2011 WU Faculty Survey Comparison with 2006 WU Survey

Key Indicators Summary

Medical Campus, Research Faculty

Washington University Faculty Survey 2011 – Introduction

These reports reflect a survey conducted in Spring 2011 of Washington University full time faculty. The survey asked about satisfaction with various aspects of faculty work life, climate, workload, sources of stress, mentoring and characteristics of life outside the institution.

The overall response rates to the 2011 Faculty Survey were 77% for the Danforth Campus and 58% for the Medical School. The following table provides additional detail on response rates.

	Washington University Faculty	Survey 2011	- Populati	on and R	esponse	Rates		
	Tradinington Chivoroky Faddiky		Danforth Campus Schools			Medical School		
		Surveyed	Respondents	Response Rate	Surveyed	Respondents	Response Rate	
Total	Full Time Faculty	890	683	77%	1737	999	58%	
Tenure and Track	Tenured & On Tenure Track	643	511	79%	645	396	61%	
	Clinical	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	767	413	54%	
	Research	247	172	70%	325	190	58%	
Rank	Professor	356	288	81%	474	280	59%	
	Associate Professor	159	129	81%	344	199	58%	
	Assistant Professor	169	125	74%	605	345	57%	
	Other (Instructors, Lecturers)	206	141	68%	314	175	56%	
Gender	Men	566	432	76%	1174	639	54%	
	Women	319	246	77%	561	358	64%	
	Other/Unknown	5	5		2	2		

The reports compare the 2011 WU Survey with the 2006 WU Survey and also with a peer group of faculty from nine private research universities who conducted similar faculty surveys over the last four years. External faculty were mapped by discipline to form relevant comparison groups to WU Schools. Here is a summary of the comparison groups used in the 2011 Faculty Survey reports.

Respondents - Comparison Groups							
	WU 2006	Peer Group					
Danforth - Tenured & Tenure Track	511	465	6418				
Medical - Tenured & Tenure Track	396	391	1683				
Medical Clinical	413	315	3540				
Danforth – Other Full Time Faculty	172	140	1383				
Medical - Research	190	263	n.a.				

If you have questions or comments, please contact Lynn McCloskey, Assistant Provost – Analysis, lynn.mccloskey@wustl.edu.

	M	ean	difference	Mean		difference
	WU 2006	WU 2011	stat significant (p<05)?	Male	Female	stat significant (p<05)?
Overall satisfaction						
Satisfied being a faculty member	3.90	3.94		3.90	3.99	
Aspects of work life - satisfaction	_					
Salary	3.29	3.26		3.27	3.25	
Teaching responsibilities	4.03	3.64	2011 less satisfied	3.71	3.54	
Advising responsibilities	4.05	3.83		3.87	3.78	
Committee / administrative responsibilities	3.74	3.46	2011 less satisfied	3.55	3.37	
Library resources	4.70	4.49	2011 less satisfied	4.50	4.49	
Clerical / administrative staff	4.07	4.01		4.11	3.90	
Computer resources	4.39	4.10	2011 less satisfied	4.08	4.13	
Computing support staff	4.01	4.04		4.02	4.07	
eaching resources						
Quality of graduate students	4.41	4.33		4.35	4.29	
Quality of professional students	4.52	4.30	2011 less satisfied	4.41	4.13	
Time available scholarly work	3.85	3.73		3.90	3.51	
Overall teaching resources				4.39	3.71	
Classroom space	4.22	4.30		4.41	4.19	
Access to teaching assistants	3.52	3.78		4.13	3.50	
Support for innovation				4.08	3.33	
Support for improving learning				4.00	3.50	
Research resources - satisfaction						
Research / scholarship resources				3.95	3.80	
Start-up funds	2.81	2.73		2.57	2.94	
Support for securing grants	3.64	3.38		3.51	3.20	
Support for managing grants				3.89	3.72	
Technical / research staff	4.24	3.94	2011 less satisfied	4.09	3.74	
)ther						
Space allocation process				3.58	3.66	
Office space	3.76	3.63		3.59	3.67	
Lab / research space	3.91	3.71		3.79	3.59	

Key to the means:

Satisfaction scale: 1=very dissatisfied; 2=somewhat dissatisfied; 3=neither dissatisfied nor satisfied; 4=somewhat satisfied; 5=very satisfied

