

**Exit Interview Study  
University of Michigan  
ADVANCE Program  
January, 2009**

**INTRODUCTION**

At the request of its Steering Committee, the ADVANCE Program embarked on an exit interview study, contacting those tenure track faculty from all UM schools and colleges who recently left UM voluntarily (people who retired, or who were not renewed or denied tenure were *not* included in the study) to learn about their reasons for leaving and the factors they considered in those decisions. The study drew on faculty who voluntarily left between September 1, 2006 and September 1, 2008 and was completed in two phases. The initial phase involved faculty who voluntarily left UM during the period September 1, 2006 through December 14, 2007. Because far fewer of those faculty were women (28% of the sample), limiting our ability adequately to assess gender differences, the pool was expanded with a second phase that included faculty who voluntarily left UM during the period December 15, 2007 through September 1, 2008.

The data collection for the first phase occurred during the summer months, 2008; data collection for the second phase began in September, 2008 and continued through October when all contacted faculty who were willing to participate were interviewed. The total sample of faculty meeting these eligibility requirements for both phases of the study was 118 faculty members (all tenure track faculty who voluntarily left UM during the periods in question); 71 of these faculty agreed to participate (60% response rate).

Because all of the participants had actually left the University of Michigan, the study involved interviewing faculty on the telephone by trained interviewers. Interviews were confidential and interviewers were selected who had no direct or indirect relationship with the faculty member with whom they talked or his/her previous UM school affiliation. Notes were taken of the interviews, and, when permission was granted, interviews were also recorded.

All interview notes were de-identified to preserve the confidentiality of the participants. Several of the interview records were then reviewed to develop and refine a coding scheme. A different subsample of interviews was then coded by two ADVANCE staff members, using the coding scheme, who obtained an acceptable inter-rater reliability of .90 or above. One of the coders then coded the remaining interviews.

**SAMPLE and DATA ANALYSIS STRATEGY**

Of the 71 faculty interviewed, most were male (68%) and white (71%). Eight of the 18 faculty of color identified as members of underrepresented minority groups<sup>1</sup>. Fewer than half (42%) were at the assistant professor level when they left UM; 58% were associate or full professors. The largest group (34%) of respondents were from LSA; fewer were from the Medical School (25%) and from the smaller schools at UM (28%). Only 9% were from the College of Engineering. These percentages are similar to the pool from which the faculty were recruited (that is, all tenure track faculty who voluntary left UM between September 1, 2006 and September 1, 2008).

---

<sup>1</sup> Of these, four identified as African American, two identified as Hispanic, and two identified as Native American.

Following is a summary of findings from this study. Analyses describe the circumstances under which faculty chose to leave UM, the factors they considered in their decisions, and how their current situations compare to their UM positions. We also assessed differences in experiences and perspectives among faculty from different schools (Engineering, LSA, Medicine and the six smaller schools combined) and between male and female faculty, tenured and untenured faculty, and faculty of color and white faculty. In addition, even though the number of faculty of color from underrepresented minority groups (i.e., African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans) is quite small, we compared their responses to all other faculty (i.e., white, Asian and Asian-American) since the experiences of underrepresented minority faculty may be importantly different from those of other faculty of color.

In the results discussed below, any references to group differences refer exclusively to differences found to be statistically different using the chi square test of significance ( $p \leq .05$ —that is, differences or effects that would have occurred by chance under the null hypothesis at or less than 5 percent of the time, which is a generally accepted standard of statistical significance in social science research). However, with such a small and purposive sample, statistical significance can only be suggestive. Thus, when they occur, we also report trends ( $p \leq .10$ ) as they indicate differences of a magnitude that might be significant with larger samples. ***All findings at the trend level are discussed in italicized text to differentiate them from those findings that are statistically significant.*** Tables are appended at the end of this report.

#### **CONSIDERATIONS AFFECTING STUDYING EXIT INTERVIEW RESPONSES**

We report and discuss people's views of their motives and experiences, as they reported them to us. We recognize that the process of making any decision, particularly an important, life-changing decision, is complex, and psychologists have demonstrated a range of factors that are likely to affect how people experience their decisions. For example, we know that people in the middle of a decision report how they are weighing various factors somewhat differently than they do once the decision is made (when the motivation to justify the decision is much stronger). We emphasize that in this study we can only describe what individuals report to us about the key factors that motivated them, and their feelings about both Michigan and their new environment. If the experimental literature is a good guide to how these results might be affected by normal decision-making processes, they will lead people to view their current environment more positively, and the Michigan environment somewhat more negatively than they did during the course of their decision-making process. That said, they did choose to leave Michigan, so in the course of their deliberations the attractive features of the new environment and the negative features of the old, did move them to leave. Finally, discussing this issue with someone still identified with Michigan may well have had additional effects—for some it may have offered an opportunity to “unload” some negative feelings, for others it may have offered a chance to provide an account of the reasons to leave, despite positive feelings about UM. In any case, we recognize that people are normally strongly motivated to justify decisions they have made, and that this motivation inevitably affects these results in ways we cannot assess directly.

#### **CIRCUMSTANCES THAT LED FACULTY TO LEAVE UM**

***Initial Impetus for Leaving.*** Nearly half of the interviewed faculty (41%) reported that they had been recruited by at least one other institution (see Table 1). A similar percentage (41%) reported that they had actively pursued other positions. For a few faculty (6%) both had happened. The circumstances concerning the remaining faculty were insufficiently clear to make a determination. There were no statistically significant differences by gender, race-ethnicity, tenure status, or school in whether or not faculty were recruited or sought out another position.

Almost all faculty (90%) left UM for another academic position; seven of the interviewed faculty (10%) moved to industry or private practice. There were no differences by gender, race-ethnicity or tenure status in type of new positions. Faculty from Engineering were more likely to have moved to a non-academic position than faculty from LSA or the other smaller schools. And Medical School faculty were more likely to have switched to a non-academic position than LSA faculty.

Of those continuing in academic positions, slightly more than one quarter (27%) moved to institutions coded as rough peers to the University of Michigan (e.g., Northwestern University, Pennsylvania State University, University of California Berkeley) and an additional 21% are now at institutions coded as more prestigious than UM (e.g., Columbia University, Harvard University, Princeton University). The remaining 41% moved to institutions coded as less prestigious overall, though of course particular programs or departments may differ from that overall judgment (e.g., Case Western Reserve University, New York University, University of Maryland).

