

**Collaborative On Academic Careers in Higher Education
Highlights**

September 25, 2006

| | Total Faculty N | Male Faculty N | % Males | Female Faculty N | % Females | White Faculty N | % White Faculty | Faculty of Color N | % Faculty of Color | Missing Race Data |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------|------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| University Population | 7803 | 4670 | 60% | 3118 | 40% | 5714 | 74% | 2040 | 26% | 49 |
| University Respondents | 4515 | 2534 | 56% | 1981 | 44% | 3377 | 75% | 1129 | 25% | 9 |
| University Response Rate | 58% | 54% | -- | 64% | -- | 59% | -- | 55% | -- | -- |
| College Population | 505 | 255 | 50% | 250 | 50% | 339 | 67% | 165 | 33% | 1 |
| College Respondents | 351 | 183 | 52% | 168 | 48% | 261 | 75% | 89 | 25% | 1 |
| College Response Rate | 70% | 72% | -- | 67% | -- | 77% | -- | 54% | -- | -- |
| Total Population | 8308 | 4925 | 59% | 3368 | 41% | 6054 | 73% | 2205 | 27% | 50 |
| Total Respondents | 4866 | 2717 | 56% | 2149 | 44% | 3638 | 75% | 1218 | 25% | 10 |
| Total Response Rate | 59% | 55% | -- | 64% | -- | 60% | -- | 55% | -- | -- |

NOTE: We are missing gender data for 15 faculty members included in the university population file which is why the total number of males (4670) and females (3118) at universities (7788) does not equal the total faculty university population (7803) in the above table, but the race data equate.

A total of 8,308 full-time pre-tenure faculty at 51 colleges and universities received the COACHE survey and 4,866 responded (overall response rate = 59%).

The COACHE survey is organized around five themes: (a) Tenure; (b) Nature of the Work; (c) Policies and Practices; (d) Climate, Culture, and Collegiality; and (e) Global Satisfaction.

(a) Tenure. Part 1.

The survey asked junior faculty to rate their level of clarity¹ surrounding four aspects of tenure: process, criteria (what things are evaluated), standards (the performance threshold), and body of evidence (the portfolio).

Clarity, Overall

Junior faculty are *most clear about process* (mean = 3.63), followed by criteria (3.53), followed by body of evidence (3.46), and least clear about standards (3.20). The issue of tenure standards has the largest standard deviation suggesting that there is more variance around that issue than the others.

Table 1. Tenure Clarity, Overall

| Clarity | Overall Mean |
|------------------|--------------|
| Process | 3.63 |
| Criteria | 3.53 |
| Standards | 3.20 |
| Body of evidence | 3.46 |

Clarity, by Gender

There is a significant difference² between males and females on clarity of tenure process, criteria, standards, and body of evidence, with females reporting less clarity in all cases.³

Table 2. Tenure Clarity, by Gender

| Clarity | Female Mean | Male Mean |
|------------------|-------------|-----------|
| Process | 3.58 *** | 3.67 |
| Criteria | 3.51 ** | 3.55 |
| Standards | 3.16 ** | 3.23 |
| Body of evidence | 3.41 *** | 3.50 |

¹ Scale: 5 = Very clear, 4 = Fairly clear, 3 = Neither clear nor unclear, 2 = Fairly unclear, 1 = Very unclear

² Significance levels; *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05 [The number of asterisks indicates the level of the difference, with more stars meaning a stronger finding – we are surer, statistically speaking, of a difference in the two categories compared.]

³ These findings raise some interesting questions for me, including: Are men really clearer or are they just more confident? If they are clearer, what accounts for that? If they are more confident, what accounts for that?

Clarity, by Race

There is a significant difference between white faculty and faculty of color on clarity of tenure standards, with white faculty reporting less clarity.

Table 3. Tenure Clarity, by Race

| Clarity | White Faculty Mean | Faculty of Color Mean |
|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Process | 3.64 | 3.61 |
| Criteria | 3.53 | 3.54 |
| Standards | 3.17 * | 3.30 |
| Body of evidence | 3.45 | 3.46 |

Clarity, by Institutional Control

There is a significant difference between faculty at private and public institutions on clarity of the tenure process, the criteria for tenure, and tenure standards, with faculty at private institutions reporting less clarity.

Table 4. Tenure Clarity, by Institutional Control

| Clarity | Private Faculty Mean | Public Faculty Mean |
|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Process | 3.57 ** | 3.65 |
| Criteria | 3.49 * | 3.54 |
| Standards | 3.09 ** | 3.23 |
| Body of evidence | 3.44 | 3.46 |

Clarity, by Institutional Type

There is a significant difference between faculty at colleges and universities on clarity of the tenure process, with faculty at universities reporting less clarity.

Table 5. Tenure Clarity, by Institutional Type

| Clarity | College Faculty Mean | University Faculty Mean |
|------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Process | 3.75 | 3.62 * |
| Criteria | 3.58 | 3.53 |
| Standards | 3.16 | 3.2 |
| Body of evidence | 3.55 | 3.45 |

Clarity, by Gender at each Institutional Type

There is a significant difference between female and male faculty at colleges on clarity of the tenure process, and the body of evidence that will be considered in the tenure decision, with females at colleges reporting less clarity.

There is a significant difference between female and male faculty at universities on clarity of the tenure process, and the body of evidence that will be considered in the tenure decision, with females at universities reporting less clarity.

Table 6. Tenure Clarity, by Gender at each Institutional Type

| Clarity | College Faculty Mean | | University Faculty Mean | |
|------------------|----------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|
| | Females | Males | Females | Males |
| Gender | | | | |
| Process | 3.59 ** | 3.89 | 3.58 * | 3.65 |
| Criteria | 3.5 | 3.66 | 3.51 | 3.54 |
| Standards | 3.07 | 3.25 | 3.17 | 3.23 |
| Body of evidence | 3.41 * | 3.69 | 3.41 * | 3.48 |

(a) Tenure. Part 2.

