=useful to a great extent). Associate professors were more positive, with 60.9% indicating reviews were at least moderately useful while 53.5% of assistant professors rated reviews as at least moderately useful. There were no differences by sex or race.

Among the 87% of associate professors who had used sample dossiers, 65% indicated that they were useful “to a great extent.” Among assistant professors using sample dossiers to prepare (71%), 47% indicated they are useful “to a great extent” and 31% indicated they are useful to a “moderate extent.” In contrast, both assistant and associate professors who had attended tenure workshops (57% of assistants and 65% of associates) the modal response was that they were only useful “to some extent” (59% and 50% respectively). There were no differences by sex or race.

Conclusions: Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Clarity and satisfaction with the promotion process improves once promoted. Overall, assistant professors rated committee, Chair and Dean as fair in the application of criteria, and associate professors rated application of criteria as very fair. Men rated their Department Chair as very fair while women rated the Chair as fair. Experience with 2 and 4 year reviews as well as sample dossiers and

tenure workshops are reported by associate professors as helpful in preparation for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

Promotion to Full

We also asked full professors (except those hired at the full professor rank) and associate professors who had been promoted to associate before 2010 to evaluate the process of promotion to full. The majority of the sample rated clarity with which policies are communicated in P&T documents, Faculty Handbook, by Department Chair and faculty as “moderately” to “very” clear (78%, 77%, 73% and 67% respectively). Communications from sources outside the respondent’s department were rated as less clear with larger proportions reporting “not clear” (22% and 26% respectively) and fewer providing ratings of “very clear” (17% for both other faculty and other UD sources).

In general, faculty members who have been promoted to full professor were significantly more satisfied with the post-tenure promotion process than those who have not been promoted. This was reflected by the higher ratings among full professors in 1) the communication clarity of the promotion criteria, 2) consistency of the promotion standards, 3) overall satisfaction and supports received, and 4) fairness of the promotion to full standards. The only gender difference after accounting for the rank effect (fewer women at higher ranks) is the satisfaction with the overall promotion process for advancement to full ($P=0.02$), with males being more satisfied than females. Similarly, the only racial difference after accounting for the rank effect is the promotion criteria communicated by department chair ($P=0.03$), with Black faculty reporting less clarity than their White peers.

Combining full and associate professors who had applied for promotion to full at UD ($N=134$), full professors reported greater fairness in applying standards by department P&T Committee, department chair and college P&T committee ($M=4.46$, 4.56 , and 4.45 respectively on a 5 point scale) compared to associate professors ($M=2.93$, 3.29 , and 3.21). Among associate professors, 18 of 89 responding associate professors have applied for promotion to full (20%). To avoid revealing sensitive information we did not ask if associate professors had applied for promotion to full but been turned down. The lower averages for associates may reflect some who have been turned down. However, since less than 9% of applicants to full have been denied over the past 3 years (spring 2014 analysis of promotion decisions by IRE), the majority of these 18 associate professors were likely currently under consideration. The more positive scores provided by full professors likely reflects increased clarity and satisfaction that accrues from having successfully completed the process.

We asked about preparing to apply for full professor. For those who had received a post tenure review, the modal response was that the review was not at all helpful. The responses were more evenly distributed across the ratings from 1=“not at all” to 4=“to a great extent” among full professors although 37% indicated post tenure reviews were not useful. Similarly to sample dossiers, UD and outside promotion workshops were seen by most associate and full professors as not useful.

Hired as Full with Tenure

We also asked faculty who were hired as tenured full professors to evaluate the clarity and fairness with which P&T standards are applied at UD. Overall they rate the standards as “somewhat clear” to

“moderately clear” and indicated that standards are consistently applied across the department. Female full professors rated the clarity of communication from other sources within UD but outside of formal documents and department faculty/Chair as more clear than did male full professors ($P=0.04$). The sample size by race among faculty hired as tenured full professors was too small to test for race effects within this population.

We asked these full professors if the standards for promotion were applied consistently across their department and college, and if the process was free from bias and based on accurate information. Responses ranged from 1=strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree with 3 being neither agree nor disagree. The mean responses indicate neutral or agreement with statements regarding consistency across department ($M=3.44$) but neutral to disagree regarding consistency across college ($M=2.67$) as was also evidenced in responses to being free from bias ($M=2.74$) although the accuracy of information was rated more positively ($M=3.26$).

Conclusions: Promotion to Full Professor

Achieving promotion to full professor results in greater clarity and satisfaction, and greater perceptions of fairness than prior to promotion. Female faculty are less satisfied with the promotion process than men. Current processes intended to prepare for promotion to full including post tenure reviews, workshops and sample dossiers are not seen as helpful. Only neutral at best perceptions of consistency across colleges and freedom from bias were found. Substantial work is needed to prepare associate professors for promotion to full, including improvements in the clarity of communications, mentorship and communications to improve perceptions of fairness and consistency of application of criteria to promotion.