Generally, the faculty did not report long-standing unhappiness at UM. More than half of the faculty (59%) had thought about leaving UM for one year or less; the remaining had thought about it for a longer period of time (see Table 2). And nearly half of the faculty (44%) indicated that they were happy at UM and wanted to stay (see Table 3). An additional 46%, while not entirely happy at UM, reported that they could have been persuaded to stay. Only 11% of the interviewees indicated that they were not happy at UM and were not interested in staying under any circumstances. There were no statistically significant differences by gender, tenure status and school on these two indicators. White faculty reported thinking about leaving longer than faculty of color. *There was also a trend for women to think about changing jobs for a longer period of time than men.*

*Counter Offers.* Fewer than half (39%) of the interviewed faculty reported receiving a counter offer from the University. Of the 43 faculty who did not receive counter offers, 13 (18%) indicated that they did not encourage counter offers and 3 (4%) indicated that UM felt it couldn't match the offer or may have been otherwise constrained from countering. Eight (11%) of the faculty reported that they were in discussion with UM, but no formal counter offer was ever made. The remaining 19 (27%) simply reported not receiving a counter offer. There were no statistically significant differences by gender, race-ethnicity, tenure status or school on receiving a counter offer. *There was, however, a trend for senior faculty to be more likely to receive a counter offer than junior faculty.* Of those who did not receive a counter offer, more than half (60%) reported that a counter offer would have encouraged them to stay at UM.

Those 28 faculty who did receive counter offers were asked why they did not accept them. Sixty-eight percent of them reported that UM was unable, or unwilling, to match the offer they received (see Table 4). Far fewer (14%) reported that the counter offer was insufficient to meet the employment needs of their partners. The remaining 18% said they didn't accept a counter offer because they wouldn't, or couldn't, stay at UM under any circumstances. There were no differences by gender, race-ethnicity, tenure status or school on reasons for not accepting a counter offer.

*Potential Encouragements to Stay.* Asked what else, if anything, would have encouraged the faculty to stay at UM, about one quarter (23%) said nothing more would have encouraged them to stay. A similar percentage indicated an employment opportunity, or better opportunity, for their partners (24%), better University leadership or administrative support at all levels (25%) and better support for research (25%) could have made a difference (see Table 5). Fewer said improved salary (18%) and more recognition or appreciation of their contributions (13%) would have been encouraging.

Women were significantly more likely than men to report that an improved department climate would have encouraged them to stay. *And there was a trend for more men than women to identify better leadership and/or administrative support at all levels as important to their staying at UM. Three items produced trend differences by race-ethnicity: faculty of color were more likely than white faculty to identify career opportunities for their partners, and addressing joint appointment difficulties, as things that would have encouraged them to stay; they were also less likely than white faculty to identify more recognition and/or appreciation as an issue.* Moreover, underrepresented minority faculty were significantly more likely than all other faculty (i.e., white, Asian, and Asian-American) to indicate that improvements in the ability to work across units would have encouraged them to stay. *There was also a trend for underrepresented minority faculty to be more likely than all other faculty to identify improved research support as an incentive to stay.*

Not surprisingly, junior faculty were significantly more likely than senior faculty to report that more time and/or support for tenure would have made a difference for them. In contrast, senior faculty were more likely than junior faculty to identify better support for research and more recognition or appreciation as important to them. *There was also a trend for more junior faculty than senior faculty to report that nothing would have encouraged them to stay.*

LSA faculty reported that better career opportunities for their partners would have encouraged them to stay more often than faculty from the smaller schools; *there was also a trend for them to report this more often than Medical School and Engineering faculty.* Medical School faculty were more likely than faculty from LSA and the smaller schools to want better leadership and/or administrative support at all levels. In addition, faculty from the smaller schools were more likely than LSA and Medical School faculty to report that a salary increase would have encouraged them to stay at UM; Engineering faculty were more likely than Medical School faculty to report the same.

We compared the responses of those who had received counter-offers (in their own opinion) with those who did not on what would have encouraged them to stay as well as the factors that led to their decisions to leave and recommendations for changes to UM's policies and procedures (discussed later in this report). There were only three statistically significant differences among the 65 comparisons made (which would not exceed the number that would be expected by chance) suggesting virtually no difference between these two groups on these dimensions.

## **REASONS FOR LEAVING**

Faculty were asked what factors they considered in their decisions to leave UM. Responses focused on improving their own career opportunities and improving the situations for their partners and/or families, as well as specific negatives about UM and/or positives about their new institutions.

*Improved Career Opportunities.* Across the 71 interviews, factors associated with improved career opportunities were identified 66 times as those considered in faculty decisions to leave UM. These included improved prospects for their research (31% of the faculty mentioned this); improved salary (23%) and a promotion (11%; see Table 6). A few reported that the new position was in a more prestigious department (7%); a similar number reported better chances for tenure at their new institutions (7%) and an improved teaching situation (6%). Three faculty members each mentioned new colleagues and leadership opportunities in their new position as positive factors.

There were no significant differences by gender, race-ethnicity, tenure status, or school on these items with one exception: not surprisingly, junior faculty were significantly more likely than senior faculty to identify concern about tenure at UM as a factor in their decisions. *There was also a trend for white faculty compared to faculty of color to report the opportunity of a promotion as a reason for leaving.*

*Negatives about UM.* Negative factors about their UM positions were mentioned 65 times by the 71 faculty members. A little over one quarter of the respondents mentioned the negative climate at UM (28%) and about a quarter mentioned problems with their department's, school's or the University's leadership (25%; see Table 6). Fewer mentioned UM's lifestyle—particularly workload (13%), teaching (10%), difficulty with joint appointments or working across units (7%), no or insufficient efforts to retain them (6%), and resources (3%) as negatives.

There were no statistically significant gender or race-ethnicity (comparing faculty of color to white faculty) differences on these negative factors. *There were, however, some trends comparing underrepresented minority faculty with majority faculty: underrepresented minority faculty were less likely to identify salary and more likely to identify joint appointments and/or working across units as issues than all other faculty; moreover, underrepresented minority faculty identified more negative factors overall than all other faculty.*

In addition, senior faculty were significantly more likely to report difficulties in joint appointments and/or working across units as a factor in their decisions to leave UM than junior faculty. Medical School faculty were also more likely to identify the negative climate at UM more often than Engineering and LSA faculty and problems with departmental, school and/or University administration more often than LSA and smaller school faculty. And Engineering faculty reported insufficient efforts to retain them as a factor more often than Medical or smaller school faculty.

