

# **THE STUDY OF NEW SCHOLARS**

**Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey©**

**INSTITUTIONAL TYPE: STATISTICAL REPORT**

*By Dr. Cathy A. Trower and Dr. Jared L. Bleak*

Reproduction: No part of this paper may be reproduced in any form without written permission from the Study of New Scholars. Any reproduction of the report material must include the usual credit line. Contact information:

Dr. Cathy A. Trower  
The Study of New Scholars  
Harvard University, Graduate School of Education  
6 Appian Way, 455 Gutman Library  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Email: [newscholars@gse.harvard.edu](mailto:newscholars@gse.harvard.edu)  
URL: <http://www.newscholars.org>  
Voice: 617-496-9344  
Fax: 617-496-9350

Copyright© 2004 by the  
President and Fellows of Harvard College  
All Rights Reserved

Recommended citation:

Study of New Scholars. *Institutional Type: Statistical Report*. By Cathy A. Trower and Jared L. Bleak.  
Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2004.

*Cover design by: William R. Trower*

## **Acknowledgements**

This study was made possible with the support of The Ford Foundation and The Atlantic Philanthropies. The Ford Foundation and The Atlantic Philanthropies are not responsible for the report's conclusions and do not endorse activities that influence legislation.

We are grateful to the following individuals who contributed to this study: Dr. Richard Chait, Ms. Janice Ballou, Dr. Hester Fuller, Ms. Heidi Short, and Dr. Rosita Thomas.

A special thanks to our pilot institutions<sup>1</sup> for agreeing to participate in this research project and to the junior faculty who took time out of their busy schedules to complete the survey. Thanks also to the focus group participants and to those who agreed to be interviewed.

### **Research Note: Results Vary By Institution**

This report presents *aggregate* statistical findings; that is, data presented here compared junior faculty at six liberal arts colleges to junior faculty at six research universities in our sample, and shows percentages *across all institutions*, not campus by campus.

---

<sup>1</sup> Colleges: Carleton, Morehouse, Mount Holyoke, Oberlin, Sarah Lawrence, and Smith.  
Universities: Brown University, Duke University, University of Arizona, University of California at Berkeley, University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign, and University of Washington.

## **Biographies**

Dr. Cathy A. Trower is Co-Principal Investigator and Senior Research Associate at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. She earned a doctorate in Higher Education Administration at the University of Maryland at College Park in 1996. In addition to her Ph.D., Cathy has an M.B.A. and a B.B.A. from the University of Iowa. Dr. Trower has published numerous articles and several book chapters about faculty work life, and edited a book entitled “Policies on Faculty Appointment: Standard Practice and Unusual Arrangements” (2000, Anker Publishing). Prior to coming to Harvard, Cathy was a senior level administrator of business degree programs, and an adjunct faculty member, at Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. Jared L. Bleak is Research Associate at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, where he earned his doctoral degree in 2003, and an Ed.M. in 1998. He also holds a B.S. in Sociology from Brigham Young University. He is the author of articles on higher education governance, innovation and changes, distance education administration, and faculty policy. In addition to this work, Jared is a faculty member in several executive education programs delivered by the Harvard Institutes for Higher Education. Prior to coming to Harvard, Jared was the director of school relations at Southern Utah University and worked in the Office of the Chancellor of the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
The Study of New Scholars .....	3
<b>SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHICS</b> .....	6
<b>SECTION II: TENURE</b> .....	8
<b>SECTION III: NATURE OF WORK</b> .....	12
<b>SECTION IV: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</b> .....	14
<b>SECTION V: CLIMATE, CULTURE, AND COLLEGIALLY</b> .....	18
<b>SECTION VI: QUALITY OF LIFE</b> .....	21
<b>SECTION VII: EQUITY AND FAIRNESS</b> .....	23
<b>SECTION VIII: GLOBAL SATISFACTION</b> .....	24
Conclusion.....	26

**The Study of New Scholars  
Institutional Type: Statistical Report**

**Executive Summary**

**The Study of New Scholars survey of full-time tenure-track faculty at six research universities and six liberal arts colleges reveals numerous differences by institutional type.**

❖ **Demographics.**

- Universities employ significantly fewer women and faculty of color, on a percentage basis, than do Colleges.
- University junior faculty earn a significantly higher salary than College junior faculty.

❖ **Tenure.**

- University junior faculty felt significantly clearer than College junior faculty about their performance expectations for tenure as a scholar.
- University junior faculty were significantly more likely than College junior faculty to agree that tenure decisions in their department are based on performance rather than on politics, relationships, or demographics.
- College junior faculty felt significantly clearer than University faculty about the expectations for teaching, advising, and campus citizenship.

❖ **Nature of Work**

- College junior faculty were significantly more satisfied than University junior faculty with: how they are expected to spend their time, the level of courses they teach, the number of students they teach, and the quality of students they teach.
- University junior faculty were significantly more satisfied than College junior faculty with the amount of time available to conduct research.