Qualitative analysis of comments regarding tenure and promotion (all groups).

The survey included four similar questions on the topic of tenure and promotion. Faculty were only asked the question most relevant to their position (e.g., only CNTT faculty were asked question 1 and only assistant TT professors and recently tenured associate professors were asked question 2, etc.)

1. What could be done to improve the promotion process for CNTT faculty at UD? (82 responses)
2. What could be done to improve the tenure process for junior faculty at UD? (85 responses)
3. What could be done to improve the promotion process for associate professors at UD? (153 responses)
4. What could be done to improve the forward trajectory of full professors at UD? (147 responses)

Responses indicate that faculty at all levels are concerned that promotion and appraisal criteria are not reflective of workload. They would like to see more clarity in promotion criteria, especially for CNTT faculty, T/TT associate professors, and for named professorships. Some CNTT and T/TT associate professors would like to see more recognition for their higher service and teaching loads. Many faculty feel that students' evaluations are used inappropriately to measure teaching excellence -- they would like a more developed set of criteria. Most faculty who commented on promotion and appraisal expressed concerns that even when criteria are clear, they are not interpreted or implemented consistently. And a good number of assistant and associate professors reported concerns that college

and university P&T committees and administrators do not fully understand what constitutes excellence within specific disciplines -- especially for interdisciplinary fields or fields outside the evaluator(s)'s area of expertise.

Of particular note in this category were comments on spousal hiring and stop the clock. Comments reflect faculty and administrator confusion, lack of understanding, and concerns about fairness and consistency of implementation.

A general theme that ran throughout was that department chairs can make a big difference, positive or negative, in faculty's experience of the tenure and promotion processes.

A large number of faculty (at all levels) expressly requested mentoring.

Work Policies

Stop the Clock

Nearly 30% of tenure track faculty thought UD's Stop the Tenure Clock Policy was 'Not Clear,' especially as communicated by other faculty in the department (31.6%). No significant differences were found for faculty with different rank, gender or race/ethnicity. Over half of tenure track faculty (54%) who respond to the survey said they were eligible to stop the tenure clock while they were an assistant professor. Among those who were eligible, over 30% feel they were 'Not at all' encouraged by their department chair (34%) and by other faculty in the department (33%). An even greater proportion of them (52%) felt 'Not at all' encouraged by other sources within UD to stop the tenure clock. Female faculty were more encouraged than male faculty and Black faculty were more encouraged than non-Black faculty to use stop the clock.

Merit, Family Leave, Sabbatical and Workload Policies

Overall, faculty members rated the clarity of the communication of workload, merit pay, sabbatical and family leave policies as "Somewhat clear" to "Moderately clear." However, there are greater than 1/3 of the faculty who reported "I don't know" about UD's parental and family leave policies, especially those communicated by department chair (45%), other faculty in department (49%), and other sources (49%). The proportion is even greater among CNTT faculty. There were no significant differences found in clarity of the merit pay policies for T/TT vs. CNTT faculty. Similarly, there were no differences found with regard to clarity of family leave policies.

On average, among those who reported they did know about the sabbatical policies, faculty members rated the clarity of the communication of sabbatical policies as "Somewhat clear" to "Moderately clear." Tenure track faculty reported greater clarity of sabbatical policies than did CNTT faculty from handbook & CBA, department chair and other faculty in the department. Among T/TT faculty, females rated the clarity of sabbatical policies communicated by handbook & CBA higher than did males ($F=3.17$ vs. $M=2.92$ on a 4 point scale). They also rated communication of sabbatical policies by other UD sources higher than males ($F=2.72$ vs $M=2.35$ on a 4 point scale). After taking into consideration the effect of tenure status, Black faculty rated the communication of sabbatical policies by handbook & CBA lower

than do Whites ($P < 0.05$). No other sex or race differences were found beyond those accountable by tenure status.

Tenure track faculty rated the clarity of workload documents as more clear than do CNTT faculty. Among tenure track faculty, males rated the clarity of workload policy communicated by the chair higher than do females ($M = 2.99$ versus 2.75 on a 4 point scale). No race differences were found regarding clarity of workload policy.

Workload

CNTT faculty reported teaching more number of total courses, number of credit hours, number of undergraduate courses and having more undergraduate advisees than do T/TT faculty. Associate professors were more likely to indicate that they teach more than their peers, while full professors were more likely to indicate that they teach less than their peers. There were no differences by sex; however Hispanic faculty indicated teaching less courses and credit hours than their peers. Full professors reported teaching less undergraduate courses and more graduate courses and students than their peers.