Next, in the Tenure section, we asked junior faculty to rate their level of clarity surrounding the tenure expectations for their performance as: a scholar (research and creative work); a teacher; an advisor to students; a colleague in their department; a campus citizen (e.g., service, committees); and a member of the broader community (e.g., outreach).

Expectations Clarity, Overall

Junior faculty are *most clear about the tenure expectations for their performance as a scholar* (3.80), followed closely by their performance as a teacher (3.76). After that, there is a fairly large drop off to the clarity of expectations for their performance as an advisor (3.30), colleague (3.28), campus citizen (3.25), and member of the broader community (2.99).

Table 7. Clarity of Performance Expectations for Tenure, Overall

| Clarity | Overall Mean |
|---|--------------|
| A scholar/producer of creative work | 3.80 |
| A teacher | 3.76 |
| An advisor to students | 3.30 |
| A colleague in your department | 3.28 |
| A campus citizen (e.g., service, committees) | 3.25 |
| A member of the broader community (e.g. outreach) | 2.99 |

Expectations Clarity, by Gender

There is a significant difference between males and females on clarity of the tenure expectations for their performance as a scholar/producer of creative work, with females reporting less clarity.

Table 8. Clarity of Performance Expectations for Tenure, by Gender

| Clarity | Female Mean | Male Mean |
|---|-------------|-----------|
| A scholar/producer of creative work | 3.71 *** | 3.86 |
| A teacher | 3.79 | 3.74 |
| An advisor to students | 3.31 | 3.29 |
| A colleague in your department | 3.26 | 3.29 |
| A campus citizen (e.g., service, committees) | 3.26 | 3.24 |
| A member of the broader community (e.g. outreach) | 3.00 | 2.99 |

Expectations Clarity, by Race

There is a significant difference between white faculty and faculty of color on clarity of the tenure expectations for their performance as a scholar/producer of creative work, as an advisor to students, and as a member of the broader community, with white faculty reporting less clarity.

Table 9. Clarity of Performance Expectations for Tenure, by Race

| Clarity | White Faculty Mean | Faculty of Color Mean |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------|
| A scholar/producer of creative work | 3.75 *** | 3.96 |
| A teacher | 3.73 | 3.85 |
| An advisor to students | 3.25 ** | 3.44 |
| A colleague in your department | 3.24 | 3.38 |
| A campus citizen (e.g., service, committees) | 3.22 | 3.33 |
| A member of the broader community (e.g. outreach) | 2.94 ** | 3.13 |

Expectations Clarity, by Institutional Control

There is a significant difference between faculty at private and public institutions on clarity of the tenure expectations for faculty performance as a scholar/producer of creative work, as a teacher, as a campus citizen, and as a member of the broader community, with faculty at private institutions reporting less clarity.

Table 10. Clarity of Performance Expectations for Tenure, by Institutional Control

| Clarity | Private Faculty Mean | Public Faculty Mean |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|
| A scholar/producer of creative work | 3.73 * | 3.81 |
| A teacher | 3.71 * | 3.77 |
| An advisor to students | 3.28 | 3.30 |
| A colleague in your department | 3.25 | 3.28 |
| A campus citizen (e.g., service, committees) | 3.15 *** | 3.27 |
| A member of the broader community (e.g. outreach) | 2.86 *** | 3.02 |

Expectations Clarity, by Institutional Type

There is a significant difference between faculty at colleges and universities on clarity of the tenure expectations for faculty performance as a scholar/producer of creative work, with faculty at colleges reporting less clarity.

There is a significant difference between faculty at colleges and universities on clarity of the tenure expectations for faculty performance as a teacher, as an advisor to students, as a colleague, and as a campus citizen, with faculty at universities reporting less clarity.

Table 11. Clarity of Performance Expectations for Tenure, by Institutional Type

| Clarity | College Faculty Mean | | University Faculty Mean | |
|---|----------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | F | M | F | M |
| A scholar/producer of creative work | 3.52 *** | | 3.82 | |
| A teacher | 4.12 | | 3.73 *** | |
| An advisor to students | 3.57 | | 3.27 *** | |
| A colleague in your department | 3.42 | | 3.26 ** | |
| A campus citizen (e.g., service, committees) | 3.53 | | 3.23 *** | |
| A member of the broader community (e.g. outreach) | 3.01 | | 2.99 | |

Expectations Clarity, by Gender at each Institutional Type

There are no significant differences between female and male faculty at colleges on clarity of the tenure performance expectations.

There is a significant difference between female and male faculty at universities on clarity of the tenure expectations for faculty performance as a scholar/producer of creative work, with female faculty at universities reporting less clarity.

Table 12. Clarity of Performance Expectations for Tenure, by Gender at each Institutional Type

| Clarity | College Faculty Mean | | University Faculty Mean | |
|---|----------------------|------|-------------------------|------|
| | F | M | F | M |
| Gender | | | | |
| A scholar/producer of creative work | 3.4 | 3.62 | 3.74 *** | 3.88 |
| A teacher | 4.05 | 4.19 | 3.76 | 3.7 |
| An advisor to students | 3.64 | 3.49 | 3.28 | 3.27 |
| A colleague in your department | 3.41 | 3.43 | 3.24 | 3.28 |
| A campus citizen (e.g., service, committees) | 3.47 | 3.58 | 3.24 | 3.21 |
| A member of the broader community (e.g. outreach) | 3.01 | 3.01 | 3 | 2.98 |

(a) Tenure. Part 3.