❖ **Policy Provision Helpfulness.**

- College junior faculty were significantly more likely than University junior faculty to report that they found (or would find) the following policy provisions to be helpful: professional assistance to improve teaching skills, travel funds to present papers or conduct research, paid research leave, childcare, and financial assistance with housing.
- University junior faculty were significantly more likely than College junior faculty to report that they found (or would find) a formal mentoring program to be helpful.

❖ **Professional Development.**

- College junior faculty were significantly more satisfied than University junior faculty with: the senior faculty's commitment to their success, the physical setting in which they work, the discretion they have over course content, and the professional assistance available for proposal writing and locating funds.

- ❖ **Salary and Benefits.**
  - College junior faculty were significantly more satisfied than University junior faculty with their salary and their benefits.
  
- ❖ **Pressure to conform.**
  - University junior faculty reported feeling significantly more pressure than College junior faculty to conform to departmental colleagues in their research areas and their research methodologies.
  
- ❖ **Climate.**
  - College junior faculty were significantly more satisfied than University junior faculty with how well they fit in their department.
  
  - College junior faculty were significantly more satisfied than University junior faculty with the gender and racial diversity of the faculty in their department.
  
- ❖ **Global Satisfaction.**
  - College junior faculty were significantly more satisfied than University junior faculty with their institution as a workplace.
  
  - College junior faculty were significantly more likely than University junior faculty to agree that the Chief Academic Officer at their institution cares about the quality of life for junior faculty.
  
  - College junior faculty plan to stay longer at their institution than University junior faculty, assuming they achieve tenure.
  
  - College junior faculty were significantly more likely than University junior faculty to agree with the statement, “If I had it to do over again, I would accept my current position.”
  
  - College junior faculty were significantly more likely than University junior faculty to recommend their department to a prospective tenure-track faculty member.
  
  - College junior faculty rated their institution as a workplace significantly higher than University junior faculty.

## **The Study of New Scholars**

**Purpose.** Our purpose is twofold. 1) To make the academy a more equitable and appealing place for new faculty to work in order to ensure that academic institutions attract the best and brightest scholars and teachers; and, 2) To increase the recruitment, retention, status, success, and satisfaction of women and minority faculty members.

**Process.** In order to fulfill our purpose, we began with focus groups in 2001 of junior faculty from representative institutions. Using those data, we created a junior faculty survey (see appendix 1) that measures workplace satisfaction with factors that enable productive and successful careers. We sought the participation of 6 premier research universities (members of the Association of American Universities), and several top-ranked liberal arts colleges (*U.S. News & World Report*) to participate in a pilot study.

The pilot study will be followed by a national rollout to the remaining AAU institutions and top-ranked liberal arts colleges that wish to participate.

The survey allows us to gauge and compare the institutional policies and practices; assess satisfaction levels of junior faculty across participating institutions; and identify the institutional characteristics and personnel practices of the best places to work, with a special focus on women and minorities.

## **What Makes a Great Academic Workplace?**

During focus groups, junior faculty told us that a great academic workplace is one that provides a variety of factors in each of five key areas: tenure, the work itself and workload, support for professional development, the climate, and the quality of life.

### **❖ Tenure**

- Clarity of tenure processes, expectations, and procedures
- Transparency of tenure process
- Consistency of tenure practices, expectations, and messages
- Equity in the application of tenure standards
- Flexibility in tenure timeline
- Feedback on progress toward tenure
- Some understanding of the chances of receiving tenure
- Reasonable performance expectations for research, teaching, and service
- Tenure decisions based on performance rather than other factors (e.g., politics, relationships, or demographic characteristics)



❖ **Work/Workload**

- Clear and reasonable expectations for how work time should be spent
- Reasonable expectations regarding the level and number of courses taught
- High quality students and a reasonable class size
- Clear and reasonable research expectations
- Enough time for research
- Amount of research funding expected
- Equity in the assigned teaching, advising, and service workload
- Ability to balance personal and professional life

❖ **Professional Development/Support**

Interpersonal relationships

- Fair treatment
- A department chair who is committed to one's success
- A senior faculty that is committed to one's success
- A senior faculty that takes an interest in one's progress and well-being
- Opportunities to collaborate with senior faculty
- A good "fit" (feeling comfortable) in one's department
- High quality mentoring

Other dimensions of support

- Nice physical setting for work
- Resources available to support the work
- Discretion over course content
- Influence over one's research program
- Competent, professional assistance with writing proposals/securing funds
- Attractive salary and benefits

❖ **Climate**

- Little or no pressure to conform to colleagues re: areas of research, methodology, political views, personal behavior, attire.
- Enjoyable professional interactions with senior colleagues
- Good racial, ethnic, and gender faculty diversity in one's department

❖ **Policy Provisions**

- Formal mentoring programs
- Periodic, formal performance reviews
- Written summary of performance reviews
- Professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants
- Professional assistance to improve teaching
- Travel funds to present papers or conduct research
- Paid research leave during the probationary period
- An upper limit on service obligations during the probationary period
- Affordable, quality childcare
- Financial assistance with housing
- Stop-the-tenure-clock for parental or other family reasons
- Personal leaves during the probationary period

### Sample and Response Rates

In the spring of 2002, the survey was sent to all full-time tenure-track faculty at six research universities and six liberal arts colleges in the United States; 1,874 individuals (724 females, 1,150 males; 260 College Faculty, 1,614 University Faculty<sup>2</sup>) received the survey. A total of 1,255 faculty members responded to the survey for a response rate of 67%. The number of survey respondents, who reported race and gender, is shown in the table below.

