Assessing the Academic Work Environment for Science and Engineering Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty at the University of Michigan in 2001, 2006, and 2012:

GENDER & RACE IN DEPARTMENT- AND UNIVERSITY-RELATED CLIMATE FACTORS

UM ADVANCE PROGRAM

NOVEMBER, 2013

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared by ADVANCE Program staff Janet E. Malley, Ellen Meader, Sara Bliss, and Teresa Nguyen with advice from Denise Sekaquaptewa and Abigail J. Stewart. We were assisted by our distinguished Evaluation Advisory Committee at every stage of our work and received invaluable feedback from our Steering Committee. We are grateful to all for their wise advice and have attempted to incorporate it in this report, but they are in no way responsible for what we have written here.

The ADVANCE committee memberships are:

STEERING COMMITTEE:

Susan Gelman (Interim Dean of LSA) Margaret Gyetko (Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, Medical School) Wayne Jones (ADVANCE Program Associate Director, Materials Science and Engineering) Jennifer Linderman (ADVANCE Program Associate Director, Chemical Engineering) Terrence McDonald (Former Dean of LSA) David Munson (Dean of Engineering) Lori Pierce (Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs) Pamela Raymond (Chair of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology) Abigail Stewart (ADVANCE Program Director, Psychology, Women's Studies) Janet Weiss (Dean of Rackham Graduate School and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs) Christina Whitman (Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs)

EVALUATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

Charles Brown (Economics) Deborah Carter (Education) Mark Chesler (Sociology) Mary Corcoran (Political Science, Public Policy, Social Work, Women's Studies) Lilia Cortina (Psychology) Paul Courant (Economics) Ben Hansen (Statistics) Ann Lin (Public Policy, Political Science) Janet Lawrence (Education) Denise Sekaquaptewa (Psychology) Gretchen Spreitzer (Business) Yu Xie (Sociology)

Advisory Board:

Charles Brown (Economics) Carol Fierke (Chemistry) Melvin Hochster (Mathematics) Gary Huffnagle (Internal Medicine, Microbiology and Immunology) Wayne Jones (Materials Science and Engineering) Pamela Raymond (Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology) Katherine Spindler (Microbiology and Immunology) Levi Thompson (Chemical Engineering) John Vandermeer (Ecology and Evolutionary Biology)

STAFF:

Wendy Ascione-Juska Shawn Beard Sara Bliss Susan Burke Chelsea Goforth Cynthia Hudgins Wayne Jones Jennifer Linderman Janet Malley Ellen Meader Keith Rainwater Denise Sekaquaptewa Abigail Stewart

INTRODUCTION

The University of Michigan was awarded a five-year NSF ADVANCE Institutional Transformation grant in fall 2001, to focus on recruitment, retention through climate improvement, and promotion of women science and engineering faculty. Since then ADVANCE has continued with funding from the University, with its focus broadened to include all faculty in all fields, but a continuing emphasis on women in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) and faculty from underrepresented groups, especially faculty of color. Faculty and staff associated with the ADVANCE Program have worked to engage discussion, stimulate new efforts, and develop optimal practices related to these efforts throughout the campus.

During the fall of 2001, staff at the Institute for Research on Women and Gender (IRWG) administered ADVANCE's first faculty climate survey; a final report from that study, released in fall 2002, is available on the UM ADVANCE website¹. In January 2004 analyses of the initial 2001 survey data assessing the climate for faculty of color were reported, and a further qualitative study of the climate for faculty of color was reported in September 2006². The results from these studies documented a relatively more negative work environment for women and minority scientists and engineers than for white men. They were used to make policy recommendations and identify practices that might improve the work environment for women and minority science and engineering faculty and faculty generally, since many measures taken to improve the climate for women and minority scientists and engineers benefit white men as well. In particular, the initial survey findings have informed the design and implementation of ADVANCE initiatives at UM.

In fall 2006, a second survey was conducted to assess change in the campus work environment for scientists and engineers at the completion of the five-year NSF-supported period of UM's ADVANCE Program. This study was a cross-sectional comparison with the initial 2001 survey data; the initial study was anonymous, and therefore, no longitudinal follow-up of identical people was possible. About one-third of the 2006 survey respondents indicated that they had participated in the 2001 study. Another third indicated that they had not, and the remaining respondents were not sure. Because the study was cross-sectional, the new sample (like the original one) included faculty on campus at the time of the survey, regardless of whether they had been on campus for the entire preceding five-year period. Reports from this second study can be found on the UM ADVANCE website³.

The 2006 study suggested little change in the climate for science and engineering faculty and a consistent pattern of a more negative climate for women faculty and faculty of color (especially female faculty of color). There were, however, indications that some things were improving. In the case of

¹ <u>http://www.umich.edu/~advproj/climatereport.pdf;</u> for tables reporting results of analyses using sampling weights, <u>http://www.umich.edu/~advproj/weightedanalysis.htm</u>

² Both reports are available on the ADVANCE website: <u>http://www.umich.edu/~advproj/S&E%20Race-</u> <u>Ethnicity%20Report.pdf</u> and <u>http://www.umich.edu/~advproj/ncid/NCIDqualstudyreport_final.pdf</u>

³ <u>http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance/faculty-climate</u>

white women, the most dramatic change was the significant decrease in reports of unwanted sexual attention over time. In addition, for all faculty except women of color, experiences of scholarly isolation were lower.

Most recently, in the fall of 2012, a third survey was conducted. As before, this study was a crosssectional comparison with the previous two studies, and the sample included faculty on campus at the time of the survey.

2012 STUDY

Our goal for this climate study was again to observe how scientists and engineers experience their working environments at UM. The first climate study surveyed women and men scientists and engineers as well as women social scientists. The same design was incorporated in the first follow-up study, and included men social scientists as well. At the third follow-up, arts and humanities faculty were also surveyed. However, this report is limited to assessment of the work environment for science and engineering tenure track faculty at the three points in time: 2001 (Time 1), 2006 (Time 2), and 2012 (Time 3)⁴.

The three studies discussed in this report were initiated under the assumption that aggregate data about difficulties faced by all or some STEM faculty at the University of Michigan would help us target intervention efforts to improve the situation for these faculty and assess how well they were working overall. We believe that our findings can, in fact, be helpful in this way. But we also offer a caution: aggregate data can only provide a picture of the overall group—that picture may, in fact, be misleading or simply irrelevant to any given individual person or particular unit. What this study can do—and we hope it does—is to give us a picture in broad strokes across many different units and individuals. It does not fill in the crucial shading and detail that only individual units and faculty can provide.

It is important to keep this in mind both in the case where an obstacle identified here may seem not to apply, and in the case where an individual may feel she faces an obstacle, but it does not appear in the aggregate data. For example, a particular woman faculty member may feel the climate in her department is quite positive. If that's so, that is great. But the aggregate data suggest that women, *on average*, find the climate less positive than their male peers. So it is worthwhile for institutional decision-makers to think about the problem, even if there are individual cases that are working fine. In fact, it would be wise for decision-makers to examine those individual cases carefully, not because they conflict with the aggregate data, but so we can learn how to ensure more women science and engineering faculty, as well as underrepresented racial-ethnic minority faculty, experience their departments as positively as white male science and engineering faculty.

⁴ A subsequent report will assess results of analyses by discipline (science and engineering, social science, and arts and humanities) in the 2012 data.

SAMPLE SURVEYED

All tenure, research, and clinical track faculty with paid appointments at the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor as of October, 2012, were sent the survey. Our focus for this report is the tenure track faculty in the following groups:

- All female tenure track science and engineering faculty at or above the rank of assistant professor (N=432).
- All male tenure track science and engineering faculty at or above the rank of assistant professor (N=1,307).

All faculty of color from underrepresented groups (African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans), and Asians and Asian Americans, were surveyed (N=440).

The sample included all science and engineering faculty on the UM campus. This included faculty from the three largest schools with science and engineering faculty (Engineering, LSA, and Medicine) as well as seven smaller schools (Dentistry, Information, Kinesiology, Natural Resources and Environment, Nursing⁵, Pharmacy, and Public Health).

QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The 2012 Survey of University of Michigan Faculty focuses on institutional and unit/department climate (see Appendix A for a copy of the survey). There are additional sections on professional employment, teaching, resources, work and career satisfaction, recognition, mentoring, research, participation, personal life, and demographics included to help us assess equivalence of faculty experiences. The 2012 survey generally replicates the 2001 and 2006 surveys to enable over-time comparisons. Minor changes and modifications were suggested by the ADVANCE Program's Evaluation Advisory Committee to address problems identified with previous surveys. This report focuses exclusively on those responses to the questions that are available at all time points and that address faculty experiences of the climate. Future reports will address other areas and include questions added in 2012.

As was true for the initial study, due to the sensitivity of the information collected and the limited number of women faculty and faculty of color in most science and engineering departments and colleges, the ADVANCE Steering Committee and Evaluation Advisory Committee advised that survey responses should continue to be anonymous, as well as confidential. To further preserve anonymity, the questionnaire did not ask faculty to identify their appointing department(s), but only their school or college. This step was critical, since some individuals would be completely identifiable if she or he identified her/his department, gender, and race-ethnicity.

⁵ The demographic makeup of the School of Nursing is quite different from the other schools. However, because preliminary analyses excluding Nursing school respondents were comparable to analyses in which they were included, we decided to keep respondents from all schools in the analysis sample.

DATA COLLECTION AND RESPONSE RATE

The survey was conducted through a web-based on-line survey; a hyperlink to the survey was initially sent via e-mail to 2,918 instructional track faculty members⁶ on October 15, 2012. Recipients could easily access the survey by clicking on the hyperlink in the e-mail and submitting their responses electronically when completed. The on-line survey allowed respondents to stop and return to the survey as necessary before submitting it. A total of 1,373 responses from tenure track faculty, representing an overall response rate of 47%⁷, were received by the end of November, 2012. Almost half of these were from science and engineering tenure track faculty; the total science and engineering sample was 626, including 452 male and 174 female faculty, and 501 white faculty and 125 faculty of color.

The overall response rate for tenure track faculty is higher than the response rates from the 2001 (41%) and 2006 (31%) faculty surveys, which used paper and pencil mail-in surveys (2001) or a combination of paper and on-line surveys (2006). It is possible that the ease of an on-line survey and ability to stop and return to the survey contributed to the higher response rate. We also shortened the survey so that individuals could complete it in 45 minutes or less.

The evidence suggests that the respondent sample was not fully representative of the larger pool of tenure track science and engineering faculty surveyed. There were no differences between the population surveyed and the respondents in terms of rank. However, women science and engineering faculty (40%) responded at a higher rate than their male counterparts (35%); and white faculty (38%) responded at a higher rate than faculty of color (28%). Preliminary analyses revealed few differences among respondents when compared by school (Engineering, LSA, Medicine, and all others); however, LSA faculty responded at a higher (47%) rate than those from Engineering (29%), Medicine (33%), and the other schools (42%). To address these issues, all analyses were conducted using appropriate weights and controls. Weighted data analyses adjust the raw survey data to represent the population from which the sample is drawn. In this case the data were weighted on the basis of race, gender, and school (Engineering, LSA, Medicine, LSA, Medicine, and all others) of the UM science and engineering faculty population surveyed.

The faculty surveyed at Time 1 (2001) included all female tenure track science and engineering faculty (N=259) and a random subsample of male tenure track science and engineering faculty (N=339); 147 of those surveyed were faculty of color. Responses from Time 1 included 135 female and 100 male science and engineering faculty; 42 of them were faculty of color.

The sample surveyed at Time 2 (2006) included all female tenure track science and engineering faculty (N=352) and a random subsample of male tenure track science and engineering faculty, stratified by race and rank (N=620). An oversampling of faculty of color included nearly all faculty of color from

⁶ This total includes 432 female and 1,307male tenure track science and engineering faculty. Research (N=413) and clinical (N=848) track faculty were surveyed at the same time.

⁷ There were 253 respondents who did not identify themselves as tenure track and/or science and engineering faculty; therefore, they were excluded from these analyses.

underrepresented groups (African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans) in the target sample and a substantial random sample of Asians and Asian Americans, totaling 208 faculty of color surveyed. Responses from Time 2 included 128 female and 148 male science and engineering faculty; 55 of them were faculty of color.

At Time 3 male scientists and engineers were older and had been at UM longer than all women scientists and engineers; they also received their highest degree longer ago and were less likely to have been hired within the past 10 years. Similarly, men scientists and engineers were more likely to be full professors than women science and engineering faculty. These findings are similar to Time 1 and Time 2 data.