Following the series of questions about the clarity of performance expectations in six categories, we asked junior faculty to rate how reasonable⁴ they felt those expectations were. Here, we report findings based only on those respondents who said that the expectations for a given item were either Very Clear (5) or Fairly Clear (4) because if respondents felt that the expectations were unclear, it doesn't make sense to analyze their opinion of reasonableness.

Reasonableness of Expectations, Overall

Junior faculty reported that the tenure expectations for *their performance as a colleague in their department are most reasonable* (4.43), followed closely by their performance as a teacher (4.40). Junior faculty reported that the tenure expectations for *their performance as a scholar are the least reasonable* (4.22); still all scores are above 4, fairly reasonable.

Table 13. Reasonableness of Performance Expectations for Tenure, Overall

| Reasonableness | Overall Mean |
|---|--------------|
| A scholar/producer of creative work | 4.22 |
| A teacher | 4.40 |
| An advisor to students | 4.36 |
| A colleague in your department | 4.43 |
| A campus citizen (e.g., service, committees) | 4.29 |
| A member of the broader community (e.g. outreach) | 4.36 |

Reasonableness of Expectations, by Gender

There is a significant difference between males and females on reasonableness of the tenure expectations for their performance as a scholar/producer of creative work, as a teacher, as an advisor to students, as a campus citizen, and as a member of the broader community, with females reporting less reasonableness.

Table 14. Reasonableness of Performance Expectations for Tenure, by Gender

| Reasonableness | Female Mean | Male Mean |
|---|-------------|-----------|
| A scholar/producer of creative work | 4.06 *** | 4.34 |
| A teacher | 4.35 ** | 4.44 |
| An advisor to students | 4.28 *** | 4.42 |
| A colleague in your department | 4.40 | 4.45 |
| A campus citizen (e.g., service, committees) | 4.27 * | 4.31 |
| A member of the broader community (e.g. outreach) | 4.32 * | 4.40 |

⁴ Scale: 5 = Very reasonable, 4 = Fairly reasonable, 3 = Neither reasonable nor unreasonable, 2 = Fairly unreasonable, 1 = Very unreasonable

Reasonableness of Expectations, by Race

There is a significant difference between white faculty and faculty of color on reasonableness of the tenure expectations for their performance as a teacher, with faculty of color reporting less reasonableness.

Table 15. Reasonableness of Performance Expectations for Tenure, by Race

| Reasonableness | White Faculty Mean | Faculty of Color Mean |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------|
| A scholar/producer of creative work | 4.20 | 4.28 |
| A teacher | 4.42 | 4.36 ** |
| An advisor to students | 4.36 | 4.34 |
| A colleague in your department | 4.45 | 4.36 |
| A campus citizen (e.g., service, committees) | 4.30 | 4.25 |
| A member of the broader community (e.g. outreach) | 4.39 | 4.29 |

Reasonableness of Expectations, by Institutional Control

There is a significant difference between faculty at private and public institutions on reasonableness of the tenure expectations for faculty performance in five out of six areas, with faculty at private institutions reporting less reasonableness.

Table 16. Reasonableness of Performance Expectations for Tenure, by Institutional Control

| Reasonableness | Private Faculty Mean | Public Faculty Mean |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|
| A scholar/producer of creative work | 4.12 * | 4.24 |
| A teacher | 4.35 ** | 4.42 |
| An advisor to students | 4.27 ** | 4.38 |
| A colleague in your department | 4.32 ** | 4.45 |
| A campus citizen (e.g., service, committees) | 4.22 * | 4.30 |
| A member of the broader community (e.g. outreach) | 4.31 | 4.37 |

Reasonableness of Expectations, by Institutional Type

There is a significant difference between faculty at colleges and universities on reasonableness of the tenure expectations for faculty performance as an advisor to students and as a campus citizen, with faculty at colleges reporting less reasonableness.

Table 17. Reasonableness of Performance Expectations for Tenure, by Institutional Type

| Reasonableness | College Faculty Mean | University Faculty Mean |
|---|----------------------|-------------------------|
| A scholar/producer of creative work | 4.27 | 4.21 |
| A teacher | 4.35 | 4.41 |
| An advisor to students | 4.24 * | 4.37 |
| A colleague in your department | 4.36 | 4.43 |
| A campus citizen (e.g., service, committees) | 4.09 *** | 4.31 |
| A member of the broader community (e.g. outreach) | 4.27 | 4.37 |

Reasonableness of Expectations, by Gender at each Institutional Type

There are no significant differences between female and male faculty at colleges on reasonableness of expectations for tenure.

There is a significant difference between female and male faculty at universities on reasonableness of the tenure expectations for faculty performance as a scholar/producer of creative work, as a teacher, as an advisor to students, and as a member of the broader community, with females at universities reporting less reasonableness.

Table 18. Reasonableness of Performance Expectations for Tenure, by Gender at each Institutional Type

| Reasonableness | College Faculty Mean | | University Faculty Mean | |
|---|----------------------|------|-------------------------|------|
| | F | M | F | M |
| Gender | | | | |
| A scholar/producer of creative work | 4.15 | 4.38 | 4.05 *** | 4.34 |
| A teacher | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.36 ** | 4.45 |
| An advisor to students | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.28 *** | 4.44 |
| A colleague in your department | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.4 | 4.46 |
| A campus citizen (e.g., service, committees) | 4.01 | 4.16 | 4.29 | 4.32 |
| A member of the broader community (e.g. outreach) | 4.26 | 4.27 | 4.33 * | 4.41 |

(b) Nature of Work

In the next series of survey questions, we asked junior faculty to rate their level of satisfaction⁵ with a number of aspects of the work, the workplace, and support services.