One-hundred and seventy-two (172) respondents indicated that they had a teaching load reduction in the past 5 years. Reasons for teaching load reduction included:

Written response for the other category corresponded with the above listed reasons, sometimes giving more detail. These responses were approximately evenly distributed across the 7 categories. Three write-ins indicated sabbatical which was not provided as a separate category from “research activity.”

| Reason for Teaching Load Reduction | N |
|------------------------------------|----|
| New Faculty | 36 |
| Buyout | 34 |
| Research activities | 45 |
| Administrative responsibilities | 75 |
| Heavy advising load | 5 |
| Family or health reasons | 12 |
| Major grant preparation | 10 |
| Other | 31 |

Full professors reported significantly fewer undergraduate advisees than other ranks. There were no differences in undergraduate advising workload by rank, sex or race. Faculty in the College of Arts and Science and College of Education and Human Development reported larger number of typical advisees in their college, and faculty in these colleges plus the College of Health Sciences reported more actual number of undergraduate advisees than other colleges. T/TT faculty reported greater service workload than do CNTT faculty, particularly at the university level. Full professors reported more service on external committees and reported chairing more committees than other faculty. While no sex or race differences were found in service workload, faculty in CANS and CAS reported greater amounts of university-level service commitments.

Respondents were asked to indicate the proportion of their workload formally assigned to scholarship. After controlling for tenure status (CNTT vs T/TT), assistant professors reported more workload allocated to scholarship than all other ranks ($LSM = 44\%$ versus 38% , 40% and 35% for associate, full professors, and instructors respectively). There were no significant differences in scholarship workload by sex or race once tenure status and rank are controlled.

Respondents were asked to self-reported elements of scholarly productivity within the past two years. A summary table is presented below.

| | | | Sex | | | | Race recode | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|------|------|------|--------|------|-------------|------|-------|------|-----------------|------|-------|------|
| | | | Male | | Female | | Hispanic | | Black | | Other non-white | | White | |
| | N | Mean | N | Mean | N | Mean | N | Mean | N | Mean | N | Mean | N | Mean |
| 1st author peer review | 453 | 1.6 | 227 | 1.8 | 194 | 1.6 | 14 | 2.6 | 16 | 1.3 | 52 | 1.9 | 335 | 1.6 |
| Other author peer review | 433 | 2.2 | 217 | 2.5 | 187 | 1.9 | 15 | 1.9 | 16 | 1.8 | 49 | 3 | 320 | 2.1 |
| Non-peer review | 436 | 1.5 | 215 | 1.4 | 195 | 1.6 | 15 | 1.5 | 16 | 1.1 | 49 | 1.5 | 326 | 1.5 |
| Conference presentaiton | 452 | 3.6 | 220 | 3.7 | 200 | 3.6 | 16 | 4.6 | 16 | 2.6 | 52 | 3.9 | 332 | 3.6 |
| Books authored | 410 | 0.2 | 207 | 0.2 | 176 | 0.2 | 16 | 0.3 | 15 | 0.1 | 46 | 0.1 | 302 | 0.2 |
| Books edited | 404 | 0.2 | 204 | 0.2 | 174 | 0.2 | 14 | 0 | 15 | 0.2 | 47 | 0.2 | 298 | 0.2 |
| Other scholarly | 269 | 1.3 | 131 | 1 | 122 | 1.5 | 11 | 0.5 | 8 | 1.9 | 27 | 1 | 206 | 1.3 |
| Grant proposals | 432 | 2.7 | 213 | 2.8 | 191 | 2.5 | 14 | 3.6 | 14 | 1.9 | 50 | 3.2 | 322 | 2.5 |
| Active grants | 415 | 1.6 | 209 | 1.7 | 179 | 1.4 | 14 | 1.9 | 14 | 0.7 | 46 | 1.8 | 310 | 1.6 |

After controlling for CNTT vs T/TT, assistant and full professors produced more first authored peer reviewed articles than did associate professors (LSM=1.31, 1.39, and 0.66 respectively) and full professors authored more books than did associate and assistant professors (LSM=0.34 vs 0.11 and 0.10 respectively). Differences were found across colleges in grant proposal writing and active grants that may be expected based on disciplines. No differences were found after controlling for tenure status, rank and college for sex or race.

Conclusions: Policies and workload

Tenure track assistant professors are generally protected from workload that may impede research productivity and advancement to associate with tenure. Full professors generally have achieved that status due to successful publication records and maintained productivity levels. In contrast, associate professors may have less time for scholarship for an array of reasons. This finding suggests the continuing need for mentoring and career development for associate professors.