We found similar differences when comparing the white instructional track faculty with instructional track faculty of color. White faculty were older than the faculty of color; they had also been at UM longer and had received their degrees earlier. Faculty of color were also more likely to have been hired in the last 10 years. These differences were also true at Time 1 and Time 2. At Time 1 and Time 3, faculty of color were more likely to be at the assistant rank; white faculty were more likely to be at the rank of full professor at all three time points. Given these differences, a variable assessing experience was constructed, combining age, years at UM, year of degree, and rank. This measure of experience was used as a control in all analyses and means that any statistical finding reported below cannot be explained by differences in age, years at UM, year of degree, or rank.

INTERPRETING SELF-REPORT DATA

Survey data are, by necessity, self-report data. For our purposes—assessment of the work environment experienced by faculty—this is actually exactly what we want. By definition, the felt work environment can only be reported on by an individual from her or his point of view.

Nevertheless, it is often tempting to think of self-report differences as "merely" subjective. We must emphasize that the subjective and the objective are identical when we are assessing aspects of personal morale and satisfaction, and perceptions of the work environment. Of course it is possible to ask whether people in general would see the situation the same way. But whether they would or would not is actually not relevant to the assessment of any individual's perspective. In the same way, a particular individual may find an office or meeting room "too warm," while another finds it "too cool." The thermostat may indicate that the temperature is 72 degrees Fahrenheit, but that outside measure is really unrelated to the individual's perception that the room is too warm (for her) or too cool (for her). Her perception is the felt or relative temperature of the room. In the same way, we are interested in the felt workplace environment for science and engineering faculty at the University of Michigan.

A somewhat different set of issues arises in the case of individuals' reports of felt discrimination and unwanted sexual attention (or sexual harassment). One reason an external standard may seem

important in these cases is that the legal system applies particular standards when legal remedies are being sought. In this study, as in other studies of faculty experience, we are not limiting our inquiry to experiences that would meet a legal standard (and, in fact, legal remedies are not in question); we are interested in experiences that may affect morale, whether or not they meet a legal standard.

DATA ANALYSIS STRATEGY

In this report we assessed experiences of women scientists and engineers on the tenure track compared to men scientists and engineers on the tenure track; in addition, we assessed race-ethnicity by comparing science and engineering faculty of color with white faculty. Preliminary analyses were conducted comparing Asian/Asian American faculty to underrepresented minority faculty that revealed few significant differences. Given this, and the small total number of faculty of color in the sample, we combined Asian/Asian American faculty with underrepresented minority faculty in these analyses to increase the power of the analyses. However, we do note in the discussion of findings the few instances where we find significant results that vary for Asian/Asian American or underrepresented minority faculty (we only had a sufficient number of faculty to do this with the 2012 data). Since there are few of them relative to all the analyses computed, they may simply be the result of chance; nevertheless, we thought it important to report them in the event that they are meaningful.

Analyses were completed using analysis of variance (ANOVAs) on scales and items from the survey to assess differences by gender and race-ethnicity, comparing mean scores of white and minority women scientists and engineers, and white and minority men scientists and engineers at the three data collection points (Time 1, Time 2, and Time 3). Analysis of variance is a statistical procedure that apportions variation in people's scores on a variable to different factors—in this case, their membership in one of the four faculty groups (white women scientists and engineers, women scientists and engineers of color, white men scientists and engineers, and men scientists and engineers of color)—at Time 1, Time 2, and Time 3. This design allows for two three-way ANOVAs (gender X race X time), first comparing Time 3 to Time 1 and then comparing Time 3 to Time 2 (analyses reporting comparisons between Time 2 and Time 1 were reported previously and are replicated here). When the ANOVA indicated an overall significant difference in one of those individual or combined factors, we pursued relevant planned comparisons between appropriate groups. In this report we discuss the comparisons by gender or race, when overall effects were important, and for gender within race, or race within gender, when more complex findings were indicated (such as interactions of gender and race with time). This is a relatively conservative way to minimize error when conducting multiple tests.

When assessing frequency data (numbers of people, rather than scores), we used logistic regression, which is appropriate when the dependent variable is dichotomous but there are continuous control variables. In several instances the frequency of "presence" on a dichotomous variable was rare for some groups, which is not surprising given the kinds of faculty experiences the climate study assesses (e.g., reports of unwanted sexual attention or discrimination). Even in such instances of rare occurrences,

planned comparisons were pursued as it was important to understand how these experiences may differ by gender/race-ethnicity faculty groups.

In the results discussed below, any references to significant differences or group differences refer exclusively to differences found to be statistically significant ($p \le .05$ —that is, differences or effects that would have occurred by chance (when there really was no difference or effect) at or less than 5 percent of the time, which is a generally accepted standard of statistical significance in social science research).

Data tables⁸ follow the report. Tables are produced for each set of analyses to allow us to show differences among the four groups (i.e., comparing male faculty by race-ethnicity, female faculty by race-ethnicity, white faculty by gender, and faculty of color by gender) as well as over time differences for each of the four groups. Each table reports means or frequencies by group at Time 1, Time 2, and Time 3 and identifies significant group differences within time as well as within group differences over time.⁹

Scales created for the initial study to assess climate were replicated in the Time 2 and Time 3 data¹⁰. Three scales, two composite scores, and one individual item assess University climate; eight scales assess departmental climate. One additional item—evaluation of department leader as committed to racial-ethnic diversity—was also used to assess departmental climate. The first four of these department climate scales are designed to assess directly department climate issues as they relate specifically to gender and/or race-ethnicity. The remaining five assess more general aspects of the climate. Following are the scales created by category.

UNIVERSITY CLIMATE

- disparaging comments about women from students and faculty (2 items)
- disparaging comments about men from students and faculty (2 items)
- disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities and/or religious groups from students and faculty (4 items)
- experiences of gender discrimination (presence of experience in any of six areas)
- experiences of racial-ethnic discrimination (presence of experience in any of six areas)
- unwanted sexual attention (1 item)

DEPARTMENTAL CLIMATE

- tolerance of diversity (4 items)
- gender egalitarian atmosphere (9 items)
- felt tokenism (2 items)

⁸ Data tables with standard deviations are available at <u>http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance/files/advance-report-</u> <u>1-stdevtables-2012.pdf</u>.

⁹ A more complete set of tables, including standard deviations, is appended to this report.

¹⁰ In the initial study, we created scales of items as a data reduction strategy that minimized the likelihood of findings resulting from chance, and maximized measurement reliability (see Cronbach, 1990, for a general account of the measurement approach employed here). See report, <u>http://www.umich.edu/~advproj/climatereport.pdf</u>, for explanation of how scales were created.

- evaluation of departmental leader as committed to racial-ethnic diversity (1 item)
- positive environment (6 items)
- scholarly isolation (7 items)
- felt surveillance (4 items)
- evaluation of departmental leader as fair (3 items)
- evaluation of departmental leader as able to create a positive environment (3 items)

OVERVIEW OF RESULTS

Our approach in this report is to describe gender differences (differences between men and women) and racial-ethnic differences (differences between white faculty and faculty of color), as well as time differences (comparing 2012 ratings to 2001 and 2006 ratings), in the work climate for science and engineering faculty. We first examine over time differences within each of the four race/gender groups and then consider differences between groups within time (differences by gender within race-ethnicity groups and differences by race-ethnicity within gender groups). We begin by describing the findings concerning the general University climate for these faculty and follow with a discussion of the experiences of the department climate more directly, considering first those variables in which both race and gender issues are implicated, and then those which are more broadly based.

We generally discuss results from aggregate data of the major scales used in the study and not the results from individual items used to construct these scales; results of all analyses, however, are included in the tables.

We next examine the relationship between the climate ratings and individuals' overall career satisfaction for white men and women and men and women of color. These relationships suggest that negative climate and work satisfaction ratings are related to lower overall career satisfaction for all four groups of faculty. Moreover, lower work satisfaction was associated with a desire to leave the University for most faculty.

FINDINGS

UNIVERSITY CLIMATE: ASSESSMENTS RELATED TO GENDER (TABLES 1A-C)

The survey asked several questions regarding institutional climate that faculty may experience on the UM campus: overheard disparaging comments about women and men, and about racial-ethnic minorities and/or religious groups, gender and racial-ethnic discrimination, and unwanted and uninvited sexual attention.

DISPARAGING COMMENTS ABOUT WOMEN AND MEN

WITHIN GROUP OVER TIME: Both groups of white faculty reported overhearing fewer disparaging comments about women at Time 3 compared to Time 2 (and compared to Time 1 in the case of white women). Men of color also reported fewer instances at both Time 2 and Time 3 compared to Time 1. Reports by women of color were unchanged over time.

Rates of overhearing disparaging comments about men decreased significantly for white men from Time 2 to Time 3 and for white women from Time 1 to Time 2 and Time 3. There were no differences in reported rates for either group of faculty of color.

BETWEEN GROUPS WITHIN TIME: White women reported overhearing more disparaging comments about women compared to white men at all three time points. There were no differences in reports for the two groups of faculty of color. And there were no differences comparing women of color and white women at Time 3; white women's reports were higher at Time 2.

There were also few differences in these group comparisons of reports of overhearing disparaging comments about men. Reports were higher for white women compared to women of color at Time 2 and compared to white men at Time 1 and Time 3.

GENDER DISCRIMINATION

Survey respondents were asked about their experiences of gender discrimination in six specific areas (hiring, promotion, salary, space/equipment and other resources, access to administrative staff, and graduate student or resident/fellow assignments). We examined each of these areas; however, in many instances frequencies were too low to compare the four groups statistically. We did, however, find that, across race-ethnicity groups, women reported more gender discrimination than men in promotion and salary at Time 3; these results are similar to those found at Time 2. To test for gender discrimination in these areas among the four groups, we created an overall felt gender discrimination score based on experience of discrimination in any of the six areas.

WITHIN GROUP OVER TIME: There were no differences in reported gender discrimination over time for any of the four groups of faculty.

BETWEEN GROUPS WITHIN TIME: Both groups of women were more likely to report some form of gender discrimination than their male counterparts at each of the three time points. There were no differences comparing women of color and white women, nor comparing men of color and white men.

UNWANTED SEXUAL ATTENTION

WITHIN GROUP OVER TIME: White women reported significantly lower levels of unwanted sexual attention at Time 2 and Time 3 compared to Time 1 (see Figure A). Rates were low across time for the other three groups of faculty. There were no within group over time differences on others' reports of unwanted sexual attention at Time 3 compared to Time 1 or Time 2.

BETWEEN GROUPS WITHIN TIME: The only significant difference in experiences of unwanted sexual attention



between groups was comparing white women to white men: white women reported higher levels at both Time 1 and Time 3. White women were also more likely than white men to report that others

reported unwanted sexual attention at Time 1 but not at Time 2 or Time 3; there were no differences between women of color and men of color to report that others reported unwanted sexual attention.

At Time 3 underrepresented minority faculty were more likely than Asian/Asian American faculty to indicate that they received reports of others' experiences of unwanted sexual attention.

UNIVERSITY CLIMATE: ASSESSMENTS RELATED TO RACE-ETHNICITY (TABLES 2A-C)

DISPARAGING COMMENTS ABOUT RACIAL-ETHNIC MINORITIES AND/OR RELIGIOUS GROUPS

WITHIN GROUP OVER TIME: Both male and female faculty of color and white women reported overhearing fewer disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities and/or religious groups at Time 3 compared to Time 1. Similarly, both groups of white faculty reported overhearing fewer disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities and/or religious groups at Time 3 compared to Time 2.

BETWEEN GROUPS WITHIN TIME: Overall among scientists and engineers, faculty of color reported hearing more disparaging remarks about racial-ethnic minorities and/or religious groups than did white faculty at Time 1, but not at the later data collection points. Comparison by racial-ethnic groups at Time 3 revealed that underrepresented minority faculty were more likely than Asian/Asian American faculty to report overhearing disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities and/or religious groups. Within gender, women of color (both underrepresented minority and Asian/Asian American women) were more likely than white women to report overhearing disparaging remarks about racial-ethnic minorities and/or religious groups at Time 1; there were no differences between these two groups at the two later data collection points.

RACIAL-ETHNIC DISCRIMINATION

As with gender discrimination, survey respondents were asked about their experiences of racial-ethnic discrimination in the same six specific areas (hiring, promotion, salary, space/equipment and other resources, access to administrative staff, and graduate student or resident/fellow assignments). Again, frequencies on the individual items were generally too low to make statistical comparisons among the four groups. Similar to our measure of gender discrimination, we created a measure of any racial-ethnic discrimination (assessed across the six areas).

WITHIN GROUP OVER TIME: White faculty generally reported very low levels of racial-ethnic discrimination (2% for both men and women at Time 3) and their reported mean rates were not significantly different over time. Rates for faculty of color were higher (18% for men of color and 26% for women of color at Time 3) and, again, did not differ significantly over time. The pattern was similar for both Asian/Asian American faculty and underrepresented minority faculty.