Our analysis presented here examines satisfaction differences on:

- A single question about how faculty spend their time at work
- A composite of several questions about teaching
 - Level of courses taught
 - Number of courses taught
 - Degree of influence over which courses are taught
 - Discretion over content of courses taught
 - Number of students taught
 - Quality of undergraduates taught/interacted with
 - Quality of graduates taught/interacted with
- A composite of several questions about research
 - Research expectations
 - Amount of time to conduct research
 - Amount of external funding required
 - Influence over research focus
- A composite of several questions about support services
 - Clerical/administrative services
 - Research services
 - Teaching services
 - Computing services

⁵ Scale: 5 = Very satisfied, 4 = Fairly satisfied, 3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2 = Fairly dissatisfied, 1 = Very dissatisfied

Satisfaction with Nature of Work Variables, Overall

Junior faculty express the **most satisfaction with aspects of teaching** (mean = 4.02), followed by how they spend their time (3.77). Support services and research composite scores are 3.52 and 3.5 respectively.

Table 19. Satisfaction with Nature of Work Variables, Overall

| Satisfaction | Overall Mean |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| How spend time | 3.77 |
| Teaching composite | 4.02 |
| Research composite | 3.50 |
| Support services composite | 3.52 |

Satisfaction with Nature of Work Variables, by Gender

There is a significant difference between males and females on satisfaction with how they spend their time at work, the research composite, and support services, with females reporting less satisfaction.

Table 20. Satisfaction with Nature of Work Variables, by Gender

| Satisfaction | Female Mean | Male Mean |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------|
| How spend time | 3.68 *** | 3.85 |
| Teaching composite | 4.03 | 4.01 |
| Research composite | 3.36 *** | 3.61 |
| Support services composite | 3.48 ** | 3.55 |

Satisfaction with Nature of Work Variables, by Race

There is a significant difference between white faculty and faculty of color on satisfaction with the teaching composite, with faculty of color expressing less satisfaction.

There is a significant difference between white faculty and faculty of color on satisfaction with support services, with white faculty expressing less satisfaction.

Table 21. Satisfaction with Nature of Work Variables, by Race

| Satisfaction | White Faculty Mean | Faculty of Color Mean |
|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| How spend time | 3.76 | 3.83 |
| Teaching composite | 4.04 | 3.95 ** |
| Research composite | 3.49 | 3.52 |
| Support services composite | 3.49 * | 3.61 |

Satisfaction with Nature of Work Variables, by Institutional Control

There is a significant difference between faculty at private and public institutions on satisfaction with how junior faculty spend their time, with faculty at private institutions reporting less satisfaction.

There is a significant difference between faculty at private and public institutions on satisfaction with the teaching composite and with the research composite, with faculty at public institutions reporting less satisfaction.

Table 22. Satisfaction with Nature of Work Variables, by Institutional Control

| Satisfaction | Private Faculty Mean | Public Faculty Mean |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| How spend time | 3.73 * | 3.79 |
| Teaching composite | 4.23 | 3.96 *** |
| Research composite | 3.59 | 3.47 * |
| Support services composite | 3.60 | 3.50 |

Satisfaction with Nature of Work Variables, by Institutional Type

There is a significant difference between faculty at colleges and universities on satisfaction with the research composite, with faculty at colleges reporting less satisfaction.

There is a significant difference between faculty at colleges and universities on satisfaction with the teaching composite, with faculty at universities reporting less satisfaction.

Table 23. Satisfaction with Nature of Work Variables, by Institutional Type

| Satisfaction | College Faculty Mean | University Faculty Mean |
|----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| How spend time | 3.78 | 3.77 |
| Teaching composite | 4.17 | 4.01 *** |
| Research composite | 3.41 * | 3.50 |
| Support services composite | 3.58 | 3.52 |

Satisfaction with Nature of Work Variables, by Gender at each Institutional Type

There is a significant difference between female and male faculty at colleges on satisfaction with the research composite, with females reporting less satisfaction.

There is a significant difference between female and male faculty at universities on satisfaction with how they spend their time, and on the research composite, and on the support services composite, with females at universities reporting less satisfaction.

Table 24. Satisfaction with Nature of Work Variables, by Gender at each Institutional Type

| Satisfaction | College Faculty Mean | | University Faculty Mean | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|------|-------------------------|------|
| | F | M | F | M |
| Gender | | | | |
| How spend time | 3.72 | 3.83 | 3.68 *** | 3.85 |
| Teaching composite | 4.23 | 4.11 | 4.01 | 4.00 |
| Research composite | 3.28 ** | 3.52 | 3.37 *** | 3.61 |
| Support services composite | 3.55 | 3.60 | 3.48 * | 3.55 |

(c) Policies & Practices, Part 1

In the next section of the survey, respondents were asked to rate the importance⁶ of 16 policies (see table 17 below) to their success, and then to rate the effectiveness⁷ of those policies on their campuses. For those who said that the following policy was “somewhat” or “very” important⁸, here are the mean effectiveness scores:

Policy Effectiveness Ratings, Overall

Junior faculty (for whom the policy is very or somewhat important) rated the following policies as *least effective: childcare, financial assistance with housing, spousal/partner hiring programs, professional assistance in obtaining outside funding, and formal mentoring*, although no policy scored higher than 3.66 in effectiveness on a 5-point scale.