Race and Gender, Respondents

Race	University Females	University Males	College Females	College Males
White, non-Hispanic	297	442	64	53
Asian American/Pacific Islander	36	76	15	8
Hispanic	15	24	8	3
African American	12	11	9	8
Multi-racial	10	10	3	5
Native American	2	2	0	0
Other (of color)	14	7	4	3
Race not reported	3	25	2	2
Total	389	597	103	80

### Findings

Throughout the following sections, you will note *f-values* and *t-values*. Both are measures of statistical significance; that is, conducting f-tests and t-tests allow researchers to demonstrate whether there are differences between more than two scores (in the case of f-tests) or two scores (in the case of t-tests). The number of asterisks following each f-value or t-value denotes the level of statistical significance as follows: \*  $p \leq .05$ ; \*\*  $p \leq .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ . One asterisk means that we are 95% confident that there is a difference between the scores and that it occurred because there really is a difference and not because of chance, two asterisks -- 99% confident, and three asterisks -- 99.9% confident.

---

<sup>2</sup> Some race data were missing or not reported.

## SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHICS

Survey respondents reported basic demographic characteristics, including: 1) Start of current academic appointment; 2) Academic rank (to rule out any full professors); 3) Whether or not they hold a joint appointment; 4) Race; 5) Gender; 6) Annual salary; and, 7) Whether or not they have children under the age of 18 living at home with them (and how many).

Table I.1. Please indicate the year in which your current faculty appointment began.

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Fall 2000 to Spring 2003	Fall 1997 to Spring 2000	Before Fall 1997	Fall 2000 to Spring 2003	Fall 1997 to Spring 2000	Before Fall 1997
63%	31%	5%	62%	31%	6%

Table I.2. What is your academic field? [Number of respondents]

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Natural Sciences	Social Sciences	Humanities	Professions	Other Fields	Natural Sciences	Social Sciences	Humanities	Professions	Other Fields
58	51	77	10	0	195	124	148	254	8

Table I.3. What is your rank?

College Faculty				University Faculty			
Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor or Lecturer	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor or Lecturer
0	8%	90%	2%	0	7%	93%	0

Table I.4. Do you hold a joint appointment (formal responsibilities in more than one department)?

College Faculty	University Faculty
10%	11%

Table I.5A. What is your gender?

College Females				University Females			
Sample Number	Sample Percent	Respondents Number	Respondents Percent	Sample Number	Sample Percent	Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
137	53%	103	56%	587	36%	389	39%

Table I.5B. What is your gender?

College Males				University Males			
Sample Number	Sample Percent	Respondents Number	Respondents Percent	Sample Number	Sample Percent	Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
123	47%	80	44%	1,027	64%	597	61%

Table I.6.A. What is your race? [NOTE: Some sample race data missing or not reported.]

College Faculty of Color				University Faculty of Color			
Sample Number	Sample Percent	Respondents Number	Respondents Percent	Sample Number	Sample Percent	Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
94	36%	66	36%	266	24%	220	23%

Table I.6.B. What is your race? [NOTE: Some sample race data missing or not reported.]

White College Faculty				White University Faculty			
Sample Number	Sample Percent	Respondents Number	Respondents Percent	Sample Number	Sample Percent	Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
166	64%	118	64%	833	76%	741	77%

Table I.7. What is your annual salary? (A=less than \$30,000, B=\$30,000 to \$44,999, C=\$45,000 to \$59,999, D=\$60,000 to \$74,999, E=\$75,000 to \$89,999, F=\$90,000 or more).

College Faculty						University Faculty					
A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F
0	4%	66%	27%	3%	0	0	8%	44%	22%	16%	10%

Table I.8. Do you have children under the age of 18 living with you at home?

College Faculty				University Faculty			
No children	1 child	2 children	3+ children	No children	1 child	2 children	3+ children
57%	19%	19%	5%	55%	23%	18%	4%

**Significant Institutional Type Differences: Demographics**

- ❖ Universities employ significantly fewer junior faculty of color (on a percentage basis) than do Colleges ( $t = -2.6822$ )\*\*.
- ❖ Universities employ significantly fewer female junior faculty (on a percentage basis) than do Colleges ( $t = -4.2191$ )\*\*\*.
- ❖ University junior faculty receive a significantly higher annual salary than College junior faculty ( $t = 8.2779$ )\*\*\*.

## SECTION II: TENURE

Tenure clarity. There were five survey measures surrounding tenure clarity including: process, criteria, standards, body of evidence, and chances.

- ❖ Nearly one third of College and University junior faculty are “unclear” about the tenure standards in their department.

Table II.1.A. I find the tenure process in my department to be...

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear	Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear
6%	66%	27%	11%	59%	29%

Table II.1.B. I find the tenure criteria (the things that are evaluated) in my department to be...