	Mean		difference	Mean		difference
	WU 2006	WU 2011	stat significant (p<05)?	Male	Female	stat significant (p<05)?
partmental climate - agree / disagree questic	ns					
feel that my department / unit is adequately supported and valued by the leadership of WU.	3.66	3.90	2011 agree more	3.97	3.82	
My chair / director / dean creates a collegial and supportive environment.	3.93	4.11		4.10	4.13	
My chair / director / dean helps me obtain the resources I need.	3.78	3.81		3.76	3.88	
have a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of my department / unit.	2.74	3.01		3.05	2.97	
My colleagues value my research / scholarship.	4.00	3.89		3.82	3.97	
l am satisfied with opportunities to collaborate with faculty in my primary department / unit.	3.97	3.95		3.97	3.93	
am satisfied with opportunities to collaborate with faculty in other units at my Institution.	3.98	4.02		4.03	4.00	
Interdisciplinary research is recognized and rewarded by my department / unit.	3.77	3.80		3.52	4.13	women agree more
I can navigate the unwritten rules concerning how one is to conduct oneself as a faculty member.	3.65	3.67		3.58	3.78	
My department / unit is a good fit for me.	3.84	4.00		3.95	4.07	
My department / unit is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and / or family responsibilities when scheduling departmental / unit	3.77	3.74		3.61	3.89	
feel excluded from an informal network in my department / unit.	2.92	2.82		2.85	2.78	
I have to work harder than some of my colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar.	3.06	3.20		3.12	3.29	
My dept / unit creates a welcoming environment for faculty who are women.	3.87	3.82		3.91	3.73	
My dept / unit creates a welcoming environment for faculty who are underrepresented minorities.	3.83	3.74		3.74	3.75	

Key to the means:

Dept climate scale: 1=strongly disagree; 2=somewhat agree; 3=neither agree nor agree; 4=somewhat agree; 5=strongly agree

	Mean		difference	Mean		difference	
	WU 2006	WU 2011	stat significant (p<05)?	Male	Female	stat significant (p<05)?	
Identity & Bias issues							
Comfortable in expressing various identities				2.87	2.82		
To what extent experienced bias/exclusion by leadership				1.26	1.46	women perceived more bias	
To what extent experienced bias/exclusion by colleagues				1.17	1.33	women perceived more bias	
To what extent experienced bias/exclusion by students				1.09	1.16		
Mentoring - how helpful							
Assigned formal mentoring helpful				3.81	4.13		
Chosen formal mentoring helpful	-			4.52	4.57		
Informal mentoring helpful - WU mentors	1			4.32	4.35		
Progress in academic career							
Research / scholarly work - valued for acad career	3.04	3.06		2.90	3.26	women perceived overvalued	
Teaching contributions- valued for acad career	2.44	2.11	2011 perceived undervalued	2.16	2.07		
Clinical work - valued for acad career	2.60	3.04	2011 perceived undervalued	3.04	3.04		
Administrative / committee service - valued for acad	2.51	2.43		2.52	2.33		
Department / unit supportive - relief	4.11	4.64	2011 more supportive	4.50	4.68		
Other							
Rate reasonableness of workload	3.28	3.37		3.32	3.44		
Average number of hours in workweek	52.92	52.18		51.81	52.65		
How likely to leave in next 3 years	2.81	2.88		2.82	2.95		
How satisfied with how role as a faculty member fits with your life outside WU?				3.70	3.68		

Key to the means:

Identities scale 1=very uncomfortable; 2=uncomfortable; 3=comfortable; 4=very comfortable

Bias scale: 1=not at all; 2=to some extent; 3=to a great extent

Mentoring helpfulness scale: 1=very unhelpful; 2=somewhat unhelpful; 3=neither helpful nor unhelpful; 4=somewhat helpful; 5=very helpful

Work items valued scale: 1=very undervalued; 2=somewhat undervalued; 3=valued appropriately; 4=somewhat overvalued; 5=very overvalued

Relief supportiveness scale: 1=very unsupportive; 2=somewhat unsupportive; 3=neither supportive nor unsupportive; 4=somewhat supportive; 5=very supportive

Workload scale: 1=much too light; 2=too light; 3=about right; 4=too heavy; 5=much too heavy

Likely to leave scale: 1=very unlikely; 2=somewhat unlikely; 3=neither likely nor unlikely; 4=somewhat likely; 5=very likely

Faculty role fits with life outside WU scale: 1=very dissatisfied; 2=somewhat dissatisfied; 3=neither dissatisfied nor satisfied; 4=somewhat satisfied; 5=very satisfied