BETWEEN GROUPS WITHIN TIME: The rates of racial-ethnic discrimination for both Asian-Asian American faculty and underrepresented minority faculty were significantly higher than that of white faculty at all three time points. They were also both significantly lower in five of the individual items that comprise

the overall racial-ethnic discrimination measure Time 3; in the case of space, equipment and other resources and access to administrative staff only underrepresented minority faculty were significantly more likely than white faculty to report such discrimination (Asian/Asian American faculty also were more likely to report such discrimination but the rate did not reach statistical significance). We found no differences comparing male and female faculty of color. Male faculty of color were significantly more likely to report some form of racial-ethnic discrimination than white men at all three points in time; women of color were more likely to report some form of racial-ethnic discrimination than white women at Time 3 (but not earlier). At Time 3 men of color also were more likely to report some form of racial-ethnic discrimination than white men in these specific areas: hiring, promotion, salary, and graduate student or resident/fellow assignments.

DEPARTMENT CLIMATE (TABLES 3A-C)

The department climate was assessed with eight scales and one single item. Five of the scales assess the department climate in general (positive climate, scholarly isolation, felt surveillance, department chair as fair and department chair creates positive environment) and were combined to create a measure of the general climate (where a higher number represents a more positive rating of the climate; thus, negative scales were reverse-scored before combining with the positive scales)¹¹. The four remaining measures address climate issues within the department specifically related to gender and/or race-ethnicity: tolerant climate, gender egalitarian atmosphere, tokenism, and department chair committed to racial-ethnic diversity. As with the general climate measure, these were combined to create a climate for diversity measure on a similar 5 point scale¹².

ASSESSMENTS RELATED TO GENERAL DEPARTMENT CLIMATE

WITHIN GROUP OVER TIME: Women of color and both white men and women rated their general department climate more positively at Time 3 compared to the previous two data collections (see Figure B). The ratings for men of color were not different over time, but were relatively high at all three data points.

BETWEEN GROUPS WITHIN TIME: White men reported a more positive department climate compared to white women at all three data points. Men of color and white



women reported a more positive climate than women of color at Time 1 and Time 2, but not at Time 3.

¹¹ The Cronbach alpha for this scale was .64 for all science and engineering faculty.

¹² The Cronbach alpha for this scale was .85 for all science and engineering faculty.

DEPARTMENT CLIMATE ASSESSMENTS RELATED TO GENDER AND RACE-ETHNICITY

WITHIN GROUP OVER TIME: The differences in climate related to gender and race-ethnicity are similar to findings related to general climate. All groups reported significantly higher mean ratings of the climate for diversity at Time 3 compared to Time 1 and Time 2 (see Figure C).

BETWEEN GROUPS WITHIN TIME: Despite these changes, both groups of male faculty reported more positive climate for diversity rates than their female colleagues at all three data points. Moreover, white faculty reported more positively than faulty of color at all three times. [At Time 1 and Time 3 that difference was specific to underrepresented minority



and white faculty; at Time 2 both underrepresented minority and Asian-Asian American faculty reported scores significant lower than that for white faculty.] Within the four gender/race-ethnicity groups, men of color reported a less positive climate for diversity than white men at all three times. Similarly, ratings for women of color were significantly lower than those for white women at Time 1 and Time 2; there was no difference between these two groups at Time 3.

Do These Differences in Climate Matter?

It is fair to ask whether the differences we have found in the climate as experienced by women scientists and engineers and science and engineering faculty of color really matter. It is always difficult to address the question of the magnitude of a difference found on a survey scale. The absolute values (from 1 as low, or negative, to 5 as high, or positive) do not correspond to any external standard (the way the values on a thermometer do), so we can't tell whether a mean difference of nearly 1/2 point (which is the difference, for example, between white female scientists' and engineers' scores on the aggregate climate scale and white male scientists' and engineers' scores) is large or small.

One way of getting at this is to look at the middle of the distributions in absolute terms. The middle (both mean and median) rating of the climate for white and minority women scientists and engineers is between 3 and 4 on the 5 point scale (3.68 for women of color and 3.63 for white women at Time 3), while the average rating for men scientists and engineers is closer to 4 (3.98 for men of color and 4.11 for white men at Time 3). Equally, we can examine the distribution of scores along the scale. The distributions of ratings do overlap, but they are also quite different (see Figures D and E). There are some women who rated the climate at Time 3 at or above 4 (34% for both white women and women of color), but many more of the men did (61% of men of color and 63% of white men). Similarly, some men rated the climate at or below 3 (5% of both men of color and white men), but again, more women did so (11% of women of color and 20% of white women). On the basis of these findings, we believe it is

reasonable to conclude that the difference in felt climate (between white and minority women scientists and engineers and their male comparison groups) persists.



Nevertheless, when we compare these data to those from the 2001 and 2006 surveys, we see improvement in the felt climate for women. In fact, the percentage of women of color and white women who rated the climate 3 or below decreased significantly from Time 1 to Time 3; the same was true for women of color comparing their ratings at Time 2 to Time 3. Moreover, the percentage of white women (and white men) who rated the climate 4 or above also increased significantly from Time 2 to Time 3. There were no differences when we compared the over time ratings for men of color.

OVERALL WORK SATISFACTION (TABLES 4A-C)

Another way to evaluate the importance of the climate differences is to examine work satisfaction. Work satisfaction was assessed with 12 items (e.g., how satisfied I am with my sense of being valued for my research, scholarship, or creativity by members of my department/unit or sense of being valued as a teacher by my students). These items were combined to create an overall work satisfaction score.

WITHIN GROUP OVER TIME: All groups, except men of color, reported significantly higher overall work satisfaction at Time 3 compared to Time 1, and also compared to Time 2 in the case of women of color and white men. For men of color, the mean satisfaction scores increased over time, but the differences were not statistically significant.

BETWEEN GROUPS WITHIN TIME: White men reported significantly higher overall work satisfaction compared to white women at Time 2 and Time 3. In contrast, there was no difference in overall work satisfaction comparing men and women of color at Time 3 (men of color were higher on this measure at Time 2). It also is interesting to note that the number of individual satisfaction items (that comprised the overall measure) that were statistically different between white men and white women increased over time (from five items at Time 2 to nine items at Time 3; men always reported higher satisfaction); in contrast, the number of individual items that were significantly different decreased over time in the case of men and women of color (from five items at Time 2 to no items at Time 3). There were no differences comparing groups by race-ethnicity within gender on the overall work satisfaction measure at any time point.

The average level of work satisfaction at Time 3 was similar for Asian/Asian American and underrepresented minority faculty; however, underrepresented minority faculty expressed a higher level of satisfaction with their ability to attract students to work with them compared to Asian/Asian American faculty.

OVERALL CAREER SATISFACTION (TABLES 5A-C)

Overall career satisfaction was assessed with the one item: how satisfied are you with your current position at UM?

WITHIN GROUP OVER TIME: Mean scores showed significant improvement from Time 1 to Time 3 for both groups of women (as well as an improvement from Time 2 to Time 3 for women of color). There were no differences over time in overall career satisfaction for either group of men.

BETWEEN GROUPS WITHIN TIME: White men reported higher satisfaction than white women at all three times and higher than men of color at Time 3; men of color reported higher satisfaction than women of color only at Time 2.

DESIRE TO LEAVE UM (TABLES 5A-C)

At Time 2 and Time 3 we also asked respondents two questions about their intention to stay at UM: how much you would like to stay at UM for your entire career, and how often do you think about leaving UM. These were combined to create a measure assessing wanting to leave UM for these two data collection points¹³.

WITHIN GROUP OVER TIME: Both groups of women and white men were less likely to indicate a desire to leave UM at Time 3 compared to Time 2 (see Figure F). There was no over time difference in the mean ratings for men of color.

BETWEEN GROUPS WITHIN TIME: White men were less likely than their female counterparts to report a desire to leave UM at Time 2 and Time 3; men of color were less likely than women of color to report the same at Time 2 (there was no difference at Time 3 for faculty of color).



INTERCORRELATIONS: WORK SATISFACTION AND CLIMATE INDICATORS WITH OVERALL CAREER SATISFACTION AND DESIRE TO LEAVE UM (TABLE 6)

OVERALL CAREER SATISFACTION

We calculated correlations of the overall climate indicators (combining the general climate and climate for diversity measures) and work satisfaction with overall career satisfaction with current position at UM separately for the four groups of tenure track faculty at all three data collection points (Table 6). Work

¹³ The Cronbach alpha for this scale was .67 for the science and engineering faculty.

satisfaction was significantly and strongly positively correlated with overall career satisfaction for all four groups of faculty at all three time points. The same was true in the case of overall climate except for women of color: overall climate was not related to overall career satisfaction at Time 3 for this group.

Experiencing disparaging comments was also important for some groups. Overhearing disparaging comments about women was negatively related to white women's overall career satisfaction at Time 1 and Time 3 and overall career satisfaction at Time 2 for women of color. Overhearing disparaging comments about men was also negatively related to overall career satisfaction for both groups of white faculty at Time 3. Gender discrimination was negatively related to white women's overall career satisfaction at all three points in time (at Time 2 it was a trend) and for both groups of men and women of color at Time 3. Racial-ethnic discrimination was negatively associated with overall career satisfaction for men of color at Time 2 and Time 3 (and also for white men at Time 3) but not for women of color.

Desire to Leave UM

Correlations of desire to leave UM with the same climate items produced results similar to those for overall career satisfaction. The intention to leave UM was strongly negatively correlated with work satisfaction and the overall climate score for both groups of white faculty at Time 2 and Time 3. Results were similar for men of color at Time 3; however, only climate was negatively associated with a desire to leave at Time 2 for this group of faculty. Neither variable was significantly associated with a desire to leave UM in the case of women of color.

All of the individual climate scales were positively associated with wanting to leave for white men at Time 3 (but not Time 2). Similarly, disparaging comments about women and men as well as gender discrimination were positively associated in the case of white women at Time 3; unwanted sexual attention was also significant at Time 2. Only racial-ethnic discrimination was associated with wanting to leave for male faculty on color at Time 3; no climate scales were associated with a desire to leave in the case of women of color.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Following is a summary of the findings by groups of measures: University climate indicators, department climate indicators, work satisfaction, and career satisfaction.

UNIVERSITY CLIMATE INDICATORS

Gender

As was found in previous years, the University climate (assessed with measures of feelings of discrimination and overhearing negative comments) continues to be more positive for men science and engineering faculty in 2012. In particular, reported rates of gender discrimination were higher for both white women and women of color in comparison to their male colleagues. White women (but not women of color) also reported more experiences overhearing disparaging comments about women than white men did, and this pattern persisted over time. However, these reports by white women of overhearing these comments did decrease over time.

Moreover, in 2012 reports of experiences of unwanted sexual attention were at the same level as they were at Time 2, and significantly lower than at Time 1.

RACE-ETHNICITY

Faculty reports also suggest that the University climate continues to be more positive for white science and engineering faculty than faculty of color in 2012, as was found in the two earlier data collections. Specifically, reported rates of racial-ethnic discrimination for faculty of color did not change. Moreover, the rate for faculty of color were significantly higher than that for white faculty at Time 3. However, both male and female faculty of color reported fewer instances of overhearing disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities and/or religious groups at Time 3 compared to Time 1.

DEPARTMENTAL CLIMATE INDICATORS

All groups reported a more positive department climate in at least some areas at Time 3. Nevertheless, some differences by gender and race-ethnicity continued to be present at Time 3.

Gender

In 2012 men faculty still reported a more positive department climate than women faculty, as they had at Time 1 and Time 2—both in the more general assessments of climate as well as the climate as related to diversity issues.

RACE-ETHNICITY

The general climate ratings were not different when comparing white faculty to faculty of color in 2012 (there were differences for women at Time 1 and Time 2—white women's ratings were more positive). Moreover, the women of color reported a more positive general climate at Time 3 compared to the two previous data collection points (rates for men of color were not different but were generally high all three years). Climate for diversity ratings were higher Time 3 compared to Times 1 and 2 for all four group. Men reported more positively at all three data points compared to their female colleagues. And white faculty reported more positively than faculty of color.

WORK SATISFACTION AND CAREER SATISFACTION

Overall work satisfaction improved for all groups except men of color. However, rates of overall career satisfaction were lower for white women compared to white men; in fact, white women reported lower career satisfaction in almost all areas compared to white men. In contrast, the ratings for faculty of color did not differ by gender at Time 3 (as they had in some areas at the two previous data collection points).

CONCLUSIONS

These data provide clear indications that things have improved over time for both women and men science and engineering faculty. The overall findings from the survey indicate that white male science and engineering faculty continue to enjoy a positive and, in some areas, improved department climate,

including less scholarly isolation and felt surveillance and a more tolerant and gender egalitarian atmosphere. They also reported higher satisfaction and decreased interest in leaving UM.