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear	Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear
14%	62%	24%	15%	60%	25%

Table II.1.C. I find the tenure standards (the performance threshold) in my department to be...

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear	Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear
32%	59%	9%	31%	54%	15%

Table II.1.D. How clear are you about the body of evidence that will be considered in making your tenure decision?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear	Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear
16%	62%	22%	22%	54%	24%

Table II.1.E. How clear to you are your own prospects for earning tenure?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear	Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear
22%	62%	16%	24%	52%	23%

Tenure expectations clarity. There were five survey measures about the clarity of tenure expectations including: as a scholar, a teacher, an advisor, a colleague, and a campus citizen.

- ❖ University junior faculty were most clear about performance expectations for scholarship, whereas College junior faculty were most clear about teaching expectations.
- ❖ University and College junior faculty were least clear about performance expectations for campus citizenship.

Table II.2.A. Is what's expected in order to earn tenure clear to you regarding your performance as a scholar?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear	Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear
19%	63%	18%	13%	45%	41%

Table II.2.B. Is what's expected in order to earn tenure clear to you regarding your performance as a teacher?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear	Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear
9%	44%	48%	17%	57%	26%

Table II.2.C. Is what's expected in order to earn tenure clear to you regarding your performance as an advisor to students?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear	Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear
24%	51%	25%	36%	49%	15%

Table II.2.D. Is what's expected in order to earn tenure clear to you regarding your performance as a colleague in your department?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear	Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear
32%	53%	16%	35%	48%	16%

Table II.2.E. Is what's expected in order to earn tenure clear to you regarding your performance as a campus citizen?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear	Unclear	Fairly Clear	Very Clear
32%	51%	18%	42%	46%	13%

Have expectations changed? The survey asked faculty whether they felt that the expectations for tenure concerning scholarship, teaching, advising, collegueship, or campus citizenship had changed since they started on the tenure-track, and if so, how they thought those changes had, or would, affect them.

- ❖ Slightly more than half of University faculty reported that expectations had not changed in any of the five areas (i.e., scholarship, teaching, advising, collegueship, and campus citizenship) since they started employment.
- ❖ Slightly more than half, to two thirds, of College faculty reported that expectations had not changed in any of the five areas (i.e., scholarship, teaching, advising, collegueship, and campus citizenship) since they started employment.
- ❖ At both Universities and College, for those who reported that expectations had changed, most reported that it was too soon to tell how the changes would affect them, or that the change had been neither for the better nor for the worse for them.

Table II.3.A. Since you were appointed, have expectations for tenure changed regarding scholarship? If so, please indicate whether the changes have been better or worse for you.

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Worse	Neither Better nor Worse	Better	Too Soon to Tell	Have not Changed	Worse	Neither Better nor Worse	Better	Too Soon to Tell	Have not Changed
12%	9%	8%	20%	51%	13%	13%	4%	17%	53%

Table II.3.B. Since you were appointed, have expectations for tenure changed regarding teaching?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Worse	Neither Better nor Worse	Better	Too Soon to Tell	Have not Changed	Worse	Neither Better nor Worse	Better	Too Soon to Tell	Have not Changed
4%	14%	2%	14%	66%	8%	17%	6%	16%	55%

Table II.3.C. Since you were appointed, have expectations for tenure changed regarding advising?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Worse	Neither Better nor Worse	Better	Too Soon to Tell	Have not Changed	Worse	Neither Better nor Worse	Better	Too Soon to Tell	Have not Changed
5%	14%	3%	17%	61%	6%	18%	3%	17%	56%

Table II.3.D. Since you were appointed, have expectations for tenure changed regarding collegueship?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Worse	Neither Better nor Worse	Better	Too Soon to Tell	Have not Changed	Worse	Neither Better nor Worse	Better	Too Soon to Tell	Have not Changed
5%	14%	1%	17%	63%	6%	17%	3%	18%	56%

Table II.3.E. Since you were appointed, have expectations for tenure changed regarding campus citizenship?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Worse	Neither Better nor Worse	Better	Too Soon to Tell	Have not Changed	Worse	Neither Better nor Worse	Better	Too Soon to Tell	Have not Changed
5%	15%	2%	19%	58%	6%	17%	3%	19%	54%

Have you received mixed messages about tenure from senior colleagues?

- ❖ Nearly half of all University faculty respondents agreed either strongly (16%), or somewhat (33%) that they had received mixed messages from senior colleagues about the requirements for tenure.
- ❖ Over half of all College faculty respondents agreed either strongly (16%), or somewhat (36%) that they had received mixed messages from senior colleagues about the requirements for tenure.

Table II.4. I have received mixed messages about tenure requirements from senior colleagues.

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
16%	36%	12%	20%	15%	16%	33%	13%	18%	19%

Are tenure decisions based primarily on performance?

- ❖ While almost three fourths (72%) of University junior faculty agreed that tenure decisions are based primarily on performance rather than on politics, relationships, or demographics, slightly less than two thirds (63%) of College junior faculty did so.