*Family/Partner Issues.* Issues related to their families and partners' employment situations that factored into their decisions to leave UM were noted 37 times by the faculty. Most prominent was that their new jobs also provided career opportunities for their partners (28% reported this; see Table 6). Fewer needed to relocate because of positions their partners already held (11%). Others reported either that their partners were unhappy with their employment (7%) or that their families were unhappy in Ann Arbor (6%). There were no differences by gender, race-ethnicity, tenure status, or school on these factors. *However, there was a trend for faculty of color to more often report lack of career opportunities for their partners at UM, or needing to relocate because of their partners' employment elsewhere, as a factor in their decisions, compared to white faculty.* No underrepresented minority faculty members identified partner issues as relevant to their decisions to leave UM.

*Positives about New Position.* Beyond better career opportunities offered by their new positions, 25 faculty mentioned other positives about their new jobs. Several (32%) reported that the geographic location was better and one (3%) indicated that the new institution was more family-friendly than UM. There were no differences by gender, race-ethnicity, tenure status, or school on these factors.

*Factors Specific to Junior Faculty.* Faculty who were assistant professors when they left the University were also asked about specific factors that may have figured into their decisions to leave. These included: setting expectations; mentoring/professional development; evaluation of performance; recognition of contributions in the department; and fostering a collegial environment. Half of the junior faculty reported that mentoring/professional development was a factor in their decisions to leave (see Table 7); further, junior women were more likely than junior men to report this. One third or more of

the junior faculty also indicated that fostering a collegial environment (41%), setting expectations (38%), evaluation of performance (32%) and recognizing their contributions in their departments (32%) were reasons for their decisions to leave. There were no differences by race-ethnicity or school on these factors.

*Factors Specific to Senior Faculty.* Senior faculty (those at the associate and full professor levels) were specifically asked about each of the following as possible factors in their decisions to leave: opportunities for leadership; opportunities to have an impact or voice in decisions; recognition of contributions in their departments; and fostering a collegial environment. Half of the senior faculty (49%) reported that lack of recognition of their contributions did factor into their decisions (see Table 7). Nearly as many (38%) reported that opportunities to have a voice or impact were a factor. About a quarter indicated that fostering a collegial environment (26%) and opportunities for leadership (24%) contributed to in their decisions.

There were no statistically significant differences by gender, race-ethnicity, or tenure status; *however, there was a trend for senior women to be more likely than senior men to identify fostering a collegial environment as a factor.* Senior Medical School faculty were significantly more likely than senior Engineering and smaller school faculty to indicate that recognition of their departmental contributions factored into their decisions to leave UM; they were also more likely than senior Engineering faculty to identify fostering a collegial environment as a factor.

#### **SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT POSITION**

*Overall Assessment of the New Position.* Faculty were asked whether or not the move was good for them and their careers. Three-quarters (73%) indicated that it was (see Table 8); only one faculty member reported that it was not. A few (11%) stated that the move was not good for their careers, but was good for their families. And the remaining reported either that the move had positives and negatives or that they weren't sure yet what the implications of the move were. Comparisons by gender, race-ethnicity, tenure status and school produced no statistically significant differences on this variable.

Faculty also provided information concerning what they found was better and worse, comparing their new positions to their UM positions.

*What was Better.* Few faculty (14%) reported that there was nothing about their new institutions that was better than their previous situations at UM. More than half (58%) reported one or two things that were better and the remaining reported three to five more positive aspects of their new positions. One quarter to one third of the faculty reported that their current situations provided a more positive department overall (34%), better salary and/or resources (29%), more opportunities for research (25%) and a more positive administrative situation (24%; see Table 9). Slightly fewer indicated that the work climate, including mentoring and leadership opportunities (20%), teaching (18%) and geographic location (16%) were better.

There were no statistically significant differences by gender or race-ethnicity (comparing faculty of color to white faculty). However, underrepresented minority faculty were more likely to report an improved workload than all other faculty. *There were also a few trends: female faculty more often reported improved teaching and research compared to male faculty; and both faculty of color and underrepresented minority faculty identified improved geography more often than white faculty and all other faculty.*

Junior faculty mentioned a better department overall and better work/life balance significantly more often than senior faculty. *There was also a trend for senior faculty to identify salary/resources and workload as better more often than junior faculty and for more junior faculty than senior faculty to identify research as better.* Medical School faculty were more likely to indicate that administrative issues were better at their new institutions than faculty from the smaller schools *and LSA faculty (the latter was just a trend).* *There was also a trend for LSA faculty to report a better workload compared to all other faculty.*

*What was Worse.* Slightly more than one quarter (28%) of the faculty reported nothing that was worse about their new institutions compared to UM and most (64%) mentioned one or two things that were worse. The remaining reported three or four negative aspects of their new positions compared to their positions at UM. About one quarter of the faculty reported administrative issues at their new institutions (27%) and their new departments (23%) as negative consequences of their job changes (see Table 9). Fewer reported that they missed their colleagues (20%), and that work-life balance (17%) and salary/resources (11%) were more negative features of their new positions.

Faculty of color were more likely than white faculty to mention a more negative geographic location for their new positions. *There was also a trend for them to report a worse home life situation but better salary and/or resources than white faculty.* Engineering faculty were more likely to report teaching as worse now compared to faculty from Medicine and the smaller schools. There were no statistically significant differences by gender and tenure status in what faculty identified as worse about their new situations. *There were, however, trends in each set of comparisons: more women than men identified administrative issues as a problem at their new institution and more junior faculty than senior faculty reported that their geographic locations of their new institutions were less desirable than UM's.*

### **SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVED POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

Finally, faculty were asked if there were any particular University or departmental practices or policies that they thought should be changed or implemented to improve the situation for faculty at UM. About one-quarter of the faculty suggested that resources and/or salaries should be improved (24%; see Table 10). Slightly fewer identified faculty morale and University climate (21%), University, school, or department leadership (17%), and mentoring (14%) as aspects of the University that should be addressed. Also mentioned were administrative accountability/transparency (13%), the tenure system—both transparency and flexibility (13%), dual career issues (13%), workload (10%) and the process for dispute resolutions (9%).