Career Development

Satisfaction with department resources

Satisfaction with departmental resources was measured on a 4 point scale (1=very dissatisfied to 4=very satisfied). College of B&E faculty reported greater satisfaction than other colleges with professional development (LSM=2.90), tech support (LSM=2.71), and advising responsibilities (LSM=3.12).

| RESOURCE | N | Mean |
|---------------------------|-----|------|
| Professional Dev support | 476 | 2.4 |
| Tech support | 477 | 2.7 |
| Clerical support | 477 | 2.8 |
| Teaching load | 459 | 2.7 |
| Advising responsibilities | 443 | 2.8 |
| Committee assignments | 452 | 2.7 |

CNTT faculty reported greater satisfaction with technical support than T/TT faculty (M= 2.9 versus 2.7 respectively). No sex, race or rank differences were found beyond those accountable by college and tenure status.

Recognition

Respondents were asked their extent of agreement with statements regarding appraisals, advancement and rewards on a five point scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree).

T/TT faculty reported greater “alignment of appraisals with workload” than do CNTT faculty (M=3.54 vs 2.88), full professors reported greater alignment than others (M=3.83), and female faculty reported greater alignment than men (M=3.46

| RECOGNITION | N | Mean |
|--------------------------------------|-----|------|
| Appraisal align with workload | 473 | 3.4 |
| Appraisal align with merit | 471 | 3.5 |
| Advancement reflects effort | 472 | 3.2 |
| Advancement reflects accomplishments | 477 | 3.9 |
| Rewards consistent with performance | 467 | 3.5 |

vs3.34). The same differences were found for “alignment with merit” for tenure-track vs CNTT faculty (M=3.60 vs 3.00), full professors (M=3.85), and females versus males (M=3.55 vs 3.40). No significant differences were found for “advancement reflects effort.” Significant differences on “advancement reflects accomplishments” with instructors lower than others (M=3.54) and Black respondents lower than others (M=3.31). Professors agreed more with the statement “rewards are consistent with performance” than did others (M=3.68).

Faculty Collaboration

Respondents were asked about their research collaborations with UD faculty on a five-point scale. Overall, satisfaction with collaborations within one’s department were “neutral” to “satisfied” (M=3.38), however Black respondents were less satisfied than Whites (LSM=2.72 vs 3.10 respectively). Faculty in B&E were less satisfied (LSM=2.62) and CEHD faculty were more satisfied (LSM=3.49) compared to other colleges. Satisfaction with collaborations across colleges was similar (LSM=3.33), except B&E faculty were less satisfied with cross college collaborations (LSM=2.99). Satisfaction with collaboration with Centers and Institutes (LSM=3.27) did not differ by rank, sex, race or college.

Respondents were also asked to rate the extent to which they were rewarded for, and participate in cross-disciplinary research (1=not at all to 4=a great extent). Overall cross-disciplinary research is somewhat to moderately rewarded (M=2.66). However B&E college faculty reported less rewards (LSM= 1.82) while CEOE faculty (LSM=2.99) reported greater rewards for cross-disciplinary research. No significant differences in satisfaction with cross-disciplinary collaboration were found for faculty of different rank, tenure status, gender or race. On average respondents reported their research is “moderately” cross-disciplinary (M=2.94), with CAS and CEOE faculty reporting most cross-disciplinary research (LSM=3.35 and 3.63 respectively) while B&E and CEHD reported least cross-disciplinary research (LSM=2.53 and 2.83 respectively).

Mentoring

Faculty were asked (on a four point scale) their disagreement or agreement with six statements covering formal and informal mentoring within their primary unit, within UD outside their primary unit, and outside UD.

| Item | Strongly disagree | | Disagree | | Agree | | Strongly agree | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|------------|----------|------------|-------|------------|----------------|------------|
| | N | % of Total | N | % of Total | N | % of Total | N | % of Total |
| Formal mentor primary unit | 187 | 42.12% | 153 | 34.46% | 77 | 17.34% | 27 | 6.08% |
| Informal Mentor primary unit | 98 | 22.17% | 89 | 20.14% | 195 | 44.12% | 60 | 13.57% |
| Formal mentor UD | 222 | 50.45% | 170 | 38.64% | 39 | 8.86% | 9 | 2.05% |
| Informal mentor UD | 152 | 34.47% | 140 | 31.75% | 119 | 26.98% | 30 | 6.80% |
| Formal mentor outside | 202 | 46.12% | 155 | 35.39% | 50 | 11.42% | 31 | 7.08% |
| Informal mentor outside | 102 | 23.13% | 82 | 18.59% | 165 | 37.41% | 92 | 20.86% |

Only 23.4 % of respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they receive formal mentoring within their primary unit, and 10.9 % receive formal mentoring at UD outside their primary unit. A much larger portion (57.7%) received informal mentoring within their unit and 33.8 % received informal mentoring at UD outside their primary unit. While only 18.5 % received formal mentoring outside UD, a much larger proportion (58.3%) reported receiving informal mentoring outside UD. Thus, from all sources, informal mentoring is more prevalent than formal mentoring.