Table II.5. From what I can gather, tenure decisions in my department are based primarily on performance rather than on politics, relationships, or demographics.

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
23%	40%	9%	22%	6%	34%	38%	8%	14%	7%

### **Significant Institutional Type Differences: Tenure**

- ❖ University junior faculty felt significantly clearer than College junior faculty regarding their performance as a scholar ( $t = 6.0155$ )\*\*\*.
- ❖ University junior faculty were significantly more likely than College junior faculty to agree that tenure decisions in their department are based on performance rather than on politics, relationships, or demographics ( $t = 2.5494$ )\*.
- ❖ College junior faculty felt significantly clearer than University faculty about the expectations for:
  - Teaching ( $t = -4.9832$ )\*.
  - Advising ( $t = -3.8892$ )\*.
  - Campus citizenship ( $t = -2.7112$ )\*.



### SECTION III: NATURE OF WORK

There were eight “Nature of Work” measures including: the way faculty spend time, the level of courses taught, the number of courses taught, the number of students taught, the quality of students taught, the research expectations, the time available to conduct research, and the amount of research funding faculty are expected to raise.

- ❖ University junior faculty were most satisfied with the level and number of courses they teach, and were least satisfied with the amount of time available to conduct research—45% of University respondents were dissatisfied with this job aspect.
- ❖ College junior faculty were most satisfied with the level of courses they teach, and significantly more so even than University faculty, and, like University faculty, were least satisfied with the amount of time available to conduct research—60% of College respondents were dissatisfied with this job aspect.

Table III.1.A. How satisfied are you with the way you spend your time as a faculty member?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
2%	15%	4%	53%	26%	5%	10%	6%	46%	26%

Table III.1.B. How satisfied are you with the level of the courses you teach?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
0%	5%	1%	31%	63%	1%	6%	6%	35%	52%

Table III.1.C. How satisfied are you with the number of courses you teach?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
4%	13%	6%	26%	50%	3%	10%	6%	29%	51%

Table III.1.D. How satisfied are you with the number of students you teach?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1%	13%	8%	29%	50%	4%	12%	11%	34%	39%

Table III.1.E. How satisfied are you with the quality of the students you teach?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
0%	5%	2%	37%	56%	4%	20%	11%	36%	28%

Table III.1.F. How satisfied are you with what's expected of you as a researcher?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied.	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
2%	11%	17%	44%	27%	3%	10%	12%	37%	37%

Table III.1.G. How satisfied are you with the amount of time you have to conduct research?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
22%	38%	10%	24%	5%	16%	29%	10%	31%	14%

Table III.1.H. How satisfied are you with the amount of research funding you are expected to find?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
6%	12%	42%	25%	15%	10%	18%	31%	26%	14%

**Significant Institutional Type Differences: Nature of Work**

- ❖ College junior faculty were significantly more satisfied than University junior faculty with four of eight Nature of Work dimensions studied, including the:
  - Way they spend their time ( $t = -2.1745$ )\*.
  - Level of courses taught ( $t = -3.0805$ \*\*).
  - Number of students taught ( $t = -2.3965$ )\*.
  - Quality of students taught ( $t = -11.3999$ \*\*\*).
  
- ❖ University junior faculty were significantly more satisfied than College junior faculty with:
  - The amount of time available to conduct research ( $t = 4.5823$ \*\*\*).
  
- ❖ There was no significant difference between University and College junior faculty with respect to three out of eight Nature of Work dimensions studied, including the:
  - Number of courses taught.
  - Research expectations.
  - Amount of research funding they are expected to find.

## SECTION IV: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Policy Helpfulness. One set of questions in the Professional Development section of the survey asked junior faculty whether or not they felt policy provisions in the following areas would be helpful: formal mentoring, performance reviews, a written summary of performance reviews, assistance with obtaining grants, assistance with improving teaching, travel funds, paid research leave, and an upper limit on service obligations.

- ❖ Junior faculty at Universities and Colleges alike reported that they found, or would find, paid research leave, travel funds, and an upper limit on service obligations during the probationary period to be especially helpful.

Table IV.1.A. How helpful do you find (or would you find) formal mentoring?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
12%	43%	45%	8%	35%	56%

Table IV.1.B. How helpful do you find (or would you find) formal performance reviews?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
2%	39%	59%	6%	36%	58%

Table IV.1.C. How helpful do you find (or would you find) a written summary of formal performance reviews?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
4%	36%	60%	7%	34%	60%

Table IV.1.D. How helpful do you find (or would you find) professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
5%	26%	69%	5%	27%	67%

Table IV.1.E. How helpful do you find (or would you find) professional assistance in improving teaching?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
5%	49%	45%	12%	51%	37%

Table IV.1.F. How helpful do you find (or would you find) travel funds to present papers or conduct research?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
0%	10%	90%	4%	14%	82%

Table IV.1.G. How helpful do you find (or would you find) paid research leave during the probationary period?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
0%	5%	95%	4%	10%	86%

Table IV.1.H. How helpful do you find (or would you find) an upper limit on service obligations for tenure-track faculty?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
1%	17%	82%	4%	18%	78%

**Significant Institutional Type Differences: Professional Development Policy Provision Helpfulness**

- ❖ University junior faculty were significantly more likely than were College junior faculty to report that they found (or would find) the following policy provision to be helpful:
  - Formal mentoring (t = 2.8708)\*\*.
- ❖ College junior faculty were significantly more likely than were University junior faculty to report that they found (or would find) the following policy provisions to be helpful:
  - Professional assistance to improve their teaching (t = - 2.8221)\*\*.
  - Travel funds to present papers or conduct research (t = -4.2716)\*\*\*.
  - Paid research leave (t = -5.8281)\*\*\*.