Table 25. Mean Effectiveness Ratings, Overall

| Policies & Practices | Mean |
|---|-------------|
| Childcare | 2.32 |
| Financial assistance with housing | 2.34 |
| Spousal/partner hiring program | 2.66 |
| Professional assistance in obtaining external grants | 2.66 |
| Formal mentoring | 2.88 |
| Paid/unpaid personal leave during probationary period | 3.00 |
| Upper limit on committee assignments | 3.16 |
| Stop-the-tenure-clock provisions | 3.18 |
| Peer reviews of teaching and research | 3.28 |
| Paid/unpaid research leave during probationary period | 3.28 |
| Professional assistance for improving teaching | 3.43 |
| Written summaries of periodic performance reviews | 3.45 |
| Periodic formal performance reviews | 3.57 |
| Upper limit on teaching obligations | 3.60 |
| Travel funds | 3.67 |
| Informal mentoring | 3.66 |

⁶ Scale: 5 = Very important, 4 = Somewhat important, 3 = Neither important nor unimportant, 2 = Somewhat unimportant, 1 = Very unimportant

⁷ Scale: 5 = Very effective, 4 = Somewhat effective, 3 = Neither effective nor ineffective, 2 = Somewhat ineffective, 1 = Very ineffective

⁸ For purposes of this analysis, we only included those who felt the policy was important to their success, as it is less critical to understand the perceived effectiveness of policies that don’t matter much to respondents.

Policy Effectiveness Ratings, by Gender

There is a significant difference between males and females on effectiveness ratings for childcare, an upper limit on committee assignments, and an upper limit of teaching load, with females reporting less effectiveness.

There is a significant difference between males and females on effectiveness ratings of stop-the-tenure-clock provisions, and with peer reviews of teaching and research, with males reporting less effectiveness.

Table 26. Mean Effectiveness Ratings, by Gender

| Policies & Practices | Female Mean | Male Mean |
|---|--------------------|------------------|
| Childcare | 2.26 * | 2.37 |
| Financial assistance with housing | 2.34 | 2.34 |
| Spousal/partner hiring program | 2.73 | 2.61 |
| Professional assistance in obtaining external grants | 2.67 | 2.65 |
| Formal mentoring | 2.93 | 2.84 |
| Paid/unpaid personal leave during probationary period | 3.08 | 2.91 |
| Upper limit on committee assignments | 3.09 ** | 3.21 |
| Stop-the-tenure-clock provisions | 3.35 | 3.01 ** |
| Peer reviews of teaching and research | 3.30 | 3.27 * |
| Paid/unpaid research leave during probationary period | 3.34 | 3.23 |
| Professional assistance for improving teaching | 3.48 | 3.38 |
| Written summaries of periodic performance reviews | 3.49 | 3.42 |
| Periodic formal performance reviews | 3.60 | 3.54 |
| Upper limit on teaching obligations | 3.56 ** | 3.63 |
| Travel funds | 3.76 | 3.60 |
| Informal mentoring | 3.69 | 3.64 |

Policy Effectiveness Ratings, by Race

There is a significant difference between white faculty and faculty of color on effectiveness ratings of formal mentoring, with white faculty expressing less effectiveness.

Table 27. Mean Effectiveness Ratings, by Race

| Policies & Practices | White Faculty Mean | Faculty of Color Mean |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Childcare | 2.27 | 2.45 |
| Financial assistance with housing | 2.35 | 2.32 |
| Spousal/partner hiring program | 2.65 | 2.67 |
| Professional assistance in obtaining external grants | 2.60 | 2.81 |
| Formal mentoring | 2.81 *** | 3.07 |
| Paid/unpaid personal leave during probationary period | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| Upper limit on committee assignments | 3.12 | 3.25 |
| Stop-the-tenure-clock provisions | 3.22 | 3.09 |
| Peer reviews of teaching and research | 3.25 | 3.38 |
| Paid/unpaid research leave during probationary period | 3.28 | 3.27 |
| Professional assistance for improving teaching | 3.41 | 3.46 |
| Written summaries of periodic performance reviews | 3.43 | 3.51 |
| Periodic formal performance reviews | 3.54 | 3.64 |
| Upper limit on teaching obligations | 3.59 | 3.62 |
| Travel funds | 3.68 | 3.67 |
| Informal mentoring | 3.67 | 3.64 |

Policy Effectiveness Ratings, by Institutional Control

There is a significant difference between faculty at private and public institutions on effectiveness ratings of spousal/partner hiring programs, professional assistance obtaining external grants, formal mentoring, peer reviews of teaching and research, periodic formal performance reviews, and written summaries of those reviews, with faculty at private institutions reporting less effectiveness.

There is a significant difference between faculty at private and public institutions on effectiveness ratings of financial assistance with housing, paid or unpaid personal leave, an upper limit on committee assignments, stop-the-clock provisions, paid or unpaid research leave, an upper limit on teaching obligations, and travel funds, with faculty at public institutions reporting less effectiveness.

Table 28. Mean Effectiveness Ratings, by Institutional Control

| Policies & Practices | Private Faculty Mean | Public Faculty Mean |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Childcare | 2.31 | 2.32 |
| Financial assistance with housing | 2.83 | 2.07 *** |
| Spousal/partner hiring program | 2.41 ** | 2.71 |
| Professional assistance in obtaining external grants | 2.59 * | 2.67 |
| Formal mentoring | 2.81 * | 2.90 |
| Paid/unpaid personal leave during probationary period | 3.37 | 2.91 *** |
| Upper limit on committee assignments | 3.32 | 3.12 * |
| Stop-the-tenure-clock provisions | 3.38 | 3.13 * |
| Peer reviews of teaching and research | 3.17 ** | 3.31 |
| Paid/unpaid research leave during probationary period | 3.89 | 3.10 *** |
| Professional assistance for improving teaching | 3.51 | 3.41 |
| Written summaries of periodic performance reviews | 3.28 *** | 3.49 |
| Periodic formal performance reviews | 3.42 *** | 3.60 |
| Upper limit on teaching obligations | 3.83 | 3.55 ** |
| Travel funds | 3.96 | 3.61 *** |
| Informal mentoring | 3.69 | 3.65 |

Policy Effectiveness Ratings, by Institutional Type

There is a significant difference between faculty at colleges and universities on effectiveness ratings of financial assistance with housing, professional assistance obtaining external grants, formal mentoring, paid or unpaid personal leave, stop-the-clock provisions, peer reviews of teaching and research, paid or unpaid research leave, travel funds, and informal mentoring, with faculty at universities reporting less effectiveness.