Nine faculty (tenured and untenured) specifically mentioned the need to improve the situation for junior faculty, including workload, leadership training, resources, and climate. Others mentioned factors of importance to particular groups of faculty (e.g., support for clinical faculty, support for interdisciplinary work, fostering international collaborations).

Women identified mentoring and morale/climate more often than men. *There was a trend for women to mention work-family issues more often than men; and for men to mention the process for dispute resolution as well as junior faculty workload more often than women.* *There was also a trend for more faculty of color than white faculty to suggest that the University address pre-emptive retention and resources for junior faculty.*

There were no statistically significant differences between faculty of color and white faculty. However, underrepresented minority faculty were significantly more likely than all other faculty to identify counter offers, the loyalty tax, workload, and working across units as areas needing improvement. *There was also a trend for these same faculty to mention workload for junior faculty more often than all other faculty. In contrast, there was a trend for them mention better resources and salary less often than all other faculty.*

Senior faculty were significantly more likely to mention climate and salary/resources than junior faculty as areas the University should address. In contrast, junior faculty were more likely than senior faculty to identify mentoring and the tenure system as needing improvement. Medical School faculty identified administrative accountability and transparency as an issue and faculty from the six smaller schools indicated that the tenure process needed to be addressed more often than their colleagues from other schools.

### **SUMMARY: KEY FINDINGS**

The following represents a summary of the key findings from the study for all faculty. There were few statistically significant differences by gender, race, tenure status and school, but those differences are also summarized below. We note again that the sample was quite small for detection of differences by these groups and that it may therefore be worthwhile to consider the pattern of trends described above along with the statistically significant findings.

- Most faculty described themselves as happy at UM prior to leaving-- 90% reported that they wanted to stay at UM or could have been encouraged to stay with changed circumstances;
- Fewer than half of the faculty reported receiving counter offers;
- Of those who received counter offers, most did not accept them because UM did not match their offers;
- Better employment opportunities for their partners, better leadership and/or University support at all levels, and better support for their research were most often mentioned as potential inducements to stay at UM;
- Important factors in faculty members' decisions to leave included:
  - improved career opportunities for the faculty member, especially in the areas of research, salary, and promotion with new position;
  - improved career opportunities for the faculty member's partner;
  - negatives about their UM position, including negative climate, problems with leadership, UM's lifestyle and workload, teaching and difficulty working across units;
  - positives about the new institution, particularly geographic location;
- Most faculty (73%) reported that the move was a good one for them;
- Most often reported as better about their new positions were:
  - the new department, research opportunities, salary and resources, climate and administration;
- Most often reported as worse about their new positions were:
  - loss of colleagues, administration, the department generally;
- Suggestions for improved policies and procedures at UM included:
  - improve resources and salaries;
  - address climate and faculty morale;
  - improve University leadership/administrative accountability and transparency at all levels;



- improve mentoring;
- increase transparency and flexibility of tenure policies;
- address partner/dual career issues;
- address workload;
- better preemptive retention practices

Significant differences by gender:

- Women were more likely than men to report that an improved department climate would have encouraged them to stay;
- Junior women were more likely than junior men to report that their experience of mentoring/professional development was a factor in their decision to leave;
- Women were more likely to mention that both of these areas (climate and mentoring) should be addressed by University administration;

Significant differences by race-ethnicity:

- Faculty of color took less time to decide to leave UM than white faculty;
- And found the geographic locations of their new institutions less desirable;
- Underrepresented minority faculty were more likely than all other faculty to indicate:
  - improvements in the ability to work across units would have encouraged them to stay;
  - improved workloads in their new positions than all other faculty;
  - counter offers, the loyalty tax, workload, and working across units were policy or procedural areas needing improvement.

Significant differences by tenure status:

- Junior faculty were more likely than senior faculty to report:
  - More time/support for tenure would have made a difference in their decision to leave;
  - Better department and better work/life balance in their new positions;
  - Mentoring and the tenure system as areas to be addressed by University administration.
- Senior faculty were more likely than junior faculty to report:
  - Better support for research could have encouraged them to stay at UM;
  - Joint appointments and/or working across units as a factor in their decision to leave;
  - Climate and salary/resources as areas for improvement at UM.

Significant differences by school category:

- Medical School faculty were more likely to report negative climate and problems with department, school and/or University leadership as factors in their decisions to leave;
- Medical School faculty reported improved administrative issues at their new institutions more often compared to faculty from the smaller schools;
- Medical school faculty were more likely than other faculty to identify administrative accountability and transparency as an issue for UM to address;
- Senior Medical school faculty were more likely to identify receiving recognition than senior Engineering and smaller school faculty, to identify fostering a collegial environment than senior Engineering faculty as factors in their decisions to leave;
- Engineering faculty more often identified insufficient efforts to retain them as a factor in their decisions to leave;
- LSA faculty were more likely to report that career opportunities for their partners would have encouraged them to stay at UM;

- Smaller school faculty were more likely than other faculty to identify the tenure process as an issue for U M to address.

### **IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS**

The findings reported here may be considered indications of potential areas of problems for faculty remaining at UM, as well as factors that move faculty to leave. Many of the factors cited by faculty as motivating their departure from UM are consistent across race, gender and tenure status (e.g., partner issues, research support, salary). Expansion of and equitable access to the dual career program, support for research, and adequate salaries are logical institutional responses to these concerns.

Some factors seem especially important for women, minorities and junior faculty (department climate, mentoring, difficulties with joint appointments, and a desire for more flexible and transparent tenure policies). Efforts to improve the climate, mentoring, joint appointments, and the transparency and fairness of tenure policies are logical institutional responses to these concerns.

Finally, quite a few faculty reported that their offer was not fully countered, despite deans' impression that counters are normally made. It is possible that the difference in the felt experience lies in real differences (for example, when chairs don't actually bring cases forward to deans). To the extent that the faculty who exit accurately perceived the absence of a counter, perhaps a logical institutional response would be to ensure that all layers of decision-makers understand that external offers need to be considered seriously, and must assess the relative costs of losing faculty (and hiring others to replace them) rather than fully countering. To the extent that the perception is based on a sense that the counter was slow and grudging, though it was actually "full," it may be possible to alter that perception by altering the process (speed, courtesy and expression of importance to UM) of countering rather than the actual content of it. Finally, since both minorities (significantly) and women (at a trend level) report faster decisions to leave, it may be particularly important to avoid creating an impression that there will be little or no counter in the course of the countering process for members of those groups.