Satisfaction. Another set of questions in the Professional Development section of the survey asked junior faculty about satisfaction with nine areas including: 1) their chairs' commitment to their success, 2) the senior faculty in their departments' commitment to their success, 3) the interest senior faculty in their department take in their professional development, 4) the physical setting in which they work, 5) the resources available to support their work, 6) their discretion over course content, 7) their influence over their own research agenda, 8) assistance with funding and proposal writing, and 9) opportunities to collaborate with senior colleagues.

- ❖ University and College junior faculty were most satisfied with the influence they have over the focus of their research agenda.
- ❖ University junior faculty were least satisfied with the assistance they receive writing proposals and locating funds.
- ❖ College junior faculty were least satisfied with the opportunities they have to collaborate with senior colleagues.

Table IV.2.A. How satisfied are you with your department chair's commitment to your success?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
6%	7%	5%	25%	57%	6%	8%	9%	23%	54%

Table IV.2.B. How satisfied are you with the commitment of senior faculty in your department to your success?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
4%	10%	7%	32%	48%	8%	13%	12%	29%	37%

Table IV.2.C. How satisfied are you with the interest senior faculty take in your professional development?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
8%	10%	13%	36%	32%	10%	15%	16%	30%	28%

Table IV.2.D. How satisfied are you with the physical setting where you work (office, labs, parking)?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
3%	13%	7%	39%	38%	8%	17%	10%	33%	32%

Table IV.2.E. How satisfied are you with the resources available to support your work (library, technology, clerical)?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
4%	18%	7%	44%	27%	6%	14%	11%	38%	32%

Table IV.2.F. How satisfied are you with the discretion you have over the content of your courses?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
0%	1%	3%	13%	84%	1%	3%	6%	22%	68%

Table IV.2.G. How satisfied are you with the influence you have over the focus of your research?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1%	1%	3%	8%	86%	< 1%	1%	3%	14%	81%

Table IV.2.H. How satisfied are you with assistance with proposal writing and locating funds?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
8%	16%	26%	29%	22%	15%	23%	26%	23%	13%

Table IV.2.I. How satisfied are you with opportunities to collaborate with senior faculty?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
7%	17%	36%	18%	22%	11%	16%	23%	24%	26%

**Significant Institutional Type Differences: Professional Development Satisfaction**

- ❖ College junior faculty were significantly more satisfied than were University junior faculty with the:
  - Senior faculty’s commitment to their success (t = - 3.5971)\*\*\*
  - Physical setting in which they work (t = -3.3052)\*\*
  - Discretion they have over course content (t = -6.1501)\*\*\*
  - Assistance available for proposal writing and locating funds (t = -3.9465)\*\*\*

## SECTION V: CLIMATE, CULTURE, AND COLLEGIALITY

This section of the survey examined the perceived degree of pressure to conform in five areas: research area, methodology, political views, personal behavior, and attire. Junior faculty also reported on whether they enjoyed their professional interactions with their senior colleagues, and how satisfied they were with: 1) their “fit” (e.g., comfort level) in their department, 2) the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity in their department, and 3) the quality of mentoring they receive from senior faculty.

Table V.1.A. How much pressure is there to conform to your colleagues when it comes to research areas?

College Faculty				University Faculty			
A great deal	Some	Hardly any	None	A great deal	Some	Hardly any	None
4%	12%	19%	64%	5%	21%	32%	42%

Table V.1.B. How much pressure is there to conform to your colleagues when it comes to research methodologies?

College Faculty				University Faculty			
A great deal	Some	Hardly any	None	A great deal	Some	Hardly any	None
3%	18%	27%	53%	6%	23%	30%	40%

Table V.1.C. How much pressure is there to conform to your colleagues when it comes to political views?

College Faculty				University Faculty			
A great deal	Some	Hardly any	None	A great deal	Some	Hardly any	None
4%	23%	22%	51%	6%	17%	27%	50%

Table V.1.D. How much pressure is there to conform to your colleagues when it comes to personal behavior?

College Faculty				University Faculty			
A great deal	Some	Hardly any	None	A great deal	Some	Hardly any	None
6%	29%	26%	39%	8%	26%	31%	35%

Table V.1.E. How much pressure is there to conform to your colleagues when it comes to attire?