Table 29. Mean Effectiveness Ratings, by Institutional Type

| Policies & Practices | College Faculty Mean | University Faculty Mean |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Childcare | 2.33 | 2.32 |
| Financial assistance with housing | 3.15 | 2.21 *** |
| Spousal/partner hiring program | 2.53 | 2.67 |
| Professional assistance in obtaining external grants | 2.94 | 2.64 *** |
| Formal mentoring | 3.14 | 2.95 * |
| Paid/unpaid personal leave during probationary period | 3.68 | 2.95 *** |
| Upper limit on committee assignments | 3.18 | 3.15 |
| Stop-the-tenure-clock provisions | 3.51 | 3.16 * |
| Peer reviews of teaching and research | 3.45 | 3.27 * |
| Paid/unpaid research leave during probationary period | 3.97 | 3.22 *** |
| Professional assistance for improving teaching | 3.34 | 3.43 |
| Written summaries of periodic performance reviews | 3.52 | 3.47 |
| Periodic formal performance reviews | 3.67 | 3.56 |
| Upper limit on teaching obligations | 3.57 | 3.60 |
| Travel funds | 4.08 | 3.64 *** |
| Informal mentoring | 3.96 | 3.68 *** |

Policy Effectiveness Ratings, by Gender at each Institutional Type

There are no significant differences between female and male faculty at colleges on policy effectiveness.

There is a significant difference between female and male faculty at universities on effectiveness ratings of an upper limit on committee assignments, with females at universities reporting less effectiveness.

There is a significant difference between female and male faculty at universities on effectiveness ratings of formal mentoring, paid or unpaid personal leave, stop-the-clock provisions, paid or unpaid research leave, professional assistance for improving teaching, periodic formal performance reviews, and travel funds, with males at universities reporting less effectiveness.

Table 30. Mean Effectiveness Ratings, by Gender at each Institutional Type

| Policies & Practices | College Faculty Mean | | University Faculty Mean | |
|---|----------------------|------|-------------------------|----------|
| | F | M | F | M |
| Gender | | | | |
| Childcare | 2.39 | 2.28 | 2.25 | 2.37 |
| Financial assistance with housing | 3.23 | 3.08 | 2.17 | 2.24 |
| Spousal/partner hiring program | 2.41 | 2.64 | 2.74 | 2.61 |
| Professional assistance in obtaining external grants | 3.11 | 2.79 | 2.63 | 2.64 |
| Formal mentoring | 3.10 | 3.18 | 3.00 | 2.90 * |
| Paid/unpaid personal leave during probationary period | 3.70 | 3.67 | 3.03 | 2.86 * |
| Upper limit on committee assignments | 3.08 | 3.27 | 3.09 * | 3.21 |
| Stop-the-tenure-clock provisions | 3.67 | 3.29 | 3.33 | 3.00 *** |
| Peer reviews of teaching and research | 3.38 | 3.50 | 3.29 | 3.26 |
| Paid/unpaid research leave during probationary period | 3.96 | 3.98 | 3.28 | 3.16 * |
| Professional assistance for improving teaching | 3.31 | 3.35 | 3.49 | 3.38 * |
| Written summaries of periodic performance reviews | 3.50 | 3.54 | 3.51 | 3.45 |
| Periodic formal performance reviews | 3.54 | 3.79 | 3.61 | 3.52 * |
| Upper limit on teaching obligations | 3.52 | 3.62 | 3.56 | 3.64 |
| Travel funds | 3.96 | 4.19 | 3.74 | 3.55 *** |
| Informal mentoring | 3.90 | 4.01 | 3.69 | 3.67 |

(c) Policies & Practices, Part 2 – Work-Family and Compensation

This section of the survey concluded with four questions about the compatibility of the tenure-track and having and raising children.

The analysis presented here examines differences on:

- A composite score on these four items
 - My institution does what it can to make **having children** and the tenure-track compatible⁹
 - My institution does what it can to make **raising children** and the tenure-track compatible
 - My departmental colleagues do what they can to make **having children** and the tenure-track compatible
 - My departmental colleagues do what they can to make **raising children** and the tenure-track compatible
- A single question about satisfaction¹⁰ with compensation (salary and benefits)
- A single question about satisfaction¹¹ with the balance one is able to strike between home and work

Work-Family and Compensation, Overall

Junior faculty rated their ability to strike a balance between work and home (satisfaction scale) very low (2.81), on a 5-point scale. The work-family composite score was also low (3.09), while satisfaction with compensation was rated only slightly higher (3.21).

Table 31. Mean Work-Family and Compensation Ratings, Overall

| Item | Mean |
|-------------------------------|------|
| Work-family composite | 3.09 |
| Compensation | 3.21 |
| Balance between home and work | 2.81 |

Work-Family and Compensation, by Gender

There is a significant difference between males and females on satisfaction with the work-family composite and on the balance between home and work, with females reporting less satisfaction.