Assistant professors received more of both formal and informal mentoring within their unit than advanced ranks. Associate professors and full professors did not differ on the extent of formal or informal mentoring they received. Because of the need for associate professors to continue career progression toward subsequent promotion, this lack of mentoring for associate professors is of substantial concern.

There was no difference between males and females regarding formal or informal mentoring within their units. However, women reported receiving more informal mentoring outside their UD department and outside UD than men; this effect remained after controlling for the rank.

Regarding mentoring that faculty received from outside their department at UD, Black and Hispanic respondents reported receiving more formal mentoring than did non-Black faculty. Additionally, Black respondents also received more formal and informal mentoring outside UD than non-Black respondents. This racial difference persisted among females, with female Black faculty receiving more formal and informal mentoring outside UD than other females.

Conclusions: Career Development

Greater alignment of recognition with workload is needed, particularly among CNTT and Black faculty. Faculty were only neutral with regard to satisfaction with opportunities to collaborate with other faculty, which is likely suppressed by a general perception that interdisciplinary research is not rewarded. In general faculty members did not perceive opportunities to receive career mentoring, and this was particularly true among associate professors. Faculty of color and female faculty reported greatest opportunities for formal and informal mentoring from sources outside UD.

Work Satisfaction and Affective Commitment

Satisfaction

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with professional experiences at UD. The modal response on all items (tabulated below) was “satisfied.”

| | Very dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very satisfied | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------|--------------|---------|-----------|---------|----------------|---------|
| Item | N | % Total | N | % Total | N | % Total | N | % Total |
| Experience of community | 32 | 6.77% | 115 | 24.31% | 255 | 53.91% | 71 | 15.01% |
| Experience of collegiality | 43 | 9.03% | 84 | 17.65% | 217 | 45.59% | 132 | 27.73% |
| Experience in primary unit | 36 | 7.58% | 75 | 15.79% | 230 | 48.42% | 134 | 28.21% |
| Satisfaction-teaching load | 19 | 4.03% | 74 | 15.68% | 295 | 62.50% | 84 | 17.80% |
| Satisfaction-service load | 29 | 6.24% | 127 | 27.31% | 233 | 50.11% | 76 | 16.34% |
| Teaching - research balance | 43 | 9.15% | 85 | 18.09% | 247 | 52.55% | 95 | 20.21% |
| Career progression | 19 | 4.05% | 93 | 19.83% | 280 | 59.70% | 77 | 16.42% |

Analysis was conducted to identify differences in the above response across college, tenure status, rank sex and race. When controlling for other factors, significant differences were found between Black and non-Black respondents for “experience of collegiality” (M=2.53 vs 2.94 respectively) and “experience in primary unit” (M=2.63 vs 2.99 respectively). Males rated more highly than females “satisfaction with teaching load” (M=3.03 vs 2.83) and “satisfaction with service load” (M=2.88 vs 2.62). Significant differences were found across rank for “satisfaction with service load” with full professors more satisfied than associate professors (LSM=2.92 vs 2.62), “satisfaction with teaching –research balance” with full professors more satisfied than associate professors (LSM=2.76 vs 2.39) and “satisfaction with career progression” with associate professors less satisfied than assistant professors (LSM=2.69 vs 2.98). CNTT faculty were less satisfied than tenure-track faculty on “teaching-research balance” (LSM=2.57 vs 2.91 respectively).

Organizational Commitment

Affective commitment to UD and general job satisfaction were each measured by multi item scale that are averaged to form composite scales. .

Significant differences were found across tenure status for both scales and for Black respondents compared with others on the affective commitment scale. CNTT faculty scored higher than tenure-track faculty on affective commitment (LSM=3.63 vs 3.39 respectively), but lower on general job satisfaction (LSM=2.20 vs 2.72 respectively).

Qualitative analysis of comments regarding Satisfaction with UD

All faculty were asked to comment on the factors that contribute to – or detract from – their satisfaction at UD. Approximately half of the participants (N = 305) provided comments.

We remark that a number of faculty reported a high degree of satisfaction with various aspects of their job such as research output, teaching, and daily work-life. Yet, even those often qualified their response with remarks such as those given below.

a. Resources and Budgeting

Faculty expressed concerns about shrinking resources and growing workloads. They reported feeling over-stretched by increased demands for grant dollars, high-visibility research output, increased teaching loads (larger classes, fewer TAs) and advising duties -- combined with a decrease in office support, infrastructure, resources and rewards. Some faculty feel that teaching and service loads are distributed unevenly and unfairly. Faculty would like more transparency surrounding money flow and RBB in general.

b. Administrative Structuring & Communication

Faculty reported a desire for increased two-way communication between faculty and the higher administration (especially deans, provost positions, and the president). They expressed concerns that the rapid growth and ongoing changes in administrative structuring make two-way communication and messaging increasingly difficult. They reported feeling separated from the higher administration, a loss of voice in university governance, and expressed a sense that faculty are considered merely a resource. Faculty would like increased involvement in policy formation and decision-making. They would like more interaction with the higher administration, involvement from administrators in faculty life, and would like to see more value placed on (appreciation of) faculty output (research, teaching, service).

c. Climate

All who reported on university climate expressed concerns about the sense of community on campus. Many reported feeling isolated or silo-ed and would like to see more intellectual exchange on campus. They want more opportunities to gather informally with colleagues and for professional collaboration. There is a sense that faculty research is little supported, appreciated, or rewarded on campus.