The overall department climate showed improvement for white women as well by Time 3. In particular, they reported more gender egalitarianism and a more positive climate. Moreover, the rate of reported experience of sexual harassment continued to be significantly lower for white women than reported levels in 2001 (as was true in 2006). Work satisfaction and overall career satisfaction were also higher for white women and they reported less desire to leave the University.

The situation for women of color also appeared to be better in some areas. We found no change in their experience of racial-ethnic discrimination; however, they reported a more positive general department climate and department climate for diversity at Time 3, and their ratings were not different from white women at this latest data collection point (as they had been earlier). Similar to white women, women of color indicated higher work satisfaction and higher overall career satisfaction in 2012 compared to earlier reports, and they reported less desire to leave the University. Moreover, overall career satisfaction was associated with gender discrimination for both women of color and white women at Time 3; however, overall career satisfaction was not associated with racial-ethnic discrimination for women of color as it was for men of color at Time 3. It is worth noting that the sample size for faculty of color would emerge.

The results for male faculty of color suggested some modest improvement. Specifically, they report a better overall department climate. However, reported experiences of racial-ethnic discrimination did not change over time (as was true for women of color) and their climate for diversity ratings were significantly lower than those for white men at all three data points. Moreover, unlike other faculty, work satisfaction did not improve for male faculty of color nor did their overall career satisfaction or their desire to leave the University (however, rates for men of color were generally positive at all data collection points).

Despite the positive changes noted, the data suggest that there continue to be clear and consistent gender differences concerning some aspects of the climate at both the University and the department levels indicating a more negative climate for women science and engineering faculty than for men as we found in the earlier studies. In most instances these differences were relatively stable across time. They also tended to be consistent across race. In the same way, race-ethnicity differences on measures directly addressing race and ethnicity revealed a similarly negative climate for science and engineering faculty of color. And again, these differences were generally consistent across time. In all instances these differences cannot be accounted for by differences in experience (e.g., rank, years at UM) or by school.

It is useful to reiterate that the climate survey reports aggregate data and only represent experiences for these four groups of faculty in general. Specific experiences to the contrary, for example in a particular department, cannot be revealed with these data. For this reason, the ADVANCE Program uses several

approaches (e.g., quantitative surveys and qualitative studies at the departmental level and of other groups of faculty as well as institutional data) to assess the effect of the program on the campus climate.

Overall, the findings from the 2012 data suggest a real improvement in the climate for all four faculty groups. The most striking change was at the department level; faculty reported a more positive and welcoming department climate in terms of both general aspects as well as those specifically related to gender and race-ethnicity. Given the clear relationship between science and engineering faculty ratings of the climate and work satisfaction with their overall career satisfaction and desire to leave UM, this is encouraging news. Clearly transforming the work environment for science and engineering faculty is a slow process. However, the findings from this most recent study suggest that the efforts are beginning to yield positive results and it is critical that we maintain the momentum we have now established.

Table 1a - Gender Related University C	imate Indicators: Means and Percentage	es by Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups for Three
Timepoints for STEM Faculty		

	n	nen of col	or	WO	men of c	color		white me	en	W	hite wor	nen
	scient	ists & eng	gineers	scient	ists & en	gineers	scient	ists & en	gineers	scient	ists & en	gineers
		mean			mean	-		mean	-		mean	-
	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3
	n=24	n=29	n=83	n=18	n=26	n=36	n=74	n=112	n=349	n=101	n=95	n=134
Disparaging comments about women	1.81	1.45	1.26	1.76	1.65	1.46	1.43	1.47	1.31	1.95	1.87	1.64
Disparaging comments about men	1.77	1.50	1.38	1.60	1.32	1.50	1.54	1.63	1.40	1.91	1.62	1.55
		percentage T1 T2 T3			percenta	ge		percenta	ge		percenta	ge
	T1	<u>T1 T2 T3</u> 8% 6% 7%			T2	T3	T1	T2	 T3	T1	T2	T3
Gender discrimination	11 12 13 1 8% 6% 7% 3		38%	47%	31%	3%	6%	4%	46%	41%	38%	
Hiring	0%	2%	3%	0%	8%	6%	2%	2%	1%	6%	6%	12%
Promotion	0%	0%	3%	14%	14%	17%	0%	2%	1%	17%	11%	14%
Salary	2%	4%	5%	24%	41%	25%	0%	3%	2%	39%	32%	31%
Space/equipment, other resources	0%	0%	2%	14%	21%	17%	2%	1%	0%	19%	13%	11%
Access to administrative staff	0%	0%	0%	8%	7%	9%	0%	0%	0%	12%	13%	10%
Graduate student or resident/fellow assignments	6%	2%	2%	6%	12%	8%	0%	0%	1%	6%	8%	6%
Unwanted sexual attention	6%	6%	1%	5%	3%	5%	5%	5%	1%	21%	9%	10%
Individuals reporting others reported unwanted sexual attention	35%	9%	11%	23%	27%	15%	17%	15%	16%	39%	24%	21%

able 1b - Gender Related University Climate Indicators: Differences within Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups across Time for STEM Faculty													
	m	en of col	or	WO	men of c	olor	١	white mer	۱	w	hite wom	en	
	scienti	sts & eng	gineers	scient	ists & en	gineers	scienti	ists & eng	ineers	scienti	sts & en	gineers	
	diffe	rences w	vithin	diffe	erences v	vithin	diffe	erences w	ithin	diffe	rences v	vithin	
	m	en of col	or	WO	men of c	olor	۱ ۱	white mer	۱	w	hite wom	en	
	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	
Disparaging comments about women	-0.55 *	-0.19	-0.36 *	-0.30	-0.19	-0.11	-0.12	-0.16 *	0.04	-0.30 *	-0.23 *	-0.08	
Disparaging comments about men	-0.39	-0.12	-0.27	-0.10	0.18	-0.28	-0.14	-0.24 *	0.09	-0.36 *	-0.07	-0.29 *	
	diffe	rences w	vithin	diffe	erences v	vithin	diffe	erences w	ithin	diffe	rences v	vithin	
	m	men of color T3-T1 T3-T2 T2-T1			men of c	olor	1	white mer	า	w	hite wom	en	
	men of color T3-T1 T3-T2 T2-T1			T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	
Gender discrimination	-1%	1%	-2%	-8%	-16%	9%	0%	-2%	3%	-8%	-4%	-5%	
Hiring	-	1%	-	-	-2%	-	-1%	-1%	0%	6%	7%	-1%	
Promotion	-	-	-	3%	3%	0%	-	-1%	-	-3%	3%	-6%	
Salary	3%	1%	2%	1%	-16%	17%	-	-1%	-	-8%	-1%	-8%	
Space/equipment, other resources	-	-	-	3%	-4%	7%	-	-	-	-8%	-2%	-6%	
Access to administrative staff	-	-	-	0%	1%	-1%	-	-	-	-3%	-4%	1%	
Graduate student or resident/fellow assignments	-4%	0%	-4%	2%	-4%	5%	-	-		-1%	-2%	2%	
Unwanted sexual attention	-5%	-5%	0%	0%	2%	-3%	-4%	-4% *	0%	-12% *	1%	-12% *	
Individuals reporting others reported unwanted sexual attention	-24%	2%	-26%	-8%	-12%	4%	-2%	1%	-2%	-18% *	-3%	-15% *	

Table 1c - Gender Related University Climate Indicators: Differences between Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups for Three Timepoints for STEM Faculty

	differe	nces be	tween	differ	ences be	tween	differe	ences be	tween	diffe	ences be	tween
	men	of color	and	wom	en of colo	or and	wh	ite men a	and	me	n of color	and
	w	hite mer	ו	w	hite wom	en	w	nite wom	en	wo	omen of c	olor
	(mon of a	olor wh	vito mon)	(wome	n of colo	r - white	(whit	e men -	white	(men o	f color - w	omen of
	(men or c	0101 - WI	iite men)		women)			women)			color)	
	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3
Disparaging comments about women	0.38 *	-0.02	-0.05	-0.18	-0.22 *	-0.18	-0.52 *	-0.40 *	-0.33 *	0.05	-0.20	-0.20
Disparaging comments about men	0.23	-0.14	-0.02	-0.31	-0.30 *	-0.05	-0.37 *	0.01	-0.16 *	0.17	0.18	-0.12
	differe	differences between men of color and			ences be	tween	differe	ences be	tween	diffe	ences be	tween
	men	of color	and	wom	en of colo	or and	wh	ite men a	and	me	n of color	and
	w	white men			hite wom	en	wł	nite wom	en	wo	omen of c	olor
	T1	white men T1 T2 T3			T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3
Gender discrimination	5%	0%	3%	-8%	6%	-7%	-43% *	-35% *	-34% *	-30% *	· -41% *	-24% *
Hiring	-	0%	2%	-	2%	-7%	-5%	-4%	-11% *	-	-6%	-3%
Promotion	-	-	2%	-3%	3%	3%	-	-9% *	-13% *	-	-	-14% *
Salary	-	1%	2%	-15%	9%	-6%	-	-28% *	-28% *	-22%	-37% *	-21% *
Space/equipment, other resources	-	-	-	-5%	7%	6%	-17% *	-12% *	-	-		-14% *
Access to administrative staff	-	-	-	-4%	-6%	-1%	-	-		-	-	-
Graduate student or resident/fellow assignments	-	-	1%	0%	4%	2%	-	-	-5% *	0%	-10%	-6%
Unwanted sexual attention	1%	1%	0%	-16%	-6%	-5%	-16% *	-4%	-9% *	1%	4%	-4%
Individuals reporting others reported unwanted sexual attention	17%	-6%	-5%	-16%	3%	-6%	-22% *	-9%	-5%	12%	-18%	-4%

Notes: Means and percentages are from weighted data. Significance indicators are from statistical analyses using ANOVA and Logistic Regression with control variable. Comparisons were not run when 0% was present.

Ns vary slightly by item; N=max number of responses by group for items in table. Differences may vary slightly due to rounding.

Survey Years: T1=2001; T2=2006; T3=2012.

*Represents significance at p≤.05 level; ^a Cannot compute, at least 1 criteria is too small.

Table 2a - Race Related University Climate Indicators: Means and Percentages by Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups for Three Timepoints for STEM Faculty

	n	men of color			men of c	color		white me	en	W	hite worr	nen
	scient	ists & eng	gineers	scient	ists & en	gineers	scient	tists & en	gineers	scient	ists & en	gineers
		mean			mean			mean			mean	
	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	T3
	n=24	n=29	n=82	n=18	n=26	n=35	n=69	n=112	n=349	n=98	n=95	n=133
Disparaging comments about racial- ethnic minorities and/or religious groups	1.68	1.35	1.25	1.64	1.65	1.31	1.28	1.32	1.18	1.44	1.40	1.22
	percentage			F	percenta	ge		percenta	ge	F	percenta	ge
	T1 T2 T3 T		T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	Т3	
Racial-ethnic discrimination	39%	20%	18%	26%	32%	26%	4%	3%	2%	0%	0%	2%
Hiring	14%	8%	8%	0%	7%	9%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	2%
Promotion	0%	8%	6%	26%	21%	17%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Salary	12%	20%	8%	12%	28%	17%	4%	1%	1%	0%	0%	2%
Space/equipment, other resources	6%	8%	5%	20%	17%	23%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Access to administrative staff	19%	8%	5%	20%	4%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Graduate student or resident/fellow assignments	6%	0%	7%	12%	13%	8%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%

Table 2b - Race Related University Climate Indicators: Differences within Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups across Time for STEM Faculty

	rr scienti diffe rr	ien of col sts & eng irences w ien of col	or gineers vithin or	wo scient diffe wo	men of c ists & en erences v men of c	olor gineers vithin olor	scienti diffe	white mei sts & eng rences w white mei	n gineers /ithin n	w scienti diffe w	hite wom sts & eng rences w hite wom	en gineers vithin en
	13-11	13-12	12-11	13-11	13-12	12-11	13-11	13-12	12-11	13-11	13-12	12-11
Disparaging comments about racial- ethnic minorities and/or religious groups	-0.43 *	-0.10	-0.33	-0.34 *	-0.34	0.00	-0.11	-0.15 *	0.04	-0.23 *	-0.18 *	-0.05
	differences within men of color			diffe wo	erences v men of c	vithin olor	diffe	rences w white me	<i>r</i> ithin n	diffe w	rences v hite wom	vithin en
	T3-T1 T3-T2 T2-T1			T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1
Racial-ethnic discrimination	-21%	-1%	-19%	0%	-5%	5%	-2%	-1%	-1%	-	-	-
Hiring	-5%	1%	-6%	-	1%	-	0%	0%	-1%	-	-	-
Promotion	-	-2%	-	-10%	-4%	-6%	-1%	0%	-1%	-	-	-
Salary	-4%	-11%	7%	5%	-11%	16%	-2%	0%	-3%	-	-	-
Space/equipment, other resources	-2%	-3%	1%	3%	6%	-3%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Access to administrative staff	-2% -3% 1%			-12%	5%	-17%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate student or resident/fellow assignments	1%	-	-	-4%	-5%	1%	-	0%	-	-	-	-