Table 32. Mean Work-Family and Compensation Ratings, by Gender

| Item | Female Mean | Male Mean |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------|
| Work-family composite | 2.97 *** | 3.19 |
| Compensation | 3.22 | 3.21 |
| Balance between home and work | 2.61 *** | 2.97 |

⁹ Scale: 5 = Strongly agree, 4 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 1 = Strongly disagree

¹⁰ Scale: 5 = Very satisfied, 4 = Fairly satisfied, 3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2 = Fairly dissatisfied, 1 = Very dissatisfied

¹¹ Scale: 5 = Very satisfied, 4 = Fairly satisfied, 3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2 = Fairly dissatisfied, 1 = Very dissatisfied

Work-Family and Compensation, by Race

There is a significant difference between white faculty and faculty of color on satisfaction with the work-family composite and on compensation, with faculty of color reporting less satisfaction.

Table 33. Mean Work-Family and Compensation Ratings, by Race

| Item | White Faculty Mean | Faculty of Color Mean |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Work-family composite | 3.11 | 3.03 * |
| Compensation | 3.25 | 3.12 * |
| Balance between home and work | 2.82 | 2.80 |

Work-Family and Compensation, by Institutional Control

There is a significant difference between faculty at private and public institutions on balance between home and work, with faculty at private institutions reporting less satisfaction.

There is a significant difference between faculty at private and public institutions on satisfaction with compensation, with faculty at public institutions reporting less satisfaction.

Table 34. Mean Work-Family and Compensation Ratings, by Institutional Control

| Item | Private Faculty Mean | Public Faculty Mean |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Work-family composite | 3.06 | 3.10 |
| Compensation | 3.49 | 3.15 *** |
| Balance between home and work | 2.71 ** | 2.84 |

Work-Family and Compensation, by Institutional Type

There is a significant difference between faculty at colleges and universities on satisfaction with the work-family composite and with compensation, with faculty at universities reporting less satisfaction.

Table 35. Mean Work-Family and Compensation Ratings, by Institutional Type

| Item | College Faculty Mean | University Faculty Mean |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Work-family composite | 3.45 | 3.06 *** |
| Compensation | 3.36 | 3.20 * |
| Balance between home and work | 2.70 | 2.82 |

Work-Family and Compensation, by Gender at each Institutional Type

There is a significant difference between female and male faculty at colleges on satisfaction with the balance between work and home, with females at colleges reporting less satisfaction.

There is a significant difference between female and male faculty at universities on the work-family composite and on the balance between work and family, with females at universities reporting less satisfaction.

Table 36. Mean Work-Family and Compensation Ratings, by Gender at each Institutional Type

| Item | College Faculty Mean | | University Faculty Mean | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|------|-------------------------|------|
| | F | M | F | M |
| Work-family composite | 3.35 | 3.55 | 2.94 *** | 3.16 |
| Compensation | 3.40 | 3.31 | 3.20 | 3.21 |
| Balance between home and work | 2.44 *** | 2.93 | 2.62 *** | 2.98 |

(d) Climate, Culture, Collegiality

In the next section of the survey, respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction¹² with these nine factors:

- The fairness with which they are supervised by their immediate supervisor
- The interest senior faculty take in their professional development
- Their opportunities to collaborate with senior faculty
- The amount of *professional* interaction they have with *senior* colleagues
- The amount of *personal* interaction they have with *senior* colleagues
- The amount of *professional* interaction they have with *junior* colleagues
- The amount of *personal* interaction they have with *junior* colleagues
- How well they feel that they “fit” in their department
- The intellectual vitality of their senior colleagues in their department

and their level of agreement¹³ with these three factors:

- There is a feeling of unity and cohesion among the faculty in my *department*
- There is a feeling of unity and cohesion among the faculty in my *school*
- On the whole, my department treats junior faculty fairly compared to one another

analyzed here in composite fashion (taking all together).

¹² Scale: 5 = Very satisfied, 4 = Fairly satisfied, 3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2 = Fairly dissatisfied, 1 = Very dissatisfied

¹³ Scale: 5 = Strongly agree, 4 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 1 = Strongly disagree

Climate Dimensions Composite, by Gender

There is a significant difference between males and females on satisfaction with the climate composite, with females reporting less satisfaction.

Table 37. Climate, by Gender

| Item | Female Mean | Male Mean |
|-------------------|-------------|-----------|
| Climate composite | 3.54 ** | 3.63 |

Climate Dimensions Composite, by Race

There is no significant difference between white faculty and faculty of color on the climate composite.

Table 38. Climate, by Race

| Item | White Faculty Mean | Faculty of Color Mean |
|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Climate composite | 3.60 | 3.56 |

Climate, by Institutional Control

There is no significant difference between faculty at private and public institutions on the climate composite.

Table 39. Climate, by Institutional Control

| Item | Private Faculty Mean | Public Faculty Mean |
|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Climate composite | 3.62 | 3.58 |

Climate, by Institutional Type

There is a significant difference between faculty at colleges and universities on satisfaction with the climate composite, with faculty at universities reporting less satisfaction.

Table 40. Climate, by Institutional Type

| Item | College Faculty Mean | University Faculty Mean |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Climate composite | 3.84 | 3.57 *** |

Climate, by Gender at each Institutional Type

There is no significant difference between females and males at colleges on satisfaction with the climate composite.

There is a significant difference between females and males at universities on satisfaction with the climate composite, with females at universities reporting less satisfaction.

Table 41. Climate, by Gender at each Institutional Type

| Item | College Faculty Mean | | University Faculty Mean | |
|-------------------|----------------------|------|-------------------------|------|
| | F | M | F | M |
| Climate composite | 3.85 | 3.82 | 3.51 *** | 3.62 |

(e) Global Satisfaction

The last section of the survey asked junior faculty a number of questions about their global satisfaction; the results for two are summarized below.

Global Satisfaction, Overall

If I had it to do all over again, I would accept my current position.