College Faculty				University Faculty			
A great deal	Some	Hardly any	None	A great deal	Some	Hardly any	None
1%	16%	31%	53%	2%	12%	33%	52%

### **Significant Institutional Type Differences: Conformity**

- ❖ University junior faculty reported feeling significantly more pressure than College junior faculty to conform with respect to:
  - Research areas ( $t = 4.6325$ )\*\*\*
  - Research methodology ( $t = 3.4722$ )\*\*\*

Professional interactions with senior colleagues.

- ❖ Most University and most College junior faculty agreed that they enjoy their professional interactions with senior colleagues.

Table V.2.A. For the most part, I enjoy my professional interactions with senior colleagues.

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
47%	34%	11%	3%	5%	43%	35%	8%	9%	5%

Satisfaction.

- ❖ While most junior faculty were very or somewhat satisfied with how well they fit in their department, faculty at Colleges are more satisfied than their University counterparts (84% and 72%, respectively).
- ❖ Junior faculty were mostly satisfied with the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the faculties in their departments, College faculty were even more so than University faculty.
- ❖ One third of University junior faculty were somewhat (19%) or very dissatisfied (14%) with the quality of mentoring they receive from senior colleagues. At Colleges, those percentages were 14% and 12% respectively.

Table V.3.A. How satisfied are you with how well you “fit” (e.g., sense of belonging/comfort level) in your department?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
3%	10%	3%	36%	48%	6%	14%	9%	36%	36%

Table V.3.B. How satisfied are you with the racial diversity of the faculty in your department?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
8%	25%	20%	28%	19%	14%	22%	28%	22%	14%

Table V.3.C. How satisfied are you with the ethnic diversity of the faculty in your department?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
7%	23%	24%	28%	18%	11%	21%	29%	22%	17%

Table V.3.D. How satisfied are you with the gender diversity of the faculty in your department?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
2%	9%	14%	37%	37%	9%	19%	18%	25%	29%

Table V.4. How satisfied are you with the quality of mentoring you receive from senior faculty?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
12%	14%	17%	36%	21%	14%	19%	17%	29%	21%



### **Significant Institutional Type Differences: Professional Interactions and Satisfaction**

- ❖ There was no statistically significant difference between University and College junior faculty concerning how well they enjoy their professional interactions with senior colleagues.
  
- ❖ College junior faculty were significantly more satisfied than University junior faculty with:
  - How well they “fit” in their department ( $t = -3.8836$ )\*\*\*
  - The racial diversity of the faculty in their department ( $t = -2.2526$ )\*
  - The gender diversity of the faculty in their department ( $t = -5.9316$ )\*\*\*

## SECTION VI: QUALITY OF LIFE

Policy Helpfulness. One set of questions in the Quality of Life section of the survey asked respondents about whether or not they feel policy provisions in the following areas would be helpful: childcare, housing assistance, stop-the-tenure-clock for familial reasons, and personal leaves during the probationary period.

Table VI.1.A. How helpful do you find (or would you find) quality, affordable childcare?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
13%	11%	76%	21%	16%	64%

Table VI.1.B. How helpful do you find (or would you find) financial assistance with housing?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
4%	23%	73%	20%	25%	56%

Table VI.1.C. How helpful do you find (or would you find) Stop-the-clock for parental or family reasons?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
4%	28%	68%	12%	20%	68%

Table VI.1.D. How helpful do you find (or would you find) personal leave during the probationary period?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
6%	34%	60%	12%	29%	59%

### **Significant Institutional Type Differences: Quality of Life Policy Provision Helpfulness**

- ❖ College junior faculty were significantly more likely than University junior faculty to report that they found (or would find) the following Quality of Life policy provisions studied to be helpful:
  - Affordable, quality childcare ( $t = -3.2322$ )\*\*
  - Financial assistance with housing ( $t = -6.4890$ )\*\*\*

Satisfaction. Another set of questions in the Quality of Life section of the survey asked junior faculty about satisfaction with salary, benefits, and personal-professional life balance.

- ❖ College junior faculty are more satisfied with their salary and benefits than were University junior faculty.
- ❖ Neither College nor University faculty were very satisfied with the balance they find between their professional and personal lives; 43% of College faculty and 46% of University faculty report that they are very or somewhat dissatisfied on this dimension.

Table VI.2.A. How satisfied are you with your salary?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
4%	12%	4%	50%	30%	13%	20%	11%	36%	20%

Table VI.2.B. How satisfied are you with your benefits?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1%	15%	9%	44%	31%	7%	16%	14%	40%	23%

Table VI.2.C. How satisfied are you with the balance between professional and personal or family time?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
15%	28%	18%	34%	6%	17%	29%	16%	28%	10%

**Significant Institutional Type Differences: Quality of Life Satisfaction**

- ❖ College junior faculty were significantly more satisfied than University junior faculty with:
  - Their salary ( $t = -6.2370$ )\*\*\* [NOTE: This is true despite the fact that they are paid significantly less than their University counterparts.]
  - Their benefits ( $t = -3.1812$ )\*\*

## SECTION VII: EQUITY AND FAIRNESS

The first three questions in this section of the survey asked respondents whether they think their assigned workloads in teaching, advising, and service are more than, the same as, or less than other junior faculty at their institution. We did not ask about research because there is not an “assigned” workload for scholarship. There was also a question about whether or not they think that all junior faculty are treated fairly compared to one another.