Table 2c - Race Related University Climate Indicators: Differences between Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups for Three Timepoints for STEM Faculty

	differe	nces betw	veen	differe	ences b	etween	differe	ences be	etween	differ	ences be	etween
	men	of color a	and	wome	en of co	lor and	wh	ite men	and	me	n of colo	r and
	W	hite men		w	hite wor	nen	w	hite worr	ien	wo	omen of c	olor
	(((wome	n of cold	or - white	(whit	e men -	white	(men o	f color - v	vomen of
	(men of c	color - whi	te men)		women)		women))		color)	
	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3
Disparaging comments about racial- ethnic minorities and/or religious groups	0.40 *	0.03	0.08	0.20 *	0.25	0.09	-0.16 *	-0.07	-0.04	0.04	-0.30	-0.06
	differe men w	nces betw of color a /hite men	veen and	differe wome wl	ences b en of co hite wor	etween lor and nen	differe wh wl	ences be ite men hite wom	etween and ien	differ me wo	ences be n of color omen of c	etween r and color
	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3
Racial-ethnic discrimination	35% *	17% *	16% *	-	-	24% *	-	-	0%	13%	-12%	-8%
Hiring	12%	7%	7% *	-	-	6% *	-	-	-1%	-	0%	0%
Promotion	-	7%	5% *	-	-	16% ^a	-	-	0% ^a	-	-13%	-11% *
Salary	9%	19% *	7% *	-	-	15% ^a	-	-	-1% ^a	0%	-8%	-8%
Space/equipment, other resources	5%	-	-	-	-	21% ^a	-	-	-	-14%	-9%	-18% *
Access to administrative staff	-	-	-	-	-	8% ^a	-	-	-	-1%	4%	-4%
Graduate student or resident/fellow assignments	-	-	6% *	-	-	7% ^a	-	-	0% ^a	-6%	-	-1%

Notes: Means and percentages are from weighted data. Significance indicators are from statistical analyses using ANOVA and Logistic Regression with control variable. Comparisons were not run when 0% was present.

Ns vary slightly by item; N=max number of responses by group for items in table. Differences may vary slightly due to rounding.

Survey Years: T1=2001; T2=2006; T3=2012.

*Represents significance at p≤.05 level; ^a Cannot compute, at least 1 criteria is too small.

	,											
	n	men of color			omen of c	olor		white me	en	W	hite won	nen
	scient	ists & eng	gineers	scient	ists & en	gineers	scient	tists & en	gineers	scient	ists & en	ngineers
	mean				mean			mean			mean	
	T1 T2 T3		T1	T2 T3	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	T3	
	n=23	n=27	n=88	n=17	n=25	n=34	n=68	n=106	n=355	n=100	n=90	n=132
Climate for diversity	3.56	3.81	4.15	2.58	2.64	3.63	4.06	4.14	4.29	3.47	3.42	3.70
General climate	3.59	3.66	3.89	2.71	2.76	3.68	3.61	3.73	3.94	3.32	3.34	3.58

Table 3a - Department Climate: Means by Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups for Three Timepoints for STEM Faculty

Table 3b - Department Climate: Differences within Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups across Time for STEM Faculty

	m	men of color			men of c	olor	۷	vhite mei	า	wh	nite wom	en	
	scienti	scientists & engineers			sts & eng	gineers	scientis	sts & eng	gineers	scientis	sts & eng	gineers	
	differences within			diffe	rences w	vithin	diffe	rences w	vithin	diffe	rences w	vithin	
	men of color			WO	men of c	olor	v	vhite mei	า	wh	nite wom	en	
	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	
Climate for diversity	0.59 *	0.34 *	0.25	1.04 *	0.99 *	0.05	0.23 *	0.15 *	0.08	0.22 *	0.28 *	-0.06	
General climate	0.30	0.23	0.07	0.97 *	0.91 *	0.05	0.33 *	0.21 *	0.11	0.27 *	0.24 *	0.02	

Table 3c - Department Climate: Differences between Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups for Three Timepoints for STEM Faculty

	differe	nces bet	ween	differe	ences bet	tween	differe	nces bet	ween	differe	nces bet	ween
	men	of color a	and	wome	en of cold	or and	whi	te men a	nd	men	of color a	and
	W	hite men	1	w	hite wom	en	wh	ite wome	en	wor	nen of co	lor
	(mon of a	men of color - white men)			n of color	- white	(white	e men - v	vhite	(men of	color - wo	omen of
	(men of color - white men)				women)			women)			color)	
	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	Т3
Climate for diversity	-0.50 *	-0.33 *	-0.14 *	-0.89 *	-0.78 *	-0.07	0.59 *	0.72 *	0.59 *	0.98 *	1.17 *	0.52 *
General climate	-0.02	-0.07	-0.05	-0.61 *	-0.58 *	0.09	0.29 *	0.38 *	0.36 *	0.88 *	0.90 *	0.21

Notes: Means are from weighted data. Significance indicators are from statistical analyses using ANOVA with control variable. Ns vary slightly by item; N=max number of responses by group for items in table. Differences may vary slightly due to rounding. Survey Years: T1=2001; T2=2006; T3=2012.

*Represents significance at p≤.05 level.

Table 4a - Work Satisfaction: Means by Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups for Three Timepoints for STEM Faculty

	n	nen of col	or	women of color				white me	en	W	hite won	nen
	scient	tists & eng	gineers	scient	ists & en	ngineers	scient	tists & en	igineers	scient	ists & er	igineers
		mean			mean			mean			mean	
	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3
	n=24	n=29	n=84	n=18	n=26	n=36	n=74	n=111	n=354	n=104	n=95	n=133
Overall work satisfaction	3.66	3.80	3.88	3.26	3.41	4.04	3.61	3.86	4.02	3.57	3.58	3.77
Opportunity to collaborate with other faculty	4.21	4.25	4.33	3.65	3.99	4.31	3.89	4.40	4.50	3.77	3.91	4.28
Amount of social interaction with members of	3.72	3.80	3.82	2.81	2.68	3.87	3.67	3.73	3.88	3.40	3.14	3.56
Level of funding for research or creative efforts	3.68	3.05	3.75	3.28	3.35	3.80	3.79	3.45	3.65	3.53	3.34	3.41
Current salary in comparison with the salaries of UM	3.61	3.22	3.44	2.79	2.72	3.66	3.16	3.62	3.81	3.03	3.25	3.37
Ability to attract students to work with me	3.48	3.98	3.66	3.39	3.54	3.74	3.39	3.76	3.90	3.88	3.40	3.71
Sense of being valued as a teacher by students	4.06	4.25	4.14	3.83	3.99	4.30	4.15	4.18	4.30	4.26	4.05	4.29
Sense of being valued as a mentor or advisor by students	4.21	4.33	4.40	4.24	4.18	4.55	4.38	4.47	4.46	4.61	4.24	4.61
Sense of being valued for my teaching by members of department/unit	3.86	3.90	3.68	2.90	2.83	3.95	3.50	3.66	3.89	3.43	3.51	3.47
Sense of being valued for research, scholarship, or creativity by members of department/unit	3.44	3.78	3.73	2.63	2.86	4.11	3.59	3.70	3.98	3.36	3.40	3.58
Level of intellectual stimulation in day-to-day contacts with faculty colleagues	3.63	3.77	3.72	3.27	3.02	4.01	3.64	3.87	4.02	3.46	3.48	3.69
Sense of contributing to theoretical developments in my discipline	3.74	4.16	4.08	3.58	4.20	4.25	4.01	4.21	4.29	4.00	3.86	4.07
Balance between professional and personal life	3.21	3.51	3.59	3.29	2.74	3.24	3.33	3.51	3.64	2.67	3.01	3.21

Table 4b - Work Satisfaction: Differences within Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups across Time for STEM Faculty

	n	nen of colo	or	WOI	nen of co	olor	W	/hite mer	۱	wł	nite wom	en
	scient	ists & engi	ineers	scienti	sts & eng	gineers	scientis	sts & eng	ineers	scientis	sts & eng	gineers
	diffe	erences wi	ithin	diffe	rences w	/ithin	differ	rences w	rithin	diffe	rences w	vithin
	n	nen of colo	or	wor	nen of co	olor	v	hite mer	ו	wh	nite wom	en
	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1
Overall work satisfaction	0.22	0.08	0.14	0.78 *	0.63 *	0.15	0.41 *	0.16 *	0.25 *	0.21 *	0.19	0.01
Opportunity to collaborate with other faculty	0.12	0.08	0.04	0.66 *	0.32	0.34	0.61 *	0.10	0.51 *	0.51 *	0.37 *	0.14
Amount of social interaction with members of department/unit	0.10	0.02	0.08	1.06 *	1.19 *	-0.13	0.21	0.15	0.06	0.16	0.42 *	-0.26
Level of funding for research or creative efforts	0.07	0.70 *	-0.63	0.52	0.45	0.07	-0.14	0.20	-0.34	-0.12	0.07	-0.19
Current salary in comparison with the salaries of UM colleagues	-0.17	0.22	-0.39	0.87 *	0.94 *	-0.07	0.65 *	0.19	0.46 *	0.34 *	0.12	0.22
Ability to attract students to work with me	0.18	-0.32	0.50	0.35	0.20	0.15	0.51 *	0.14	0.37	-0.17	0.31	-0.48 *
Sense of being valued as a teacher by students	0.08	-0.11	0.19	0.47 *	0.31 *	0.16	0.15	0.12	0.03	0.03	0.24	-0.21
Sense of being valued as a mentor or advisor by students	0.19	0.07	0.12	0.31 *	0.37 *	-0.06	0.08	-0.01	0.09	0.00	0.37 *	-0.37
Sense of being valued for my teaching by members of department/unit	-0.18	-0.22	0.04	1.05 *	1.12 *	-0.07	0.39 *	0.23 *	0.16	0.04	-0.04	0.08
Sense of being valued for research, scholarship, or creativity by members of department/unit	0.29	-0.05	0.34	1.48 *	1.25 *	0.23	0.39 *	0.28 *	0.11	0.22	0.18	0.04
Level of intellectual stimulation in day-to-day contacts with faculty colleagues	0.09	-0.05	0.14	0.74 *	0.99 *	-0.25	0.38 *	0.15	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.02
Sense of contributing to theoretical developments in my discipline	0.34	-0.08	0.42	0.67	0.05	0.62	0.28 *	0.08	0.20	0.07	0.21	-0.14
Balance between professional and personal life	0.38	0.08	0.30	-0.05	0.50	-0.55 *	0.31 *	0.13	0.18	0.54 *	0.20	0.34 *

Table 4c - Work Satisfaction: Differences between Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups for Three Timepoints for STEM Faculty

	differe	ances het	veen	differe	nces het	ween	differe	nces het	Neen	differe	nces het	ween
	men	of color a	and	wome	an of colo	r and	whit	e men ar	nd	men	of color	and
		vhita man		w0116	nite wome	n unu	wh	ito womo	n	won	on color	lor
	v	vince men		(worse		711 white	(white		n II	(mon of r		omon of
	(men of o	color - whi	te men)	(wome		- white	(writte	e men - w	nite	(men or o	20101 - W	omen or
	T 4	To	то	T 4	women)	To	, ,	women)	то	T 4	COIOI)	To
	11	12	13	11	12	13	11	12	13	11	12	13
Overall work satisfaction	0.06	-0.06	-0.14	-0.31	-0.17	0.27	0.04	0.28 *	0.25 *	0.40	0.39 *	-0.16
Opportunity to collaborate with other faculty	0.32	-0.15	-0.17	-0.12	0.08	0.03	0.12	0.49 *	0.22 *	0.56 *	0.26	0.02
Amount of social interaction with members of department/unit	0.05	0.07	-0.06	-0.59	-0.46	0.31	0.27	0.59 *	0.32 *	0.91 *	1.12 *	-0.05
Level of funding for research or creative efforts	-0.11	-0.40 *	0.10	-0.25	0.01	0.39	0.26	0.11	0.24 *	0.40	-0.30	-0.05
Current salary in comparison with the salaries of UM colleagues	0.45	-0.40 *	-0.37 *	-0.24	-0.53	0.29	0.13	0.37	0.44 *	0.82	0.50	-0.22
Ability to attract students to work with me	0.09	0.22	-0.24	-0.49	0.14	0.03	-0.49	0.36 *	0.19	0.09	0.44	-0.08
Sense of being valued as a teacher by students	-0.09	0.07	-0.16	-0.43 *	-0.06	0.01	-0.11	0.13	0.01	0.23	0.26	-0.16
Sense of being valued as a mentor or advisor by												
students	-0.17	-0.14	-0.06	-0.37 *	-0.06	-0.06	-0.23	0.23	-0.15	-0.03	0.15	-0.15
Sense of being valued for my teaching by members of department/unit	0.36	0.24	-0.21	-0.53	-0.68	0.48 *	0.07	0.15	0.42 *	0.96 *	1.07 *	-0.27
Sense of being valued for research, scholarship, or creativity by members of department/unit	-0.15	0.08	-0.25 *	-0.73	-0.54	0.53 *	0.23	0.30	0.40 *	0.81	0.92 *	-0.38
Level of intellectual stimulation in day-to-day contacts with faculty colleagues	-0.01	-0.10	-0.30	-0.19	-0.46	0.32	0.18	0.39 *	0.33 *	0.36	0.75 *	-0.29
Sense of contributing to theoretical developments in my discipline	-0.27	-0.05	-0.21	-0.42	0.34	0.18	0.01	0.35 *	0.22 *	0.16	-0.04	-0.17
Balance between professional and personal life	-0.12	0.00	-0.05	0.62 *	-0.27	0.03	0.66 *	0.50	0.43 *	-0.08	0.77 *	0.35

Notes: Means are from weighted data. Significance indicators are from statistical analyses using ANOVA with control variable.