**Table 1: Initial Impetus for Job Change**

|   | male faculty (N=48) | female faculty (N=23) | white faculty (n=53) | faculty of color (N=18) | junior faculty (N=30) | senior faculty (N=41) | COE faculty (N=9) | LSA faculty (N=24) | MED faculty (N=18) | Other faculty (N=20) | total | %   |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|-----|
| recruited by other institution(s)       | 21                  | 8                     | 21                   | 8                       | 11                    | 18                    | 5                 | 8                  | 5                  | 11                   | 29    | 41% |
| faculty member pursue other position(s) | 19                  | 10                    | 23                   | 6                       | 16                    | 13                    | 3                 | 9                  | 10                 | 7                    | 29    | 41% |
| both happened                           | 2                   | 2                     | 4                    | 0                       | 1                     | 3                     | 1                 | 2                  | 1                  | 0                    | 4     | 6%  |
| not clear how happened                  | 6                   | 3                     | 5                    | 4                       | 2                     | 7                     | 0                 | 5                  | 2                  | 2                    | 9     | 13% |

**Table 2: How Long Faculty Thought About Leaving UM**

|                    | male faculty (N=48) | female faculty (N=23) | white faculty (n=53) | faculty of color (N=18) | junior faculty (N=30) | senior faculty (N=41) | COE faculty (N=9) | LSA faculty (N=24) | MED faculty (N=18) | Other faculty (N=20) | total | %   |
|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|-----|
| less than 6 months | 11                  | 6                     | 9                    | 8                       | 7                     | 10                    | 5                 | 7                  | 1                  | 4                    | 17    | 25% |
| 6 months to 1 year | 19                  | 4                     | 19                   | 4                       | 12                    | 11                    | 2                 | 6                  | 7                  | 8                    | 23    | 34% |
| more than 1 year   | 15                  | 13                    | 23                   | 5                       | 11                    | 17                    | 2                 | 10                 | 8                  | 8                    | 28    | 41% |

**Table 3: Satisfaction with Position at UM**

|  | male faculty (N=48) | female faculty (N=23) | white faculty (n=53) | faculty of color (N=18) | junior faculty (N=30) | senior faculty (N=41) | COE faculty (N=9) | LSA faculty (N=24) | MED faculty (N=18) | Other faculty (N=20) | total | %   |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|-----|
| not happy at UM; wanted to leave                   | 2                   | 4                     | 6                    | 1                       | 4                     | 3                     | 1                 | 3                  | 1                  | 2                    | 7     | 11% |
| not happy at UM; could have been persuaded to stay | 22                  | 8                     | 24                   | 6                       | 12                    | 18                    | 4                 | 7                  | 10                 | 9                    | 30    | 46% |
| happy at UM; wanted to stay                        | 21                  | 8                     | 19                   | 10                      | 11                    | 18                    | 4                 | 13                 | 6                  | 6                    | 29    | 44% |

**Table 4: Reason for Not Accepting Counter Offer**

|   | male faculty (N=48) | female faculty (N=23) | white faculty (n=53) | faculty of color (N=18) | junior faculty (N=30) | senior faculty (N=41) | COE faculty (N=9) | LSA faculty (N=24) | MED faculty (N=18) | Other faculty (N=20) | total | %   |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|-----|
| UM didn't/couldn't match offer          | 14                  | 5                     | 13                   | 6                       | 8                     | 11                    | 2                 | 7                  | 4                  | 6                    | 19    | 68% |
| no/insufficient opportunity for partner | 3                   | 1                     | 2                    | 2                       | 1                     | 3                     | 0                 | 2                  | 0                  | 2                    | 4     | 14% |
| wouldn't/couldn't stay                  | 3                   | 2                     | 4                    | 1                       | 1                     | 4                     | 1                 | 3                  | 1                  | 0                    | 5     | 18% |

**Table 5: What Would Have Encouraged Them to Stay at UM**

|  | male faculty (N=48) | female faculty (N=23) | white faculty (n=53) | faculty of color (N=18) | junior faculty (N=30) | senior faculty (N=41) | COE faculty (N=9) | LSA faculty (N=24) | MED faculty (N=18) | Other faculty (N=20) | total | %   |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|-----|
| nothing                                  | 11                  | 5                     | 13                   | 3                       | 10                    | 6                     | 1                 | 6                  | 5                  | 4                    | 16    | 23% |
| some/better opportunity for partner      | 10                  | 7                     | 10                   | 7                       | 7                     | 10                    | 1                 | 10 <sup>a</sup>    | 3                  | 3 <sup>a</sup>       | 17    | 24% |
| better leadership/administrative support | 15                  | 3                     | 15                   | 3                       | 8                     | 10                    | 3                 | 4 <sup>a</sup>     | 9 <sup>ab</sup>    | 2 <sup>b</sup>       | 18    | 25% |
| better support for research              | 12                  | 6                     | 12                   | 6                       | 3 <sup>a</sup>        | 15 <sup>a</sup>       | 4                 | 6                  | 4                  | 4                    | 18    | 25% |
| more salary                              | 9                   | 4                     | 10                   | 3                       | 5                     | 8                     | 3 <sup>a</sup>    | 2 <sup>b</sup>     | 1 <sup>ac</sup>    | 7 <sup>bc</sup>      | 13    | 18% |
| leadership opportunities                 | 1                   | 3                     | 4                    | 0                       | 1                     | 3                     | 0                 | 2                  | 0                  | 2                    | 4     | 6%  |
| more time/ support for tenure            | 2                   | 2                     | 3                    | 1                       | 4 <sup>a</sup>        | 0 <sup>a</sup>        | 0                 | 1                  | 0                  | 3                    | 4     | 6%  |
| more recognition/appreciation            | 8                   | 1                     | 9                    | 0                       | 1 <sup>a</sup>        | 8 <sup>a</sup>        | 1                 | 3                  | 2                  | 3                    | 9     | 13% |
| better climate                           | 0 <sup>a</sup>      | 3 <sup>a</sup>        | 2                    | 1                       | 0                     | 3                     | 0                 | 3                  | 0                  | 0                    | 3     | 4%  |
| joint appointment issues addressed       | 1                   | 0                     | 0                    | 1                       | 1                     | 0                     | 0                 | 0                  | 0                  | 1                    | 1     | 1%  |
| partner benefits                         | 1                   | 0                     | 1                    | 0                       | 0                     | 1                     | 1                 | 0                  | 0                  | 0                    | 1     | 1%  |

<sup>abc</sup>Denotes statistically significant difference at  $p \leq .05$ .