Faculty as a whole agree “somewhat” that they’d accept their current position (4.09). The frequency data show that a majority of faculty (78.3%) agree either somewhat or strongly that they would accept the position again, with almost half of respondents (49.3%) saying they “strongly” agree that they would do so.

How do you rate your institution as a place for junior faculty to work?

As a group, faculty’s rating of their institution as a place to work were between “so-so” and “good” but closer to “good” (3.78). “Good” was the most frequent response (48.6%). Only 8% said that their institution was bad or awful.

Table 42. Global Satisfaction, Overall

| Item | Overall Mean |
|--|--------------|
| I’d accept my current position again | 4.09 |
| How do you rate your institution as a place for junior faculty to work | 3.78 |
| Composite of these two questions together | 3.92 |

Global Satisfaction, by Gender

There is a significant difference between males and females on global satisfaction, with females reporting less satisfaction.

Table 43. Global Satisfaction, by Gender

| Item | Female Mean | Male Mean |
|---|-------------|-----------|
| Composite of the two questions together | 3.89 * | 3.94 |

Global Satisfaction, by Race

There is a significant difference between white faculty and faculty of color on global satisfaction, with faculty of color reporting less satisfaction.

Table 44. Global Satisfaction, by Race

| Item | White Faculty Mean | Faculty of Color Mean |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Composite of the two questions together | 3.94 | 3.84 *** |

Global Satisfaction, by Institutional Control

There is no significant difference between faculty at private and public institutions on the global satisfaction composite.

Table 45. Global Satisfaction, by Institutional Control

| Item | Private Faculty Mean | Public Faculty Mean |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|
| Composite of the two questions together | 3.98 | 3.90 |

Global Satisfaction, by Institutional Type

There is a significant difference between faculty at colleges and universities on global satisfaction, with faculty at universities reporting less satisfaction.

Table 46. Global Satisfaction, by Institutional Type

| Item | College Faculty Mean | University Faculty Mean |
|---|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Composite of the two questions together | 4.15 | 3.90 *** |

Global Satisfaction, by Gender at each Institutional Type

There is no significant difference between males and females at colleges and at universities on global satisfaction.

Table 47. Global Satisfaction, by Gender at each Institutional Type

| Item | College Faculty Mean | | University Faculty Mean | |
|---|----------------------|------|-------------------------|------|
| | F | M | F | M |
| Gender | | | | |
| Composite of the two questions together | 4.12 | 4.19 | 3.87 | 3.92 |

Six independent factors (i.e., *Collegiality, Nature of work, Tenure, Work-family, Policy effectiveness, and Compensation*) were regressed onto *Global Satisfaction*. With the exception of *Compensation*, each factor represents a composite of several survey questions.

Regression Coefficients, Overall

For faculty overall, each of the six factors (i.e., Collegiality, Nature of work, Tenure, Work-family, Policy effectiveness, and Compensation) independently predicted Global satisfaction. Collegiality was the most predictive, followed by Nature of work; Compensation was the least predictive.

Table 48. Overall t values

| Item | t value | Significance |
|----------------------|---------|--------------|
| Collegiality | 28.059 | *** |
| Nature of work | 16.160 | *** |
| Tenure | 9.036 | *** |
| Work-Family | 7.425 | *** |
| Policy effectiveness | 5.306 | *** |
| Compensation | 5.039 | *** |

Regression Coefficients, by Gender

All six factors independently predicted Global satisfaction for both men and women. For both genders, Collegiality best predicted Global satisfaction, followed by Nature of work.

Policy effectiveness and Work-family were better predictors of Global Satisfaction for women than for men, whereas Tenure was a better predictor of Global satisfaction for men than for women.

Table 49. t values by gender

| Item | Females t value | Significance | Males t value | Significance |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Collegiality | 16.412 | *** | 18.708 | *** |
| Nature of work | 9.052 | *** | 12.210 | *** |
| Tenure | 3.272 | *** | 4.932 | *** |
| Work-Family | 4.013 | *** | 3.098 | ** |
| Policy effectiveness | 4.543 | *** | 3.182 | *** |
| Compensation | 3.279 | *** | 3.476 | *** |

Regression Coefficients, by Race

For white faculty, all six factors independently predicted Global satisfaction; for faculty of color, only Tenure was not a predictor.

For both white faculty and faculty of color, Collegiality best predicted Global satisfaction, followed by Nature of Work. The remaining factors were better predictors of Global satisfaction for white faculty than for faculty of color.

Table 50. t values by race

| Item | White Faculty t value | Significance | Faculty of Color t value | Significance |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Collegiality | 21.790 | *** | 11.490 | *** |
| Nature of work | 13.704 | *** | 6.321 | *** |
| Tenure | 6.086 | *** | 1.671 | |
| Work-Family | 4.065 | *** | 2.900 | ** |
| Policy effectiveness | 5.105 | *** | 2.711 | ** |
| Compensation | 3.737 | *** | 2.959 | ** |

Regression Coefficients, by Institutional Type

For university faculty, all six factors independently predicted Global satisfaction, whereas for college faculty only Collegiality, Nature of work, and Work-family were predictors (i.e., neither Tenure, Policy effectiveness, nor Compensation predicted Global satisfaction).

For college and university faculty, Collegiality best predicted Global satisfaction, followed by Nature of work.

Table 51. t values by institutional type

| Item | College Faculty t value | Significance | University Faculty t value | Significance |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Collegiality | 5.598 | *** | 23.973 | *** |
| Nature of work | 6.407 | *** | 13.912 | *** |
| Tenure | .909 | | 5.853 | *** |
| Work-Family | 2.907 | ** | 4.330 | *** |
| Policy effectiveness | .634 | | 5.796 | *** |
| Compensation | -1.103 | | 5.215 | *** |