

## **Executive Summary**

The 2012-2013 Faculty Welfare Committee developed a faculty climate survey administered by University Technology Services (UTS) to over 2000 faculty, with almost 740 faculty completing the survey during April-June 2013.

UTS generated graphical summaries for each item, as well as a file of all comments provided by faculty. The Office of the Provost provided support for a report to the Faculty Welfare Committee prepared by the Statistical Laboratory in the Department of Statistics that included item analyses and a qualitative summary of the long-form responses. The quantitative and qualitative summaries can present quite different pictures of unit atmosphere at USC, though results are largely consistent for other survey themes. Items from the questionnaire have been rephrased in this summary to ease interpretation of results.

### **Policies and Conditions at USC Columbia**

From the UTS summary, faculty support for changes in current policies or conditions at USC was strongest for the following items, listed in order of importance. The items cover a disparate range of issues, from benefits to infrastructure; from graduate student support to faculty governance.

1. Tuition assistance for children of faculty.
2. Improvement of USC building conditions.
3. Faculty involvement in selecting institution-wide software and technology.
4. Aid to attract and retain quality graduate students.
5. Improvements in campus accessibility for persons with disabilities.
6. Reduced teaching/service responsibilities to build research programs.
7. Parking.
8. Travel per diem.
9. Salary.
10. Research travel funds.

Faculty felt the university was most effective on the following items, listed in order from most effective. Most of the items reflect satisfaction with unit atmosphere, though remarks on unit atmosphere in the qualitative summary identify some of these very same issues as sources of concern. The high rankings for items on discrimination may reflect an absence of minorities in departments, though an abstention option should have precluded such responses.

1. Respect from department staff.
2. Addressing discrimination against or harassment of minorities.
3. Respect for colleagues' research.
4. Respect from students.
5. Respect from unit chair.
6. Addressing sex discrimination or harassment.
7. Respect from colleagues.

8. Department obligations scheduled within regular workday.
9. Reporting of minority discrimination or harassment.

### **Demographic Disparities**

The item analysis by the Statistical Laboratory looked for disparities within the demographic variables Gender and Faculty Rank (tenured, tenure-track, non-tenure track). Race/ethnicity disparities were summarized, but not tested, since the number of minority respondents was quite low. Note that one-third of the respondents provided no information on race/ethnicity.

### **Gender**

Thirteen items showed strong evidence of gender disparity, with female faculty uniformly expressing greater dissatisfaction than male faculty with current conditions or policies on the items in question. The five items with greatest gender disparity below highlight differences in unit atmosphere, health care, and research environment.

1. Equal treatment of male and female faculty.
2. Ability to discuss personal and/or family responsibilities when scheduling departmental obligations.
3. Sharing of views by all participants at faculty meetings.
4. Available health care options for family/household.
5. Presence of research colleagues on campus.

### **Faculty Rank**

There were 34 items with significant faculty rank disparities. Many of these significant items showed a gulf between non-tenure track faculty and tenured/tenure-track faculty, with high percentages of non-tenure track-faculty expressing dissatisfaction with current conditions or policies. The items with greatest faculty rank disparity focused exclusively on tenure and promotion issues.

This result is perhaps not unexpected since the items below could be seen as surrogates for faculty rank, though the direction of some of the disparities may be unanticipated. Tenured faculty were more satisfied with post-tenure review; Non-tenure track faculty were highly dissatisfied with the tenure/promotion process; tenure-track faculty had less understanding of unit criteria than tenured faculty; tenure-track faculty were more satisfied with assistance available for pre-tenure/promotion and more satisfied with feedback on progress to tenure and promotion.

1. Satisfaction with post-tenure review.
2. Satisfaction with the tenure/promotion process.
3. Understanding of unit criteria for achieving tenure/promotion.
4. Satisfaction with assistance available to pre-tenure/promotion.
5. Feedback on progress toward tenure/promotion