Table VII.1.A. Consider your *assigned* workload in teaching. In comparing yourself with other junior faculty, would you say your teaching workload is less than, the same as, or greater than theirs?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Significantly Greater	Somewhat Greater	The Same	Somewhat Less	Significantly Less	Significantly Greater	Somewhat Greater	The Same	Somewhat Less	Significantly Less
9%	17%	70%	3%	1%	8%	17%	67%	6%	2%

Table VII.1.B. Consider your *assigned* workload in advising. In comparing yourself with other junior faculty, would you say your advising workload is less than, the same as, or greater than theirs?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Significantly Greater	Somewhat Greater	The Same	Somewhat Less	Significantly Less	Significantly Greater	Somewhat Greater	The Same	Somewhat Less	Significantly Less
10%	18%	59%	11%	2%	11%	19%	60%	8%	2%

Table VII.1.C. Consider your *assigned* workload in service. In comparing yourself with other junior faculty, would you say your service workload is less than, the same as, or greater than theirs?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Significantly Greater	Somewhat Greater	The Same	Somewhat Less	Significantly Less	Significantly Greater	Somewhat Greater	The Same	Somewhat Less	Significantly Less
11%	17%	59%	11%	2%	17%	20%	53%	8%	2%

Table VII.2. On the whole, my department treats junior faculty fairly compared to one another.

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
33%	42%	7%	12%	5%	44%	32%	9%	9%	6%

### Significant Institutional Type Differences: Equity

- ❖ University junior faculty were significantly more likely than College junior faculty to believe that their assigned service load was greater than that of their peers ( $t = 2.1594$ )\*.

## SECTION VIII: GLOBAL SATISFACTION

The survey asked how satisfied junior faculty are with their institution as a workplace; if they know who the Chief Academic Officer is and whether that person seems to care about the quality for life for junior faculty; how long they plan to stay at their institution, assuming they achieve tenure; whether they would accept their current position again; whether or not they would recommend their department to a prospective faculty member; and, how they rate their institution overall as a place for junior faculty to work.

Table VIII.1. All things considered, how satisfied are you with *your institution* as a place to work?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
3%	5%	3%	33%	55%	5%	12%	8%	43%	32%

Table VIII.2. The person who serves as chief academic officer at my institution seems to care about the quality of life for junior faculty.

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
44%	39%	9%	5%	3%	17%	30%	26%	18%	9%

Table VIII.3. Assuming you achieve tenure, how long do you plan to remain at your institution?

College Faculty				University Faculty			
Rest of my career	Foreseeable Future	No more than five years after earning tenure	Don't Know	Rest of my career	Foreseeable future	No more than five years after earning tenure	Don't know
33%	50%	3%	14%	14%	51%	13%	22%

Table VIII.4. If I had it to do over again, I would accept my current position.

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
73%	19%	3%	2%	3%	56%	27%	6%	7%	4%

Table VIII. 5. If a candidate for a tenure-track faculty position asked you about your department as a place to work, would you recommend it?

College Faculty			University Faculty		
Strongly	With reservations	Would not recommend	Strongly	With reservations	Would not recommend
62%	36%	2%	52%	43%	5%

Table VIII.6. How do you rate your institution as a place for junior faculty to work?

College Faculty					University Faculty				
Great	Pretty good	So-so	Pretty bad	Awful	Great	Pretty good	So-so	Pretty bad	Awful
38%	51%	9%	2%	0%	27%	49%	17%	5%	2%

### **Significant Institutional Type Differences: Global Satisfaction**

- ❖ College junior faculty were significantly more satisfied than University junior faculty with their institution as a workplace ( $t = -5.3946$ )\*\*\*.
- ❖ College junior faculty were significantly more likely than University junior faculty to agree that the Chief Academic Officer at their institution cares about the quality of life for junior faculty ( $t = -8.7558$ )\*\*\*.
- ❖ College junior faculty plan to stay longer at their institution than University junior faculty, assuming they achieve tenure ( $t = -6.6097$ )\*\*\*.
- ❖ College junior faculty were significantly more likely than University junior faculty to agree with the statement, “If I had it to do over again, I would accept my current position” ( $t = -4.0229$ )\*\*\*.
- ❖ College junior faculty were significantly more likely than University junior faculty to recommend their department to a prospective tenure-track faculty member ( $t = -2.7538$ )\*\*.
- ❖ College junior faculty rated their institution as a workplace significantly higher than University junior faculty ( $t = -4.7610$ ).

## **Conclusion**

This study reveals that junior faculty at Colleges are significantly more satisfied than faculty at Research Universities with 14 of 28 aspects of the academic workplace. College junior faculty felt clearer than University junior faculty about the expectations for teaching, advising, and service; however, University faculty were clearer about performance expectations for research. These, and other key differences are noted in the Executive Summary (pages 1-2).

In addition to the quantitative findings reported here, our survey asked several open-ended questions which are analyzed and reported on in another paper [Qualitative Findings]. That report also includes the results of interviews conducted with a sample of men and women at research universities.