Withdrawal Cognitions (Continuance Commitment)

Among 470 faculty responding, 16.6% (78) indicated that they had received an outside employment offer within the last 5 years. While slightly more associate professors (21.8%) and fewer assistant professors (12.5%) received outside offers, this difference was not statistically significant.

These 78 respondents were asked to indicate adjustments to their job resulting from the outside offer. Responses were tabulated as shown below. Most adjustments were in the form of salary and resources. The "other" category resulted in a number of write-in comments. Three indicated that they did not ask for match for various reasons. Five indicated that nothing happened, it was

| Results of Counter-offer | N |
|------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Salary adjustment | 22 |
| Administrative responsibilities | 6 |
| Teaching load reduction | 5 |
| Equipment, laboratory or research funds | 10 |
| Employment of spouse or partner | 4 |
| Other | 26 |

ignored, or there was a negative response. A few indicated that the offer was informal and ignored. Others indicated their position was changed from temporary to permanent or non-tenure track to tenure-track.

Withdrawal Cognitions

Faculty were asked how likely they are to leave UD in the next three years on a five-point scale (1=very likely to 5=very unlikely). On average responses were “neither likely or unlikely” to “somewhat unlikely.” Testing for tenure status, rank, college, sex and race, male faculty were less likely to seek other employment than females (LSM=3.51 vs 3.22) and CNTT faculty are less likely to seek other employment than tenure-track faculty (LSM=3.60 vs 3.13).

We asked respondents the extent to which they have considered reasons to leave UD. The most considered reasons were: enhance career, supportive work environment, increase salary and increase time for research. The least considered reasons were dual career, family issues, nonacademic job and lower cost of living.

| Reasons to Leave UD | Not at all | | Some extent | | Moderate extent | | Great Extent | |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| | N | % of Total | N | % of Total | N | % of Total | N | % of Total |
| enhance career | 126 | 27.69% | 95 | 20.88% | 104 | 22.86% | 130 | 28.57% |
| supportive work environment | 153 | 33.70% | 92 | 20.26% | 92 | 20.26% | 117 | 25.77% |
| increase salary | 185 | 40.66% | 110 | 24.18% | 97 | 21.32% | 63 | 13.85% |
| time for research | 201 | 44.47% | 92 | 20.35% | 86 | 19.03% | 73 | 16.15% |
| reduce stress | 238 | 52.54% | 106 | 23.40% | 50 | 11.04% | 59 | 13.02% |
| tenure/promotion | 313 | 69.25% | 67 | 14.82% | 38 | 8.41% | 34 | 7.52% |
| retirement | 325 | 71.74% | 47 | 10.38% | 37 | 8.17% | 44 | 9.71% |
| dual career | 327 | 72.51% | 50 | 11.09% | 40 | 8.87% | 34 | 7.54% |
| family issues | 342 | 75.83% | 52 | 11.53% | 35 | 7.76% | 22 | 4.88% |
| nonacademic job | 354 | 78.49% | 59 | 13.08% | 32 | 7.10% | 6 | 1.33% |
| lower cost of living | 396 | 88.20% | 34 | 7.57% | 10 | 2.23% | 9 | 2.00% |

We tested for differences by tenure status, rank, sex, race and college. Significant differences were:

- **Tenure or promotion:** CNTT greater than T/TT; Asian respondents greater than non-Asian.
- **Enhance career:** Faculty in CEOE more than other colleges.
- **Increase time for research:** Associate professors more than others; CAS faculty more than others and CEHD faculty less than others; females more than males.
- **Reduce stress:** Females more than males.
- **Family issues:** Instructors and assistant professors more than others.
- **Dual career:** Tenure-track more than CNTT; assistant professors more than associates, associates more than full professors, instructors more than full professors.
- **Retirement:** CNTT more than tenure track; full professors more than others and assistants less than others, Hispanic faculty less than others.

Conclusions: Satisfaction and Withdrawal

Associate professors are least satisfied with service workload and career progression. Males are more satisfied with teaching and service loads than women and Black faculty rated their experience of collegiality within their primary unit lower than non-blacks. Black faculty experienced lower affective commitment to the University while CNTT faculty were more committed, although they experienced less general job satisfaction. Based on qualitative comments, concerns about shrinking resources and growing workloads, desire for greater communication between faculty and administration and a general sense of lack of community may impede overall satisfaction and commitment. Withdrawal from the university is most likely to occur when faculty, particularly associate professors seek an outside job to enhance one's career, gain a more supportive work environment, gain more time for research, increase salary or to reduce stress.