Ns vary slightly by item; N=max number of responses by group for items in table. Differences may vary slightly due to rounding.

*Represents significance at p≤.05 level.

Survey Years: T1=2001; T2=2006; T3=2012.

Table 5a - Overall CareerSatisfaction and Desire to Leave UM: Means by Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups for Three Timepoints for STEM Faculty

	1	men of col	or	W	omen of a	color		white me	en	v	vhite won	nen
	scien	tists & eng	gineers	scient	tists & en	gineers	scien	tists & en	gineers	scien	tists & er	ngineers
		mean			mean			mean			mean	
	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3
	n=24	n=29	n=84	n=18	n=26	n=35	n=71	n=112	n=352	n=101	n=95	n=133
Overall career satisfaction	3.60	3.77	3.76	3.01	3.20	3.93	3.86	3.93	4.09	3.35	3.47	3.78
Want to leave		2.59	2.44		3.18	2.45		2.44	2.21		2.82	2.55

Table 5b - Overall Career Satisfaction and Desire to Leave UM: Differences within Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups across Time for STEM Faculty

	n	nen of colo	or	WO	men of c	olor		white me	n	wł	nite wom	en
	scient	ists & eng	ineers	scienti	sts & eng	gineers	scient	ists & eng	gineers	scienti	sts & eng	gineers
	diffe	erences w	ithin	diffe	rences w	vithin	diffe	erences w	/ithin	diffe	rences w	vithin
	n	nen of colo	or	WO	men of c	olor		white me	n	wł	nite wom	en
	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2	T2-T1
Overall career satisfaction	0.16	-0.01	0.17	0.92 *	0.73 *	0.19	0.23	0.16	0.07	0.43 *	0.31	0.12
Want to leave		-0.15			-0.74 *			-0.24 *			-0.27 *	

Table 5c - Overall Career Satisfaction and Desire to Leave UM: Differences between Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups for Three Timepoints for STEM Faculty

	diffe	ences bei	tween	diffe	rences be	etween	differ	ences bet	ween	diffe	rences be	tween
	me	n of color	and	wom	en of col	or and	wh	ite men a	and	me	en of color	and
		white mer	า	W	hite wor	nen	w	hite wome	en	w	omen of c	olor
	(man of		ite men)	(wome	en of colo	or - white	(whit	te men - v	white	(men o	of color - w	omen of
	(men ol	COIOT - WI	iite men)		women)		women)			color)	
	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3
Overall career satisfaction	-0.26	-0.16	-0.33 *	-0.34	-0.27	0.15	0.51 *	0.46 *	0.31 *	0.59	0.57 *	-0.17
Want to leave		0.15	0.24		0.37	-0.10		-0.37 *	-0.34 *		-0.59 *	0.00

Notes: Means are from weighted data. Significance indicators are from statistical analyses using ANOVA with control variable. Ns vary slightly by item; N=max number of responses by group for items in table. Differences may vary slightly due to rounding. Survey Years: T1=2001; T2=2006; T3=2012.

*Represents significance at p≤.05 level.

Table 6 - Correlations of Overall Career Satisfaction and Wanting to Leave UM with Climate and Work Satisfaction Indicators by Race-Ethnicity-Gender Groups for Three Timepoints for STEM Faculty

		overall caree	r satisfaction			want to	leave UM	
	men	women	white	white	men	women	white	white
l ime 1	01 COIO1	01 COIO1	n=71	n=101			men	women
Overall work satisfaction	0.87 ***	0.77 ***	0.50 ***	0.75 ***				
Overall climate	0.73 ***	0.58 *	0.50 ***	0.63 ***				
Disparaging comments about women	0.04	-0.26	-0.17	-0.25 **				
Disparaging comments about men	0.23	-0.13	0.08	-0.16				
Disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities	0.01	-0.08	-0.03	-0.11				
Unwanted sexual attention	0.09	-0.42	-0.23	-0.17				
Gender discrimination	-0.03	-0.06	-0.16	-0.27 *				
Racial-ethnic discrimination	-0.30	-0.36	-0.04	а				
	-							

		overall caree	r satisfaction			want to	o leave UM	
	men	women	white	white	men	women	white	white
Time 2	of color	of color	men	women	of color	of color	men	women
	n=29	n=26	n=112	n=95	n=29	n=26	n=110	n=94
Overall work satisfaction	0.47 **	0.77 ***	0.68 ***	0.60 ***	-0.19	-0.08	-0.47 ***	-0.44 ***
Overall climate	0.59 **	0.67 ***	0.59 ***	0.60 ***	-0.56 **	-0.25	-0.55 ***	-0.47 ***
Disparaging comments about women	0.08	-0.43 *	-0.05	-0.10	0.17	0.26	-0.03	0.20
Disparaging comments about men	-0.04	-0.12	-0.11	0.05	0.01	0.19	0.06	0.12
Disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities	-0.16	-0.04	-0.18	0.01	0.20	0.11	0.09	0.06
Unwanted sexual attention	0.08	-0.05	0.10	-0.07	-0.02	0.06	0.05	0.22 *
Gender discrimination	0.08	0.02	-0.05	-0.18	-0.15	0.26	0.09	0.05
Racial-ethnic discrimination	-0.38 *	-0.08	-0.03	а	0.13	0.29	0.10	а

		overall caree	er satisfaction			want t	o leave UM	
	men	women	white	white	men	women	white	white
Time 3	of color	of color	men	women	of color	of color	men	women
	n=84	n=35	n=352	n=133	n=83	n=36	n=351	n=132
Overall work satisfaction	0.74 ***	0.50 **	0.71 ***	0.70 ***	-0.51 ***	-0.15	-0.56 ***	-0.46 ***
Overall climate	0.57 ***	0.27	0.56 ***	0.66 ***	-0.53 ***	-0.18	-0.49 ***	-0.54 ***
Disparaging comments about women	0.03	0.04	-0.09	-0.26 **	0.06	-0.22	0.10 *	0.24 **
Disparaging comments about men	0.01	0.08	-0.15 **	-0.24 **	-0.01	-0.01	0.17 ***	0.21 *
Disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities	-0.01	-0.13	-0.14 **	-0.08	-0.03	-0.13	0.16 **	0.14
Unwanted sexual attention	0.14	0.02	-0.09	-0.18 *	-0.12	-0.08	0.11 *	0.13
Gender discrimination	-0.27 *	-0.42 *	-0.19 ***	-0.34 ***	0.04	0.25	0.17 **	0.31 ***
Racial-ethnic discrimination	-0.26 *	-0.10	-0.17 **	-0.04	0.25 *	-0.17	0.14 *	0.03

Notes: Correlations were run with weighted data.

Ns vary slightly by item; N=max # of responses by group for items in table. Survey Years: Time 1=2001; Time 2=2006; Time 3=2012.

*p≤.05, **p≤.01, ***p≤.001; ^a Cannot compute, at least 1 variable is constant.

Appendix A Survey of University of Michigan Faculty (2012)

Survey of University of Michigan Faculty

Throughout this survey, "faculty" refers to all tenured and tenure-track, primary research, and clinical track faculty.

If you need to complete the survey in more than one sitting, please click on the ">>" button at the bottom of this page; this will save your responses. Once you have advanced to the next page of the survey, you may then close your browser window and return to the full survey at a later time.

If you need to go back to a previous page in the survey, please click on the "<<" button at the bottom of the page. Please do not use the back button of your web browser.

Procedures for Completing the Survey

Procedures for Completing the Survey

Thank you very much for participating in the University of Michigan Faculty Survey. Throughout this survey, "faculty" refers to all tenured and tenure-track, primary research, and clinical track faculty. You are able to stop and return to your survey at a later time, until you click the final submit button at the end of the survey. You may skip any questions you do not feel comfortable answering, and you have the opportunity to write additional comments near the end of the survey.

We hope to receive completed surveys no later than November 16, 2012.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, or wish to obtain information, ask questions or discuss any concerns about this study with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact the University of Michigan Health Sciences and Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board, 540 E Liberty St., Ste 202, Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2210, (734) 936-0933 [or toll free, (866) 936-0933], irbhsbs@umich.edu.

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT

In the chart below, please select the appropriate response option to indicate when you obtained your highest academic degree, your first UM appointment, and when you started on the tenure track at UM (if applicable).

	1960-64	1965-69	1970-74	1975-79	1980-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000-04	2005-09	2010-12
year of highest degree	0	\bigcirc									
year of first UM appointment	0	\bigcirc									
year started tenure track at UM	0	\bigcirc									

Please indicate, in the following chart, your budgeted appointment for *July 2011-June 2012* at UM, including the School or College in which you held the appointment, as well as the rank and fraction of time associated with that appointment.

If you had multiple budgeted appointments, please list information for second, third, and fourth budgeted appointments, where applicable, as well. (Note: Fraction amounts should not equal more than 100%; and all ranks include adjunct appointments.)

	school/college	rank code (note that all ranks include adjunct appointments)	appointment fraction (e.g., 100%, 50%)
1st (only) budgeted appointment	▼	▼	
2nd budgeted appointment			
3rd budgeted appointment			
4th budgeted appointment	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	▼	

How would you classify the primary field of your UM appointment? (select only one)

- Social Science
- Science or Engineering (basic, natural, clinical & applied science)
- Arts/Humanities

Do you currently have one or more dry	(unfunded) appointmen	ts?				
) yes						
o no						
IMARY DEPARTMENT/UNIT						
PRIMARY DEPARTMENT/UNIT						
Many of the following questions ask yo the <i>department/unit that you consider</i> (regardless of percentage of budgeted	ou to rate conditions in y to be your primary appo appointment).	/our " primary depa <i>intment.</i> Normally th	<i>rtment/unit</i> ." If yo his would be the d	ou have multiple app lepartment/unit in wh	ointments, we woul lich you spend the r	d like you to rate nost time
However, we are most interested in instructional appointment in another de please simply choose one to rate for the	<i>learning about instruc</i> epartment/unit, please s his questionnaire.	tional departments elect the instruction	∕ units, so if you h al department/uni	nave an administrativ it. If you teach in two	e position and an a departments/units	dditional to an equal degre
My primary department/unit is in the follo	owing school/college:					
My appointment in this department/unit i	is on the following track:					.
RESOURCES						
RESOURCES	ur level of satisfaction wi	th your current alloc	ations of these ite	ems in your primary	department/unit.	
RESOURCES	ur level of satisfaction wi	th your current alloc somewhat dissatisfied	ations of these ite neutral	ems in your primary somewhat satisfied	department/unit. very satisfied	not applicable
RESOURCES In the chart below, please indicate you Office space: amount of space	ur level of satisfaction wi	th your current alloc somewhat dissatisfied	ations of these ite neutral	ems in your primary somewhat satisfied	department/unit. very satisfied	not applicable
RESOURCES In the chart below, please indicate you Office space: amount of space location	very dissatisfied	th your current alloc somewhat dissatisfied	ations of these ite	ems in your primary somewhat satisfied	department/unit.	not applicable
RESOURCES In the chart below, please indicate you Office space: amount of space location computer equipment other (please specific):	ur level of satisfaction wi	th your current alloc somewhat dissatisfied	ations of these ite neutral	somewhat satisfied	department/unit. very satisfied	not applicable
RESOURCES In the chart below, please indicate you Office space: amount of space location computer equipment other (<i>please specify</i>):	ur level of satisfaction wi	th your current alloc somewhat dissatisfied	ations of these ite	ems in your primary somewhat satisfied	department/unit. very satisfied	not applicable

	verydissatisfied	dissatisfied	neutral	satisfied	verysatisfied	not applicable
amount of space	0	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
location appropriate to needs of research	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
contiguity of space	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
computer equipment	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
lab equipment	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
service from vendors (e.g., repairs, supplies, upgrades)	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
safety	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
ability to control temperature	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
maintenance (i.e. huilding problems						27

addrossed by physical plant)		\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
other (please specify):		\bigcirc			\bigcirc	
		0	0	0	0	0
unding sources:						
		somewhat		somewhat		
	verydissatisfied	dissatisfied	neutral	satisfied	verysatisfied	not applicable
University	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
external	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
-						
Please describe any resource allocatio	n issues in your prima	ary department/unit t	hat concern you:			
					4	
Have you ever had an outside offer while	e at UM?					
Have you ever had an outside offer while	e at UM?					
Have you ever had an outside offer while yes no	e at UM?					
Have you ever had an outside offer while yes no	e at UM?					
Have you ever had an outside offer while yes no Did an outside offer ever result in a sala	e at UM? ary increase?					
Have you ever had an outside offer while yes no Did an outside offer ever result in a sala	e at UM? ary increase?					
Have you ever had an outside offer while yes no Did an outside offer ever result in a sala yes no	e at UM? ary increase?					
Have you ever had an outside offer while yes no Did an outside offer ever result in a sala yes no	e at UM? ary increase?					
Have you ever had an outside offer while yes no Did an outside offer ever result in a sala yes no Why not?	e at UM? ary increase?					
Have you ever had an outside offer while yes no Did an outside offer ever result in a sala yes no Why not?	e at UM? ary increase?					
Have you ever had an outside offer while yes no Did an outside offer ever result in a sala yes no Why not?	e at UM? ary increase?					
Have you ever had an outside offer while yes no Did an outside offer ever result in a sala yes no Why not?	e at UM? ary increase?					