**Table 6: Factors Considered in Decision to Leave UM**

|   | male<br>faculty<br>(N=48) | female<br>faculty<br>(N=23) | white<br>faculty<br>(n=53) | faculty<br>of color<br>(N=18) | junior<br>faculty<br>(N=30) | senior<br>faculty<br>(N=41) | COE<br>faculty<br>(N=9) | LSA<br>faculty<br>(N=24) | MED<br>faculty<br>(N=18) | Other<br>faculty<br>(N=20) | total | %   |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-----|
| <b>career opportunities for faculty member:</b>         |                           |                             |                            |                               |                             |                             |                         |                          |                          |                            |       |     |
| salary  | 11                        | 5                           | 13                         | 3                             | 6                           | 10                          | 0                       | 6                        | 4                        | 6                          | 16    | 23% |
| research opportunity                                    | 14                        | 8                           | 17                         | 5                             | 10                          | 12                          | 3                       | 6                        | 5                        | 8                          | 22    | 31% |
| colleagues  | 2                         | 1                           | 2                          | 1                             | 2                           | 1                           | 0                       | 0                        | 2                        | 1                          | 3     | 4%  |
| teaching  | 3                         | 1                           | 3                          | 1                             | 3                           | 1                           | 0                       | 2                        | 1                        | 1                          | 4     | 6%  |
| more prestigious department                             | 4                         | 1                           | 4                          | 1                             | 1                           | 4                           | 2                       | 1                        | 0                        | 2                          | 5     | 7%  |
| promotion   | 5                         | 3                           | 8                          | 0                             | 2                           | 6                           | 1                       | 0                        | 4                        | 3                          | 8     | 11% |
| worried about tenure/being successful at UM             | 4                         | 1                           | 4                          | 1                             | 5 <sup>a</sup>              | 0 <sup>a</sup>              | 0                       | 1                        | 3                        | 1                          | 5     | 7%  |
| leadership opportunity                                  | 3                         | 0                           | 2                          | 1                             | 0                           | 3                           | 0                       | 1                        | 1                        | 1                          | 3     | 4%  |
| <b>negatives about UM:</b>                              |                           |                             |                            |                               |                             |                             |                         |                          |                          |                            |       |     |
| negative climate; not happy                             | 11                        | 9                           | 15                         | 5                             | 8                           | 12                          | 1 <sup>a</sup>          | 4 <sup>b</sup>           | 9 <sup>ab</sup>          | 6                          | 20    | 28% |
| problem with department/university leadership           | 14                        | 4                           | 14                         | 4                             | 7                           | 11                          | 3                       | 3 <sup>a</sup>           | 10 <sup>ab</sup>         | 2 <sup>b</sup>             | 18    | 25% |
| difficulty with joint appointments/working across units | 3                         | 2                           | 3                          | 2                             | 0 <sup>a</sup>              | 5 <sup>a</sup>              | 2                       | 2                        | 0                        | 1                          | 5     | 7%  |
| no/insufficient effort to retain                        | 3                         | 1                           | 2                          | 2                             | 1                           | 3                           | 2                       | 2 <sup>ab</sup>          | 0 <sup>a</sup>           | 0 <sup>b</sup>             | 4     | 6%  |
| UM lifestyle (workload, less time for family)           | 4                         | 5                           | 6                          | 3                             | 3                           | 6                           | 0                       | 4                        | 2                        | 3                          | 9     | 13% |
| teaching  | 4                         | 3                           | 5                          | 2                             | 1                           | 6                           | 2                       | 3                        | 0                        | 2                          | 7     | 10% |
| resources   | 2                         | 0                           | 2                          | 0                             | 0                           | 2                           | 0                       | 1                        | 1                        | 0                          | 2     | 3%  |
| <b>issues related to partner/family:</b>                |                           |                             |                            |                               |                             |                             |                         |                          |                          |                            |       |     |
| partner career opportunity                              | 16                        | 4                           | 14                         | 6                             | 9                           | 11                          | 2                       | 10                       | 3                        | 5                          | 20    | 28% |
| needed to relocate because of partner's job             | 4                         | 4                           | 4                          | 4                             | 4                           | 4                           | 1                       | 4                        | 1                        | 2                          | 8     | 11% |
| unsatisfactory (or no) position for partner             | 2                         | 3                           | 2                          | 3                             | 1                           | 4                           | 0                       | 2                        | 0                        | 3                          | 5     | 7%  |
| family not happy in Ann Arbor                           | 4                         | 0                           | 4                          | 0                             | 1                           | 3                           | 1                       | 3                        | 0                        | 0                          | 4     | 6%  |
| <b>positives about new institution:</b>                 |                           |                             |                            |                               |                             |                             |                         |                          |                          |                            |       |     |
| geographic location                                     | 14                        | 9                           | 18                         | 5                             | 7                           | 16                          | 2                       | 10                       | 3                        | 8                          | 23    | 32% |
| more family-friendly                                    | 1                         | 1                           | 2                          | 0                             | 1                           | 1                           | 1                       | 0                        | 0                        | 1                          | 2     | 3%  |

<sup>ab</sup>Denotes statistically significant difference at  $p \leq .05$ .