Work Climate

Chairperson

All respondents were asked 13 items that reflect a single dimension of the Chair's transactional leadership style (Coefficient alpha = .96). Items were scaled on a four point scale (1=strongly disagree, 4=strongly agree, with no neutral point). The average score for Chair leadership was 3.28. Analysis of variance was conducted to test for tenure status, rank, college, sex and race effects. Black faculty rated their chair leadership lower than others (LSM=2.87 vs 3.38).

Three items were asked reflecting the Chair's respect for the faculty members (Coefficient alpha = .91). The average score for chair respect was 4.42 on a 5 point scale with 5 being "strongly agree." Analysis of variance tested tenure status, rank, college, sex and race effects. A significant main effect was found for race such that Black faculty rated their chair as less respectful than did others (LSM=3.97 vs 4.58).

Three items asked about the faculty members voice in decision making, meetings and committees using 5 point scale from 1=never to 5=always. The three items factor into a single scale of voice with an internal consistency coefficient alpha = .78. The mean response was 3.57. Significant differences were found for rank with professors having more voice than others (LSM=3.61 vs 3.38), Black faculty reporting less voice than others (LSM=3.05 vs 3.50) and faculty in the B&E college reporting less voice than others (LSM=2.86 vs 3.35).

Colleagues

All respondents were asked 11 questions regarding relations with colleagues within their department. Item responses were on a four-point scale with 4 being "strongly agree" with positively worded items. Factor analysis revealed two factors: one composed of three items associated with giving and receiving feedback (Coefficient alpha = .88), and one composed of items related to trust and mutual respect (Coefficient alpha = .85). Two items did not fit the factor structure: need to work harder to be considered legitimate, and comfort raising work-family issues.

The average scores for giving and receiving feedback was 2.62, value and trust was 3.08, working harder to be considered legitimate 2.42 and work-family considerations 2.78. Analysis of variance was

conducted to test for tenure status, rank, college, sex and race effects. Statistically significant differences were

- **Giving and receiving feedback:** Black faculty rated colleagues lower than others (LSM=2.15 vs 2.67)
- **Work harder to be considered legitimate:** CNTT faculty agreed more than T/TT (LSM=3.56 vs 2.66)
- **Comfort raising work family issues:** Black faculty indicated less comfort than others (LSM=2.34 vs 2.92).

No differences were found for the “valuing and trusting” scale.

Climate for Diversity

Respondents were asked to rate the climate for diversity on a scale from poor to excellent overall and for women, faculty of color, and for LGBTQ faculty separately within their department and college.

Department: The modal response regarding climate for women was “Very Good” and “Good” for faculty of color and LGBTQ faculty. However, women rate the department climate for women (mode=Very Good) significantly lower than do men (mode=Excellent). Similarly, underrepresented minority (URM) faculty rate the department diversity climate overall (bimodal “Poor” or “Good”) and for faculty of color mode “Poor”) significantly less positive than do non-URM faculty (mode = “Good”) for both indices.

Departmental efforts to recruit diverse faculty was similarly rated as “Good” to “Very Good” by most non-URM faculty and split “Fair” or “Very Good” by URM faculty. While the comparison between men and women was more similar, women were somewhat more likely (26%) than men (17%) to indicate the department’s diversity recruiting efforts are “Fair.”

College: The modal rating of college climate for overall, women, faculty of color and LGBTQ diversity was “Good.” However, URM faculty were consistently more negative than non-URM faculty on all measures. Women provided consistently lower ratings than men on all dimensions, although the difference was not as large as the URM/non-URM difference.

Clearly majority and male faculty are less sensitive to issues of diversity than their female and URM colleagues who more likely experience the effects of negative climate for diversity.

Commitment to Diversity

Respondents were asked to indicate their disagreement or agreement on a 5-point scale with 9 items designed to reflect University policies designed to reflect a commitment to diversity. Cronbach’s alpha of .94 indicates substantial multicollinearity. The items were thus averaged to provide a single indicator of commitment to diversity. Notable differences across the population are:

- Associate professors rated commitment to diversity lower than assistants (LSM=2.56 vs 2.86)
- Black faculty rated commitment to diversity lower than others (LSM=2.32 vs 3.39)
- Male’s ratings were significantly higher than female’s (M=2.97 versus 2.74).

- Colleges were significantly different. Colleges rated highest were CHS, CANS, and B&E (LSM=3.22, 3.10 and 2.93 respectively) while colleges rated lowest were CEHD and COE (LSM=2.66 and 2.54 respectively). CAS and CEOE obtained middle ratings not significantly different from the others (LSM=2.84 and 2.70 respectively).