CAREER SATISFACTION

CAREER SATISFACTION

How satisfied are you with the following dimensions of your professional development in your primary department/unit? Select the response option that best expresses your level of satisfaction for each dimension below.

	verydissatisfied	somewhat dissatisfied	neutral	somewhat satisfied	verysatisfied	not applicable
opportunity to collaborate with other faculty	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\odot	\odot
amount of social interaction with members of my department/unit	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
level of funding for my research or creative efforts	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
current salary in comparison to the salaries of my UM colleagues	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
ability to attract students to work with me	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
sense of being valued as a teacher by		\bigcirc				28

mystudents						
sense of being valued as a mentor or advisor by my students	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
sense of being valued for my teaching by members of my department/unit	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
sense of being valued for my research, scholarship, or creativity by members of my department/unit	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
level of intellectual stimulation in my day-to-day contacts with faculty colleagues	0	0	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot	\bigcirc
sense of contributing to theoretical developments in my discipline	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
balance between professional and personal life	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
other (<i>please specify</i>):	0	\bigcirc	0	0	0	\bigcirc
		C				
	0			0		0
How likely is it that you will stay at UM for	or your entire career	?				
1-very unlikely	2	3		4	5	-very likely
\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc		\bigcirc	\odot	
How much would you like to stay at UM	for your entire caree	r?				
1-not at all	2	3		4 5-ve		verymuch
\odot	\bigcirc	C		\bigcirc		\bigcirc
How often do you think about leaving UM						
· · · · · ·	17					
1-never	2	3		4		5-often

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following items about your work experiences generally, as well as how you manage your work load in your primary department/unit.

	stronglydisagree	tend to disagree	neutral	tend to agree	stronglyagree
I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
l can decide on my own how to go about doing my work.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job.	•	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc
My impact on what happens in my department/unit is large.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department/unit.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I have significant influence over what happens in my department/unit.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I regularly bring work home.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I respond to work-related communications (e.g., emails, texts, and phone calls) during my personal time away from work.		\odot	•	0	\odot
I work during my vacations.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I allow work to interrupt me when I spend time with my family or friends.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I continue to learn more and more as time goes by.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	°29

I have developed a lot as a person.		0	0	0	0
I find myself learning often.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
DGNITION					
RECOGNITION					
las vour primary dopartmont/unit over p	ominated you for an away	rd in the following areas?			
		a in the following areas :			
		yes		no	
teaching		0		0	
		0		0	
		0			
service		0		\bigcirc	
Has your primary department/unit failed	to nominate you for an av	ward for which you were qu	alified?		
🥥 yes					
o no					
I don't know					
0					
Please elaborate:					
ITORING I					
MENTORING					
Overall, how effective is your primary dep	partment/unit at mentoring	g its junior faculty?			
1-verv ineffective	2	3	4		5-verv effective
0	0	0	\bigcirc		0
Do you have at least one mentor/career	advisor?				
,					
🥥 yes					
🔘 no					
Please indicate how much of the various	kinds of support/advice y	you <i>currently</i> receive from a	Il your mentors/career ad	dvisors in each a	rea listed:
	none	some	a la	t	too much
serves as a role model				L	
promotes my career through			0		
promotes my career unough			\bigcirc		

 \bigcirc \bigcirc networking advises about preparation for advancement (e.g., promotion, leadership positions) \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc advises about getting my work published \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc advises about department politics \bigcirc \bigcirc 30

	-	-	-	~
advises about obtaining the resources I need	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
advocates for me	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
advises about balancing work and family	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
other (please specify):	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

MENTORING II

MENTORING

Do you serve as a mentor/career advisor to another faculty member(s)?

) yes

🔘 no

Please indicate how much of the various kinds of support/advice you currently provide as a mentor/career advisor in each area listed:

	none	some	a lot	too much
serve as a role model for mentee	0	0	0	0
promote mentee's career through networking	\bigcirc	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
advise mentee about preparation for advancement (e.g., promotion, leadership positions)	0	\odot	•	0
advise mentee about getting work published	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\odot	\bigcirc
advise mentee about department politics	\bigcirc	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
advise mentee about obtaining the resources needed	\bigcirc	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc
advocate for mentee	\bigcirc	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
advise mentee about balancing work and family	\bigcirc	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc
other (please specify):	0	\odot	\bigcirc	0

TEACHING

TEACHING

▼

Faculty on campus engage in teaching in a variety of ways. Some mainly provide one-on-one instruction, others offer classroom teaching through formal courses, and many do a mixture. How would you characterize your main teaching responsibilities in each of the categories below?

	none	some	most	all
one-on-one instruction	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
formal seminar courses	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\odot
formal lecture courses	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\odot
occasional lectures in large courses	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\odot
modeling correct professional behavior	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\odot
other (please describe):	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

How many formal courses, in a lecture and/or seminar format, do you teach each academic year?

31

How s	atisfied	are	you	with	your	teaching	load?
			~				

verydissatisfied	somewhat dissatisfied	neutral	somewhatsatisfied	verysatisfied	not applicable
\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

In a given year, for how many students do you serve as primary advisor?

graduate students	
undergraduate students	

RESEARCH

RESEARCH

Are you a member of a well-established research team? By this we mean a collaboration that has existed for one year or more, or has submitted research proposals together, or has coauthored papers together.

• Yes, I belong to a well-established research team.

No, my research team cannot be considered a well-established one.

I am not a member of a single research team. Depending on the project, I work with different teams.

I usually work alone.

We would like to know about your general attitudes and satisfaction with your research collaboration. Please rate your views about your research collaboration.

	stronglydisagree	somewhat disagree	neither agree nor disagree	somewhat agree	stronglyagree	not applicable
In general, collaboration has improved my research productivity.	0	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
In general, collaboration has improved the quality of my research.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Collaboration has posed a significant time burden in my research.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Thinking about your own experiences in the past, what barriers have you encountered when trying to establish research collaborations with investigators from other departments, institutions, or organizations? Check all that apply; if this does not apply to your situation, please mark the box for 'NA'.

- lack of time
- lack of funding

Iack of support staff to assist with collaborative research efforts

Iimited awareness of opportunities to network with people outside of my discipline

proximity to other researchers

lack of interest among potential partners

political or organizational pressures

have not encountered any major barriers

other (please specify):

NA 📃

PARTICIPATION

In a typical year:

how many department, college and/or university level committees do you serve on?	
how many do you chair?	

Have you ever been asked to serve and/or served as department chair, department section/area/program chair, or center/lab/institute/program director or administrator?

	yes	no
asked to serve:	0	\bigcirc
served:		\odot

Do you feel you have been excluded from participating in important decision-making college and/or department level committees?

\frown	
\bigcirc	yes

🔘 no

INSTITUTIONAL/DEPARTMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS

INSTITUTIONAL/DEPARTMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements concerning conditions in your primary department/unit, and your relationships with your primary department/unit colleagues by selecting the appropriate response option.

	strongly disagree	tend to disagree	neutral	tend to agree	strongly agree	not applicable
My research interests are valued by my colleagues.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I feel pressured to change my research agenda in order to fit in.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I feel/felt pressured to change my research agenda to make tenure/be promoted.	0	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I am comfortable asking questions about performance expectations.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I am/was reluctant to bring up issues that concern me for fear that it will/would affect my promotion/tenure.	0	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc
My colleagues expect me to represent "the point of view" of my gender.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
My colleagues expect me to represent "the point of view" of my race/ethnicity.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
My colleagues solicit my opinions about their research ideas and problems.	0	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc
My colleagues have lower expectations						
of me than of other faculty.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I constantly feel under scrutiny by my colleagues.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I have/had to work harder than I believe my colleagues do, in order to be/have been perceived as a legitimate scholar.	0	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc
There are many unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with unit colleagues.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Others seem to find it easier than I to "fit in."	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
I feel I have received adequate information and feedback about what it	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	33

How would you rate your primary department/unit's executive leader (chair or director) in each of the following areas? Select the appropriate response option for each item.

The chair/director of my primary department/unit...

	poor	below average	average	above average	superior
maintains high academic standards.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
is open to constructive criticism.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
is an effective administrator.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
shows interest in faculty.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
encourages and empowers faculty.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
treats faculty in an even-handed way.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
helps me obtain resources I need.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
gives me useful feedback about my performance.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
articulates a clear vision.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
articulates clear criteria for promotion/tenure.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
honors agreements.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
handles disputes/problems effectively.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
communicates consistently with faculty.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
creates a cooperative and supportive environment.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
shows commitment to racial-ethnic diversity.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

For each item, please select the response option that best corresponds to how much influence you feel you have over the following matters in your primary department/unit:

	really no influence	minor influence	some influence	substantial influence	tremendous influence	not applicable
unit curriculum decisions	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
size of salary increases I receive	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
obtaining money for travel to professional meetings	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
securing the facilities or equipment I need for my research	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
selecting new graduate students or residents/fellows	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
selecting new faculty members to be hired	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
determining who gets tenure	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
selecting the next unit head	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
affecting the overall unit climate/culture	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Please indicate in the chart below any job-related discrimination you have experienced at UM within the last five years.

Check the boxes indicating the basis for the discrimination (columns labeled: race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, etc.) and the areas in which the discriminatory behavior has affected your career at UM (rows labeled: hiring, promotion, etc.).

Please select all that apply.

Areas affected by the discriminatory behavior

Basis for the discrimination

	not applicable	race/ ethnicity	gender	sexual orientation	physical disability	religious affiliation	other
hiring							
promotion							
							34

salary				
space/equipment, other resources				
access to administrative staff				
graduate student or resident/fellow assignments				
other (please specify):				

Within the past 5 years, have you experienced any unwanted and uninvited sexual attention (defined as including unwanted sexual teasing, jokes, remarks, or questions; unwanted pressure for dates; unwanted letters, phone calls, or e-mails; unwanted touching, leaning over, cornering, or pinching; unwanted pressure for sexual favors; stalking; rape or assault)?