**Table 7: Factors Specifically Asked About**

|   | male faculty (N=20) | female faculty (N=10) | white faculty (n=53) | faculty of color (N=18) | COE faculty (n=3) | LSA faculty (N=6)  | MED faculty (N=12) | Other faculty (n=9)  | total | %   |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|-----|
| <b>Specific factors: junior faculty</b>     |                     |                       |                      |                         |                   |                    |                    |                      |       |     |
| setting expectations                        | 7                   | 4                     | 9                    | 2                       | 0                 | 2                  | 5                  | 4                    | 11    | 38% |
| mentoring/professional development          | 7 <sup>a</sup>      | 8 <sup>a</sup>        | 13                   | 2                       | 0                 | 2                  | 7                  | 6                    | 0     | 50% |
| evaluation of performance                   | 6                   | 3                     | 6                    | 3                       | 0                 | 2                  | 2                  | 5                    | 9     | 32% |
| recognizing contributions in the department | 9                   | 3                     | 9                    | 3                       | 0                 | 2                  | 7                  | 3                    | 12    | 32% |
| fostering a collegial environment           | 7                   | 5                     | 10                   | 2                       | 1                 | 1                  | 6                  | 4                    | 12    | 41% |
|   | male faculty (N=28) | female faculty (N=13) | white faculty (n=53) | faculty of color (N=18) | COE faculty (n=6) | LSA faculty (N=18) | MED faculty (N=6)  | Other faculty (n=11) | total | %   |
| <b>Specific factors: senior faculty</b>     |                     |                       |                      |                         |                   |                    |                    |                      |       |     |
| opportunities for leadership                | 7                   | 3                     | 9                    | 1                       | 2                 | 3                  | 1                  | 4                    | 10    | 24% |
| opportunities to have impact, voice         | 9                   | 3                     | 10                   | 2                       | 2                 | 2                  | 4                  | 4                    | 12    | 38% |
| recognizing contributions in the department | 11                  | 5                     | 13                   | 3                       | 1 <sup>a</sup>    | 6                  | 5 <sup>ab</sup>    | 4 <sup>b</sup>       | 16    | 49% |
| fostering a collegial environment           | 7                   | 5                     | 10                   | 2                       | 0 <sup>a</sup>    | 5                  | 4 <sup>a</sup>     | 3                    | 12    | 36% |

**Table 8: Was the Move a Good One for You and Your Career?**

|                                    | male faculty (N=48) | female faculty (N=23) | white faculty (n=53) | faculty of color (N=18) | junior faculty (N=30) | senior faculty (N=41) | COE faculty (N=9) | LSA faculty (N=24) | MED faculty (N=18) | Other faculty (N=20) | total | %   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|-----|
| no                                 | 0                   | 1                     | 1                    | 0                       | 0                     | 1                     | 0                 | 1                  | 0                  | 0                    | 1     | 1%  |
| not sure                           | 4                   | 4                     | 5                    | 3                       | 1                     | 7                     | 2                 | 3                  | 1                  | 2                    | 8     | 11% |
| yes and no                         | 1                   | 1                     | 2                    | 0                       | 1                     | 1                     | 0                 | 0                  | 1                  | 1                    | 2     | 3%  |
| yes for family life/not for career | 6                   | 2                     | 6                    | 2                       | 3                     | 5                     | 1                 | 5                  | 0                  | 2                    | 8     | 11% |
| yes                                | 37                  | 15                    | 39                   | 13                      | 25                    | 27                    | 6                 | 15                 | 16                 | 15                   | 52    | 73% |

<sup>ab</sup>Denotes statistically significant difference at  $p \leq .05$ .

**Table 9: How Current Situation Compares to Experiences at UM**

|  | male<br>faculty<br>(N=48) | female<br>faculty<br>(N=23) | white<br>faculty<br>(n=53) | faculty<br>of color<br>(N=18) | junior<br>faculty<br>(N=30) | senior<br>faculty<br>(N=41) | COE<br>faculty<br>(N=9) | LSA<br>faculty<br>(N=24) | MED<br>faculty<br>(N=18) | Other<br>faculty<br>(N=20) | total | %   |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-----|
| <b>What's better:</b>                          |                           |                             |                            |                               |                             |                             |                         |                          |                          |                            |       |     |
| salary/resources                               | 12                        | 8                           | 15                         | 5                             | 5                           | 15                          | 2                       | 7                        | 7                        | 4                          | 20    | 29% |
| research                                       | 9                         | 9                           | 13                         | 5                             | 11                          | 7                           | 2                       | 3                        | 6                        | 7                          | 18    | 25% |
| teaching                                       | 6                         | 7                           | 10                         | 3                             | 6                           | 7                           | 2                       | 5                        | 2                        | 4                          | 13    | 18% |
| climate (mentoring & leadership opportunities) | 11                        | 3                           | 10                         | 4                             | 6                           | 8                           | 1                       | 5                        | 5                        | 3                          | 14    | 20% |
| work/life balance; child care; lifestyle       | 3                         | 1                           | 4                          | 0                             | 4 <sup>a</sup>              | 0 <sup>a</sup>              | 0                       | 1                        | 2                        | 1                          | 4     | 6%  |
| department overall                             | 16                        | 8                           | 17                         | 7                             | 15 <sup>a</sup>             | 9 <sup>a</sup>              | 4                       | 6                        | 9                        | 5                          | 24    | 34% |
| administrative issues                          | 13                        | 4                           | 14                         | 3                             | 5                           | 12                          | 2                       | 5                        | 8                        | 2                          | 17    | 24% |
| better for partner                             | 3                         | 2                           | 4                          | 1                             | 1                           | 4                           | 1                       | 2                        | 1                        | 1                          | 5     | 7%  |
| home life                                      | 3                         | 1                           | 2                          | 2                             | 2                           | 2                           | 1                       | 1                        | 1                        | 1                          | 4     | 6%  |
| geography                                      | 8                         | 3                           | 6                          | 5                             | 4                           | 7                           | 2                       | 5                        | 2                        | 2                          | 11    | 16% |
| workload                                       | 2                         | 2                           | 2                          | 2                             | 0                           | 4                           | 0                       | 4                        | 0                        | 0                          | 4     | 6%  |
| <b>What's worse:</b>                           |                           |                             |                            |                               |                             |                             |                         |                          |                          |                            |       |     |
| salary/resources                               | 6                         | 2                           | 8                          | 0                             | 4                           | 4                           | 3                       | 2                        | 2                        | 1                          | 8     | 11% |
| research                                       | 5                         | 1                           | 5                          | 1                             | 4                           | 2                           | 1                       | 2                        | 3                        | 0                          | 6     | 9%  |
| teaching                                       | 5                         | 0                           | 4                          | 1                             | 2                           | 3                           | 2                       | 3                        | 0                        | 0                          | 5     | 7%  |
| climate (mentoring & leadership opportunities) | 3                         | 1                           | 3                          | 1                             | 2                           | 2                           | 1                       | 2                        | 1                        | 0                          | 4     | 6%  |
| work/life balance; child care; lifestyle       | 1                         | 0                           | 1                          | 0                             | 1                           | 0                           | 0                       | 1                        | 0                        | 0                          | 1     | 17% |
| department overall                             | 13                        | 3                           | 14                         | 2                             | 4                           | 12                          | 2                       | 6                        | 4                        | 4                          | 16    | 23% |
| administrative issues                          | 10                        | 9                           | 15                         | 4                             | 11                          | 8                           | 0                       | 5                        | 6                        | 8                          | 19    | 27% |
| miss colleagues                                | 9                         | 5                           | 11                         | 3                             | 4                           | 10                          | 2                       | 6                        | 1                        | 5                          | 14    | 20% |
| home life                                      | 0                         | 1                           | 0                          | 1                             | 1                           | 0                           | 0                       | 0                        | 1                        | 0                          | 1     | 1%  |
| geography                                      | 3                         | 2                           | 1 <sup>a</sup>             | 4 <sup>a</sup>                | 4                           | 1                           | 2                       | 1                        | 2                        | 0                          | 5     | 7%  |
| workload                                       | 0                         | 0                           | 0                          | 0                             | 0                           | 0                           | 0                       | 0                        | 0                        | 0                          | 0     | 0%  |

<sup>a</sup>Denotes statistically significant difference at  $p \leq .05$ .