Qualitative analysis of personal actions to advance diversity

Faculty were asked to provide information on what they personally have done to advance diversity of faculty at UD. 183 people responded (45% of the faculty who completed the survey). Of these responses approximately 1/3 mentioned recruiting faculty and roughly the same percentage mentioned recruiting students. However, many such responses were vague, and it was not clear how the respondent had directly contributed to diversity. Others mentioned serving on caucuses or advising McNair students. Several faculty mentored students, but interestingly, very few mentioned mentoring other faculty.

Climate for Disabilities

We asked faculty about accessibility, supportiveness and policies for persons with physical, cognitive or psychological disabilities. Over a quarter of the faculty reported not knowing about accessibility and more did not know about support or policies. Overall, among those who reported knowing, most indicated ratings of moderate to great on each dimension.

| | Not at all | Some extent | Moderate | Great extent | Don't know |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| | % of Total | % of Total | % of Total | % of Total | % of Total |
| Dept Accessible | 1.42% | 16.27% | 29.95% | 26.65% | 25.71% |
| UD Accessible | 1.66% | 19.43% | 30.57% | 19.43% | 28.91% |
| Chair Supportive | 0.72% | 5.04% | 14.15% | 36.93% | 43.17% |
| Faculty Supportive | 0.72% | 7.19% | 20.62% | 33.09% | 38.37% |
| Policies Clear | 3.90% | 8.78% | 18.05% | 20.24% | 49.02% |

The tables below summarize the patterns of responses regarding accessibility, supportiveness and policies for faculty with disabilities. Those who do not have a disability, or have no experience with others who have disabilities are more likely to indicate that they don't know. However, among those who provide ratings, more positive ratings of accessibility and support are provided by those without disabilities and no experience with others who have disabilities.

| Self disability | | Not at all | Some extent | Moderate | Great extent | Don't know |
|---------------------|--------------------|------------|-------------|----------|--------------|------------|
| Have accomodation | Dept Accessible | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 3 |
| | UD Accessible | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 2 |
| | Chair Supportive | 0 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 3 |
| | Faculty Supportive | 0 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| | Policies Clear | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Not requested accom | Dept Accessible | 1 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 |
| | UD Accessible | 1 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| | Chair Supportive | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 9 |
| | Faculty Supportive | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 9 |
| | Policies Clear | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| No Disability | Dept Accessible | 3 | 59 | 113 | 100 | 102 |
| | UD Accessible | 4 | 70 | 115 | 71 | 115 |
| | Chair Supportive | 1 | 15 | 53 | 133 | 167 |
| | Faculty Supportive | 1 | 24 | 76 | 123 | 146 |
| | Policies Clear | 9 | 31 | 64 | 72 | 188 |

| Other disability | | Not at all | Some extent | Moderate | Great extent | Don't know |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------------|-------------|----------|--------------|------------|
| No experience | Dept Accessible | 0 | 24 | 52 | 42 | 78 |
| | UD Accessible | 3 | 22 | 50 | 38 | 83 |
| | Chair Supportive | 1 | 5 | 23 | 50 | 113 |
| | Faculty Supportive | 1 | 6 | 34 | 47 | 105 |
| | Policies Clear | 5 | 9 | 25 | 38 | 112 |
| Occasional experience | Dept Accessible | 4 | 38 | 57 | 50 | 26 |
| | UD Accessible | 3 | 48 | 56 | 32 | 34 |
| | Chair Supportive | 2 | 14 | 27 | 70 | 58 |
| | Faculty Supportive | 2 | 21 | 43 | 58 | 48 |
| | Policies Clear | 7 | 24 | 34 | 35 | 70 |
| Frequent experience | Dept Accessible | 1 | 7 | 16 | 20 | 3 |
| | UD Accessible | 1 | 11 | 21 | 11 | 3 |
| | Chair Supportive | 0 | 1 | 7 | 33 | 6 |
| | Faculty Supportive | 0 | 3 | 8 | 31 | 4 |
| | Policies Clear | 4 | 3 | 14 | 9 | 16 |

Conclusions: Work Climate and Conditions for Diversity

Significant differences were found by race with Black faculty reporting less voice, lower perceptions of a climate for giving and receiving feedback, and less comfort in raising family issues than do non-black faculty. Overall, faculty rate the climate for diversity as good to very good, however females view the climate as less supporting of women, and URM faculty rate the climate for diversity lower than non-URM faculty. Significant differences across colleges, faculty rank, race and sex were found for commitment to diversity. Support for faculty with disability were generally rated favorably, however faculty who have no experience with disability either were uncertain about support, or perceived supports as more favorable than those who have a disability or have experiences with others with disability. These findings consistently show that those not directly affected by climate for specific diversity factors view the climate as more positively than those of underrepresented groups.