) yes				
no				
Did you make an official report of it	o anyone?			
) yes				
o no				
Why?				
Why not?				
In your primary department/unit_hov	prevalent are instances of	unwanted and uninvited sexual a	ttention?	
1-not at all prevalent	2	3	4	5-very prevalent
	0	0	-	
Within the past five years, how man that either you or they would define	y individuals from UM have as unwanted and uninvited s	come to you concerned about be sexual attention?	ehavior they experienced	
Are you now, or in the past five yea	s have you ever been, the c	fficially designated person to who	om people report incidences of u	nwanted sexual attention?
) yes				
no				
STITUTIONAL/DEPARTMENTAL CL	IMATE			
STITUTIONAL/DEPARTMENTAL CL	IMATE			

friendly	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	hostile
racist	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	non-racist
homogeneous	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	diverse
disrespectful	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\odot	respectful
collegial	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\odot	contentious
non-sexist	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	sexist
collaborative	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	individualistic
cooperative	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\odot	competitive
homophobic	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	non-homophobic
not supportive	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\odot	supportive

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements concerning the atmosphere in your primary department/unit by selecting the appropriate response option:

	strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	stronglyagree
Some faculty have a condescending attitude toward women.	0	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	0
Sexist remarks are heard in the classroom.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\odot
There is equal access for both men and women to lab/research space.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
The environment promotes adequate collegial opportunities for women.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
Men receive preferential treatment in the areas of recruitment and promotions.	0	\bigcirc	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot
Men are more likely than women to receive helpful career advice from colleagues.	0	\bigcirc	\odot	\bigcirc	0
In meetings, people payjust as much attention when women speak as when men do.	0	\bigcirc	\odot	\bigcirc	0
Women are appropriately represented in senior positions.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
Sex discrimination is a big problem in my department.	0	\bigcirc	0	0	\bigcirc

How often within the last five years at UM have you overheard insensitive or disparaging comments about the following types of people in general, or about

particular people as a member of that group, made by faculty or students? [This does not refer to comments about an individual as an individual.] Please select one for each row. Select "never" if not applicable.

about women in general, or about particular women as "typical" of women

comment made by:

	never	once or twice/year	couple of times/term	more than once/month	weekly
faculty	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
students	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

about men in general, or about particular men as "typical" of men

comment made by:

	never	once or twice/year	couple of times/term	more than once/month	weekly
faculty	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
students	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

about racial/ethnic minorities, or about particular persons of color as "typical" of a racial/ethnic group

comment made by:

36

	never	once or twice/year	couple of times/term	more than once/month	weekly
faculty	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
students	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

about a religious group or about particular persons as "typical" of a religious group

comment made by:

	never	once or twice/year	couple of times/term	more than once/month	weekly
faculty	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
students	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

about sexual minorities (that is, gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender individuals), or about particular persons as "typical" of a sexual minority

comment made by:

	never	once or twice/year	couple of times/term	more than once/month	weekly
faculty	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
students	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

about individuals based on their political perspectives

comment made by:

	never	once or twice/year	couple of times/term	more than once/month	weekly
faculty	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
students	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

about those from other countries

comment made by:

	never	once or twice/year	couple of times/term	more than once/month	weekly
faculty	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
students	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Please mark all that apply for each statement.

In my primary department/unit...

	men	women	international	racial/ethnic minorities	sexual minorities	disabled
I belong to this group.						
as far as I know, there are NO faculty who belong to this group.						
there is a supportive department community for these faculty.						
the department environment is one in which these faculty feel comfortable and are included.						
these faculty members voice their ideas in meetings as often as faculty not belonging to this group.						
some faculty members have a condescending attitude toward members of this group.						
some faculty members expect more from these faculty than from others.						
some faculty members expect less from these faculty than from others.						

	PE	RS	0	٨V	LI	LI	F	E
--	----	----	---	----	----	----	---	---

PERSONAL LIFE				
Do you <i>currently</i> have a spouse/par	tner?			
ves				
o no				
What, if any, is your spouse's/parti	ner's employment or caree	r field?		
				1
What is your spouse's/partner's en	ployment status?			
full-time				
part-time				
not employed				
What is your spouse's/partner's pro	<i>ferred</i> employment status	at this time?		
full-time				
part-time				
not employed				
If your spouse/partner is employed	at UM, what type of appoir	ntment does he or she have? Sele	ect all that apply.	
faculty member		🗌 librarian/cura	ator	
primary research appointment		office or sup	port staff	
post-doctoral or fellowship		health field		
administrative/professional staff		other (please	e specify):	
technical				
Have you ever sought help from UN	l in attempting to find appro	opriate employment for your spou	se/partner?	
🥥 yes				
🔘 no				
not applicable				
How satisfied were you with UM's h	elp in locating appropriate	opportunities for your spouse/par	tner?	
1-very dissatisfied	2	3	4	5-verv satisfied
0	\bigcirc		\bigcirc	0
Have you ever considered leaving L	M to improve career oppor	tunities for your spouse/partner?		
) yes				
ono				
not applicable				

DEMOGRAPHICS

Age (is years): See: make braile Sec: protection (select one) Alian American					
Sex:	Age (in years):				
See: Instale Instale Instale Indicate your level of responsibility: Series Instale Indicate your level of responsibility:					
Ser:					
maile temale US. citzen? yes no ReclaffEthick Identification (select one): African Amorican African Amorican Ear Amorican Ear Amorican Ear Amorican Make American/Merican Indian Make American/Merican Indian Advant Amorican Make American/Merican Indian A for optimized as describe): Other (please describe): African for whom you do, or haw. provide(c) care: Age of oldest: If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities are shared equality. A more parenting responsibilities A more	Sex:				
Emaile US. citizen? yes no Reclaif Ethnic identification (select one): Aftican American Euro American Mode (please describe): Other (please describe): Age of children for whom you do, or haw. provide(c) cause. Age of oldest: If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner? If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities to and ear of the parenting responsibilities are shared equaly. I handle somonibilities. 2 The parenting responsibilities Are you responsibilities tor taking case of another adult, including an adult tamity member? yes Prese indicate your level of responsibility:) male				
U.S. citizen? yes no Recall'Ethnic Identification (select one): African American African American African American Anian Anian American Anian	jemale				
yes no Reclaif Ethnic Identification (select one): African American Asian American Eastantiation of Hispanic American Eastantiation of Hispanic American Native American/American Indian Make American/American Indian Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Age of youngest: Age of youngest: Age of oldist: If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner handles may are shared equally. A geodolast: If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner handles may are shared equally. A geouse-partner is spouse-partner is the parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse-partner is spouse-partner. Are you responsibilities. Z The parenting responsibilities A geouse-partner is spouse-partner in the parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse-partner is spouse-partner. Are you responsibilities. Z The parenting responsibilities are shared equally. A geouse-partner is spouse-partner is spouse-partner in the parenting responsibilities is an index of the parenting responsibilities are shared equally. A geouse-partner is spouse-partner is a spouse-partner is	U.S. citizen?				
 no Reclar/Ethnic Identification (select one): African American African American Lainako or Maerican Lainako or Mispanic American Indian Made American/American Indian Marce Indiane of Children for whom you do, or have, more american Indiane Indian	🔘 yes				
Racial/Ethnic Identification (select one): Atican American Euro American Latina'or Hispanic American Native American/American Indian Mixed (please describe): Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Age of okiest: If you have children for whom you do, or have, more the parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner? Are you responsibilities: 2 The parenting responsibilities are shared equality: Are you responsibilities: 2 The parenting responsibilities are shared equality: Are you responsibilities: 3 0 Are you responsibilities care of another adult, including an adult family member? • yes In the distribution of responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner? • yes Provided by the of of responsibility:	🔘 no				
Recial/Ethnic Identification (select one): African American Aiian American Latinatio or Hispanic American Latinatio or Hispanic American Attice American/American Indian Mixed (please describe): Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Age of youngest: Age of youngest: Age of youngest: Age of oldest: If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your Apouse/partner? Age you responsibilities. Age of youngest: Age of oldest: Age of old					
African American Euco American Euco American Euco American Shate American/American Indian Mixed (please describe): Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Age of youngest: Age of youngest: Age of oldest: If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner? Are you responsibilities. Are you responsibility:	Racial/Ethnic Identification (select one):				
Asian American Euro American Latina/o or Hispanic American Indian Mued please describe): Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Age of youngest Age of oldest: If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner? I handle most of the parenting 2 The parenting responsibilities 4 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	African American				
Euro American Euro American Idination or Hispanic American Indian Winde (please describe): Other	Asian American				
Latanalo or Hispanic American Native American/American Indian Mixed (please describe): Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Age of oldest: Age of oldest: If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner? If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner? I handle most of the parenting 2 The parenting responsibilities 4 of the parenting responsibilities 4 of the parenting responsibilities 8 of the parenting responsibilities 4 of the parenting responsibilities 8 of the parenting responsibilities 9 wes 9 no Please Indicate your level of responsibility:	Euro American				
Muse Antendrahamilier dan indian Mixed (please describe): Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Involved(d) care: Age of youngest: Age of oldest: If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner? I handle most of the parenting 2 The parenting responsibilities 4 0 Are you responsible for taking care of another adult, including an adult family member? • yes • no Please indicate your level of responsibility:	Latina/o or Hispanic American				
Other (please describe): Other (please describe): Provide(d) care: Age of youngest: Age of oldest: If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner? I handle most of the parenting 2 The parenting responsibilities 3 4 5 My spouse/partner? Are you responsible for taking care of another adult, including an adult family member? • yes • no Please indicate your level of responsibility:	Native American/American Indian Mixed (please describe):				
Other (please desoribe): Number of children for whom you do, or have, provide(d) care: Age of youngest: Age of oldest: If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner? I handle most of the parenting 2 The parenting responsibilities 4 of the parenting responsibilities. 2 The parenting responsibilities 4 of the parenting responsibilities. 2 The parenting responsibilities 4 of the parenting responsibilities. 2 The parenting responsibilities 4 of the parenting responsibilities. 2 The parenting responsibilities 4 of the parenting responsibilities. 3 of the parenting responsibilities 4 of the parenting responsibilities. 4 of the parenting responsibilities are shared equally. 4 of the parenting responsibilities. 3 of the parenting responsibilities are shared equally. 4 of the parenting responsibilities are shared					
Number of children for whom you do, or have, provide(d) care: Age of youngest: Age of oldest: If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner? I handle most of the parenting responsibilities. 2 The parenting responsibilities. 4 O 0 Are you responsible for taking care of another adult, including an adult family member? • no	Other (please describe):				
Age of youngest: Age of oldest: If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner? I handle most of the parenting responsibilities. 2 The parenting responsibilities. 2 0 Are you responsible for taking care of another adult, including an adult family member? • Please indicate your level of responsibility:	Number of children for whom you do, or ha provide(d) care:	ve,			
Age of oldest:	Age of youngest:				
If you have children and a spouse/partner, how would you describe, in general, the distribution of parenting responsibilities between you and your spouse/partner?	Age of oldest:				
1 3 5 I handle most of the parenting responsibilities. 2 The parenting responsibilities are shared equally. 4 My spouse/partner handles n of the parenting responsibilit Are you responsible for taking care of another adult, including an adult family member? • • • yes no no • • •	If you have children and a spouse/partner, spouse/partner?	how would yo	u describe, in general, the distribution of pare	enting responsibiliti	es between you and your
responsibilities. 2 are shared equally. 4 of the parenting responsibilit Are you responsible for taking care of another adult, including an adult family member? yes no Please indicate your level of responsibility:	1 I handle most of the parenting		3 The parenting responsibilities		5 My spouse/partner handles mos
Are you responsible for taking care of another adult, including an adult family member? yes no Please indicate your level of responsibility:	responsibilities.	2	are shared equally.	4	of the parenting responsibilities
Are you responsible for taking care of another adult, including an adult family member? yes no Please indicate your level of responsibility:	0	0	0	0	0
 yes no Please indicate your level of responsibility:	Are you responsible for taking care of anot	ther adult, inclu	uding an adult family member?		
no Please indicate your level of responsibility:	🥥 yes				
Please indicate your level of responsibility:	🔘 no				
	Please indicate your level of responsibility	:			
a Law as law as a solution of the solution of a solution of a solution of a solution of the so	🖉 Lam aalalumanaihla far taliir	of an other and the	including on adult family or on her		

I share these responsibilities with others.

Please indicate if your professional life has been affected by any of the following in the past five years. Please select all that apply.

	Having children has affected my professional life in the following ways:	Having ongoing care responsibilities for a person who is ill, disabled or aging has affected my professional life in the following ways:	My own health issues have affected my professional life in the following ways:
not applicable			
professional travel curtailed			
inability to work evenings and weekends			
disruptions of work during the day			
unexpected time away from work			
opportunities not offered			
opportunities not taken			
other: (please specify)			

Did you complete a similar faculty survey in fall, 2006?

-) yes
- 🔘 no
- maybe

Please describe/list the most positive or favorable aspects of your primary department/unit, as well as the most negative or unfavorable aspects of it:

Additional comments:

CAMPUS-WIDE INITIATIVES			

CAMPUS-WIDE INITIATIVES

Please indicate if you have heard or read about any of the following new or existing initiatives at the University of Michigan.

Mcubed project:

- Yes
- 🔘 No
- Not sure

What do you think the Mcubed project is about?

TEP workshops (Strategies Toward Excellent Practices (STEP) in Departments of Schools and Colleg	ges):
Yes	
No	
Not sure	
Vhat do you think the STEP workshops are about?	
IFT (Leadership and Integration in Faculty Transitions) workshops	
Yes	
No No	
Not sure	
/hat do you think the LIFT workshops are about?	
PFP (University of Michigan President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program)	
Ves	
No No	
Not sure	
/hat do you think the PPFP program is about?	
his is the end of the survey. Please do not click on the ">>" button below until you have con	npleted the survey. Once you click the ">>" bເ