**Table 10: Suggestions for New/Improved UM Policies and Procedures**

|  | male<br>faculty<br>(N=48) | female<br>faculty<br>(N=23) | white<br>faculty<br>(n=53) | faculty<br>of color<br>(N=18) | junior<br>faculty<br>(N=30) | senior<br>faculty<br>(N=41) | COE<br>faculty<br>(N=9) | LSA<br>faculty<br>(N=24) | MED<br>faculty<br>(N=18) | Other<br>faculty<br>(N=20) | total | %   |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-----|
| <b>General Issues:</b>                                     |                           |                             |                            |                               |                             |                             |                         |                          |                          |                            |       |     |
| leadership   | 9                         | 3                           | 10                         | 2                             | 6                           | 6                           | 2                       | 2                        | 5                        | 3                          | 12    | 17% |
| administrative accountability/transparency                 | 5                         | 4                           | 7                          | 2                             | 5                           | 4                           | 0 <sup>a</sup>          | 2 <sup>b</sup>           | 6 <sup>abc</sup>         | 1 <sup>c</sup>             | 0     | 13% |
| process for dispute resolution                             | 6 <sup>a</sup>            | 0 <sup>a</sup>              | 5                          | 1                             | 2                           | 4                           | 2                       | 1                        | 2                        | 1                          | 6     | 9%  |
| mentoring  | 3 <sup>a</sup>            | 7 <sup>a</sup>              | 7                          | 3                             | 8 <sup>a</sup>              | 2 <sup>a</sup>              | 0                       | 4                        | 3                        | 3                          | 10    | 14% |
| tenure system (transparency, flexibility)                  | 4                         | 5                           | 7                          | 2                             | 7 <sup>a</sup>              | 2 <sup>a</sup>              | 0 <sup>a</sup>          | 2 <sup>b</sup>           | 1 <sup>c</sup>           | 6 <sup>abc</sup>           | 0     | 13% |
| resources/salaries   | 12                        | 5                           | 15                         | 2                             | 2 <sup>a</sup>              | 15 <sup>a</sup>             | 3                       | 4                        | 4                        | 6                          | 17    | 24% |
| morale/climate   | 6 <sup>a</sup>            | 9 <sup>a</sup>              | 11                         | 4                             | 3 <sup>a</sup>              | 12 <sup>a</sup>             | 0                       | 6                        | 5                        | 4                          | 15    | 21% |
| better counter offers                                      | 4                         | 1                           | 3                          | 2                             | 2                           | 3                           | 1                       | 3                        | 1                        | 0                          | 5     | 7%  |
| pre-emptive retention                                      | 3                         | 0                           | 3                          | 0                             | 0                           | 3                           | 0                       | 2                        | 1                        | 0                          | 3     | 4%  |
| loyalty tax  | 0                         | 1                           | 0                          | 1                             | 0                           | 1                           | 0                       | 1                        | 0                        | 0                          | 1     | 1%  |
| teaching (load/team-teaching)                              | 0                         | 1                           | 1                          | 0                             | 1                           | 0                           | 0                       | 0                        | 0                        | 1                          | 1     | 1%  |
| workload   | 4                         | 3                           | 4                          | 3                             | 1                           | 6                           | 0                       | 5                        | 1                        | 1                          | 7     | 10% |
| partner/dual career issues                                 | 4                         | 5                           | 6                          | 3                             | 3                           | 6                           | 0                       | 5                        | 1                        | 3                          | 9     | 13% |
| work-family balance  | 1                         | 3                           | 3                          | 1                             | 2                           | 2                           | 0                       | 1                        | 1                        | 2                          | 4     | 6%  |
| <b>Issues specific to some groups:</b>                     |                           |                             |                            |                               |                             |                             |                         |                          |                          |                            |       |     |
| support for clinical track                                 | 1                         | 0                           | 1                          | 0                             | 1                           | 0                           | 0                       | 0                        | 1                        | 0                          | 1     | 1%  |
| recognition of RO1 equivalents                             | 2                         | 0                           | 2                          | 0                             | 1                           | 1                           | 0                       | 1                        | 1                        | 0                          | 2     | 3%  |
| interdisciplinary issues/working across units              | 6                         | 5                           | 7                          | 4                             | 4                           | 7                           | 1                       | 5                        | 2                        | 3                          | 11    | 16% |
| foster international collaborations                        | 1                         | 0                           | 1                          | 0                             | 1                           | 0                           | 0                       | 1                        | 0                        | 0                          | 1     | 1%  |
| short leashes on projects/conflict of interest constraints | 1                         | 0                           | 1                          | 0                             | 1                           | 0                           | 0                       | 0                        | 1                        | 0                          | 1     | 1%  |
| <b>Issues specific to junior faculty:</b>                  |                           |                             |                            |                               |                             |                             |                         |                          |                          |                            |       |     |
| climate  | 1                         | 0                           | 1                          | 0                             | 0                           | 1                           | 0                       | 1                        | 0                        | 0                          | 1     | 1%  |
| resources  | 1                         | 0                           | 0                          | 1                             | 1                           | 0                           | 0                       | 0                        | 0                        | 1                          | 1     | 1%  |
| leadership training  | 0                         | 1                           | 1                          | 0                             | 1                           | 0                           | 0                       | 0                        | 0                        | 1                          | 1     | 1%  |
| workload/mentoring/support                                 | 6                         | 0                           | 3                          | 3                             | 2                           | 4                           | 1                       | 3                        | 0                        | 2                          | 6     | 9%  |

<sup>abc</sup>Denotes statistically significant difference at  $p \leq .05$ .